

**20**

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

**FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA**

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

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2006-2007)**

**TWENTIETH REPORT**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

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

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2006-2007)

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 18.5.2006*

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on 18.5.2006*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*May, 2006/Vaisakha, 1928 (Saka)*

**C.R.D. No. 26**

*Price* : Rs. 113.00

© 2006 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 .....	(iii)
ABBREVIATIONS .....	(v)
INTRODUCTION .....	(vii)
REPORT	
CHAPTER I    Introductory .....	1
CHAPTER II    Overall Analysis of Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply .....	3
Status of Implementation of Direction 73A .....	3
CHAPTER III    Drinking Water Scenario in Rural Areas of the Country—Overall Analysis of Demands for Grants (2006-07) of the Department for the Rural Water Supply Sector .....	5
A.    Evolution of drinking water schemes under Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM) .....	5
B.    Overall position of outlay and expenditure provided for drinking water supply in rural areas .....	8
C.    Issue of unspent balances under ARWSP ...	11
D.    Inter-component allocation under ARWSP ...	13
E.    Physical achievements under ARWSP .....	17
F.    Slippages of habitations .....	23
CHAPTER IV    Swajaldhara .....	26
A.    Financial Performance under Swajaldhara ....	27
B.    Physical performance under Swajaldhara .....	28
C.    Community Contribution under Swajaldhara .....	30
CHAPTER V    Sustainability, Water Management and Conservation .....	33
	(i)

	PAGE
CHAPTER VI Quality of Drinking Water in Rural Areas .....	37
CHAPTER VII Drinking Water Scenario in Rural Schools .....	41
CHAPTER VIII Rural Sanitation .....	44

APPENDICES

I. Statement indicating Outlay and Actual expenditure during Ninth and Tenth Plan .....	53
II. State-wise unspent balance of funds as on 31 December, 2005 under ARWSP .....	54
III. Financial progress under Rural Water Supply Programme (Central & State Sector) during 2004-2005 .....	56
IV. Financial progress under Rural Water Supply Programme (Central & State Sector) during 2005-2006 .....	61
V. Recommendation para Nos. 2.49 and 2.50 of Eleventh Report of the Committee (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) ...	65
VI. Financial and Physical performance under Swajaldhara for the year 2003-2004 .....	66
VII. Financial and Physical performance under Swajaldhara for the year 2004-2005 .....	69
VIII. Detailed status indicating water quality affected habitations reported by States .....	72
IX. State-wise unspent balance of funds as on 31 December, 2005 under CRSP .....	75
X. Extracts of the Minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 22 March, 2006 .....	76
XI. Minutes of sitting of the Committee held on 13 April, 2006 .....	78
XII. Extracts of Minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 9 May, 2006 .....	80
XIII. Statement of observations/recommendations .....	82

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. Pallani Shamy
- \*12. Shri Prabodh Panda
- @13. Vacant
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

---

\*Hon'ble Speaker has changed the nomination of Shri Prabodh Panda, MP (LS) from Standing Committee on Water Resources to Standing Committee on Rural Development *vide* para No. 1580, Lok Sabha Bulletin Part II dated 23 August, 2005.

@Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil, MP (LS) and member of the Committee ceased to be member of the Lok Sabha *vide* Notification No. 21/5/2005/T *w.e.f.* 23.12.2005 (AN).

*Rajya Sabha*

22. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
23. Vacant
24. Vacant
25. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
26. Shri Penumalli Madhu
27. Vacant
28. Dr. Chandan Mitra
29. Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilonia
30. Vacant
31. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*

---

<sup>§</sup>Hon'ble Chairman, Rajya Sabha has changed the nomination of Shrimati Vanga Geetha, MP (RS) from Standing Committee on Industry to Standing Committee on Rural Development *w.e.f.* 23 August, 2005 *vide* Committee Branch-I note dated 25.8.2005.

#Shrimati Vanga Geetha, MP (RS), Shri Ghanshyam Chandra Kharwar, MP (RS), Shri Kalraj Mishra, MP (RS), Dr. Faguni Ram MP (RS) and Prof. R.B.S. Varma, MP (RS) and members of the Committee on Rural Development ceased to be members of the Rajya Sabha due to completion of the tenure of the members of Rajya Sabha *w.e.f.* 2.4.2006 *vide* Coordination Cell note dated 23.3.2006.

## ABBREVIATIONS

ACA	—	Additional Central Assistance
ARWSP	—	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme
ASHA	—	Accredited Social Health Activist
BE	—	Budget Estimates
BMS	—	Basic Minimum Services
CAP	—	Comprehensive Action Plan
CGWB	—	Central Ground Water Board
CRSP	—	Central Rural Sanitation Programme
DLM	—	District Level Monitors
DWSC	—	District Water and Sanitation Committee
DWSM	—	District Water and Sanitation Management
FC	—	Fully Covered
HRD	—	Human Resource Development
IEC	—	Information Education and Communication
MIS	—	Management Information System
MNP	—	Minimum Needs Programme
MPR	—	Monthly Progress Reports
NAG	—	National Agenda for Governance
NC	—	Not Covered
NCMP	—	National Common Minimum Programme
NDWM	—	National Drinking Water Mission
NGO	—	Non-Governmental Organisation
NHRDP	—	National Human Resource Development Programme
O&M	—	Operation and Maintenance
PC	—	Partially Covered
PRIs	—	Panchayati Raj Institutions
R&D	—	Research and Development
RE	—	Revised Estimates
RGNDWM	—	Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission
SWSM	—	State Water Sanitation Management
TSC	—	Total Sanitation Campaign
UNICEF	—	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
UT	—	Union territory



## 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 Twentieth Report on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development).

2. The Committee examined the Demands for Grants pertaining to the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) for the year 2006-07 which were laid on the Table of the House on 11 March, 2006.

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) on 13 April, 2006.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 9 May, 2006.

5. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officials of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) for placing before them the requisite material and their considered views in connection with the examination of the subject.

6. They would also like to place on record their deep sense of appreciation for the invaluable assistance rendered to them by the officials of Lok Sabha Secretariat attached to the Committee.

NEW DELHI;  
17 May, 2006  

---

27 Vaisakha, 1928 (Saka)

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

## REPORT

### CHAPTER I

#### INTRODUCTORY

The Ministry of Rural Development consists of three Departments: (i) Department of Rural Development, (ii) Department of Land Resources, and (iii) Department of Drinking Water Supply.

1.2 The Department of Drinking Water Supply was created in October, 1999 as the nodal Department in the Ministry of Rural Development providing financial, scientific and technical assistance to the States in drinking water and sanitation sector. Drinking Water Supply is one of the six components of 'Bharat Nirman' which has been conceived as a plan to be implemented in four years from 2005-2006 to 2008-2009 for building rural infrastructure and bringing basic amenities to rural India. Under the drinking water component of 'Bharat Nirman', it is envisaged to cover all uncovered habitations of Comprehensive Action Plan 1999 and also address the problem of slippages and water quality. At present, the following schemes/programmes are being implemented by the Department:

- (i) Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme or ARWSP launched in 1972;
- (ii) Swajaldhara Programme launched in 2002;
- (iii) National Rural Drinking Water Quality and Surveillance Programme launched in February, 2006; and
- (iv) Rural Sanitation Programme, which was earlier implemented as Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) launched in 1986 and subsequently, restructured in 1999. Finally, the provision for allocation based component of CRSP has been phased out in 2002. The Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) under restructured CRSP was launched *w.e.f.* 1 April, 1999 following community led and people-centric approach.

1.3 The detailed Demands for Grants of the Ministry were laid in Parliament on 11 March, 2006.

1.4 The Demands for Grants of the Department were laid in the Parliament under Demand No. 80.

1.5 The overall Demands for Grants of the Department for 2006-2007 is Rs. 6001.70 crore for both plan and non-plan.

1.6 In the present Report, the Committee have examined the implementation of respective Centrally Sponsored Schemes/Programmes as indicated in the aforesaid para in the context of overall budgetary allocation in the Demands for Grants for the year 2006-2007.

## CHAPTER II

### OVERALL ANALYSIS OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (2006-2007) OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY

#### **Status of Implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee in their First and Eleventh Reports under direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha.**

As per direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, the Minister concerned shall make once in six months a statement in the House regarding the status of implementation of recommendations contained in the Reports of Departmentally Related Standing Committees of Lok Sabha with regard to his Ministry.

2.2 First Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development on Demands for Grants (2004-05) was presented to Parliament on 18 August, 2004. Hon'ble Minister of Rural Development made a statement in the House in pursuance of direction 73A on 6 May, 2005. On examination of the statement it was found that the status of action taken on each of the 31 recommendations was not indicated in the statement. A general remark on the action taken by the Government on few recommendations was made. As such, the statement was found to be deficient of the set procedure. Further, the Committee presented Eleventh Report on Demands for Grants (2005-06) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply to Parliament on 20 April, 2005. The statement with regard to this Report has fallen due on 19 October, 2005.

2.3 The Department of Drinking Water Supply was requested to take the necessary action for tabling the revised statement with regard to First Report and making a statement by Hon'ble Minister in respect of Eleventh Report *vide* Lok Sabha Secretariat OM dated 20 January, 2006 and subsequent reminders dated 24 February, 2006 and 14 March, 2006. Besides, the format in which the statement has to be made was also sent to the Department for their use. In spite of this, revised statement in respect of First Report and the statement in respect of Eleventh Report is yet to be made by the Hon'ble Minister.

2.4 The Committee note that the primary objective of inserting direction 73A in the Directions by the Speaker was to make the Government more accountable for implementation of the various recommendations of the Committee. The Committee are concerned to note that even after a lapse of around six months when the statement on Eleventh Report has fallen due and about three months when the Minister was requested for making the revised statement in respect of First Report, the statements are yet to be made by the Hon'ble Minister. The Committee would like to recommend to the Ministry to ensure that the statements are made at the earliest during the Second part of the Seventh Session. The Committee further strongly recommend to the Ministry to ensure that the statements on each of the reports are made within the specified period, *i.e.*, six months after the presentation of the Report to Parliament as per direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, in future.

## CHAPTER III

### DRINKING WATER SCENARIO IN RURAL AREAS OF THE COUNTRY—OVERALL ANALYSIS OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (2006-07) OF THE DEPARTMENT FOR THE RURAL WATER SUPPLY SECTOR

Rural Drinking Water Supply is a State subject, and has been included in the Eleventh Schedule of the Constitution among the subjects that may be entrusted to Panchayats by the States. The Department of Drinking Water Supply supplements the efforts of the State Governments in providing drinking water and sanitation facilities in the rural habitations by rendering financial and technical assistance under Centrally Sponsored Schemes.

#### **The crisis of water envisaged as per Tenth Plan Document and the World Water Development Report 2003**

3.2 According to Mid Term Appraisal to Tenth Plan, in India per capita availability was about 5200 cubic meter in 1951 but it had fallen to 2200 cubic meter in 1999 and further 1820 cubic meter in 2001 reflecting the effect of rising population. A per capita availability of 1700 cubic meter is required in order to be free of water stress, while availability below 1000 cubic meter is termed as water scarcity. Average availability is therefore, likely to fall below the water stress level in the near future. The per capita storage of about 207 cubic meter is way below the storage achieved in many of the countries such as Russia (6103 cubic meter), Australia (4733 cubic meter), Brazil (3145 cubic meter), US (1964 cubic meter) etc.

3.3 Further the World Water Development Report 2003 'Water for People, Water for Life' stated the global water crisis will reach unprecedented levels in the years ahead with growing per capita scarcity of water in many parts of the developing world.

#### **A. Evolution of drinking water schemes under Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM)**

3.4 As per the information furnished by the Government, a National Water Supply and Sanitation Programme was introduced in the social sector in the year 1954. The Government of India provided assistance to the States to establish special investigation divisions in the Fourth

Five Year Plan to carry out identification of the problem villages. Taking into account the magnitude of the problem and to accelerate the pace of coverage of problem villages, the Government of India introduced the Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) in 1972-73 to assist the States and the Union territories with 100 per cent grants-in-aid to implement the rural water supply schemes in such villages. This programme continued till 1973-74. But with the introduction of the Minimum Needs Programme (MNP) during the Fifth Five Year Plan (from 1974-75), ARWSP was withdrawn. The programme was, however, reintroduced in 1977-78 in which the progress of supply of safe drinking water to identified problem villages under the MNP was not adequately focused.

3.5 The entire programme was given a mission approach when the Technology Mission on Drinking Water Management, called the National Drinking Water Mission (NDWM) was introduced as one of the five missions in 1986. The NDWM was renamed as Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM) in 1991.

#### **Constitution and Functions of RGNDWM**

3.6 The primary objective of RGNDWM is to improve the performance and cost effectiveness of the ongoing programmes in the field of rural drinking water supply so as to ensure the availability of an adequate quantity of drinking water of acceptable quality and to ensure sustained availability of such water on a long term basis. The other main objectives of the Mission include ensuring sustainability of the systems and sources, preserving quality of water by institutionalizing water quality monitoring and surveillance as well as support States for tackling the quality problem and to promote community and household sanitation. The Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) and Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) are the two programmes currently being administered by the RGNDWM under the Department of Drinking Water Supply.

3.7 Under the RGNDWM funds are provided to the States under the following programmes:—

- (a) **Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP):** for supplementing State Government's efforts in providing access to safe drinking water to all rural habitations in the country;

- (b) **Sector Reform/Swajaldhara:** up to 20 per cent of annual ARWSP allocation is earmarked for institutionalizing community participation in Rural Water Supply Programme. Sector Reform Projects were implemented initially in 67 districts on the basis of community participation to the extent of 10 per cent of the capital cost and shouldering entire O&M responsibility by the community. Sector Reform Project approach was scaled up throughout the country as Swajaldhara in December, 2002 so that the reform projects can be taken up in any district of the country within the overall ceiling of 20 per cent of ARWSP funds;
- (c) **Sub-Mission:** Five Sub-Mission on problems of water quality and water conservation have been set up. Before 1 April, 1998, projects under sub-missions were sanctioned centrally by RGNDWM and implemented by State Governments. Since then, powers have been delegated to State Governments to sanction projects under sub-mission. From 2006-2007 focused funding for tackling water quality problems is being done.
- (d) **Human Resources Development (HRD):** for creating trained manpower at various levels (including Panchayat functionaries at grass roots levels);
- (e) **Research and Development (R&D):** in various priority areas of source finding, technology development/application, preparation of hydrogeomorphological maps, solar photovoltaic deep well water pumping systems etc.;
- (f) **Management Information System (MIS):** Development of software for monitoring the data/programme at different levels;
- (g) Provisions of water supply in rural schools not covered by the Ministry of Human Resource Development;
- (h) **Information Education & Communication:** Awareness campaign, sensitizing of community and various agencies involved in implementation of rural water supply/rural sanitation programme under RGNDWM;
- (i) Monitoring & Investigation Units, Purchase of Rigs, Water Quality Monitoring & Surveillance, Monitoring & Evaluation Activity, Solar Voltaic Pumps and innovative projects.



**B. Overall position of outlay and expenditure provided for drinking water supply in rural areas**

3.8 The comparative position of Plan outlay earmarked and expenditure made by the Department for the Rural Drinking Water Supply Sector is as under:—

Ninth Plan	(Rs. in crore)
Outlay	8564.00
Expenditure	8455.00
Tenth Plan	
Outlay proposed	24800
Outlay provided	13245 (increased to 16,855)
Expenditure	11694.42 (upto March, 2006)

3.9 The statement indicating outlay and actual expenditure during the Ninth and Tenth Plan (year-wise) for ARWSP is given in Appendix I.

3.10 The information relating to financial achievements for the last four years in the Tenth Plan is as follows:

	(Rs. in crore)	
Years (Tenth Plan)	Amount Earmarked	Amount Released
2003-2004	2585.00	2564.90
2004-2005	2900.00	*2930.79
2005-2006	#4060.00	**4098.03
2006-2007	5200.00	—

#At RE stage amount increased to Rs. 4060.00 crore for rural water supply.

\*The excess amount of Rs. 30.79 crore was reappropriated from the Sanitation Sector

\*\*The excess amount of Rs. 38.03 crore was reappropriated from the Sanitation Sector

**The assessment of outlay by the Department based on the National Common Minimum Programme and Bharat Nirman programme of the Government**

3.11 The activity wise details of the proposed outlay of Rs. 24,800 crore as Central share for the Rural Water Supply for Tenth Plan

provided are as under:	(Rs. in crore)
1. Coverage of rural habitations	12,300
2. Sector Reforms—community participation in Rural Water Supply Programme and related policy issues, Sustainability of systems and sources, Role of PRIs and NGOs, Restructuring and Re-orientation of the Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission	2,000
Water Quality, Sub-Missions including that on Sustainability, Research and Development, Technology and Integrated Water Resource Management	10,000
Other activities like Human Resource Development (HRD), Information, Education and Communication (IEC), Management Information System (MIS), Monitoring and Evaluation, Fresh habitation Survey and Validation of Data.	500

### The projections made under Bharat Nirman

3.12 Providing drinking water in rural areas is one of the six components of Bharat Nirman.

3.13 The financial requirement projected to fulfil the objective of Rural Drinking Water Component of Bharat Nirman is as under:

#### Total Fund Requirement for the period 2005-2009

	(Rs. in crore)		
Component	Central Share	State Share	Total
Coverage of schools	461.936	461.936	923.872
Coverage of left-over habitations of CAP' 99	3285.285	3285.285	6570.570
Coverage of slipped back/newly emerged habitations	8830.729	7185.720	16016.449
Tackling water quality problems in affected habitations and putting in place water quality monitoring and surveillance system	6687.090	2229.030	8916.120
Outstanding liability for Swajaldhara	319.600	0	319.600
Calamity	952.500	0	952.500
DDP	952.500	0	952.500
O&M	2857.500	2857.500	5715.500
Sustainability	952.500	317.500	1270.000
<b>Total</b>	<b>25300.000</b>	<b>16336.971</b>	<b>41636.971</b>

3.14 The National Common Minimum Programme of the Government has envisaged provision of safe drinking water to all. As per the Comprehensive Action Plan (CAP) prepared on the basis of information furnished by the State Governments, the objective could be achieved subject to availability of funds. As per the information furnished by the Department a requirement of Rs. 5,550 crore was reflected to Planning Commission against which an outlay of Rs. 5,200 crore is provided in the BE 2006-2007.

3.15 As regards the issues which need to be tackled as per Government's own data are:—

Not covered habitations	—	3,935
Slipped back habitations	—	2.8 lakh
Quality affected habitations	—	2,16,794
Coverage of schools	—	3.5 lakh (as per 6th Educational Survey)

3.16 When asked whether the allocation would be sufficient to tackle the aforesaid issues related to drinking water supply in rural areas, the Department has informed as under:

“For the year 2006-07, the total budget allocation for Rural Drinking Water Supply is Rs. 5200 crore, Rs. 4680.00 crore for non-North Eastern states/UTs and Rs. 520.00 crore for North Eastern States. It may be mentioned that a requirement of Rs. 5550 crore was reflected to Planning Commission. Therefore the actual allocation made is comparatively less. However, within the available resources all out efforts will be made to tackle the major issues. The uncovered, slipped back and quality affected habitations are to be covered in the 4 year period of Bharat Nirman from 2005-06 to 2008-09.; Rural Schools are to be covered by the end of 2006-07. The strategy adopted for the purpose is:—

- (i) Providing regional schemes from alternative sources by extending new pipelines;
- (ii) Supplementing with new schemes for habitations served by outlived schemes;
- (iii) Rejuvenation of outlived schemes which are functioning below their rated capacity;
- (iv) Reviving traditional sources;
- (v) Providing rainwater-harvesting structures;

- (vi) Integrated approach by combining *in-situ* treatment from alternate safe sources, recharging and roof-top rainwater harvesting;
- (vii) Coordinating with the Ministry of Human Resource Development for coverage of schools;
- (viii) Focused funding for water quality affected habitations from 2006-07;
- (ix) World Bank funding proposals for Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh and Assam and extending on-going World Bank funded projects in Maharashtra and Karnataka are in progress and proposals for World Bank funding in Punjab, Tamil Nadu and Uttaranchal are in the pipeline. Total project value will be about US \$ 1 billion;
- (x) States are exploring possibilities for obtaining funds from external agencies like NABARD, HUDCO and LIC; and
- (xi) Depending on the absorption capacity and performance of States, more funds would be requested for at the RE stage."

### **C. Issue of unspent balances under ARWSP**

3.17 As per the Performance Budget of the Department for the financial year 2006-07, unspent balance of funds under ARWSP as on 31 December, 2005 was Rs. 2,113.30 crore. The State-wise list of unspent balance of funds under ARWSP is given in *Appendix II*.

3.18 Further, as per the data indicated in Performance Budget under Rural Water Supply Programme, during 2004-2005 the unspent opening balance as on 1 April, 2004 was Rs. 227.98 crore and percentage expenditure under Central and State Sector was reported to be 76.58 per cent and 84.67 per cent respectively. Further for the year 2005-06, unspent balance as on 1 April, 2005 was Rs. 525.94 crore and percentage expenditure under the Central and State Sector was merely 38.54 per cent and 42.08 per cent respectively. Thus, the unspent balance during the last two financial years has further increased. The detailed State-wise financial progress under Rural Water Supply Programme (Central and State Sector) during 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 is given in *Appendix-III & IV*.

3.19 On the issue of huge amount of unspent balance of the funds and low percentage expenditure under ARWSP as highlighted above, the Department has mentioned that the Department lays emphasis on timely utilisation of funds by the State Governments. The 2nd

instalment is released only after the expenditure level of 60 per cent of the available funds, *i.e.* opening balance at the beginning of the year plus the funds released under ARWSP earlier during the year, is attained. The Department has informed that the progress of expenditure figures is monitored through Monthly Progress Reports (MPR). The updated expenditure figures as received from the Department for the Central Sector for 2004-05 and 2005-06 are 83.83 per cent and 47.45 per cent respectively.

3.20 The Committee note with concern the critical data with regard to availability of water in the near future as given in the Mid Term Appraisal of the Tenth Plan according to which average availability of water is likely to fall below the water stress level in the near future. The per capita storage of water *i.e.* 207 cubic metre is way below the storage achieved in many of the countries such as Russia (6103 cubic metre), Australia (4733 cubic metre), Brazil (3145 cubic metre), US (1964 cubic metre) etc. The Committee observe from the aforesaid data that the availability of drinking water in the coming years may be at an alarming position. In view of this, there is an urgent need to pay greater attention to this sector. The detailed analysis of the allocation and utilisation position has been done in the succeeding part of the report. Here the Committee may like to emphasise the need for efficient planning and delivery mechanism of the different schemes of the Department to make safe drinking water available and accessible in rural areas.

3.21 The Committee find that providing drinking water in rural areas is one of the six components of ambitious programme of the Government 'Bharat Nirman'. The total fund requirement for the years 2005-2009 as projected to meet the different components *viz.* coverage of schools, coverage of left-over habitations, coverage of slipped back/newly emerged habitations, tackling water quality, outstanding liability for Swajaldhara, calamity, DDP, O&M and sustainability is Rs. 41,636.971 crore. The yearly allocation may come to around Rs. 9,000 crore. At present level of annual allocation *i.e.* Rs. 5200 crore during the year 2006-07, it is difficult to achieve the targets set under Bharat Nirman. Even the Department has agreed to the inadequacy of allocation. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee strongly recommend to enhance the allocation for drinking water sector. The Committee would also like the Department to apprise them as to how the projects made under Bharat Nirman would be met keeping in view the fact that the level of allocation during the first two years of Bharat Nirman *i.e.* 2005 and 2006 is very low as compared to the projections.

3.22 The Committee note that even the allocation provided during each of the year is not being meaningfully utilised. The Committee are concerned to note that as on 31 December, 2005 Rs. 2,113.30 crore was lying unspent with State Governments. Another area of concern is the low level of achievement by the different State Governments. The percentage expenditure was 76.58 per cent in 2004-05 and 47.45 per cent in 2005-06. The Department has cited non-receipt of monthly progress reports by the States reflecting up-to-date expenditure as the reason for unspent balances. Even the updated expenditure figures received from the Department for the Central sector indicate that the expenditure reported was 83.83 per cent during 2004-05 and 47.45 per cent during the year 2005-06. The Committee are not inclined to accept the casual reply of the Department stating non-receipt of monthly progress reports as the reason for unspent balances in this era of technological advancement. The Committee have repeatedly been expressing their concern over the under-spending with various State Governments. In spite of that, there seems to be little improvement in this regard. In view of this scenario, the Committee strongly recommend to the Department to take all the desired actions to ensure that every paisa earmarked for the drinking water sector is meaningfully utilised. As regards the issue of getting monthly progress reports from the State Governments, the Committee would like the Department to evolve some mechanism so that online reporting can be ensured from the State Governments.

#### **D. Inter component allocation under ARWSP**

3.23 ARWSP is a Centrally Sponsored Scheme for providing financial and technical assistance to State Governments to supplement their efforts of providing drinking water in rural habitations. ARWSP however, has different components with different funding patterns. These are as follows:—

- (i) ARWSP (Normal): Under this, component funds are allocated to the States for covering rural habitations and schools with drinking water facility. 15 per cent of funds can be utilised for O&M of rural water schemes. The funding pattern for this is 50:50 between Centre and State. States can utilise upto 15 per cent of their annual allocation for taking up projects for sub-mission projects on quality, 5 per cent for sub-mission projects on sustainability. The funding pattern for sub-mission projects is 75:25 between Centre and State. The sub-mission on water quality has been revised in February, 2006 and it has been decided to retain upto

20 per cent of ARWSP funds at the Centre and to release the same for approved projects of quality affected States only to provide focus funding for tackling quality problems.

- (ii) ARWSP (DDP): About 5 per cent of annual plan allocation is earmarked to States covered by Desert Development Programme. The funding pattern for this is 100 per cent from the Centre.
- (iii) ARWSP (Sector Reforms/Swajaldhara): Upto 20 per cent of ARWSP allocation can be utilised for Sector Reforms later scaled up as Swajaldhara. The funding pattern under this is 90 per cent from Centre and 10 per cent through community contribution.
- (iv) ARWSP (calamity relief): 5 per cent of the ARWSP allocation is kept a side for giving financial assistance to States for restoration of water supply suffered on account of natural calamity. The funding pattern under this is 100 per cent from Centre.

3.24 In the earlier report on Demands for Grants 2005-2006, the Committee had raised the issue of simplification of funding pattern under ARWSP since monitoring such a complex inter-State and inter-component allocation is a difficult task. (Refer paras 2.49 and 2.50 of 11th Report on Demands for Grants 2005-2006 given in *Appendix V*). During the Conference of Ministers of States and Union Territories in-charge of rural drinking water sector and sanitation, some of the issues highlighted included:—(i) relaxation of ARWSP guidelines for matching share wherein it was suggested to change the Centre-State allocation criteria to 90:10 or 75:25 and (ii) Enhancement of Central allocation to difficult areas.

3.25 The Secretary, during the oral evidence has stated that there have been letters from the North-Eastern States saying that they are unable to pay their share *i.e.* 50:50 State and Centre under ARWSP norms. So they have requested for 90:10 funding pattern. She further added that the Department had written to the Planning Commission saying that the ratio may be changed to 75:25 for North-Eastern States. For rest of the States, the Department had requested the Planning Commission to ensure that at least they should in the Annual Plans earmark 50 per cent for this important sector of drinking water supply. The Secretary had, however, stated that during Eleventh Plan, Department is proposing to give States some flexibility.

3.26 On the issue of raising ARWSP allocation for sustainability from 5 to 20 per cent, the Department has stated as under:

“Sustainability of drinking water sources has been made an integral part of the project for which 5 per cent of ARWSP funds for coverage could be utilized. Being an user department, the State PHEDs utilise only 3 to 4 per cent of the total water availability. Therefore, for overall sustainability of water resources focus should be given by Ministry of Water Resources. Moreover, the emphasis at present is to cover the uncovered habitations. It will be ensured that States spend funds for sustainability through roof-top rainwater harvesting etc.”

3.27 On the issue of detailed monitoring mechanism to keep a watch on the inter-component allocation of ARWSP, the Department had stated that Central Government monitors the implementation of the inter-component allocation through periodical meetings and conferences and also while releasing the 2nd instalment of ARWSP funds.

**3.28 The Committee note with concern that the inter-State and inter-component funding pattern under ARWSP is extremely complicated and as such monitoring such a complex criteria becomes an onerous task. Thus, reiterating their earlier recommendation, the Committee suggest to the Department to simplify the pattern.**

3.29 During the Conferences of States’ Ministers in charge of drinking water supply, it was highlighted by a number of States to provide more funds under ARWSP and change the funding pattern to 75:25 for Centre and States. While noting that steps have been initiated to change funding pattern for North-Eastern States, the Committee would stress that there is a need to explore similar options with respect to other States that are facing resource constraint and have large number of habitations in difficult areas. The Committee urge the Department to take the immediate action in this regard.

3.30 On the question of how the prescribed inter component funding pattern under ARWSP is ensured, the Department has failed to submit a categorical reply. The Committee feel that monitoring of implementation of inter component allocation merely through periodical meetings and conferences is not practical or feasible. There is no mechanism to supervise States that do not adhere to the norm of inter-component allocation under ARWSP. The Committee desire that a system should be put in place whereby it could be ensured that States adhere to the norm of inter-component allocation.



3.31 The Committee have been informed by the Secretary during oral evidence that remaining Not Covered habitations are in remote and difficult areas and achieving the target for NC habitations is difficult. Apart from coverage of NC habitations, quality of drinking water and sustainability have emerged as extremely relevant issues and as such rigid allocation for the said aspects is not justified in the changed scenario. The Committee would further like to add that the States have their unique and peculiar problems with regard to quality and sustainability in drinking water sector and hence providing for rigid allocation under various components is not desirable.

The Committee, therefore, urge the Department to provide flexibility to States to utilise the amount earmarked for quality and sustainability depending upon their local conditions and requirements. The Committee would like the Department to take urgent corrective action in this regard and suitably modify the guidelines of ARWSP allowing the States flexibility to spend more than a minimum threshold. The Committee may be accordingly apprised of the Department's assessment on the issue. Till the issue is finalised the Committee urge the Department to formulate an appropriate monitoring mechanism for the same.

**Investment made for drinking water sector by the Government initiatives and physical achievements with regard to coverage of NC/PC habitations**

3.32 As reported in Economic Survey with an investment of Rs. 50,000 crore (upto 31 March, 2005) considerable success has been achieved in meeting the drinking water needs of the rural population. More than 3.7 million hand pumps and 1.73 lakh piped water schemes have been installed in the rural areas. Further it has been stated in the Economic Survey that as on 1 April, 2005, 96.1 per cent of rural habitations were fully covered and 3.6 per cent were partially covered leaving 0.3 per cent not covered habitations with drinking water facilities.

**3.33 Scenario of Drinking Water and Sanitation in rural areas in the country**

As on 1.4.2005

Total habitations	14,22,664
NC habitations	4,588
PC habitations	50,479

As on 28.2.2006

Total habitations	14,22,664
NC habitations	3,164
PC habitations	41,457

**Coverage of habitations during 10th Plan**

	NC	PC	Total
2002-03	4388	34862	39250
2003-04	3914	35822	39736
2004-05	21731	47908	69639
2005-06	16645	45246	61891

**Performance during 2005-06 as per Outcome Budget**

	Target	Achievement
NC	3522	860
PC	8375	7531
Slipped back	34373	50251
Quality affected	10000	3249

**E. Physical achievements under ARWSP**

3.34 As per the latest information received from the Department, following is the status of coverage of habitations as on 1.4.1999 and 28.2.2006:

As on 1.04.1999			
NC	PC	FC	Total
38065	268496	1116103	14,22,664
As on 28.02.2006			
3164	41,457	1377662	14,22,664

3.35 Outcome Budget reveals the following dismal performance of Drinking Water Supply schemes:—

**Targets for Coverage of NC habitations of CAP 1999**

1st Quarter	—	1021		
2nd Quarter	—	352		
3rd Quarter	—	1021		
4th Quarter	—	1128		
	<b>Total</b>	3522	Achievement	653

**Target for Coverage of PC habitations of CAP 1999**

1st Quarter	—	2429		
2nd Quarter	—	837		
3rd Quarter	—	2429		
4th Quarter	—	2680		
	<b>Total</b>	8375	Achievement	5958

3.36 As per the information furnished by the Department plan-wise achievement of NC/PC habitation is as below:—

8th Plan	—	3,39,705 habitations
9th Plan	—	4,17,951 habitations
10th Plan (first four years)	—	2,10,516 habitations

3.37 The year-wise data with regard to the targets and achievement in terms of number of habitations covered during the 9th and 10th Plan is as follows:

Year	Target	Achievement
1	2	3
IX Plan		
1997-98	99613	116994
1998-99	104902	112933

1	2	3
1999-2000	90061	74636
2000-01	79468	68648
2001-02	45526	44740
X Plan		
2002-03	63869	39250
2003-04	111051	39736
2004-05	74868	69639
2005-06	56270	61891*

\*As on 28.2.2006

3.38 The target for coverage of rural habitations fixed and achievements made during the years 2003-04, and 2004-05 are as follows:

Year	Target			Achievements		
	NC	PC	Total	NC	PC	Total
2003-04	9652	101399	111051	3914	35822	39736
2004-05	30731	44137	74868	21731	47908	69639

3.39 During 2005-06, target for slipped back and quality affected habitations were given separately. The target and achievement during 2005-06 is as under:

	Target	Achievement (As on 28.2.2006)
Remaining NC habitations	3522	850
Remaining PC habitations	8375	7531
Slipped back habitations	34373	50251
Quality affected habitation	10000	3249
Total	56270	61891

3.40 On the issue of the specific problems encountered by the States, the Department has stated that problems encountered by States/

Union territories regarding coverage of habitations with safe drinking water varies from State to State due to topographic and demographic variations. The major problems encountered by the following States, as reported by the Department are as follows:

**Arunachal Pradesh:** Population lives in scattered habitations on isolated hilly terrain; the cost of water supply system network for the same is very high due to inaccessibility of habitations; lack of ground and surface sources availability near the habitations; difficulty in procurement and transportation of materials; long gestation period.

**Assam:** Scattered habitations on isolated hilly terrain; difficulty in procurement and transportation of materials; majority of the uncovered habitations are in the North Cachar Hills and in Bodoland Territorial districts, which are difficult areas.

**Jammu & Kashmir:** The population live in scattered clusters on isolated hilly terrain/hill tops; the cost of water supply system based on multi stage pumping and distribution network for the same is very high due to inaccessibility of such habitations; lack of ground and surface sources available in nearby habitations; lack of water resources in Kandi areas; difficulty in procurement and transportation of materials; long gestation period.

**Maharashtra:** Depletion of ground water sources; poor recharge of ground water due to hard rock in many places; deterioration of water quality; Ratnagiri, Sindhudurg, Nandurbar, Nanded, Pune, Osmanabad and Aurangabad have major concentration of CAP 99 not covered habitations due to hard rock area and poor recharge.

**Nagaland:** Scattered habitations on isolated hilly terrain/hill tops; majority of uncovered habitations of CAP 99 are in Zunheboto, Tuensang and Dimapur districts; habitations in remote areas cost of water supply system based on multi stage pumping and distribution network for the same is very high due to inaccessibility of such habitations; habitations in remote areas; depleting surface streams due to jhoom cultivation; lack of ground and surface sources available nearby habitations; difficulty in procurement and transportation of materials; long gestation period.

**Punjab:** Deterioration of water quality of ground water sources; high cost of surface water schemes; decision of State Govt. to implement piped water supply scheme only; Gurdaspur, Jalandhar, Hoshiarpur and Kapurthala districts have major concentration of CAP 99 habitations.

**Rajasthan** Deterioration of water quality of ground water sources; high cost of surface water based piped water schemes particularly in water quality affected areas lack of water resources in desert districts; high cost and O&M problems of implementation of scheme based on treatment technologies in water quality problem habitations.

**Uttaranchal:** Population lives in scattered clusters on isolated hilly terrain/hill tops; high cost of water supply systems with multi stage pumping and distribution network; inaccessibility of problem habitations; lack of ground and surface sources availability in habitations; difficulty in procurement and transportation of materials; long gestation period.

3.41. On the issue of specific steps taken by the Department to tackle the specific problems of poor performing States, the Department has stated that they do so through regular reviews and field visits by Department officers and providing possible technical and financial solutions. The possible solutions for high cost of piped water supply schemes are suggested for adopting traditional sources/systems like dug wells, tanks, nadis, roof-top rain collection system with improvement, rainwater collection ponds, domestic type or hand-pumps attached technology treatment packages etc. The adoption of technologies and their success depend upon the acceptance of community. For successful implementation of these interventions, the Department is providing assistance for capacity building and IEC related activities. The matter has also been taken up with Planning Commission to ensure that adequate funds are provided to the States under State Plans so that they are able to provide share for release under ARWSP. Steps have also been initiated to change the funding pattern from 50:50 to 75:25 in respect of North Eastern States. For Assam, Rajasthan, Uttaranchal, Maharashtra and Punjab, World Bank funding has been proposed.

3.42 The Committee find from the information furnished to them that with an investment of around Rs. 50,000 crore in the drinking water sector, the Government claims that 96 per cent of the rural habitations have actually been covered. The Committee have repeatedly been expressing concern over the authenticity of the proclamations made by the Government with regard to coverage of habitations. The status of slipped back habitations has been reviewed in the coming part of the report. As per the Government's data, at present 3,164 are the not covered habitations and 41,457 are the partially covered habitations. As regards the achievement with regard to NC/PC habitations, the Committee find from the data indicated by the Department that during 8th Plan 3,39,705 habitations could

be covered. Further during 9th Plan total coverage was 4,17,951. During 10th Plan the coverage during the first four years is 2,10,516. It could be seen from the data that the number of coverage of habitations has drastically reduced during 10th Plan as compared to 9th Plan.

3.43 Further while reviewing the performance during the year 2005-06 the Committee note that there is gross mismatch between the targets and achievements. Against the target of 3,522 NC habitations the achievement during the first three quarters is 653 and similarly for PC habitations against the targets of 8,375 achievement is 5,958. The Committee further note from the replies that one of the main reasons for lower rate of coverage of habitations has been given to be the location of most of the habitations being in difficult areas. In the plain areas like Punjab and Rajasthan, deterioration of water quality of ground water resources, high cost of surface water schemes, decision of State Government to implement piped water supply scheme etc. have been cited as the problems encountered regarding coverage of habitations.

While appreciating the difficulties for coverage in hill areas, the Committee are not convinced with the reason put forth for coverage in plain areas. The Committee feel that with the advancement in technology, even difficult areas can be covered. The Committee would like the Department to explore technology options and it should be ensured that all the uncovered habitations are covered within a stipulated time frame.

3.44 The Committee further find that as on 1 April, 2005 there were 4588 not covered habitations. Further as on 1 April, 2006 the status of not covered habitations was 3935. Thus only 653 NC habitations could be covered during the year 2005-06. Further the Committee also find that as per the weightage for allocation of funds given in guidelines upto 15 per cent of the funds can be allocated for NC/PC habitations on 2:1 ratio. The Committee find that while huge allocation might have been made to States having more NC/PC habitations as per the Government's data, the status of coverage reflects that only few habitations are being covered due to certain reasons as explained above. In view of this scenario, the Committee would like that realistic targets for coverage of NC/PC habitations should be set keeping in view the ground position.

3.45 Besides, the Committee note that the issue of sustainability of resources is the basic area of concern. The detailed analysis in this has been made in the coming Chapter of the report. Here the Committee would like to recommend that more emphasis now should be given to sustainability and quality issues.

## F. Slippages of habitations

3.46 As per the information received from the Department during examination of previous Demands for Grants 2005-2006, a State-wise habitation survey was initiated in 26 States in 2003 the results of which are being revalidated by IIPA. It is learnt from the replies furnished by the Department, that IIPA had entered into MoU with Government to complete the validation of 6 February, 2006.

However, the revalidation exercise is still in progress and IIPA has submitted data in respect of 14 States *i.e.* Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Mizoram, Sikkim, Rajasthan, Meghalaya, Kerala, Assam, Jharkhand, Goa, Bihar, Punjab, Nagaland and Pondicherry, which is under examination. For these States/UTs, the correction of names of habitations, deletion of duplicate entries have been done. As per the data submitted by IIPA, number of NC/PC have gone up as compared to the raw data submitted by some States such as Jharkhand and Assam, and the distance from the water source has been indicated as 1.61 km/2km for a large number of habitations to show higher number of NC habitations in Bihar and Rajasthan. Therefore the categorization of habitations into NC/PC/FC needs to be checked for which the Department proposes to conduct a random survey by involving other agencies also.

For 15 States/UTs the IIPA is in the process of submitting data. Regarding remaining 6 States/UTs the position is as under:

Manipur	The State Government has not provided the revised habitations data inspite of repeated reminders.
Chandigarh	All rural habitations are fully covered. As such data cleansing is not required.
Delhi	All rural habitations are fully covered. Therefore, they have not conducted the Habitation survey.
A&N Islands	The UT Administration has submitted data for only one district which consists many inconsistencies. They have been repeatedly requested to provide the updated data. The same is still awaited.
Daman & Diu	They have submitted the incomplete data.
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	IIPA has to take up the cleansing process.



3.47 As per the information received by the Department, the 10th Plan Working Group assessed the approximately 2.8 lakh habitations have slipped back. From the data provided by the States it would appear that the number of slipped back NC/PC habitations are about 3 lakh habitations.

3.48 On the question of evolving mechanism to monitor and assess slippages on regular basis, the Department has responded by saying that they have devised a format to monitor and assess availability of water whereby States/Union territories will submit Yearly Status Reports regarding status of drinking water supply and availability of water which will give the position of slippages. Besides, through Monthly Progress Reports the States/Union territories are required to furnish, alongwith other relevant information, the names of the habitations which will enable the Department to monitor the progress.

3.49 Besides on the basis of Monthly Progress Report and Yearly Status Report received from the States, a software is being developed in consultation with NIC. Once the software is developed and States start doing on-line data entry, the Department will have a clear picture of slippages on regular basis. A random sample survey of habitations is also proposed to be conducted shortly which *inter alia* include the reasons for slippages.

3.50 The strategy adopted to address the problem of slippages under Bharat Nirman include:

- (i) providing regional schemes from alternative sources by extending new pipelines;
- (ii) supplementing with new schemes for habitations served by outlived schemes;
- (iii) rejuvenation of outlived schemes which are functioning below their rated capacity;
- (iv) reviving traditional sources; and
- (v) providing rainwater-harvesting structures.

3.51 The Committee have persistently been expressing their serious concern over the dichotomy in the data with regard to accessibility and availability of drinking water in rural areas in the country. The Committee in the action taken replies on 11th Report on Demands for Grants 2005-06 (refer para 7 of 14th Report—Fourteenth Lok Sabha) had been informed that revalidation data of habitations survey being done by Indian Institute of Public

Administration (IIPA) would be completed by February, 2006. While examining the Demands for Grants of current year, the Committee note that IIPA has submitted data in respect of only 14 States. Even in these States there are certain discrepancies and now the Department proposes to conduct a random survey by involving other agencies. The Committee deplore the way the different surveys are being undertaken to know the position of slippage of habitations. The Committee further find that as per the various Budget documents since the year 2005-06 a lot of allocation is being made and results are being indicated with regard to coverage of slippage of habitations. The Committee fail to understand how the status of coverage of slippage of habitations is being reflected without having the basic facts about ground situation in this regard. The Committee are of the view that it is of utmost necessity to have the exact position of the availability of drinking water in each of the habitations for future planning. In view of this scenario, the Committee strongly recommend that the Government should look into the matter critically in order to finalise the parameters for conducting the survey. The survey itself should be completed expeditiously and the Committee be informed accordingly.

3.52 The Committee further note from the replies that the Department is evolving mechanism to monitor and assess slippages on regular basis. On the basis of Monthly Progress Report and Yearly Status Report received from the States, a software is being developed in consultation with NIC. Besides the Committee had been apprised that with regard to regular updation of survey some of the State Governments had certain reservations with regard to infrastructure for periodic updation of slipped back habitations (refer para 7 of 14th Report). The Committee fail to understand how the updation of the data of slipped back habitations would be possible without having the basic data with regard to slipped back habitations. Once the core data of slipped back habitations is available, regular monitoring of the data may be possible. Therefore, the Department should first of all ensure that the core data with regard to slipped back habitations is procured at the earliest. Thereafter, the mechanism for slippage of habitations may be finalised.

## CHAPTER IV

### SWAJALDHARA

Upto 20 percent of the annual outlay under ARWSP is earmarked for providing incentives to States which implement projects to institutionalise community based rural water supply systems by incorporating the following three basic principles for ensuring peoples' participation:

- Adoption of a demand-driven responsive and adaptable approach based on empowerment of villagers to ensure their full participation in the project through a decision making role in the choice of scheme design, control of finances and management arrangements;
- Increasing role of Government for empowering User Groups/Gram Panchayats for sustainable management of drinking water assets and Integrated Water Management and Conservation.
- Inculcating a sense of ownership of assets through partial cost sharing either in cash or kind or both and 100% responsibility of Operation & Maintenance by end-users.

4.2 Government of India had launched the Sector Reform Project on the above principles in 1999 on pilot basis in 67 districts of 26 States. The project implementation period was for three years and based on the experience with these pilot projects, the reforms were scaled up as Swajaldhara in December, 2002 so that the projects based on these principles could be taken up anywhere in the country. Under Swajaldhara, Government of India makes State-wise allocation of funds, and the State Governments, in turn, make district-wise allocations. Swajaldhara Guidelines stipulate that while indicating tentative allocation to districts, the State Government will ensure equitable spread of water supply schemes. Another notable feature of Swajaldhara is involvement of VWSC/Panchayati Raj Institutions in planning, execution, operation and maintenance of rural drinking water supply schemes.

## A. Financial Performance under Swajaldhara

4.3 The financial performance of Swajaldhara since its inception in 2002 as on 15 February, 2006 is as follows:

(Rs. in lakhs)

Year	Total Project Outlay	Total amount released	Total available Fund	Reported Expenditure	Percentage Expenditure
2002-03	24,581.83	20,017.80	22,773.53	15,278	67%
2003-04	20,000.00	14,064.77	15,470.00	6253.17	40%
2004-05	21,147.94	22,175.94	24,889.31	4752	19.09%
2005-06	41,674.65	17,943.03	18,205.96	315.46	1.73%

4.4 From the figures indicated above, it can be found that there is huge amount of underspending under Swajaldhara. On being questioned about the reasons for such gross underspending, the Department has clarified that Swajaldhara is implemented in project mode. Releases are made against specific projects sanctioned during the year. The above information available with the Committee shows expenditure against projects sanctioned for that year and not expenditure during the year. The percentage expenditure is calculated against total funds available with the States. Whenever the 2nd instalment releases has been made recently, but the State has not yet had the time to spend/report it, the percentage expenditure would go down.

4.5 Elaborating on the reasons for underspending under Swajaldhara, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence has stated as under:

"I just want to clarify that we give funds into two instalments. For example the number of schemes taken up in the first year namely 2002-03 was about 4,500. We gave only 50 per cent to them. They come back to us saying that they have utilised 60 per cent of the funds. Then we release the next instalment of 50 per cent. So when we look at the expenditure it is against the total additional funds. ...But the fact is the availability of funds keep on changing because we are giving them the second instalment."

## B. Physical performance under Swajaldhara

4.6 The physical performance under Swajaldhara scheme for the years 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06 as reported till 15 February, 2006 is as follows:

Year	Number of schemes taken up	Number of schemes completed
2002-03	4552	2307
2003-04	5255	1908
2004-05	5330	1021
2005-06	14906	45

4.7 On the issue of non completion and poor physical performance of the schemes under Swajaldhara, as elaborated above, the Department has stated as under:

“The Department has to depend upon reporting by the States, which are required to send progress reports and also enter the data online in the Departments web-based system. A project is ‘complete’ under Swajaldhara when the community takes over the O&M responsibility of the assets. The projects under Swajaldhara follow a scheme cycle of about 36 months consisting of four distinct phases and a post project completion phase. Since mostly small schemes are likely to be taken up in a single Gram Panchayat under Swajaldhara—I, the duration of scheme cycle could be between 12-18 months. It may, however, be clarified that the period indicated is indicative and in some cases the projects may take a longer period. Since 2002-03 was the first year of Swajaldhara, the start-up and sensitization phases took longer than envisaged, as they involved working with the communities. 2,323 schemes have been reported complete out of 4,552, *i.e.* about 51 per cent. The reporting is increasing every month. There may be more schemes completed in the field, which is not being reported by the concerned States.”

4.8 Providing further clarification on the issue, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence has stated as under:

“The schemes under Swajaldhara are to be taken up by VWSC. They are sub-Committees of Panchayats. Even to ground the scheme, it takes time. She further informed that in the guidelines the Department has said that it will take 18 months to 2 years

to complete this project. But the funds for 2002-03 were given right in March. I do agree that even now, two years have lapsed and they should have completed.”

4.9 Besides on the issue of monitoring and reporting of projects taken up under Swajaldhara, the Secretary acknowledged that they do need to refine monitoring and reporting system. The Department are trying to put web based monitoring system at the district level. Besides, non-receipt of Utilisation Certificates from States also create hurdle in release of 2nd instalment of funds. The Secretary has stated that VWSC have taken them up and they have to get the Chartered Accountant to audit their accounts. The Secretary conceded that the Department need to push in for more progress in completion of these projects.

**4.10 The Committee find from the status of financial and physical achievements under Swajaldhara as indicated above that performance of Swajaldhara is not satisfactory since the year 2002-03. Not only that, the financial achievements indicate that there is deterioration in the percentage of achievement year after year. The percentage expenditure, which was 67 per cent during 2002-03, came down to 40 per cent during 2003-04 and subsequently reduced on 19.09 per cent and a meagre 1.73 per cent during the years 2004-05 and 2005-06 respectively. As regards physical achievements, while appreciating the fact that some schemes may have more gestation period the Committee wish to point out that from the replies furnished by the Department itself it is apparent that most of the schemes are short duration schemes the gestation period of which is 12 to 18 months. As such 50 per cent of the projects initiated during the year 2002-2003 being incomplete is not understandable. The situation is further alarming during 2003-04 when the percentage declared to around 40 per cent and then around 20 per cent during 2004-05. The Committee are further concerned to note the reasons advanced by the Department like late reporting of schemes, longer gestation period, the system of releasing of funds etc. for huge under-spending and shortfall in achieving the physical targets. The Committee deplore the way the unsatisfactory achievement under Swajaldhara has been tried to be justified. The Committee would like the Department to make all out efforts to ensure that the allocation made under the Swajaldhara is meaningfully utilised. Besides the State/district-wise reasons for under-spending as well as non-completion of projects should be obtained from the concerned State Governments and the Committee may be apprised accordingly.**

**4.11 The Committee further recommend that concrete steps for strengthening the monitoring and reporting system should be taken.**

**They feel that in this age where India is making giant strides in the field of Information Technology, the Department cannot confine itself to obsolete monitoring and reporting system practiced currently. The Committee therefore, emphasise that the web based monitoring system at the district level proposed by the Department should be put in place and made functional at the earliest.**

### **C. Community Contribution under Swajaldhara**

4.12 As per the Swajaldhara principles, funding pattern for the States include 90 per cent Centre and 10 per cent community contribution for capital cost sharing either in cash or kind including labour or both and 100 per cent responsibilities of O&M by the users. On the question whether it is feasible for the community to provide 10 per cent contribution, the Department has informed that the number of schemes taken up each year has progressively increased which shows that the community are willing to pay for the service of their choice. The Department has also informed that during the last meeting of State Ministers, held on 31 January and 1 February 2006, all States responded positively to the Swajaldhara principles and stated that more funds should be allocated for such projects. One of the recommendations of the meeting was also to extend the principles of Swajaldhara to ARWSP from the Eleventh Plan.

4.13 However, one of the reasons for under performance of Swajaldhara is inadequate sensitisation of the communities as rural communities till now have been accustomed to a supply driven rather than a demand driven participatory approach. Also, as per the reply of the Department it is stated some States later expressed their inability to implement some of the approved schemes as the dialogue with the Community failed in some cases. These projects were subsequently revised and new locations approved.

4.14 Explaining stand on the question whether Department has considered providing more funds to such States that are able to meet more community contribution the Department has clarified that Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme, for which upto 20 per cent of the annual ARWSP funds can be earmarked. Funds are then allocated to each State as per the allocation criteria worked out for the year for ARWSP. Till now, the demand for more funds has come only from a few States where community contribution is available. However, these better performing States could not be provided with additional funds beyond their allocation.

4.15 As indicated in the Performance Budget, Community Contribution is zero per cent in 21 States/Union territories during the year 2003-04 (**Appendix V**). During 2004-05, the Community Contribution is nil in 14 States/Union territories (**Appendix VI**). Even when the Community Contribution is nil, allocation has been reflected for Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra, Jharkhand, Tripura, Uttaranchal and West Bengal during 2003-04. Further during 2004-05, releases were made to Nagaland where the Community Contribution has been stated to be zero.

4.16 During the course of oral evidence, the Secretary further clarified as under:

“...wherever it is zero (community contribution) projects have not been sanctioned there for 2002, 2003 and 2004. In 2005-06, we have been a bit more flexible. We have given the funds to the States because they had given us district-wise allocation. We are in the process now of collecting information about the community contribution for 2005-06. But in other years, wherever it is zero generally we have not given funds to that particular State like Arunachal Pradesh where it was zero. ....”

4.17 The Committee have gathered the impression that the Department is very optimistic about the Swajaldhara scheme. It seems that some of the States have responded positively to the Swajaldhara principles and desired more funds for these projects. It has further been stated by the Department that one of the recommendations of the meeting of State Ministers was to extend the principles of Swajaldhara to ARWSP from Eleventh Plan. The Committee had analysed the proposal of replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara in their earlier reports (refer para 2.63 of 11th Report) and expressed concerns that since Swajaldhara is a demand-driven scheme, the better performing States would only be able to take the benefit of the scheme. Thus the less performing States would be deprived of the Central allocation. The Committee had strongly recommended (para 2.65 of 11th Report) to review the position in this regard. The Committee note that the apprehensions of the Committee have not been adequately addressed by the Department. The Committee while reiterating their earlier recommendation in this regard would like to have a categorical response of the Department.

4.18 The Committee take note of the fact that Swajaldhara is a small component of ARWSP wherein 20 per cent funds under ARWSP are earmarked for projects under Swajaldhara. As per



Swajaldhara principles, 90 per cent contribution is made by the Centre and 10 per cent by community to encourage people to have participation and inculcate a sense of ownership. The Committee are constrained to note the ambiguous reply of the Department on the issue of desirability of obtaining 10 per cent community contribution for projects under Swajaldhara. On the one hand the Department has stated that increase in number of projects taken up under Swajaldhara reflects the willingness of the communities to come forward with 10 per cent contribution whereas on the other hand, it has been stated that some States have expressed inability to implement schemes as the dialogue with community failed in some cases.

4.19 Besides, as indicated in the Performance Budget for a large number of States in the year 2003-04 and 2004-05, community contribution has been indicated as zero. During 2003-04, as many as 21 States/Union territories and 14 States/Union territories during 2004-05 have reported Community Contribution as nil. Even though the Secretary during the course of oral evidence has stated that projects were not sanctioned where Community Contribution was zero during 2002, 2003 and 2004, the data reflects otherwise. Allocation has been indicated for Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Maharashtra, Jharkhand, Tripura, Uttaranchal and West Bengal during 2003-04 and to Nagaland during 2004-05, even though the Community Contribution indicated is nil. The Committee feel that there is some confusion with regard to the release of outlay under Swajaldhara. Even when 10 per cent Community Contribution is mandatory under the scheme, the allocation is being made without having any Community Contribution, thereby defeating the very purpose of Swajaldhara *i.e.* inculcating the feeling of ownership by way of Community Contribution. In view of this scenario, the Committee understand that the whole principle of Swajaldhara need review particularly when the overall policy of Government aims to replace ARWSP with Swajaldhara, the detailed analysis of which has been given in the preceding part of the report. The Committee while reiterating their earlier stand in this regard would like the categorical reply of the Department in the light of the observations given above. The Committee would like to know the details of the States which have expressed their inability to implement the said schemes.

## CHAPTER V

### SUSTAINABILITY, WATER MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION

Under ARWSP, for sustainability 5 per cent of allocation can be utilised. The Department has stated that they give due emphasis to sustainability as it is necessary to minimise slippages. Sustainability can be achieved through convergence with other schemes, and also by involving the community in the implementation and O&M of the water supply schemes. Sustainability of drinking water sources contribute to the overall sustainability of water sources.

5.2 On the Committee's earlier recommendation of raising ARWSP allocation for sustainability from 5 to 20 per cent the Department has stated as under:

"Sustainability of drinking water sources has been made an integral part of the project for which 5 per cent of ARWSP funds for coverage could be utilized. Being an user department, the State PHEDs utilise only 3 to 4 per cent of the total water availability. Therefore, for overall sustainability of water resources focus should be given by Ministry of Water Resources. Moreover, the empahsis at present is to over the uncovered habitations. It will be ensured that States spend funds for sustainability through roof-top rainwater harvesting etc."

5.3 On the question of operational status of hand pumps & piped water supply schemes the Department has informed that as per the information received from State/Union territories till 2 March, 2006 there are 41 lakhs hand pumps installed out of which 37 lakhs handpumps are working. As on 1 March, 2006, there are 2 lakh piped water supply schemes out of which 1.65 lakh schemes are working. Besides, there are 15.3 lakh stand posts, of which 14.1 lakh are in working condition.

5.4 The Secretary during the course of oral evidence on the issue of sustainability has stated as under:

"...one of the main reasons for slippages is lowering of water table, and the strategy to cover these slipped back habitations is by replacing outlived schemes by new scheme, rejuvenating

outlived scheme, providing regional schemes etc. ...The other issue of reliability is linked with system sustainability. The States can utilise upto 15 per cent of the ARWSP funds for O&M."

#### **Issue of reliance on ground water for drinking water schemes**

5.5 On the subject of grave problem of fast depleting sources of ground threatening system and sources sustainability, the Department has informed that guidelines of watershed development programmes like DDP, DPAP, IWDP, Hariyali also provide focus on water harvesting for sustainability of drinking water sources. Convergence of all watershed and water conservation programmes is suggested at all levels in the States, including projects to be taken up under NREGA.

5.6 On being enquired about the Department's strategy with regard to use of surface water *vis-a-vis* ground water like hand-pump, the Department has responded that wherever the ground water potential is good and the quality of water is acceptable, in such places, the Department gives emphasis on hand pumps as it is the most cost-effective system of drinking water supply. Surface water sources are suggested in such places where the ground water quality is contaminated and/or the ground water potential is poor. Department has suggested to the States to adopt conjunctive use of water so as to optimize usage of both ground and surface water.

5.7 The Committee during examination of action taken replies on Demands for Grants 2005-06 had found that there were only five States *viz.* Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Tamil Nadu, Lakshadweep and Kerala who had enacted and implemented legislation on control and development of ground water resources in various States as on 12 March, 2003. As informed by the Secretary during oral evidence, this number has now increased to ten. In the remaining States either the Bill is not implemented or they have simply initiated some sort of action such as preparation of draft Bill, setting up Committee etc. to consider the matter or have not responded on the matter.

**5.8 The Committee while reiterating their concern with regard to the issue of sustainability would like to emphasise that sustainability of the drinking water source and the systems have emerged as extremely pertinent issues and greatest challenge confronting the drinking water supply sector. For sustainability to be achieved a multipronged approach is required which *inter-alia* includes:**

- (i) **Ascertaining exact data with regard to slippages and subsequently exploring reasons for the same and addressing the problem in a proactive manner;**

- (ii) Earmarking more funds under the scheme to be utilised for sustainability;
- (iii) Active involvement of communities in implementation of schemes and O&M of water supply schemes;
- (iv) Contribution to regulation and control ground water extraction and development of ground water;
- (v) Integration of all programmes pertaining to water conservation, management water harvesting etc. and taking a holistic approach on the issue; and
- (vi) Awareness creation and IEC activities to inculcate in people the value of water as a socio-economic good etc.

The Committee would like to have a categorical response of the Department to each of the suggestions given above and the action taken/proposed to be taken in this regard.

5.19 The Committee find from the information made available by the Department that more emphasis is being given under the schemes of the Department to handpumps on the ground of its being cost effective. The Committee find that the depletion of ground water is a crucial matter which needs to be taken into consideration while deciding the strategy of the Department to provide drinking water. Further the Committee have their apprehensions on the data with regard to the working systems provided under the schemes of the Department. As per the Government's own data around 3 lakh habitations would have been converted to slipped back habitations by now. The total number of habitations in the country is 14,22,664 habitations and as such as per the Government estimate around 20 per cent of the habitations would have fallen from covered to not covered status as of now. The real position in this regard may be even grimmer. This is the serious area of concern which need to be addressed urgently. Unless the sources of water are healthy, the functioning of the systems cannot be ensured. Since most of the availability of water is through ground water, in the absence of sustainability of resources the position of working systems as indicated in the reply cannot be properly understood. The Committee would like the Department to verify the said data and inform the Committee accordingly. Besides they would like to recommend that more stress needs to be given to use of surface water resources. In cases where ground water is drawn, it should be ensured that there is some system of water recharge whereby the drawl of water should be matched by equal quantity of water seeped through water recharge systems.

5.10 The Committee further find that only 10 States as of now have enacted and implemented legislation on control and development of ground water. The Committee feel that involving States in the huge endeavour of controlling use of ground water is necessary and immediate enactment of such a legislation is imperative. The Committee would like the Department to impress upon the States in collaboration with Ministry of Water Resources to put such a legislation in place at the earliest. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard.

## CHAPTER VI

### QUALITY OF DRINKING WATER IN RURAL AREAS

As per outcome Budget of the Department for 2005-2006, the target and achievement for quality affected habitations during the year 2005-06 are as under:—

#### Quality affected habitations

Targets		Achievement	
1st Quarter	—	2500	3249 (as on 28 February, 2006)
2nd Quarter	—	2000	
3rd Quarter	—	3000	
4th Quarter	—	2500	
Total		1000	

6.2 As per water quality survey made in March 2000 the following data was noted as on 31 March, 2004:

Total affected habitations	2,16,968
Excess fluoride	31,306
Excess Salinity	23,495
Excess Iron	1,18,088
Excess Arsenic	5,029
Excess Nitrate	1,13,958
Affected with multiple problem	25,092

6.3 as per latest reports furnished by States/Union territories as on 1 April, 2006 the status in this regard is as follows:

Total affected habitations	1,95,813
Fluoride	29,070
Salinity	12,425
Iron	1,04,437
Arsenic	7,067
Nitrate	19,387
Affected with multiple problem	23,427

The detailed status indicating quality affected habitations reported by States is given in Appendix-VIII.

6.4 The Department further submitted that water quality survey ordered in March, 2000 in Phase-I and Phase-II were in different stages of completion till 2004-05. During this stage, the States have been advised to utilise upto 20 per cent of ARWSP funds for Sub-mission under water quality & sustainability.

6.5 Regarding strategy of the Department to address the issue of drinking water quality, the Department has informed that the Government of India in February 2006 has approved major policy changes for Sub-Mission programme on water quality, wherein, it has now been decided to retain upto 20 per cent of ARWSP funds at the Centre to provide focused funding to those States which have reported drinking water quality problems for treatment of water contamination. The ratio of affected habitations to be provided with alternate safe source based drinking water supply scheme and *in-situ* treatment technology based drinking water supply scheme should be, as far as possible, as follows—

Sl.No.	Type of Problem	Alternate Safe Source Vs In-situ Treatment
(i)	Arsenic, fluoride and salinity	90:10
(ii)	Iron affected habitations	30:70
(iii)	Nitrate affected habitations	100:0

6.6 The objective of water Quality Monitoring & Surveillance programme was monitoring the quality of water and its function was identifying water quality problem areas and tackling the same by applying appropriate technology. 459 districts have been sanctioned with district water quality testing laboratories, out of which, 386 have been reported as established. Also, the States have established an additional 148 district water testing laboratories. As this infrastructure of laboratories was found inadequate to test all the sources, the Government has launched the community based National Rural Drinking Water Quality Monitoring & Surveillance Programme in February 2006, wherein each Gram Panchayat would be provided with a field testing kit to monitor the quality of all drinking water sources. The positive samples would then be rechecked by the district/State laboratory.

6.7 For the Bharat Nirman period, for tackling water quality problems in affected habitations and putting in place water quality monitoring and surveillance system the total fund requirement for the period would be as follows:

**Total Fund Requirement for the period 2005-2009**

(Rs. In crore)

Component	Central Share	State Share	Total
Tackling water quality problems in affected habitations and putting in place water quality monitoring and surveillance system	6687.090	2229.030	8916.120

6.8 Also on the issue of integrated approach keeping in view the linkages between quality of drinking water, health and environment, the Department has informed that in this programme, monitoring of water quality will be done by the water supply agencies and surveillance will be done by health department officials at all levels. Department of Drinking Water supply is coordinating with Ministry of Health & Family Welfare for convergence of activities at various levels. It has been felt that convergence can take place by having common institutional structures as far as possible by way of having same Committees for health, water supply and sanitation programmes. In addition, Accredited Social Health Activist (ASHA) engaged by National Rural Health Mission will be engaged for inspection of drinking water sources and monitoring the quality at the grass root level using field testing kits. Efforts are also being made to have common IEC and capacity building activities wherever possible. Regular meetings with the officials of Ministry of Health & Family Welfare are taking place.

**6.9 The Committee would like to highlight that the richest possession a country can be proud of in the 21st century is its water resources. The Committee opine that it is not sufficient to simply provide for drinking water in rural areas, but the Government should simultaneously focus on quality of the water as it has major linkages with health and well-being of the people. While the Department is giving targets category-wise to State Governments wherein coverage of quality affected habitations is one of the components, the Committee are distressed to note the pathetic achievements *vis-a-vis* targets with regard to quality affected habitations. Against a target of 10,000 habitations in 2005-06, the achievement was merely**



3,249 indicating their failure to address such a critical dimension of the problem. That too when the targets themselves were too small as compared to the total work to be taken *i.e.*, addressing 1,95,000 habitations. The Committee would therefore like to recommend to the Department to address the issue of quality more vigorously and enhance the annual targets. Efforts should be made to meet the targets in this regard.

6.10 As per the information received from the Department on the setting up of District level Water Quality Laboratory, out of 459 sanctioned laboratories, 368 have been established. The Committee would like the Department to ensure that the remaining sanctioned labs are established expeditiously. Further the Department should ensure that labs are sanctioned in rest of the districts, on an urgent basis.

6.11 The Committee are pleased to note the efforts of the Department with regard to water monitoring and surveillance programme which entails coordination and convergence with the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. While agreeing with the Department that the issue of health, drinking water and sanitation are intimately linked and should be addressed through a coordinated approach, the Committee agree with the proposal of the Department for having common institutional structures by way of common Committees for health, water supply and sanitation programme. They would like the Department to continue efforts in this direction and update the Committee about the concrete action taken in this regard.

## CHAPTER VII

### DRINKING WATER SCENARIO IN RURAL SCHOOLS

The report of the 7th All India Education Survey reveals the following picture with regard to the number of rural schools as on 30 September, 2002.

Total number of rural schools	8,53,457
Primary schools	5,73,091
Upper Primary schools	1,93,865
Secondary schools	63,633
Higher Secondary	22,868

The Department has informed that the number of rural schools without drinking water facilities is not available in the Report.

7.2 The Department has further informed that as per the information made available to the Department by States/Union territories, the number of rural schools not having drinking water supply as on 01.04.2005 is 2,07,691. Further, the number of private unaided schools not having drinking water supply is 3,226—(2557 Primary and 669 upper primary).

7.3 The Department of Elementary Education has informed that in 2004-05, 78,358 rural schools were yet to be provided with drinking water supply. The Department of Drinking Water is taking up the matter with Department of Elementary Education to finalise the actual figures of schools yet to be covered with drinking water supply.

7.4 The Department allocates funds to States/Union territories under ARWSP who can utilise funds available under ARWSP for providing drinking water facilities in rural schools. The Department does not fix financial targets for coverage of rural schools. The coverage of schools is to be done in coordination with Department of Elementary Education.

#### **Physical Targets and achievements**

7.5 As per feedback received from Department, the coverage of rural schools was discussed during the recently concluded State

Minister's Conference held in New Delhi on 31st January-1st February 2006. The Department impressed upon all the State/UT Governments to meet the target. It was unanimously agreed by all the States/UTs that they will cover all the rural schools by March 2007.

7.6 The details of physical targets and achievements with regard to coverage of schools with drinking water for the years 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-2006 are as under:

Year	Target	Achievement
2003-04	78554	42155
2004-05	66273	20040
2005-06	140000	35538*

\*As on 28.2.2006

7.7 On the issue of miserable performance with regard to targets and achievement in 2005-06 as revealed by outcome Budget, the Department informed that All the States/UTs have agreed that they will cover all the remaining rural schools with drinking water supply facility by March 2007. The Department proposes to keep a close watch of the progress of the coverage of rural schools during the year 2006-07.

7.8 The Committee have consistently been drawing the attention of the Department towards the critical need to provide drinking water in schools. In spite of that the situation does not seem to have been improved. The worst part is that the Government does not have the exact basic data with regard to number of schools not having drinking water facility. There is vast difference between the data furnished by the Department of Elementary Education according to which 78,358 rural schools are yet to be provided with drinking water supply, and the data furnished by the Department of Drinking Water Supply which indicate that the said number is 2,07,691. The number of rural schools has increased from 6.37 lakh (as per 6th Educational Survey) to 8,53,457 (as per 7th All India Educational Survey). As such the number of schools not having drinking water facilities may be more. Further this is the situation as reported in Government data which itself seems to be not firm. The Committee apprehend that the reality in this regard may be worse.

In spite of according priority to rural schools as per the policy of the Government the physical achievements corresponding to the

targets do not reflect the seriousness on the part of the Department. There is huge shortfall in achievement of targets during the year 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06. Not only that the achievement has reduced considerably during 2004-05 as compared to the previous year. Further the achievement during 2005-06 *i.e.*, 35,538 against the huge targets of 1,40,000 is far from satisfactory. In this scenario, the Committee deplore the way one of the important areas is being addressed by the Department. It is really painful that after 56 years of planned development, the schools could not be provided even the basic facility of drinking water. The Committee cannot accept any excuse for delaying it further since there is an urgent need to provide drinking water to all the schools in the country. The Government should take up this aspect with all the seriousness it deserves and formulate a strategy which should be implemented in a time bound manner to achieve the task of providing drinking water to all the schools in the country.

## CHAPTER VIII

### RURAL SANITATION

#### Schemes for Rural Sanitation: Central Rural Sanitation Programme and Total Sanitation Campaign

##### Overall scenario with regard to Rural Sanitation

As per the Government's own data, 38 per cent of the population in rural areas have been covered by the sanitation so far.

The coverage for the last five years is given below:

Sl.No.	Year	Approximate coverage at the end of the year
1.	2005-06	38%
2.	2004-05	32%
3.	2003-04	27.5%
4.	2002-03	23%
5.	2001-02	22.5%

8.2 As regards the strategy of the Department to cover all the rural areas, the representatives of the Department during the course of oral evidence submitted that the targets have been set for full coverage by the year 2012. By 2010, the target was to cover 65 per cent of the population.

8.3 As regards the resources, the Department has informed that as per the latest estimate of the Department, in view of the additional requirement of funds on account of revision in TSC guidelines, a total of Rs. 6682 crore is required for covering the whole country under TSC by the year 2012. Taking into consideration the funds released to TSC projects so far and the Budget allocation for 2006-07, about Rs. 2400 crore would be spent on TSC projects by the end of the 10th Plan period. So, the balance amount required would be about Rs. 4300 crore over the next five financial years which works out to an average of Rs. 860 crore per year. Considering the present level of funding, it is safely presumed that the necessary funds would be available for taking up TSC projects.

### **Use of toilets constructed under Government schemes**

8.4 When asked about the study undertaken to find out as to whether the toilets constructed by the Central and State Government assistance are being used or the space is utilised for meeting the additional requirement of the family, the Department has informed that independent agencies as District Level Monitors (DLMs) have been engaged by the Department for 398 districts to monitor the process and quality of the TSC implementation. As part of the monitoring exercise the DLMs are collecting data regarding the use of the toilet facilities created which varies from State to State. From their reports it appears that about 80 per cent of the toilets constructed under TSC are being used by the households.

8.5 On being asked for reasons for non usage of toilets constructed the Department informed that practicing open defecation is an age old habit of the people in rural areas which could be changed by continuous behaviour change communication and awareness creation. Efforts are being made under TSC to enable people to adopt the sanitation facilities and hygiene behaviour. As a result of these efforts, 80 per cent of toilets constructed are being used. Efforts are on to talk to the remaining 20 per cent households to use the toilets. It is not correct to interpret that non-use is a misuse of Government money, because once the facility is available, with little motivation, use can be increased.

8.6 The Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) was launched in 1986 in the Ministry of Rural Development with the objective of improving the quality of life of rural people and to provide privacy and dignity to the women. The programme provided 100 percent subsidy for construction of sanitary latrines for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and landless labourers and subsidy as per prevailing rates in the States to others. The Programme was supply driven, highly subsidized, and gave emphasis on a single construction model.

8.7 The programme was restructured with effect from 1 April, 1999 and people oriented, demand-driven, Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) was launched. TSC moves away from the principle of State-wise allocation to demand driven approach. The programme gives emphasis on Information, Education and Communication (IEC) for demand generation for sanitation facilities. It also lay emphasis on school sanitation and hygiene education for bringing attitudinal and behavioural changes for relevant sanitation and hygiene practices from young as itself.

### Financial Performance under CRSP/TSC

8.8 The outlay for the sanitation sector for the 9th and 10th Plan is as follows:

9th Plan outlay for CRSp as proposed — Rs. 549.00 crore

Actual expenditure during the 9th Plan year-wise

(Rs. in crore)

Year	CRSP
1997-98	96.68
1998-99	64.90
1999-00	92.00
2000-01	130.86
2001-02	129.92
Total IX Plan	514.36

8.9 The total fund allocation by the Planning Commission during 10th Five Year Plan is Rs. 2,330 crore. The funds released till now are approximately Rs. 2,350 crore.

The year-wise break-up is given below:

(Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Year	Budget allocation	Fund released
1.	2002-03	165	141
2.	2003-04	165	205 *
3.	2004-05	400	368
4.	2005-06	700	660.71 **
5.	2006-07	800	—

\*Rs. 40 crore was given additional at the RE Stage.

\*\*Actual release as on 31st March 2006.

8.10 As per information provided by the Department, funds released upto 10 February, 2006 for the year 2005-06 were shown as Rs. 455.41 crore. Thus, in the last one and half month, approximately

Rs. 200 crore were released whereas in more than 10 months of financial year, only Rs. 456 crore were released. Besides, as per latest data received from the Department so far, the total outlay of TSC projects is Rs. 6,239 crore out of which Centre, State Governments and community share is Rs. 3,674 crore, Rs. 1,424 crore and Rs. 1,141 crore respectively.

8.11 The details of expenditure incurred under TSC during the last five years is given in the table below:

(Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Year	Amount released	Amount Actually spent
1.	2001-02	126.74	34.16
2.	2002-03	137.36	29.75
3.	2003-04	199.16	269.04
4.	2004-05	349.19	211.46
5.	2005-06	660.71*	222.00**

\*As on 31st March, 2006

\*\*Provisional figures for 2005-06

Thus, till date Rs. 438.00 crore is the unspent balance of funds under CRSP. The State-wise unspent balance of funds till 31.12.2005 is given in Appendix XV.

**8.12 The Committee take note of the fact that allocation for sanitation sector has been enhanced for the 10th Plan Period *vis-a-vis* 9th Plan. Besides, an analysis of the amount allocated and released for the previous four years during the 10th Plan reveals that funds allocated to this sector have substantially been enhanced. However, given the fact that as of now, as per Government's estimate only 38 per cent there is a long way to go before 100 per cent sanitation can be achieved and further augmentation of fund would be a positive step in that direction.**

8.13 The Committee have been informed that to cover the whole country under Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) by 2012, there would be a requirement of Rs. 860 crore per year. The Committee feel that apart from coverage of whole country under TSC, the main emphasis of Government should be to enhance the percentage of rural households provided with sanitation which stands at a dismal 38 per cent at present. The Committee would, therefore, recommend



to seek more funds from Planning Commission not only for the coverage of all districts under TSC but to implement other activities related to cleanliness to ensure each and every rural household is provided with sanitation facilities and the rural areas get clean environment. The Committee accordingly urge the Department to make efforts for stepping up the outlay considerably.

8.14 The Committee are dismayed over the dismal performance of the Department over the last five years as far as utilisation of sanctioned amount is concerned. The Committee fail to understand that how, given the bleak scenario of rural sanitation, the Department can afford to spend as low as 30 to 40 per cent of the amount allocated in 2001-2002 and 2002-2003. Even for 2004-2005 the amount spent was approximately 50 per cent of the amount allocated. The Committee take strong exception to the lackadaisical approach of the Department in this regard and desire to be furnished with proper justification along with the remedial action taken in this regard.

8.15 Besides, for the year 2005-06, the Department has informed that out of the amount allocated *i.e.* Rs. 700 crore amount released was only Rs. 660.71 crore out of which amount spent till 31st March was only Rs. 227 crore thus making a huge shortfall in the amount utilised *i.e.*, Rs. 433 crore. The Committee take strong objection to the way huge funds to the tune of crores of rupees are lying unspent in such a critical sector. The Committee would like the department to justify on the aforesaid matter. They also recommend that efforts should be made to ensure timely utilisation of the amount allocated in subsequently years.

#### Physical Performance under Total Sanitation Campaign

8.16 As per the figures indicated by the Department, it is estimated that 38 per cent of rural sanitation facilities. The coverage last five years is given as under:—

Sl.No.	Year	Approximate coverage at the end of the year
1.	2005-06	38%
2.	2004-05	32%
3.	2003-04	27.5%
4.	2002-03	23%
5.	2001-02	22.5%

8.17 As CRSP was replaced by TSC, which is a demand driven scheme, no year-wise target is provided. The achievement for last five years is as follows:

Financial year	IHHL	School Toilets	Women Sanitation	Balwadi Toilets
2001-02	642010	10210	512	675
2002-03	662130	11197	498	1131
2003-04	6382835	67066	1566	10169
2004-05	4568448	54844	1707	11658
2005-06	8585033	68311	2242	25857

#### **Achievements under TSC**

8.18 As per the Performance Budget of the Department, The main physical components sanctioned in 540 projects to be achieved over a period of 4 years and the achievements reported as on 31 January, 2006 are as under:

Component	Sanctioned (In lakh)	Achievement (As on 31.01.2006) (in lakh)
Construction of Individual House Hold Latrines	866.70	198.68
Construction of Sanitary Complex for women	34081	6394
Construction of School toilets	578610	198670
Construction of toilets for Balwadis/Anganwadis	173560	41862
Setting up of Rural Sanitary Marts/Production centers	4307	5897

#### **State-wise performance under CRSP (TSC) during the year 2004-05**

Overall releases	Rs. 367.66 crore
Expenditure	Rs. 213.07 crore

8.19 In the States of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Manipur, Meghalaya release and expenditure during the year 2004-05 has been stated to be zero. The utilisation in Goa (releases are for Rs. 1.34 crore) Nagaland (release are for Rs. 6.2 crore) Punjab (releases are for Rs. 6.99 crore) is almost nil. In Dadra & Nagar Haveli, the expenditure is Rs. 1.67 lakh although the releases are nil. In Arunachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh,

Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Orissa, Sikkim and Uttaranchal the under-spending is more than 50 per cent of the allocated amount.

8.20 When asked about the massive underperformance in terms of utilisation of funds under CRSP, the Department has informed that the unspent balance of Rs. 480 crore reflected in the performance budget is against the total fund released to all the TSC project since 1999 and not out of Rs. 630 crore budgeted for 2005-06. So far Government has released Rs. 1,563 crore to TSC projects. It is worth mentioning that in TSC programme, immediately after utilising 60 per cent of the available fund, a project is eligible for claiming 2nd instalment of release so that there is adequate fund with the TSC project for implementation. In such a scenario, Rs. 480 crore unspent as reported in the Performance Budget does not reflect under performance. As on 31st March, 2006, Rs. 766.41 crore out of Rs. 1,563 crore released to the TSC projects has been utilized which is about 49 per cent of the total fund released.

#### **Financial achievement during 2005-06**

Overall release	Rs. 455.42 crore
Expenditure reported by States	Rs. 209.59 crore

8.21 In Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Meghalaya, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal, the expenditure has been stated to be nil.

8.22 The Mid-Term Appraisal to 10th Plan talks about implementing a National Mission on Sanitation and Public Health, with the objective of building a safe hygienic toilets in every households, developing correspondence sewerage structures and an enhancing awareness of good personal hygiene. This may be executed in mission mode, through village Panchayats jointly with civil society mobilized for this purpose, preferably by empowering women. The aim should be provide all dwelling units with sanitation facilities by 2010 @ 20 million dwelling units per year with adequate water supply.

**8.23 The Committee are concerned to note that as per Government's estimate, only 38 per cent rural habitations could be provided with sanitation facilities till date. The Committee are further disturbed to note the rather slow pace of coverage of habitations with sanitation facilities. India is committed to the Millennium Development Goal of reducing by half the number of people without access to sanitation by the year 2010 and achieving cent per cent**

coverage in the country by the year 2012. The Committee feel that to achieve the Millennium Development Goal, the Department with the current level of achievement, will have to work with a hands on approach to deal with the issue. The Committee would like to know the Action Plan and strategies devised for the attainment of Millennium Development Goal.

8.24 Further, as per the Performance Budget of the Department there is gross under achievement with regard to sanctioned individual household latrines (IHHL), sanitation complex for women, school toilets, toilets for Balwadis/Anganwadis. Out of 866.70 lakh sanctioned IHHL, the achievement was only 198.68 lakh till 31 January, 2006. Similarly, for sanitation complex for women, out of 34,081 lakh sanctioned complexes, achievement was only 6,394 lakh. The position of school coverage is rather more disappointing. Out of the target of 5,78,610 toilets, 1,98,670 toilets could be constructed by 31 January, 2006. Similarly, in the case of Balwadis/Anganwadis out of 1,73,560 sanctioned toilets, achievement was merely 41,862.

8.25 Further disturbing is the State-wise performance as indicated in the Budget documents. The expenditure position in Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Manipur, Meghalaya, Punjab, Goa and Nagaland is alarming. In Arunachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Orissa, Sikkim and Uttaranchal the under-spending is more than 50 per cent. The State specific performance is further dismal during 2005-06 as indicated in the preceding para of the report. As indicated in the Budget documents, Rs. 480 crore is lying unspent with various State Governments.

The Committee deplore such a poor performance of sanitation programme in the country. In this scenario, the Committee feel that the objective of outlay augmentation is defeated if the projects are not completed in time. The Committee would urge the Department to be more actively engaged in the entire process of TSC starting from providing allocation till the completion of projects. The Committee desire the Department to furnish to them the reasons for such unsatisfactory achievement of physical targets and take effective measures to rectify the anomaly in future. Besides, the Committee feel that one of the reasons for under-utilisation of funds may be inadequate outlay provided under the scheme for construction of a toilet to each beneficiary. The Committee would like the comment of the Department in this regard so as to analyse the position critically and comment further.

8.26 The Committee are constrained to find from the reply of the Department that open defecation is an age-old habit because of which only 80 per cent of toilets constructed under Government schemes are being used. The Committee feel that non use may also be due to toilets becoming dysfunctional after some time and not because of lack of awareness by people. If there are hygienic and functional toilets in rural areas, the people will be certainly inclined to use them. Even if it is to be believed that non use is due to improper sanitation and hygiene habits of the people, it implies that IEC activities undertaken by the Department under TSC have not been up to the required standards and have failed to deliver result on field. The Committee, therefore, urge that the Department should take all the desired efforts to ensure that the toilets constructed under the Government schemes are actually used. Otherwise, the whole objective of spending crores of rupees is defeated. The Committee would like to emphasise that proper sanitation involves provision of water, drainage, disposal of garbage and is intimately linked with the issue of health care. Thus the Department should have appropriate intervention in consultation with the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare to address the problem. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the response of the Department on the proposal put forth in the Approach paper to the Tenth Plan regarding National Mission on Sanitation and Public Health and efforts made by them in this direction.

NEW DELHI;  
17 May, 2006  

---

27 Vaisakha, 1928 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,  
Chairman,  
Standing Committee on  
Rural Development.

## APPENDIX I

### STATEMENT INDICATING OUTLAY AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURE DURING 9TH AND 10TH PLAN

(Rupees in crore)

9th Plan Year	Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP)	
	Outlay	Expenditure
1997-98	1302.00	1299.91
1998-99	1612.00	1600.64
1999-00	1715.00	1714.41
2000-01	1960.00	1896.55
2001-02	1974.95	1943.05
Total	8563.95	8454.56

The year-wise details in terms of outlay and actual expenditure for the last 4 years in the Tenth Plan for ARWSP is as follows:

(Rupees in crore)

10th Plan Year	Rural Water Supply Programm (ARWSP)	
	Outlay	Actual
2002-2003	2110.00	2100.70
2003-2004	2585.00	2564.90
2004-2005	2900.00	2930.79@
2005-2006	4050.00*	4098.03@
2006-2007	5200.00	—

\*At RE stage amount increased to Rs. 4060.00 crore for rural water supply.

@ The increase in actuals is on account of utilization of unutilised NE funds of Sanitation for Rural Water Supply.

**APPENDIX II**  
STATE-WISE UNSPENT BALANCE OF FUNDS  
AS ON 31.12.2005

(Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	State/UT	ARWSP
1	2	3
1.	Andhra Pradesh	149.27
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	25.84
3.	Assam	15.25
4.	Bihar	137.77
5.	Chhattisgarh	25.72
6.	Gujarat	79.86
7.	Goa	0.00
8.	Haryana	6.67
9.	Himachal Pradesh	68.23
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	250.61
11.	Jharkhand	49.83
12.	Karnataka	102.68
13.	Kerala	7.57
14.	Madhya Pradesh	19.72
15.	Maharashtra	348.97
16.	Manipur	26.67
17.	Meghalaya	26.98
18.	Mizoram	10.74
19.	Nagaland	3.48
20.	Orissa	49.23

1	2	3
21.	Punjab	18.98
22.	Rajasthan	404.69
23.	Sikkim	1.91
24.	Tamil Nadu	44.03
25.	Tripura	5.62
26.	Uttar Pradesh	69.41
27.	Uttaranchal	30.60
28.	West Bengal	94.07
29.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	37.89
30.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	0.01
31.	Pondicherry	0.00
32.	Daman and Diu	0.00
33.	Lakshadweep	1.00
	Total	2113.30



## APPENDIX III

FINANCIAL PROGRESS UNDER RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROGRAMME  
(CENTRAL AND STATE SECTOR) DURING 2004-2005

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl.No.	State/UT	Month Code	Central Sector-ARWSP (Normal+DDP)+Natural Calamities						State Sector		
			O.B. as on 1.4.2004**	Allocation (Normal+DDP)	Release	Total Availability	Exp-diture	% age Expen.	Provision	Exp-diture	% age Expen.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.	Andhra Pradesh	03	0.00	13760.40	16418.40	16418.40	15484.40	94.31	24140.24	24140.24	10.00
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	03	820.94	6125.00	6825.00	7645.94	7645.94	100.00	2387.00	2387.00	100.00
3.	Assam	03	2304.06	10331.00	9565.62	11869.68	11596.82	97.70	8857.65	6419.84	72.48
4.	Bihar	03	1582.69	7405.00	8941.03	10503.72	4388.43	41.78	5866.00	2514.19	42.86
5.	Chhattisgarh	03	0.00	2663.00	2269.80	2269.80	1646.86	72.56	8345.00	7470.37	89.52
6.	Goa	03	551.33	121.00	0.00	551.33	551.33	100.00	1318.35	1318.35	100.00
7.	Gujarat	03	0.43	6696.35	6696.35	6696.78	6696.78	100.00	20886.00	11189.79	53.58
8.	Haryana	03	0.00	2707.00	2707.00	2707.00	2707.00	100.00	10528.00	9825.33	93.33
9.	Himachal Pradesh	03	87.48	5438.20	5438.20	5525.68	4141.09	74.94	11475.88	11475.88	100.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	03	4576.53	12868.60	12833.60	17410.13	13261.97	76.17	12500.00	9900.00	79.20
11.	Jharkhand	03	793.46	2949.00	2752.83	3546.29	835.84	23.57	3475.00	3231.17	92.98
12.	Karnataka	03	68.31	11777.55	12677.44	12745.75	12092.39	94.87	10353.81	9904.34	95.86
13.	Kerala	03	0.00	3946.00	4401.00	4401.00	4157.00	94.46	11339.00	4999.66	44.09
14.	Madhya Pradesh	03	0.00	7745.00	7945.00	7945.00	7945.00	100.00	11880.64	7524.53	63.33
15.	Maharashtra	03	3880.42	15971.00	15971.00	19851.42	9500.88	47.86	20094.16	25978.23	129.28
16.	Manipur	03	747.87	2103.00	2103.00	2850.87	1362.45	47.79	773.78	773.78	100.00
17.	Meghalaya	03	1120.85	2422.00	2813.87	3734.72	2263.14	60.60	3100.00	2806.99	90.55
18.	Mizoram	03	0.00	1737.00	1810.00	1810.00	1401.68	77.44	1657.72	1469.11	88.62
19.	Nagaland	03	171.95	1782.00	1702.00	1873.95	1660.99	88.64	1541.00	1516.12	98.39
20.	Orissa	03	0.00	6934.00	6934.00	6934.00	4310.77	62.17	5952.73	4607.35	77.40
21.	Punjab	03	0.00	2815.00	2815.00	2815.00	2516.20	89.39	9886.00	7103.64	71.86
22.	Rajasthan	03	520.05	29239.90	30439.76	30959.81	22777.78	73.57	26920.82	19135.16	71.08
23.	Sikkim	03	14.12	731.00	731.00	745.12	610.61	81.95	2406.04	2406.04	100.00
24.	Tamil Nadu	03	0.00	7125.00	8494.13	8494.31	5882.15	69.25	42200.00	35587.22	84.33
25.	Tripura	03	1024.41	2149.00	1575.13	2599.54	2077.06	79.90	359.00	296.22	82.51

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
26.	Uttar Pradesh	03	2562.92	12991.00	13455.00	16017.92	12263.54	76.56	24371.23	24371.23	100.00
27.	Uttaranchal	03	969.84	3035.00	3265.47	4235.31	3660.17	88.42	13451.36	13451.36	100.00
28.	West Bengal	03	1016.09	8527.00	8270.21	9286.30	8553.91	92.11	10736.00	8538.92	79.54
29.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	11	4.40	5.63	2037.00	2041.40	0.00	0.00	850.00	256.44	30.17
30.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	03	0.45	3.75	0.00	0.45	0.00	0.00	148.00	148.00	100.00
31.	Daman and Diu*	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—
32.	Delhi*	0	0.00	2.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—
33.	Lakshadweep	05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	186.00	9.60	5.16
34.	Pondicherry	03	0.00	2.81	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	841.47	734.21	87.25
Total			22798.60	192110.00	201787.84	224586.44	171992.17	76.58	308827.68	261490.31	84.67

\*From these States/UTs the provision has not been received so far.

\*\*Provisional

Item	O.B.	B.E.	R.E.	Releases	Availability	Exp. Report	% age
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
ARWSP (Normal)+Natural Calamities	22673.94	217370.01	220893.08	189380.84	212054.78	162564.48	76.66
ARWSP (DDP)	124.66	12440.00	12440.00	12407.00	12531.66	9427.69	75.23

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
ARWSP (Others \$)			—	—	—		61.65	—	—		—
ARWSP (Swajaldhara)			NA	21147.94	21147.94		34152.01	34152.01	NA		NA
ARWSP (Sector Reform)			—	—	—		14892.31	14892.31	—		0.00
ARWSP (PM's Schemes)			16991.95	33016.05	33016.05		38784.22	55776.17	29335.09		52.59
Monitoring & Evaluation			—	500.00	26.32		26.32	26.32	—		0.00
ARWSP (M&I Units)			—	205.00	116.00		158.37	158.37	158.37		10.00
DPAP Areas			—	0.00	—		—	—	—		—
Sub-Missions (ARWSP)+			—	—	—		716.43	—	—		—
Professional Services			—	500.00	250.00		250.00	250.00	250.00		100.00
Research			—	200.00	5.00		4.77	4.77	4.77		100.00
HRD/Training			—	1490.00	300.00		300.00	300.00	—		0.00
IEC			—	1010.00	510.00		510.00	510.00	3.90		0.76
MIS			—	1500.00	1200.00		1339.41	1339.41	2.30		0.17
Exhibition			—	10.00	6.75		6.75	6.75	6.75		100.00
Seminar/Conference			—	25.00	17.00		17.00	17.00	17.00		100.00
Assistance from WHO/UNICEF etc.			—	500.00	0.00		—	—	—		—

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Mission Management		—	85.00	71.86	71.83	71.83	71.83	71.83	71.83	100.00	
Other Charges		—	1.00	0.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Grand Total		39790.55	290000.00	290000.00	293078.91	332153.03	201842.18	60.77			

+Releases made under ARWSP head

#Grand total in O.B. column is the unspent balance from ARWSP (Normal+DDP+Natural Calamities+PM's Scheme) funds available in the previous year.

\$Other Releases made under ARWSP normal head to different States are as under

1. Rs. 10.12 lakh released to Haryana for M&I.
2. Rs. 4.45 lakh released to Meghalaya for M&I.
3. Rs. 4.35 lakh released to Meghalaya for M&I.
4. Rs. 42.73 lakh released to Arunachal Pradesh for Computerisation.

Note 1: The expenditure figure does not include the expenditure under Swajaldhara, Sector Return and Submission as year-wise expenditure under these programmes is not available.

Note 2: Grand total of release figures includes Rs. 30.80 crore released to NE states from the NE budget earmarked to CRSP

**APPENDIX IV**

**FINANCIAL PROGRESS UNDER RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROGRAMME (CENTRAL AND STATE SECTOR) DURING 2005-2006**

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl.No.	State/UT	Month Code	Central Sector-ARWSP (Normal+DDP)+Natural Calamities						State Sector		
			O.B. as on 1.4.2004**	Allocation (Normal+DDP)	Release	Total Availability	Exp-diture	%age Expen.	Provision	Exp-diture	% age Expen.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.	Andhra Pradesh*	12	934.00	24077.35	21882.29	22816.29	9754.00	42.45	23947.35	6765.50	28.25
2.	Arunachal Pradesh*	11	0.00	9993.61	10674.54	10674.54	3212.90	30.10	851.01	851.01	100.00
3.	Assam*	11	272.86	16851.29	8425.65	8698.51	7173.60	82.47	6115.12	3100.68	50.71
4.	Bihar*	12	6115.30	15324.00	7662.00	13777.30	7368.06	53.48	9750.05	3269.43	33.53
5.	Chhattisgarh*	11	622.94	5904.97	2952.49	3575.43	1003.95	28.08	9136.90	3935.42	43.07
6.	Goa*	9	0.00	221.05	110.13	110.13	0.00	—	1870.00	349.24	18.68
7.	Gujarat*	11	0.00	12339.00	12750.16	12750.16	4746.50	37.37	20886.00	5391.70	25.81
8.	Haryana*	12	0.00	3590.00	1795.00	1795.00	1239.01	69.03	18640.00	10839.41	58.15
9.	Himachal Pradesh*	11	1384.59	10650.00	9595.00	10979.59	4156.19	37.85	9595.58	6453.32	67.25

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
10.	Jammu and Kashmir*	8	4148.16	20073.00	21671.50	25819.66	758.30	2.94	10100.00	1285.00	12.72
11.	Jharkhand*	10	2710.45	6334.61	3167.31	5877.76	895.00	15.23	5200.00	949.48	18.26
12.	Karnataka*	12	653.36	19808.99	20775.94	21429.30	14054.00	65.58	17800.00	8637.42	48.52
13.	Kerala*	12	244.00	6170.65	6015.85	6259.85	2777.90	44.38	28474.00	3130.62	10.99
14.	Madhya Pradesh*	11	0.00	15101.00	15039.88	15039.88	5578.93	37.09	8754.08	5560.80	63.52
15.	Maharashtra*	12	10350.54	31610.88	32360.88	42711.42	11443.16	26.79	14129.85	4121.39	29.17
16.	Manipur*	9	1488.42	3430.93	1715.47	3203.89	536.73	16.75	1460.00	326.98	22.40
17.	Meghalaya*	11	1471.58	3949.77	1974.89	3446.47	755.46	21.92	3120.00	1382.42	44.31
18.	Mizoram*	12	408.32	2831.58	2599.27	3007.59	941.82	31.31	446.08	446.08	—
19.	Nagaland*	9	212.96	2907.91	1453.96	1666.92	1318.50	79.10	1220.00	326.58	26.77
20.	Orissa*	12	2623.23	14212.40	7106.20	9729.43	5438.93	55.90	9211.44	2108.60	22.89
21.	Punjab*	12	298.80	4172.53	4024.31	4323.11	981.72	22.71	8276.00	7364.10	88.98
22.	Rajasthan*	12	8182.03	48614.72	46844.98	55027.01	18233.84	33.14	34133.43	15495.15	45.40
23.	Sikkim*	9	134.51	1195.53	1273.77	1408.28	541.50	38.54	2942.50	1324.65	45.02
24.	Tamil Nadu*	12	2611.98	11875.00	5937.50	8549.48	5632.97	65.89	41100.00	22020.71	53.58
25.	Tripura*	12	522.48	3503.10	1751.55	2274.03	1711.86	75.28	843.15	260.80	30.93
26.	Uttar Pradesh*	12	3754.38	28372.10	14186.05	17940.43	10999.47	61.31	33652.70	16366.94	48.63

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
27.	Uttaranchal*	11	575.14	6559.12	6362.05	6937.19	3877.24	26.46	12400.00	9841.24	79.36
28.	West Bengal*	11	732.39	15246.90	13918.95	14651.34	5244.06	35.79	12889.00	3761.07	29.18
29.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	—	2041.40	34.38	1747.51	3788.91	—	0.00	—	—	—
30.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	9	0.45	22.92	0.00	0.45	0.00	0.00	36.14	36.14	100.00
31.	Daman and Diu		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	—	—	—
32.	Delhi	—	0.00	4.69	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	—	—	—
33.	Lakshadweep	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	—	—	—
34.	Pondicherry*	12	100.00	17.19	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	868.50	667.34	76.84
	Total		52594.27	344956.17	285775.08	338369.35	130393.60	38.54	347848.88	146369.22	42.08

\*Only from these States/UTs the provision has been received so far.

\*\*Provisional

Note: In month code column No. 3, the number 0 shown against some States/UTs indicates that no report has been received from the States/UTs.

Item	O.B.#	B.E.	R.E.	Releases	Availability	Exp. Report	% age
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
ARWSP (Normal)+Natural Calamities	49490.30	340227.35	341267.35	268681.58	318171.88	125096.81	39.32
ARWSP (DDP)	3103.97	18225.00	18225.00	17093.50	20197.47	5296.79	26.23
ARWSP (Swajaldhara)	NA	41674.65	41674.65	21309.93	21309.93	—	—



1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
ARWSP (PM's Programme)	—	—	—	—	—	1683.06	—
Monitoring & Evaluation	—	300.00	300.00	14.81	14.81	—	0.00
ARWSP (M&I Units)	—	160.00	160.00	148.21	148.21	—	0.00
DPAP Areas	—	—	—	276.16	276.16	—	0.00
Sub-Missions (ARWSP)+	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Professional Services	—	500.00	500.00	—	—	—	—
Research	—	100.00	100.00	6.52	6.52	6.52	100.00
HRD/Training	—	1490.00	1490.00	273.29	273.29	—	0.00
IEC	—	510.00	510.00	15.69	15.69	12.20	77.76
MIS	—	1500.00	1500.00	1481.37	1481.37	—	0.00
Exhibition	—	7.00	7.00	—	—	—	—
Seminar/Conference	—	20.00	20.00	11.30	11.30	11.30	100.00
Assistance from WHO/UNICEF etc.	—	0.00	0.00	—	—	—	—
Mission Management	—	85.00	85.00	16.75	16.75	16.75	100.00
Other Charges	—	1.00	1.00	—	—	—	—
Grand Total	52594.27	405000.00	406000.00	309423.43	362017.70	132128.96	36.50

\*Releases made under ARWSP head.

#Grand total in O.B. column is that unspent balance from ARWSP (Normal-DDP+Natural Calamities) funds available in the previous year.

Note 1: The expenditure figure does not include the expenditure Swajaldhara and Submission as year-wise expenditure under these programmes is not available.

Note 2: Amount released to M & I units includes Rs. 63.79 lakh released from ARWSP normal head.

## APPENDIX V

### RECOMMENDATION PARA NOS. 2.49 AND 2.50 OF ELEVENTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE (FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

2.40 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 utilised, 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.

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.

## APPENDIX VI

FINANCIAL AND PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE UNDER SWAJALDHARA SCHEME  
FOR YEAR '2003-2004' AS ON 15TH FEBRUARY, 2006

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl.No.	State	Financial Parameters											Physical Parameters		
		Amount Allocated to States	Ist Installment	IInd Installment	Total Amount Released against the allocation (4+5)	Amount Released for Startup, IEC etc.	Amount Released for Sector Status Study	Total Amount Released (6+7+8)	Community Contribution	Interest Accrued	Total Available Fund (7+8+9)	Reported Expenditure	%expenditure	No. of schemes taken up	Schemes completed
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.	A&N Islands	12.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
2.	Andhra Pradesh	1,616.07	808.00	751.50	1,559.50	80.80	0.00	1,640.30	182.85	12.32	1,835.47	1,325.43	72.21	423	331
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	447.41	223.71	0.00	223.71	0.00	4.37	223.71	44.74	0.00	268.45	0.00	0.00	181	75
4.	Assam	754.59	377.30	302.05	679.35	37.73	0.00	717.08	104.92	5.43	827.45	385.04	46.53	378	120
5.	Bihar	873.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
6.	Chandigarh	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
7.	Chhattisgarh	262.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.15	0.00	13.15	0.00	0.00	13.15	0.00	0.00	0	0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
8.	D. & N. Haveli	8.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.40	0.00	4.40	0.00	0.00	4.40	0.00	0.00	0	0
9.	Daman and Diu	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
10.	Delhi	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
11.	Goa	14.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
12.	Gujarat	765.56	382.78	382.78	765.56	38.28	0.00	803.84	27.23	0.00	831.07	605.34	72.84	34	21
13.	Haryana	234.23	117.12	0.00	117.12	11.71	0.00	128.83	0.00	0.00	128.83	0.00	0.00	155	0
14.	Hiamchal Pradesh	680.19	340.11	80.76	420.87	34.01	0.00	454.88	0.00	11.17	466.05	171.90	36.89	139	4
15.	Jammu and Kashmir	1,497.90	748.95	0.00	748.95	74.90	0.00	823.85	38.81	0.00	862.66	134.52	15.59	121	59
16.	Jharkhand	356.02	178.01	0.00	178.01	17.80	0.00	195.81	0.00	0.05	195.86	3.79	1.93	3	3
17.	Karnataka	1,397.03	698.52	547.50	1,246.02	69.85	0.00	1,315.87	46.13	4.50	1,366.50	921.11	67.41	244	162
18.	Kerala	504.03	252.02	193.22	445.24	25.00	0.00	470.24	24.71	3.68	498.63	247.57	49.65	56	3
19.	Lakshadweep	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
20.	Madhya Pradesh	840.54	420.27	160.26	580.53	42.03	0.00	622.56	101.03	1.21	724.80	352.68	48.66	702	135
21.	Maharashtra	2,172.15	1,086.07	0.00	1,086.07	108.61	0.00	1,194.68	0.00	0.00	1,194.68	113.07	9.46	37	0
22.	Manipur	153.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
23.	Meghalaya	176.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
24.	Mizoram	126.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
25.	Nagaland	130.22	65.11	65.11	130.22	6.51	0.00	136.73	19.81	0.00	156.54	57.80	36.92	9	0
26.	Orissa	733.28	366.64	305.24	671.88	36.66	0.00	708.54	32.55	18.59	759.68	207.82	27.36	157	62
27.	Pondicherry	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
28.	Punjab	313.79	156.89	11.87	168.76	0.00	0.00	168.76	31.99	0.00	200.75	11.33	5.64	0	0
29.	Rajasthan	2,191.77	1,095.50	676.17	1,771.67	109.55	0.00	1,881.22	236.13	0.23	2,117.58	621.89	29.37	1004	231
30.	Sikkim	53.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
31.	Tamil Nadu	673.22	336.60	336.60	873.20	33.66	0.00	706.86	66.62	0.09	773.57	536.19	69.31	445	442
32.	Tripura	156.93	78.47	55.70	134.17	7.85	0.00	142.02	0.00	0.60	142.62	35.74	25.06	814	249
33.	Uttar Pradesh	1,532.91	766.46	0.00	766.46	76.65	0.00	843.11	386.63	2.87	1,232.61	392.33	31.83	291	0
34.	Uttaranchal	364.33	182.00	49.50	231.50	18.20	0.00	249.70	0.00	1.00	250.70	29.46	11.75	20	6
35.	West Bengal	943.90	471.50	100.00	571.50	47.15	0.00	618.65	0.00	0.00	618.65	100.16	16.19	42	5
	Total	20,000.00	9,156.02	4,018.25	13,174.27	890.50	4.37	14,064.77	1,344.15	61.74	15,470.68	6,253.17	40.42	5255	1908

**APPENDIX VII**

**FINANCIAL AND PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE UNDER SWAJALDHARA SCHEME  
FOR YEAR '2004-2005' AS ON 15TH FEBRUARY, 2006**

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl.No.	State	Financial Parameters											Physical Parameters		
		Amount Allocated to States	Ist Installment	IInd Installment	Total Amount Released against the allocation (4+5)	Amount Released for completion of SRP schemes	Amount Released for Startup, IEC etc.	Total Amount Released (6+7+8)	Community Contribution	Interest Accrued	Total Available Fund (9+10+11)	Reported Expenditure	%expenditure	No. of schemes taken up	Schemes completed
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.	A&N Islands	12.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
2.	Andhra Pradesh	1,632.65	1224.49	14.72	1,239.21	2,953.84	244.90	4,437.95	183.58	0.64	4,622.17	671.18	14.52	599	232
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	473.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
4.	Assam	797.36	132.74	0.00	132.74	0.00	26.55	159.29	3.50	0.41	163.20	36.08	22.11	32	0
5.	Bihar	923.98	587.24	0.00	567.24	0.00	138.60	725.84	6.67	0.00	732.51	0.00	0.00	21	0
6.	Chandigarh	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
7.	Chhattisgarh	332.20	274.12	0.00	247.12	0.00	49.83	296.95	7.57	0.00	304.52	0.00	0.00	61	0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
8.	D. & N. Haveli	8.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
9.	Daman and Diu	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
10.	Delhi	6.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
11.	Goa	15.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
12.	Gujarat	826.42	619.81	206.61	826.42	0.00	123.96	950.38	7.31	0.00	957.69	826.42	86.29	169	96
13.	Haryana	245.48	184.86	0.00	184.86	0.00	36.97	221.83	118.45	0.00	340.28	0.00	0.00	155	0
14.	Hiamchal Pradesh	677.16	507.87	0.00	507.87	0.00	101.57	609.44	0.00	0.00	609.44	0.00	0.00	440	0
15.	Jammu and Kashmir	1,560.02	1,170.02	0.00	1,170.02	0.00	234.00	1,404.02	141.31	0.00	1,545.33	179.77	11.63	220	5
16.	Jharkhand	368.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
17.	Karnataka	1,253.54	940.15	193.39	1,133.54	1,152.33	168.08	2,473.90	420.65	1.19	2,895.74	839.71	29.00	169	59
18.	Kerala	492.54	366.93	42.00	408.93	0.00	73.98	482.81	54.29	0.39	537.49	41.76	7.77	67	0
19.	Lakshadweep	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
20.	Madhya Pradesh	966.49	724.54	0.00	724.54	0.00	144.97	869.51	133.96	0.84	1,004.31	49.72	4.95	454	60
21.	Maharashtra	1,992.80	1,494.60	0.00	1,494.60	0.00	298.92	1,793.52	448.85	0.56	2,242.93	437.62	19.51	549	0
22.	Manipur	162.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
23.	Meghalaya	186.12	139.59	0.00	139.59	0.00	27.92	167.51	64.44	0.00	231.95	0.00	0.00	43	0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
24.	Mizoram	133.25	95.84	0.00	95.84	0.00	19.19	116.03	12.06	0.00	128.09	17.75	13.86	5	0
25.	Nagaland	137.48	216.76	0.00	216.76	0.00	0.00	216.76	0.00	0.00	216.76	0.00	0.00	4	0
26.	Orissa	865.23	648.92	77.36	726.28	0.00	129.76	856.06	98.29	2.72	957.07	221.84	23.18	285	52
27.	Pondicherry	6.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
28.	Punjab	351.11	263.33	0.00	263.33	0.00	52.67	316.00	39.00	0.00	355.00	10.07	2.84	20	0
29.	Rajasthan	2,544.51	1,902.91	0.00	1,902.91	0.00	381.68	2,284.55	207.87	0.71	2,493.17	789.93	31.68	641	359
30.	Sikkim	57.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
31.	Tamil Nadu	889.10	666.83	222.27	889.10	0.00	133.37	1,022.47	87.85	2.55	1,112.87	451.30	40.55	373	144
32.	Tripura	164.97	177.41	10.31	187.72	0.00	24.75	212.47	18.48	0.48	231.43	63.78	27.56	181	14
33.	Uttar Pradesh	1,621.06	1,215.80	0.00	1,215.80	0.00	243.16	1,458.96	432.25	2.32	1,893.53	115.34	6.09	651	0
34.	Uttaranchal	378.67	401.01	0.00	401.01	0.00	0.00	401.01	162.30	0.00	563.31	0.00	0.00	106	0
35.	West Bengal	1,064.06	582.20	0.00	582.20	0.00	116.44	698.64	51.88	0.00	750.52	0.00	0.00	85	0
	Total	21,147.94	14,511.97	766.66	15,278.63	4,109.17	2,791.14	22,175.94	2,700.56	12.81	24,889.31	4,752.27	19.09	5330	1021



## APPENDIX VIII

DETAILED STATUS INDICATING WATER QUALITY AFFECTED HABITATIONS REPORTED BY STATES  
(On the basis of survey ordered in March, 2000 and updated by States in Bharat Nirman Action Plan)

Sl.No.	State/UT	Habitations Affected by						Total as on 31.3.2005
		Fluoride	Salinity	Iron	Arsenic	Nitrate	Multiple	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1497	1058	0	0	0	0	2555
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	0	0	353	0	0	213	566
3.	Assam	660	0	23841	730	0	2950	28181
4.	Bihar	383	0	21540	794	2000	0	24717
5.	Chhattisgarh	17	61	4932	11	0	0	5021
6.	Goa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.	Gujarat	2563	1528	0	0	838	0	4929
8.	Haryana	119	72	0	0	0	145	336
9.	Himachal Pradesh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10.	Jharkhand	1159	0	129	18	1	41	1348
11.	Jammu and Kashmir	0	0	47	0	0	67	114
12.	Karnataka	5000	0	6633	0	4077	4460	20170
13.	Kerala	34	86	564	0	78	105	867
14.	Madhya Pradesh	3282	279	105	0	33	153	3852
15.	Maharashtra	2748	1424	2491	0	4552	0	11215
16.	Manipur	0	0	37	0	0	0	37
17.	Meghalaya	0	0	124	0	0	0	124
18.	Mizoram	0	0	26	0	0	0	26
19.	Nagaland	0	0	136	0	0	0	136
20.	Orissa	794	651	26136	0	0	435	28016
21.	Punjab	588	1289	164	0	0	0	2041
22.	Rajasthan	6992	4428	131	0	7693	12639	31883
23.	Sikkim	0	0	76	0	0	0	76
24.	Tamil Nadu	452	61	68	0	104	735	1420

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
25.	Tripura	40	0	2613	106	0	172	2931
26.	Uttaranchal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27.	Uttar Pradesh	2077	612	2375	0	11	1302	6377
28.	West Bengal	665	811	11883	5408	0	0	18767
29.	A&N Islands	0	0	16	0	0	10	26
30.	D&N Haveli	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31.	Daman and Diu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
32.	Delhi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
33.	Lakshadweep	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
34.	Pondicherry	0	65	17	0	0	0	82
35.	Chandigarh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	29070	12425	104437	7067	19387	23427	195813

**APPENDIX IX****STATE-WISE UNSPENT BALANCE OF FUNDS  
Till 31.12.2005 under CRSP**

(Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	State/UT	CRSP	Total
1.	Andhra Pradesh	38.49	187.76
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	-95.00	-69.16
3.	Assam	3.18	18.43
4.	Bihar	33.73	171.50
5.	Chhattisgarh	1.33	27.05
6.	Gujarat	31.70	111.56
7.	Goa	—	0.00
8.	Haryana	6.33	13.00
9.	Himachal Pradesh	2.43	70.66
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	2.39	253.00
11.	Jharkhand	43.30	93.13
12.	Karnataka	54.32	157.00
13.	Kerala	8.71	16.28
14.	Madhya Pradesh	40.79	60.51
15.	Maharashtra	36.20	385.17
16.	Manipur	0.43	27.10
17.	Meghalaya	—	26.98
18.	Mizoram	0.01	10.75
19.	Nagaland	-0.53	2.95
20.	Orissa	60.27	109.50
21.	Punjab	4.15	23.13
22.	Rajasthan	31.32	436.01
23.	Sikkim	4.02	5.93
24.	Tamil Nadu	45.99	90.02
25.	Tripura	1.30	6.92
26.	Uttar Pradesh	68.78	138.19
27.	Uttaranchal	6.91	37.51
28.	West Bengal	49.06	143.13
29.	A & N Islands	—	37.89
30.	D & N Haveli	0.01	0.02
31.	Pondicherry	0.38	0.38
32.	Daman & Diu	—	0.00
33.	Lakshadweep	—	1.00
	Total	480.00	2593.30

## APPENDIX X

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

#### EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE FOURTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 22 MARCH, 2006

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1700 hrs. in Committee Room No. G-074, Parliament Library Building, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Hannan Mollah
3. Shri K.C. Pallam Shamy
4. Smt. Tejaswini Seeramesh
5. Shri Mohan Singh
6. Shri Sita Ram Singh
7. Shri Bagun Sumbrai

*Rajya Sabha*

8. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
9. Shri Penumalli Madhu
10. Shri Kalraj Mishra
11. Dr. Faguni Ram

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
3. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Shri A.K. Shah — *Under Secretary*

#### **Representatives of Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply)**

1. Shrimati Sunila Basant, Secretary (Department of Drinking Water Supply)
2. Shri Atul Chaturvedi, AS & FA, Ministry of Rural Development

3. Shrimati Lalitha Kumar, Joint Secretary (Drinking Water Supply)
4. Shri Kumar Alok, Director (CRSP)
5. Shri R.P. Nath, Director (Drinking Water Supply)
6. Shri Ravi Kant Sinha, Director (Swajaldhara)
7. Shri R.M. Deshpande, Additional Adviser

\*\*

\*\*

\*\*

At the outset the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee convened for the purpose of briefing by the representatives of (i) Department of Drinking Water Supply, Ministry of Rural Development, (ii) Ministry of Panchayati Raj on their Demands for Grants (2006-07).

*[The representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) were called in]*

2. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply and drew their attention to the provision of direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker.

3. The Committee were then briefed by the Secretary, Department of Drinking Water Supply on Demands for Grants (2006-2007). The main issues that came up during the course of briefing were under-spending of outlay under the various schemes of the Department, specifically under Swajaldhara, need to address to the issue of slipped back habitations, contamination of water, inadequate attention to sanitation in rural areas, involvement of local institutions and communities for the purpose of conservation and management of water and the position of drinking water and sanitation in schools in rural areas. The Secretary explained the efforts being made by the Department to address to all these issues. The Secretary also responded to the various queries of members of the Committee in this regard.

*[The representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply then withdrew at 1600 hrs. Thereafter, the Secretary, Ministry of Panchayati Raj alongwith the other officers of the Ministry were called in].*

4. \*\*

\*\*

\*\*

5. A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

*The Committee then adjourned*

---

\*\*Not related with the Report.

## APPENDIX XI

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

#### MINUTES OF THE SEVENTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, THE 13 APRIL, 2006.

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1330 hrs. in Committee Room No. 'D', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Mohan Jena
3. Shri Dawa Narbula
4. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
5. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
6. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
7. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
8. Shri Mohan Singh
9. Shri Sita Ram Singh
10. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
11. Shri Bagun Sumbrai
12. Shri Mitrasen Yadav

*Rajya Sabha*

13. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
14. Shri Penumalli Madhu
15. Dr. Chandan Mitra
16. Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilonia

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Shri A.K. Shah — *Under Secretary*

#### **Representatives of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)**

1. Shrimati Sunila Basant, Secretary (Department of Drinking Water Supply)
2. Shri Atul Chaturvedi, AS & FA, Ministry of Rural Development
3. Shrimati Lalitha Kumar, Joint Secretary (Drinking Water Supply)
4. Shri Kumar Alok, Director (CRSP)

5. Shri R.P. Nath, Director (Drinking Water Supply)
6. Shri Ravi Kant Sinha, Director (Swajaldhara)
7. Shri R.M. Deshpande, Additional Adviser

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee convened for taking oral evidence of the representatives of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2006-2007).

*[The representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) were then called in]*

3. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) and drew their attention to the provisions of direction 55(1) of the 'Directions by the Speaker'.

4. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2006-2007). The Secretary, Department of Drinking Water Supply, briefed the Committee on the implementation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes of the Department viz. Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) and Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) (restructured as TSC), as well as scheme for water quality, sustainability and Swajaldhara. She apprised the Committee on the physical achievements made with regard to the Not Covered and Partially Covered habitations, coverage of schools with drinking water and sanitation facilities, quality affected and slipped back habitations etc. The Committee expressed their concern on the slow pace of progress made for coverage of NC habitations, quality affected and coverage of schools. The poor performance of Swajaldhara was particularly highlighted.

5. The Committee also raised the issue of underspending and underutilisation of the funds earmarked for the schemes. Concern was also expressed by the Committee regarding depletion of ground water table, need for co-ordinated efforts by the Ministry of Water Resources, Ministry of Agriculture and Department of Drinking Water Supply, water harvesting and water conservation measures etc. The Secretary responded by pointing out in detail the efforts made by the Department to address each of these issues such as suggesting water conservation measures to States alongwith technical assistance, role of State and District Water and Sanitation Mission, IEC Programmes for education and sensitization for the community etc. Further, issues relating to Swajaldhara Scheme such as role of PRIs in the service delivery system, slow progress of projects taken up under the scheme, feasibility of continuing with ten per cent community contribution under Swajaldhara were discussed in great detail.

6. The Secretary explained the initiatives taken by the Department to address these issues. She also explained the State-wise reasons for the underachievement of targets with regard to NC and PC coverage under ARWSP.

7. A verbatim record of the proceeding has been kept.

*The Committee then adjourned.*



## APPENDIX XII

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

#### EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-FIRST SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, THE 9 MAY, 2006

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1300 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Prabodh Panda—*In the Chair*

#### MEMBERS

##### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri Dawa Narbula
5. Shri Sita Ram Singh
6. Shri Bagun Sumbrai
7. Shri Mitrasen Yadav

##### *Rajya Sabha*

8. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
9. Shri Penumalli Madhu
10. Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilia

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Additional Secretary*
2. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri A.K. Shah — *Under Secretary*

2. In the absence of Chairman, the Committee chose Shri Prabodh Panda, M.P. to act as Chairman for the sitting under Rule 258 (3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. \*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

4. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration the draft Report on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) and adopted the draft Report with slight modifications.

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

*The Committee then adjourned.*

---

\*\*\*Not related with the Report.

### APPENDIX XIII

#### STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS

Sl. No.	Para No.	Recommendations/Observations
1	2	3
1.	2.4	<p>The Committee note that the primary objective of inserting direction 73A in the Directions by the Speaker was to make the Government more accountable for implementation of the various recommendations of the Committee. The Committee are concerned to note that even after a lapse of around six months when the statement on Eleventh Report has fallen due and about three months when the Minister was requested for making the revised statement in respect of First Report, the statements are yet to be made by the Hon'ble Minister. The Committee would like to recommend to the Ministry to ensure that the statements are made at the earliest during the Second part of the Seventh Session. The Committee further strongly recommend to the Ministry to ensure that the statements on each of the reports are made within the specified period, <i>i.e.</i>, six months after the presentation of the Report to Parliament as per direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, in future.</p>
2.	3.20	<p>The Committee note with concern the critical data with regard to availability of water in the near future as given in the Mid Term Appraisal of the Tenth Plan according to which average availability of water is likely to fall below the water stress level in the near future. The per capita storage of water <i>i.e.</i> 207 cubic meter is way below the storage achieved in many of the countries such as Russia (6103 cubic meter), Australia (4733 cubic meter), Brazil (3145 cubic</p>

---

meter), US (1964 cubic meter) etc. The Committee observe from the aforesaid data that the availability of drinking water in the coming years may be at an alarming position. In view of this, there is an urgent need to pay greater attention to this sector. The detailed analysis of the allocation and utilisation position has been done in the succeeding part of the report. Here the Committee may like to emphasise the need for efficient planning and delivery mechanism of the different schemes of the Department to make safe drinking water available and accessible in rural areas.

3. 3.21 The Committee find that providing drinking water in rural areas is one of the six components of the ambitious programme of the Government 'Bharat Nirman'. The total fund requirement for the years 2005-2009 as projected to meet the different components *viz.* coverage of schools, coverage of left-over habitations, coverage of slipped back/newly emerged habitations, tackling water quality, outstanding liability for Swajaldhara, calamity, DDP, O&M and sustainability is Rs. 41,636.971 crore. The yearly allocation may come to around Rs. 9,000 crore. At present level of annual allocation *i.e.* Rs. 5200 crore during the year 2006-07, it is difficult to achieve the targets set under Bharat Nirman. Even the Department has agreed to the inadequacy of allocation. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee strongly recommend to enhance the allocation for drinking water sector. The Committee would also like the Department to apprise them as to how the projects made under Bharat Nirman would be met keeping in view the fact that the level of allocation during the first two years of Bharat Nirman *i.e.* 2005 and 2006 is very low as compared to the projections.

1	2	3
4.	3.22	<p>The Committee note that even the allocation provided during each of the year is not being meaningfully utilised. The Committee are concerned to note that as on 31 December, 2005 Rs. 2,113.30 crore was lying unspent with State Governments. Another area of concern is the low level of achievement by the different State Governments. The percentage expenditure was 76.58 per cent in 2004-05 and 47.45 per cent in 2005-06. The Department has cited non-receipt of monthly progress reports by the States reflecting up-to-date expenditure as the reason for unspent balances. Even the updated expenditure figures received from the Department for the Central sector indicate that the expenditure reported was 83.83 per cent during 2004-05 and 47.45 per cent during the year 2005-06. The Committee are not inclined to accept the casual reply of the Department stating non-receipt of monthly progress reports as the reason for unspent balances in this era of technological advancement. The Committee have repeatedly been expressing their concern over the under-spending with various State Governments. In spite of that, there seems to be little improvement in this regard. In view of this sceario, the Committee strongly recommend to the Department to take all the desired action to ensure that every paisa earmarked for the drinking water sector is meaningfully utilised. As regards the issue of getting monthly progress reports from the State Governments, the Committee would like the Department to evolve some mechanism so that online reporting can be ensured from the State Governments.</p>
5.	3.28	<p>The Committee note with concern that the inter-State and inter-component funding patter under ARWSP is extremely complicated and as such monitoring such a complex criteria becomes an</p>

1	2	3
		onerous task. Thus, reiterating their earlier recommendation, the Committee suggest to the Department to simplify the pattern.
6.	3.29	During the Conferences of States' Ministers in charge of drinking water supply, it was highlighted by a number of States to provide more funds under ARWSP and change the funding pattern to 75:25 for Centre and States. While noting that steps have been initiated to change funding pattern for North-Eastern States, the Committee would stress that there is a need to explore similar options with respect to other States that are facing resource constraint and have large number of habitations in difficult areas. The Committee urge the Department to take the immediate action in this regard.
7.	3.30	On the question of how the prescribed inter component funding pattern under ARWSP is ensured, the Department has failed to submit a categorical reply. The Committee feel that monitoring of implementation of inter component allocation merely through periodical meetings and conferences is not practical or feasible. There is no mechanism to supervise States that do not adhere to the norm of inter-component allocation under ARWSP. The Committee desire that a system should be put in place whereby it could be ensured that States adhere to the norm of inter-component allocation.
8.	3.31	The Committee have been informed by the Secretary during oral evidence that remaining Not Covered habitations are in remote and difficult areas and achieving the target for NC habitations is different. Apart from coverage of NC habitations, quality of drinking water and sustainability have emerged as extremely

---

relevant issues and as such rigid allocation for the said aspects is not justified in the changed scenario. The Committee would further like to add that the States have their unique and peculiar problems with regard to quality and sustainability in drinking water sector and hence providing for rigid allocation under various components is not desirable.

The Committee, therefore, urge the Department to provide flexibility to States to utilise the amount earmarked for quality and sustainability depending upon their local conditions and requirements. The Committee would like the Department to take urgent corrective action in this regard and suitably modify the guidelines of ARWSP allowing the States flexibility to spend more than a minimum threshold. The Committee may be accordingly apprised of the Department's assessment on the issue. Till the issue is finalised the Committee urge the Department to formulate an appropriate monitoring mechanism for the same.

9. 3.42 The Committee find from the information furnished to them that with an investment of around Rs. 50,000 crore in the drinking water sector, the Government claims that 96 per cent of the rural habitations have actually been covered. The Committee have repeatedly been expressing concern over the authenticity of the proclamations made by the Government with regard to coverage of habitations. The status of slipped back habitations has been reviewed in the coming part of the report. As per the Government's data, at present 3,164 are the not covered habitations and 41,457 are the partially covered habitations. As regards the achievement with regard to NC/PC habitations, the Committee find from the data indicated by the Department that during 8th Plan 3,39,705

---

habitations could be covered. Further during 9th Plan total coverage was 4,17,951. During 10th Plan the coverage during the first four years is 2,10,516. It could be seen from the data that the number of coverage of habitations has drastically reduced during 10th Plan as compared to 9th Plan.

10. 3.43

Further while reviewing the performance during the year 2005-06 the Committee note that there is gross mismatch between the targets and achievements. Against the target of 3,522 NC habitations the achievement during the first three quarters is 653 and similarly for PC habitations against the targets of 8,375 achievement is 5,958. The Committee further note from the replies that one of the main reasons for lower rate of coverage of habitations has been given to be the location of most of the habitations being in difficult areas. In the plain areas like Punjab and Rajasthan, deterioration of water quality of ground water resources, high cost of surface water schemes, decision of State Government to implement piped water supply scheme etc. have been cited as the problems encountered regarding coverage of habitations.

While appreciating the difficulties for coverage in hill areas, the Committee are not convinced with the reason put forth for coverage in plain areas. The Committee feel that with the advancement in technology, even difficult areas can be covered. The Committee would like the Department to explore technology options and it should be ensured that all the uncovered habitations are covered within a stipulated time frame.

11. 3.44

The Committee further find that as on 1 April, 2005 there were 4588 not covered habitations. Further as on 1 April, 2006 the status of not

---



covered habitations was 3935. Thus only 653 NC habitations could be covered during the year 2005-06. Further the Committee also find that as per the weightage for allocation of funds given in guidelines upto 15 per cent of the funds can be allocated for NC/PC habitations on 2:1 ratio. The Committee find that while huge allocation might have been made to States having more NC/PC habitations as per the Government's data, the status of coverage reflects that only few habitations are being covered due to certain reasons as explained above. In view of this scenario, the Committee would like that realistic targets for coverage of NC/PC habitations should be set keeping in view the ground position.

12. 3.45

Besides, the Committee note that the issue of sustainability of resources is the basic area of concern. The detailed analysis in this has been made in the coming Chapter of the report. Here the Committee would like to recommend that more emphasis now should be given to sustainability and quality issues.

13. 3.51

The Committee have persistently been expressing their serious concern over the dichotomy in the data with regard to accessibility and availability of drinking water in rural areas in the country. The Committee in the action taken replies on 11th Report on Demands for Grants 2005-06 (refer para 7 of 14th Report—Fourteenth Lok Sabha) had been informed that revalidation data of habitations survey being done by Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) would be completed by February, 2006. While examining the Demands for Grants of current year, the Committee note that IIPA has submitted data in respect of only 14 States. Even in these States there are certain discrepancies and now the Department

---

proposes to conduct a random survey by involving other agencies. The Committee deplore the way the different surveys are being undertaken to know the position of slippage of habitations. The Committee further find that as per the various Budget documents since the year 2005-06 a lot of allocation is being made and results are being indicated with regard to coverage of slippage of habitations. The Committee fail to understand how the status of coverage of slippage of habitations is being reflected without having the basic facts about ground situation in this regard. The Committee are of the view that it is of utmost necessity to have the exact position of the availability of drinking water in each of the habitations for future planning. In view of this scenario, the Committee strongly recommend that the Government should look into the matter critically in order to finalise the parameters for conducting the survey. The survey itself should be completed expeditiously and the Committee be informed accordingly.

14.

3.52

The Committee further note from the replies that the Department is evolving mechanism to monitor and assess slippages on regular basis. On the basis of Monthly Progress Report and Yearly Status Report received from the States, a software is being developed in consultation with NIC. Besides the Committee had been apprised that with regard to regular updation of survey some of the State Governments had certain reservations with regard to infrastructure for periodic updation of slipped back habitations (refer para 7 of 14th Report). The Committee fail to understand how the updation of the data of slipped back habitations would be possible without having the basic data with regard to slipped back habitations. Once the core data of slipped back habitations is

1	2	3
15.	4.10	<p data-bbox="651 459 1228 663">available, regular monitoring of the data may be possible. Therefore, the Department should first of all ensure that the core data with regard to slipped back habitations is procured at the earliest. Thereafter the mechanism for slippage of habitations may be finalised.</p> <p data-bbox="651 689 1228 1865">The Committee find from the status of financial and physical achievements under Swajaldhara as indicated above that performance of Swajaldhara is not satisfactory since the year 2002-03. Not only that, the financial achievements indicate that there is deterioration in the percentage of achievement year after year. The percentage expenditure, which was 67 per cent during 2002-03, came down to 40 per cent during 2003-04 and subsequently reduced on 19.09 per cent and a meagre 1.73 per cent during the years 2004-05 and 2005-06 respectively. As regards physical achievements, while appreciating the fact that some schemes may have more gestation period the Committee wish to point out that from the replies furnished by the Department itself it is apparent that most of the schemes are short duration schemes the gestation period of which is 12 to 18 months. As such 50 per cent of the projects initiated during the year 2002-2003 being incomplete is not understandable. The situation is further alarming during 2003-04 when the percentage declared to around 40 per cent and then around 20 per cent during 2004-05. The Committee are further concerned to note the reasons advanced by the Department like late reporting of schemes, longer gestation period, the system of releasing of funds etc. for huge under-spending and shortfall in achieving the physical targets. The Committee deplore the way the unsatisfactory achievement under Swajaldhara has been tried to be justified. The Committee would like the</p>

1	2	3
		<p>Department to make all out efforts to ensure that the allocation made under the Swajaldhara is meaningfully utilised. Besides the State/district-wise reasons for under-spending as well as non-completion of projects should be obtained from the concerned State Governments and the Committee may be apprised accordingly.</p>
16.	4.11	<p>The Committee further recommend that concrete steps for strengthening the monitoring and reporting system should be taken. They feel that in this age where India is making giant strides in the field of Information Technology, the Department cannot confine itself to obsolete monitoring and reporting system practiced currently. The Committee therefore, emphasise that the web based monitoring system at the district level proposed by the Department should be put in place and made functional at the earliest.</p>
17.	4.17	<p>The Committee have gathered the impression that the Department is very optimistic about the Swajaldhara scheme. It seems that some of the States have responded positively to the Swajaldhara principles and desired more funds for these projects. It has further been stated by the Department that one of the recommendations of the meeting of State Ministers was to extend the principles of Swajaldhara to ARWSP from Eleventh Plan. The Committee had analysed the proposal of replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara in their earlier reports (refer para 2.63 of 11th Report) and expressed concerns that since Swajaldhara is a demand-driven scheme, the better performing States would only be able to take the benefit of the scheme. Thus the less performing States would be deprived of the Central allocation. The Committee had strongly</p>

1	2	3
		recommended (para 2.65 of 11th Report) to review the position in this regard. The Committee note that the apprehensions of the Committee have not been adequately addressed by the Department. The Committee while reiterating their earlier recommendation in this regard would like to have a categorical response of the Department.
18.	4.18	The Committee take note of the fact that Swajaldhara is a small component of ARWSP wherein 20 per cent funds under ARWSP are earmarked for projects under Swajaldhara. As per Swajaldhara principles, 90 per cent contribution is made by the Centre and 10 per cent by community to encourage people to have participation and inculcate a sense of ownership. The Committee are constrained to note the ambiguous reply of the Department on the issue of desirability of obtaining 10 per cent community contribution for projects under Swajaldhara. On the one hand the Department has stated that increase in number of projects taken up under Swajaldhara reflects the willingness of the communities to come forward with 10 per cent contribution whereas on the other hand, it has been stated that some States have expressed inability to implement schemes as the dialogue with community failed in some cases.
19.	4.19	Besides, as indicated in the Performance Budget for a large number of States in the year 2003-04 and 2004-05, community contribution has been indicated as zero. During 2003-04, as many as 21 States/Union territories and 14 States/Union territories during 2004-05 have reported Community Contribution as nil. Even though the Secretary during the course of oral evidence has stated that projects were not sanctioned where Community Contribution was zero during 2002, 2003 and 2004, the data

reflects otherwise. Allocation has been indicated for Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Maharashtra, Jharkhand, Tripura, Uttaranchal and West Bengal during 2003-04 and to Nagaland during 2004-05, even though the Community Contribution indicated is nil. The Committee feel that there is some confusion with regard to the release of outlay under Swajaldhara. Even when 10 per cent Community Contribution is mandatory under the scheme, the allocation is being made without having any Community Contribution, thereby defeating the very purpose of Swajaldhara *i.e.* inculcating the feeling of ownership by way of Community Contribution. In view of this scenario, the Committee understand that the whole principle of Swajaldhara need review particularly when the overall policy of Government aims to replace ARWSP with Swajaldhara, the detailed analysis of which has been given in the preceding part of the report. The Committee while reiterating their earlier stand in this regard would like the categorical reply of the Department in the light of the observations given above. The Committee would like to know the details of the States which have expressed their inability to implement the said schemes.

20. 5.8 The Committee while reiterating their concern with regard to the issue of sustainability would like to emphasise that sustainability of the drinking water source and the systems have emerged as extremely pertinent issues and greatest challenge confronting the drinking water supply sub-sector. For sustainability to be achieved a multipronged approach is required which *inter-alia* includes:
- (i) Ascertaining exact data with regard to slippages and subsequently exploring reasons for the same and addressing the problem in a proactive manner;

- (ii) Earmarking more funds under the scheme to be utilised for sustainability;
- (iii) Active involvement of communities in implementation of schemes and O&M of water supply schemes;
- (iv) Contributing to regulation and control of ground water extraction and development of ground water;
- (v) Integration of all programmes pertaining to water conservation, management water harvesting etc. and taking a holistic approach on the issue; and
- (vi) Awareness creation and IEC activities to inculcate in people the value of water as a socio-economic good etc.

The Committee would like to have a categorical response of the Department to each of the suggestions given above and the action taken/ proposed to be taken in this regard.

21.

5.9

The Committee find from the information made available by the Department that more emphasis is being given under the schemes of the Department to handpumps on the ground of its being cost effective. The Committee find that the depletion of ground water is a crucial matter which needs to be taken into consideration while deciding the strategy of the Department to provide drinking water. Further the Committee have their apprehensions on the data with regard to the working systems provided under the schemes of the Department. As per the Government's own data around 3 lakh habitations would have been converted to slipped back habitations by now. The total number of habitations in the country is 14,22,664 habitations and as such as per the Government estimate around 20 per cent of the

---

habitations would have fallen from covered to not covered status as of now. The real position in this regard may be even grimmer. This is the serious area of concern which need to be addressed urgently. Unless the sources of water are healthy, the functioning of the systems cannot be ensured. Since most of the availability of water is through ground water, in the absence of sustainability of resources the position of working systems as indicated in the reply cannot be properly understood. The Committee would like the Department to verify the said data and inform the Committee accordingly. Besides they would like to recommend that more stress needs to be given to use of surface water resources. In cases where ground water is drawn, it should be ensured that there is some system of water recharge whereby the drawl of water should be matched my equal quantity of water seeped through water recharge systems.

22. 5.10 The Committee further find that only 10 States as of now have enacted and implemented legislation on control and development of ground water. The Committee feel that involving States in the huge endeavour of controlling use of ground water is necessary and immediate enactment of such a legislation is imperative. The Committee would like the Department to impress upon the States in collaboration with Ministry of Water Resources to put such a legislation in place at the earliest. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard.
23. 6.9 The Committee would like to highlight that the richest possession a country can be proud of in the 21st century is its water resources. The Committee opine that it is not sufficient to simply provide for drinking water in rural



---

areas, but the Government should simultaneously focus on quality of the water as it has major linkages with health and well-being of the people. While the Department is giving targets category-wise to State Governments wherein coverage of quality affected habitations is one of the components, the Committee are distressed to note the pathetic achievements *vis-a-vis* targets with regard to quality affected habitations. Against a target of 10,000 habitations in 2005-06, the achievement was merely 3,249 indicating their failure to address such a critical dimension of the problem. That too when the targets themselves were too small as compared to the total work to be taken *i.e.*, addressing 1,95,000 habitations. The Committee would therefore like to recommend to the Department to address the issue of quality more vigorously and enhance the annual targets. Efforts should be made to meet the targets in this regard.

24. 6.10 As per the information received from the Department on the setting up of District level Water Quality Laboratory, out of 459 sanctioned laboratories, 368 have been established. The Committee would like the Department to ensure that the remaining sanctioned labs are established expeditiously. Further the Department should ensure that labs are sanctioned in rest of the districts, on an urgent basis.
25. 6.11 The Committee are pleased to note the efforts of the Department with regard to water monitoring and surveillance programme which entails coordination and convergence with the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. While agreeing with the Department that the issue of health, drinking water and sanitation are intimately linked and should be addressed

---

through a coordinated approach, the Committee agree with the proposal of the Department for having common institutional structures by way of common Committees for health, water supply and sanitation programme. They would like the Department to continue efforts in this direction and update the Committee about the concrete action taken in this regard.

26.

7.8

The Committee have consistently been drawing the attention of the Department towards the critical need to provide drinking water in schools. In spite of that the situation does not seem to have been improved. The worst part is that the Government does not have the exact basic data with regard to number of schools not having drinking water facility. There is vast difference between the data furnished by the Department of Elementary Education according to which 78,358 rural schools are yet to be provided with drinking water supply, and the data furnished by the Department of Drinking Water Supply which indicate that the said number is 2,07,691. The number of rural schools has increased from 6.37 lakh (as per 6th Educational Survey) to 8,53,457 (as per 7th All India Educational Survey). As such the number of schools not having drinking water facilities may be more. Further this is the situation as reported in Government data which itself seems to be not firm. The Committee apprehend that the reality in this regard may be worse.

In spite of according priority to rural schools as per the policy of the Government the physical achievements corresponding to the targets do not reflect the seriousness on the part of the Department. There is huge shortfall in achievement of targets during the year 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06. Not only that the achievement has reduced considerably during

---

2004-05 as compared to the previous year. Further the achievement during 2005-06 *i.e.*, 35,538 against the huge targets of 1,40,000 is far from satisfactory. In this scenario, the Committee deplore the way one of the important areas is being addressed by the Department. It is really painful that after 56 years of planned development, the schools could not be provided even the basic facility of drinking water. The Committee cannot accept any excuse for delaying it further since there is an urgent need to provide drinking water to all the schools in the country. The Government should take up this aspect with all the seriousness it deserves and formulate a strategy which should be implemented in a time bound manner to achieve the task of providing drinking water to all the schools in the country.

27. 8.11 The Committee take note of the fact that allocation for sanitation sector has been enhanced for the 10th Plan Period *vis-a-vis* 9th Plan. Besides, an analysis of the amount allocated and released for the previous four years during the 10th Plan reveals that funds allocated to this sector have substantially been enhanced. However, given the fact that as of now, as per Government's estimate only 38 per cent rural households are provided with sanitation facilities, the Committee feel that there is a long way to go before 100 per cent sanitation can be achieved and further augmentation of funds would be a positive step in that direction.
28. 8.12 The Committee have been informed that to cover the whole country under Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) by 2012, there would be a requirement of Rs. 860 crore per year. The Committee feel that apart from coverage of whole country under TSC, the main emphasis

---

of Government should be to enhance the percentage of rural households provided with sanitation which stands at a dismal 38 per cent at present. The Committee would, therefore, recommend to seek more funds from Planning Commission not only for the coverage of all districts under TSC but to implement other activities related to cleanliness to ensure each and every rural household is provided with sanitation facilities and the rural areas get clean environment. The Committee accordingly urge the Department to make efforts for stepping up the outlay considerably.

29. 8.13 The Committee are dismayed over the dismal performance of the Department over the last five years as far as utilisation of sanctioned amount is concerned. The Committee fail to understand that how, given the bleak scenario of rural sanitation, the Department can afford to spend as low as 30 to 40 per cent of the amount allocated in 2001-2002 and 2002-2003. Even for 2004-2005 the amount spent was approximately 50 per cent of the amount allocated. The Committee take strong exception to the lackadaisical approach of the Department in this regard and desire to be furnished with proper justification along with the remedial action taken in this regard.
30. 8.14 Besides, for the year 2005-06, the Department has informed that out of the amount allocated *i.e.* Rs. 700 crore amount released was only Rs. 660.71 crore out of which amount spent till 31st March was only Rs. 227 crore thus making a huge short fall in the amount utilised *i.e.*, Rs. 433 crore. The Committee take strong objection to the way huge funds to the tune of crores of rupees are lying unspent in such a critical sector. The Committee would like the department to justify on the aforesaid matter.

---

They also recommend that efforts should be made to ensure timely utilisation of the amount allocated in subsequently years.

31. 8.22 The Committee are concerned to note that as per Government's estimate, only 38 per cent rural habitations could be provided with sanitation facilities till date. The Committee are further disturbed to note the rather slow pace of coverage of habitations with sanitation facilities. India is committed to the Millennium Development Goal of reducing by half the number of people without access to sanitation by the year 2010 and achieving cent per cent coverage in the country by the year 2012. The Committee feel that to achieve the Millennium Development Goal, the Department with the current level of achievement, will have to work with a hands on approach to deal with the issue. The Committee would like to know the Action Plan and strategies devised for the attainment of Millennium Development Goal.
32. 8.23 Further, as per the Performance Budget of the Department there is gross under achievement with regard to sanctioned Individual household latrines, sanitation complex for women, school toilets, toilets for Balwadis/Anganwadis. Out of 866.70 lakh sanctioned IHHL, the achievement was only 198.68 lakh till 31 January, 2006. Similarly, for sanitation complex for women, out of 34,081 lakh sanctioned complexes, achievement was only 6,394 lakh. The position of school coverage is rather more disappointing. Out of the target of 5,78,610 toilets, 1,98,670 toilets could be constructed by 31 January, 2006. Similarly, in the case of Balwadis/Anganwadis out of 1,73,560 sanctioned toilets, achievement was merely 41,862.

1	2	3
33.	8.24	<p>Further disturbing is the State-wise performance as indicated in the Budget documents. The expenditure position in Dadra &amp; Nagar Haveli, Manipur, Meghalaya, Punjab, Goa and Nagaland is alarming. In Arunachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Orissa, Sikkim and Uttaranchal the under-spending is more than 50 per cent. The State specific performance is further dismal during 2005-06 as indicated in the preceding para of the report. As indicated in the Budget documents, Rs. 480 crore is lying unspent with various State Governments.</p> <p>The Committee deplore such a poor performance of sanitation programme in the country. In this scenario, the Committee feel that the objective of outlay augmentation is defeated if the projects are not completed in time. The Committee would urge the Department to be more actively engaged in the entire process of TSC starting from providing allocation till the completion of projects. The Committee desire the Department to furnish to them the reasons for such unsatisfactory achievement of physical targets and take effective measures to rectify the anomaly in future. Besides, the Committee feel that one of the reasons for under-utilisation of funds may be inadequate outlay provided under the scheme for construction of a toilet to each beneficiary. The Committee would like the comment of the Department in the regard so as to analyse the position critically and comment further.</p>
34.	8.25	<p>The Committee are constrained to find from the reply of the Department that open defecation is an age-old habit because of which only 80 per cent of toilets constructed under Government schemes are being used. The</p>

---

Committee feel that non use may also be due to toilets becoming dysfunctional after some time and not because of lack of awareness by people. If there are hygienic and functional toilets in rural areas, the people will be certainly inclined to use them. Even if it is to be believed that non use is due to improper sanitation and hygiene habits of the people, it implies that IEC activities undertaken by the Department under TSC have not been up to the required standards and have failed to deliver results on field. The Committee, therefore, urge that the Department should take all the desired efforts to ensure that the toilets constructed under the Government schemes are actually used. Otherwise, the whole objective of spending crores of rupees is defeated. The Committee would like to emphasise that proper sanitation involves provision of water, drainage, disposal of garbage and is intimately linked with the issue of health care. Thus the Department should have appropriate intervention in consultation with the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare to address the problem. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the response of the Department on the proposal put forth in the Approach paper to the Tenth Plan regarding National Mission on Sanitation and Public Health and efforts made by them in this direction.

---