

**14**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2005-2006)**

**FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA**

**MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2005-2006)**

*[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained  
in the Eleventh Report of the Standing Committee on  
Rural Development (Fourteenth Lok Sabha)]*

**FOURTEENTH REPORT**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

FOURTEENTH REPORT  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2005-2006)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2005-2006)

*[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained  
in the Eleventh Report of the Standing Committee on  
Rural Development (Fourteenth Lok Sabha)]*

*Presented to Lok Sabha on .....*  
*Laid in Rajya Sabha on .....*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*November, 2005/Agrahayana, 1927 (Saka)*

**C.R.D. No. 017**

*Price : Rs. 43.00*

© 2005 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Eleventh Edition) and Printed by Jainco Art India, New Delhi-110 005.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2005-2006) .....	(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(v)
CHAPTER I      Report .....	1
CHAPTER II      Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government .....	26
CHAPTER III      Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's reply .....	48
CHAPTER IV      Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee .....	49
CHAPTER V      Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited .....	64

### APPENDICES

I.	Statement of Operational Guidelines on capital investment subsidy scheme for construction of rainwater harvesting structures for Individual Households, Community and Institutions .....	67
II.	Statement indicating position of enactment of legislation on control and development of ground water resources in various States as on the 12th March, 2003 .....	88
III.	Extracts of minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 27 October, 2005 .....	92
IV.	Analysis of Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Eleventh Report of the Committee (14th Lok Sabha) .....	99

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2005-2006)

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri L. Ganesan
5. Shri Mohan Jena
6. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
7. Shri Subhash Maharia
8. Shri Hannan Mollah
9. Shri Dawa Narbula
10. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
11. Shri K.C. Palanisamy
12. Shri Prabodh Panda
13. Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil
14. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
15. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
16. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
17. Shri Mohan Singh
18. Shri Sita Ram Singh
19. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
20. Shri Bagun Sumbrai
21. Shri Mitrasen Yadav

*Rajya Sabha*

22. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
23. Shrimati Vanga Geetha
24. Shri Ghanshyam Chandra Kharwar
25. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
26. Shri Penumalli Madhu
27. Shri Kalraj Mishra
28. Dr. Chandan Mitra
29. Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilonia
30. Dr. Faguni Ram
31. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

- |                           |   |                             |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri John Joseph       | — | <i>Secretary</i>            |
| 2. Shri S.K. Sharma       | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri V.K. Sharma       | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i>      |
| 4. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i>     |

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2005-2006) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Fourteenth Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Eleventh Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2004-2005) on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development).

2. The Eleventh Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 20 April, 2005. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 24 August, 2005.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 27 October, 2005.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Eleventh Report of the Committee is given in Appendix IV.

NEW DELHI;  
22 November, 2005  
1 Agrayana, 1927 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,  
*Chairman,*  
*Standing Committee on*  
*Rural Development.*

## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Rural Development (2005-2006) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Eleventh Report on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 20 April, 2005.

2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 41 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:

- (i) Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government:

Para Nos. 2.15, 2.32, 2.33, 2.43, 2.44, 2.64, 2.65, 3.12, 3.13, 3.14, 4.12, 4.13, 4.14, 4.17, 4.20, 4.23, 5.9, 5.10, 6.29, 6.30 and 6.31.

- (ii) Recommendation which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's reply:

Para No. 2.63.

- (iii) Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee:

Para Nos. 2.30, 2.31, 2.34, 2.45, 2.49, 2.50, 2.51, 2.66, 4.10, 4.11, 4.15, 4.16, 5.8, 6.26, 6.27 and 6.28.

- (iv) Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited:

Para Nos. 2.53, 4.24 and 5.7.

**3. The Committee desire that final replies in respect of recommendations for which only interim replies have been given by the Government should be furnished to the Committee within three months of the presentation of the Report.**

4. The Committee will now deal with action taken by the Government on some of these recommendations in the succeeding paragraphs.



## **A. Survey with regard to Slippage of Habitations**

### **Recommendations (Para Nos. 2.30, 2.31 and 2.34)**

5. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee for the last three years have been emphasizing the need to have the exact data of slippage of habitations. They note that in this direction a State-wise habitation survey was initiated and in 26 States the results have been made available. However there were some discrepancies in the data and the results are being revalidated by Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA). The Committee would like to be apprised of the final position with regard to slippage of habitations, after the revalidation is completed.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.30)*

“The Committee are constrained to note the handling of ‘Not Covered’ and ‘Partially Covered’ habitations by the Department. Although the Department admits that slippage of habitations is at a larger level and for that the Working Group for Tenth Plan has estimated 2.8 lakh slipped back habitations, the picture of slipped back habitations will be more clear when the final results of the aforesaid survey are made available. With the said state of affairs, the Department has continued to claim that the position of coverage of habitations in the country is 95 per cent. Not only that, States of Bihar, Chhattigarh, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, Daman and Diu and Delhi are stated to be the States/Union territories which have achieved 100 per cent coverage. The Committee disapprove the way a very bright picture as opposed to the ground position with regard to the availability of drinking water in the country is projected by the Department. The Committee strongly recommend that announcements regarding achievement of the Department should be realistic and accurately presented in various Budget documents presented to the Parliament as well as submitted to the Parliamentary Committees.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.31)*

“On the issue of periodical updation of data of slipped back habitations, the Committee note that the Department propose revalidation on the quarterly basis. The Committee find that revalidation is a detailed exercise and as such revalidation should

be done on yearly basis. On the issue of the reservations of State Governments, that they have no infrastructure in this regard, the Committee would like the Department to sort out the matter in consultation with the State Governments and the viable option of appointing some agency for the purpose and also for allocating outlay from the allocation of ARWSP should be explored. The details in this regard when finalized should be placed before the Committee for further review and comments."

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.34)*

6. The Government in the action taken replies have stated as under:

"As per the agreement, the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) is required to give validated data of habitation survey by February 2006. IIPA has initiated the data cleansing process in respect of 22 States till date. So the final position with regard to slippage is still not known at present. To expedite the revalidation process, the Department has called the representatives of States/UTs in different groups to discuss with the representatives of this Department, NIC and IIPA for effective and time bound action. The Committee will be apprised in due course of time."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.30)*

"The observation of the Committee have been noted and the process of obtaining slippage of habitations from States on annual basis has been initiated."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.31)*

"Under the Action Plan for Bharat Nirman the Department has asked the States/UTs to provide web-enabled computerized data of the uncovered habitations of CAP 99, as well as uncovered rural schools and quality affected and slipped back habitations. This would be in addition to obtaining annual slippages data from States. The Department has initiated the process of obtaining the data on annual basis, which is likely to result in presentation of realistic data on ongoing basis. The validation exercise is currently been done by IIPA. The Department will continue to do the validation annually through agency/agencies as and when required."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.34)*

7. The Committee have persistently been expressing their strongest concern over the dichotomy in the data with regard to accessibility and availability of drinking water in rural areas in the country. The said issue was stressed upon in the aforesaid recommendations of the Committee. The Committee note from the replies that the current position in this regard is as under:

- (i) surveys results with regard to slippage of habitations in 22 States are being revalidated by the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA). The revalidated data of habitation survey is to be made available by IIPA by February, 2006; and
- (ii) pursuant to the recommendations of the Committee, the Department has initiated the process of obtaining the information regarding the slippage of habitations from States on annual basis.

The Committee find that updation of the information with regard to slippage of FC and PC habitations to NC habitations on annual basis is not possible without procuring the initial data for which the survey is being initiated/revalidated as stated above. The Committee would like the Department to ensure that revalidation is completed by the stipulated date *i.e.* February, 2006 so that the future action with regard to regular updation of data on annual basis can be initiated by the State Governments.

The Committee also find that data with regard to 22 States/Union territory Administrations is being updated by IIPA. The Committee would like to be apprised of the status of the States/Union territory Administrations from which survey results are still awaited.

The Committee further find from the replies that the Department propose to discuss the issue of time bound action for completion as well as revalidation of survey with the State Governments/Union territory Administrations in different groups. The Committee would like that the issue of annual reporting of slippage of habitations should also be discussed with the representatives of State Governments/UT Administrations at the said meeting so that an effective mechanism can be worked out for the purpose. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the outcome of the aforesaid meeting.

The Committee in their earlier recommendation (refer para No. 2.34) had further observed that the State Governments had certain reservations with regard to infrastructure for periodic updation of slipped back habitations. The Committee had recommended to sort out the matter in consultation with the State Governments so that the viable option of appointing some agency for the purpose of and for allocating outlay from the allocation of ARWSP could be explored. The replies of the Department are silent on the aforesaid issue. The Committee would like the Department to respond on the matter so as to enable them to further review the position in this regard.

**B. Analysis of the mechanism of reporting by State Governments**

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.45)**

8. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee are further constrained to note that while in some States physical achievement is less than 50 per cent, some States could achieve the inflated targets as high as upto 2320 per cent in Orissa and 1300 per cent in Goa. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply of the Department that these States fix the targets on a very low scale whereas these States could cover much more habitations. The Committee find that there is gross mismatch between physical and financial achievements. besides such a data reflects that there is some sort of confusion in reporting the data by the State Governments. The Committee strongly recommend the Department to have a critical and indepth analysis of the mechanism of reporting by State Governments and explain the position to the Committee so as to enable them to understand State specific performance in a better way and comment further in this regard.”

9. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“This year the Department has undertaken a detailed exercise for fixing the realistic targets. The unit cost involved in coverage of not covered and partially covered habitations and the amount allocated to the States/UTs were taken into account while working out the targets.

It is pertinent to point out that even in 2004-05 the net physical achievement was to the extent of 92.63 per cent as against the target of coverage of 74,868 habitations, the actual achievement reported is 69,347. During 2005-06, the States and UTs have been given realistic targets for schools as well as habitations, keeping in view unit cost of coverage and availability of funds with different States.”

10. The Committee in their earlier recommendation had noticed that while in some States physical achievement of ARWSP was 50 per cent, some States could achieve the inflated targets as high as upto 2320 per cent in Orissa and 1300 per cent in Goa. While expressing concern over the gross mismatch between physical and financial achievements, the Committee had recommended to have a critical and in depth analysis of the mechanism of reporting by State Governments. In pursuance of the recommendation of the Committee, the Department has undertaken a detailed exercise for fixing the realistic targets whereby the unit cost involved in coverage of not covered and partially covered habitations and the amount allocated to States/UTs were taken into account. The Committee while appreciating the stand taken by the Department to ensure realistic targets note that nothing has been done to analyse the system of reporting by the State Governments. The reporting of achievement of inflated targets as high as 2320 per cent clearly indicates that there is some sort of confusion in reporting of data by State Governments.

The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation to check and analyse the mechanism of reporting by State Governments/Union territory Administrations and would like the Department to undertake critical assessment in this regard and inform the Committee accordingly.

#### **C. Inter-component Allocation of ARWSP**

##### **Recommendations (Para Nos. 2.49, 2.50, 4.10 and 4.11)**

11. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee find that different funding patterns have been adopted under the various components of ARWSP. Under ARWSP (Normal) 50 : 50 is the Central and State Government contribution, but in case of DDP, 100 per cent is the Central allocation. For quality and sustainability for which 15 per cent and 5 per cent of allocation respectively under ARWSP can be utilized, the Centre : State ratio is 75 : 25. For Swajaldhara for which 20 per cent of the outlay under ARWSP is earmarked, 90 per cent is the Central contribution and 10 per cent is the community contribution. While appreciating the fact that for quality and sustainability, States are being provided more Central funds, the Committee note that monitoring of such a complex inter-State allocation criterion is a difficult task. The Committee would like the Department to explain how the monitoring is being done so

as to ensure that the specified State contribution and specified inter-scheme allocation is ensured for the specific purpose, to enable the Committee to come to some meaningful conclusion and comment further in this regard."

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.49)*

"The Committee also note the water tight compartments for allocating resources for various components of ARWSP. For example for sustainability 5 per cent outlay is earmarked and for quality 15 per cent allocation can be used. 20 per cent of funds are earmarked for Swajaldhara. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to simplify the inter-component allocation of ARWSP. The Department may examine the issue and apprise the Committee accordingly."

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.50)*

"The Committee find from what has been stated above that the sustainability of system itself is dependent on sustainability of sources. Another noticeable issue is that 90 per cent of all drinking water is dependent on ground water sources. The ground water is depleting fast which may be the main reason for slippage of FC and PC habitations to NC habitations the details of which have been given in the previous chapter of the Report. In this scenario, the Committee conclude that the major challenge that the Department may have to face in the coming years is the sustainability of sources."

*Recommendation (Para No. 4.10)*

"The Committee further note that although the Department accepts the magnitude of the problem relating to sustainability of water sources, substantial efforts have not been made in this regard. Only 5 per cent of the funds under ARWSP could be used for water sustainability. The issue of water tight compartments for different components under ARWSP has been dealt with in the previous part of the report. Here the Committee would like to recommend to the Government to give more thrust on sustainability and the allocation for the purpose should be enhanced. There is an urgent need to enhance the allocation for sustainability since the issue of slippage of habitations can only be tackled by handling this issue. The Department would be able to achieve the objective of full coverage of habitations only when the problem of sustainability is properly handled. The

Committee would like the Department to take earnest action in this regard and inform the Committee accordingly."

*Recommendation (Para No. 4.11)*

12. The Government in the action taken replies have stated as under:

"In so far as ARWSP (DDP), ARWSP (Calamity Relief) and ARWSP (Swajaldhara) are concerned, there is no difficulty in monitoring as there is no State share for these components. However, in respect of remaining components watch has to be kept as for coverage as well as operation and maintenance, funding pattern is 50:50, and in respect of Quality and Sustainability it is 75 per cent Central and 25 per cent State. While releasing the second instalment, it is scrutinized whether the State Government has made provision for State contribution in accordance with the funding pattern. In case the contribution from the State is less than their due share as per the funding pattern, the release of Central funds are reduced accordingly in the release of second instalment."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.49)*

"To give due weightage to various aspects of the rural drinking water supply it is necessary to bifurcate the ARWSP funds in various components, viz., quality, sustainability, calamity relief, Swajaldhara etc. The funds for rural drinking water supply are mainly for the coverage of habitations through ARWSP (normal) but focus has also to be given on the coverage through reform process under Swajaldhara and also for quality and sustainability. For calamity relief, funds are required to be earmarked to leave some rooms to meet the contingencies arising out of natural calamities and other emergent situations."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.50)*

"Sustainability of sources is dependent on the replenishment of ground water table, which is the mandate of Ministry of Water Resources. As a User-Department, this Department contributes its share to the overall cause, by various methods of rain-water harvesting, roof-top harvesting and artificial recharge. This requires integrated efforts of various Ministries."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 4.10)*



“It is proposed to make sustainability, a part of coverage for which 70 per cent of ARWSP allocation will be earmarked. It is also proposed to make source-strengthening an integral part of all coverage schemes. Depending on requirement, States can utilize more funds for sustainability. Under Swajaldhara programme, sustainability of drinking water sources is an integral component of the water supply scheme. In this regard State Governments have been provided with a CD on Rainwater Harvesting and a Manual on Artificial Recharge and Rainwater Harvesting. Also, in order to identify the correct location for existing drinking water sources and also for locating water harvesting structures, hydrogeomorphological maps (groundwater prospect maps) have been got prepared for 10 States and sent to State Governments by utilizing services of National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA), Hyderabad.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 4.11)*

13. The Committee in their respective reports have repeatedly been recommending to the Department to lay more stress on sustainability and quality. The Committee find that there is no clarity in the stand of the Department in this regard. Pursuant to recommendation No. 2.50, whereby the Committee had recommended for simplification of the inter-component allocation of ARWSP, the Department has reproduced the already known inter-component allocation criterion as per the guidelines. However, in response to recommendation no. 4.11, the Department has stated that there is a proposal to make sustainability, a part of coverage for which 70 per cent of ARWSP allocation will be earmarked. As per the said proposal, State Governments would be provided flexibility to utilize funds for sustainability.

The Committee note that the problem of coverage is directly related to sustainability of the water resources. Not only this, the issue of quality of water is too related to sustainability. Besides, it is very difficult to monitor such a complex formula of Centre : State allocation whereby for each category different criteria have been fixed. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to provide some sort of flexibility to State Governments in addressing the issues of coverage, sustainability and quality. In view of the aforesaid position, the Department should reconsider the earlier recommendations of the Committee. The State Governments should be provided some flexibility in utilisation of allocation under ARWSP for coverage, sustainability and quality depending upon the



requirement. Besides, Centre-State inter-scheme allocation criteria should be simplified. The Committee would like a categorical response of the Department in this regard.

#### D. State's contribution under ARWSP

##### Recommendation (Para No. 2.51)

14. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee further note that under normal ARWSP, States are unable to contribute equal amount of what is allocated by the Central Government in a year. In this regard the Committee desire that the total outlay provided by the Union Government as well as State Governments so far may be furnished so as to enable the Committee to analyse the position of matching share by State Governments in a better way and comment further in this regard.”

15. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“As desired by the Committee the year-wise and State-wise details of the Central as well as State share is given as under:

#### Investment in Rural Drinking Water Supply—Centre and States

(Rs. in Crore)

Name of the State	Investment in Rural Drinking Water Supply					
	2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
	Central*	State	Central*	State	Central*	State
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Andhra Pradesh	208.73	161.18	316.40	182.40	373.88	96.61
Bihar	37.03	44.55	36.05	67.65	96.72	53.33
Chhattisgarh	29.43	65.15	32.40	72.75	26.90	75.11
Goa	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.61	0.00
Gujarat	99.98	195.18	145.68	199.42	114.06	186.60
Haryana	33.57	64.76	34.83	100.29	29.64	102.28
Himachal Pradesh	82.29	98.23	64.86	85.36	66.03	93.58

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jammu and Kashmir	111.96	80.85	150.59	108.00	150.22	125.00
Jharkhand	19.50	80.00	25.00	70.06	31.66	78.25
Karnataka	143.56	109.37	183.50	109.97	198.94	141.72
Kerala	18.99	66.70	70.14	76.82	63.25	113.39
Madhya Pradesh	95.86	124.38	113.65	115.61	120.27	89.96
Maharashtra	224.63	261.67	230.02	263.71	293.67	200.94
Orissa	61.47	64.43	84.53	68.96	104.38	59.53
Punjab	30.81	84.95	26.73	76.19	35.33	109.77
Rajasthan	247.18	379.31	298.18	440.10	370.79	475.93
Tamil Nadu	129.28	411.00	135.92	375.00	161.59	411.00
Uttaranchal	45.05	71.56	27.63	73.70	40.71	77.11
Uttar Pradesh	113.66	192.04	135.10	197.14	169.92	101.58
West Bengal	101.15	120.03	109.46	68.79	103.05	88.87
Arunachal Pradesh	36.50	30.09	45.92	53.11	70.79	55.70
Assam	56.23	56.30	106.33	70.25	140.76	87.86
Manipur	9.47	21.79	17.02	9.00	21.03	17.00
Meghalaya	29.36	22.60	22.14	29.25	30.86	31.00
Mizoram	21.96	18.20	14.75	17.56	20.77	16.78
Nagaland	21.81	21.81	19.81	15.61	20.85	15.41
Sikkim	8.96	12.70	7.91	12.96	9.03	15.38
Tripura	31.98	20.14	28.64	20.21	24.43	18.61
<b>Total</b>	<b>2050.40</b>	<b>2878.97</b>	<b>2483.32</b>	<b>2979.86</b>	<b>2890.11</b>	<b>2938.31</b>
<b>Total Central Budget Utilised</b>	<b>2100.70</b>		<b>2564.90</b>		<b>2930.78</b>	

\*Central releases include releases under ARWSP (normal), DDP, Calamity, PM's programme. Sector Reforms/Swajaldhara and Management Information System (MIS)

16. The Committee in the earlier recommendation had desired the information relating to total outlay provided by the Union Government and State Governments so far under normal ARWSP. The Department instead of furnishing the total outlay in this regard has given the data for the years 2002-2003, 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. The Committee would like the Department to furnish the requisite data as per the earlier recommendation.

While analysing the data furnished for the aforesaid three years, the Committee find that Andhra Pradesh, J&K, Goa, Karnataka and Tripura have contributed considerably lesser amount than Central allocation under ARWSP in all the three years. Another trend noticed is that the number of States not contributing equal matching share as per the guidelines is increasing year after year. In 2002-03, eight States/Union Territory Administrations contributed lesser than the Central allocation. The number of States/Union territory Administrations increased to ten in 2003-04 and seventeen in 2004-05.

The Committee further note that as per the guidelines (refer Para 2.5.1 of guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programmes) the allocation of Central Assistance under the ARWSP is subject to the matching provision/expenditure by the States under the State Sector Minimum Needs Programme (MNP). Releases under the ARWSP would not exceed the provision for Rural Water Supply made by the State Government under the MNP. In such a situation the Committee fail to understand how the Central allocation is being released without ensuring the equal allocation by the State Governments as per the stipulated guidelines. The Committee while expressing the strong concern over the matter would like the Department to analyse the reasons therefor and inform the Committee accordingly.

#### **E. Special Allocation under ARWSP**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.53)**

17. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee appreciate that special allocation is indicated in the aforesaid para has been made for Tsunami affected States *viz.*, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Pondicherry and Kerala. The Committee call for strict monitoring so as to ensure that the allocation earmarked for Tsunami affected areas is utilized for the intended objective *i.e.* restoration of water supply to such areas.”

18. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“The funds have been released to the States/UTs concerned for the purpose of restoration of water supply in such areas and this intention has been indicated to them while releasing funds from calamity relief component of ARWSP. The States/UTs concerned have been asked to provide information about the utilization of fund and restoration of water supply in the affected areas.”

**19. The Committee note that Tsunami affected States/Union territory Administrations which provided special funds under ARWSP have been asked to report about the utilisation of funds and restoration of water supply in the affected areas. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation for strict monitoring and would like to be apprised about the details of physical and financial achievement in this regard.**

#### **E-1 Replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.65)**

19A. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee in their earlier report (Para No. 2.60 of 1st Report—14th Lok Sabha) had examined the concept of replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara and expressed serious concerns in this regard. \* \* \* The Committee strongly recommend to review the position in this regard in the light of what has been stated above and the apprehensions expressed by the Committee. The Committee may be adequately explained about the position to enable them to analyse the not so encouraging performance of ARWSP as evaluated above.”

19B. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“The Committee have noted earlier that now the Department has initiated action to extend the reforms process to ARWSP instead of replacing it with Swajaldhara. The detailed modalities for this are still being discussed in the EFC and the Committee shall be informed of the same when finalised. It is proposed to gradually incorporate the reforms, *i.e.* community participation, from the Eleventh Plan. In the intervening period, the States are to be guided towards a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Department to enable them to take up the reforms. \* \* \*”

19C The Committee note that the detailed modalities to extend the reforms process to ARWSP are being discussed in the Expenditure Finance Committee (EFC) and it is proposed to gradually incorporate the reforms *i.e.* community participation from the Eleventh Plan. The Committee while noting that ARWSP and Swajaldhara are two district schemes of drinking water, would like to reiterate their earlier stand on the issue of replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara. These two schemes should be implemented separately. The concern of the Committee expressed in their earlier recommendations should be considered while finalizing the policy for drinking water schemes for Eleventh Plan.

The Committee further note that as per the guidelines (refer Para 3.4.1. of the Guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme and Para No. 15.4 of guidelines of Swajaldhara) funds for Sector reforms and Swajaldhara are released district-wise. The Committee would like that the guidelines in this regard should be strictly followed and the unit of allocation/releases of funds for all the Central Sector Schemes of drinking water should be the district.

#### **F. Relaxed norms for backward districts under Swajaldhara**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.66)**

20. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee note that recently Swajaldhara guidelines have been amended to reduce proportion of cash contribution from 5 per cent to 2.5 per cent in the case of Scheduled Tribe/ Scheduled Caste habitations. The remaining 7.5 per cent contribution can be in kind (labour, material etc.). The Committee would like that the possibility of extending the facility of said relaxed norms should be explored in case of most backward districts in the country.”

21. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“Extent of SC/ST population is one of the criteria for identification of the most backward districts, along with agricultural productivity per worker and agriculture wage rate. There are specific poverty alleviation schemes for the most backward districts; it may not be desirable to extend the relaxed community contribution in these districts. However, as burden of community contribution is related to the cost of schemes, which in turn is dependent on geohydrological conditions, a proposal to give flexibility to State Governments/SWSM to further relax the extent of the cash contribution in DDP and hill areas is under consideration.”

22. The Committee find that their earlier recommendation to extend the facility of relaxed norms with regard to proportion of cash contribution under 'Swajaldhara' on the lines of relaxation provided to Scheduled Tribes/Scheduled Castes habitations to most backward districts in the country has not been agreed by the Department. The plea taken is that there are specific poverty alleviation schemes for the most backward districts.

The Committee are not inclined to accept the reply of the Department. The Committee find that there is a proposal to extend the relaxation in condition of community contribution in DDP and hill areas on the basis of higher costs due to geohydrological conditions. While appreciating the said proposal of the Department, the Committee feel that there is an urgent need to consider most backward districts too for said relaxation. The people in most backward districts may not be in a position to contribute ten per cent of community contribution in cash. However, they may contribute by kind (labour, material). The Committee also note that the main purpose of community contribution is to provide ownership concept of assets created under a scheme and contribution by way of labour or material is altogether appreciable in this context. The Committee would like the Department to reconsider the earlier recommendation to extend the facility of relaxed norms to most backward districts so that more and more Swajaldhara schemes can be taken in such districts.

#### **G. Water Testing Laboratories**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.14)**

23. The Committee had recommended as under:

"The Committee find that in order to address the water quality problems, it is essential to identify the exact problems besides ascertaining the magnitude of the problem. The Committee feel that if the water quality is tested correctly it will go a long way in dealing with the problem of contamination of drinking water. The Committee appreciate the position of the Government to institutionalize community based water quality monitoring and surveillance programme by adoption of catchment area project wherein quality will be tested at the grass roots level by the Panchayats/VWSC. The Committee also note that some efforts are being made to provide district level testing laboratories, for

which Rs. 425.95 lakh have been released by the Department. The Committee would like to know the physical performance of the funds released in this regard so far. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the funding pattern for water quality testing laboratories at the Panchayats/VWSC level.”

24. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“The physical performance of the funds released for providing district level water quality testing laboratories for which, an amount of Rs. 429.95 lakh has been released by the Department, is as follows:

Labs sanctioned = 442; Labs established = 268.

The State Governments are being requested to send the updated status reports and also to expedite setting up of the remaining labs. Uttar Pradesh is seeking funds as per the revised norms as they could not set up the labs in the year in which these were sanctioned. Wherever required, like in Bihar, revalidation requests are being processed. Gujarat has informed that they would out-source water quality monitoring services. Some States are facing problems of non-availability of technical staff for manning these laboratories, due to ban on creation of posts by the State Governments. Options like out-sourcing, employing trained manpower on contract basis, etc. are to be considered in such cases. As regards funding pattern for water quality testing laboratory at the Panchayat/VWSC level, 100 per cent funding from Central Government for provision of field-testing kits, one for each revenue village, has been proposed under the National Rural Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance Programme.”

**25. The Committee appreciate the proposal of the Department to provide 100 per cent Central funding for providing field testing kits, one for each revenue village. They hope that the decision in this regard is taken at the earliest. As regards the existing position with regard to district level laboratories, the Committee find from the data that there is a huge gap between labs sanctioned and labs established. The Committee would like to be apprised of the reasons for this huge difference specifically when 100 per cent funds are to be provided by the Central Government. Since water testing labs can go a long way in tackling the problem of contamination of water, the Committee would like the Department to pursue the matter further with the State Governments.**

Besides, the Committee find that problems are also being faced for manning these laboratories by some of the State Governments. The Committee would like the Department to interact with the State Governments in this regard so that a viable solution can be found.

#### **H. Water Conservation**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.15)**

26. The Committee had recommended as under:

“On the issue of water conservation, the Committee note that ARWSP guidelines provide for dual water policy for rural habitations facing acute water problems. The Committee feel that dual water policy should apply to all areas of the country since scarcity of drinking water is the issue concerning all the States/ Union Territories. It should be ensured that every habitation should use the treated water for drinking and cooking and for other purposes, like washing and ablution, untreated water can be used. The Committee recommend to the Department to think of revising ARWSP guidelines and inform them about the action taken in this regard.”

27. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“As per ARWSP guidelines, dual water policy is to be followed in quality affected habitations only, for serving the minimum needs for cooking and drinking purposes. Only about 14 per cent of the total habitations are affected with water quality. In the remaining 86 per cent non-contaminated habitations, the norms of 40 lpcd are being followed for water supply.”

28. The Committee are constrained to note the casual reply furnished by the Department on such a serious issue *i.e.* water conservation and management. On the recommendation of the Committee to have dual water policy for all rural areas in the country, it has simply been stated that as per the guidelines dual water policy is to be followed in quality-affected habitations. The Committee deplore the way their recommendation on such a serious matter is dealt with. The Committee find that there is an urgent need to conserve each drop of drinking water. As such there is an urgent need to implement dual water policy in each area in the country. The Committee while reiterating their earlier recommendation would like that the issue of dual policy with regard to use of water in rural areas should be dealt with seriously and the guidelines revised accordingly.



## **I. Water Management**

### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.16)**

29. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee find that efforts have not been made so far for treating the used water and then supplying the same for drinking water purposes. Besides another issue which needs urgent attention is the leakage of water where water is being supplied through pipes. The Committee would like the Department to analyze the position in this regard, take the desired action and inform them accordingly.”

30. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“During various review meetings and also during the technical review meetings held by the officials of this Department, the concerned State Government are requested to pay more attention to reduce leakage of water especially through pipelines. In rural areas, the predominant water supply is arranged through hand pumps. Guidelines on sustainability have been issued in 2002.”

**31. The Committee note that the reply of the Department on the aforesaid recommendation is incomplete. No response has been given to the part of the recommendation whereby the Committee have desired to analyse the position with regard to treating the used water and then supplying the same for drinking purposes. The Committee would like the Department to respond on the aforesaid issue.**

## **J. Desalination Project at Lakshadweep**

### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.24)**

32. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee further note that Union Territory of Lakshadweep has furnished a request for setting up of sea water based desalination plant at Kavaratti. The proposal is being processed for SFC approval. The Committee would like the early clearance of the said project. The Committee also calls for more serious attempts by the Department on this issue in view of what has been stated above.”

33. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“The proposal of setting up a desalination plant, 300 cubic meter per day capacity at Kavaratti has been approved by the SFC in April, 2005 at a cost of Rs. 8.97 crore. The Administrator of UT of Lakshadweep has recently informed that a 100 cubic meter per day desalination plant based on the latest technology called as low temperature thermal desalination has been installed at Kavaratti at a cost of Rs. 4.95 crore. Services of National Institute of Ocean Technology, Chennai have been taken for the purpose. This Department has asked the UT of Lakshadweep to identify whether this particular plant can be upgraded from 100 cubic meter per day capacity to 300 cubic meter per day capacity, which will be the requirement of Kavaratti. Reply from Lakshadweep UT Administration is awaited.”

**34. The Committee find that the proposal for setting up desalination plant of 300 cubic meter per day capacity costing Rs. 8.97 crore at Kavaratti in Lakshadweep has been approved by SFC. The Committee also note that UT of Lakshadweep has been requested to identify whether the recently installed desalination plant of the capacity of 100 cubic meter per day can be upgraded to 300 cubic meter per day capacity. The Committee hope that the State Government of Lakshadweep may have responded by now. The Committee would like early action in this regard so that the desalination plant of 300 cubic meter can be installed/upgraded expeditiously. The Committee would also like to be informed in this regard.**

#### **K. Drinking Water in Schools**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 5.7)**

35. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee have repeatedly been drawing the attention of the Department towards the urgent need to provide safe drinking water in rural schools in a stipulated time frame. In spite of that the work has not been done at the desired level. As per Government’s own data 34 per cent of the Government schools are yet to have facility of drinking water. The ground reality in this regard may be further grim. About private, public and Government aided schools, the data of drinking water availability is yet to be procured. Further alarming is the data with regard to achievement of physical targets by States/Union territories

during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. As many as 8 States/Union Territories reported nil performance during 2003-2004. Further, for Haryana, Daman and Diu, Delhi and Lakshadweep no targets were fixed. The worse is the position during 2004-2005. Twelve States/Union Territories reported nil achievement. The Committee find that the Government have set the targets of coverage of all schools by the end of Tenth Plan. In this scenario it seems difficult to achieve the targets. Another disturbing fact noticed by the Committee is the Department's concept that there is no question of slippage of coverage of schools. The Committee fail to understand as to how the Department can stop the various issues such as the resources being dry, or the system going non-operational which is rampant in case of rural habitations when it comes to the issue of school coverage. The Committee are constrained to note the thinking of the Department in this regard. Without verifying the ground reality, the Department has chosen to state that the position of slippage of coverage of schools for non-coverage is not applicable to schools. The Committee would like to be apprised of the reaction of the Department in this regard."

36. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

"The Department agrees with the observation of the Committee that there could be slippage in schools too. In the light of observations of the Committee and pending receipt of results of the Seventh All India Education Survey, the Department has initiated collection of data on schools where drinking water facilities are not functioning, as well as data on availability of drinking water facilities in Government-aided and private schools."

**37. The Committee find that pursuant to their recommendation to verify the position of slippage of coverage of schools, the Department has initiated action for collection of data in this regard from Government, Government aided and private schools. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the agencies involved for the collection of the said data and the targets fixed in this regard.**

#### **L. Drinking Water in Schools under Swajaldhara**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 5.8)**

38. The Committee had recommended as under:

"On the issue of contributing 10 per cent community contribution from MPLAD funds for the schools covered under Swajaldhara,

the Committee fail to understand the logic furnished by the Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation that MPLAD funds, which is Government's funding cannot be substitute for community contribution. The Committee strongly feel that schools cannot be treated at par with other rural habitations. The schools can not be deprived of drinking water or sanitation in case community is not ready to contribute. If MPLAD funds can not be equated with community contribution, then 100 percent Central assistance should be provided for coverage of schools in this regard."

39. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

"For the coverage of schools under ARWSP, there is no contribution from community as funding pattern is 50 per cent Central and 50 per cent State. Swajaldhara is a contributory approach with 90 per cent Central and 10 per cent community contribution. Rural schools can be covered by the States and UTs from the funds provided under ARWSP."

**40. The Committee find the reply of the Department vague and evasive. The Committee had raised the issue of contributing 10 per cent community contribution from MPLAD funds for the schools covered under Swajaldhara or 100 per cent contribution for schools under the scheme. The Department instead of working on the formula suggested by the Committee have chosen to clarify the position of Centre-State contribution under ARWSP. The Committee find that school coverage is part of Swajaldhara too and the recommendation of the Committee related to school coverage under Swajaldhara only. The Committee deplore the way the Department has dealt with their recommendation. The Committee would like the Department to reconsider their recommendation and take action urgently.**

#### **M. Adequate Outlay for Rural Sanitation**

##### **Recommendations (Para Nos. 6.26 and 6.27)**

41. The Committee had recommended as under:

"The Committee have repeatedly been expressing their strongest concern on the issue of sanitation in rural areas in their respective reports. However, nothing substantial could be done so far. It is a matter of serious concern that even after more than five decades of planned development in the country only 31 per cent of the

rural households, that too as per the Government's own data could be provided latrines, not to speak of the total sanitation. As many as 64 per cent of the rural households defacate in open. As rightly admitted by the Finance Minister, sanitation remains critically deficient out of Rs. 3,663 crore proposed during Tenth Plan, the Department has got Rs. 955 crore which is around one-fourth of the proposed outlay of the Department. The Committee further note that fund required for rural sanitation would be of the order of Rs. 676 billion and Rs. 503 billion respectively if the goal of achieving 50 per cent of rural sanitation by 2015 and full sanitation by 2025 has to be achieved as set by 'World Summit for Sustainable Development' held at Johannesburg in 2002. More so as per Department's own estimates, a total of Rs. 5,932 crore would be required if the target of covering the whole country by Total Sanitation Programme has to be achieved by 2010. The Committee observe that during 2005-2006, the outlay has been increased from Rs. 400 crore as provided during 2004-2005 to Rs. 700 crore. But even the enhanced outlay is not sufficient. There is an urgent need to step up the outlay considerably."

*Recommendation (Para No. 6.26)*

"The Committee further find that the Department has initiated action for mobilizing resources through domestic resources and World Bank. The proposal in this regard after the approval of Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission has been forwarded to the World Bank. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the projects to be taken up by the World Bank assistance. Besides the Committee note that there is enough potential to mobilise resources through internal as well as international resources like World Bank. The Committee urge to pay more attention in this regard keeping in view the funds constraint."

*Recommendation (Para No. 6.27)*

42. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

"It is true that Rural Sanitation coverage in the country is low. It was only 22 percent in 2001 which has increased to 33 percent in 2005. There could be 11 percent increase in rural sanitation coverage since 2001 due to implementation of Total Sanitation Campaign. During the 10th Plan Period, Planning Commission

had allocated only Rs. 955 crore which was a meagre amount. However, in the Mid-Term Appraisal of the Tenth Plan, Planning Commission has agreed to increase it by another Rs. 1,350 crore and already during the four years of the current Plan approximately Rs. 1,450 crore has been made available. It is expected that the actual availability of fund for rural sanitation in the Tenth Plan would be Rs. 2,300 crore.

The Department has estimated that for implementation of Total Sanitation Campaign in all the districts in the country, approximately Rs. 5,951 crore would be required. Of late Planning Commission has already stepped up the allocation for rural sanitation and it is expected that adequate funds would be provided by the Planning Commission for rural sanitation in the years to come."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 6.26)*

"In the year 2003, Department has estimated a budgetary gap of Rs. 4,086 crore for implementation of Total Sanitation Campaign and accordingly initiated steps to mobilise resources from World Bank funding. Proposal in this regard has been sent to Department of Economic Affairs which in turn has forwarded it to the World Bank. In the meantime, considering the necessity of promoting rural sanitation coverage, Planning Commission has already enhanced the budgetary allocation. Considering the current level of budgetary allocation of Rs. 700 crore in 2005-06 and maintaining a normal growth rate in the allocation, it is expected that the budgetary gap of Rs. 4,086 crore can easily be met and there may not be any necessity to seek World Bank funding for rural sanitation sector."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 6.27)*

**43. The Committee find from the replies of the Department that out of Rs. 5,951 crore projected outlay for Tenth Plan, actual availability of funds for rural sanitation would be to the tune of Rs. 2,300 crore. Thus, there will be a gap of Rs. 3,651 crore. Further in the year 2003, the Department has estimated a budgetary gap of Rs. 4,086 crore. On the one hand it has been stated that steps are being taken to mobilize resources from World Bank funding, on the other hand it has been submitted that it may not be necessary to seek World Bank funding for rural sanitation sector keeping in view the current level of budgeting. The Committee fail to understand the line of action taken by the Department so far as the issue of**

mobilization of funds for rural sanitation is concerned. There is no clarity on the data as well as the policy of the Department to mobilize resources for the purpose. The Committee while expressing their deep concern over the way the replies have been furnished by the Department would like the Department to clarify the position so as to enable the Committee to analyse the position and comment further in this regard.

#### **N. Construction of Toilets in rural areas in the country**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 6.28)**

44. The Committee had recommended as under:

“Besides funds constraint, the Committee find that implementation of the sanitation programme is not too impressive. Out of 3,94,48,353 sanctioned BPL toilets, the achievement is 94,94,525. Community complexes position is further worse. Out of 30,203 community complexes sanctioned so far, the achievement is 4,607. The State-wise position also indicates the similar view. There is huge difference between releases and expenditure. Worst is the position in certain North-Eastern States. In 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, in Mizoram, Manipur and Meghalaya the position of expenditure reported as well as toilets constructed is nil. As per Government's own admission States like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, Gujarat, North-Eastern States, Himachal Pradesh, Goa and Karnataka are some of the non-performing States. In this scenario the Committee find that merely enhancing the outlay will not be sufficient. Since Total Sanitation Campaign is a demand driven programme there is an urgent need for educating the masses about the ill effects of open defecation. The success of the programme can be achieved through public involvement. More needs to be done with regard to the involvement of Panchayats, NGOs/VOs so that public through them can be educated and more projects could be demanded by them. State Governments too need to be motivated in this regard. The Committee feel that the Department has to work on war footing, if the objective of total sanitation is to be achieved within a stipulated time frame.”

45. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“It is true that in order to promote rural sanitation, the Department has to work on war-footing and it has been doing so since the launch of the programme. The implementation of



Total Sanitation Campaign programme is not uniform throughout the country. There are States where the implementation is picking up quickly whereas in some States it is slow. However, various steps have been taken to improve the pace of implementation and to ensure that higher priority is given by the States and district implementing agencies to this programme. As a result the implementation has improved significantly in the past 3-4 years and more than 1.31 crore household toilets have been constructed under TSC which is more than the number of toilets constructed under erstwhile CRSP during 1986 to 2002. All out efforts are being made to ensure that slow moving States also give high priority to TSC implementation.

In order to ensure greater community involvement, the Department has launched Nirmal Gram Puraskar which is an incentive scheme for the PRIs, individuals and organizations working for successful implementation of the programme. This has evoked good response and in 2005, 38 Gram Panchayats and 2 Block Panchayats have got this award. In addition to this, greater focus on Information Education and Communication (IEC) as well as capacity building of different stakeholders has been given to ensure better implementation of the programme. It is expected that Department will get good results of these efforts in near future."

**46. The Committee in their earlier recommendation had expressed concern over the poor performance of rural sanitation programme and stressed on the need for public involvement through Panchayats and NGOs/VOs. The Committee also laid emphasis on motivation of State Governments in this regard. The Committee find from the replies of the Department that while on the one hand it has accepted the challenge of providing sanitation facilities to rural areas in the country, on the other hand a sense of complacency is reflected in the reply. The achievement of targets with regard to providing sanitary latrines is as low as around 25 per cent. The position of community complexes is worse where the achievement is as low as around 15 per cent. Even then the Department has tried to justify the achievement by comparing the cumulative data between 1986 to 2002 and the last 3-4 years. The Committee express strong concern over the poor performance of Rural Sanitation Programme. They would like to be apprised about the concrete corrective action taken by the Department so far. The Committee are of the view that there is an urgent need to work on this in the mission mode and there is no scope of being complacent. As such the Committee calls for concrete action on the lines suggested in the earlier recommendation.**



## CHAPTER II

### RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

#### **Recommendation (Para 2.15)**

The Committee note from the data furnished by the Department that during Tenth Plan, the allocation made for drinking water is Rs. 13,245 crore against the proposed outlay of the Department amounting to Rs. 24,800 crore. The Department has later projected outlay of Rs. 26,000 crore. Thus almost half of what was proposed for Tenth Plan has been made available for the Department. Further during the first four years of Tenth Plan upto 2005-2006, Rs. 7,275.19 crore could be allocated. Thus Rs. 5,969.81 crore is the balance amount. Besides, the Committee find that to achieve the target envisaged in the National Common Minimum Programme of the Government the requirement of outlay for the next five years has been assessed as Rs. 31,950 crore. As regards the releases from the Department, the data indicate 100% achievement. State-wise allocation and spending position has been reviewed in the subsequent part of the report.

The Committee find from the information provided by the Department that the gap between the projected outlay and the existing allocation is to be filled through enhanced budgetary and extra budgetary support. For the said purpose three projects in Kerala, Karnataka and Maharashtra with World Bank loan component of US \$ 398.10 million were taken up. Out of these, two projects have been completed. Further three more projects in the said States are being taken up with World Bank assistance. Another method suggested is taking up the projects on private-public partnership. The Department has proposed to analyze the private-public partnership in five States namely Uttaranchal, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Karnataka and West Bengal.

In the aforesaid scenario the Committee conclude that resource constraint is the major challenge for achieving the laudable targets set by the Government. Even the proposed extra budgetary support is not to be required level. The Committee note that drinking water is the fundamental need for the survival of life in the world. As such, it

needs top most priority. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend the following:

- (i) Central allocation for drinking water should further be augmented. There cannot be any compromise on the issue of drinking water. The Government should provide the requisite outlay to achieve the set objective;
- (ii) There is enough scope for getting loans from the World Bank and other international institutions/organizations etc. Efforts should be made in this regard and more projects in the remaining States should be taken up; and
- (iii) The proposal for private-public partnership should be analysed expeditiously and the Committee be apprised of the outcome of such analysis in the aforesaid five States.

#### **Reply of the Government**

- (i) The Department has been pursuing augmentation of central allocation for drinking water supply vigorously with the result that it became possible to increase the central allocation. This would be evident from the fact that as against Rs. 2900 crores in 2004-05, the allocation for 2005-06 is Rs. 4050 crores. In the mid-term review of the 10th plan, Planning Commission has agreed to provide an additional amount of Rs. 3,500 crore during the 10th Plan for rural drinking water sector.
- (ii) Three projects are currently being implemented with World Bank Aid in the States of Karnataka, Maharashtra and Kerala. 3 more projects for States of Uttaranchal, Punjab and Tamil Nadu are in advanced stages of negotiations with the World Bank. Also a proposal for funding through the World Bank for tackling water quality problems in 9 selected States (which would cover 90% of the problem) is under consideration. Additionally Rajasthan has also approached European Union Commission for funding in the rural water sector in the State.
- (iii) Since drinking water supply is a State subject, it is for the State Governments to take up projects on private-public partnership. A Conference of State Secretaries was held on 25th May 2005 at Vigyan Bhawan and the observations of the Standing Committee in regard to public-private partnership projects were brought into the notice of all State

Secretaries concerned with rural drinking water supply. WSP-SA has already prepared an approach paper on Public Private Partnership in rural water supply sector, have also finalized Terms of Reference (ToR) and invited Expression of Interest for hiring local consultants to support WSP-SA and RGNDWM in developing a PPP framework and risk assessment for rural water supply schemes in deepening and broadening the scope of their existing engagements with the private sector and civil society organizations.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.32)**

The Committee are disturbed to find that the position of actual coverage of habitations reflects a sharp decline as compared to previous year. Equally disturbing is the fact that same routine reply stating that Not Covered (NC) habitations are in the difficult terrain is furnished by the Department every year. The Committee fail to understand the said reply of the Department in this age of technological advancement. They would like the Department to inform the Committee about the technology options explored to provide such difficult areas with drinking water. It should be ensured that the said difficult areas are covered within a stipulated time frame.

#### **Reply of the Government**

As on 1st April, 2005, there are 55067NC/PC habitations of CAP 99 which are yet to be covered. Under Bharat Nirman it is envisaged to cover all these balance habitations of CAP 99 by 2008-09. Yearly targets have also been given to the States and the department is in the process of obtaining the list of all the balance habitations of CAP 99 in order to monitor their coverage in each of the next 4 years. Further for transparency and accountability, they have been asked to prepare list of habitations to be covered each year which would be hosted on the web-site of the Department. The technology options to provide difficult areas with drinking water are multi stage pumping, rain water harvesting by check dams and gully plugs, roof top rain water harvesting and hydrams. Another technological option is the conjunctive use of ground and surface water and/or combination of conjunctive use and rainwater harvesting structures.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.33)**

The Committee further find that there is utter confusion with regard to the data indicated regarding coverage of habitations. Two Budget Speeches of Finance Minister made during 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 reflect this position. The Finance Minister during 2004-2005 indicated the number of to be covered habitations as 75,000 and during 2005-2006 this data has been stated to be as 74,000 indicating achievement of only 1,000 habitations. The Department's data reflect the achievement of 35,591 habitations during 2004-2005. Even the Secretary has acknowledged the discrepancy in the data. The Committee find from the aforesaid position that perhaps there is a race for chasing data irrespective of the ground reality in this regard. The Committee are really disappointed to note such a situation and strongly recommend that the data presented by the Department should be realistic.

### **Reply of the Government**

The data is compiled on the basis of input received from State/UTs. In 2004-05 the physical achievement was 69,347 habitations which included the uncovered CAP 99 habitations as well as slipped back and quality affected habitations. As per the reports received from the States and UTs, as on 1st April 2005, there are 55,067 habitations of CAP 99, which are yet to be covered. The process of obtaining data of slipped back habitations from States on annual basis has already been initiated and this is likely to result in presentation of realistic data on ongoing basis. The States and UTs have been asked to provide the list of the habitations, which are yet to be covered in electronic form which can be put on the website so that realistic data is available.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.43)**

The Committee after analyzing the position of the performance of States, note that whereas from the side of the Union Government, the spending is ensured almost 100 per cent as could be seen from the earlier part of the report, the State-wise performance is not so encouraging. Only 66.03 per cent of the total available funds could be utilized during 2003-2004, whereas during 2004-2005, 38.47 per cent is the utilization position. The Committee note that the data during 2004-2005 may further increase with more States indicating physical achievement, but with the level of the achievement noted during 2003-2004, the performance is not so favourable.

Another disappointing fact is the lower absorption capacity of State Governments as indicated by the Secretary during the course of oral evidence. The Committee are really confused with the paradox of demanding more outlay without ensuring the absorption capacity of the State Governments. As noted earlier by the Committee, on the issue of drinking water, there is no scope for compromise. In this situation the Department has to work on war footing. The issue of increasing the absorption capacity of State Governments and better performance on the drinking water sector should be taken up at the highest level so that a dialogue on this aspect could be held at various Chief Ministers conferences/seminars. Further on the Department's part, the issue should be debated in various workshops/seminars arranged where the officials of the State Governments represent so that the situation could be analyzed State-wise and corrective action initiated thereon. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action initiated in this regard.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The Department organize State Secretaries Conference on 25th May, 2005 and the issue of increasing absorption capacity of the States was discussed. It was emphasized that there is need for early coverage of habitations (uncovered of CAP 99 as well as slipped back habitations) and minimize the closing balances. It was also impressed upon that the States which are still having left over uncovered habitations of CAP 99 need to make extra efforts. The enhanced allocation for 2005-06 was brought to the notice of State Secretaries and they were advised to make advance planning to ensure full utilization. The progress of utilisation of fund is also being reviewed in the Quarterly Performance Reviews undertaken in the Planning Commission. The targets for 2005-06 have been drawn taking into account the allocation for 2005-06 and cost of coverage of habitations. It is also proposed to seriously take up the issue in the forthcoming regional conferences with State Secretaries in charge of Rural Drinking Water and Sanitation which are scheduled to be held in September—October, 2005 and conference of Ministers of State Governments in-charge of rural drinking water supply scheduled in October 2005.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.44)**

The Committee note that during 2004-2005, the unspent balances were to the tune of Rs. 39,834.37 lakh against the said data of

Rs. 40,068.96 lakh during the previous year. It is significant to note that there is only improvement of Rs. 234.59 lakh as compared to previous year. The Committee find that when the issue for huge unspent balances, was brought to the knowledge of the Department, instead of taking the desired action the Department has tried to justify the position by stating that unspent balances during 2004-2005 are lesser than 2003-2004. The Committee disapproves the aforesaid tendency on the part of the Department and feel that urgent and desired action should be taken in case of under spending of scarce resources.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Department is making sincere efforts and taking all possible steps to ensure maximum utilization of the funds by the States. The issue is being discussed in all for a, including State Secretaries Conferences. The last Conference was held on 25th May 2005 wherein the progress of utilization of funds was discussed. The progress on utilization of funds is being monitored on a regular basis through various reports. To give disincentive to the States having large unutilized funds, there already exists a provision for reduction of release in the second instalment to the extent of the amount of the Opening Balance in excess of 15% of the allocation. From this year the provision has been made further strict by Ministry of Finance and now the Opening Balance in excess of 10% of allocation will be taken for reducing the release in second instalment.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.64)**

The Committee note that the performance of Swajaldhara is not very encouraging. The number of projects taken under Swajaldhara, which was 4,723 during 2002-03, has further declined to 3,791 during 2003-2004. During 2004-2005, the position is further worse. Only 2,074 schemes could be taken up. The number of completed schemes has also declined. During 2002-2003, 1,102 schemes were completed. The number increased to 1,145 during 2003-2004 but declined considerably during 2004-2005 to only 6 schemes. To understand more about the implementation of the scheme, the Committee would like to be apprised of the cumulative data of number of projects taken up so far, habitations/population benefited, expenditure incurred, projects completed etc.

### Reply of the Government

The desired cumulative data on progress of schemes under Swajaldhara since inception of the scheme (year 2002-03) to 11.8.2005 is annexed.

#### Swajaldhara Scheme including SRP

As on 11.8.2005

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	State	Total Allocation under Swajaldhara	No. of Districts	Total Release	Total Expenditure	Total No. of Schemes	Schemes Completed	Total amount released for SRP Schemes so far
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	24.69		0	0.00	0	0	
2.	Andhra Pradesh*	11200.15	20	13677.43	7710.10	2676	1589	19646.56
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	921.17	15	228.08	0.00	181	75	680.62
4.	Assam	2309.54	14	1033.2	661.98	474	70	1225.90
5.	Bihar	1797.71	5	725.84	0.00	21	0	1122.00
6.	Chandigarh	0.00		0	0.00	0	0	
7.	Chhattisgarh	858.00	14	552.11	115.84	163	53	1122.00
8.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	25.94	1	9.14	0.00	1	0	
9.	Daman & Diu	0.00		0	0.00	0	0	
10.	Delhi	12.35		0	0.00	0	0	
11.	Goa	29.59		0	0.00	0	0	
12.	Gujarat	2933.62	13	2590.4	1121.58	183	21	10117.23
13.	Haryana	502.66	10	361.64	7.85	157	0	1391.16
14.	Himachal Pradesh	2010.13	9	1219.63	131.94	911	36	607.36
15.	Jammu & Kashmir	3057.92	14	2227.87	314.29	341	64	2197.99
16.	Jharkhand	724.14	21	195.81	0.00	0	0	1122.00
17.	Karnataka*	3130.22	25	4061.65	412.97	270	57	8336.08
18.	Kerala	1532.28	12	1094.92	360.85	235	4	4986.88
19.	Lakshadweep	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
20.	Madhya Pradesh	2336.04	30	1817.97	572.72	1269	149	4837.74
21.	Maharashtra	12535.27	24	9585.87	3137.60	1370	0	9863.67
22.	Manipur	316.45		0	0.00	0	0	
23.	Meghalaya	363.08	6	167.51	0.00	43	0	272.10
24.	Mizoram	260.13	3	116.03	17.75	5	0	223.35
25.	Nagaland*	267.70	3	288.38	57.80	13	0	333.22
26.	Orissa	2270.19	31	1758.65	372.82	645	72	6060.00
27.	Pondicherry	12.35		0	0.00	0	0	
28.	Punjab	664.90	11	484.76	11.33	20	0	1426.69
29.	Rajasthan	5433.10	28	4591.16	748.91	1452	240	6801.62
30.	Sikkim	110.53	4	0	0.00	0	0	607.97
31.	Tamil Nadu	3187.02	29	3186.83	1797.79	1200	983	18987.81
32.	Tripura	321.90	4	260.69	0.00	195	0	2310.21
33.	Uttar Pradesh	4286.02	70	3209.94	585.50	1137	82	5556.56
34.	Uttaranchal	743.00	11	601.21	0.00	106	0	1122.00
35.	West Bengal	2055.72	15	1234.58	113.43	135	5	3597.61
	Total	66233.51	442	55281.3	18253.05	13203	3500	114556.33

\*This includes amount released to complete schemes of SRP under Swajaldhara.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### Recommendation (Para No. 2.65)

The Committee in their earlier report (Para No. 2.60 of 1st Report—14th Lok Sabha) had examined the concept of replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara and expressed serious concerns in this regard. The concerned expressed by the Committee have been given at Appendix-III. The Committee strongly recommend to review the position in this regard in the light of what has been stated above and the apprehensions expressed by the Committee. The Committee may be adequately explained about the position to enable them to analyse the not so encouraging performance of ARWSP as evaluated above.



### **Reply of the Government**

The Committee have noted earlier that now the Department has initiated action to extend the reforms process to ARWSP instead of replacing it with Swajaldhara. The detailed modalities for this are still being discussed in the EFC and the Committee shall be informed of the same when finalised. It is proposed to gradually incorporate the reforms, *i.e.* community participation, from the XI Plan. In the intervening period, the States are to be guided towards a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Department to enable them to take up the reforms. The salient features of the proposed MoU are:

- Role of State Governments
  - Transfer funds, functions and functionaries to the appropriate PRIs for management of the village DWS systems,
  - Responsible for multi-village and capital intensive schemes and for addressing problems of water quality, setting up water testing laboratories,
  - Proper training and capacity development of GPs/VWSC, etc. on various aspects of DWS e.g. to O&M; water quality; system and source sustainability.
  - Conduct Sector Status studies, prepare State Vision Statement, a comprehensive Water & Sanitation Policy and Action Framework;
  - Enacting legislative measures, amend rules, and institutional strengthening of PRIs to enable them effectively manage rural water supply;
  - Commitment to various aspects of the reforms initiative and key policy parameters of Centrally Sponsored schemes.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 19C of Chapter I of the Report).

### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.12)**

The Committee find from the data furnished by the Department that so far 2,16,794 habitations have been affected by various contaminations like fluoride, arsenic, salinity, iron, nitrate etc. The worst affected States having drinking water quality problems in rural areas are West Bengal, Bihar, Rajasthan, Orissa, Karnataka, Gujarat, Assam, Tripura, Tamilnadu, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Andhra Pradesh. The Committee further find that as per the existing position, 15 percent of ARWSP funds can be utilized for taking care of quality problem. While analyzing the Demands for Grants of previous year (refer Para 2.90 of 1st Report-14th Lok Sabha), the committee were informed that the Department has proposed to enhance the earmarked outlay for water quality from 15 percent to 30 percent. The Committee further note that as per the estimates prepared by the Department, additional fund of Rs. 13,000 crore is required to tackle the problem of quality habitations in various States. The Committee concludes that the funds constraint is the major factor, which needs to be tackled urgently. On the proposal of the Department to enhance and earmark funds of up to 15% to 30% for quality under ARWSP funds, the Committee would like to hear from the Department about the exact position in this regard. The Committee further note that the Finance Minister while presenting the Budget 2005-06 emphasised on the issue of quality of drinking water in the affected habitations. The Committee hope that adequate outlay would be provided for in this regard and they be appraised accordingly.

### **Reply of the Government**

As per the existing ARWSP guidelines upto 15% of funds released to the State Governments under normal ARWSP can be utilized for tackling water quality problems. This ceiling can be relaxed for fully covered States with the approval of the Central Government. The Department's endeavour has been to arrange the requisite funds to tackle water-quality problems in all the affected habitations. During the Xth Plan period, re-orientation of Sub-Mission on water quality and retention of 15% of ARWSP funds is proposed at the Centre, for allocation to limited States having water quality problems. It is also proposed to increase the limit to upto 20% of ARWSP funds for tackling water quality problems. These quality problems to have focused funding as per requirement and funds not to be allocated as per ARWSP inter-State criteria. Projects to be sanctioned by a Committee at the State with mandatory representation of RGNDWM. Monitoring of these projects would be done at the Central level. State share of

these projects to remain as 25%. Funds allocated for water quality by GoI as per weightage proposed below:

Arsenic	=	35%
Fluoride	=	35%
Brackishness	=	15%
Iron	=	5%
Nitrate	=	5%
Multiple problems	=	5%

The XIIth Finance Commission has also awarded funds to the acutely affected States for tackling water quality problems—West Bengal has been allocated Rs. 600 crore for arsenic, Andhra Pradesh—Rs. 325 crore for fluoride, Rajasthan—Rs. 150 crore for fluoride, Haryana—Rs. 100 crore for salinity and water logging. The Government has formulated Bharat Nirman, which is conceived as a plan to be implemented in four years, from 2005-06 to 2008-09 for building rural infrastructure. Tackling all water quality problems in 2,16,968 habitations is one of the sub-components of the drinking water supply component of Bharat Nirman. All State Governments have been requested to submit Action Plans for the Bharat Nirman programme. The total funds estimated for tackling water quality problems is Rs. 8451 crore and Rs. 465 crore for National Rural Water Quality Monitoring & Surveillance Programme. The Department has approached Planning Commission to consider additional Central assistance for tackling these water quality problems. The Planning Commission has indicated that there is likelihood in providing additional central budget to tackle water quality problems. However, the balance funds need to be tied up with funding from World Bank.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.13)**

The Committee further note that State Governments are not serious in tackling the issue of quality of drinking water which is evident from the fact that 1st phase of survey as initiated in 1999 which require stratified random sampling of 10 percent of sources in blocks has not been completed so far by all States. With regard to 2nd phase involving coverage of 100 percent survey of blocks, only a few States could complete the survey. Similar is the position with regard to action plans

by the State Governments. Only Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan and West Bengal have furnished the proposals in this regard. The Committee feel that in this scenario, Union Government have to play a more pro active role in this regard. The State Governments will have to be motivated to address the problem of quality habitations on a priority basis. The Department should take the desired steps in this regard and apprise the Committee accordingly.

### **Reply of the Government**

In the recent meeting held with representatives of States having major water quality problems on 21/7/2005, it was informed that Uttar Pradesh and Bihar have not yet completed the first phase of survey. West Bengal, Assam, Jharkhand and Maharashtra have not yet completed Phase-II survey. Gujarat, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh have completed both phases of survey. All the States have been requested to prepare Action Plan on the basis of quality affected habitations as on 1/4/2005 (list of affected habitations to be enclosed with the Action Plan) for tackling these problems in a phased manner of 4 years from now and submit to the Ministry immediately, along with cost norms and estimates.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.14)**

The Committee find that in order to address the water quality problems, it is essential to identify the exact problems besides ascertaining the magnitude of the problem. The Committee feel that if the water quality is tested correctly it will go a long way in dealing with the problem of contamination of drinking water. The Committee appreciate the position of the Government to institutionalize community based water quality monitoring and surveillance programme by adoption of catchment area project wherein quality will be tested at the grass roots level by the Panchayats/VWSC. The Committee also note that some efforts are being made to provide district level testing laboratories, for which Rs. 425.95 lakh have been released by the Department. The Committee would like to know the physical performance of the funds released in this regard so far. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the funding pattern for water quality testing laboratories at the Panchayats/VWSC level.

### **Reply of the Government**

The physical performance of the funds released for providing district level water quality testing laboratories for which, an amount of Rs. 429.95 lakh has been released by the Department, is as follows: Labs sanctioned = 442; Labs established = 268. The State Governments are being requested to send the updated status reports and also to expedite setting up of the remaining labs. Uttar Pradesh is seeking funds as per the revised norms as they could not set up the labs in the year in which these were sanctioned. Wherever required, like in Bihar, revalidation requests are being processed. Gujarat has informed that they would out-source water quality monitoring services. Some States are facing problems of non-availability of technical staff for manning these laboratories, due to ban on creation of posts by the State Governments. Options like out-sourcing, employing trained manpower on contract basis, etc. are to be considered in such cases. As regards funding pattern for water quality testing laboratory at the Panchayat/VWSC level, 100% funding from Central Government for provision of field-testing kits, one for each revenue village, has been proposed under the National Rural Water Quality Monitoring & Surveillance Programme.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 25 of Chapter I of the Report).

### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.12)**

The Committee further find that efforts are being made in different directions by several Ministries of the Union Government like the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources and Drinking Water Supply), Ministry of Water Resources, Ministry of Agriculture etc. Similarly the problem is being tackled by the State Governments under their own schemes. There is an urgent need to coordinate the efforts being made on the issue of sustainability as well as water conservation. There should be some sort of coordinating mechanism through which efforts made in the separate directions can be coordinated so that the issue may be tackled more effectively. More so, there is also an urgent need to coordinate the schemes being implemented by the State Governments at the field level. All these coordinating mechanisms would not only help in coordinating the efforts made in different directions, but would also help in having a

clear idea of the magnitude of the problem which may be the basic input for the future planning. The Committee would like the Department to duly communicate to the Ministry of Finance/Planning Commission and Ministry of Water Resources the nodal Ministry for water conservation, the concerns of the Committee in this regard. Besides, this issue needs to be appropriately raised during various interactions, conferences, seminars etc. The Committee may also be kept apprised about the outcome of such interactions.

### **Reply of the Government**

Concerns of the Committee in regard to co-ordination of efforts for sustainability of ground water sources being handled by a number of Ministries have been conveyed to the Ministry of Water Resources, the nodal Ministry for water conservation. A Coordinating mechanism through which, efforts made in separate directions by several Ministries of Union Government like Ministry of Water Resources, Ministry of Environment and Forest, Department of Land Resources, Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Agriculture apart from Department of Drinking Water Supply has been worked out by Ministry of Water Resources, who have constituted a Committee for this purpose and a representative of the Department is a member of this Committee. As regards co-ordinating the schemes being implemented by the State Governments at the field level, the integrated approach of Govt. of Andhra Pradesh can be a role model under which funds from various Governments sources are pooled up to take up rain water harvesting structures for recharging the ground water. Other State Governments like Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Mizoram are also doing exemplary work for sustainability of sources. The suggestion of the Committee of raising the issues on coordinated effort for sustainability of drinking water sources in various interactions, conferences, Seminars has been noted.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.13)**

The Committee further note that around 90 per cent of drinking water is dependant on ground water and there is an urgent need to discourage water schemes dependent on ground water. More stress needs to be given on the use of surface water and to water harvesting. The Committee find that the Department has proposed a bankable scheme for extending financial assistance for household and community level rain water harvesting structures. The said scheme has been formulated in consultation with NABARD and circulated to the State

Governments for the purpose. The Committee also note that majority of the States who have sent comments desire enhancement of subsidy component. The Committee would like the Department to furnish the details of the scheme so as to enable the Committee for comment further in this regard.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The complete details of the draft scheme on NABARD assisted Capital investment subsidy scheme for construction of rainwater harvesting structures for individual households, community and institutions is enclosed at Annexure I for kind perusal.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.14)**

The Committee observe from the information provided by the Department that State Governments are not serious on such a serious issue of water sustainability and water management. On the aforesaid scheme for water harvesting, in spite of the pursuance of the Department, only 8 State Governments have so far responded. Further on the model Bill for protection and conservation of water resources, none of the State Governments have furnished their comments. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to have reforms in the land bye-laws of the State Governments whereby water harvesting structures in individual buildings may be made compulsory. Since State Governments have to implement various schemes, their cooperation is the prerequisite. The Committee feel that perhaps there is an urgent need to play a more pro-active role by the Union Government. Certain efforts need to be made for motivating the State Governments. These issues further need to be taken at the Cabinet Secretariat level so that more constructive dialogue can be undertaken at various Chief Ministers Conferences being conducted by the Government. The Department may also deliberate this issue in various conferences and seminars held with the officers of State Governments and suitable action may be taken by the mixed tactics of persuasion and compulsion. The Committee would like the Department to take the desired action in this regard and apprise them accordingly.

#### **Reply of the Government**

A Draft Bill on Control and Development of Ground Water Resources prepared by Ministry of Water Resources was circulated to



all the States for enactment. The latest status in this regard is given in Annexure II. Comments of Ministry of Water Resources on the draft model Bill prepared by this Department on 'Conservation and protection of drinking water sources" have been received. It has been opined by them that this would lead to duplication of work and ambiguity. However, MoWR has agreed to incorporate the concerns of this Department in this regard in their model Bill, which is being framed as per the recommendations of a Working Group, which has been constituted in that Ministry for the purpose.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.17)**

The Committee would also like to recommend to the Department to involve more and more NGOs/VOs on the various issues specifically on the issue of enlightening the public about the magnitude of the problem of sustainability and water conservation. The milestones in different directions can be achieved only when the public is made aware of the need to conserve each drop of water. Besides for technology dissemination for various projects specifically for individual water harvesting mechanism, people's participation through NGOs/VOs of having good track records can play an important and crucial role. The Department should take the desired action in this regard and inform the Committee accordingly.

#### **Reply of the Government**

NGOs/Voluntary Organisations (VOs) are being involved in various States for generating awareness on sustainability and water conservation. For this purpose, the process of setting up Communication and Capacity Development units have been set in motion in all the States where State specific IEC activities would be taken up in the areas of rural water supply and sanitation.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.20)**

The Committee find that the Department has initiated process for full involvement of Panchayati Raj Institution for handling the various schemes related to drinking water supply and sanitation sectors. The Committee feel that capacity building of the Panchayati Raj Institution



is the major constraint. Association of Panchayats with the various drinking water supply schemes and programmes will not be enough. There is an urgent need that the drinking water and sanitation schemes are implemented fully by the Panchayati Raj Institutions in true spirit of the mandate of the Constitution as entered in article 243G. Not only that, outlay for the purpose should also be devolved in the specific accounts of PRIs. The Committee feel that by implementing the schemes through PRIs the community participation to the greatest extent can be ensured. Once the community is motivated and ready to evince interest and feel the ownership of these schemes, all the elated issues like maintenance of sources and sustainability will automatically be taken care of. The Committee strongly recommend to the Government to initiate the process in this regard and apprise them accordingly.

#### **Reply of the Government**

Rural Drinking Water as well as laws governing the Panchayati Raj Institutions are State subjects. While the Central Government may not intervene directly, the Department has initiated steps to encourage States for greater involvement of PRIs in the Rural Drinking Water Sector. This is proposed to be done by adding a weightage in the inter-state allocation of ARWSP funds for rural population managing their drinking water assets and by encouraging States to set up O&M Corpus Fund for Gram Panchayats for which matching grant upto 10% of capital cost of the scheme would be provided by the Centre. Also, the States are being supported to prepare a Sector Status Study, which will give a snapshot of the current status and gaps. The States would then be entering into an MoU with the Department to carry out the required changes for involvement of PRIs in a time bound manner. All States are being financially supported to set-up Communication and Capacity Development Units (CCDUs), *inter-alia* for building capacity of functionaries of Panchayati Raj Institutions.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.23)**

The Committee in their earlier reports have been drawing the attention of the Department to pay more attention to desalination of sea water for drinking purposes. The reply of the Department smacks of the casual approach in this regard. Instead of taking an urgent action, the Department seems to be contended simply by stating that drinking water is a State subject. The Committee fail to understand

the mindset of the Department. In spite of the fact that massive investment is being made by the Union Government and the Government's resolve to provide drinking water to each and everybody in rural areas, the Department has chosen to respond to the critical issues simply by stating that water is a State subject. The Committee feel that the problem of drinking water in coastal areas has to be handled in a different way. The desalination of sea water is perhaps the desired option for these areas. The Committee would like the Department to pay more attention towards various related issues, like R&D for having cost effective technology, for desalination plants. Further there is an urgent need to study the experience of desalination plants in other countries.

### **Reply of the Government**

Tackling excess salinity in drinking water was one of the 5 Sub-Mission programmes launched by this Department. 15% of the funds allocated for tackling water quality problems was earmarked for tackling salinity. There are 6 technology options for desalination which are Electrodialysis, Reverse Osmosis (SWRO), Multistage Flash thermal desalination (MSF), Multi-effect Distillation (MED), Vapour Compression and solar stills. A total of 194 desalination plants were approved in the country, of which 150 were installed and only 77 of them are working. A Committee is being set-up to examine the reasons for failure of desalination plants and suggest improvements so that, in future, when desalination plants would be set up by State Governments, they would be in position to run them satisfactorily, involving active community participation. UT of Lakshadweep has recently set up a desalination plant on a new technology, i.e., low temperature thermal desalination. A Central Team has been formed to assess this new technology developed by NIOT, Chennai. World Bank and UNICEF are being approached for providing information on different technologies being adopted across the world along with their economics.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 5.9)**

In the aforesaid scenario, the Committee feel that it is really shameful to find that in spite of five and a half decades of planned development, providing drinking water to schools is a distant reality. The Committee while expressing their strong concerns in this regard call for taking the issue on a mission mode. The Committee note that education and drinking water is on top most priority of the

Government. Not only that, cess for education is being levied since 2004-2005. Besides recommending for adequate outlay for the purpose, there is an urgent need to have a coordinate approach with all the Union Ministries related with the subject and the State Government in this regard.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The Department has already initiated action for coordinated approach for the coverage of rural schools with drinking water supply. All out efforts are being made to cover all the rural schools with drinking water supply by 2006-07. Most of the States have been given targets to cover all rural schools during the current year itself.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 5.10)**

The Committee also call for a high level intervention in this regard since the country cannot wait further on this issue. The Committee would like that their concerns in this regard should be duly communicated to the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance and Cabinet Secretariat and all the other concerned Ministries and they be apprised of their reaction in this regard. The Committee would further like to be apprised about the reasons for nil achievement of targets in the aforesaid States. Besides, the Committee would like the Department to explain whether fixing no targets for as many as five States, the details of which have been furnished above, means 100 per cent coverage of schools,, in those States. The Committee urge for the clarification in this regard.

#### **Reply of the Government**

These concerns were taken up at various forums including Conferences with the State/UTs Secretaries in charge of rural drinking water supply and sanitation. The Department has included coverage of rural schools under Bharat Nirman in its presentation to National Rural Infrastructure Committee, which has agreed to the intervention required in this regard. The States/UTs have been advised accordingly to prepare the Action Plan for the coverage of all the rural schools under Bharat Nirman by 2006-07.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 6.29)**

The worst and critically deficient status is school sanitation. It is really a matter of shame for the country that whereas 31 per cent of the rural areas are stated to be having sanitary latrines when it comes to schools only 15 per cent of the primary schools could be provided toilets. The Committee in their earlier reports have repeatedly been drawing the attention of the Department in this regard, but it seems nothing substantial could be done so far. The Committee have no data to substantiate the percentage of dropouts from schools due to the basic facilities of drinking water and sanitation specifically with regard to girls, yet they feel that this may be the major factor of dropouts from schools. The schools should be provided toilets without any further loss of time. The Department has to work on a mission mode. Besides adequate outlay, State Governments should be consulted urgently so that the objective of having separate toilets for boys and girls is achieved within stipulated time frame.

#### **Reply of the Government**

School sanitation is one of the areas of concern and that is why it has been included as a component in Total Sanitation Campaign and separate fund has been earmarked for it. The objective is to provide separate toilet blocks for boys and girl students. School sanitation coverage was only 15% as per 6th All India Educational Survey conducted in 1993. However, based on the findings of our survey, it emerges that approximately 40-50% schools have sanitation facilities. The Department is striving hard to work in coordination with Department of Elementary Education of Ministry of Human Resource Development and to ensure 100% coverage of schools with water supply and sanitation facilities. States have been asked to try a time bound action plan so that this problem is taken care of during the 10th Plan itself. With acceleration in pace of implementation, it is expected that the desired objectives could be achieved by the end of 10th Plan period.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 6.30)**

The Committee further find that having the toilets in schools will be a major factor for awareness creation. Since children are the motivating factors for adults, the inculcation of habits of sanitation will automatically be a forceful factor for awareness in adults in the

family. Sanitation is more related to mindset. Once the habit is developed, the society themselves will demand for the facilities and this will put pressure on the implementing authorities to perform better and deliver results. The Committee hold the view that to achieve the objective of school sanitation, there is an urgent need to take coordinated and concerted efforts in consultation with the Ministry of Finance, Planning Commission, State Governments, District Authorities, PRIs, NGOs and all other concerned Ministries/Departments. The Committee strongly feel that since too many Ministries/Departments are involved in the task higher level intervention is needed. The Committee would like that the concerns of the Committee may be brought to the knowledge of Cabinet Secretariat in this regard.

#### **Reply of the Government**

It is true that for proper implementation of school sanitation and hygiene education programme, greater coordinated efforts are required between various line Ministries of Government of India as well as State Governments, District implementing agencies, PRIs, NGOs, etc. In order to ensure greater coordination at the Central level, Ministry of Rural Development has already constituted a Coordination Panel for school sanitation programme headed by Secretary (DWS) with Joint Secretaries of Deptt. of Elementary Education, Deptt. of Women & Child Development, Department of Tribal Welfare, Deptt. of Health & Family Welfare and Department of Drinking Water supply as members. As per the observations of the Committee, the matter has been brought to the knowledge of the Cabinet Secretariat.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 6.31)**

The Committee conclude that sanitation and drinking water are the inter related issues. It is alarming to note the fact that 64 per cent of India defecates in open resulting in 20,900 MT of excreta everyday. The Committee find that open defecation not only pollutes the environment but also is the major factor for water contamination. Not only that, the use of toilets can be ensured if water is made available. Thus there is an urgent need to have a coordinated approach in this regard. The Committee may further like to add here that with the use of water efficient devices, huge saving of water can be made. The Committee calls for the effective steps by the Department in this regard.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Committee has recommended for coordinated approach for rural sanitation and drinking water supply programme which are inter-related. The Department is also of the same view and as a result, water supply and sanitation issues are being handled by the same Department in Government of India and it has been emphasised upon the State Governments to implement the programme in a coordinated manner with proper linkages with two programmes.

The Department also feels that for promotion of rural sanitation, water efficient devices are necessary and as a result, the Department is promoting the use of 'Rural Plans' which consume less water for flushing excreta and are useful for water scarce areas.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **CHAPTER III**

#### **RECOMMENDATION WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF GOVERNMENT'S REPLY**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.63)**

The Committee understand that at present 20 per cent of annual allocation under ARWSP can be spent on demand driven Swajaldhara for which 10 per cent of the outlay has to be contributed by the community. They also note that as per the existing position there is no flexibility of allocation of more than 20 per cent of outlay if more projects are demanded by State Governments. So far as the issue of replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara is concerned, the Committee find that the Department has already initiated the necessary plans and changes to facilitate phased extension of reform proposals to ARWSP from the beginning of the Eleventh Plan.

The Committee would like to add here that since Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme, the better performing States would only be able to take the benefits of the scheme. Thus, the less performing States would be deprived of the Central allocation.

##### **Reply of the Government**

The Committee has noted that the Department has initiated plans for phased extension of reforms to ARWSP from the beginning of the Eleventh Plan. As regards apprehension of the Committee regarding better performing States concerning benefits of the scheme, it may be mentioned that funds under Swajaldhara are allocated to the States every year as per the inter-state ARWSP allocation ratio fixed for the year. For the current financial year (2005-06), the States have been informed that if there are no demands driven Swajaldhara schemes in the States, the Swajaldhara allocation may be utilized in ARWSP mode. Hence the apprehension of the Committee that less performing States will be deprived of Central allocation has been taken care of.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE**

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.30)**

The Committee for the last three years have been emphasizing the need to have the exact data of slippage of habitations. They note that in this direction a State-wise habitation survey was initiated and in 26 States the results have been made available. However there were some discrepancies in the data and the results are being revalidated by Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA). The Committee would like to be apprised of the final position with regard to slippage of habitations, after the revalidation is completed.

#### **Reply of the Government**

As per the agreement, the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) is required to give validated data of habitation survey by February 2006. IIPA has initiated the data cleansing process in respect of 22 States till date. So the final position with regard to slippage is still not known at present. To expedite the revalidation process, the Department has called the representatives of States/UTs in different groups to discuss with the representatives of this Department, NIC and IIPA for effective and time bound action. The Committee will be apprised in due course of time.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 7 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.31)**

The Committee are constrained to note the handling of 'Not Covered' and 'Partially Covered' habitations by the Department. Although the Department admits that slippage of habitations is at a larger level and for that the Working Group for Tenth Plan has



estimated 2.8 lakh slipped back habitations, the picture of slipped back habitations will be more clear when the final results of the aforesaid survey are made available. With the said state of affairs, the Department has continued to claim that the position of coverage of habitations in the country is 95 per cent. Not only that, States of Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, Daman and Diu and Delhi are stated to be the States/Union territories which have achieved 100 per cent coverage. The Committee disapprove the way a very bright picture as opposed to the ground position with regard to the availability of drinking water in the country is projected by the Department. The Committee strongly recommend that announcements regarding achievement of the Department should be realistic and accurately presented in various Budget documents presented to the Parliament as well as submitted to the Parliamentary Committees.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The observation of the Committee have been noted and the process of obtaining slippage of habitations from States on annual basis has been initiated.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 7 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.34)**

On the issue of periodical updation of data of slipped back habitations, the Committee note that the Department propose revalidation on the quarterly basis. The Committee find that revalidation is a detailed exercise and as such revalidation should be done on yearly basis. On the issue of the reservations of State Governments, that they have no infrastructure in this regard, the Committee would like the Department to sort out the matter in consultation with the State Governments and the viable option of appointing some agency for the purpose and also for allocating outlay from the allocation of ARWSP should be explored. The details in this regard when finalized should be placed before the Committee for further review and comments.

### **Reply of the Government**

Under the Action Plan for Bharat Nirman the Department has asked the States/UTs to provide web-enabled computerized data of the uncovered habitations of CAP 99, as well as uncovered rural schools and quality affected and slipped back habitations. This would be in addition to obtaining annual slippages data from States. The Department has initiated the process of obtaining the data on annual basis, which is likely to result in presentation on realistic data on ongoing basis. The validation exercise is currently been done by IIPA. The Department will continue to do the validation annually through agency/agencies as and when required.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 7 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.45)**

The Committee are further constrained to note that while in some States physical achievement is less than 50 per cent, some States could achieve the inflated targets as high as upto 2320 per cent in Orissa and 1300 per cent in Goa. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply of the Department that these States fix the targets on a vary low scale whereas these States could cover much more habitations. The Committee find that there is gross mismatch between physical and financial achievements. besides such a data reflects that there is some sort of confusion in reporting the data by the State Governments. The Committee strongly recommend the Department to have a critical and indepth analysis of the mechanism of reporting by State Governments and explain the position to the Committee so as to enable them to understand State specific performance in a better way and comment further in this regard.

### **Reply of the Government**

This year the Department has undertaken a detailed exercise for fixing the realistic targets. The unit cost involved in coverage of not covered and partially covered habitations and the amount allocated to the States/UTs were taken into account while working out the targets.

It is pertinent to point out that even in 2004-05 the net physical achievement was to the extent of 92.63 per cent as against the target

of coverage of 74,868 habitations, the actual achievement reported is 69,347. During 2005-06, the States and UTs have been given realistic targets for schools as well as habitations, keeping in view unit cost of coverage and availability of funds with different States.”

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 10 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.49)**

The Committee find that different funding patterns have been adopted under the various components of ARWSP. Under ARWSP (Normal) 50 : 50 is the Central and State Government contribution, but in case of DDP, 100 per cent is the Central allocation. For quality and sustainability for which 15 per cent and 5 per cent of allocation respectively under ARWSP can be utilized, the Centre : State ratio is 75 : 25. For Swajaldhara for which 20 per cent of the outlay under ARWSP is earmarked, 90 per cent is the Central contribution and 10 per cent is the community contribution. While appreciating the fact that for quality and sustainability, States are being provided more Central funds, the Committee note that monitoring of such a complex inter-State allocation criterion is a difficult task. The Committee would like the Department to explain how the monitoring is being done so as to ensure that the specified State contribution and specified inter-scheme allocation is ensured for the specific purpose, to enable the Committee to come to some meaningful conclusion and comment further in this regard.

### **Reply of the Government**

In so far as ARWSP (DDP), ARWSP (Calamity Relief) and ARWSP (Swajaldhara) are concerned, there is no difficulty in monitoring as there is no State share for these components. However, in respect of remaining components watch has to be kept as for coverage as well as operation and maintenance, funding pattern is 50 : 50, and in respect of Quality and Sustainability it is 75 per cent central and 25 per cent State. While releasing the second installment, it is scrutinized whether the State Government has made provision for State contribution in accordance with the funding pattern. In case the contribution from the State is less than their due share as per the funding pattern, the release

of Central funds are reduced accordingly in the release of second installment.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 13 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.50)**

The Committee also note the water tight compartments for allocating resources for various components of ARWSP. For example for sustainability 5 per cent outlay is earmarked and for quality 15 per cent allocation can be used. 20 per cent of funds are earmarked for Swajaldhara. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to simplify the inter-component allocation of ARWSP. The Department may examine the issue and apprise the Committee accordingly.

#### **Reply of the Government**

To give due weightage to various aspects of the rural drinking water supply it is necessary to bifurcate the ARWSP funds in various components, viz., quality, sustainability, calamity relief, Swajaldhara etc. The funds for rural drinking water supply are mainly for the coverage of habitations through ARWSP (normal) but focus has also to be given on the coverage through reform process under Swajaldhara and also for quality and sustainability. For calamity relief, funds are required to be earmarked to leave some rooms to meet the contingencies arising out of natural calamities and other emergent situations.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 13 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.51)**

The Committee further note that under normal ARWSP, States are unable to contribute equal amount of what is allocated by the Central Government in a year. In this regard the Committee desire that the total outlay provided by the Union Government as well as State Governments so far may be furnished so as to enable the Committee

to analyse the position of matching share by State Governments in a better way and comment further in this regard.

### Reply of the Government

As desired by the Committee the year-wise and State-wise details of the Central as well as State share is Annexed.

(Rs. in Crore)

#### Investment in Rural Drinking Water Supply—Centre and States

Name of the State	Investment in Rural Drinking Water Supply					
	2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
	Central*	State	Central*	State	Central*	State
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Andhra Pradesh	183.77	161.18	316.40	182.40	373.88	96.61
Bihar	37.03	44.55	36.05	67.65	96.72	53.33
Chhattisgarh	29.43	65.15	32.40	72.75	26.90	75.11
Goa	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.61	0.00
Gujarat	99.98	195.18	145.68	199.42	114.06	186.60
Haryana	33.57	64.76	34.83	100.29	29.64	102.28
Himachal Pradesh	113.56	98.23	64.86	85.36	66.03	93.58
Jammu and Kashmir	111.96	80.85	150.59	108.00	150.22	125.00
Jharkhand	19.50	80.00	25.00	70.06	31.66	78.25
Karnataka	143.56	109.37	183.50	109.97	198.94	141.72
Kerala	18.99	66.70	70.14	76.82	63.25	113.39
Madhya Pradesh	95.86	124.38	113.65	115.61	120.27	89.96
Maharashtra	193.36	261.67	230.02	263.71	293.67	200.94
Orissa	61.47	64.43	84.53	68.96	104.38	59.53
Punjab	30.81	84.95	26.73	76.19	35.33	109.77
Rajasthan	235.96	379.31	298.18	440.10	370.79	475.93

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tamil Nadu	79.92	411.00	135.92	375.00	161.59	411.00
Uttaranchal	36.83	71.56	27.63	73.70	40.71	77.11
Uttar Pradesh	113.66	192.04	135.10	197.14	169.92	101.58
West Bengal	101.15	120.03	109.46	68.79	103.05	88.87
Arunachal Pradesh	36.50	30.09	45.92	53.11	70.79	55.70
Assam	56.23	56.30	106.33	70.25	140.76	87.86
Manipur	9.47	21.79	17.02	9.00	21.03	17.00
Meghalaya	29.36	22.60	22.14	29.25	30.86	31.00
Mizoram	21.22	18.20	14.75	17.56	20.77	16.78
Nagaland	21.81	21.81	19.81	15.61	20.85	15.41
Sikkim	8.96	12.70	7.91	12.96	9.03	15.38
Tripura	24.28	20.14	28.64	20.21	24.43	18.61
<b>Total</b>	<b>1948.20</b>	<b>2878.97</b>	<b>2483.32</b>	<b>2979.86</b>	<b>2890.11</b>	<b>2938.31</b>
<b>Total Central Budget Utilised</b>	<b>2100.70</b>		<b>2564.90</b>		<b>2930.78</b>	

Central releases include releases under ARWSP [normal, DDP, Calamity, PM's programme. Sector Reforms/Swajaldhara and Management Information System (MIS)]

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 16 of Chapter I of the Report)

### Recommendation (Para No. 2.66)

The Committee notes that recently Swajaldhara guidelines have been amended to reduce proportion of cash contribution from 5 per cent to 2.5 per cent in the case of Scheduled Tribe/Scheduled Caste habitations. The remaining 7.5 per cent contribution can be in kind (labour, material etc.). The Committee would like that the possibility of extending the facility of said relaxed norms should be explored in case of most backward districts in the country.

### **Reply of the Government**

Extent of SC/ST population is one of the criteria for identification of the most backward districts, along with agricultural productivity per worker and agriculture wage rate. There are specific poverty alleviation schemes for the most backward districts; it may not be desirable to extend the relaxed community contribution in these districts. However, as burden of community contribution is related to the cost of schemes, which in turn is dependent on geohydrological conditions, a proposal to give flexibility to State Governments/SWSM to further relax the extent of the cash contribution in DDP and hill areas is under consideration.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 22 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.10)**

The Committee find from what has been stated above that the sustainability of system itself is dependent on sustainability of sources. Another noticeable issue is that 90 per cent of all drinking water is dependent on ground water sources. The ground water is depleting fast which may be the main reason for slippage of FC and PC habitations to NC habitations the details of which have been given in the previous chapter of the Report. In this scenario, the Committee concludes that the major challenge that the Department may have to face in the coming years is the sustainability of sources.

### **Reply of the Government**

Sustainability of sources is dependent on the replenishment of ground water table, which is the mandate of Ministry of Water Resources. As a User-Department, this Department contributes its share to the overall cause, by various methods of rain-water harvesting, roof-top harvesting and artificial recharge. This requires integrated efforts of various Ministries.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 13 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.11)**

The Committee further note that although the Department accepts the magnitude of the problem relating to sustainability of water sources, substantial efforts have not been made in this regard. Only 5 per cent of the funds under ARWSP could be used for water sustainability. The issue of water tight compartments for different components under ARWSP has been dealt with in the previous part of the report. Here the Committee would like to recommend to the Government to give more thrust on sustainability and the allocation for the purpose should be enhanced. There is an urgent need to enhance the allocation for sustainability since the issue of slippage of habitations can only be tackled by handling this issue. The Department would be able to achieve the objective of full coverage of habitations only when the problem of sustainability is properly handled. The Committee would like the Department to take earnest action in this regard and inform the Committee accordingly.

#### **Reply of the Government**

It is proposed to make sustainability, a part of coverage for which 70 percent of ARWSP allocation will be earmarked. It is also proposed to make source-strengthening an integral part of all coverage schemes. Depending on requirement, States can utilize more funds for sustainability. Under Swajaldhara programme, sustainability of drinking water sources is an integral component of the water supply scheme. In this regard State Governments have been provided with a CD on Rainwater Harvesting and a Manual on Artificial Recharge and Rainwater Harvesting. Also, in order to identify the correct location for existing drinking water sources and also for locating water harvesting structures, hydrogeomorphological maps (groundwater prospect maps) have been got prepared for 10 States and sent to State Governments by utilizing services of National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA), Hyderabad.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 13 of Chapter I of the Report)



#### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.15)**

On the issue of water conservation, the Committee note that ARWSP guidelines provide for dual water policy for rural habitations facing acute water problems. The Committee feel that dual water policy should apply to all areas of the country since scarcity of drinking water is the issue concerning all the States/Union Territories. It should be ensured that every habitation should use the treated water for drinking and cooking and for other purposes, like washing and ablution, untreated water can be used. The Committee recommend to the Department to think of revising ARWSP guidelines and inform them about the action taken in this regard.

#### **Reply of the Government**

As per ARWSP guidelines, dual water policy is to be followed in quality affected habitations only, for serving the minimum needs for cooking and drinking purposes. Only about 14 per cent of the total habitations are affected with water quality. In the remaining 86 per cent non-contaminated habitations, the norms of 40 lpcd are being followed for water supply.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 28 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.16)**

The Committee find that efforts have not been made so far for treating the used water and then supplying the same for drinking water purposes. Besides another issue which needs urgent attention is the leakage of water where water is being supplied through pipes. The Committee would like the Department to analyze the position in this regard, take the desired action and inform them accordingly.

#### **Reply of the Government**

During various review meetings and also during the technical review meetings held by the officials of this Department, the concerned State Governments are requested to pay more attention to reduce leakage of water especially through pipelines. In rural areas, the

predominant water supply is arranged through hand pumps. Guidelines on sustainability have been issued in 2002.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Para No. 31 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 5.8)**

On the issue of contributing 10 per cent community contribution from MPLAD funds for the schools covered under Swajaldhara, the Committee fail to understand the logic furnished by the Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation that MPLAD funds, which is Government's funding cannot be substitute for community contribution. The Committee strongly feel that schools cannot be treated at par with other rural habitations. The schools cannot be deprived of drinking water or sanitation in case community is not ready to contribute. If MPLAD funds cannot be equated with community contribution, then 100 percent Central assistance should be provided for coverage of schools in this regard.

#### **Reply of the Government**

For the coverage of schools under ARWSP, there is no contribution from community as funding pattern is 50 per cent Central and 50 per cent State. Swajaldhara is a contributory approach with 90 per cent Central and 10 per cent community contribution. Rural schools can be covered by the States and UTs from the funds provided under ARWSP.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Para No. 40 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 6.26)**

The Committee have repeatedly been expressing their strongest concern on the issue of sanitation in rural areas in their respective reports. However, nothing substantial could be done so far. It is a

matter of serious concern that even after more than five decades of planned development in the country only 31 per cent of the rural households, that too as per the Government's own data could be provided latrines, not to speak of the total sanitation. As many as 64 per cent of the rural households defacate in open. As rightly admitted by the Finance Minister, sanitation remains critically deficient out of Rs. 3,663 crore proposed during Tenth Plan, the Department has got Rs. 955 crore which is around one-fourth of the proposed outlay of the Department. The Committee further note that fund required for rural sanitation would be of the order of Rs. 676 billion and Rs. 503 billion respectively if the goal of achieving 50 per cent of rural sanitation by 2015 and full sanitation by 2025 has to be achieved as set by 'World Summit for Sustainable Development' held at Johannesburg in 2002. More so as per Department's own estimates, a total of Rs. 5,932 crore would be required if the target of covering the whole country by Total Sanitation Programme has to be achieved by 2010. The Committee observe that during 2005-2006, the outlay has been increased from Rs. 400 crore as provided during 2004-2005 to Rs. 700 crore. But even the enhanced outlay is not sufficient. There is an urgent need to step up the outlay considerably.

#### **Reply of the Government**

It is true that Rural Sanitation coverage in the country is low. It was only 22 percent in 2001 which has increased to 33 percent in 2005. There could be 11 percent increase in rural sanitation coverage since 2001 due to implementation of Total Sanitation Campaign. During the 10th Plan Period, Planning Commission had allocated only Rs. 955 crore which was a meagre amount. However, in the Mid-Term Appraisal of the Tenth Plan, Planning Commission has agreed to increase it by another Rs. 1,350 crore and already during the four years of the current Plan approximately Rs. 1,450 crore has been made available. It is expected that the actual availability of fund for rural sanitation in the Tenth Plan would be Rs. 2,300 crore.

Department has estimated that for implementation of Total Sanitation Campaign in all the districts in the country, approximately Rs. 5,951 crore would be required. Of late Planning Commission has already stepped up the allocation for rural sanitation and it is expected that adequate funds would be provided by the Planning Commission for rural sanitation in the years to come.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 43 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 6.27)**

The Committee further find that the Department has initiated action for mobilizing resources through domestic resources and World Bank. The proposal in this regard after the approval of Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission has been forwarded to the World Bank. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the projects to be taken up by the World Bank assistance. Besides the Committee note that there is enough potential to mobilise resources through internal as well as international resources like World Bank. The Committee urge to pay more attention in this regard keeping in view the funds constraint.

### **Reply of the Government**

In the year 2003, Department has estimated a budgetary gap of Rs. 4,086 crore for implementation of Total Sanitation Campaign and accordingly initiated steps to mobilise resources from World Bank funding. Proposal in this regard has been sent to Department of Economic Affairs which in turn has forwarded it to the World Bank. In the meantime, considering the necessity of promoting rural sanitation coverage, Planning Commission has already enhanced the budgetary allocation. Considering the current level of budgetary allocation of Rs. 700 crore in 2005-06 and maintaining a normal growth rate in the allocation, it is expected that the budgetary gap of Rs. 4,086 crore can easily be met and there may not be any necessity to seek World Bank funding for rural sanitation sector.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 43 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 6.28)**

Besides funds constraint, the Committee find that implementation of the sanitation programme is not too impressive. Out of 3,94,48,353 sanctioned BPL toilets, the achievement is 94,94,525. Community

complexes position is further worse. Out of 30,203 community complexes sanctioned so far, the achievement is 4,607. The State-wise position also indicates the similar view. There is huge difference between releases and expenditure. Worst is the position in certain North-Eastern States. In 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, in Mizoram, Manipur and Meghalaya the position of expenditure reported as well as toilets constructed is nil. As per Government's own admission States like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, Gujarat, North-Eastern States, Himachal Pradesh, Goa and Karnataka are some of the non-performing States. In this scenario the Committee find that merely enhancing the outlay will not be sufficient. Since Total Sanitation Campaign is a demand driven programme there is an urgent need for educating the masses about the ill effects of open defecation. The success of the programme can be achieved through public involvement. More needs to be done with regard to the involvement of Panchayats, NGOs/VOs so that public through them can be educated and more projects could be demanded by them. State Governments too need to be motivated in this regard. The Committee feel that the Department has to work on war-footing, if the objective of total sanitation is to be achieved within a stipulated time frame.

#### **Reply of the Government**

It is true that in order to promote rural sanitation, the Department has to work on war-footing and it has been doing so since the launch of the programme. The implementation of Total Sanitation Campaign programme is not uniform throughout the country. There are States where the implementation is picking up quickly whereas in some States it is slow. However, various steps have been taken to improve the pace of implementation and to ensure that higher priority is given by the States and district implementing agencies to this programme. As a result the implementation has improved significantly in the past 3-4 years and more than 1.31 crore household toilets have been constructed under TSC which is more than the number of toilets constructed under erstwhile CRSP during 1986 to 2002. All out efforts are being made to ensure that slow moving States also give high priority to TSC implementation.

In order to ensure greater community involvement, the Department has launched Nirmal Gram Puraskar which is an incentive scheme for the PRIs, individuals and organizations working for successful implementation of the programme. This has evoked good response and in 2005, 38 Gram Panchayats and 2 Block Panchayats have got this award. In addition to this, greater focus on Information Education

and Communication (IEC) as well as capacity building of different stakeholders has been given to ensure better implementation of the programme. It is expected that Department will get good results of these efforts in near future.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

**Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Para No. 46 of Chapter I of the Report)

## CHAPTER V

### RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.53)**

The Committee appreciate that special allocation as indicated in the aforesaid para has been made for Tsunami affected States *viz.*, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Pondicherry and Kerala. The Committee call for strict monitoring so as to ensure that the allocation earmarked for Tsunami affected areas is utilized for the intended objective *i.e.* restoration of water supply to such areas.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The funds have been released to the States/UTs concerned for the purpose of restoration of water supply in such areas and this intention has been indicated to them while releasing funds from calamity relief component of ARWSP. The States/UTs concerned have been asked to provide information about the utilization of fund and restoration of water supply in the affected areas.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Para No. 19 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.24)**

The Committee further note that Union territory of Lakshadweep has furnished a request for setting up of sea water based desalination plant at Kavaratti. The proposal is being processed for SFC approval. The Committee would like the early clearance of the said project. The Committee also calls for more serious attempts by the Department on this issue in view of what has been stated above.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The proposal of setting up a desalination plant, 300 cubic meter per day capacity at Kavaratti has been approved by the SFC in April,

2005 at a cost of Rs. 8.97 crore. The Administrator of UT of Lakshadweep has recently informed that a 100 cubic meter per day desalination plant based on the latest technology called as low temperature thermal desalination has been installed at Kavaratti at a cost of Rs. 4.95 crore. Services of National Institute of Ocean Technology, Chennai have been taken for the purpose. This Department has asked the UT of Lakshadweep to identify whether this particular plant can be upgraded from 100 cubic meter per day capacity to 300 cubic meter per day capacity, which will be the requirement of Kavaratti. Reply from Lakshadweep UT Administration is awaited.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 34 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 5.7)**

The Committee have repeatedly been drawing the attention of the Department towards the urgent need to provide safe drinking water in rural schools in a stipulated time frame. In spite of that the work has not been done at the desired level. As per Government's own data 34 per cent of the Government schools are yet to have facility of drinking water. The ground reality in this regard may be further grim. About private, public and Government aided schools, the data of drinking water availability is yet to be procured. Further alarming is the data with regard to achievement of physical targets by States/ Union territories during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. As many as 8 States/ Union territories reported nil performance during 2003-2004. Further, for Haryana, Daman and Diu, Delhi and Lakshadweep no targets were fixed. The worse is the position during 2004-2005. Twelve States/ Union territories reported nil achievement. The Committee find that the Government have set the targets of coverage of all schools by the end of Tenth Plan. In this scenario it seems difficult to achieve the targets. Another disturbing fact noticed by the Committee is the Department's concept that there is no question of slippage of coverage of schools. The Committee fail to understand as to how the Department can stop the various issues such as the resources being dry, or the system going non-operational which is rampant in case of rural habitations when it comes to the issue of school coverage. The Committee are constrained to note the thinking of the Department in this regard. Without verifying the ground reality, the Department has chosen to state that the position



of slippage of coverage of schools for non coverage is not applicable to schools. The Committee would like to be apprised of the reaction of the Department in this regard.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Department agrees with the observation of the Committee that there could be slippage in schools too. In the light of observations of the Committee and pending receipt of results of the Seventh All India Education Survey, the Department has initiated collection of data on schools where drinking water facilities are not functioning, as well as data on availability of drinking water facilities in Government-aided and private schools.

[File No. H-11011/1/2005/SW/DWS-III dated 24 August, 2005 of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 37 of Chapter I of the Report)

NEW DELHI;  
22 November, 2005  
1 Agrahayana, 1927 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,  
*Chairman,*  
*Standing Committee on*  
*Rural Development.*

## **APPENDIX I**

### **OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES**

CAPITAL INVESTMENT SUBSIDY SCHEME FOR CONSTRUCTION  
OF RAINWATER HARVESTING STRUCTURES FOR INDIVIDUAL  
HOUSEHOLDS, COMMUNITY AND INSTITUTIONS

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY

**RAINWATER HARVESTING**

**Background**

There is no denying the truth that water is life. However, this scarce resource is fast depleting and its management and conservation is not getting the due attention which it deserves. The scarcity of safe drinking water has made rainwater harvesting techno-economically feasible worth considering for alternate supply, supplementary supply or improved supply. There is no O&M cost though one time initial capital investment is high. For overcoming this problem of initial capital investment, the scheme for financing rainwater-harvesting structures at individual household, community and institutional levels is being introduced.

**Objective**

The main objective of the scheme is to enable the community, individual households and institutions to serve their own needs of drinking water for 100 non-rainy days in a year at the rate of 10 litres per capita per day by taking loan and repaying it in easy instalments for DDA/DPAP/HADP areas and North-Eastern States. This safe drinking water will save them about Rs. 2000 per family in a year as water borne disease.

It will generate employment for 2 skilled and 2 unskilled persons for construction of 10,000 litres capacity ferro-cement tank.

**Salient Features**

**Eligible Organizations**

- (a) The project for construction of rainwater harvesting system/ structure can be taken up by individuals, community based organizations, institutions, schools and offices, non-governmental organizations, voluntary organizations, self-help groups, Panchayati Raj Institutions for RWH structures

constructed by them for community purposes (RWH structures for Panchayats will be constructed from their own budgets.

- (b) Government bodies/institutions are not eligible for the scheme as they can construct the rainwater harvesting structures from their normal budget.
- (c) For schools, loan may be availed and repaid either by Panchayats or PTA for Government schools, it should be provided in the normal budget of the Education Department.

#### **Location**

- (d) Under the scheme, the beneficiaries will be free to construct at any place as per Type designs, which necessarily includes a connecting over-flow pipe to recharge pit/shaft for ground water recharge. Wherever individual recharge pit is not possible, the entire street's overflowing pipe can be connected to common recharge pit, and capacities as suitable to their use.

(Details of approximate estimate of ferro-cement rain water harvesting systems are enclosed as Annexures I-IV).

#### **Conditions for Scientific Storage**

- (e) RWH structure (ferro-cement tank) built under the scheme shall be structurally sound or of engineering considerations and functionally suitable to store rain water. The general conditions for scientific conditions will be as follows:
  - (i) The construction of RWH structures shall be as per Guidelines issued by DDWS/State Public Health Engineering Department specification laid down in this behalf.
  - (ii) The RWH structure shall have protection from rodents.
  - (iii) The RWH structures will have protection from birds.

#### **Credit Linked Assistance**

- (a) Subsidy under the scheme is linked to institutional credit and will be available only to those beneficiaries who take finance from commercial banks, cooperative banks and regional rural banks.

- (b) Assistance under the scheme shall be available on capital cost of construction of RWH structures.

### **Training**

A general awareness programme on the scheme for the beneficiaries and a training programme for the skilled/unskilled workers for construction, maintenance and operation of rainwater harvesting structures will be organized by NIRD/NGRI/PHED/NGO.

### **Implementation Period**

- (i) The scheme shall be implemented during the 10th Five Year Plan with an approved outlay of Rs. crore and with financial assistance of Rs. crore from the GOI;
- (ii) The scheme will be applicable to all beneficiaries for construction of RWH structures in respect of which loans are sanctioned during the 10th Five Year Plan.

### **Target**

- (i) Under the scheme, creation of no. of rainwater harvesting structures is targeted.
- (ii) The scheme shall be implemented by the DWSMs/PHEDs

### **Insurance**

- (iii) It will be the responsibility of the owner of the rainwater storage system to have the insurance for the rainwater storage system.

### **Subsidy**

A. Subsidy under the scheme shall be provided on the capital cost of the project as follows:

- (i) Rate of subsidy shall be 22.5% of the capital cost of the project.
- (ii) Details of RWH system giving capacity and cost are available in Annexures I-IV.
- (iii) Subsidy for the project under the scheme shall be released through NABARD for projects financed by the commercial,

cooperative and regional rural banks, ADFCs, scheduled PCBs, NFDFI and other institutions eligible for refinance from NABARD and through DWSM for projects financed by DWSM.

**B. Subsidy will be released in two instalments:**

- (i) 50% of the subsidy amount will be released to NABARD by DWSM/PHED/RWS Department in advance. Accordingly, NABARD would release subsidy to the participating banks in advance for keeping the same in a Subsidy Reserve Fund Account of the concerned borrowers, to be adjusted finally against loan amount of the bank on completion of the project. This amount of 50% advance subsidy would be released by NABARD to the participating bank on submission of a project profile cum claim form.
- (ii) The remaining 50% of the subsidy amount would be disbursed to the participating bank(s) by NABARD after conduct of an inspection by the inspection committee consisting of officials from NABARD, participating bank(s) and DWSM/PHED/RWS Department in the concerned state.

**C. Adjustment of subsidy in borrower's account**

The subsidy released to the bank/DWSM for an individual project will be kept in a separate borrower-wise account. The adjustment of subsidy will be back ended. Accordingly, the full project cost including the subsidy amount, but excluding the margin money contribution from the beneficiary, would be back ended. Accordingly, the full project cost including the subsidy amount, but disbursed as a loan by the banks. The repayment schedule will be drawn on the loan amount in such a way that the total subsidy amount is adjusted after the full bank loan component with interest is liquidated.

**D. No interest chargeable on subsidy portion:**

The subsidy admissible to the beneficiary under the scheme will be kept in the subsidy reserve fund account (borrower-wise) in the books of the financing banks. No interest should be charged on this by the bank. In view of this, for purposes of charging interest on the loan component, the subsidy amount should be excluded. The balance lying to the credit of the subsidy reserve fund account will not form part of demand and time liabilities for the purpose of SLR/CRR.

### **Pattern of Assistance**

For projects financed through banks/NABARD

(i)	Owner's contribution	—	10%
(ii)	Subsidy from the State Govt.	—	22.5%
(iii)	Institutional loan from commercial/ cooperative banks etc.	—	67.5%

### **Institutional Lending**

#### **A. Eligible Financing Institutions**

The eligible financing institutions under the scheme are:

- (i) Commercial banks, regional rural banks (RRBs), State cooperative banks (SCBs), state cooperative agricultural and rural development banks (SARDBs), north-eastern development finance corporation (NDFC) and such other institutions which will be eligible for refinance from NABARD.

#### **B. Term Loan**

- (i) 67.5% of the project cost can be raised as term loan from the financing banks. As the subsidy is back-ended, eligible amount of the subsidy (22.5%) would be initially allowed as term loan to the beneficiary. The repayment schedule will be drawn on the total loan amount (including subsidy) in such a way that the subsidy amount is adjusted after liquidation of net bank loan (excluding subsidy).
- (ii) Repayment period will depend upon the cash flow and will be upto 7-8 years including a grace period of one year. The first annual instalment will fall due after 23 months from the date of first disbursement.
- (iii) Rate of interest to borrowers on term loan shall be 12% per annum (being negotiated). This is applicable from the date of the first disbursement of loan.

### **Time Limit for Completion**

A time limit of 15 months is prescribed for completion of the project from the date of sanction by bank. However, if reasons for

delay are justified, a further grace period of 3 months may be allowed by the participating bank. If the project is not completed within the stipulated period, the benefit of subsidy shall not be available and advance subsidy has to be refunded forthwith.

### **Refinance Assistance from NABARD**

#### **A. For Construction of RWH Structures**

For construction of RWH structures, NABARD would provided refinance to commercial bank/RRBs/SCBs/SCARDBs and such other eligible institutions @ 90% of the amount financed by the banks as term loan. However, quantum of refinance is 95% in case of SCARDBs in north-eastern region. Rate of interest of refinance will be decided by NABARD from time to time and at present it is @ 8.5% per annum.

### **Publicity and Training**

A general awareness programme on the scheme for the beneficiaries and a training programme for the skilled/unskilled workers for construction, maintenance and operation of rainwater harvesting structures will be organized by NIRD/NGRI/PHED/NGO.

### **Other Conditions:**

- (i) RWH system may be treated as infrastructure for financing
- (ii) The participating banks/VWSCs/NABARD etc. will adhere to their own norms for appraisal of project.
- (iii) It will be the responsibility of the owner of the rainwater harvesting system to have the insurance for the rainwater harvesting system.
- (iv) A signboard at the site assisted under “Ministry of Rural Development, Department of Drinking Water Supply” will be exhibited.
- (v) Government’s interpretation of various terms will be final.
- (vi) Any other pre and post inspection may be undertaken to verify physical and financial progress as and when required.
- (vii) Government reserves the right to modify, add and delete any term and condition without assigning any reason.



## **Procedure to be followed for sanctioning of project and release of subsidy**

### **Projects financed through banks**

- (a) Any beneficiary individually, community based organizations, SHG, Voluntary Organizations, NGOs, PRIs and DWSMs will submit the project proposal for term loan and subsidy to the bank on an application form as prescribed by the concerned bank along with report and other documents for appraisal and sanction of loan after getting approval of DWSM.
- (b) Bank after appraisal and sanctioning and disbursement of the first instalment of loan will furnish a brief project profile-cum-claim form for advance subsidy in the prescribed format given at Annexure I along with a copy of bank's sanction letter to RO, NABARD with a copy to the DWSM.
- (c) NABARD on receipt of project profile-cum-claim form from the participating bank, will sanction and released 50% advance subsidy to the participating bank for keeping the same in the Subsidy Reserve Fund Account (borrower-wise). NABARD will forward a copy of the sanction and project profile as indicated in Annexure I to the head office of DWSM project-wise for replenishment or adjustment against advance subsidy provided by State Government to NABARD. The release of subsidy by NABARD will be subject to availability of funds from State Government.
- (d) When the project is nearing completion, the DWSM/RD Department will inform the bank who will initiate action for an inspection by the committee consisting of officials from the bank, NABARD and DWSM to ensure that the rainwater harvesting structures conform to technical and financial parameters. After inspection is conducted, the bank will submit the claim form for final subsidy in the prescribed format given in Annexure II to NABARD, in triplicate, with a copy to DWSM. The inspection report of the committee and completion certificate should invariably be enclosed with the claim form for final subsidy. NABARD shall release the final subsidy to banks which will be replenished by PHED/ State Government or adjusted against the subsidy amount provided to NABARD in advance.

### **Projects financed through DWSM**

- (a) DWSM shall provide assistance to the VWSCs for construction of RWH systems.
- (b) The VWSCs shall formulate proposals in the format prescribed by DWSM and shall submit to DWSM.
- (c) The VWSCs shall examine the proposal and shall recommend to DWSM for consideration.
- (d) DWSM shall consider the proposals by way of table/field appraisal according to the quantum of assistance involved.
- (e) The pattern of funding, interest rate, mode of release of sanctioned assistance shall be as per DDWS letter no. Dt.
- (f) The sanctioned assistance shall be released through NABARD to the VWSCs.
- (g) The DWSM shall periodically furnish progress reports to State Governments/DDWS.
- (h) DWSM shall release advance subsidy for parking in VWSC's account. The project-wise subsidy shall be adjusted/ replenished by DWSM.
- (i) DWSM shall furnish utilization certificate to State Government/DDWS.
- (j) DWSM shall furnish utilization certificate to State Government/DDWS.
- (k) DWSM may undertake inspection of RWH structures to verify the utilization on a random basis.

### **Monitoring**

- (i) The monitoring of each project shall be done by DWSM and review will be done on a monthly basis with NABARD/ SWSM.
- (ii) As indicated in paragraph, a committee consisting of officials from NABARD, DWSM/DDWS, participating bank(s) as the case may be and State Government would inspect the project work within the overall scope of the operational guidelines of the above scheme and would submit its report which should be enclosed with Annexure II. For this purpose, the promoters/participating banks/NABARD will initiate necessary action to get the inspection conducted on the project site by the committee at the time when the project is completed so as to avoid any delay in release/adjustment of subsidy.
- (iii) The progress report of the scheme as per format at Annexures-IV & V shall be sent by NABARD/DWSM directly to the DDWS on a monthly basis.

NOTE FOR DISCUSSION WITH STATE ON SCHEME FOR  
EXTENDING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR HOUSEHOLD,  
COMMUNITY AND INSTITUTIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION  
OF RAIN WATER HARVESTING STRUCTURES  
IN RURAL AREAS

Department of Drinking Water Supply proposes to introduce a credit linked scheme to promote rain water harvesting structure by individual households, community and institutions. The scheme is being discussed with NABARD at present. Salient features of the scheme will be as given below:

- The objective of the scheme will be to give credit to individual, community and institutions for creating rain water harvesting structures.
- The scheme will be operational in DDP, HADP, DPAP areas and North Eastern States.
- Investment subsidy as well as interest subsidy is proposed to be given to the beneficiaries. It is proposed to give 20% investment subsidy and full interest subsidy to the individual household for promoting rain water harvesting structures.
- Interest subsidy is considered justified to ensure willingness of the beneficiary to come forward for the loan as he/she is investing for the future generation's benefit as well as contributing to groundwater recharge. As interest burden on a household RWH structure costing Rs. 19,000 comes to Rs. 4857.49 for a six-year period at the rate of 9%. Investment subsidy can be enhanced to 20% of the cost+interest burden.
- The interest rate will be negotiated with the bank and expected to be about 9-10%.
- The scheme will be implemented through DWSMs at the district level.
- The identification of beneficiaries will be done by DWSM along with the bank.
- There will be a Central and State level Monitoring Committee headed by Secretary (DWS) and SWSM respectively.
- The subsidy funds to the banks will be released by State Governments directly.

State Government can offer their comments on the salient features of the guidelines so that any modification if required may be incorporated.

*ANNEXURE-I*

FORMAT FOR PROJECT PROFILE CUM CLAIM FOR CALMING  
50% ADVANCE SUBSIDY/REFINANCE (TO BE SUBMITTED BY  
BANK IN TRIPLICATE TO NABARD WITH A COPY TO DWSM)

(1) Regional Office, NABARD

(2) DWSM

**Capital investment Subsidy Scheme for construction of RWH Systems**

**Part-I**

**For use by bank**

1. Name & address of project:
2. Name & address of beneficiary
3. Name & address of financing bank
4. Date of receipt of proposal/application:
5. (a) date of sanction of term loan by bank:  
(b) Date of disbursement of first instalment:
6. Means of Finance:
  - Total outlay
  - Beneficiary
  - Bank Loan
7. Item wise financial projection:
8. Capacity to be created
  - (i) 50000 litres
  - (ii) 10000 litres
  - (iii)
  - (iv)

9. Rate of interest (to be) charged
  - (a) in the case of CBS
  - (b) In the case of others convenor bank of SLBC
10. Brief coverage on technical feasibility and financial viability  
(Enclose separate sheet along with project report)
11. Other relevant information
12. The project has been appraised and found to be technically feasible and financially viable. We intend/do not intend to avail of refinance from NABARD. The refinance amount is Rs. .... (if to be availed).
13. An Amount of Rs. .... (Rupees ....) being 50% of the eligible amount of subsidy may please be released in respect of the project for crediting to the "Subsidy reserve Fund Account-Borrowerwise."
14. We note that a time limit of 15 months is stipulated for completion of the project from the date of sanction of project. If reasons for delay in completion of the project are justified, a maximum grace period of 3 months may be allowed for completion of project. We also note that the advance subsidy has to be refunded rth-with if the project is not competed within the above stipulated period and as per the broad parameter of the scheme. It is further noted that in case of any delay in refund of subsidy the participating bank/beneficiary will be liable for payment of the scheme.

Place: ( \_\_\_\_\_ )

Date: **Seal and signature of the  
authorized signatory of bank**

## Part II

### (For use of RO, NABARD)

(A) (For use by NABARD)

Advance Subsidy

The claim of advance subsidy for Rs. \_\_\_\_\_ is forwarded herewith for release of the same.

Date:

( \_\_\_\_\_ )

**Authorised Signatory**  
**Regional Office, NABARD**

(B) For use by NABARD

Scheme Code

State Code

District Code

Project Code

Bank code

An amount of Rs. \_\_\_\_\_ is released as advance subsidy on \_\_\_\_\_ (name of the bank) *vide* subsidy disbursement advice no. \_\_\_\_\_ (copy enclosed). This amount may please be replenished/adjusted by DWSM.

Date:

( \_\_\_\_\_ )

**Authorised Signatory**  
**Head Office, NABARD**

(C) For use by DWSM/PHED

An amount of Rs. \_\_\_\_\_ as advance subsidy against above mentioned claim is hereby released/replenished to NABARD vide D.D. No. \_\_\_\_\_ dated \_\_\_\_\_ drawn on \_\_\_\_\_ (Bank)

Date:

( \_\_\_\_\_ )

**Authorised Signatory**  
**Member Secretary, DWSC/DWSM**

*ANNEXURE II*

FORMAT FOR CLAIMING FINAL INSTALMENT OF SUBSIDY  
HAD LIKE (TO BE SUBMITTED BY BANK IN TRIPPLICATE  
TO NABARD WITH A COPY TO DWSM

To

- (1) Regional Office, NABARD**
- (2) DWSM**

Capital investment Subsidy Scheme for construction of Rain Water  
Harvesting Systems

**Part I**

**For use by bank**

1. Name, address/location of project:
2. Name & address of beneficiary
3. Name & address of financing bank
4. Date of sanction of term loan by bank:
5. Date of sanction of refinance by NABARD, if applicable:
6. Date and amount of refinance released by NABARD:
7. Date of last inspection of project by bank:  
(enclose copy of inspection report)
8. 

(i)	Total cost of project	Rs.
(ii)	beneficiary contribution	Rs.
(iii)	Bank loan	Rs.
9. Capacity to be created
  1. 5000 litres
  2. 10000 litres
  3. 25000 litres

10. Advance subsidy
  - (i) Date of receipt
  - (ii) Amount Rs.
11. Rate of interest being charged by financing bank
  - (a) In the case of CBs PLR %
  - (b) In the case of others PLR of convenor bank of SLBC %
12. Whether construction has been carried out as per the technical parameters envisaged under the project.
13. Total amount of expenditure incurred in the project-itemwise details duly certified by a chartered accountant (copy of all receipts & certificates the chartered accountant are to be enclosed).
14. Various permissions/approvals obtained by the NGOs/PRC for establishment and commissioning of the project from various government authorities. (copy of each such approval is to be enclosed)
15. The completion/commissioning certificate is required to be signed by the beneficiary & verified by a qualified/approved engineer/architecture certificate is required to be counter signed by the branch manager of the financing bank.

Since the above project is complete as per terms and conditions stipulated under the scheme, final inspection of the RWH system has been arranged, and an amount of Rs. \_\_\_\_\_ (Rupees \_\_\_\_\_) being the final instalment of subsidy may please be released for crediting to the "Subsidy reserve Fund Account-Borrower-wise." Copy of the inspection report of IC is enclosed.

16. This is to certify that the remarks given by IC have been complied with.

Place:	( _____ )
Date:	Seal and signature of the
Enclosure: Completion certificate licence	Branch Manager
inspection report of Committee, etc.	(Bank)



## Part II

(For use of RO, NABARD)

### (A) (For use RO NABARD)

An amount of Rs. \_\_\_\_\_ as final instalment of subsidy towards the above claim of \_\_\_\_\_ (name of the bank) in respect of \_\_\_\_\_ (name of the project) may be released.

Place:

( \_\_\_\_\_ )

Date:

Authorised signatory  
Regional Office, NABARD

### (B) For use by Head Office NABARD

Scheme Code

State Code

District Code

Project Code

Bank code

An amount of Rs. \_\_\_\_\_ is released as final subsidy on \_\_\_\_\_ (name of the bank) *vide* subsidy disbursement advice no. \_\_\_\_\_ (copy enclosed). This amount may please be released by DWSM.

Date:

( \_\_\_\_\_ )

Authorised signatory  
Head Office, NABARD

### (C) For use by DWSM

An amount of Rs. \_\_\_\_\_ as final subsidy against above mentioned claim is hereby released/replenished to NABARD *vide* D.D. No. \_\_\_\_\_ dated \_\_\_\_\_ drawn on \_\_\_\_\_ (Bank)

Date:

( \_\_\_\_\_ )

Authorised signatory  
Head Office/DWSM

ANNEXURE III

FORMAT FOR UTILIZATION CERTIFICATE  
FOR THE USE OF FINANCING BANK TO BE SUBMITTED, IN  
TRIPLICATE, TO THE REGIONAL OFFICE OF NABARD  
CAPITAL INVESTMENT SUBSIDY SCHEME FOR  
CONSTRUCTION/RENOVATION OF RWHS

**Utilisation Certificate**

1. Name, address and location of the beneficiary and project
2. Name of the financing bank
3. Name and address of the financing branch
4. Date of sanction of loan by bank
5. Date of inspection by Monitoring Committee
6. Date of commission of the unit
7. 

(i) Total Financial Outlay	Rs. _____			
(ii) Margin Money	Rs. _____			
(iii) Bank Loan	Rs. _____			
(iv) Subsidy Received	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"><tr><td style="width: 25%;">Date of receipt from NABARD</td><td style="width: 25%;">Amount (Rs.) Fund</td><td style="width: 50%;">Date of credit to the Subsidy Reserve A/c of the Borrower</td></tr></table>	Date of receipt from NABARD	Amount (Rs.) Fund	Date of credit to the Subsidy Reserve A/c of the Borrower
Date of receipt from NABARD	Amount (Rs.) Fund	Date of credit to the Subsidy Reserve A/c of the Borrower		
(a) 50% Advance Subsidy				
(b) Final installment of subsidy				
<u>          Total          </u>				
8. 

(i) Capacity created	
(a) New unit—Litres	
9. Rates of interest charged by financing bank % p.a.
  - (a) In the case of CBs-PLR-% P.A.
  - (b) In the case of others-  
PLR of Convener Bank of SLB(C)

10. The bank has not availed refinance from NABARD.
11. This is to certify that the full amount of subsidy received in respect of the above project has been fully utilized (by way of crediting to the "Subsidy Reserve Fund Account—borrower-wise) and adjusted in the books of account under the sanctioned terms and conditions of the project within the overall guidelines of the scheme.

Place:

( \_\_\_\_\_ )

Date:

Seal and signature of the  
authorized signatory of bank.

ANNEXURE IV&V

PROGRESS OF CAPITAL INVESTMENT SUBSIDY SCHEME  
FOR RURAL GODOWNS

SANCTIONED SCHEMES

STATUS AS ON

Sl.No.	State	Name of the party	Location	Capacity Litres	TFO sanctioned	Bank loan	Promoter's equity	Total eligible subsidy	Subsidy released to financing banks

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT

**Department of Drinking  
Water Supply**

**SHRI S.K. HAZRA,  
GENERAL MANAGER,  
National Bank for Agriculture &  
Rural Development,  
Plot No. C-24, G Block,  
Bandra Kurla Complex,  
Bandra East, Mumbai-400 051  
Tel. : 022-6539324, 6530029  
Fax : 022-6530090  
E-Mail : nabid@boms5.vsnl.net.in**

**DWSM**

6. Consolidated details of pending applications/sanctions (for all banks in the State)

Sl.No.	Activity	Number of Applications Received	Number of Applications Sanctioned	Number of Applications Pending	Number Disbursed***		
					Fully	Partly	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Shallow Tube Well with pump Set						
2.	Low lift irrigation points						
3.	Pump Set						
4.	Dug Well						
5.	Total						

\*\*\*Problems and constraints if any.

RO-in-charge/on-charge of ICD-RO

(To be submitted to HO by 21st of the succeeding month)

## APPENDIX II

### POSITION OF ENACTMENT OF LEGISLATION ON CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT OF GROUND WATER RESOURCES IN VARIOUS STATES AS ON 12.03.2003

#### STATES/UTs WHERE LEGISLATION ENACTED AND BEING IMPLEMENTED

Sl.No.	States/UTs	Status of Implementation
1	2	3
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Andhra Pradesh Water, Land and Trees Act, 2002 covering whole State has been enacted with effect from 18.04.2002.
2.	Goa	The Goa Ground Water Regulation Act, 2002 has already been enacted by the State Legislature on 25.01.2002.
3.	Tamil Nadu	The Chennai Metropolitan Area Ground Water (Regulation) Amendment Act, 1987 has been enacted to regulate ground water development in Chennai and some of the nearby revenue villages. The President has assented to the Tamil Nadu Ground Water (Development & Management) Bill, 2002.
4.	Lakshadweep	Lakshadweep Ground Water (Development & Control) Regulation, 2001 has been enacted with effect from 01.11.2001.
5.	Kerala	The "Kerala Ground Water (Control and Regulation) Act, 1997" has since been passed by the State Legislative Assembly.

#### STATES/UTs WHERE BILLS PASSED BUT NOT ENACTED

1.	Gujarat	Has enacted legislation on 1987 as "Bombay Irrigation (Gujarat Amendment) Act, 1976" by amending the "Bombay Irrigation Act, 1976". The legislation is applicable only to nine identified districts in the Gujarat State.
----	---------	---

1	2	3
2.	Maharashtra	The Maharashtra Ground Water (Control and Regulation of Development and Management) Bill, 2000 has been sent for assent of Hon'ble President of India.
3.	West Bengal	"West Bengal Water Resources Conservation, Protection and Development (Management, Control and Regulation) Bill, 2000" has been received for assent of the Hon'ble President of India. Some changes are proposed to be incorporated in the Bill.
4.	Pondicherry	Pondicherry Ground Water (Control & Regulation) Bill, 2002 has been passed by the State Legislature and referred to the Ministry of Home Affairs for President's assent.

STATES/UTs WHICH HAVE INITIATED ACTION FOR  
PREPARING LEGISLATION

1.	Assam	Model Bill to regulate and control the development of ground water has been framed by the State Government and is sent to Committee Members for comments.
2.	Bihar	The State Government has set up a Committee to consider the matter and decision will be taken as per recommendations of the Committee.
3.	Haryana	Draft Bill is under preparation by the State Government.
4.	Himachal Pradesh	The Draft Bill is under consideration of the State Government.
5.	Jammu & Kashmir	The draft Bill is being examined by the State Government.
6.	Karnataka	The Karnataka Ground Water (Regulation and Control) Bill, 2002 is under consideration of the State Government.



1	2	3
7.	Mizoram	Preparation of Draft Bill for regulating ground water with reference to Model Bill for the State is under process in PHED.
8.	Orissa	The matter is under consideration of Government of Orissa.
9.	Punjab	The Government of Punjab has prepared a draft on "Punjab Ground Water (Control and Regulation) Act, 1998" and sent it to CGWA for comments.
10.	Rajasthan	Rajasthan Ground Water (Regulation) Bill, 1997 is under consideration of the State Government.
11.	Uttar Pradesh	Draft Bill on U.P. Ground Water (Control and Regulation Act), 1997 has been prepared and circulated to Members of State Water Council for suggestion and modifications.
12.	Daman & Diu	Ground Water (Control & Regulation) Act, 2002 has been prepared and referred to the Ministry of Rural Development for concurrence.
13.	NCT Delhi	The State Government proposes to amend the Delhi Water Board Act to accommodate concerns expressed in the Model Bill, draft of which has since been prepared and at consultation stage.

STATES/UTs WHICH FEEL IT NOT NECESSARY  
TO ENACT LEGISLATION

1.	Nagaland	In view of State Government at this stage it may not be necessary to enact any law.
2.	Sikkim	In view of State Government enactment of legislation to control the extraction of ground water considered not necessary in the State.

1	2	3
3.	Tripura	In view of the State Government it is felt not necessary to make legislation to regulated ground water development in the State at this stage.
4.	Chandigarh	In UT of Chandigarh there is already a Bye-law requiring permission of Chandigarh Administration for withdrawal of ground water in Capital Project Areas. No action was required.

STATES/UTs WHICH HAVE NOT RESPONDED YET

1.	Arunachal Pradesh	No response.
2.	Chhattisgarh	A copy of Model Bill was sent to the State Government as requested by them.
3.	Jharkhand	Letter from Hon'ble Minister (WR) acknowledged.
4.	Madhya Pradesh	"Madhya Pradesh Peyjal Parirakshan Adhiniyam, 1986" for protection of drinking water sources exists.
5.	Manipur	No response.
6.	Meghalaya	No response.
7.	Uttaranchal	No response.
8.	Andaman & Nicobar	No response.
9.	Dadar & Nagar Haveli	No response.

### APPENDIX III

#### COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2005-2006)

#### EXTRACTS OF MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY THE 27 OCTOBER, 2005

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1200 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

#### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Mohan Jena
4. Shri Subash Maharia
5. Shri Hannan Mollah
6. Shri Dawan Narbula
7. Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil
8. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
9. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
10. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
11. Shri Mohan Singh
12. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
13. Shri Bagun Sumbrai

#### *Rajya Sabha*

14. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
15. Shrimati Vanga Geetha
16. Shri Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
17. Shri Penumalli Madhu
18. Shri Kalraj Mishra
19. Dr. Chandan Mitra
20. Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilania
21. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri A.K. Shah — *Under Secretary*
4. Shrimati Gurjeet Kaur — *Assistant Director*

2. The Chairman, at the outset, welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee and felicitated Smt. Vanga Geetha, MP, Rajya Sabha on her nomination as the member of the Committee. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration Memorandum No. 2 regarding action taken report on Eleventh Report of the Committee on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development). The Committee after deliberation adopted the draft report with certain modifications as indicated in *Annexure*.

3. \*\*\*

4. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the aforesaid draft action taken Reports on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Department/Ministry and present the same to both the Houses of Parliament.

5. The Committee, thereafter, decided that the next sitting might be convened on Thursday, the 10th November, 2005.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

---

\*Not related with the Report.

ANNEXURE

[See Para 2 of the Minutes of the sitting held on 27.10.2005]

Sl.No.	Page No.	Para No.	Line No.	Modifications
1	2	3	4	5
1.	15 & 16	—	4 from below	<p><i>For</i> “The Committee while expressing concern over the trend of diminishing States’ matching contribution would like the Department to analyse the reasons therefore and inform the Committee accordingly.”</p> <p><i>Read</i> “The Committee further note that as per the guidelines (refer Para 2.5.1 of guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programmes) the allocation of Central Assistance under the ARWSP is subject to the matching provision/ expenditure by the States under the State Sector MNP. Releases under ARWSP would not exceed the provision for Rural Water Supply made by the State Government under the MNP. In such a situation the Committee fail to understand how the Central allocation is being released without ensuring the equal allocation by the State Governments as per the stipulated guidelines. The Committee while expressing the strong concern over the matter would like the</p>

1	2	3	4	5
				Department to analyse the reasons therefore and inform the Committee accordingly."
2.	17 & 18	—	2	<p><i>Add at the end:</i></p> <p>"E-1 Replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara Recommendation (Para No. 2.65)</p> <p>19A The Committee had recommended as under:</p> <p>"The Committee in their earlier report (Para No. 2.60 of 1st Report—14th Lok Sabha) had examined the concept of replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara and expressed serious concerns in this regard. Xxx xxx xxx The Committee strongly recommend to review the position in this regard in the light of what has been stated above and the apprehensions expressed by the Committee. The Committee may be adequately explained about the position to enable them to analyse the not so encouraging performance of ARWSP as evaluated above."</p> <p>19B The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:</p> <p>"The Committee have noted earlier that now the Department has initiated action to extend the reforms process to ARWSP instead of replacing it with Swajaldhara. The detailed modalities for this</p>

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

are still being discussed in the EFC and the Committee shall be informed of the same when finalised. It is proposed to gradually incorporate the reforms, *i.e.* community participation, from the Eleventh Plan. In the intervening period, the States are to be guided towards a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Department to enable them to take up the reforms. xx xx xx”

19C The Committee note that the detailed modalities to extend the reforms process to ARWSP are being discussed in the EFC and it is proposed to gradually incorporate the reforms *i.e.* community participation from the Eleventh Plan. The Committee while noting that ARWSP and Swajaldhara are two distinct scheme of drinking water, would like to reiterate their earlier stand on the issue of replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara. These two schemes should be implemented separately. The concern of the Committee expressed in their earlier recommendations should be considered while finalizing the policy for drinking water schemes for Eleventh Plan.

1	2	3	4	5
				<p>The Committee further note that as per the guidelines (refer Para 3.4.1 of the guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme and Para No. 15.4 of guidelines of Swajaldhara) funds for Sector reforms and Swajaldhara are released district-wise. The Committee would like that the guidelines in this regard should be strictly followed and the unit of allocation/releases of funds for all the Central Sector Schemes of drinking water should be a district."</p>
3.	21	25	10	<p><i>For</i> "Besides the Committee find that problems are also being faced for manning these laboratories by some of the State Governments. The Committee note that the options like out sourcing and employing trained manpower on contract basis are being considered by State Governments. The Committee would like the Department to interact with the State Governments in this regard so that a viable solution can be found."</p> <p><i>Read</i> "Besides, the Committee find that problems are also being faced for manning these laboratories by some of the State Governments. The Committee would like the Department to interact with the State Governments in this regard so that a viable solution can be found."</p>



1	2	3	4	5
4.	31	46	8	<p><i>After "last 3-4 years" Add "The Committee express strong concern over the poor performance of Rural Sanitation Programme. They would like to be apprised about the concrete corrective action taken by the Department so far."</i></p>

#### APPENDIX IV

[Vide Para 4 of the Introduction]

#### ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE ELEVENTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (14TH LOK SABHA)

I.	Total number of recommendations	41
II.	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government: Para Nos. 2.15, 2.32, 2.33, 3.43, 2.44, 2.64, 2.65, 3.12, 3.13, 3.14, 4.12, 4.13, 4.14, 4.17, 4.20, 4.23, 5.9, 5.10, 6.29, 6.30 and 6.31	21
	Percentage to the Total recommendations	(51.22%)
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies: Para No. 2.63	1
	Percentage to the total recommendations	(2.44%)
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee: Para Nos. 2.30, 2.31, 2.34, 2.45, 2.49, 2.50, 2.51, 2.66, 4.10, 4.11, 4.15, 4.16, 5.8, 6.26, 6.27 and 6.28	16
	Percentage to the total recommendations	(39.02%)
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited: Para Nos. 2.53, 4.24 and 5.7	3
	Percentage to the total recommendations	(7.32%)