

23

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2006-2007)**

**FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA**

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

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

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

**TWENTY-THIRD REPORT**



मयमेव जयते

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

TWENTY-THIRD REPORT  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2006-2007)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2006-2007)

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

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 16.3.2007*

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on 16.3.2007*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*March, 2007/Phalguna, 1928 (Saka)*

**C.R.D. No. 29**

*Price : Rs. 98.00*

© 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 (2006-2007) .....	(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(v)
CHAPTER I Report .....	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government .....	35
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies .....	47
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee .....	48
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited .....	74
APPENDICES	
I. Physical and Financial Status of Swajaldhara 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06 as on 21 August, 2006 .....	75
II. Extracts of Minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 27 February, 2007 .....	89
III. Analysis of Action taken by the Government on the recommendation contained in the Twentieth Report of the Committee (14th Lok Sabha) .....	91

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2006-2007)

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shrimati Susmita Bauri
3. Shri Mani Charenamei
4. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
5. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
6. Shri George Fernandes
7. Shri Zora Singh Mann
8. Shri Krishna Murari Moghe
9. Shri Hannan Mollah
10. Shri D. Narbula
11. Shri A. F. G. Osmani
12. Shri T. Madhusudan Reddy
13. Adv. Renge Patil Tukaram Ganpatrao
14. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
15. Shrimati Jyotirmoyee Sikdar
16. Shri Sita Ram Singh
17. Shri D.C. Srikantappa\*
18. Shri Bagun Sumbrui
19. Shri Chandramani Tripathi
20. Shri Beni Prasad Verma
21. Shri Dharmendra Yadav

---

\*Hon'ble Speaker has changed the nomination of Shri D.C. Srikantappa, MP (LS) from Standing Committee on Urban Development to Committee on Rural Development *vice* the vacancy caused due to change of nomination of Shri Shrichand Kriplani MP (LS) from Standing Committee on Rural Development to Standing Committee on Chemicals and Fertilizers *vide* Lok Sabha Bulletin Part II, para No. 2847 dated August 31, 2006.

*Rajya Sabha*

22. Shri Balihari
23. Shri Jayantilal Barot
24. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
25. Shri Pyarelal Khandelwal
26. Dr. Chandan Mitra
27. Shri P.R. Rajan
28. Shri Bhagwati Singh
29. Ms. Sushila Tiriya
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-I*

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2006-2007) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Twenty-Third Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twentieth Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2005-2006) on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Department of Drinking Water supply (Ministry of Rural Development).

2. The Twentieth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 18 May, 2006. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 23 August, 2006.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 27 February, 2007.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twentieth Report of the Committee is given in *Appendix III*.

NEW DELHI;  
15 March, 2007  

---

24 Phalgun, 1928 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,  
Chairman,  
Standing Committee on  
Rural Development.

## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Rural Development (2006-2007) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Twentieth Report on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 18 May, 2006.

2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 34 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:

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

Para Nos. 2.4, 3.20, 3.45, 4.11, 5.8, 5.9, 5.10, 6.10, 6.11, 8.11, 8.12 and 8.25.

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

NIL

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

Para Nos. 3.21, 3.22, 3.28, 3.29, 3.30, 3.31, 3.42, 3.43, 3.44, 3.51, 3.52, 4.10, 4.17, 4.18, 4.19, 6.9, 7.8, 8.13, 8.14, 8.22, 8.23 and 8.24

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

NIL

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

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

##### **Recommendation Serial No. 2 and 3 (Para Nos. 3.21 and 3.22)**

4. The Committee had recommended as under:

"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. 5,200 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 projections 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".

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.21)*

"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 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”.

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.22)*

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

“It is a fact that the allocation made during 2005-06 and 2006-07 was not as per projections made for the requirement of funds under Bharat Nirman. The Department would strongly take up this issue with Planning Commission for providing enhanced allocation in the coming two years of Bharat Nirman. The State Governments have also framed their Action Plan. However, for the funding gaps, the States have been asked to seek external funding, loan from NABARD, etc”.

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.21)*

“The Department has put in place an online monitoring mechanism for monthly progress reports. A training programme is being organized to familiarize the States for data entry in the software. Once the States start using this system, the timely receipt of expenditure figures will be ensured.

From 2006-07, only 10 per cent carried over funds will be allowed as against 15 per cent till last year. In case the opening balance is more than 10 per cent (till last year it was 15 per cent), a cut equivalent to opening balance in excess of 10 per cent will be imposed at the time of release of second instalment. This would be a deterrent factor and the States would ensure utilization of funds released under ARWSP. Letters have been sent to the States having large opening balance for ensuring full utilization”.

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.22)*

**6. The Committee in the earlier recommendation had raised their concern over inadequate allocation to meet the set targets under the ambitious programme ‘Bharat Nirman’ with reference to its drinking water component. In response to the Committee’s recommendation, the Department has now assured to take up the matter strongly with Planning Commission. Besides, it has also been stated that the States have been asked to seek external funding loan from NABARD etc. The Committee find that although more than two years of Bharat Nirman have already passed, the Department has yet to get the adequate allocation for achieving the set targets. Besides, the**

Committee disapprove the way the responsibility of arranging outlay has been passed on to the State Governments whereas the Bharat Nirman is the project of the Union Government and the targets are being fixed by them. In view of the aforesaid scenario, the Committee strongly recommend to the Ministry to take up the issue of inadequate allocation at the highest level. The matter should be taken up at the Cabinet Secretary level and the observations of the Committee in this regard should be conveyed.

Another area of concern expressed by the Committee in their earlier recommendation was huge opening balances with the various State Governments. The Department instead of explaining the reasons for under utilization of resources has simply stated that an online monitoring mechanism has been put in place which will ensure the timely receipt of data. Another deterrent measure taken by the Department is to decrease the permissible percentage of carried over funds by the State Governments from 15 per cent to 10 per cent. In case the opening balance by a State Government is more than 10 per cent, a cut equivalent to opening balance in excess of 10 per cent will be imposed at the time of release of second instalment. The Committee feel that the progressive States would be benefited by the aforesaid measure of imposing cut in the funds to be allocated to underperforming States. The under performing States which are in need of more allocation would actually be deprived of their due share. While expressing concern over the under utilization of resources by these States, the Committee note that much more needs to be done to motivate the State Governments to implement ARWSP seriously. Besides there is an urgent need to know the State specific reasons responsible for under utilization of resources under this priority programme so that suitable measures can be taken in this regard. The Committee strongly recommend to the Department to find out the States/district-wise problems and take action accordingly. The Committee should also be kept informed about the same.

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

##### **Recommendation Serial No. 5, 7 and 8 (Para Nos. 3.28, 3.30 and 3.31)**

7. The Committee had recommended as under:

“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”.

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.28)*

“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”.

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.30)*

“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”.

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.31)*

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

“The Department has considered the earlier recommendation of the Standing Committee for simplifying the funding pattern. The

funding pattern for different components has been kept taking into account the importance of that component, fund requirement and capacity of the State to contribute funds for that component. At present, it would not be desirable to change the existing funding pattern. However, this would be reviewed at an appropriate time”.

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.28)*

“The system being followed by the Department is as follows:

- A. There is a separate allocation for Swajaldhara and Water Quality. Adherence of the norms of funding pattern of these components are monitored at the time of releasing the second and the subsequent instalment.
- B. In DDP and Calamity components, there is no State share and thus there is no need for such a mechanism.
- C. Funds released under ARWSP (Normal) are utilized for the following components:
  - (i) operation and maintenance upto 15 per cent. The funding pattern for this is 50:50 between Centre and States;
  - (ii) sustainability upto 5 per cent. The funding pattern for this is 75:25 between Centre and States; and
  - (iii) rest of the funds are utilised for Coverage. The funding pattern for this is 50:50 between Centre and States.

50 per cent of the allocated funds are released to the States towards first instalment in the beginning of the financial year. On attaining the 60 per cent expenditure of the available funds (first instalment + carry over funds of the last year), State Government is required to send a proposal for release of second instalment in the prescribed format. In this prescribed format, all the details relating to expenditure incurred on O&M, sustainability and coverage are mentioned. In case, there is excess expenditure on O&M, the said expenditure is treated as inadmissible and corresponding cut equivalent to the excess expenditure is made in the second instalment. Further, while calculating the State share, the funding pattern of various components is taken into account. As an example, if the expenditure incurred on sustainability is  $(0.05x)$ , the share to be provided by the State Government would be  $(0.95x) + (0.05x)/3$ . Thus a mechanism exists to monitor the expenditure incurred on different components under ARWSP (Normal)”.

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.30)*

“The Committee’s suggestion to provide flexibility to States to utilize the amount earmarked for quality and sustainability depending upon their local conditions and requirements has been examined by the Department. On the basis of the request received from the State Governments with the approval of the Cabinet in February 2006, it has been decided to retain 20 per cent of the ARWSP funds at the Centre for releasing to quality affected States only to provide focused funding for tackling water quality problems. Revised guidelines on sub-mission on water quality have already been issued in the month of March, 2006 (available on the Department website [www.ddws.gov.in](http://www.ddws.gov.in)). Activities for sustainability will be taken up by the State Governments out of 5 per cent of ARWSP funds allocated to them for the purpose, under the delegated power. As reporting of sub-mission projects on source sustainability is still not proportionate to even 5 per cent of ARWSP funds released to the State Governments, they were directed to ensure that 5 per cent is spent exclusively on sub-mission projects related to water sources. It is being impressed upon the State Governments that sustainability of sources should be an integral part of the water supply systems. The State Departments dealing with rural water supply will have to coordinate with other sectoral programmes to address the issue of sustainability”.

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.31)*

**9. The Committee have repeatedly been recommending to the Department to simplify the inter-State and inter-component funding pattern under ARWSP. As per the existing criteria funds are provided under different components to the States for covering rural habitations with drinking water facilities which 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.
- (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 aside 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.

Even though the Committee had been pursuing this matter year after year, the Department has not bothered to consider and implement the recommendation of the Committee. In the replies now furnished to the Committee, it has been stated that it would not be desirable to change the existing funding pattern and the same would be reviewed at an appropriate time. The Committee express serious concern over the vague and unsatisfactory reply of the Department. On the issue of monitoring, the expenditure under the different heads as stated above, the Department has stated that they have devised a formula in this regard. The formula stated by the Department in this regard is as under:

“if the expenditure incurred on sustainability is  $(0.05 x)$ , the share to be provided by the State Government would be  $(0.95 x) + (0.05 x) / 3$ . Thus, a mechanism exists to monitor the expenditure incurred on different components under ARWSP (Normal)”.

The Committee are unable to comprehend this complicated formula and fail to understand how the component wise expenditure would have been monitored by the Department with this complicated formula. The Committee may like to reiterate here that due to distinct and peculiar problems of each State and region, it is not appropriate to provide for such a rigid allocation of different components. For instance, a particular State may face major impediment with regard to tackling a particular component such as quality etc., hence they may require to spend more on the aforesaid component. State Governments should, be provided flexibility to use the earmarked allocation keeping in view the State specific problems *viz* non-availability, quality, sustainability etc.

In view of this scenario, the Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation to simplify the inter- State and inter-component funding pattern under ARWSP.



### C. Inter-State allocation under ARWSP

#### Recommendation Serial No. 6 (Para No. 3.29)

10. The Committee had recommended as under:

“During the Conferences of States’ Ministers incharge 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”.

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

“The Department has seriously considered the recommendations of the Committee for changing the funding pattern to 75:25 between Centre and the State. It may be mentioned that by changing the funding pattern the Centre would not be able to provide more funds to the States than what is being provided at present. The funds of the Central Government are limited and whatever is the Budget allocation of the Department, the same is distributed to the States. At present States are providing an amount equivalent to the amount that has been allocated by the Centre. Changing the funding pattern will amount to less contribution by the States (1/3rd of the allocation made by the Centre) and thus there would be less availability of funds for rural drinking water supply. The Department has decided that at the time of formulation of Annual Plan, the Planning Commission would be apprised of the tentative allocation of different States so that Planning Commission could make provision of adequate funds in the State Plan for the matching share”.

**12. As per the existing formula of allocation of funds under ARWSP, State Governments have to allocate equal amount of funds as earmarked by the Union Government. The Committee in the earlier recommendation while noting that steps are being initiated to change funding pattern for North Eastern States had recommended to explore similar options with respect to other States that are facing resource constraint and have large number of habitations in difficult areas. Pursuant to the recommendation, the Department has expressed**



their limitations to implement the aforesaid recommendation. It has been stated that the enhancing of the Central allocation would result in decreased effective allocation under ARWSP to different States. The Committee feel that the Department has generalized the recommendation of the Committee for all the States. The spirit of the recommendation was to assist those States which have large number of habitations in difficult areas and are facing resource constraint. The Department should first of all identify these States. Besides, no response with regard to the status of the revision of funding pattern with regard to North Eastern States which was under active consideration of the Government has been given. The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation and would like the Department to consider their recommendation in the right perspective. Besides, enhanced allocation to these States should be provided so that the issue of getting lesser effective contribution by the States with the revised funding pattern from 50:50 to 75:25 can be addressed.

**D. Authenticity of data with regard to status of coverage and the issue of slippages**

**Recommendation Serial Nos. 9, 10, 11, 13 and 14  
(Para Nos. 3.42, 3.43, 3.44, 3.51 and 3.52)**

13. The Committee had recommended as under:

“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”.

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.42)*

“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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.43)*

“The Committee further find that as on 1 April, 2005 there were 4,588 not covered habitations. Further as on 1 April, 2006 the status of not covered habitations was 3,935. 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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.44)*

“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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.51)*

“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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.52)*

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

“The data regarding coverage of habitations with drinking water facilities in rural areas relates to data of habitation survey conducted in 1991 and updated in 1999 (Comprehensive Action Plan 1999, CAP 99) by State Governments. Based on CAP 99 and subsequent coverage reported by States Governments, there were 4,588 Not Covered (NC), and 50,479 Partially Covered (PC), (Total 55067) out of 14,22,664 habitations as on 1.4.2005 in the country. It may be mentioned that the habitation survey 1991 and the subsequent updation in 1999 were done by State Governments and the habitation wise information was maintained at the State PHEDs. In 2005-06, 11660 CAP 1999 NC/PC habitations, 76,457 slipped back NC/PC and 4,498 water quality affected habitations were covered. The coverage status is dynamic and there are always possibilities of slippage from FC to PC/NC and from PC to NC due to reasons such as sources going dry or lowering of ground water table; sources becoming quality affected; systems outliving their lives; systems working below rated capacity due to poor operation and maintenance; increase in population resulting in lower per capita availability and emergence of new habitations. State Governments were requested in February, 2003 to conduct a fresh habitation survey to assess the status of coverage of habitations. The survey data of 2003 reveals that a large number of habitations have slipped back from FC to PC/NC and from PC to NC.

As on date, the coverage reported for first four years of the Tenth Plan is 2,41,240 habitations, thus showing a shortfall of 1,76,711 habitations from Ninth Plan. States may have taken up easily accessible habitations for coverage in the earlier years and thereby covered more number of habitations.

Some States are, at present, taking up large projects which take 2-3 years for completion while States such as Uttaranchal are taking up multi stage pumping schemes, which also take 2-3 years to complete. While the projects are ongoing, coverage is not reported, but will be done so on completion. Besides, there is still one year left in the Tenth Plan and the coverage position is likely to increase with focus on coverage under Bharat Nirman programme”.

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.42)*

“The Committee’s observations are noted. Time and again at various foras the Department has emphasized the need to cover all habitations within a stipulated time frame by adopting and exploring low cost technological advancements. Under the drinking water component of Bharat Nirman, it is contemplated to cover all uncovered habitations by 2008-09. Of the uncovered 55,067 NC /PC habitations, 11,660 habitations were covered in the first year of Bharat Nirman. From 2006-07, 20 per cent of ARWSP funds have been allocated to only those States having water quality problems to tackle the problem in a focused manner.

Regarding technology options being used in various States, the position is as follows:-

- (i) Rajasthan is providing drinking water mainly through Piped Water Supply (PWS), Hand Pumps and Tankas;
- (ii) Himachal Pradesh, Haryana and Punjab are mainly taking up PWS;
- (iii) Uttaranchal, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya and Nagaland are taking multi stage pumping schemes;
- (iv) Sikkim is providing water supply through lift pumping schemes; and
- (v) J&K is providing water through deep tubewells and PWS in the valleys and tapping perennial streams with Gravity PWS in the hilly areas.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.43)*

“During 2005-06 target for slipped back and quality affected habitations were given separately for monitoring the performance of the State Governments. The target and achievement during 2005-06 is as under:

	Target	Achievement
Balance NC habitations of CAP 99	3522	1456
Remaining PC habitations of CAP 99	8375	10204
Slipped back habitations	34373	76457
Quality affected habitation	10000	4498
<b>Total</b>	<b>56270</b>	<b>92615</b>

It can be seen from the above table that State Governments have achieved less than the target fixed for them in the Remaining NC habitations of CAP 99 and quality affected habitations where as they have exceeded their target in the other categories. The State Governments are facing difficulties in coverage of remaining uncovered habitations as these habitations are located in difficult areas and coverage of these habitations require location of safe water source and building infrastructure to bring water from the located source, which normally is at a distant place. Funds are being separately allocated from 2006-07 to tackle water quality affected habitations.

In view of this, realistic targets have been fixed for coverage during 2006-07. While fixing targets for 2006-07, the coverage of habitations in the previous year by the State Governments, fund availability during current year, cost of coverage per habitations as indicated by the State Governments in their Action Plan for Bharat Nirman were taken into consideration. The Department feels that the State Governments will be able to achieve the realistic targets fixed for them this year. The target for coverage of habitations during 2006-07 are as under:

Coverage of remaining NC Habitations	1120
Coverage of remaining PC Habitations	17000
Coverage of Slipped Back Habitations	40000
Coverage of Quality Affected Habitations	15000
Total coverage target	73120

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.44)*

“State Governments were requested in February, 2003 to conduct fresh habitation survey to assess the status of coverage of main and other habitations and rural schools with respect to availability of safe drinking water. The Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) was entrusted with the task of correcting the habitation survey conducted by States/UTs which was to be completed by February 2006. IIPA has so far completed the task in respect of 22 States/UTs. For 10 States/UTs, data submitted by them have been cleansed by the Department itself. Validation is not required to be done for Delhi as all habitations are fully covered. This data for all States/UTs has now been hosted on the website and will be used as a benchmark. The Department

now proposes to conduct field validation of the 2003 survey data through a random sample survey.

The Department has developed software to capture the status of availability of drinking water and other information in a habitation. This software has been linked to the corrected data of habitation survey 2003. The States/UTs are required to furnish information on status of availability of water habitationwise on yearly basis and with this it will be possible to assess the exact position of availability of drinking water in each habitation in the country. This software has been hosted in the Department's website and States/UTs have been requested to make data entry and then periodically update the status on-line. The Department is also organising a training through NIC to familiarize the State government officials with the software."

*Replies to Recommendations (Para Nos. 3.51 and 3.52)*

**15. The Committee in their earlier recommendations had raised various issues concerning authenticity of data with regard to status of coverage of habitations in rural areas in the country, decreasing number of coverage of NC/PC habitations during Tenth Plan as compared to Ninth Plan, the status of coverage of slipped back habitations and the Government's strategy to deal with the aforesaid issues. From the information provided by the Department in the action taken replies with regard to various recommendations, the Committee note that there is too much confusion about the data with regard to coverage of habitations. Many categories have been evolved viz. not covered habitations(NC), partially covered habitations(PC), quality affected habitations, slipped back habitations etc. which makes utter confusion with regard to actual coverage of habitations in the country. As regards the status of not covered habitations as per the Government's own data, the Committee have persistently been impressing upon the Department to cover these habitations within a stipulated time frame by providing adequate outlay and with technological interventions. In spite of that the latest data with regard to achievement of NC habitations reflect that out of the target of 3,522 habitations, the achievement is just 1,456 i.e. even less than half of the projected habitations. Similar is the position with regard to quality affected habitations. Out of the target of 10,000 habitations, the achievement is 4,498 habitations. Even with this less than 50 per cent of coverage of these habitations, the action taken replies reflect a sense of complacency in the Department. The Department seems to be contented with the achievement of the**



targets. The Committee are not satisfied with the aforesaid achievement of targets of NC and quality affected habitations as per the Government's own data. Further the Committee also has apprehensions that the ground situation in this regard may be much worse.

Besides the aforesaid issues raised above, the major concern is having some authentic data about the coverage of habitations as stated above. In this regard, pursuant to pursuing the matter consistently in various reports, the Department has initiated a survey in this regard. Since there were some discrepancies in the results of the survey, the data was to be revalidated by Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA). The habitation wise survey was initiated in 2003 and the process of revalidation was proposed to be completed by February, 2006. Even after completion of so many years, the Department is still to have the final results of the aforesaid survey. The Committee further find that IIPA has so far completed the task in respect of 22 States/UTs and for 10 States/UTs, the data submitted by them have been cleansed by the Department. The Committee find from the information provided that the Department now proposes to conduct field validation of the 2003 survey data through a random sample survey. The Committee feel that again the cleansing of data by the Department after the validation by IIPA and the field validation may further take a couple of years making the exercise of survey meaningless since the scenario between the years 2003 and the year the final results would be available (that may be perhaps after 2007-08 or taking more years) may completely change. The Committee feel that unless the core data with regard to actual NC/PC habitations is available, the purpose of developing the software to enable the State Governments to periodically update the data in this regard cannot be achieved. Further, the Committee do not understand the logic behind putting the information about NC/PC habitations on the website when the results of the habitation survey are still to be finalized through the random sample survey by the Department. While disapproving the way the Survey Report is being delayed, the Committee strongly recommend to the Government to find out ways and means to conduct the survey to know the ground situation and then periodically update the information within the stipulated time frame.

The Committee further note that the major thrust needs to be given to sustainability of sources to arrest the tendency of covered habitations falling into the category of partially covered (PC) and not covered (NC) habitations. In this regard, the Committee note



from the replies furnished with regard to the recommendation at para No. 3.31, that even the 5 per cent of ARWSP funds allocated under sub-missions for source sustainability are not being used by the State Governments. The Committee feel that unless the stress is given to sustainability of sources, the issue of coverage of habitations cannot be tackled in a meaningful way. The Committee therefore strongly recommend to the Department to take all the measures through taking various initiatives to motivate the State Governments to give more stress to the sustainability of sources which may finally ensure that the covered habitations are not converted into not covered/partially covered habitations. The Committee would like to be apprised about the steps taken in this regard by the Department.

**E. Issue of physical performance and community contribution under Swajaldhara**

**Recommendation Serial Nos. 15, 17, 18 and 19  
(Para Nos. 4.10, 4.17, 4.18 and 4.19)**

16. The Committee had recommended as under:

“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 to 19.09 per cent and a meager 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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 4.10)*

“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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 4.17)*

“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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 4.18)*

“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."

*Recommendation (Para No. 4.19)*

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

"The Department has already accepted that schemes sanctioned in 2002-03 and 2003-04 at least should have been completed by now. Letters have been written to all States for the same. Also, a special meeting was called State-wise in July 2006 and the matter reviewed individually. Efforts are ongoing to ask the States to complete and report completion of these schemes within December 2006. Districts that have not completed schemes of these two years are not being released any funds for new schemes in 2006-07. All States and districts have been asked to use the web-based reporting system and update their entries.

State-wise review of ongoing Swajaldhara schemes with special focus on schemes sanctioned in the year 2002-03 and 2003-04 was taken in July 2006. The State Governments have furnished the following reasons for delay in completion of projects:

- (i) community contribution is difficult to obtain as other schemes like ARWSP do not have this element. (All States);

- (ii) convincing the community to share capital costs is a long process and takes time. (Himachal Pradesh, Uttranchal, Assam, Meghalaya, Karnataka);
- (iii) at some places, the community withdraws its contribution due to internal differences. There are cases of the community withdrawing its contribution after the funds have been released for works to start. In such cases, either re-convincing the community or relocating the scheme to another habitation takes time. Uttar Pradesh had to relocate all schemes of 2003-04 from 63 districts to only 22 districts, which lost them one full year. (Uttar Pradesh, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra);
- (iv) release of 2nd installment is delayed as the reporting from DWSC to district takes time and they do not properly complete the progress reports etc. The chairpersons of the DWSC do not give priority to the paperwork. (Nagaland, Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand, Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar); and
- (v) there is shortage of staff at the GP and District levels to undertake extensive and continued dialogue with the communities to explain Swajaldhara principles and they find it easier to implement schemes like ARWSP. (All States)

As stated to the Committee earlier, the number of schemes being reported as complete is increasing. The latest position of completion of schemes is as under:

Projects sanctioned during the year	Status as on	No. of schemes	
		Taken up	Completed
2002-03	Feb. 2006	4552	2307
	July 2006	4473	2627
2003-04	Feb. 2006	5225	1908
	July 2006	5863	2288
2004-05	Feb. 2006	5330	1021
	July 2006	5429	1897
2005-06	Feb. 2006	14906	45
	July 2006	15315	73

(Note: Number of projects of 2002-03 are less in July 2006, as number of projects were revised at the request of the States of Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Uttar Pradesh. These States could not ground the projects due to some of the reasons given above)"

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 4.10)*

“ARWSP is not being replaced with Swajaldhara. It is proposed that from the Eleventh Plan, there will be only one scheme funded from the Centre, namely ARWSP. This scheme will have an element of community participation, but may not insist on community contribution in cash for capital costs. This would be decided by the respective State Governments. The concern of the Committee that some States may be deprived of funds due to under performance shall be suitably addressed. The Department feels that while allocations will be made in an equitable manner to all States, release of installments would depend upon the State’s absorption capacity and performance to provide drinking water.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 4.17)*

“Swajaldhara promotes the principles of the 73rd Constitutional amendment. Its performance differs from State to State based on the States’ present status of devolution of the subject of rural drinking water to the panchayats. In States like Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Uttaranchal, Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat and Orissa, there is increasing demand for the scheme. In States like Punjab, Haryana, Bihar, North Eastern States, the demand is not much. In Manipur, only one district of Ukhrul has taken projects. Sikkim has categorically stated that they do not want Swajaldhara funds as community contribution is not forthcoming. In spite of there being no demand from some States, the number of projects undertaken under Swajaldhara has been increasing over the years. The ambiguity is because of differences in community participation in different parts of this large country. The Department has not been able to meet the increased demands of States like Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu as we try to maintain equity amongst all States and not allot funds only to better performing States. The Department shares the apprehension of the Committee that if funds are allocated as per demand, only the better performing States would get all the funds.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 4.18)*

“Allocations are made to all States at the beginning of the year. However, releases are made only to those States that report having received projects from the districts. The projects are approved by the district or State level body, in accordance with the guidelines of the Scheme. No Swajaldhara project can be implemented if the community contribution is not given, as it is part of the

project cost. Since the community contribution need not be paid upfront, release of first installment is made on request of the State and community contribution can come during the course of implementation. The Department scrutinizes the deposit of community contribution at the time of release of second installment, which is not released if the data is given by the State. This aspect is also checked by the District Level Monitors (DLM) deputed for the purpose. The reports annexed in the Performance Budget are data as reported by the States at the time. In case of some of the States noticed by the Committee, the relevant data was not reported at that time. Since then, the Department has also initiated on-line data entry from the district and State levels. Also States have been updating the information and also reporting the community contribution. Only in the case of Nagaland for 2004-05, the funds were released for completion of Sector Reforms Projects (SRP) of Dimapur, hence community contribution is shown as zero. SRP had the concept of taking community contribution upfront, without which the project would not have been sanctioned. Under Swajaldhara community contribution may be given as the project is implemented, and even in installments. The latest status, year-wise and State-wise for Swajaldhara is annexed at Appendix I for the perusal of the Committee."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 4.19)*

**18. The Committee in their earlier report had reviewed the performance and policy of community contribution under Swajaldhara. After detailed analysis the following observations were made by the Committee :—**

- (i) there was dismal performance of Swajaldhara with specific reference to the financial achievement since 2002-03;
- (ii) a large number of projects initiated during the different years remained incomplete;
- (iii) as many as 21 States/UTs in 2003-04 and 14 States/UTs during 2004-05 reported community contribution as nil. Not only that, the allocation was being made to some of the States even when the community contribution was nil during the years 2003-04 and 2004-05.

**The Department in the action taken replies with regard to the various observations made by the Committee on the aforesaid issues**

has furnished updated data. Even the updated data indicate the performance as very poor. The updated figures indicate the percentage expenditure as 70.1 per cent during 2002-03, 48.68 per cent during 2003-04, 31.37 per cent during 2004-05 and 2.99 per cent during 2005-06. As regards the number of completed projects, the latest data indicate that around 50 per cent of the projects started even during the year 2002-03 remained incomplete. Further with regard to the projects started during 2003-04 and subsequent years, the number of completed projects is further reduced, even when the gestation period as indicated by the Department itself for different projects is 12-18 months. The number of projects completed is about 40 per cent during 2003-04 and is about 20 per cent during 2004-05. Further during 2005-06 the number of completed projects is very marginal. The Department on the one hand has indicated various reasons for the poor performance of the scheme particularly the difficulty in obtaining the community contribution under the scheme, on the other hand, the Department has tried to justify Swajaldhara by stating that in some of the States where the status of devolution with regard to Panchayati Raj Institutions in tune with the principles of 73rd Constitutional Amendment, the scheme is performing well. In States like Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Uttaranchal, Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat and Orissa there is increasing demand for the scheme. With regard to the issue of indicating allocation in case of States *viz.* Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Maharashtra, Jharkhand, Tripura, Uttaranchal and West Bengal during 2003-04 and to Nagaland during 2004-05 where the community contribution has been indicated as nil, the Department has furnished no reasons.

The Committee conclude from the aforesaid analysis that there are serious problems in implementation of Swajaldhara which need to be reviewed urgently. Foremost issue to be addressed is community contribution. Since community contribution amounting to 10/20 per cent based on the amount of the project to be taken up under Swajaldhara is the pre condition for taking a project, the failure to get the community contribution makes the Swajaldhara impracticable. The Committee have persistently been raising their concern on the aforesaid issue which has not been addressed adequately in the action taken replies furnished by the Department. Another issue which the Committee have been pursuing year after year is the proposed policy of the Government to replace ARWSP by community contribution scheme Swajaldhara. The Committee have been given to understand that ARWSP is not being replaced with Swajaldhara. Even in the recent report when the Committee had raised this issue, the Department has stated that it is proposed that from the Eleventh



Plan there will be only one scheme funded from the Centre namely ARWSP which will have an element of community contribution which may not insist on community contribution in cash for capital cost. There is much ambiguity in the statement furnished by the Department. On the one hand it is being stated that ARWSP is not being replaced with Swajaldhara, on the other hand community contribution is proposed to be made an integral part of ARWSP even when the Department has agreed that there is problem in getting the community contribution under Swajaldhara in various States. This one or the other way indicates changing the basic features of ARWSP and putting Swajaldhara community contribution component into it irrespective of the fact whether it is called ARWSP or Swajaldhara. The Committee strongly disapprove the way ARWSP is being proposed to be restructured and recommend to the Government to consider the serious apprehensions expressed by the Committee with regard to replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara in their various reports and ensure that community contribution is not made part of ARWSP. Further the principles of Swajaldhara should also be reviewed keeping in view the poor performance of the scheme as indicated above.

#### F. Quality of drinking water in rural areas

##### Recommendation Serial No. 23 (Para Nos. 6.9)

19. The Committee had recommended as under:

“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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 6.9)*



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

“Against the target of covering 10,000 water quality affected habitations in 2005-06, the achievement reported by States is 4,439 as on 31 July, 2006. Some of the projects are comprehensive water supply projects, which could take two years or more to complete. During the current year 2006-07, following the budgetary allocation of Rs 1,040 crore to tackle water quality problems, it is targeted to sanction projects in 27,000 habitations and also to provide safe drinking water in at least 15,000 habitations.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 6.9)*

**21. The Committee are constrained to note the casual way in which the Department has responded to such a critical issue of quality of drinking water in rural areas. The Department has tried to justify the under achievement to the extent of 50 per cent even when the updated data is taken into consideration with regard to achievement of targets set under water quality affected habitations in 2005-06 by stating that some of the projects are comprehensive water supply projects which could take two years or more to complete. The Committee deplore the under achievement of the targets particularly when the yearly targets fixed to address the problems of quality affected habitations are too small as compared to the total work to be undertaken *i.e.* addressing 1,95,000 quality affected habitations. While reiterating the earlier recommendation, the Committee would like to emphasize for a strategy to tackle the issue of coverage of quality affected habitations within a stipulated time frame.**

#### **G. Drinking Water Scenario in Rural Schools**

##### **Recommendation Serial No. 26 (Para No. 7.8)**

22. The Committee had recommended as under:

“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."

*Recommendation (Para No.7.8)*

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

"Department of Drinking Water Supply and Department of Elementary Education and Literacy (DEEL) are working in coordination with each other to provide drinking water facility to all schools. It has been ascertained from the DEEL that the data furnished by them about the number of schools not having drinking water facilities relate to elementary schools only. On the other hand, the Department has compiled the information based on the reports furnished by States/UTs in different review meetings which indicates that there were approximately 2.07 lakh schools not having drinking water facility as on 1st April 2005 and during 2005-06, 65788 rural schools have been covered. The Department has developed a software to obtain the names alongwith the status of water supply and sanitation facilities and

States/UTs have been requested to do the data entry in this regard.

During 2005-06, the achievement in coverage of schools has improved as compared to preceding years. Though the achievement is far less than the target set for 2005-06, the Department is constantly pursuing the matter with the States Governments."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No.7.8)*

24. The Committee maintain that providing drinking water to rural children in schools should be the primary objective of the welfare State and are unhappy to note that the Government has failed miserably in their responsibility to the children of India especially from rural areas.

The Committee urge that all ambiguity with regard to exact data for number of schools without drinking water facilities should be resolved at the earliest. The Department should furnish exact data for school coverage with respect to primary, upper primary and secondary and higher secondary schools. This data should be compiled in coordination with Department of Elementary Education so that there are no discrepancies between the data furnished by the Department of Drinking Water Supply and Department of Elementary Education. The finalised actual figures with regard to number of schools yet to be covered should be intimated to the Committee.

With regard to the issue of targets and achievement for coverage of schools, during 2005-06, the target was 1,40,000 schools out of which achievement reported was 35,538 while examining Demands for Grants, 2006-07. In the action taken reply, the Department has informed that 65,788 schools were covered during 2005-06. The Committee take strong exception to the way overstated figures are being cited to reflect higher achievements. The Department has also avoided to respond on the issue of low achievements *vis-à-vis* targets during 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06. The Committee fail to understand how, in such a bleak scenario, all States would be able to cover remaining rural schools with drinking water facility by March, 2007 as committed to by them. The Department should provide appropriate clarification for the issues raised above.

The Committee note that the Department has developed software for online data entry by States/ Union territories for school coverage. The Department should ensure that the aforesaid mechanism is made

operational at the earliest and the feedback from the States is hosted on the Department website and updated at regular intervals. The Committee recommend to the Department to devise a time bound strategy to cover all rural schools in consonance with the objectives of Bharat Nirman. For the same, the Department should fix realistic targets and make all out efforts to meet them given the significance and immediate necessity of providing this basic service to rural children. The Committee may be duly informed of all the concrete measures taken in this regard.

#### H. Financial Performance under CRSP/TSC

##### Recommendation Serial Nos. 29 and 30 (Para Nos. 8.13 and 8.14)

25. The Committee had recommended as under:

“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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 8.13)*

“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 31 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 subsequent years.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 8.14)*

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

“The Total Sanitation Programme is demand driven with community participation. During initial years, demand was low and hence utilisation of the fund was also low. In later years, it has gained momentum and utilisation is also improving. Further, as per the scheme, once a project is sanctioned, 30 per cent of the Central share is released to the district. The State also releases its share. As activities pick up slowly in the initial phase, some balance remains in the project account of the district. Year-wise break up of districts in which projects were sanctioned is given below:

Financial year (FY)	No. of projects sanctioned
1999-2000	39
2000-2001	46
2001-2002	65
2002-2003	116
2003-2004	132
2004-2005	80
2005-2006	81
Total	559

In order to ensure that districts have adequate funds in hand when the need arises, it has been provided in the guidelines that when 60 per cent of the Central and State share has been spent, districts can claim the next installment. Thus, availability of the fund with the district does not imply under utilisation.

The Department is making efforts to increase the pace of utilization of the money in the field. Review missions are being sent to the district to monitor and encourage performance. Communication and Capacity Development Units (CCDU) have been set up in the States to give thrust to the programme by increasing IEC activities and increasing the capacity of the stakeholders. One teacher from each school is being given training in sanitation aspects to promote it among students.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 8.13)*

As mentioned in reply to Paragraph 8.13, when a project is sanctioned for a district, 30 per cent of the Central share is released to the district so that it can start the work. In the initial phase the activity picks up slowly and then it gains momentum. As it is a demand driven scheme, expenditure can be incurred only when adequate demand is generated among the users. This IEC activity takes time. As can be seen in the table in reply to Paragraph 8.13, a large number of districts have been sanctioned projects in 2004-05 and 2005-06 only. It is expected that the utilisation will improve in the coming years and for this purpose all out efforts are being made.

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 8.14)*

**27. The Committee strongly object to the Department's response with regard to low allocation and utilisation of amount for sanitation sector on the pretext that the project is demand driven with community participation. The Committee differ with the argument furnished by the Department and hold that once the projects are sanctioned for a particular district, the assumption is that there is already sufficient demand generation and hence there should be no excuse for huge unspent balances. Further the Department has tried to justify the huge under utilization by stating that guidelines permit next instalment when 60 per cent of the Central and State share has been spent by a district. The Committee fail to understand how the Department can take the excuse of the aforesaid guidelines when the under-spending under sanitation programme ranges between 50 to 70 per cent during the years 2001-02 to 2004-05. Not only that during the year 2005-06 out of the allocated outlay of Rs. 700 crore the expenditure was only Rs. 227 crore. The Department cannot afford such a huge under-spending particularly when the sanitation scenario in rural areas in the country is too bleak where only 38 per cent rural population could be provided the sanitation facilities as per the Government's record. While reiterating the earlier recommendation, the Committee strongly recommend to the Department to take all the efforts in consultation with the State Governments and apprise the Committee accordingly.**

#### **I. Physical Performance under TSC in 2005-06**

##### **Recommendation Serial Nos. 31, 32 and 33 (Para Nos. 8.22, 8.23 and 8.24)**

28. The Committee had recommended as under:

"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."

*Recommendation (Para No. 8.22)*

"Further, as per the Performance Budget of the Department there is gross under achievement with regard to sanctioned Individual household latrines, sanitation complexes 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 complexes 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."

*Recommendation (Para No. 8.23)*

"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 & 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 the regard so as to analyse the position critically and comment further."

*Recommendation (Para No. 8.24)*

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

"The Department is making all out efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals by 2010 and the decision of Government of India of 100 per cent coverage of all households by 2012. For this purpose, sanitation projects have been sanctioned in 559 districts and for rest of the districts, it is likely to be sanctioned within this financial year. The project aims to achieve universal sanitation in the district within a time span of 4-5 years. All districts have been asked to prepare Project Implementation Plan (PIP) for the district and progress of the project is being monitored against this PIP. Further, to generate demand from the target group and to create capacity among the persons responsible for implementation of the project, efforts on communication and capacity building are going on. One Communication and Capacity Development Unit (CCDU) has been started in each State to develop State specific Information, Education and Communication (IEC) strategies and to improve the ability of the field level functionaries who are involved in this campaign. Till date about 2.42 crore households have constructed toilets, 2.61 lakh school toilets, 71,725 Anganwadi toilets, 7610 community complexes have been constructed and 4265 production centers/Rural Sanitary Marts (RSMs) have been set up. It is expected that with all these efforts, more than 1 crore IHHL would be constructed in 2006-07, out of which about 23 lakh have already been constructed.

The progress has been slow in some States, while in some other States it has progressed well. Efforts are being made to sensitize the slow States to the different nature of this scheme and for this purpose workshops, seminars, training programmes are being held regularly in the State. Some Key Resource Centers have been



identified, which are conducting regular training for persons working in this field. Greater emphasis is being put on the IEC activities. PRIs have been actively involved and help of NGOs are being taken wherever found feasible.

Districts, which have been slow in implementing TSC, have been identified and special effort is being made to speed up the pace in these districts. Sates have been requested to send review missions to review the progress and give suggestions to remove bottlenecks in the implementation. The rates allowed for construction of toilets by the beneficiary have also been revised.”

*Replies to Recommendations (Para Nos. 8.22, 8.23 and 8.24)*

**30. The Committee in their earlier recommendation has reviewed the performance of Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) in rural areas in the country. The Committee had observed that there was under achievement of targets under the different categories viz construction of household toilets, school/Anganwadi toilets and community complexes. Besides while evaluating the State-wise performance the Committee had found that Rs. 480 crore was lying unspent with various State Governments. The Committee had desired reasons for under utilization of funds from the Department. Instead of probing the reasons for poor performance of TSC, the Department has furnished an evasive reply whereby simply the targets fixed under the programme have been reproduced. Not only that the Department is optimistic to achieve the Millennium Development Goal of reducing by half the number of people without access to sanitation by the year 2010 and achieving cent percent coverage in the country by the year 2012. The Committee express serious concern over the way such serious issues are being handled by the Department. They would like the Department to take all the desired efforts in consultation with State Governments to attain the Millennium Development Goal. The Committee may also be kept apprised about the initiatives taken in this regard.**

## CHAPTER II

### RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 1 (Para No. 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.

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

The Hon'ble Minister of Rural Development has made the statements regarding the status of implementation of recommendations contained in the both Reports in the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha on 23 May, 2006.

In future, the Department would make all efforts to ensure that the Statement in the House regarding the status of implementation of recommendations contained in the Reports of Departmentally Related Standing Committee are made within the specified period.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 2 (Para No. 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 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. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The National Water Policy of Ministry of Water Resources, Government of India (April, 2002) gives highest priority to drinking water under Water Allocation Priorities and it is indicated that irrigation and multipurpose projects should invariably include a drinking water component, wherever there is no alternative source of drinking water. Drinking water needs of human beings and animals should be the first charge on any available water.

The Ministry of Water Resources, GoI has launched in 2005 the "National project for repair, renovation and restoration of water bodies directly linked to Agriculture". Although the main thrust of the project is for augmentation of storage capacity of the tanks /water bodies for enhancing the irrigation potential, indirectly it will also help to improve the availability of water for drinking water.

Under the Ministry of Rural Development, Department of Land Resources, the programme Hariyali has been launched with a view to increase water availability to the rural community. The main objective of this programme is "Harvesting every drop of rainwater for purposes of irrigation, plantations including horticulture and floriculture, pasture development, fisheries etc. to create sustainable sources of income for the village community as well as for drinking water supplies." Also, the NREGA gives the highest priority to water conservation works to be taken up for employment generation.

The Department of Drinking Water Supply has published handbook on Rainwater Harvesting and has sent to all the State Governments dealing with rural water supply for adopting rooftop harvesting,

construction of Check Dams, Percolation Tanks and other techniques for increasing water availability at the village level for drinking water supply. To support this, the Department of Drinking Water Supply is providing 5 per cent of the ARWSP fund every year to all the States. Since rural water is a State subject and State governments are empowered to plan, sanction, implement and execute rural water supply projects, the observations made by the Committee for the need for efficient planning and delivery mechanism have been brought to the notice of all the State governments. The State departments dealing with rural water supply have also been requested to promote conjunctive use of surface water and ground water and to co-ordinate with other Sectoral programmes.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

**Recommendation Serial No. 12 (Para No. 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.

**Reply of the Government**

The Department agrees that more emphasis need to be given for quality and sustainability. For quality, the allocation has already been increased. Previously, States could utilize upto 15 per cent of their allocation of ARWSP (Normal) for tackling water quality problems. From this year, focused funding for water quality has been introduced. Now about 20 per cent of total allocation of ARWSP is set aside for tackling water quality problems and inter State allocation of the said fund is made based on the water quality status of different States.

Activities for sustainability will be taken up by the State Governments out of 5 per cent of ARWSP funds allocated to them for the purpose, under the delegated power. As reporting of sub-mission projects on source sustainability is still not proportionate to even 5 per cent of ARWSP funds released to the State Governments, they were directed to ensure that 5 per cent is spent on exclusively on sub-mission projects related to water sources. It is being impressed upon the State Governments that sustainability of sources should be an integral part of the water supply systems.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 16 (Para No. 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.

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

Online monitoring is being insisted upon for reporting progress under Swajaldhara. NIC has conducted training workshops in States to train and familiarize the State and district-level officials with the web-site of the Department of Drinking Water Supply. In the discussions held with the State Secretaries/ Chief Engineers in July, 2006 it emerged that the States are making all efforts for online data entry at the district-level. However, some practical problems have been brought to the notice of this Department and NIC regarding uploading of the data and programming of the website. Necessary remedial actions are being undertaken. Most of the States have indicated that they are hopeful of 100 per cent online entry at district-level by September, 2006 except a few States like Nagaland, Meghalaya, Assam and Bihar, which would take longer.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 20 (Para No.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.

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

- (i) Survey of all habitations has been completed and status as in 2003 has been hosted on the Department's website. This data will serve as a baseline for the status of habitations. The Department has initiated the process of obtaining a Yearly Status Report in 2006, which would give the slippage position annually, with respect to the 2003 status. The reasons for slippage are part of this report.
- (ii) Activities for sustainability will be taken up by the State Governments out of 5 per cent of ARWSP funds allocated to them for the purpose, under the delegated power. As reporting of sub-mission projects on source sustainability is still not proportionate to even 5 per cent of ARWSP funds released to the State Governments, they were directed to ensure that 5 per cent is spent on exclusively on sub-mission projects related to water sources. It is being impressed upon the State Governments that sustainability of sources should be an integral part of the water supply systems. With the mandate of the Department and limited funds, the first priority is coverage with safe drinking water. The issue of sustainability has to be addressed in co-ordination with other sectoral programmes.
- (iii) Swajaldhara scheme promotes the concept of community participation in planning, implementation and O&M of the water supply schemes. It is proposed to give incentives to States for transfer of drinking water assets to Panchayats.

- (iv) Those State Governments who have not enacted a law so far have been requested to adopt the draft bill on Regulation and Control of Ground Water Extraction and Development of Groundwater, prepared by Ministry of Water Resources.
- (v) Various schemes of Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development), Ministry of Environment and Forests, Ministry of Water Resources, contribute to overall conservation of water resources. NREGA programme accords top priority to water conservation.
- (vi) Each State has been sanctioned a Communication and Capacity Development Unit (CCDU), with funding for its programmes. These units are to take up state specific programmes for awareness and IEC. Also, Swajaldhara schemes have a component of IEC at the district level.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

**Recommendation Serial No. 21 (Para No.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 by equal quantity of water seeped through water recharge systems.

### **Reply of the Government**

The data given to the Committee has been supplied by the States. Since verifying the whole data is not possible, the Department has initiated the process of sample checking and also checking through Registrar General of Census Operations for around 4000 habitations. The Department has also suggested to the States to take up conjunctive use of surface water to meet requirements for drinking purposes.

Since the use of ground water for drinking purposes is only 3 per cent, restrictions on other uses would have to be put in place by the States. The issue of ensuring system of water recharge whereby, withdrawal of water should be matched by equal quantity of water recharge will be addressed if the draft bill on Regulation and Control of Ground Water Extraction and Development of Groundwater, prepared by Ministry of Water Resources, is adopted by the State Governments. Those State Governments who have not enacted a law so far have been requested to adopt this draft bill prepared by Ministry of Water Resources.

It is being impressed upon the State Governments that sustainability of sources should be an integral part of the water supply systems. 5 per cent of ARWSP is earmarked for sustainability. Various schemes of Department of Land Resources Ministry of Water Resources, etc. contribute to overall conservation of water resources. NREGA programme accords top priority to water conservation.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Recommendation Serial No. 22 (Para No. 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 endeavor 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.

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

As this is a State subject, action in this regard has to be taken by the States. However, as desired by the Committee, the State Governments have been requested to take necessary action in the matter.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 24 (Para No.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.

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

The issue of setting up of already sanctioned district water quality testing laboratories has been pursued with the States. As per the latest reports submitted by the States 416 labs have been established out of 445 labs sanctioned by the Govt. of India leaving a balance of 29 labs in Uttaranchal, J&K, Manipur, Nagaland and Sikkim. States have been requested to send proposals for 73 districts not having district water testing laboratories. Reminders have also been issued.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 25 (Para No.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.

### **Reply of the Government**

National Institute of Communicable Diseases (NICD) has been identified as the National Referral Institute for the National Rural Drinking Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance Programme. Establishment of linkages between health and water supply Department is one of the activities as per the MoU signed between DDWS and NICD. NICD is imparting orientation training to State Government officers of PHE Departments. Similarly representatives from the Health Departments will be one of the members in State Water and Sanitation Mission (SWSM) and District Water and Sanitation Mission (DWSM). Monitoring and Surveillance activities at all levels including Gram Panchayat have to be done with the cooperation of the health Department. ASHA a worker of National Rural Health Mission at the village level can be one of the grass root workers for this programme. She will also be imparted training for our programme for monitoring and Surveillance activities. Manuals and guidelines have been sent to Ministry of Health and Family Welfare for development of their training programme for ASHA.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Recommendation Serial No. 27 (Para No. 8.11)**

The Committee take note of the fact that allocation for sanitation sector has been enhanced for the 10th Plan Period *vis-à-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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The department has projected a requirement of Rs. 5300 crores in its Approach Paper for XI Plan to the Planning Commission to make adequate fund provision in the 11th Five Year Plan.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Recommendation Serial No. 28 (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The department has projected a requirement of Rs. 5300 crores in its Approach Paper for XI Plan to the Planning Commission to make adequate fund provision in the 11th Five Year Plan.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Recommendation Serial No. 34 (Para No. 8.25)**

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 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.

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

Multiple design options for construction of toilets have been made available to the users, out of which an user can choose depending upon his preference, local condition and financial capability. Rural Sanitary Marts (RSM)/Production Centre (PC) have been established in various parts of the districts for supply of and to give necessary guidance to the users. Masons are being trained and people are being made aware about maintenance requirement of the toilets through person-to-person contact and also through various IEC activities at the village level.

Apart from construction and use of toilets, other activities in day-to-day life which require observance of sanitation and hygiene practices like safe keeping of drinking water, washing hands after defecation, washing hands before and after meals, taking water for drinking through water ladle, etc. are also being publicized through IEC activities.

For disposal of household garbage, kitchen waste and waste water, solid and liquid waste management has been included in the project as a component of the project. For this, up to 10 per cent of the project fund can be utilized to improve safe and hygienic conditions of the villagers. Village opinion makers like PRI members, teachers, ICDS workers and ASHA workers under NRHM are also being trained in propagating sanitary behaviour among villagers. For this purpose, the Department is in close touch with NRHM authorities, SSA

authorities and ICDS authorities both at Centre, State and district level. Training modules have been developed and training on sanitation and hygiene practices are being imparted to these village opinion makers when they come for regular Departmental training. Further, synergies with Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Department of Elementary Education, and Ministry of Women & Child Development are also being explored.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

**CHAPTER III**

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT  
DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE  
GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES

—Nil—

## CHAPTER IV

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

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 3 (Para No. 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.

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

It is a fact that the allocation made during 2005-06 and 2006-07 were not as per projections made for the requirement of funds under Bharat Nirman. The Department would strongly take up this issue with Planning Commission for providing enhanced allocation in the coming 2 years of Bharat Nirman. The State Governments have also framed their Action Plan. However, for the funding gaps, the States have been asked to seek external funding, loan from NABARD, etc.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

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

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 6 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 4 (Para No. 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 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.

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

The Department has put in place an online monitoring mechanism for monthly progress reports. A training programme is being organized to familiarize the States for data entry in the software. Once the States start using this system, the timely receipt of expenditure figures will be ensured.

From 2006-07, only 10 per cent carried over funds will be allowed as against 15 per cent till last year. In case the opening balance is more than 10 per cent (till last year it was 15 per cent), a cut equivalent to opening balance in excess of 10 per cent will be imposed at the time of release of 2nd instalment. This would be a deterrent factor and the States would ensure utilization of funds released under ARWSP. Letters have been sent to the States having large Opening balance for ensuring full utilization.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

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

(Please see Paragraph No. 6 of Chapter I of the Report)



### **Recommendation Serial No. 5 (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Department has considered the earlier recommendation of the Standing Committee for simplifying the funding pattern. The funding pattern for different components has been kept taking into account the importance of that component, fund requirement and capacity of the State to contribute funds for that component. At present, it would not be desirable to change the existing funding pattern. However, this would be reviewed at an appropriate time.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 9 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation Serial No. 6 (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Department has seriously considered the recommendations of the Committee for changing the funding pattern to 75:25 between Centre and the State. It may be mentioned that by changing the funding pattern, the Centre would not be able to provide more funds to the

States than what is being provided at present. The funds of the Central Government is limited and whatever is the Budget allocation of the Department, the same is distributed to the States. At present States are providing an amount equivalent to the amount that has been allocated by the Centre. Changing the funding pattern will amount to less contribution by the States (1/3rd of the allocation made by the Centre) and thus there would be less availability of funds for Rural Drinking Water Supply. The Department has decided that at the time of formulation of Annual Plan, the Planning Commission would be apprised of the tentative allocation of different States so that Planning Commission could make provision of adequate funds in the State Plan for the matching share.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

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

(Please see Paragraph No. 12 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 7 (Para No. 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.

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

The system being followed by the Department is as follows:

- A. There is a separate allocation for Swajaldhara and Water Quality. Adherence of the norms of funding pattern of these components are monitored at the time of releasing the second and the subsequent installment.
- B. In DDP & Calamity components, there is no state share and thus there is no need for such a mechanism.

- C. Funds released under ARWSP (Normal) are utilized for the following components:
1. Operation and Maintenance upto 15%. The funding pattern for this is 50:50 between Centre and States.
  2. Sustainability upto 5%. The funding pattern for this is 75:25 between Centre and States.
  3. Rest of the funds are utilized for Coverage. The funding pattern for this is 50:50 between Centre and States.

50% of the allocated funds are released to the States towards first installment in the beginning of the financial year. On attaining the 60% expenditure of the available funds (first installment + carry over funds of the last year), State Government is required to send a proposal for release of second installment in the prescribed format. In this prescribed format, all the details relating to expenditure incurred on O&M, sustainability and coverage are mentioned. In case, there is excess expenditure on O&M, the said expenditure is treated as inadmissible and corresponding cut equivalent to the excess expenditure is made in the second installment. Further, while calculating the state share, the funding pattern of various components is taken into account. As an example, if the expenditure incurred on sustainability is  $(0.05x)$ , the share to be provided by the State Government would be  $(0.95x) + (0.05x) / 3$ . Thus, a mechanism exists to monitor the expenditure incurred on different components under ARWSP (Normal).

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

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

(Please see Paragraph No. 9 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 8 (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Committee's suggestion to provide flexibility to States to utilize the amount earmarked for quality and sustainability depending upon their local conditions and requirements has been examined by the Department. On the basis of the request received from the State Governments with the approval of the Cabinet in February, 2006 it has been decided to retain 20 per cent of the ARWSP funds at the Centre for releasing to quality affected States only to provide focused funding for tackling water quality problems. Revised guideline on submission on water quality have already been issued in the month of March, 2006 (available on the Department website [www.ddws.gov.in](http://www.ddws.gov.in)).

Activities for sustainability will be taken up by the State Governments out of 5 per cent of ARWSP funds allocated to them for the purpose, under the delegated power. As reporting of sub-mission projects on source sustainability is still not proportionate to even 5 per cent of ARWSP funds released to the State Governments, they were directed to ensure that 5 per cent is spent exclusively on sub-mission projects related to water sources. It is being impressed upon the State Governments that sustainability of sources should be an integral part of the water supply systems. The State departments dealing with rural water supply will have to co-ordinate with other sectoral programmes to address the issue of sustainability.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 9 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation Serial No. 9 (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The data regarding coverage of habitations with drinking water facilities in rural areas relates to data of habitation survey conducted in 1991 and updated in 1999 (Comprehensive Action Plan 1999, CAP 99) by State Governments. Based on CAP 99 and subsequent coverage reported by State Governments, there were 4588 Not Covered (NC), and 50479 Partially Covered (PC), (Total 55067) out of 14,22,664 habitations as on 1.4.2005 in the country. It may be mentioned that the habitation survey 1991 and the subsequent updation in 1999 were done by State Governments and the habitation-wise information was maintained at the State PHEDs. In 2005-06, 11660 CAP 1999 NC/PC habitations, 76457 slipped back NC/PC and 4498 water quality affected habitations were covered. The coverage status is dynamic and there are always possibilities of slippage from FC to PC/NC and from PC to NC due to reasons such as sources going dry or lowering of ground water table; sources becoming quality affected; systems outliving their lives; systems working below rated capacity due to poor operation and maintenance; increase in population resulting in lower per capita availability, and; emergence of new habitations. State Governments were requested in February 2003 to conduct a fresh habitation survey to assess the status of coverage of habitations. The Survey Data of 2003 reveals that a large number of habitations have slipped back from FC to PC/NC and from PC to NC.

As on date, the coverage reported for first four years of the X Plan is 241240 habitations, thus showing a shortfall of 176711 habitations from IX Plan. States may have taken up easily accessible habitations for coverage in the earlier years and thereby covered more number of habitations.

Some States are, at present, taking up large projects which take 2-3 years for completion while States such as Uttranchal are taking up multi stage pumping schemes, which also take 2-3 years to complete. While the projects are ongoing, coverage is not reported, but will be done so on completion. Besides, there is still one year left in the X<sup>th</sup> Plan and the coverage position is likely to increase, with focus on coverage under Bharat Nirman programme.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

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

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 15 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 10 (Para No. 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 area 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Committee's observations are noted. Time and again at various foras the Department has emphasized the need to cover all habitations within a stipulated time frame by adopting and exploring low cost technological advancements. Under the drinking water component of Bharat Nirman, it is contemplated to cover all uncovered habitations by 2008-09. Of the uncovered 55067 NC/PC habitations, 11660 habitations were covered in the first year of Bharat Nirman. From 2006-07, 20% of ARWSP funds have been allocated to only those States having water quality problems to tackle the problem in a focused manner.

Regarding technology options being used in various States, the position is as follows:

1. Rajasthan is providing drinking water mainly through Piped Water Supply (PWS), Hand Pumps and Tankas.
2. Himachal Pradesh, Haryana and Punjab are mainly taking up PWS.
3. Uttaranchal, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya and Nagaland are taking multi stage pumping schemes.
4. Sikkim is providing water supply through lift pumping schemes.
5. J&K is providing water through deep tubewells and PWS in the valleys and tapping perennial streams with Gravity PWS in the hilly areas.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 15 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 11 (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

During 2005-06, target for slipped back and quality affected habitations were given separately for monitoring the performance of the State Governments. The target and achievement during 2005-06 is as under:

	Target	Achievement
Balance NC habitations of CAP 99	3522	1456
Remaining PC habitations of CAP 99	8375	10204
Slipped back habitations	34373	76457
Quality affected habitation	10000	4498
<b>Total</b>	<b>56270</b>	<b>92615</b>

It can be seen from the above table that State Governments have achieved less than the target fixed for them in the Remaining NC habitations of CAP 99 and Quality affected habitations where as they have exceeded their target in the other categories. The State Governments are facing difficulties in coverage of remaining uncovered habitations as these habitations are located in difficult areas and coverage of these habitations require location of safe water source and building infrastructure to bring water from the located source, which normally is at a distant place. Funds are being separately allocated from 2006-07 to tackle water quality affected habitations.

In view of this, realistic targets have been fixed for coverage during 2006-07. While fixing targets for 2006-07, the coverage of habitations in the previous year by the State Governments, fund availability during current year, cost of coverage per habitations as indicated by the State Governments in their Action Plan for Bharat Nirman were taken into consideration. The department feels that the State Governments will



be able to achieve the realistic targets fixed for them this year. The target for coverage of habitations during 2006-07 is as under:

Coverage of remaining NC Habitations	1120
Coverage of remaining PC Habitations	17000
Coverage of Slipped Back Habitations	40000
Coverage of Quality affected habitations	15000
Total coverage target	73120

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

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

(Please see Paragraph No. 15 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 13 (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

State Governments were requested in February 2003 to conduct fresh habitation survey to assess the status of coverage of main and other habitations and rural schools with respect to availability of safe drinking water. The Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) was entrusted with the task of correcting the habitation survey conducted by States/UTs which was to be completed by February 2006. IIPA has so far completed the task in respect of 22 States/UTs. For 10 States/UTs, data submitted by them have been cleansed by the Department itself. Validation is not required to be done for Delhi as all habitations are fully covered. This data for all States /UTs has now been hosted on the website and will be used as a benchmark. The Department now proposes to conduct field validation of the 2003 Survey data through a random sample survey.

The Department has developed software to capture the status of availability of drinking water and other information in a habitation. This software has been linked to the corrected data of Habitation survey 2003. The States/UTs are required to furnish information on status of availability of water habitation wise on yearly basis and with this, it will be possible to assess the exact position of availability of drinking water in each habitation in the country. This software has been hosted in the Department's website and States/UTs have been requested to make data entry and then periodically update the status on-line. The Department is also organizing a training through NIC to familiarize the State government officials with the software.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 15 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation Serial No. 14 (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Department has developed software to capture the status of availability of drinking water and other information in a habitation. This software has been linked to the corrected data of Habitation survey 2003. The States/UTs are required to furnish information on status of availability of water habitationwise on yearly basis and with this, it will be possible to assess the exact position of availability of drinking water in each habitation in the country. This software has been hosted in the Department's website and States/UTs have been requested to make data entry and then periodically update the status on-line. The Department is also organizing a training through NIC to familiarize the State government officials with the software.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 15 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation Serial No. 15 (Para No. 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 to 19.09 per cent and a meager 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.

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

The Department has already accepted that schemes sanctioned in 2002-03 and 2003-04 atleast should have been completed by now. Letters have been written to all States for the same. Also, a special meeting was called Statewise in July 2006 and the matter reviewed individually. Efforts are ongoing to ask the States to complete and report completion of these schemes within December 2006. Districts that have not completed schemes of these 2 years are not being released any funds for new schemes in 2006-07. All States and districts have been asked to use the web-based reporting system and update their entries.

State-wise review of ongoing Swajaldhara schemes with special focus on schemes sanctioned in the year 2002-03 and 2003-04 was taken in July 2006. The State Governments have furnished the following reasons for delay in completion of projects:

1. Community contribution is difficult to obtain as other schemes like ARWSP do not have this element. (All States)
2. Convincing the community to share capital costs is a long process and takes time. (Himachal Pradesh, Uttaranchal, Assam, Meghalaya, Karnataka)
3. At some places, the community withdraws its contribution due to internal differences. There are cases of the community

withdrawing its contribution after the funds have been released for works to start. In such cases, either re-convincing the community or relocating the scheme to another habitation takes time. Uttar Pradesh had to relocate all schemes of 2003-04 from 63 districts to only 22 districts, which lost them one full year. (Uttar Pradesh, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra)

4. Release of 2nd installment is delayed as the reporting from DWSC to district takes time and they do not properly complete the progress reports etc. The chairpersons of the DWSC do not give priority to the paperwork. (Nagaland, Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand, Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar)
5. There is shortage of staff at the GP and District levels to undertake extensive and continued dialogue with the communities to explain Swajaldhara principles and they find it easier to implement schemes like ARWSP. (All States)

As stated to the Committee earlier, the number of schemes being reported as complete is increasing. The latest position of completion of schemes is as under:

Projects sanctioned during the year	Status as on	No. of schemes	
		Taken up	Completed
2002-03	Feb. 2006	4552	2307
	July 2006	4473	2627
2003-04	Feb. 2006	5225	1908
	July 2006	5863	2288
2004-05	Feb. 2006	5330	1021
	July 2006	5429	1897
2005-06	Feb. 2006	14906	45
	July 2006	15315	73

(Note: Number of projects of 2002-03 are less in July 2006, as number of projects were revised at the request of the States of Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Uttar Pradesh. These States could not ground the projects due to some of the reasons given above)

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

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

(Please see Paragraph No. 18 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 17 (Para No. 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.

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

ARWSP is not being replaced with Swajaldhara. It is proposed that from the XI Plan, there will be only one scheme funded from the Centre, namely ARWSP. This scheme will have an element of community participation, but may not insist on community contribution in cash for capital costs. This would be decided by the respective State Governments. The concern of the Committee that some states may be deprived of funds due to under performance shall be suitably addressed. The Department feels that while allocations will be made in an equitable manner to all States, release of installments would depend upon the State's absorption capacity and performance to provide drinking water.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

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

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 18 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 18 (Para No. 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.

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

Swajaldhara promotes the principles of the 73rd Constitutional amendment. Its performance differs from State to State, based on the States' present status of devolution of the subject of rural drinking water to the panchayats. In States like Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Uttaranchal, Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat and Orissa, there is increasing demand for the scheme. In States like Punjab, Haryana, Bihar, NE States, the demand is not much. In Manipur, only one district of Ukhrul has taken projects. Sikkim has categorically stated that they do not want Swajaldhara funds as community contribution is not forthcoming. In spite of there being no demand from some States, the number of projects undertaken under Swajaldhara has been increasing over the years. The ambiguity is because of differences in community participation in different parts of this large country. The Department has not been able to meet the increased demands of States like Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu as we try to maintain equity amongst all States and not allot funds only to better performing States. The Department shares the apprehension of the Committee that if funds are allocated as per demand, only the better performing States would get all the funds.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

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

(Please see Paragraph No. 18 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation Serial No. 19 (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

Allocations are made to all States at the beginning of the year. However, releases are made only to those States that report having received projects from the districts. The projects are approved by the district or State level body, in accordance with the guidelines of the Scheme. No Swajaldhara project can be implemented if the community contribution is not given, as it is part of the project cost. Since the community contribution need not be paid upfront, release of first installment is made on request of the State and community contribution can come during the course of implementation. The Department scrutinizes the deposit of community contribution at the time of release of 2nd installment, which is not released if the data is given by the State. This aspect is also checked by the District Level Monitors (DLM) deputed for the purpose. The reports annexed in the Performance Budget are data as reported by the States at the time. In case of some



of the States noticed by the Committee, the relevant data was not reported at that time. Since then, the Department has also initiated on-line data entry from the district and State levels. Also, States have been updating the information and also reporting the community contribution. Only in the case of Nagaland for 2004-05, the funds were released for completion of Sector Reforms Projects (SRP) of Dimapur, hence community contribution is shown as zero. SRP had the concept of taking community contribution upfront, without which the project would not have been sanctioned. Under Swajaldhara, community contribution may be given as the project is implemented, and even in installments. The latest status, year-wise and State-wise for Swajaldhara is annexed for the perusal of the Committee.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

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

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 18 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 23 (Para No.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.

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

Against the target of covering 10,000 water quality affected habitations in 2005-06, the achievement reported by States is 4439 as

on 31/7/2006. Some of the projects are Comprehensive water supply projects, which could take 2 years or more to complete. During the current year 2006-07, following the budgetary allocation of Rs 1040 crore to tackle water quality problems, it is targeted to sanction projects in 27,000 habitations and also to provide safe drinking water in atleast 15,000 habitations.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 21 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation Serial No. 26 (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

Department of Drinking Water Supply and Department of Elementary Education and Literacy (DEEL) are working in coordination with each other to provide drinking water facility to all schools. It has been ascertained from the DEEL that the data furnished by them about the number of schools not having drinking water facilities relate to elementary schools only. On the other hand, the Department has compiled the information based on the reports furnished by States/UTs in different review meetings which indicates that there were approximately 2.07 lakh schools not having drinking water facility as on 1st April 2005 and during 2005-06, 65788 rural schools have been covered. The Department has developed a software to obtain the names alongwith the status of water supply and sanitation facilities and States/UTs have been requested to do the data entry in this regard.

During 2005-06, the achievement in coverage of schools has improved as compared to preceding years. Though the achievement is far less than the target set for 2005-06, the Department is constantly pursuing the matter with the State Governments.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 24 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 29 (Para No. 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.

### Reply of the Government

The Total Sanitation Programme is demand driven with community participation. During initial years, demand was low and hence utilization of the fund was also low. In later years, it has gained momentum and utilization is also improving. Further, as per the scheme, once a project is sanctioned, 30 per cent of the central share is released to the district. The State also releases its share. As activities pick up slowly in the initial phase, some balance remains in the project account of the district. Year wise break up of districts in which projects were sanctioned is given below:

Financial year (FY)	No. sanctioned
1999-2000	39
2000-2001	46
2001-2002	65
2002-2003	116
2003-2004	132
2004-2005	80
2005-2006	81
Total	559

In order to ensure that districts have adequate funds in hand when the need arises, it has been provided in the guideline that when 60 per cent of the central and state share has been spent, districts can claim the next installment. Thus, availability of the fund with the district does not imply under utilization.

The department is making efforts to increase the pace of utilization of the money in the field. Review missions are being sent to the district to monitor and encourage performance. Communication and Capacity Development Units (CCDU) have been set up in the states to give thrust to the programme by increasing IEC activities and increasing the capacity of the stakeholders. One teacher from each school is being given training in sanitation aspects to promote it among students.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 27 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation Serial No. 30 (Para No. 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 31 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 subsequent years.

### **Reply of the Government**

As mentioned in reply to Paragraph 8.13, when a project is sanctioned for a district, 30 per cent of the central share is released to the district so that it can start the work. In the initial phase the activity picks up slowly and then it gains momentum. As it is a demand driven scheme, expenditure can be incurred only when adequate demand is generated among the users. This IEC activity takes time. As can be seen in the table in reply to Paragraph 8.13, a large number of districts have been sanctioned projects in 2004-05 and 2005-06 only. It is expected that the utilization will improve in the coming years and for this purpose all out efforts are being made.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 27 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation Serial No. 31 (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The department is making all out effort to achieve the MDG by 2010 and the decision of Government of India of 100% coverage of all households by 2012. For this purpose, sanitation projects have been sanctioned in 559 districts and for rest of the districts, it is likely to be sanctioned within this financial year. The project aims to achieve universal sanitation in the district within a time span of 4-5 years. All districts have been asked to prepare Project Implementation Plan (PIP) for the district and progress of the project is being monitored against this PIP. Further, to generate demand from the target group and to create capacity among the persons responsible for implementation of the project, efforts on communication and capacity building is going on. One Communication and Capacity Development Unit (CCDU) has been started in each state to develop state specific Information, Education and Communication (IEC) strategies and to improve the ability of the field level functionaries who are involved in this campaign. Till date about 2.42 crore households have constructed toilets, 2.61 lakh school toilets, 71,725 Anganwadi toilets, 7610 community complexes have been constructed and 4265 production centers/rural sanitary marts (RSMs) have been set up. It is expected that with all these efforts, more than 1 crore IHHL would be constructed in 2006-07, out of which about 23 lakh have already been constructed.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 30 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation Serial No. 32 (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The department is making all out effort to achieve the MDG by 2010 and the decision of Government of India of 100% coverage of all households by 2012. For this purpose, sanitation projects have been sanctioned in 559 districts and for rest of the districts, it is likely to be sanctioned within this financial year. The project aims to achieve universal sanitation in the district within a time span of 4-5 years. All districts have been asked to prepare Project Implementation Plan (PIP) for the district and progress of the project is being monitored against this PIP. Further, to generate demand from the target group and to create capacity among the persons responsible for implementation of the project, efforts on communication and capacity building is going on. One Communication and Capacity Development Unit (CCDU) has been started in each State to develop state specific Information, Education and Communication (IEC) strategies and to improve the ability of the field level functionaries who are involved in this campaign. Till date about 2.42 crore households have constructed toilets, 2.61 lakh school toilets, 71,725 Anganwadi toilets, 7610 community complexes have been constructed and 4265 production centers/rural sanitary marts (RSMs) have been set up. It is expected that with all these efforts, more than 1 crore IHHL would be constructed in 2006-07, out of which about 23 lakh have already been constructed.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 30 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation Serial No. 33 (Para No. 8.24)**

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 & 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 the regard so as to analyse the position critically and comment further.

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

The progress has been slow in some States, while in some other States it has progressed well. Efforts are being made to sensitize the slow States to the different nature of this scheme and for this purpose workshops, seminars, training programmes are being held regularly in the State. Some Key Resource Centers have been identified, which are conducting regular training for persons working in this field. Greater emphasis is being put on the IEC activities. PRIs have been actively involved and help of NGOs are being taken wherever found feasible.

Districts, which have been slow in implementing TSC, have been identified and special effort is being made to speed up the pace in these districts. States have been requested to send review missions to review the progress and give suggestions to remove bottlenecks in the implementation. The rates allowed for construction of toilets by the beneficiary have also been revised.

[O.M. No. H-11011/2/2006-DWS-III dated: 23 August, 2006  
of Department of Drinking Water Supply  
(Ministry of Rural Development)]

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

(Please see Paragraph No. 30 of Chapter I of the Report)



**CHAPTER V**

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

NIL

NEW DELHI;  
15 *March*, 2007  
24 *Phalgunā*, 1928 (*Saka*)

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

**APPENDIX I**

**PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL STATUS OF SWAJALDHARA (2002-03) AS ON 21.8.2006**

(Rupees in lakh)

Sl. No.	State	Financial Parameters										Physical Parameters	
		Project Outlay	GOI Share	Ist Installment	IIInd Installment	Total Amount Released (3+4)	Community Contribution	Interest Accrued	Total Available Fund (5+6)	Reported Expenditure	%expenditure	No. of schemes taken up	Schemes completed
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1.	Andhra Pradesh	9,082.78	7,951.45	4,002.43	3,912.16	7,914.59	1,102.65	50.36	9,067.60	7,101.07	78.31	1620	1361
2.	Assam	831.78	757.59	370.12	222.89	593.01	74.21	18.74	685.96	357.92	52.18	53	23
3.	Chhattisgarh	283.10	263	131.5	110.51	242.01	20.79	0	262.8	115.84	44.08	102	53
4.	D & N Haveli	9.98	9.48	4.74	0	4.74	0.5	0	5.24	0	0	1	0
5.	Gujarat	184.42	167.97	83.99	78.54	162.53	17.47	0	180	169.21	94.01	30	28
6.	Haryana	24.55	21.95	10.98	0	10.98	2.6	0	13.58	7.85	57.81	2	0
7.	Himachal Pradesh	664.42	607.04	335.78	269.75	605.53	61.49	1.5	668.52	131.94	19.74	439	36
8.	Karnataka	246.09	218.15	109.07	109.07	218.14	28.63	6.59	253.36	158.67	62.63	55	26

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
9.	Kerala	589.03	511.29	272.84	251.88	524.72	80.06	0.11	604.89	193.28	31.95	84	40
10.	Madhya Pradesh	563.85	529.01	264.49	254.2	518.69	57.81	0.28	576.78	417.72	72.42	87	71
11.	Maharashtra	8,261.52	7,427.68	3,721.14	2,847.49	6,568.63	832.73	49	7,450.36	5,982.22	80.29	761	103
12.	Orissa	725.39	671.69	335.87	319.33	655.2	53.57	4.09	712.86	196.08	27.51	287	56
13.	Rajasthan	412.52	374.52	187.26	187.26	374.52	38.81	0	413.33	205.68	49.76	35	10
14.	Tamil Nadu	1,521.07	1,395.00	702.04	694.5	1,396.54	121.8	3.07	1,521.41	856.38	56.29	389	387
15.	Uttar Pradesh	1,123.73	1,030.61	565.98	490.68	1,056.66	103.43	29.6	1,189.69	668.8	56.22	490	483
16.	West Bengal	52.19	47.76	23.88	9.85	33.73	4.43	0.06	38.22	13.27	34.72	8	0
	Total	24,576.42	21,984.19	11,122.11	9,758.11	20,880.22	2,600.98	163.4	23,644.60	16,575.93	70.1	4443	2677

PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL STATUS OF SWAJALDHARA (2003-04) AS ON 21.8.2006

**Normal Release Status**

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	State	Financial Parameters											Physical Parameters	
		Amount Allocated to States	Ist Installment	IIInd Installment	Total Amount Released against the allocation (2+3)	Amount Released for Startup, IEC etc.	Total Amount Released (4+5+6)	Community Contribution	Interest Accrued	Total Available Fund (6+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
1.	A&N Islands	12	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.	Andhra Pradesh	1,616.07	808	751.5	1,559.50	80.80	1,640.30	183.2	12.32	1,835.82	1,328.43	72.36	423	334
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	447.41	223.71	0	223.71	0.00	228.08	46.48	0	274.56	14.61	5.32	90	22
4.	Assam	754.59	377.3	302.05	679.35	37.73	717.08	187.59	5.97	910.64	392.65	43.12	432	166
5.	Bihar	873.73	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6.	Chandigarh	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.	Chhattisgarh	262.8	0	0	0	13.15	13.15	0	0	13.15	0	0	0	0
8.	D&N Haveli	8	4	0	4	0.40	4.4	0.4	0	4.8	0	0	1	0



1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
24.	Mizoram	126.88	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25.	Nagaland	130.22	65.11	65.11	130.22	6.51	136.73	10	0.09	146.82	95.56	65.08	9	0
26.	Orissa	733.28	366.64	309.38	676.02	36.66	712.68	34.47	18.72	765.87	223.14	29.14	157	62
27.	Pondicherry	6	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
28.	Punjab	313.79	156.89	71.4	228.29	0.00	228.29	31.99	6.07	266.35	135.59	50.91	14	0
29.	Rajasthan	2,191.77	1,070.50	676.17	1,746.67	109.55	1,856.22	236.13	0.23	2,092.58	644.6	30.8	100.4	233
30.	Sikkim	53.42	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31.	Tamil Nadu	673.22	336.6	336.6	673.2	33.66	706.86	66.62	0.09	773.57	536.19	69.31	445	442
32.	Tripura	156.93	78.47	55.7	134.17	7.85	142.02	17.39	0.6	160.01	35.74	22.33	814	249
33.	Uttar Pradesh	1,532.91	766.45	0	766.45	76.65	843.1	419.04	19.28	1,281.42	1,027.70	80.2	537	0
34.	Uttaranchal	364.33	182	82.5	264.5	18.20	282.7	13.01	1.47	297.18	42.06	14.15	24	17
35.	West Bengal	943.9	471.5	100	571.5	47.15	618.65	91.65	0	710.3	100.16	14.1	42	5
	Total	20,000.00	9,131.02	5,419.15	14,550.17	890.50	15,440.67	1,916.18	95.46	17,456.69	8,497.98	48.68	5893	2199



1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
9.	Daman & Diu	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Delhi	6.35	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11.	Goa	15.04	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12.	Gujarat	826.42	619.81	206.61	826.42	0	123.96	950.38	7.31	0	957.69	826.42	86.29	183	103
13.	Haryana	246.48	184.86	0	184.86	0	36.97	221.83	118.45	0	340.28	0	0	155	0
14.	Himachal Pradesh	677.16	507.87	81.75	589.62	0	101.57	691.19	32.96	2.55	726.7	209.68	28.85	427	51
15.	Jammu & Kashmir	1,560.02	1,170.02	0	1,170.02	0	234.00	1,404.02	141.31	0	1,545.33	193.71	12.53	223	12
16.	Jharkhand	368.12	0	0	0	0.	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17.	Karnataka	1,253.54	940.15	242.14	1,182.29	1,152.33	188.03	2,522.65	420.65	4.06	2,947.36	918.89	31.18	182	70
18.	Kerala	492.54	366.93	20	386.93	0	73.88	460.81	54.14	15.09	530.04	993.79	187.49	40	25
19.	Lakshadweep	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20.	Madhya Pradesh	966.49	724.54	129	853.54	0	144.97	998.51	110.49	1.11	1,110.11	513	46.21	454	114
21.	Maharashtra	1,992.80	1,494.60	454.4	1,949.00	0	298.92	2,247.92	433.57	10.17	2,691.66	849.11	31.55	504	8
22.	Manipur	162.86	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23.	Meghalaya	186.12	139.59	0	139.59	0	27.92	167.51	64.44	0	231.95	0	0	43	0



1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
24.	Mizoram	133.25	96.84	0	96.84	0	19.19	116.03	12.06	0	128.09	17.75	13.86	5	0
25.	Nagaland	137.48	216.76	0	216.76	0	0.00	216.76	38.61	8.83	264.2	457.11	173.02	4	0
26.	Orissa	865.23	648.92	83.48	732.4	0	129.78	862.18	97.92	3.51	963.61	269.19	27.94	295	67
27.	Pondicherry	6.35	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
28.	Punjab	351.11	263.33	5.44	268.77	0	52.67	321.44	39	0.48	360.92	85.62	23.72	20	2
29.	Rajasthan	2,544.51	1,902.91	126	2,028.91	0	381.68	2,410.59	207.87	0.71	2,619.17	789.93	30.16	641	359
30.	Sikkim	57.11	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31.	Tamil Nadu	889.1	666.83	222.27	889.1	0	133.37	1,022.47	87.85	3.13	1,113.45	559.4	50.24	366	154
32.	Tripura	164.97	123.73	0	123.73	0	24.75	148.48	18.48	0.48	167.44	63.78	38.09	181	14
33.	Uttar Pradesh	1,621.06	1,234.11	0	1,234.11	0	243.16	1,477.27	387.56	21.81	1,886.64	559.14	29.64	1056	3
34.	Uttaranchal	378.67	401.01	0	401.01	0	0.00	401.01	162.3	0	563.31	0	0	26	0
35.	West Bengal	1,064.06	582.2	0	582.2	0	116.44	698.64	51.88	0	750.52	0	0	85	0
	Total	21,147.94	14,476.60	1,602.67	16,079.27	4,106.17	2,791.14	22,976.58	2,694.22	73.75	25,744.55	8,076.00	31.37	5927	1484

**Additional Release Status 2004-05**

(Rs. in lakh)

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 (8+9+10+11)	Reported Expenditure	%expenditure	No. of Schemes taken up	Schemes completed
1.	Gujarat	1,173.67	880.25	0	880.25	0	0.00	880.25	0	0	880.25	0	0	0	0
2.	Karnataka	261.5	196.12	0	196.12	0	0.00	196.12	0	0	196.12	0	0	0	0
3.	Maharashtra	942.66	706.99	0	706.99	0	0.00	706.99	0	0	706.99	0	0	0	0
4.	Rajasthan	322.3	241.73	0	241.73	0	0.00	241.73	0	0	241.73	0	0	0	0
5.	Tamil Nadu	229.7	172.27	57.44	229.71	0	0.00	229.71	25.42	1.14	256.27	288.02	112.39	45	39
	Total	2,929.83	2,197.36	57.44	2,254.80	0	0.00	2,254.80	25.42	1.14	2,281.36	288.02	12.63	45	39
	Grand Total (Normal+Additional)	24,077.77	16,673.96	1,660.11	18,334.07	4,106.17	2,791.14	25,231.38	2,719.64	74.89	28,025.91	8,364.03	29.84	5972	1523



1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
9.	Daman & Diu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Delhi	12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11.	Goa	28.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12.	Gujarat	1,629.73	1,222.31	0	1,222.31	0	244.46	1,466.77	0	0	1,466.77	0	0	240	0
13.	Haryana	511.69	383.72	0	383.72	0	76.75	460.47	0	0	460.47	0	0	52	0
14.	Himachal Pradesh	1,250.82	938.14	0	938.14	0	187.62	1,125.76	0	0	1,125.76	0	0	393	0
15.	Jammu & Kashmir	2,900.60	2,175.46	0	2,175.46	0	435.09	2,610.55	27.78	0	2,638.33	133.07	5.04	2096	0
16.	Jharkhand	805.61	604.21	0	604.21	0	120.84	725.05	0	0	725.05	0	0	161	0
17.	Karnataka	2,253.99	1,690.49	0	1,690.49	0	338.10	2,028.59	41.22	0.04	2,069.85	133.25	6.44	329	0
18.	Kerala	784.65	588.49	0	588.49	0	117.70	706.19	0	0	706.19	0	0	39	0
19.	Lakshadweep	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20.	Madhya Pradesh	2,200.27	1,650.27	0	1,650.27	0	330.04	1,980.31	36.86	0	2,017.17	101.02	5.01	1002	0
21.	Maharashtra	4,019.88	3,014.93	0	3,014.93	0	602.98	3,617.91	0	0	3,617.91	0	0	359	0
22.	Manipur	320.93	238.96	0	238.96	0	48.14	287.1	0	0	287.1	0	0	33	0
23.	Meghalaya	366.77	275.08	0	275.08	0	55.01	330.09	0	0	330.09	0	0	18	0
24.	Mizoram	262.58	196.94	0	196.94	0	39.38	236.32	15.49	0	251.81	128.05	50.85	23	0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
25.	Nagaland	270.91	203.18	0	203.18	0	40.64	243.82	39.21	0	283.03	9.07	3.2	15	0
26.	Orissa	1,807.40	1,355.45	0	1,355.45	0	271.11	1,626.56	61.32	0	1,687.88	61.1	3.62	409	0
27.	Pondicherry	12.5	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
28.	Punjab	530.53	397.91	0	397.91	0	79.58	477.49	0	0	477.49	0	0	29	0
29.	Rajasthan	4,580.72	3,381.85	0	3,381.85	0	687.11	4,068.96	41.28	0.71	4,110.95	72.04	1.75	692	0
30.	Sikkim	112.53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31.	Tamil Nadu	1,730.13	1,297.60	69.75	1,367.35	0	259.52	1,626.87	63.7	145.97	1,836.54	442.07	24.07	421	130
32.	Tripura	325.1	241.44	0	241.44	0	48.77	290.21	0	0	290.21	0	0	136	0
33.	Uttar Pradesh	3,608.10	2,706.08	0	2,706.08	0	541.22	3,247.30	0	0	3,247.30	0	0	659	0
34.	Uttaranchal	834.12	625.59	0	625.59	0	125.12	750.71	0	0	750.71	0	0	78	0
35.	West Bengal	1,938.90	1,454.18	0	1,454.18	0	290.84	1,745.02	0	0	1,745.02	0	0	0	0
	Total	41,674.65	29,559.89	69.75	29,629.64	0	5,967.42	35,597.06	326.86	146.72	36,070.64	1,079.67	2.99	15313	130

### Additional Release Status 2005-06

Sl. No.	State	Financial Parameters												Physical Parameters	
		Additional Amount Allocated to States	Ist Instalment	IInd Instalment	Total Amount Released against the allocation (4+5)	Amount Released for Completion of SRP schemes	Amount Released Startup, IEC etc.	Total Amount Released (6+7+8)	Community Contribution	Interest Accrued	Total Available Fund (10+11+12+13)	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.	Andhra Pradesh	1,020.20	765.15	0	765.15	0	0.00	765.15	0	0	765.15	0	0	0	0
2.	Gujarat	543.21	407.41	0	407.41	0	0.00	407.41	0	0	407.41	0	0	0	0
3.	Haryana	170.63	127.97	0	127.97	0	0.00	127.97	0	0	127.97	0	0	0	0
4.	Himachal Pradesh	416.91	312.68	0	312.68	0	0.00	312.68	0	0	312.68	0	0	0	0
5.	Jharkhand	268.53	201.4	0	201.4	0	0.00	201.4	0	0	201.4	0	0	0	0
6.	Karnataka	751.32	563.49	0	563.49	0	0.00	563.49	0	0	563.49	0	0	0	0
7.	Kerala	261.53	196.15	0	196.15	0	0.00	196.15	0	0	196.15	0	0	0	0
8.	Madhya Pradesh	495.97	371.98	0	371.98	0	0.00	371.98	0	0	371.98	0	0	0	0
9.	Maharashtra	1,339.91	1,004.93	0	1,004.93	0	0.00	1,004.93	0	0	1,004.93	0	0	0	0
10.	Nagaland	90.33	67.75	0	67.75	0	0.00	67.75	0	0	67.75	0	0	0	0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
11.	Orissa	602.59	451.94	0	451.94	0	0.00	451.94	0	0	451.94	0	0	0	0
12.	Punjab	49.92	37.44	0	37.44	0	0.00	37.44	0	0	37.44	0	0	0	0
13.	Rajasthan	1,598.48	11,98.86	0	11,98.86	0	0.00	11,98.86	0	0	1,198.86	0	0	0	0
14.	Tamil Nadu	576.69	432.52	0	432.52	0	0.00	432.52	0	0	432.52	0	0	0	0
15.	Uttaranchal	278.03	208.52	0	208.52	0	0.00	208.52	0	0	208.52	0	0	0	0
16.	West Bengal	646.28	484.71	0	484.71	0	0	484.71	0	0	484.71	0	0	0	0
	Total	9,110.53	6,832.90	0	6,832.90	0	0.00	6,832.90	0	0	6,832.90	0	0	0	0
	Grand Total (Normal+Additional)	50,785.18	36,392.79	69.75	36,462.54	0	5,967.42	42,429.96	326.86	146.72	42,903.54	1,079.67	2.52	15313	130

## APPENDIX II

### COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2006-2007)

#### EXTRACTS OF MINUTES OF THE FIFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY THE 27 FEBRUARY, 2007

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1630 hrs. in Room No. '139',  
Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Hannan Mollah — *In the Chair*

#### MEMBERS

#### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Mani Charenamei
3. Shri Zora Singh Mann
4. Shri Krishna Murari Moghe
5. Shri D. Narbula
6. Shri A.F.G. Osmani
7. Adv. Renge Patil Tukaram Ganpatrao
8. Shrimati Jyotirmoyee Sikdar
9. Shri Sita Ram Singh
10. Shri Bagun Sumbrui
11. Shri Beni Prasad Verma

#### *Rajya Sabha*

12. Shri Balihari
13. Shri Jayantilal Barot
14. Dr. Chandan Mitra
15. Shri P.R. Rajan
16. Shri Bhagwati Singh

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary-I*
3. Shri A.K. Shah — *Deputy Secretary-II*



2. In the absence of Chairman, the Committee chose Shri Hannan Mollah, 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. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee and solicited their cooperation in examination and finalisation of draft action taken reports on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) and reports on Demands for Grants (2007-2008) of various Departments/Ministries under the jurisdiction of the Committee. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration Memorandum No. 2 regarding draft action taken report on Twentieth Report of the Committee on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development). The Committee after deliberations adopted the draft report without any modification.

4. \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\*

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

6. The Committee then adjourned to meet again at 1500 hrs. onwards on 1 March, 2007 for consideration and adoption of two draft action taken reports on Demands for Grants (2006-07) in respect of Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development) and Ministry of Panchayati Raj.

---

\*\*\*Relevant portions of the minutes not related to the subject have been kept separately.

### APPENDIX III

[Vide Para 4 of the Introduction]

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

I. Total number of recommendations	34
II. Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	12
Para Nos. 2.4, 3.20, 3.45, 4.11, 5.8, 5.9, 5.10, 6.10, 6.11, 8.11, 8.12 and 8.25	
Percentage to the Total recommendations	35.29%
III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	Nil
Percentage to Total recommendation	Nil
IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	22
Para Nos. 3.21, 3.22, 3.28, 3.29, 3.30, 3.31, 3.42, 3.43, 3.44, 3.51, 3.52, 4.10, 4.17, 4.18, 4.19, 6.9, 7.8, 8.13, 8.14, 8.22, 8.23 and 8.24	
Percentage to Total recommendations	64.71%
V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	Nil
Percentage to Total recommendation	Nil