

**7**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2004-2005)**

**FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA**

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

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2004-2005)**

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

**SEVENTH REPORT**



सत्यमेव जयते

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

SEVENTH REPORT  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2004-2005)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2004-2005)

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

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 19.03.2005*

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on 19.03.2005*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*March, 2005/Phalgun, 1926 (Saka)*

C.R.D. No. 010

*Price* : Rs. 33.00

© 2005 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

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

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2004-2005) .....	(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(v)
CHAPTER I Report .....	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government .....	28
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies .....	53
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee .....	55
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final reply of the Government is still awaited .....	67
APPENDICES	
I. Status of Sector Reform Project (as on 30.11.2004) .....	68
II. State-wise Status of Swajaldhara Scheme (2002-2003) .....	71
III. State-wise Status of Swajaldhara Scheme (2003-2004) .....	72
IV. Extract of minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 4.03.2005 .....	73
V. Analysis of Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the First Report of the Committee (14th Lok Sabha). ....	75

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004-2005)

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

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

*Rajya Sabha*

22. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
23. Shri Ghanshyam Chandra Kharwar
24. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
25. Shri Penumalli Madhu
26. Shri Stephen Marandi
27. Shri Kalraj Mishra

(iv)

28. Dr. Chandan Mitra
29. Shri Keshubhai S. Patel
30. Dr. Faguni Ram
31. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Secretary*
2. Shri V.K. Sharma — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Shri A.K. Shah — *Under Secretary*

## INTRODUCTION

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

2. The First Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 18 August, 2004. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 14 December, 2004.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 4 March, 2005.

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

NEW DELHI;  
19 March, 2005  

---

28 Phalgun, 1926 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,  
Chairman,  
Standing Committee on  
Rural Development.

## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Rural Development (2004-2005) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their First Report on Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 18 August, 2004.

2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 31 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:

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

Para Nos. 2.15, 2.16, 2.18, 2.25, 2.32, 2.33, 2.59, 2.79, 2.80, 2.81, 2.82, 2.90, 2.104, 2.109, 2.110, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.

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

Para Nos. 2.30, 2.39 and 2.91

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

Para Nos. 2.19, 2.24, 2.28, 2.29, 2.40, 2.60, 2.98 and 2.99.

- (iv) Recommendation in respect of which final reply of the Government is still awaited:

Para No. 2.17.

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

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



**A. Inadequate allocation of outlay and funds constraint to rural water supply sector**

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.15)**

5. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee find from the position of data as indicated above that the Department has been allocated almost half of what has been proposed by Planning Commission during Tenth Plan. Similar trend has been noticed while analysing the outlay position during 2004-2005. Out of the proposed allocation of Rs. 3,142 crore, the Department has been sanctioned BE for Rs. 2,900 crore. Further, the Committee find that the various aspects covered while proposing the outlay for Tenth Plan *viz.* the position of slippage of FC category of habitations into PC and PC into NC habitations have not been taken into account. The Committee also note that the gap in the resources is proposed to be bridged through extra budgetary assistance like World Bank assistance. While analyzing the position of World Bank assistance coming in the field of drinking water, the Committee note that only in four States, one or two projects could be taken up by donor assistance/loan. The said aspect of getting lesser outlay as proposed by Planning Commission has repeatedly been taken up while analyzing the Demands for Grants of previous years and the Committee have repeatedly been emphasizing to take up the matter with the Planning Commission in view of the top most priority accorded by the Government to provide drinking water to rural areas. While appreciating the resource constraints, the Committee would again like to recommend to take up the matter with the Planning Commission for adequate allocation for drinking water with convincing reasons and commensurate with ground realities. Allocation of lesser amount by Planning Commission shows that the Ministry has not been able to plead their case forcefully for optimum amount. The Committee feel that the Ministry has not done their homework properly before going to Planning Commission for enhanced amount. The Ministry should be able to convince the Planning Commission that shortfall in allocation in such a vital area affects the quality of life and involves great risk.

The Committee also note that the Secretary of the Department has stated that though overall allocation for rural water supply sector has increased over the years, the actual allocation for the main programme of ARWSP has not increased to that extent as a

substantial part of the total outlay is diverted for other programmes and activities such as Swajaldhara, Sector Reforms, etc. In this context, the Committee recommend that outlay for both the programmes should be increased and fund constraint should not hinder the implementation of any of the rural drinking water supply schemes.

The Committee appreciate that World Bank has been approached in the field of drinking water. The Committee would like to recommend that the Government should endeavour to get World Bank assistance for taking up more projects in remaining States so as to bridge the gap between the required outlay and the Government resources in hand. The issue regarding involving corporate sector in the field of drinking water has been analyzed in the succeeding chapters of the Report. Here the Committee would like to emphasize that the Government should endeavour to chalk out an effective and result oriented strategy to motivate and convince the corporate/private sector in fulfilling their social responsibility *i.e.* providing drinking water to rural masses."

6. The Government in their action taken reply have stated as under:

"The Department of Drinking Water Supply has been making concerted efforts to get higher allocations for the rural water supply sector every year. The matter has also been taken up at the level of Minister (RD) with the Planning Commission.

The Committee's recommendation for seeking assistance from the World Bank and the Corporate/private sector towards providing drinking water to rural masses has been noted. In fact the Department had already initiated steps in this regard. Two concept papers on Water Quality and Sustainability and Sanitation have been prepared and sent to the Department of Economic Affairs for posing the same to External Funding Agencies like the World Bank. A presentation on the subject was also made by the Secretary, Department of Drinking Water Supply to the World Bank President on 18 November, 2004 at New Delhi wherein both the Finance Minister and the Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission were present. The Department has also prepared a concept paper on School Sanitation and Hygiene Education, which includes, *inter alia*, the drinking water supply component and forwarded the same to the Planning Commission with request for additional funding from the Education cess levied in the current year's budget. The

Department has also posed the fund requirement to Twelfth Finance Commission through a memorandum.

The Planning Commission has decided to allocate the amount of Rs. 248 crore as additional grant for rural water supply sector during the year 2004-05."

**7. The Committee note the efforts made by the Department for seeking adequate outlay from the Ministry of Finance/Planning Commission as well as to generate additional resources from World Bank and the Corporate/Private Sector to meet the challenge of providing drinking water to rural masses in the country, pursuant to the earlier recommendation. They also find that due to the efforts of the Department, Planning Commission has allocated an additional grant of Rs. 248 crore for rural water supply sector during the year 2004-05. The Committee would like the Department to continue the efforts in this regard and inform the Committee on the achievement made accordingly.**

**B. Regular information on slippage of habitations from fully covered to partially covered and non covered categories**

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.17)**

8. The Committee had recommended as under:

"The Committee in their earlier Reports on Demands for Grants had expressed their concern over the dichotomy in the data with regard to accessibility and availability of drinking water. The Committee have been informed that the Government is commissioning a survey to analyze the position with regard to slippage of habitations from FC to PC and PC to NC categories. They note that the survey results could be received from 24 States/ Union territories. Further, they also note that after the survey results are received, the same would be re-evaluated through an independent evaluator. The Committee find that State/UT Governments are taking long time in finalization of the survey. They are unable to comprehend how planning on the part of the Government is made without having a clear picture of the slippage of habitations thereby indicating the actual position with regard to availability of drinking water to rural masses. In this scenario, the

Committee feel that there should be some in built mechanism in the monitoring system of the Government to know about the position of slippage of targets at a regular interval and the same should be indicated every year in the Performance Budget.”

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

“A mechanism for monitoring the slippage of habitations on quarterly basis is being worked out in consultation with the State Governments.”

**10. The Committee find that pursuant to their recommendation, a mechanism for monitoring the slippage of habitations on quarterly basis is being worked out in consultation with the State Governments. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the said mechanism and final action taken by the Department in this regard.**

#### **C. Projection of realistic targets**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.18)**

11. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee further find that the Government on the one hand claims coverage of 94 percent rural habitations. On the other hand, they find that by their own admission two lakh habitations are estimated to slip back from FC to PC and PC to NC habitations by the end of the Tenth Plan. The position may be further alarming when the survey is completed and evaluated by the independent evaluator. Further, the Committee also find that during every year, the Government claims to cover all the NC habitations, but the final result is slippage of targets. The Government propose to cover 70,484 habitations (30,423 NC+40,061 PC) during the year 2004-2005. During the first three months of the financial year, the Government could cover only 1,380 habitations that speaks volume of the dim possibility of covering the target habitations during the said year. The Committee fail to understand how the Department would address the remaining issues of sustainability, quality and sector reforms, etc. The Committee are deeply concerned over the unrealistic projections being made by the Department which on paper reflect a bright picture with regard to implementation of drinking water schemes. The Committee also feel that the ground reality in this regard is not so optimistic as could be been from

the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister whereby he has stated that the biggest crisis that the world will face in the 21st Century will be crisis of water. In this scenario, the Committee would like to strongly recommend to the Government to project realistic targets during each Plan."

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

"The slippage of two-lakh habitations from FC to PC/NC and from PC to NC is based on the estimates made by the working group of Tenth Plan. It was envisaged in the Tenth Plan to cover all the NC and PC habitations as per the survey results of 1999 in the first two years and cover the 'slipped back' habitations in the next three years. The targets from the first two years of Tenth Plan were, therefore, so fixed so as to achieve full coverage in first two years. Notwithstanding this, the targets were fixed in consultation with the State Governments.

A fresh habitation survey has been completed by the State/ Union territories and the results thereof are being validated by the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA). After validation, the Department will have a more realistic picture of coverage in rural areas.

The Department agrees that there is need to project realistic targets. The procedure for fixation of targets is being streamlined. It is felt that while fixing targets, basis parameters such as status of coverage of habitations at the beginning of the year, unit cost of installation of water source, allocation under ARWSP and State Sector are kept in view. The entire procedure for fixation of target was deliberated in the Conference cum Workshop of State Secretaries held on 22-23 November 2004."

13. **The Committee note that the Department has acknowledged the need for projecting realistic targets and the entire procedure for fixation of target was deliberated in the Conference-cum-Workshop of State Secretaries held on 22-23 November. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the deliberations held at the aforesaid Conference and the decision taken in this regard. The Committee also find that the position of slippage of targets was assessed by the survey which is being validated by the Indian Institution of Public Administration. The Committee would like to be apprised of the result of the aforesaid survey so as to have a better idea of the position of coverage of habitation in the country.**

**D. Mismatch between physical and financial achievement under Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP)**

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.19)**

14. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee find from the data made available to them that there is a mismatch between physical and financial achievement under ARWSP. During the year 2003-04, financial achievement has been shown as 83.67 per cent. However, the position of achievement of NC and PC targets indicate 35.33 per cent. The Committee also note that there is a declining trend, if we analyse the data with regard to achievement of NC and PC habitations. The achievement during the year 2003-04 is around 35 per cent, if compared with the achievement during the year 1998-99. The Committee would like the Department to explain the specific reasons for mismatch between target and achievement and the declining trend in achievement in the coverage of NC and PC habitations.”

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

“The Department agrees that there had been mismatch between physical and financial achievements. The main reason is that the allocation of funds under ARWSP is made on the basis of criteria wherein the weightage to different parameters is as under:

1.	Rural Population	40
2.	States under DDP, DPAP, HADP and special category hill states in terms of rural areas	35
3.	NC/PC village (at 2:1 ratio)	15
4.	Quality affected villages	10

Thus, in the allocation of funds, number of NC/PC habitations has only 15 per cent weightage. Further, slippage from ‘Fully Covered’ (FC) to ‘Partially Covered’ (PC)/‘Not Covered’ (NC) status occurs due to, *inter alia*, sources going dry, systems becoming defunct due to outliving of their designed life span, emergence of quality problems and poor operation and maintenance. Especially for solving water quality problems, in 90 per cent cases water has

to be brought from an alternative safe source which could be at a distance and hence capital intensive. Thus, there could be a mismatch between financial allocation and physical targets for coverage."

16. The Committee are not inclined to accept the reasons given by the Department for discrepancy between physical and financial achievement under ARWSP. While acknowledging the constraints faced by the Department in tackling rural water supply problem, especially with regard to Operation and Maintenance, the Committee still feel that discrepancy between financial and physical achievement appears to be huge and Department has failed to furnish satisfactory reply on reasons for declining trend in the coverage of NC and PC habitations over the years despite remarkable increase in allocation to rural water supply sector. Here, the Committee would like the Department to consider issues raised by the Committee more seriously and try to bridge the gap between physical and financial achievement so as to address the problem of declining trend in achievement in the coverage of NC and PC habitations.

E. Under achievement of physical targets in ARWSP in certain States/Union territories

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.24)**

17. The Committee had recommended as under:

"The Committee find that year after year the physical performance of ARWSP in certain States/Union territories is not up to the mark. The attention of the government has repeatedly been drawn towards this aspect in the previous Reports on Demands for Grants. However, nothing concrete seems to have been done. While admitting that implementation of ARWSP is the responsibility of State Governments, the Committee feel that the Union Government have to play a pro-active role so as to ensure that different Centrally Sponsored Schemes are successfully implemented. The Committee could like the Department to find out State-wise/UT-wise, reasons for under achievement of physical targets in ARWSP in certain State/Union territories and inform the Committee accordingly."

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

"The habitations yet to be covered are in difficult areas where there are no sources or the sources are in far off places. The States



explained during the review meetings that in the absence of adequate sources in the vicinity of habitations, they are finding it extremely difficult to achieve coverage within the limited resources allocated to them. It is also relevant to mention that the continuous drought for three years in some States from the year 2001 onwards had its impact on the achievement of coverage by the States. However, it would be the endeavour of the Department to streamline the procedure for fixation of targets with reference to the availability of resources so that there is no under achievement of physical targets by the States."

**19. The Committee in their earlier recommendation had urged the Department to find out the State/Union territory-wise reasons for under achievement of physical target in ARWSP in non performing States/Union territory. The Department, instead of addressing the issue categorically, has given a general reply stating that the habitations yet to be covered are in difficult areas where there are no sources or the sources are in far off places. The Committee have been hearing the same routine reply for the last many years. While expressing their unhappiness on such vague reply, the Committee would like to be clearly informed of the State/Union territory-wise data of Not Covered/Partially Covered habitations, required allocation, allocation made so far year wise along with the physical and financial achievements so as to enable the Committee to understand the problem encountered in case of NC/PC habitations in a more realistic way.**

#### **F. Provision for relaxation of norms**

##### **Recommendations (Para Nos. 2.28 and 2.29)**

20. The Committee had recommended as under:

"The Committee find that the aforesaid norms with regard to supply of drinking water in rural areas were fixed in 1977-78. They also note that in the guidelines there is a provision for relaxation of norms to provide for 55 liters per capita per day with a source within 0.5 kilometers in the plains and 50 meters elevation in the hills. They further find that the side relaxed norms were applicable in case of States where coverage of all NC and PC rural habitations have been completed. Further relaxation is subject to 10 per cent beneficiary contribution and shouldering full responsibility for O&M. The Committee would like to be informed about the names of States/Union territories who are enjoying the relaxed norms."

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.28)*



21. "The Committee in their preceding Chapter have analyzed the position of slippage of FC & PC habitations into NC habitations and had concluded that there is no clear picture available with the Union Ministry with regard to slippage of habitations. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee feel that the Government should, first of all, ascertain the position of full coverage in different States/Union territories and then only the revised norms to the State having full coverage should be applied."

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.29)*

22. The Government in their action taken reply have stated as under:

"The States, which have covered all NC/PC habitations, can make use of the provision for relaxation of the norms to provide for 55 lpcd with a source with 0.5 km in the plains and 50 metre elevation in the hills. As per the coverage status reported by the State based on Comprehensive Action Plan, 1999, 11 States and 3 Union territories viz. Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Daman & Diu, Delhi and Chandigarh have no NC/PC habitations. However, the position in regard to availing of the relaxed norms under ARWSP is being ascertained from the aforesaid States/Union territories."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.28)*

"The results of the new all India survey are being complied and validated and the revised norms will be applicable only to such States/Union territories, which are found to have no NC/PC habitations."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.29)*

23. **The Committee note that the information regarding the names of the States/Union territories who are at present enjoying the relaxed norms for drinking water for rural areas is awaited from States/Union territories. The Committee would like to be informed about the information when received. The Committee are further surprised to note the names of States/Union territories which includes Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Orissa in the list of States which have achieved the full coverage status. The Committee feel that the ground reality in this regard is quite different. The position of full coverage is reflected**

only on paper. The Committee may like to add that in the guidelines there is provision of relaxed norms, but the State/Union territories which are enjoying this position is not known to the Union Government. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to have the available data of the actual ground position in various States/Union territories for the future planning and making projections. The Committee would like the Department to ascertain the actual ground position of availability of drinking water first of all and apprise the Committee accordingly.

The Committee reiterate that planning regarding rural water supply sector will be inadequate and ineffective without concrete information on the slippage of habitations. The Committee would, therefore, like to be apprised of the result of the All-India Survey as well as the observations/recommendations of the Union Government on the same.

**G. Involvement of corporate/private sector in the field of drinking water supply in rural areas**

**Recommendations (Para Nos. 2.32 and 2.33)**

24. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee find that the Government have been requesting corporate sector to come forward in the field of drinking water supply in rural areas in different conferences, seminars through CII and ASSOCHAM. The Committee would like to be informed about the reaction of the corporate sector in this regard.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.32)*

“The Committee further feel that adequate and effective steps to motivate the corporate sector/private sector to fulfill their social obligations like provision of drinking water for rural areas have not been made by the Government. Instead of delving deep into the matter, a very casual approach has been made through conferences and seminars. To motivate the corporate sector, concerted efforts and skills are essential. In this regard, the Committee feel that the Government should explore all possibilities of involving the private/corporate sectors in the field of rural infrastructure development like rural drinking water supply. However, at the same time the, Committee show their apprehension that development of such an important sector as drinking water

supply should not be left to the mercy of the private/corporate bodies and the Government should be able to generate enough funds for investment in the rural drinking water supply sector.

Keeping these varied aspects in view, the Committee would like to recommend that the Government should chalk out a comprehensive strategy so that the corporate and private sector could be convinced and motivated to come forward for participation.

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.33)*

25. The Government in their action taken reply have stated as under:

“The Department has made presentations and interacted with CII, FICCI and ASSOCHAM on issues and strategies in rural water management. However, no positive response has so far been received from them.

Since drinking water is a State subject, the policy framework providing for role of corporate sector in rural drinking water supply will need to be evolved by the respective State Governments. Government of India has, however, initiated discussions with the State Governments on alternative delivery mechanisms and this was discussed in the recent Conference cum Workshop of State Secretaries organized at New Delhi on 23-23 November, 2004. State Governments have requested Government of India to have a concept note outlining various successfully operative models involving public-private partnership in rural drinking water supply sector in different countries/States prepared which could form discussion paper for initiating suitable policy changes by the State Governments. Action has been initiated in this regard by Government of India and it is expected that the concept note so prepared would facilitate evolution of effective public-private partnership in rural drinking water supply sector.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.32)*

“As mentioned in the reply to para No. 2.32, Government of India will provide technical support to the State Governments in taking appropriate policy initiative in this regard.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.33)*

26. The Committee note the initiatives taken by the Government to involve corporate sector in the field of rural drinking water sector. The Committee would further like to be informed of the deliberations on above theme in the Conference of State Secretaries. The Committee expect the Government of India to complete the concept note at the earliest to enable State Governments in initiate suitable policy changes in this regard.

#### H. Status of the three programmes of the Prime Minister

##### Recommendation (Para No. 2.40)

27. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee find that the three Programmes of the Prime Minister were initiated with the noble objective to address the problem arising out of unprecedented drought of 2002. The programme was to be implemented in two years 2003-2005 and Rs. 800 crore were earmarked for the programme. From the financial and physical achievements as reported above, the Committee find that there is a huge gap between release and expenditure reported by the State Government. Almost 70 per cent of the funds released are lying unspent with various State Governments. The Committee are constrained to note the position of expenditure reported by the States and would like the Government to explain the reasons for such a huge underspending. The Committee observe that the physical achievement in three sectors for which the programme was meant is as below:

- (i) Number of hand pumps installed around 25 per cent of the target.
- (ii) Number of traditional sources revived around 10 per cent of the target.
- (iii) Number of schools covered around 30 per cent of the target.

The Committee conclude that the position of physical achievement is worse than the financial achievement. The Committee are disappointed to note the physical and financial achievement of the programme and would like an explanation from the Government in this regard.”

28. The Government in their action taken reply have stated as under:

“The Prime Minister’s programme has been finalized and the guidelines issued only in July 2003. By the time the funds were released, the time left for implementation during 2003-04 was very little. Introducing a new scheme takes time to get actually grounded at the functional level. It is also relevant to mention that 10 per cent of the contribution in respect of PM’s programme has to come from the community which also takes time in comparison to programmes run completely out of Government funds. However, the matter has been discussed in the review meetings held with various States wherein the State Governments have promised to achieve full targets by the end of 2004-05.”

*Reply of the Recommendation (Para No. 2.40)*

29. The Committee are not inclined to accept the explanation furnished by the Department for the ineffective implementation of three programmes of Prime Minister initiated with the objective to address the problem arising out of unprecedented drought of 2002. The programme was to be implemented in two years 2003-2005. The target date for implementation of the programme is running out. The Committee further find that the State Governments have promised to achieve full target by the end of 2004-05 in the review meetings. The Committee have their doubts on fulfillment of the promise made by the States specially when the achievement in three programmes as noted by the Committee while examining Demands for Grants 2004-05 was as low as 25, 10 and 30 per cent respectively. The Committee would like to be apprised of the names of the State Governments who have promised fulfilment of the targets along with the latest position of implementation of the programme so as to review the position and comment further in this regard.

**I. Concerns regarding replacement of ARWSP with Swajaldhara Scheme**

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.60)**

30. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee note that as per the Union Government’s Policy ARWSP would be replaced by Swajaldhara scheme gradually. They also note that whereas ARWSP is applicable to each and every

State and district, Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme. The Committee appreciate the fact that sustainability of drinking water resource can be ensured only when people realize that water is an economic and social good and should be treated as such. Providing drinking water free of cost has created a mindset in the rural masses that water is a social right to be provided by the Government. There is an urgent need to change the mindset of the people. However, there are certain concerns as indicated below to be addressed before ARWSP is replaced by Swajaldhara:

- (i) As has been highlighted in the previous chapters, the position of NC habitations is not clear with the Government. Unless the results of the recent survey being undertaken by the various States are analysed, the clear picture with regard to NC and PC habitations would not emerge;
- (ii) During Tenth Plan, Rs. 24,800 crore have already been earmarked under ARWSP, but how the Government would ensure utilisation of resources is not clear;
- (iii) Since Swajaldhara scheme is a demand driven scheme, how the Government would address the problems with regard to accessibility, availability, sustainability and quality etc. especially for the States/Districts which are not up to the mark and could not be motivated to come forward with the projects;
- (iv) In case ARWSP is phased out, how the Government would achieve the objective of full coverage is not clear;
- (v) The position of implementation of Swajaldhara is also not very encouraging. Excepting Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu, none of the States show completion of even a single project taken up under the scheme;
- (vi) As per Government's reply, there is no problem of community contribution under Swajaldhara. However, Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme and hence, the projects are demanded from areas where people have the mindset to bear the cost of the projects and owe the responsibilities of operation and maintenance. However, since Swajaldhara is applicable to few of the districts and few areas in the country what will be the position of community contribution is not clear;

- (vii) Under ARWSP some inter-sector allocation according to a fixed criteria has been made. However, Swajaldhara does not have any such prescribed weightage;
- (viii) How the Government would take care of the capital intensive complex projects costing to the tune of several lakhs of rupees under Swajaldhara is not clear; and
- (ix) Whether the rural masses have enough resources and are ready to bear the cost of drinking water from a distant source to the village entry point is not clear as per the replies of the Government.

In view of the aforesaid concerns, the Committee feel that a hurried approach to switch over to Swajaldhara mode will not be prudent. A move with caution and introspection is necessary. A demand driven approach by a community calls for education, proper appraisal of the needs and clear cut understanding with sufficient alertness and eagerness to shoulder the responsibilities matched by adequate financial support. That Swajaldhara initiative has not received wider acclaim from many areas shows that proper endeavour is yet to come and as such making haste to replace ARWSP with this initiative could be fatal. Too much haste in reforms is not prudent. The Government should wait and watch before arriving at any final conclusion. The Committee, would, therefore, like that before taking any action to replace ARWSP by the demand driven scheme of Swajaldhara, all the issues referred to above should be addressed carefully and after interacting with the State Governments and Gram Panchayats and thereby people at large, the Government should carefully draft the guidelines of Swajaldhara. The Committee should be kept informed about the steps taken.

The Committee are also of the opinion that a streamlined monitoring mechanism should be in place so that the implementing agencies of Swajaldhara Projects can be made accountable. Moreover, data should be maintained regarding the number of DWSCs constituted in the various States of the country, the number of projects implemented by them, the amount of fund at their disposal, among other things. The Committee feel that adopting a strict vigilance and monitoring mechanism on the part of the State/ Union Government would go a long way in proper implementation of the projects while also ensuring that community contribution is optimally utilized without any risk of its squandering."

31. The Government in their action taken reply have stated as under:

“The issues involved in extension of reform principles to cover the entire sector were discussed in a two-day conference-cum-workshop of State Secretaries held at New Delhi on 22-23rd November, 2004. The main recommendations of the aforesaid conference-cum-workshop are as under:

1. Almost all States felt that, rural drinking water supply and sanitation schemes should be implemented and managed by Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs). However, the transfer need not be done in a hurry. More time may be required by Panchayats to accept the transfer. Transfer of water supply schemes should be a gradual and step-by-step process.
2. To facilitate transfer of Rural Water Supply (RWS) schemes to PRIs, Legislative framework may be strengthened by incorporating suitable provisions in the Panchayati Raj Acts and Bye-Laws framed thereunder, so that PRIs manage rural water supply schemes as their Constitutional and statutory duty.
3. Capacity development of PRIs be undertaken on large-scale. State representatives felt that Swajaldhara was started hurriedly without taking up the IEC activities, which is pre-requisite for the success of any participatory community based programme. The concept of Communication and Capacity Development Unit (CCDU) should have been introduced earlier.
4. CCDUs can play an effective role in facilitating transfer of RWS schemes to PREIs. Establishment of CCDUs is a step in the right direction. They should be the nodal point for capacity development of PRIs to manage RWS schemes and building the enabling environment for the purpose. They should also codify the best practices and success stories.
5. Multiplicity of schemes and funding pattern should be avoided. Some States (M.P. and Arunachal Pradesh) suggested that schemes should be transferred to Gram Panchayats after coverage with 40 lpcd supply level is achieved. There should not be any community contribution in NC coverage upto 40 lpcd supply level and quality



schemes. Other States like Andhra Pradesh felt that principle of 'no community contribution' should be applied only for providing 10 lpcd water in water scarcity areas where relief work is undertaken under drought relief works. Most States felt that the principle of community contribution towards capital cost of schemes could be introduced without being dogmatic or rigid about 10 per cent community contribution.

6. Once a habitation is covered with 40 lpcd level, the assets should be transferred to PRIs for O&M. For subsequent schemes for augmenting supply level above 40 lpcd or restoring 40 lpcd level of a "slipped-back" habitation, community contribution in capital cost should be mandatory.
7. Source-Strengthening measures, Rain Water Harvesting and recharge of ground water be made an integral part of the coverage scheme.
8. Implementation of protection of Drinking Water Sources Bill and Ground Water Exploitation Bill should be non-negotiable principle of reforms. Central assistance to be contingent on this.
9. Earmarking of funds by Government of India for undertaking water quality schemes.
10. Implementation of Water Quality schemes in project mode as was being done earlier through the Sub-Mission.

The aforesaid recommendations of the conference-cum-workshop and the suggestions of the Committee would be kept in view when final decision in the matter of transformation of ARWSP into a reforms oriented programme is taken by the Union Government."

**32. The Committee in their earlier recommendations had raised serious concerns over the policy decision taken by the Union Government to replace a well conceived old programme ARWSP by a demand driven programme Swajaldhara. The various issues raised inter alia included the fate of States and Union Territories who are not up to the mark and do not come forward with the projects, the fate of remaining NC & PC habitations and capital intensive complex projects which cannot be covered by Swajaldhara. Besides, another area of concern as pointed out by the Committee was the capacity of the poorest of the poor in rural areas to bear the community**

contribution. The Committee find that instead of addressing each issue categorically, a vague and incomplete reply indicating the recommendations of a Conference cum Workshop organized by the Ministry has been furnished. The Committee find that the recommendations of the aforesaid conference have nothing to do with the various concerns expressed by the Committee. The Committee are also confused to note the reply of the Department according to which the recommendations of the Committee would be kept in view when the final decision in the matter of transformation of ARWSP is take by the Union Government. While examining the Demands for Grants of previous year the Committee had been informed that a policy decision to gradually replace ARWSP by Swajaldhara has been taken. The Committee would like to be informed clearly about the policy of the Department in this regard. They would also like a detailed, analytical and critical response to each of the concerns expressed by the Committee in their earlier report so as to enable them to comment further in this regard.

#### J. Issue of sustainability and management of water resources

##### Recommendations (Para Nos. 2.79 and 2.81)

33. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee note that after achieving substantial coverage of habitations with provisions of drinking water, the issue of sustainability—both of the source and system—has emerged as the most pertinent issue. As focussed in the President’s address to the Parliament and also in the Finance Minister’s Budget Speech, various measures for conservation of water are the need of the day. In this context, the Committee also feel that maximum stress should be given to the conservation of water resources by adopting such measures as:

1. Control on over extraction and exploitation of ground water sources. The Committee note that a model Bill to regulate and control the development of ground water drafted by the Ministry of Water Resources has been circulated to all the State Governments for enactment by their respective legislation. The Committee strongly recommend that the legal formalities in most of the States should be completed expeditiously and Ground Water Model Bill with area specific requirements should be implemented at the earliest.

2. Further, the Committee feel that water harvesting schemes should be given priority by the Department. It has been stated by the Ministry that State Governments have been advised that up to 5 per cent of the fund released under ARWSP should be used for Sub-Mission on sustainability. The Committee feel that mere allocation of funds for taking up sustainability issues will not serve the purpose. The Finance Minister proposed that Government would launch a nationwide water harvesting scheme with 50 per cent capital subsidy to NABARD by which one lakh irrigation units at an average cost of Rs. 20,000 per unit will be covered. The Committee would like to know the details of the said Scheme and further recommend that such schemes should be started in the drinking water supply sector. Involving the community in setting up such conservation structures will be a positive step in this direction.
3. The Committee are of the view that partial treatment of the problem will not serve any purpose. All the issues pertaining drinking water availability, sustainability of sources and systems drinking water quality are interrelated and cannot be addressed in isolation. The need of the hour is adopting a holistic approach on water management issues. In this context, the Committee feel that experts in the relevant fields should be involved to discuss these issues so that an objective and acceptable solution can be reached."

*(Recommendation (Para No. 2.79)*

"The Committee feel that the most important issue that has been more or less neglected so far is to make the masses aware about the precious resource of water and how its wastage can bring about acute water scarcity disturbing environmental and ecological balance. Most disturbing is the fact that the Government do not think it necessary to maintain any data with regard to the wastage of water. Mismanagement of water resources and lack of proper awareness result in the wastage of millions of gallons of water per day. In this context, the Committee are of the view that the Government should give focussed attention to their IEC Programme teaching the masses about their duties to conserve water sources. Mass media can be used extensively, like giving advertisements in newspapers, slide shows in theaters etc. to educate the masses."

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.81)*

34. The Government in their action taken replies have stated as under:

“This issue of sustainability of sources and systems has been addressed extensively under reform initiatives launched by Government of India in the rural drinking water supply in 1999 by sanctioning 67 Sector Reform Pilot projects in the country. These were then scaled up throughout the country under Swajaldhara in Dec. 2002. The reform initiatives involved community participation for partial capital cost sharing and owning the assets created and take up 100 per cent O&M responsibility leading to sustainability of systems.

The Department of Drinking Water Supply has accorded top most priority to water harvesting for ensuring sustainability of sources. This Department has taken the following action so far:

- (i) A CD on rain water harvesting has been got prepared by the Department for disseminating information to the rural masses for promoting rain water harvesting.
- (ii) TV spots on Rainwater Harvesting, Water Conservation have been got prepared and will be telecast shortly.
- (iii) Technical Manual on Water Harvesting and Artificial recharge has been finalized and is under print.
- (iv) Hydrogeomorphological maps have been prepared from NRSA for planning water recharging structures apart from helping the State in locating sustainable drinking water sources.
- (v) Revival of traditional rainwater harvesting is being impressed upon.
- (vi) Various other programmes of Ministry of Rural Development viz., DPAP, DDP, HADP, IWDP, Hariyali also aim to sustainability of sources.
- (vii) As Ministry of Water Resources is managing the Ground Water Model Bill on control of over exploitation of ground water, the observations of the Committee have been communicated to them for taking further necessary action. Also, this department is constantly reminding the Ministry of Water Resources for furnishing the latest status.

- (viii) The scheme announced by the Finance Minister for launching nation-wide water harvesting scheme with 50 per cent capital subsidy by NABARD for 1 lakh irrigation units at an average cost of Rs. 20,000 per unit is being handled by Ministry of Water Resources. The observations of the Committee have been conveyed to them. Further, this Department has also formulated a scheme for NABARD assistance for individual household, community and institutional rainwater harvesting structures. A draft scheme has been circulated to the States for their comments."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.79)*

"(a) As per National Water Policy, management of Water Resources is the responsibility of Ministry of Water Resources. As User Department, we have been contributing our share by requesting State Government's to impress upon the community to conserve water and avoid wastage of water. For awareness generation and to take up State-specific IEC activities, guidelines for setting up Communication and Capacity Development Unit at the State level have been circulated and proposals have been invited from the States. The status of proposals received from various States is placed at Appendix II.

(b) As per CPHEEO Water Supply manual, a maximum of 10 per cent of the daily demand is permissible towards wastage of water through leakages in the distribution system. State Governments will be again impressed upon to reduce wastage/loss of treated drinking water. State Govt.'s are also requested to provide soakage pits to drain the waste water from all hand pumps in the rural areas, which would act as point source recharges.

(c) Spots on water conservation, health & hygiene practices have been prepared for airing through TV and Radio. CD has been cut on traditional practices of rain water harvesting and circulated to all State Governments for field application."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.81)*

**35. The Committee note with satisfaction the efforts made by the Department in tackling the issue of sustainability of drinking water sources and according priority to water harvesting measures. The Committee would, however, appreciate elaborate information on steps taken by the Department to ensure revival of traditional rain**

water harvesting methods. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the current status of Model Bill on Nationwide water harvesting scheme. The Committee would reiterate their recommendation to the Government to maintain data with regard to wastage of water. Besides issuing guidelines to State Governments the Committee would like to be informed of ways of financial and technical support provided by the Union to the State Governments to promote rainwater harvesting schemes.

#### K. Provision of drinking water to rural schools

##### Recommendation (Para Nos. 2.98 and 2.99)

36. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee in their respective reports had repeatedly been recommending to the Government to give top most priority to provide drinking water to schools in rural areas. In spite of that, the physical achievement of the programme indicate that serious attention has not been paid towards this programme. It is really a matter of concern that even after more than five decades of planned development, provision of drinking water to schools is a distant dream. The Committee are really disturbed to note the position of coverage of schools in various States. In several States, the coverage has been indicated as zero per cent. While appreciating the fact that the responsibility of implementation of ARWSP and of school coverage is with the State Governments, the Committee feel that adequate efforts to sensitize the various State Governments about the urgency of providing drinking water to schools are not being made by the Union Government. The Committee would like the Department to coordinate with other Ministries/Departments involved in this regard as well as the respective Departments of various State Governments so that all the schools can be covered within a stipulated timeframe. The Committee further find that Seventh all-India Educational Survey has been completed and the results are being compiled by the NCERT. The Committee would like to be apprised of the results when available. Besides, they would also like that the future planning to be made with regard to providing drinking water to rural schools should be made according to the recent data that would be made available as per the Seventh all-India Educational Survey. The Committee in their earlier Reports on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) [refer para 3.60 of 46th Report and para 25 of 52nd Report, 13th Lok Sabha] had

recommended that under the sector reform project of Swajaldhara programme, guidelines should be made a little flexible regarding school coverage. Provision should be made so that the 10 per cent of beneficiary funds could be contributed from the MPLAD funds. As per the action taken reply, the Government could not agree to the recommendation on the plea that community is an essential ingredient in the successful implementation, operation and maintenance of rural water supply schemes, hence Swajaldhara guidelines provide for 10 per cent contribution by the community. The Committee, while taking up the issue again would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation and again emphasize that school coverage should not be treated at par with coverage of habitations as per normal programme. So far as 10 per cent community contribution is concerned, as a special case for school coverage, Swajaldhara guideline should be made flexible so that 10 per cent community contribution could be provide from MPLAD funds."

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.98)*

"On the issue to ensure drinking water in privately managed schools, the Committee in their earlier Report had recommended that Government aided schools should also be brought under the purview of Government school coverage programme (refer para 3.60 of 46th Report, 13th Lok Sabha). The Government in their action taken reply had stated that it is responsibility of private management to provide drinking water in privately managed schools. The Committee while examining the action taken reply had desired to be apprised about the overall position of drinking water in such Government aided schools in order to assess position in the right perspective. The Committee would like to be apprised about the specific steps taken by the Department with regard to coverage of privately managed schools.

In this context, the Committee would like to recommend that all these categories of schools, *viz.*, Government schools, Government-aided and recognized schools and private schools should be covered under the rural drinking water supply programme, so that the supply of potable drinking water can be made available to each and every school of the country thereby ensuring health and well-being of school children.

Further, the Committee feel that the provision of potable drinking water should be extended to local primary health centres and dispensaries thus benefiting a large number of people."

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.99)*



37. The Government in their action taken replies have stated as under:

“Provision of drinking water and sanitation facilities in all rural schools is targeted by the end of the Tenth Plan. However, Government of India has been impressing upon the States to draw up a time-bound Action Plan in this regard and ensure attainment of the target ahead of the deadline, preferably by 31 March, 2006. A coordination panel under the chairmanship of Secretary, Department of Drinking Water Supply has also been set up to monitor progress in this regard. The Department has also prepared a concept paper on School Sanitation and Hygiene Education, which includes, *inter alia*, the drinking water supply component and has forwarded the same to the Planning Commission with request for additional funding from the Education Cess levied in current year’s budget. Members of Parliament can also utilize funds from MPLADS for financing schemes for providing drinking water in rural schools.

The results of Seventh All India Educational Survey have not yet been made available. A D.O. letter in this regard has also been sent by Minister (RD) to Minister (HRD).”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.98)*

“While the Government is taking all steps to see that all Government schools get covered with the facility of drinking water supply by the year 2005-06, there is no proposal to extend the facility to private schools. Private schools generally charge fees from the students and it is therefore incumbent upon them to provide basic facilities like drinking water supply in the schools run by them.

Regarding potable drinking water supply to local primary health centres and dispensaries, it is presumed that drinking water supply is part of the infrastructure to be provided to these Centres as no request in this regard has been received from Ministry of Health & Family Welfare. The factual position is being ascertained from the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.99)*



38. The Committee find that Union Government target to provide drinking water and sanitation facilities in all rural schools by the end of Tenth Plan and to achieve the objective State Governments are being impressed upon to draw up a time bound Action Plan. Besides, Planning Commission is also being requested to provide additional funding from the educational cess levied in current year's budget. The Committee hold the view that the efforts being made in this regard need to be vigorously pursued with the State Governments so that the said dead-line is not shifted further. Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance should further be pursued for adequate allocation of funds to achieve the objective.

Besides what has been stated above, the Committee in the earlier recommendation had raised certain issues as indicated below:

- (i) The efforts made by the State Governments and various Union Ministries need to be coordinated so as to achieve the objective of providing drinking water to all rural schools by the stipulated time-frame;
- (ii) Swajaldhara guidelines should be made flexible so that 10 per cent community contribution could be provided from MPLAD funds.
- (iii) Government/Government aided, recognized and private schools should be covered under the rural drinking water supply programme.
- (iv) Facility of potable drinking water should be extended to local primary health centres and dispensaries.

On item at (i) above nothing has been said in the reply of the Government. The Committee would like the reaction of the Department in this regard. As regards the issue raised at (ii) above, the reply of the Department is vague. It has been stated simply that MPs can utilise funds from MPLAD for rural drinking water schemes. Nothing specific has been stated on the recommendation of the Committee to make Swajaldhara guidelines flexible to allow 10 per cent contribution to be made by the community from MPLAD funds so that the projects of the school coverage do not suffer for want of community contribution. The Committee desire specific reply of the Department in this regard.

On the issue at (iii) above while acknowledging that providing drinking water to private schools is not the sole responsibility of the Government, the Committee feel that onus of monitoring whether

these schools provide the basic facilities like drinking water rests with the Union Government. The Government should first of all monitor the data with regard to provision of drinking water in recognized, Government aided and private schools and place it before the Committee to enable them to analyse the position and comment further in this regard.

As regards provision of potable water to local primary health centres and dispensaries, the Committee note that the position in this regard is being ascertained from the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. The Committee would like to be apprised of the status in this regard so as to analyse and comment further.

## CHAPTER II

### RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.15)**

The Committee find from the position of data as indicated above that the Department has been allocated almost half of what has been proposed by Planning Commission during Tenth Plan. Similar trend has been noticed while analysing the outlay position during 2004-2005. Out of the proposed allocation of Rs. 3,142 crore, the Department has been sanctioned BE for Rs. 2,900 crore. Further, the Committee find that the various aspects covered while proposing the outlay for Tenth Plan *viz.* the position of slippage of FC category of habitations into PC and PC into NC habitations has not been taken into account. The Committee also note that the gap in the resources is proposed to be bridged through extra budgetary assistance like World Bank assistance. While analyzing the position of World Bank assistance coming in the field of drinking water, the Committee note that only in four States, one or two projects could be taken up by donor assistance/loan. The said aspect of getting lesser outlay as proposed by Planning Commission has repeatedly been taken up while analyzing the Demands for Grants of previous years and the Committee have repeatedly been emphasizing to take up the matter with the Planning Commission in view of the top most priority accorded by the Government to provide drinking water to rural areas. While appreciating the resource constraints, the Committee would again like to recommend to take up the matter with the Planning Commission for adequate allocation for drinking water with convincing reasons and commensurate with ground realities. Allocation of lesser amount by Planning Commission shows that the Ministry has not been able to plead their case forcefully for optimum amount. The Committee feel that the Ministry has not done their homework properly before going to Planning Commission for enhanced amount. The Ministry should be able to convince the Planning Commission that shortfall in allocation in such a vital area affects the quality of life and involves great risk.

The Committee also note that the Secretary of the Department has stated that though overall allocation for rural water supply sector has increased over the years, the actual allocation for the main programme

of ARWSP has not increased to that extent as a substantial part of the total outlay is diverted for other programmes and activities such as Swajaldhara, Sector Reforms, etc. In this context, the Committee recommend that outlay for both the programmes should be increased and fund constraint should not hinder the implementation of any of the rural drinking water supply schemes.

The Committee appreciates that World Bank has been approached in the field of drinking water. The Committee would like to recommend that the Government should endeavour to get World Bank assistance for taking up more projects in remaining States so as to bridge the gap between the required outlay and the Government resources in hand. The issue regarding involving corporate sector in the field of drinking water has been analyzed in the succeeding chapters of the Report. Here the Committee would like to emphasize that the Government should endeavour to chalk out an effective and result oriented strategy to motivate and convince the corporate/private sector in fulfilling their social responsibility *i.e.* providing drinking water to rural masses.

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

The Department of Drinking Water Supply has been making concerted efforts to get higher allocations for the rural water supply sector every year. The matter has also been taken up at the level of Minister (RD) with the Planning Commission.

The Committee's recommendation for seeking assistance from the World Bank and the Corporate/private sector towards providing drinking water to rural masses has been noted. In fact the Department had already initiated steps in this regard. Two concept papers on Water Quality and Sustainability and Sanitation have been prepared and sent to the Department of Economic Affairs for posing the same to External Funding Agencies like the World Bank. A presentation on the subject was also made by the Secretary, Department of Drinking Water Supply to the World Bank President on 18.11.2004 at New Delhi wherein both the Finance Minister and the Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission were present. The Department has also prepared a concept paper on School Sanitation and Hygiene Education, which includes, *inter alia*, the drinking water supply component and forwarded the same to the Planning Commission with request for additional funding from the Education Cess levied in the current year's budget. The Department has also posed the fund requirement to XII Finance Commission through a memorandum.

The Planning Commission has decided to allocate the amount of Rs. 248 crore as additional grant for rural water supply sector during the year 2004-05.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

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

(Please see Paragraph number 7 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.16)**

While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee are constrained to note the position of underspending during the different plans. Although they note that during 9th Plan the underspending was lesser as compared to the previous plan, the Committee feel that in this resource starved economy, every single rupee meant for such a priority area should be timely and meaningfully utilized and the Government should chalk out a clear cut strategy to ensure cent percent utilization of the valuable resources. The Committee have repeatedly been expressing their concern over the serious issue of underutilization of resources in their previous Reports also. However, they note with constraint that nothing fruitful has come out and this has become a recurring feature every year. The Committee would again emphasize that much is required to be done in this direction and they should be informed about the concrete steps taken or proposed by the Government in this respect.

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

The Department of Drinking Water Supply is making all possible efforts to utilize the allocation made for water and sanitation sector. The position regarding utilization of funds by the Department of Drinking Water Supply during the last 3 years is as under:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	Amount utilised	Reasons for savings
1	2	3	4
2001-02	2160.00	2072.35	At the RE stage, the overall plan allocation was reduced to Rs. 2110.00 crore. Rs. 31.31 crore was transferred to Non-Lapsable Pool of North

1	2	3	4
			Eastern States and there was unspent balance of Rs. 6.34 crore.
2002-03	2400.00	2241.80	At the RE stage, the overall plan allocation was reduced to Rs. 2250.00 crore, Rs. 5.98 crore was transferred to Non-Lapsable Pool of North Eastern States and there was unspent balance of Rs. 2.22 crore.
2003-04	2750.00	2769.90	The overall plan allocation was increased to Rs. 2770.00 crore. The unspent balance was only Rs. 0.10 crore.

Thus, it can be seen that due to rigorous monitoring of the position by Government of India, the unspent amount has decreased in the last three years and it is the endeavour of Government of India to ensure full utilisation of allocated funds.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.18)**

The Committee further find that the Government on the one hand claims coverage of 94 percent rural habitations. On the other hand, they find that by their own admission 2 lakh habitations are estimated to slip back from FC to PC and PC to NC habitations by the end of the 10th Plan. The position may be further alarming when the survey is completed and evaluated by the independent evaluator. Further, the Committee also find that during every year, the Government claims to cover all the NC habitations, but the final result is slippage of targets. The Government propose to cover 70,484 habitations (30,423 NC + 40,061 PC) during the year 2004-2005. During the first three months of the financial year, the Government could cover only 1,380 habitations that speaks volume of the dim possibility of covering the target habitations during the said year. The Committee fail to understand

how the Department would address the remaining issues of sustainability, quality and sector reforms, etc. The Committee are deeply concerned over the unrealistic projections being made by the Department which on paper reflect a bright picture with regard to implementation of drinking water schemes. The Committee also feel that the ground reality in this regard is not so optimistic as could be seen from the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister whereby he has stated that the biggest crisis that the world will face in the 21st Century will be crisis of water. In this scenario, the Committee would like to strongly recommend to the Government to project realistic targets during each plan.

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

The slippage of 2-lakh habitations from FC to PC/NC and from PC to NC is based on the estimates made by the working group of Tenth Plan. It was envisaged in the Tenth Plan to cover all the NC and PC habitations as per the survey results of 1999 in the first two years and cover the 'slipped back' habitations in the next three years. The targets for the first two years of Tenth Plan were therefore so fixed so as to achieve full coverage in first two years. Notwithstanding this, the targets were fixed in consultation with the State Governments.

A fresh Habitation survey has been completed by most of the States/UTs and the results thereof are being validated by the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA). After validation, the Department will have a more realistic picture of coverage in rural areas.

The Department agrees that there is need to project realistic targets. The procedure for fixation of targets is being streamlined. It is felt that while fixing targets, basic parameter such as status of coverage of habitations at the beginning of the year, unit cost of installation of water source, allocation under ARWSP and State Sector are kept in view. The entire procedure for fixation of target was deliberated in the Conference cum Workshop of State Secretaries held on 22-23rd November 2004.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

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

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

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.25)**

The Committee further find that in DDP areas in J&K, the performance of the programme is very poor. While admitting the fact that difficult geographical conditions and militancy hinder the implementation of the programme, the Committee feel that the steps taken by the Union Government and State Governments to ensure proper implementation of the programme are not adequate which result in almost one-fifth physical achievement. The Committee would like the Department to analyse the reasons and take corrective steps in this regard. Besides the outlay earmarked should be realistic so that huge underspending does not occur every year.

**Reply of the Government**

The recommendation of the Committee has been noted. The State Government has been asked to analyse the reasons for under-achievement in terms of physical targets and financial expenditure and take appropriate corrective measures to prevent recurrence of the same in future under intimation to this Department.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.32)**

The Committee find that the Government have been requesting corporate sector to come forward in the field of drinking water supply in rural areas in different conferences, seminars through CII and ASSOCHAM. The Committee would like to be informed about the reaction of the corporate sector in this regard.

**Reply of the Government**

The Department has made presentations and interacted with CII, FICCI and ASSOCHAM on issues and strategies in rural water management. However, no positive response has so far been received from them.

Since drinking water is a State subject, the policy framework providing for role of corporate sector in rural drinking water supply will need to be evolved by the respective State Governments. Government of India has, however, initiated discussions with the State Governments on alternative delivery mechanisms and this was



discussed in the recent Conference cum Workshop of State Secretaries organized at New Delhi on 22-23 November, 2004. State Governments have requested Government of India to have a concept note outlining various successfully operative models involving public-private partnership in rural drinking water supply sector in different countries/ States prepared which could form discussion paper for initiating suitable policy changes by the State Governments. Action has been initiated in this regard by Government of India and it is expected that the concept note so prepared would facilitate evolution of effective public-private partnership in rural drinking water supply sector.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

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

(Please see Paragraph number 26 of Chapter I of the Report)

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

The Committee further feel that adequate and effective steps to motivate the corporate sector/private sector to fulfill their social obligations like provision of drinking water for rural areas have not been made by the Government. Instead of delving deep into the matter, a very casual approach has been made through conferences and seminars. To motivate the corporate sector, concerted efforts and skills are essential. In this regard, the Committee feel that the Government should explore all possibilities of involving the private/corporate sectors in the field of rural infrastructure development like rural drinking water supply. However, at the same time the, Committee show their apprehension that development of such an important sector as drinking water supply should not be left to the mercy of the private/corporate bodies and the Government should be able to generate enough funds for investment in the rural drinking water supply sector.

Keeping these varied aspects in view, the Committee would like to recommend that the Government should chalk out a comprehensive strategy so that the corporate and private sector could be convinced and motivated to come forward for participation.

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

As mentioned in the reply to para No. 2.32, Government of India will provide technical support to the State Governments in taking appropriate policy initiative in this regard.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph number 26 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.59)**

The Committee find that the implementation of sector reform projects and Swajaldhara Scheme is not very satisfactory. As could be seen from the data made available to them, there is huge under-spending under each of the programmes. They also note that some of the projects are being closed due to variety of factors as in the case of Sikkim reported by the Government. Further, the position is alarming in many of the States where the expenditure has been indicated as nil and in all the Union Territories except Dadra and Nagar Haveli where no funds have been released so far. Further, no scheme could be completed in Union Territories and in most of the States, no project could be completed. The Committee also note that the Department has initiated certain steps to ensure the implementation of the Swajaldhara. However, they note that the steps to be initiated by the Department at this stage like preparation of State vision statement, detailed annual action plan by the State Governments, etc. should have been ensured before launching of the said Scheme. It appears that proper planning has not been made by the Department before starting Swajaldhara.

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

As had been indicated in the replies furnished earlier, being reform based programmes, the implementation of Sector Reform Project took some time to take off in most States. The approved project outlay indicated the upper ceiling for project expenditure in the Sector Reform Pilot Projects. It did not imply as if schemes for such amount had been prepared and approved by Government of India. Based on the demand-generated, the total estimated project outlay of Sector Reform Pilot Projects was only Rs. 1328.38 crore and Government of India have released Rs. 1145.56 crore. Together with amount mobilized as community contribution and amount accrued as interest, total available funds are to the tune of Rs. 1311.91 crore against which an expenditure of Rs. 1065.96 crore has been reported and 75,391 of 86,799 rural drinking water supply schemes taken up have been completed. The full details are enclosed at Appendix I.

As regards Swajaldhara, it may be noted that pace of implementation of rural drinking water supply schemes taken up under

Swajaldhara 2002-03 and Swajaldhara 2003-04 has shown signs of picking up. As per latest available reports, 1091 schemes out of 4734 schemes taken up under Swajaldhara 2002-03 have been completed and an expenditure of Rs. 90.00 crore has been incurred against total release of Rs. 138.83 crore by Government of India. All schemes taken up under Swajaldhara 2002-03 are expected to be completed during the current financial year. Details are enclosed at Appendix II.

Similarly, under Swajaldhara 2003-04, as per latest available reports, 1192 schemes have been completed and in expenditure of Rs. 37.34 crore has been incurred against total release of Rs. 99.62 crore by Government of India. Most of the schemes taken up under Swajaldhara 2003-04 are expected to be completed during the current financial year. Details are enclosed at Appendix III.

It may also be noted that only in the year 2002-03, Swajaldhara was implemented on 'first come, first served' basis when schemes were approved by Government of India. During 2002-03, Swajaldhara schemes could be taken up only in 15 States and one Union Territory. After the issue of comprehensive guidelines on Swajaldhara in June 2003, Swajaldhara has become an 'allocation based demand-driven' programme where if any State or Union Territory does not provide requisite information as per Para 15.6.2. of Swajaldhara Guidelines, funds are not released. Hence, in the year 2003-04, funds under Swajaldhara were released to 21 States and one Union Territory.

As regards the observation that proper planning has not been made by the Department before starting Swajaldhara, it is respectfully submitted that at that point of time it was thought that the reform initiative should not remain confined to just 67 Sector Reform Pilot Project districts and if any Gram Panchayat in any State or district of the country came forward and agreed to adhere to the reform principles, they should be allowed to take up rural drinking water supply schemes. The MoU process relates to institutionalization of the reform principles in the entire water and sanitation sector and address issues confronting the sector and is not confined to implementation of Swajaldhara alone.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.79)**

The Committee note that after achieving substantial coverage of habitations with provision of drinking water, the issue of sustainability-

both of the source and system—has emerged as the most pertinent issue. As focussed in the President's address to the Parliament and also in the Finance Minister's Budget speech, various measures for conservation of water are the need of the day. In this context, the Committee also feel that maximum stress should be given to the conservation of water resources by adopting such measures as:—

- (1) Control on over extraction and exploitation of ground water sources. The Committee note that a model Bill to regulate and control the development of ground water drafted by the Ministry of Water Resources has been circulated to all the State Governments for enactment by their respective legislation. The Committee strongly recommend that the legal formalities in most of the States should be completed expeditiously and Ground Water Model Bill with area specific requirements should be implemented at the earliest.
- (2) Further, the Committee feel that water harvesting schemes should be given priority by the Department. It has been stated by the Ministry that State Governments have been advised that up to 5 percent of the fund released under ARWSP should be used for Sub-Mission on sustainability. The Committee feel that mere allocation of funds for taking up sustainability issues will not serve the purpose. The Finance Minister proposed that Government would launch a nationwide water harvesting scheme with 50 per cent capital subsidy to NABARD by which one lakh irrigation units at an average cost of Rs. 20,000 per unit will be covered. The Committee would like to know the details of the said Scheme and further recommend that such schemes should be started in the drinking water supply sector. Involving the community in setting up such conservation structures will be a positive step in this direction.
- (3) The Committee are of the view that partial treatment of the problem will not serve any purpose. All the issues pertaining drinking water availability, sustainability of sources and systems drinking water quality are interrelated and cannot be addressed in isolation. The need of the hour is adopting a holistic approach on water management issues. In this context, the Committee feel that experts in the relevant fields should be involved to discuss these issues so that an objective and acceptable solution can be reached.

### Reply of the Government

This issue of sustainability of sources and systems has been addressed extensively under reform initiatives launched by Government of India in the rural drinking water supply in 1999 by sanctioning 67 Sector Reform Pilot projects in the country. These were then scaled up throughout the country under Swajaldhara in Dec. 2002. The reform initiatives involved community participation for partial capital cost sharing and owning the assets created and take up 100% O&M responsibility leading to sustainability of systems.

The Department of Drinking Water Supply has accorded topmost priority to water harvesting for ensuring sustainability of sources. This Department has taken the following action so far.

- (i) A CD on rain water harvesting has been got prepared by the Department for disseminating information to the rural masses for promoting rain water harvesting.
- (ii) TV spots on Rainwater Harvesting, Water Conservation have been got prepared and will be telecast shortly.
- (iii) Technical Manual on Water harvesting and Artificial recharge has been finalized and is under print.
- (iv) Hydrogeomorphological maps have been prepared from NRSA for planning water recharging structures apart from helping the State in locating sustainable drinking water resources.
- (v) Revival of traditional rainwater harvesting is being impressed upon.
- (vi) Various other programmes of Ministry of Rural Development *viz.*, DPAP, DDP, HADP, IWDP, Hariyali also aim to sustainability of sources.
- (vii) As Ministry of Water Resources is managing the Ground Water Model Bill on control of over exploitation of ground water, the observations of the Committee have been communicated to them for taking further necessary action. Also, this department is constantly reminding the Ministry of water Resources for furnishing the latest status.
- (viii) The scheme announced by the Finance Minister for launching nation-wide water harvesting scheme with 50%

capital subsidy by NABARD for 1 lakh irrigation units at an average cost of Rs. 20,000 per unit is being handled by Ministry of Water Resources. The observations of the Committee have been conveyed to them.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

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

(Please *see* Paragraph number 35 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.80)**

The Committee in their earlier reports had drawn the attention of the Department to the need of the hour to accept sea water for drinking water and other purposes (refer para no. 3.108, 46th Report, 13th Lok Sabha). They had also drawn the attention of the Department about the need to explore cost effective technologies in this regard. The Committee had recommended to stress that the Government should give more thrust for exploration of sea water for drinking water and other purposes. The Committee are pleased to note that the Government has finally agreed to install a desalination plant with a capacity of three hundred million per day (mld.). The approximate cost of which is Rs. 1,000 crore as Finance Minister stated in his Budget Speech. They also appreciate that under the Common Minimum Programme, the Government propose to install desalination plants in States of Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Orissa.

The Committee were informed the project to install a smaller desalination plant has been proposed for Lakshadweep. The Committee would like to know the details of said Project. They feel that since resource constraint is a major issue, stress should be more upon installing such smaller plants which need lesser capital investment.

The Committee feel that the steps ensured by the Government in this regard would go a long way in providing drinking water in coastal areas as recommended by them in their earlier reports. The Committee would like that more projects should be launched in other States. Besides, as recommended by them earlier Government should pay more attention to R&D to explore cost effective technologies in this regard. The Committee would also like to recommend to study the technologies used in their countries where water for drinking water and other purposes is provided by desalination projects.

### **Reply of the Government**

- (a) RGNDWM has already identified electro dialysis, reverse osmosis, thermal MSF and MED technologies and Solar stills as potential treatment methods for conversion of sea water to drinking water.
- (b) Conversion of sea water to potable water by solar stills was experimented by SPPERI in parts of Gujarat under R&D project sponsored by RGNDWM. This method though does not involve any mechanical or electrical equipment, delivers very low output of potable water. Simple low cost treatment technologies are being explored under R&D programme for developing specific ion exchange technology by using ion-selective resins.
- (c) The Union Government has been requesting States to set up desalination plants. 194 desalination plants based on membrane technology were approved by the Mission for various States to provide water free from excess brackishness in the affected habitations. 150 plants have been established out of which 77 are functional. However, State Governments are not keep on setting up desalination plants due to high cost and O&M problems.
- (d) The details of desalination plant at Lakshadweep are as follows: Cost = Rs. 12.70 crore, Location = Kavaratti, Capacity = 6 lakh litres per day; Population benefited at present = 10,113; Technology envisaged = Sea Water Reverse Osmosis.
- (e) As Countries like Israel, Maldives, Kuwait and UAE have developed advanced technologies in the field of sea water desalination. RGNDWM would interact with these countries for assessing the potential of new technologies for replication in the Indian context.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III,  
dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.81)**

The Committee feel that the most important issue that has been more or less neglected so far is to make the masses aware about the precious resources of water and how its wastage can bring about acute



water scarcity disturbing environmental and ecological balance. Most disturbing is the fact that the Government do not think it necessary to maintain any data with regard to the wastage of water. Mismanagement of water resources and lack of proper awareness result in the wastage of millions of gallons of water per day. In this context, the Committee are of the view that the Government should give focussed attention to their IEC Programme teaching the masses about their duties to conserve water sources. Mass media can be used extensively, like giving advertisements in newspapers, slide shows in theatres etc. to educate the masses.

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

- (a) As per National Water Policy, management of Water Resources is the responsibility of Ministry of Water Resources. As User Department, we have been contributing our share by requesting State Government's to impress upon the community to conserve water and avoid wastage of water. For awareness generation and to take up state-specific IEC activities, guidelines for setting up Communication and Capacity development Unit at the State level have been circulated and proposals have been invited from the States. The status of proposals received from various States is placed at Annexure-II.
- (b) As per CPHEEO Water Supply manual, a maximum of 10% of the daily demand is permissible towards wastage of water through leakages in the distribution system. State Governments will be again impressed upon to reduce wastage/loss of treated drinking water. State Govt's are also requested to provide soakage pits to drain the waste water from all hand pumps in the rural areas, which would act as point source rechargers.
- (c) Spots on water conservation, health & hygiene practices have been prepared for airing through TV and Radio. CD has been cut on traditional practices of rain water harvesting and circulated to all State Governments for field application.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

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

(Please see Paragraph number 35 of Chapter I of the Report)



**Recommendation (Para No. 2.82)**

The Committee also feel that a holistic approach in treating the drinking water and sanitation issues is the best solution in the modern day context. People should be taught not to dump sewerage and other pollution in the water sources which give rise to a vicious cycle of pollution feeding back into the system.

**Reply of the Government**

A holistic approach for integrated waste supply and sanitation management is being followed in the Department. As water quality gets affected due to insanitation, through the National water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance Programme to be launched, it is proposed to conduct sanitary surveys which are economic ways of monitoring water quality and communities will be made aware of health impact of insanitary practices of waste disposal and pollution of water sources.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.90)**

The Committee note that as per the guidelines of ARWSP, 20 per cent of its funds are earmarked for sub-Mission activities, out of which 5 per cent is for tackling sustainability issue and 15 per cent is for taking care of quality problems. Fully covered States can utilize more than 15 per cent of the ARWSP funds with specific approval of the Government of India. The Committee further observe that the Government have proposed to enhance the earmarked funds for water quality from 15 per cent to 30 per cent, which is a positive step. The Committee feel that in the recent times, the problem of sustainability alongwith quality has emerged as one of the challenges to be tackled in this field, which should be given maximum priority. Earmarking of more funds for the sector will go a long way in dealing with the problem of drinking water quality. Further, since the Government have identified the main causes responsible for drinking water contamination, *i.e.* fluoride and arsenic, proper technical know-how should be developed to deal with these problems and at the same time some immediate action plan should also be drawn.

**Reply of the Government**

A concept paper for seeking enhanced allocation to tackle water quality problems in all quality affected habitations in a focused manner

has been prepared with a total requirement of funds of Rs. 13,600 crore. 90% of the quality affected habitations (other than iron which is 70%) will be provided safe drinking water facility from alternate safe sources which are free from contamination. 10% of water quality problem habitations (30% for iron) would be provided safe drinking water by installing treatment plants. It is envisaged to cover all the quality affected habitations by 2010. The said concept paper has been submitted to the Planning Commission and the Department of Economic Affairs.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.104)**

The Committee note that pursuant to their recommendation made in their earlier Reports (refer 3.60 of 46th Report, 13th Lok Sabha), seven States of North East and Sikkim were requested to conduct a fresh survey during 2003-2004 to ascertain latest status of rural habitation and they have already furnished the data which have been examined and evaluated by an independent agency. The Committee also find that survey results from Sikkim are still awaited. The committee would like to be apprised about the latest position with regard to coverage of habitations in North Eastern States as per the survey after valuation by an independent agency. Besides, they would also like that Sikkim should be impressed upon to complete the survey without any further delay. The Committee are constrained to note the position of expenditure under ARWSP in North Eastern States. The position of coverage in all the States is very poor. Only Mizoram and Sikkim could achieve 60 per cent and 55 per cent coverage respectively. The status of implementation of Swajaldhara Scheme indicate that project proposals have been received only from Assam. All the other North Eastern States have failed to come up with any proposed project under the Swajaldhara Scheme. The Committee would like the Department to interact with the North Eastern States to know about their specific problems with regard to non-furnishing of projects under Swajaldhara.

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

In the National Common Minimum Programme, one of the items relate to addressing the special problems of hill States. We have called for a concept paper from all the hill States (which include all the North-Eastern States). The Department is also conducting a conference cum workshop with all the States and during the said conference the

interaction will be made with the North-Eastern States on the issues raised by the Committee. One main reason is non-existence of Panchayats in the Scheduled tribe areas.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.109)**

The Committee note that during 10th Plan period, National Human Resource Development Programme (NHRDP) implementation was discontinued. However, during the 9th Plan period when the programme was under implementation, 24 States had set up HRD cells. The Committee would like to know the fate of these cells on which a large amount of funds have been spent so far. Further, it has been stated that in the current financial year, Rs. 1,490 lakh has been proposed to be allocated for the HRD activities. The Committee would like to know the actual status regarding allocation, release and expenditure of funds for HRD activities.

**Reply of the Government**

Government has restructured the HRD and IEC programmes and revised guidelines for setting up Communication and Capacity Development Unit (CCDU) have been issued. These HRD Cells will get merged into the CCDU. As per this, the assets of the existing HRD Cells will get transferred to CCDU. The States have been asked to initiate proposal under CCDU for IEC and HRD activities. As soon as the proposals are received, these will be processed and funds will be released. In the current financial year, a provision of Rs. 14.90 crore has been made for HRD activities against which release of fund is 'Nil' at present. As soon as CCDU proposals from States are received, funds would be released to the States.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.110)**

Further, the Committee note that IEC Programme has also not received due attention from the Government. During 2002-03 and 2003-04, only Rs. 16.53 lakh was spent for IEC whereas for the current year 2004-05, an allocation of Rs. 10.10 lakh has been made. The Committee feel that in the prevailing scenario, when the Government's

policy focus has changed to make the Schemes demand responsive and participative, HRD&IEC Programmes should receive maximum attention. Efforts should be made to use modern information technology methods to promote mass awareness and also for capacity development of the community so that they are able to participate in a more productive manner.

### **Reply of the Government**

The existing IEC programme has been restructured and Communication and Capacity Development Unit (CCDU) are being set up in the States to help create awareness for Swajaldhara and Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) programmes. The earlier TSC guidelines were discontinued in the 10th Plan as a result, the expenditure incurred in the 2002-03 and 2003-04 was nominal to meet the committed liabilities of the previous plan programme. In the current year, budgetary allocation of Rs. 10.10 crore has been made for IEC which will be utilized to support activities of CCDU. Proposals from CCDUs are awaited and as soon as these are received, these will be processed and fund released. In addition to that, a National Communication Strategy has been developed for creating mass awareness about sanitation and hygiene issues. A detailed media plan has been prepared using the modern mass media tool, which will be executed in the later part of current financial year.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III,  
dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.8)**

The Committee have been repeatedly bringing to the notice of the Government that the percentage coverage of rural household with sanitation facilities show a dismal picture. The Committee note with dismay that the Census 2001 found that only 22 per cent rural households have been covered with sanitation facilities. Further, the Committee find that underutilisation of funds has become a recurrent feature. For 2002-03, the provisional expenditure figure show an underspending of Rs. 70.68 crore while for the year 2003-04, the provisional figure show Rs. 36.82 crore as shortfall in expenditure. Further, the performance in both financial and physical aspects, in a number of States show an alarming situation. In such a scenario, the Committee strongly recommend that the Department should optimize expenditure of the available funds. The Committee further find that the Department is providing provisional expenditure figure even for

the year 2002-03 which should have been updated by mid 2004 at the time of preparing the Performance Budget (2003-04). Further, the Committee feel that the Government should ensure that project proposals are forthcoming from all the States so that lopsided coverage does not take place. Till now 398 projects in the country are under implementation with a number of remaining districts, where such projects under TSC have not yet taken off. The Committee would again like to know whether these left out districts are getting any funds for sanitation programmes especially when TSC projects are not being forwarded by them.

### Reply of the Government

It is true that as per Census 2001, only 22% rural households had access to sanitation facilities. However, in order to accelerate the sanitation coverage, Government of India has reoriented its policies and accordingly Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) was restructured to launch a demand, responsive, community led Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) project in selected districts initially. These projects are implemented in campaign mode taking district as a unit with the objective to ensure 100% coverage of both BPL and APL households with toilet facilities using intensive Information, Education and Communication campaigns to create demand for such facilities. Since launching of TSC, rural sanitation coverage has increased. TSC at present is under implementation in 398 districts of the country and as per report received so far, about 92 lakh households have constructed toilets under TSC. Taking this into consideration, the rural sanitation coverage has increased to approximately 30% in 2004.

It is not correct that the funds earmarked for sanitation have been underutilised. BE, RE and release position over the last 4 years is given in the table below:

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl.No.	Year	B.E.	R.E.	Release
1.	2000-2001	14000.00	14000.00	13085.26
2.	2001-2002	15000.00	13500.00	13005.54
3.	2002-2003	16500.00	14000.00	14110.27
4.	2003-2004	16500.00	16500.00+ 4000.00*	20500.00

\*Additional provided for sanitation programme to meet increased demand in the supplementary demand for grants.

As per this, it may be seen that expenditure in rural sanitation programme has been gradually increasing and in the year 2003-04, Rs. 40 crore additional was allocated for the programme to meet the increased demand. The Committee in its recommendation has mentioned that there has been shortfall in expenditure. There was no shortfall in release of funds by Government of India. It is worth mentioning that TSC projects are sanctioned for a period of 4-5 years and the fund is to be utilized during this period. The fund is not expected to be utilized by the end of the concerned financial year. Funds to the project districts are released as and when the proposals are received or a new project is sanctioned which may not be necessarily in the beginning of the year so the actual utilization on the ground may be less than the releases made. It is further to mention that the actual utilization has increased considerably in the last few financial years. From 2002-03 the TSC implementation progressed well with 24 lakh household latrines constructed during 2002-03 and 45 lakh household latrines during 2003-04.

The expenditure figure furnished for the year 2002-03 has been the actual expenditure *i.e.* Rs. 9432.45 lakh, which was indicated as provisional figure in the performance budget.

It is true that performance in physical and financial aspects in all the States are not uniform. Some States are implementing the programme effectively whereas in some States the implementation is poor. Those States where the implementation is slow, efforts are being taken by way of organizing workshops, review meeting, sending review missions and other kind of technical guidance to improve the implementation.

Till now Government of India has sanctioned Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) projects in 398 districts and intends to extend the projects to all the remaining districts in the country during the 10th Plan. Already proposals of 142 districts have been approved to take up base line survey and prepare detailed TSC project report. For this purpose, Rs. 10 lakh has been sanctioned to these districts. Efforts are being made to bring other left over districts also under TSC implementation.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III,  
dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.9)**

The Committee are concerned to note that no updation of data regarding coverage of rural schools with sanitation facilities have been done so far. During the examination of Demands for Grants (2003-04), the same figures from the Sixth All India Education Survey were quoted by the Department. The Committee feel that in the absence of regular evaluation of the actual work done in the field, the ground reality will not be clear. In such a scenario, the fixing of targets or its subsequent achievement lose their meaning and the figures remain only on paper. The Committee have been informed that the Seventh All India Education Survey has been completed and the results are being compiled at present. The Committee strongly recommend that the survey results should be made available expeditiously and the statistics emerging from it should be meaningfully used to set targets and achievement.

Further, the Committee are of the opinion that school sanitation should be given topmost priority with special attention for provision of lavatory facilities for girls. It has been stated by the Department that under TSC, 10 percent of the total funds is to be provided by the community. The Committee urge the Government to look into the feasibility aspect of this Scheme, and further recommend that under this Scheme, guidelines should be made a little flexible regarding school coverage. There should be the provision that 10 percent community contribution of funds can be made from the MPLAD Scheme. The Committee also feel that along with encouraging community participation, there should be some provision for Central allocation to be given to each State for providing sanitation facilities to rural schools.

In this context, the Committee would like to recommend that construction of sanitary toilets in schools should be of standard quality with provision of adequate supply of water, so that these do not fall into disuse after a certain point of time thus rendering the entire amount invested on these a wastage.

Further, the Committee feel that the provision of hygienic sanitation facilities should be extended to local primary health centres and dispensaries thus benefiting a large number of people.

**Reply of the Government**

In order to assess the actual status of water supply and sanitation facilities in schools, Ministry of Human Resource Development has



undertaken 7th All India Educational survey. The results have not been released by NCERT for which the matter has been taken up by Department of Drinking Water Supply with Deptt. of Elementary Education. Pending that, each TSC project district has been advised to conduct detailed base line survey which also includes assessment of the status of availability of water supply and sanitation facilities in rural schools. Each TSC project has been advised to ensure full coverage of schools with water supply and sanitation facilities.

Government of India is attaching very high priority to school sanitation and hygiene education in the schools. To meet the special needs of girl students, a provision for constructing separate toilet block for girl students has been incorporated in the TSC guidelines and all States have been advised accordingly. The provision of 10% of the unit cost of toilet construction to be met by the community is made only to ensure greater involvement of the community, Gram Panchayat (GP), Parents Teacher Associations (PTA), etc. in the programme. This will enhance the effectiveness of the programme. Where the community or the PTAs are not able to contribute, the GPs step in to help 10% of community share, which is Rs. 2000/- only. So far we have not received any reference from any State Government regarding difficulties being faced in receiving community contribution of 10% towards school toilet construction. The Committee has recommended to make separate allocation for school toilet construction to those districts where TSC is not being implemented. In order to extend water supply & sanitation facilities to all rural schools in the country, Government is working out a separate national programme, which will be extended to all districts.

In order to ensure that construction of sanitary toilets in schools are of standard quality and toilets constructed are put into use, special emphasis is being given by Department of Drinking Water Supply on these issues. For this purpose, detailed technical notes have been developed and circulated among all TSC project districts giving toilet design options and also highlighting important issues to be kept in mind while constructing toilets. In order to ensure sustainability of use, operation and maintenance of toilets, hygiene education is emphasized for which training of the teachers is being undertaken.

The Committee has recommended that the provision of sanitation facilities need to be extended to primary centres and dispensaries also. Such facilities are extended under various programmes of Ministry of Health & Family Welfare. However, there is a provision of construction



of community toilet blocks at public places under TSC guidelines. Those districts where these facilities are not extended under regular programme of Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, community sanitation facilities can be constructed in around primary health centres if required.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.10)**

The Committee find that the focus of policy in the drinking water supply and sanitation sectors is to encourage community participation. However, it is a matter of serious concern that no such change in policy orientation is reflected in IEC or HRD Programmes of the Government. The Committee feel that if the Government want to make the demand-driven Schemes successful, proper attention should be given to spread awareness among the rural masses with special emphasis on educating school children regarding adoption of hygienic sanitation habits. Involvement of NGOs/VOs in this regard will go a long way in such interaction with the grassroots to encourage and motivate them to take responsibility of their community assets.

The Committee find that another important issue that needs to be addressed is the problem of open defecation. As the figure furnished by the Department shows that 64 percent of the population in India defecates in open, resulting in 20,000 MT of excreta everyday, the Committee feel that alongwith providing sanitation facilities to rural masses, awareness should be spread among them so that sanitary latrines constructed are used to the optimum. It has been observed though sanitary latrines/complexes are in place, those often fall into disuse, thus rendering the entire amount spent on them a wastage. The Committee strongly recommend that all means at the disposal of the Government right to the grassroot level should be utilized to educate the masses against open defecation and adopting hygienic sanitation habits.

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

It is true that spreading awareness among rural masses is essential to make the demand driven scheme successful. For this purpose, adequate focus on IEC and HRD is required to be given. Considering this need, Government of India has restructured its IEC and HRD programmes and new guidelines for setting up Communication and

Capacity Development Unit (CCDU) has been issued. All States have been advised to set up CCDU and submit detailed proposals for taking-up and State specific HRD and IEC activities. In the first three years, GOI will give financial support to the States on 100% share basis and for the remaining 2 years 75% funding support will be given by GOI.

In order to build the capacity of implementers and all stakeholders, guidelines for support to key resource centers have been issued. As per this, financial support will be given to the training institutions at the national, State and district level to carry out capacity development activities. As per the existing guidelines, TSC projects may engage NGOs following transparent procedures to take up IEC & HRD activities.

It is true that a large number of rural population is to be educated against the dangers of open defecation and for adopting hygiene behaviour. For this purpose, various steps are being taken by Department of Drinking Water Supply. One of the most important activities taken is to develop National and District specific communication strategy. As per this, focus will be given on interpersonal communication at the district level and mass media communication at the national level. A national level media plan has already been prepared as part of which TV, radio and print medium advertisements have been prepared. The media plan will be implemented shortly. For effective communication at the district level, various communication tools are being developed.

In addition, for giving focus to IEC under TSC, provision is made in TSC guidelines that more than 15% of the project funds should be earmarked for taking up IEC activities, which includes hygiene education in schools. The guidelines also clearly say that the project districts can involve NGOs/voluntary organizations like self-help groups for carrying out IEC activities, setting up of rural sanitary marts and production centres etc. An incentive based reward scheme called 'Nirmal Gram Puraskar' has been launched on 2nd October, 2003 to reward those PRI institutions, which achieve open defecation free environment in their respective PRI areas. Individuals and organizations which help in achieving this objective would also be rewarded suitably.

In order to ensure that the toilets constructed are put into use and do not fall into dis-use special emphasis is being given on monitoring. For this purpose, greater focus is given on monitoring the process of implementation and use of the facilities. Department is engaging

independent evaluators (District Level Monitoring Agencies—DLMs) to monitor the TSC implementation.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.11)**

The Committee note with appreciation that incentives in the field of rural sanitation has been started for PRIs, individuals, organizations for adopting hygienic sanitation practices. The Committee feel that such incentive Schemes should be encouraged in all villages/districts of the country so that people come forward and participate enthusiastically in the implementation and O&M of the sanitation projects.

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

An incentive based reward scheme called 'Nirmal Gram Puraskar' had been launched on 2nd October, 2003 to reward those PRI institutions, which achieve open defecation free environment in their respective PRI areas. Individuals and organizations which help in achieving this objective would also be rewarded suitably. This Nirmal Gram Puraskar is open to all the Panchayati Raj institutions namely at the Gram, Block and District level. The Department is encouraging all the PRIs to apply for this award after obtaining the distinction of achieving open defecation free environment. The application forms along with information on Nirmal Gram Puraskar has already been uploaded on the Departmental website at ddws.nic.in for wider dissemination. So far 649 applications have been received which are in different stages of scrutiny.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

### CHAPTER III

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

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

The Committee further note that the relaxed norms are applicable on the condition that 10 per cent beneficiary contribution and shouldering full responsibility for O&M by the community has been achieved. They find that while under ARWSP, there is no condition of 10 per cent beneficiary contribution, the said beneficiary contribution is applicable in case of Swajaldhara since Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme. The Committee fail to understand how the said criteria would be applicable to States/Districts where although the full coverage as per the Government's criteria is achieved but no Swajaldhara project is there. The Committee would like the Government to ponder over the aforesaid position and clarify the position accordingly.

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

The relaxed norms under ARWSP can be applied in districts/States which have achieved full coverage, even if there is no Swajaldhara scheme in the district, as the Department will collect at least 10% of the capital cost of the scheme as contribution from the community and on completion of the rural drinking water supply scheme by the Department, it will be handed over to the community for operation and maintenance.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III,  
dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.39)**

The Committee in their respective Reports have been stressing to bring the different programmes meant for same purpose under one umbrella. However, the Committee feel that the policy of the Government is to start a plethora of schemes to achieve a single objective. ARWSP covers all the aspects for which Three Programmes of the Prime Minister were started on 15th August, 2002. The Committee further note that as per the policy of UPA Government,

they intend to bring all drinking water schemes under the umbrella of Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM). The Committee would like to be informed about the status of different programmes meant for drinking water and the steps taken to bring them under the same RGNDW Mission.

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

Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM) is administering all Centrally Sponsored Rural Drinking Water Supply Schemes and will continue to do so.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.91)**

The Committee further note that survey regarding quality affected habitations with 5-10 percent stratified sampling in the first phase, which was commissioned way back in March 2000 has not been taken up seriously by majority of the States. Further, very few States like Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu have furnished data for the second phase of the survey. While taking a serious note of this attitude of the State Governments, the Committee strongly recommend that the Union Government should take a pro-active step and issue directions to all the State Governments to complete the aforesaid survey within a stipulated time frame. Independent evaluators should be engaged to complete the survey with a thorough scrutiny that it is carried out in an efficient manner.

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

The survey has been completed. Information received from the State Governments has been compiled. As there are no wide variations in the survey, it is not proposed to get it evaluated through independent evaluators.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

## CHAPTER IV

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

#### Recommendation (Para No. 2.19)

The Committee find from the data made available to them that there is a mismatch between physical and financial achievement under ARWSP. During the year 2003-04, financial achievement has been shown as 83.67 per cent. However, the position of achievement of NC and PC targets indicate 35.33 per cent. The Committee also note that there is a declining trend, if we analyse the data with regard to achievement of NC and PC habitations. The achievement during the year 2003-04 is around 35 per cent, if compared with the achievement during the year 1998-99. The Committee would like the Department to explain the specific reasons for mismatch between targets and achievements and the declining trend in achievement in the coverage of NC and PC habitations.

#### Reply of the Government

The Department agrees that there had been mismatch between physical and financial achievements. The main reason is that the allocation of funds under ARWSP is made on the basis of criteria wherein the weightage to different parameters is as under:

---

1. Rural Population	—	40
2. States under DDP, DPAP, HADP and special category hill states in terms of rural areas	—	35
3. NC/PC village (at 2:1 ratio)	—	15
4. Quality affected villages	—	10

---

Thus, in the allocation of funds, number of NC/PC habitations has only 15% weightage. Further, slippage from 'Fully Covered' (FC) to 'Partially Covered' (PC)/'Not Covered' (NC) status occurs due to, inter alia, sources going dry, systems becoming defunct due to outliving of their designed life span, emergence of quality problems and poor

operation and maintenance. Especially for solving water quality problems, in 90% cases water has to be brought from an alternative safe source which could be at a distance and hence capital intensive. Thus, there could be a mismatch between financial allocation and physical targets for coverage.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

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

(Please *see* Paragraph Number 16 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.24)**

The Committee find that year after year the physical performance of ARWSP in certain States/UTs is not up to the mark. The attention of the Government has repeatedly been drawn towards this aspect in the previous Reports on Demands for Grants. However, nothing concrete seems to have been done. While admitting that implementation of ARWSP is the responsibility of State Governments, the Committee feel that the Union Government have to play a pro-active role so as to ensure that different Centrally Sponsored Schemes are successfully implemented. The Committee would like the Department to find out State-wise/UT-wise, reasons for under achievement of physical targets in ARWSP in certain States/UTs and inform the Committee accordingly.

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

The habitations yet to be covered are in difficult areas where there are no sources or the sources are in far off places. The States explained during the review meetings that in the absence of adequate sources in the vicinity of habitations, they are finding it extremely difficult to achieve coverage within the limited resources allocated to them. It is also relevant to mention that the continuous drought for 3 years in some States from the year 2001 onwards had its impact on the achievement of coverage by the States. However, it would be the endeavour of the Department to streamline the procedure for fixation of targets with reference to the availability of resources so that there is no under achievement of physical targets by the States.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

**Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph Number 19 of Chapter I of the Report)

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.28)**

The Committee find that the aforesaid norms with regard to supply of drinking water in rural areas were fixed in 1977-78. They also note that in the guidelines there is a provision for relaxation of norms to provide for 55 litres per capita per day with a source within 0.5 kilometres in the plains and 50 metres elevation in the hills. They further find that the said relaxed norms were applicable in case of States where coverage of all NC and PC rural habitations have been completed. Further relaxation is subject to 10 per cent beneficiary contribution and shouldering full responsibility for O&M. The Committee would like to be informed about the names of States/UTs who are enjoying the relaxed norms.

**Reply of the Government**

The States, which have covered all NC/PC habitations, can make use of the provision for relaxation of the norms to provide for 55 lpcd with a source within 0.5 km in the plains and 50 metre elevation in the hills. As per the coverage status reported by the States based on Comprehensive Action Plan, 1999, 11 States and 3 UTs viz. Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Daman & Diu, Delhi and Chandigarh have no NC/PC habitations. However, the position in regard to availing of the relaxed norms under ARWSP is being ascertained from the aforesaid States/UTs.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

**Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph Number 23 of Chapter I of the Report)

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.29)**

The Committee in their preceding Chapter have analyzed the position of slippage of FC & PC habitations into NC habitations and had concluded that there is no clear picture available with the Union Ministry with regard to slippage of habitations. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee feel that the Government should, first of all,



ascertain the position of full coverage in different States/UTs and then only the revised norms to the States having full coverage should be applied.

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

The results of the new all India survey are being compiled and validated and the revised norms will be applicable only to such States/UTs, which are found to have no NC/PC habitations.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

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

(Please *see* Paragraph Number 23 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.40)**

The Committee find that the three programmes of the Prime Minister were initiated with the noble objective to address the problem arising out of unprecedented drought of 2002. The programme was to be implemented in two years 2003-2005 and Rs. 800 crore were earmarked for the programme. From the financial and physical achievements as reported above, the Committee find that there is a huge gap between release and expenditure reported by the State Government. Almost 70 per cent of the funds released are lying unspent with various States Governments. The Committee are constrained to note the position of expenditure reported by the States and would like the Government to explain the reasons for such a huge underspending. The Committee observe that the physical achievement in three sectors for which the programme was meant is as below:

- (i) Number of hand pumps installed around 25 per cent of the target.
- (ii) Number of traditional sources revived around 10 per cent of the target.
- (iii) Number of schools covered around 30 per cent of the target.

The Committee conclude that the position of physical achievement is worse than the financial achievement. The Committee are disappointed to note the physical and financial achievement of the programme and would like an explanation from the Government in this regard.

### Reply of the Government

The Prime Minister's programme has been finalized and the guidelines issued only in July 2003. By the time the funds were released, the time left for implementation during 2003-04 was very little. Introducing a new scheme takes time to get actually grounded at the functional level. It is also relevant to mention that 10% of the contribution in respect of PM's programme has to come from the community which also takes time in comparison to programmes run completely out of Government funds. However, the matter has been discussed in the Review Meetings held with various States wherein the State Governments have promised to achieve full targets by the end of 2004-05.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph Number 29 of Chapter I of the Report)

### Recommendation (Para No. 2.60)

The Committee note that as per the Union Government's Policy ARWSP would be replaced by Swajaldhara Scheme gradually. They also note that whereas ARWSP is applicable to each and every State and district, Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme. The Committee appreciate the fact that sustainability of drinking water resource can be ensured only when people realize that water is an economic and social good and should be treated as such. Providing drinking water free of cost has created a mindset in the rural masses that water is a social right to be provided by the Government. There is an urgent need to change the mindset of the people. However, there are certain concerns as indicated below to be addressed before ARWSP is replaced by Swajaldhara:

- (i) as has been highlighted in the previous chapters, the position of NC habitations is not clear with the Government. Unless the results of the recent survey being undertaken by the various States are analysed, the clear picture with regard to NC and PC habitations would not emerge;
- (ii) during Tenth Plan, Rs. 24,800 crore have already been earmarked under ARWSP, but how the Government would ensure utilisation of resources is not clear;

- (iii) since Swajaldhara scheme is a demand driven scheme, how the Government would address the problems with regard to accessibility, availability, sustainability and quality etc. especially for the States/Districts which are not up to the mark and could not be motivated to come forward with the projects;
- (iv) in case ARWSP is phased out, how the Government would achieve the objective of full coverage is not clear;
- (v) the position of implementation of Swajaldhara is also not very encouraging. Excepting Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu, none of the States show completion of even a single project taken up under the scheme;
- (vi) as per Government's reply, there is no problem of community contribution under Swajaldhara. However, Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme and hence, the projects are demanded from areas where people have the mindset to bear the cost of the projects and owe the responsibilities of operation and maintenance. However, since Swajaldhara is applicable to few of the districts and few areas in the country what will be the position of community contribution is not clear;
- (vii) under ARWSP some inter-sector allocation according to a fixed criteria has been made. However, Swajaldhara does not have any such prescribed weightage;
- (viii) how the Government would take care of the capital intensive complex projects costing to the tune of several lakhs of rupees under Swajaldhara is not clear;
- (ix) whether the rural masses have enough resources and are ready to bear the cost of drinking water from a distant source to the village entry point is not clear as per the replies of the Government.

In view of the aforesaid concerns, the Committee feel that a hurried approach to switch over to Swajaldhara mode will not be prudent. A move with caution and introspection is necessary. A demand driven approach by a community calls for education, proper appraisal of the needs and clear cut understanding with sufficient alertness and eagerness to shoulder the responsibilities matched by adequate financial support. That Swajaldhara initiative has not received wider acclaim

from many areas shows that proper endeavour is yet to come and as such making haste to replace ARWSP with this initiative could be fatal. Too much haste in reforms is not prudent. The Government should wait and watch before arriving at any final conclusion. The Committee would, therefore, like that before taking any action to replace ARWSP by the demand driven scheme of Swajaldhara, all the issues referred to above should be addressed carefully and after interacting with the State Governments and Gram Panchayats and thereby people at large, the Government should carefully draft the guidelines of Swajaldhara. The Committee should be kept informed about the steps taken.

The Committee are also of the opinion that a streamlined monitoring mechanism should be in place so that the implementing agencies of Swajaldhara Projects can be made accountable. Moreover, data should be maintained regarding the number of DWSCs constituted in the various States of the country, the number of projects implemented by them, the amount of fund at their disposal, among other things. The Committee feel that adopting a strict vigilance and monitoring mechanism on the part of the States/Union Government would go a long way in proper implementation of the projects while also ensuring that community contribution is optimally utilized without any risk of its squandering.

### **Reply of the Government**

The issues involved in extension of reform principles to cover the entire sector were discussed in a two-day conference-cum-workshop of State Secretaries held at New Delhi on 22-23rd November, 2004. The main recommendations of the aforesaid conference-cum-workshop are as under:—

1. Almost all States felt that, rural drinking water supply and sanitation schemes should be implemented and managed by Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs). However, the transfer need not be done in a hurry. More time may be required by Panchayats to accept the transfer. Transfer of water supply schemes should be a gradual and step-by-step process.
2. To facilitate transfer of Rural Water Supply (RWS) schemes to PRIs, Legislative framework may be strengthened by incorporating suitable provisions in the Panchayati Raj Acts and Bye-Laws framed thereunder, so that PRIs manage

rural water supply schemes as their Constitutional and statutory duty.

3. Capacity development of PRIs be undertaken on large-scale. State representatives felt that Swajaldhara was started hurriedly without taking up the IEC activities, which is prerequisite for the success of any participatory community based programme. The concept of Communication and Capacity Development Unit (CCDU) should have been introduced earlier.
4. CCDUs can play an effective role in facilitating transfer of RWS schemes to PRIs. Establishment of CCDUs is a step in the right direction. They should be the nodal point for capacity development of PRIs to manage RWS schemes and building the enabling environment for the purpose. They should also codify the best practices and success stories.
5. Multiplicity of schemes and funding pattern should be avoided. Some States (M.P. and Arunachal Pradesh) suggested that schemes should be transferred to Gram Panchayats after coverage with 40 lpcd supply level is achieved. There should not be any community contribution in NC coverage upto 40 lpcd supply level and quality schemes. Other States like Andhra Pradesh felt that principle of 'no community contribution' should be applied only for providing 10 lpcd water in water scarcity areas where relief work is undertaken under drought relief works. Most States felt that the principle of community contribution towards capital cost of schemes could be introduced without being dogmatic or rigid about 10% community contribution.
6. Once a habitation is covered with 40 lpcd level, the assets should be transferred to PRIs for O&M. For subsequent schemes for augmenting supply level above 40 lpcd or restoring 40 lpcd level of a "slipped-back" habitation, community contribution in capital cost should be mandatory.
7. Source-Strengthening measures, Rain Water Harvesting and recharge of ground water be made an integral part of the coverage scheme.
8. Implementation of protection of Drinking Water Sources Bill and Ground Water Exploitation Bill should be non-negotiable principle of reforms. Central assistance to be contingent on this.

9. Earmarking of funds by Government of India for undertaking water quality schemes.
10. Implementation of Water Quality schemes in project mode as was being done earlier through the Sub-Mission.

The aforesaid recommendations of the conference-cum-workshop and the suggestions of the Committee would be kept in view when final decision in the matter of transformation of ARWSP into a reforms oriented programme is taken by the Union Government.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III, dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

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

(Please see Para No. 32 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.98)**

The Committee in their respective reports had repeatedly been recommending to the Government to give topmost priority to provide drinking water to schools in rural areas. In spite of that, the physical achievement of the programme indicate that serious attention has not been paid towards this programme. It is really a matter of concern that even after more than five decades of planned development, provision of drinking water to schools is a distant dream. The Committee are really disturbed to note the position of coverage of schools in various States. In several States, the coverage has been indicated as 0 per cent. While appreciating the fact that the responsibility of implementation of ARWSP and of school coverage is with the State Governments, the Committee feel that adequate efforts to sensitize the various State Governments about the urgency of providing drinking water to schools are not being made by the Union Government. The Committee would like the Department to coordinate with other Ministries/Departments involved in this regard as well as the respective Departments of various State Governments so that all the schools can be covered within a stipulated time frame. The Committee further find that the Seventh all-India Educational Survey has been completed and the results are being compiled by the NCERT. The Committee would like to be apprised of the results when available. Besides, they would also like that the future planning to be made with regard to providing drinking water to rural schools should be made according to the recent data that would be made available as

per the Seventh all-India Educational Survey. The Committee in their earlier Reports on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) [refer para 3.60 to 46th Report and para 25 of 52nd Report, 13th Lok Sabha] had recommended that under the sector reform project or Swajaldhara programme, guidelines should be made a little flexible regarding school coverage. Provision should be made so that the 10 per cent of beneficiary funds could be contributed from the MPLAD funds. As per the action taken reply, the Government could not agree to the recommendation on the plea that community is an essential ingredient in the successful implementation, operation and maintenance of rural water supply schemes, hence Swajaldhara guidelines provide for 10 per cent contribution by the community. The Committee, while taking up the issue again would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation and again emphasize that school coverage should not be treated at par with coverage of habitations as per normal programme. So far as 10 per cent community contribution is concerned, as a special case for school coverage, Swajaldhara guideline should be made flexible so that 10 per cent community contribution could be provided from MPLAD funds.

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

Provision of drinking water and sanitation facilities in all rural schools is targeted by the end of the Tenth Plan. However, Government of India has been impressing upon the States to draw up a time-bound Action Plan in this regard and ensure attainment of the target ahead of the deadline, preferably by 31.3.2006. A coordination panel under the chairmanship of Secretary, Department of Drinking Water Supply has also been set up to monitor progress in this regard. The Department has also prepared a concept paper on School Sanitation and Hygiene Education, which includes, *inter alia*, the drinking water supply component and has forwarded the same to the Planning Commission with request for additional funding from the Education Cess levied in current year's budget. Members of Parliament can also utilize funds from MPLADS for financing schemes for providing drinking water in rural schools.

The results of Seventh All India Educational Survey have not yet been made available. AD.O. letter in this regard has also been sent by Minister (RD) to Minister (HRD).

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III,  
dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 38 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.99)**

On the issue to ensure drinking water in privately managed schools, the Committee in their earlier Report had recommended that Government aided schools should also be brought under the purview of Government school coverage programme (refer Para 3.60 of 46th Report, 13th Lok Sabha). The Government in their action taken reply had stated that it is responsibility of private management to provide drinking water in privately managed schools. The Committee while examining the action taken reply had desired to be apprised about the overall position of drinking water in such Government aided schools in order to assess position in the right perspective. The Committee would like to be apprised about the specific steps taken by the Department with regard to coverage of privately managed schools.

In this context, the Committee would like to recommend that all these categories of schools, *viz.*, Government schools, Government-aided and recognized schools and private schools should be covered under the rural drinking water supply programme, so that the supply of potable drinking water can be made available to each and every school of the country thereby ensuring health and well-being of school children.

Further, the Committee feel that the provision of potable drinking water should be extended to local primary health centres and dispensaries thus benefiting a large number of people.

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

While the Government is taking all steps to see that all Government schools get covered with the facility of drinking water supply by the year 2005-06, there is no proposal to extend the facility to private schools. Private schools generally charge fees from the students and it is therefore incumbent upon them to provide basic facilities like drinking water supply in the schools run by them.



Regarding potable drinking water supply to local primary health centres and dispensaries, it is presumed that drinking water supply is part of the infrastructure to be provided to these Centres as no request in this regard has been received from Ministry of Health & Family Welfare. The factual position is being ascertained from the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III,  
dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

**Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Para No. 38 of Chapter I of the Report)

## CHAPTER V

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

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.17)**

The Committee in their earlier Reports on Demands for Grants had expressed their concern over the dichotomy in the data with regard to accessibility and availability of drinking water. The Committee have been informed that the Government is commissioning a survey to analyze the position with regard to slippage of habitations from FC to PC and PC to NC categories. They note that the survey results could be received from 24 States/UTs. Further, they also note that after the survey results are received, the same would be re-evaluated through an independent evaluator. The Committee find that State/UT Governments are taking long time in finalization of the survey. They are unable to comprehend how planning on the part of the Government is made without having a clear picture of the slippage of habitations thereby indicating the actual position with regard to availability of drinking water to rural masses. In this scenario, the Committee feel that there should be some inbuilt mechanism in the monitoring system of the Government to know about the position of slippage of targets at a regular interval and the same should be indicated every year in the Performance Budget.

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

A mechanism for monitoring the slippage of habitations on quarterly basis is being worked out in consultation with the State Governments.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No. H-11011/2/2004-TM III,  
dated 14.12.2004 (Department of Drinking Water Supply)]

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

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

NEW DELHI;  
19 March, 2005  

---

28 Phalgun, 1926 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,  
Chairman,  
Standing Committee on  
Rural Development.

## APPENDIX I

### STATUS OF SECTOR REFORM PROJECT (AS ON 30.11.2004)

(Rs. in Lakhs)

Sl.No.	Name of the district	Estimated cost of schemes	Total Gol released	Community Contribution	Interest	Total Available Fund	Reported Expenditure	Total No. of Schemes	Schemes Completed	Atmarpan by Community
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	Chittoor	3700.03	2244.00	308.44	132.57	2685.01	2684.27	1641	1209	646
2.	Khammam	3753.00	3403.66	485.95	105.34	3394.95	3746.72	1601	1600	1600
3.	Nalgonda	4000.00	3581.89	442.40	148.54	4172.83	2848.04	965	640	294
4.	Nellore	3420.00	2244.00	237.00	100.00	2581.00	2079.03	394	320	320
5.	Prakasam	4000.00	3366.00	404.62	100.60	3871.22	3305.64	504	496	496
6.	Guntur	4000.00	3693.45	401.42	56.96	4151.83	3493.10	381	199	199
7.	East Godavari	2749.46	1113.56	257.29	8.94	1379.79	1378.80	176	67	67
8.	Lohit	281.20	252.45	25.76	27.42	305.63	281.20	79	41	41
9.	West Siang	449.45	428.17	34.09	15.50	477.76	442.27	102	28	21
10.	Jorhat	569.00	472.34	38.44	14.64	525.42	394.64	871	863	863
11.	Kamrup	600.00	422.52	39.50	12.90	474.92	460.36	1312	719	712
12.	Sonitpur	465.62	331.04	37.60	12.45	381.09	377.30	2244	2219	2219
13.	Vaishali	1300.00	1122.00	107.88	99.65	1329.53	1024.37	6403	4869	4869
14.	Durg	1301.00	1122.00	113.65	51.73	1287.38	1268.51	1293	1267	1267
15.	Mehsana	4000.00	3708.00	607.79	32.14	4347.93	4371.00	320	320	320
16.	Rajkot	3463.00	3043.23	328.00	65.00	3436.23	2702.00	272	267	97
17.	Surat	4000.00	3366.00	306.00	10.37	3682.37	3620.00	343	262	0
18.	Karnal	1037.49	844.71	89.28	21.79	955.78	756.12	93	55	55
19.	Yamuna Nagar	601.41	546.44	54.31	12.57	613.32	493.14	252	233	233
20.	Simour	784.00	607.36	78.46	38.92	724.74	643.77	193	106	0
21.	Srinagar	1690.10	1384.07	84.27	51.89	1520.23	955.70	98	30	30

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
22.	Udhampur	834.56	813.92	61.84	28.28	904.04	746.07	123	93	81
23.	Dhanbad	228.23	1122.00	20.31	65.53	1207.84	130.41	141	5	5
24.	Bellary	1312.00	1122.00	244.12	135.18	1501.30	1203.97	710	677	609
25.	Mangalore	3900.00	3660.08	456.08	76.80	4192.96	2509.01	2243	1609	1387
26.	Mysore	3997.89	3554.00	328.03	118.16	4000.19	3020.75	1124	1094	1094
27.	Kasaragod	2701.00	2742.88	198.87	110.16	3051.91	1759.94	255	255	255
28.	Kollam	2196.00	2244.00	134.06	114.33	2492.39	1283.71	148	120	120
29.	Gwalior	543.00	821.29	44.68	70.57	936.54	587.19	968	828	828
30.	Hoshangabad	1385.23	1122.00	138.52	99.76	1360.28	1217.01	1104	1057	1047
31.	Narsinghpur	1247.00	1122.00	199.64	190.16	1511.80	1509.83	1139	982	952
32.	Raisen	1762.41	1269.01	149.63	141.68	1560.32	1519.39	768	576	576
33.	Sehore	685.11	503.44	66.22	30.75	600.41	522.58	244	163	1
34.	Amravati	1478.90	1184.10	104.25	57.54	1345.89	1223.00	891	481	481
35.	Dhule	2200.00	1763.43	195.47	106.33	2065.23	1528.00	191	132	8
36.	Nanded	3605.53	3477.00	343.00	79.00	3899.00	2666.28	359	86	26
37.	Raigad	3743.00	3439.14	379.00	87.00	3905.14	2687.00	340	146	0
38.	Ri-Bhol	307.07	272.10	29.45	5.52	307.07	307.07	111	111	111
39.	Sarchhip	244.15	223.35	20.80	0.00	244.15	223.35	11	11	11
40.	Dimapur	594.83	333.22	20.29	8.83	362.34	342.41	7	4	4
41.	Balasore	1800.00	1572.00	160.30	106.39	1838.69	1822.00	2286	2286	2286
42.	Ganjam	2415.00	2244.00	239.62	59.88	2543.50	2543.50	1340	1340	1340
43.	Sundergarh	2788.40	2244.00	112.69	132.36	2489.05	2487.01	2598	2502	2502
44.	Bhatinda	581.28	210.28	16.64	5.39	232.31	185.85	22	0	0
45.	Moga*	273.45	344.00	19.63	0.99	364.62	117.14	23	0	0
46.	Muktsar	611.62	872.41	18.37	56.46	947.24	136.57	31	0	0
47.	Alwar	2422.49	2319.00	357.07	61.88	2737.95	1982.61	512	205	135
48.	Rajsamand	396.16	552.00	32.25	22.39	606.64	277.34	54	25	12
49.	Jaipur*	3209.00	2774.00	326.39	51.12	3151.51	2930.55	391	218	126

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
50.	Sikkar	1470.00	1116.62	109.69	14.21	1240.52	920.71	143	10	4
51.	Sikkim South	0.00	363.02	7.97	0.00	370.99	0.00	0	0	0
52.	Sikkim West	0.00	244.95	0.00	0.00	244.95	0.00	0	0	0
53.	Coimbatore	3988.00	3366.00	315.00	134.00	3815.00	3844.00	1650	1650	1650
54.	Cuddalore	4000.00	3366.00	411.28	99.05	3876.33	3823.69	2355	2355	2355
55.	Perambalur	3472.61	2934.30	315.40	139.50	3389.20	3371.90	1184	1184	1184
56.	Vellore	3934.00	3701.20	370.10	38.36	4109.88	3934.00	3411	3411	3411
57.	Kancheepuram	3162.93	2855.99	297.22	8.83	3162.04	2015.50	536	536	536
58.	Virudhunagar	2880.00	2764.32	288.00	10.08	3062.40	1888.86	505	505	505
59.	West Tripura	2481.29	2310.21	209.86	25.14	2545.21	2164.71	15061	14710	14710
60.	Agra	1416.77	897.83	109.24	101.38	1108.45	1044.16	4685	3285	3285
61.	Chandauli	1600.67	1286.63	224.83	56.46	1567.92	1341.00	4222	2862	2862
62.	Lucknow	1650.67	1122.00	103.35	112.53	1337.88	1201.48	4061	4017	4017
63.	Mirzapur	1160.96	862.41	79.48	47.17	989.06	872.42	1015	946	946
64.	Sonebhadra	1462.42	1387.69	166.16	58.43	1612.28	1239.30	6012	5705	5705
65.	Midnapur	2090.50	1847.79	236.45	60.13	2144.37	1434.13	1847	1267	1267
66.	N. 24 Parganas	1982.97	1749.82	199.16	42.63	1991.61	1638.62	2305	2011	2011
67.	Haridwar	2368.00	1122.00	91.45	110.89	1324.34	1065.62	106	8	8
	Total	132837.86	114516.32	12434.01	4201.15	131151.48	106595.92	86769	75278	72802

\*Rs. 247.57 lakh has been transferred from Muktsar to Moga.

\*Rs. 530.00 lakh has been transferred from Rajsamand to Jaipur.

\*Rs. 75.00 lakh has been transferred from Sikar to Alwar.

## APPENDIX II

### STATE-WISE STATUS OF SWAJALDHARA SCHEME (2002-03)

As on 3.12.2004

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	Name of States	Financial									Physical	
		Project Outlay	GOI share	1st instal.	2nd instal.	Com. Contribut.	Interest received	Total Available Fund	Exp. Upto date	% of exp.	Total No. Schemes	Completed Schemes
1.	Andhra Pradesh	9082.78	7951.43	4002.56	1667.97	1102.42	10.99	6783.94	4130.22	60.88	1650	608
2.	Assam	831.78	757.59	370.12	0.00	74.21	1.42	445.75	176.64	39.63	53	0
3.	Chhattisgarh	283.10	263.00	131.50	0.00	20.79	0.00	152.29	105.83	69.49	102	43
4.	DNH	9.98	9.48	4.74	0.00	0.50	0.00	5.24	0.00	0.00	1	0
5.	Gujarat	184.42	167.97	83.99	78.55	16.05	0.00	178.59	92.92	52.03	30	0
6.	Haryana	24.55	21.95	10.98	0.00	2.60	0.00	13.58	0.00	0.00	2	0
7.	Himachal Pradesh	714.66	652.78	335.79	0.00	61.49	0.00	397.28	57.66	14.51	471	22
8.	Karnataka	246.09	218.15	109.07	9.24	28.63	0.11	147.05	39.14	26.62	55	0
9.	Kerala	616.33	535.71	272.84	0.00	80.06	0.00	352.90	106.24	30.11	116	0
10.	Madhya Pradesh	563.85	529.01	264.49	0.00	57.81	0.16	322.46	202.67	62.85	87	12
11.	Maharashtra	8261.52	7427.66	3722.09	121.77	832.73	1.42	4678.01	2945.26	62.96	782	0
12.	Orissa	725.39	671.68	335.84	0.00	53.57	0.00	389.41	95.58	24.54	287	9
13.	Rajasthan	412.52	374.52	187.26	187.26	38.81	0.00	413.33	205.68	49.76	35	10
14.	Tamil Nadu	1521.08	1395.00	702.04	692.59	121.80	1.35	1517.78	838.82	55.27	389	387
15.	Uttar Pradesh	1236.79	1132.05	565.98	3.44	104.77	0.19	674.38	3.10	0.46	655	0
16.	West Bengal	52.19	47.76	23.88	0.00	4.43	0.00	28.31	0.00	0.00	8	0
Total		24767.01	22155.74	11123.17	2760.82	2600.67	15.64	16500.30	8999.76	54.54	4723	1091

Note: It has been reported by the State Government that 10 schemes pertaining to Srikakulam District of Andhra Pradesh and 1 scheme of cachar district of Assam have not been grounded. Hence these schemes have been deleted from total 4734 schemes approved at a total cost of Rs. 24799.76 Lakh with GoI share of Rs. 22185.55 Lakh.

### APPENDIX III

#### STATE-WISE STATUS OF SWAJALDHARA SCHEME (2003-04) As on 3.12.2004

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl.No.	Name of the State	Financial							Physical		
		Allocation	Ist Instalment (Rs. in lakh)	2nd instalment released	Community Contribution	Interest Accrued	Total Available Fund	Expenditure incurred	% age	No. of Schemes taken up	No. of Schemes completed
1.	Tamil Nadu	673.21	336.60	336.60	67.11	0.02	740.33	507.82	68.59	445	442
2.	Andhra Pradesh	1616.00	808.00	0.00	182.70	1.70	994.10	564.60	56.80	360	127
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	447.41	223.71	0.00	44.74	0.00	268.45	0.00	0.00	181	69
4.	Assam	754.59	377.30	0.00	73.66	0.06	451.02	238.38	52.85	369	0
5.	DNH	8.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
6.	Gujarat	765.56	382.78	382.78	0.00	0.00	765.56	600.29	568.65	347	21
7.	Haryana	234.23	117.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	117.12	0.00	0.00	0	0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	680.20	340.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	340.11	0.00	0.00	0	0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	1497.90	748.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	748.95	0.00	0.00	0	0
10.	Jharkhand	356.02	178.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	178.01	0.00	0.00	0	0
11.	Karnataka	1397.03	698.52	55.25	31.38	0.39	785.54	175.80	22.38	0	0
12.	Kerala	504.03	252.02	0.00	16.84	0.00	268.86	157.01	58.40	33	2
13.	Madhya Pradesh	840.54	420.27	27.00	101.01	1.03	549.31	250.94	45.68	566	75
14.	Maharashtra	2172.13	1086.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	1086.07	113.06	10.41	0	0
15.	Nagaland	130.22	65.11	0.00	19.81	0.00	84.92	57.80	68.06	9	0
16.	Orissa	733.28	366.64	6.39	0.00	0.00	373.03	187.60	50.29	231	46
17.	Punjab	313.79	156.89	0.00	31.99	0.00	188.88	11.33	6.00	0	0
18.	Rajasthan	2191.00	1095.50	0.00	354.67	0.00	1450.17	869.78	59.98	1921	410
19.	Tripura	156.93	78.47	25.89	0.00	0.00	104.36	0.00	0.00	0	0
20.	Uttar Pradesh	1532.91	766.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	766.46	0.00	0.00	0	0
21.	Uttaranchal	364.00	182.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	182.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
22.	West Bengal	943.00	471.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	471.50	0.00	0.00	0	0
Total		18311.98	9156.03	833.91	923.91	3.20	10918.75	3734.41	34.20	4462	1192

**APPENDIX IV**

**COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2004-2005)**

**EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE ELEVENTH SITTING OF  
THE COMMITTEE HELD ON FRIDAY, THE 4 MARCH, 2005**

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1630 hrs. in Committee Room 'D', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

**MEMBERS**

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Mohan Jena
3. Shri Dawa Narbula
4. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
5. Shri Mohan Singh
6. Shri Bagun Sumbrai

*Rajya Sabha*

7. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
8. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
9. Shri Penumalli Madhu
10. Dr. Chandan Mitra
11. Dr. Faguni Ram
12. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

**Secretariat**

1. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Shri A.K. Shah — *Assistant Director*



2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

3. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration Memorandum No. 4 along with the draft action taken report on Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply. After deliberations, the Committee adopted the report without any modification.

4. \*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

5. The Committee then authorized the chairman to finalise the said draft action taken reports on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Ministry/Department and to present the same to Parliament.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

---

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

## APPENDIX V

[Vide Para 4 of the Introduction]

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

I. Total Number of recommendations	31
II. Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government Para Nos. 2.15, 2.16, 2.18, 2.25, 2.32, 2.33, 2.59, 2.79, 2.80, 2.81, 2.82, 2.90, 2.104, 2.109, 2.110, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11	19
Percentage to the Total recommendations	(61.29%)
III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies Para Nos. 2.30, 2.39 and 2.91	3
Percentage to the Total recommendations	(9.68%)
IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee Para Nos. 2.19, 2.24, 2.28, 2.29, 2.40, 2.60, 2.98 and 2.99	8
Percentage to the Total recommendations	(25.80%)
V. Recommendation in respect of which final reply of the Government is still awaited Para No. 2.17	1
Percentage to the Total recommendations	(3.23%)