

3

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2009-2010)**

FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA

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

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2009-2010)**

THIRD REPORT



सत्यमेव जयते

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

THIRD REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2009-2010)

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2009-2010)

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 17 December, 2009
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 17 December, 2009*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

December, 2009/Agrahayana, 1931 (Saka)

CRD No. 3

Price : Rs. 100.00

© 2009 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Thirteenth Edition) and printed by National Printers, New Delhi-110028.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(v)
INTRODUCTION	(vii)
ABBREVIATIONS	(ix)

REPORT

CHAPTER I	Introductory	1
	Importance of Drinking water and sanitation	1
CHAPTER II	Status of the implementation of the recommendations made by The Committee in the Thirty-Seventh Report under direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha'	4
CHAPTER III	Overall Analysis	6
	A. Evolution of Centrally Sponsored Scheme (ARWSP) now NRDWP	6
	B. Major focus of the Department in Revised Guidelines	6
	C. Changes incorporated consequent upon enforcement of Revised Guidelines	7
	D. General Analysis	9
	(i) Allocation <i>vis-à-vis</i> utilization during 10th plan and 11th plan so far	9
	(ii) Utilisation of funds during 10th Plan	10
	(iii) Utilisation of funds during 11th Plan and urgency for higher funds	11
	(iv) Use of funds in Annual Plans	12
CHAPTER IV	Major issues	15
	A. Current scenario on drinking water and sanitation	15
	B. Policy Interventions	20

(i)

C.	Goals for Eleventh Plan Period	22
D.	Performance under Bharat Nirmam	24
E.	Unspent Balances	25
F.	Need for tackling water quality	33
G.	Modified ARWSP on drinking water	37
CHAPTER V	Schemes-wise Analysis	43
A.	ARWSP/NRDWP	43
(i)	Project Planning & Implementation	43
(ii)	Monitoring & Review	46
(iii)	World Bank funded drinking water projects	48
B.	Total Sanitation Campaign	49
(i)	Investment made in rural sanitation sector	49
(ii)	Evolution of schemes	50
(iii)	Components of TSC	51
(iv)	Unit cost of individual household toilets	51
(v)	Revision in funding pattern for Community Sanitary complexes	51
(vi)	Financial & Physical performance	51
(vii)	Some major issues	52
(a)	Under performance in all components	52
(b)	Need for generation of awareness for use of toilets in rural areas as also in schools	53
(c)	Need for enhancing the cost of Individual Household Latrines (IHHL) and Anganwadis and school toilets	54
(d)	Convergence of sanitation work under NREGA works and linking health with sanitation	54
(e)	Proper Assessment of Nirmal Gram Puraskar	55
C.	Jalmani-stand alone water purification system	58

APPENDICES

I. Financial Requirement – Summary of Demands for Grants	61
II. State-wise allocation and release of funds under revised sub-mission programme on water quality during 2006-2007 and 2007-2008	63
III. Physical progress under TSC during 2007-2008	64
IV. Physical progress under TSC during 2008-2009	66
V. Extracts of the Minutes of the second sitting of the Committee held on 6 October, 2009	68
VI. Extracts of the Minutes of the sixth sitting of the Committee held on 10 November, 2009	71
VII. Extracts of the Minutes of the seventh sitting of the Committee held on 14 December, 2009	74
VIII. Statement of Recommendations/Observations	76

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2009-2010)

Smt. Sumitra Mahajan — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Pulin Bihari Baske
3. Shri Kunvarjibhai Mohanbhai Bavalia
4. Shri Sanjay Dhotre
5. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
6. Shri Manikrao Hodlya Gavit
7. Shri H.D. Kumaraswamy
8. Shri Raghuvir Singh Meena
9. Shri Sidhant Mohapatra
10. Shri Gobinda Chandra Naskar
11. Shri Rakesh Pandey
12. Shri P.L. Punia
13. Shri A. Venkatarami Reddy
14. Shri Jagdish Sharma
15. Shri Navjot Singh Sidhu
16. Shri Jagdanand Singh
17. Dr. Sanjay Singh
18. Shri Makansingh Solanki
19. Shri Kodikkunnil Suresh
20. Shrimati Usha Verma
21. Shri Ramesh Vishwanath Katti

Rajya Sabha

22. Shri Ganga Charan
23. Vacant*
24. Shri Silvius Condpan
25. Shrimati Kanimozhi
26. Dr. Ram Prakash
27. Shri P.R. Rajan
28. Shri Arjun Singh
29. Shri Bhagwati Singh
30. Shrimati Maya Singh
31. Miss Anusuiya Uikey

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri V.R. Ramesh — *Director*
3. Shri A.K. Shah — *Additional Director*

* Consequent upon the resignation of Shri Ajay Singh Chautala from the membership of Rajya Sabha *w.e.f.* 3rd November, 2009 *vide* Notification No. RS. 10/2009-T dated 6 November, 2009.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2009-2010) having been authorized by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Third Report on Demands for Grants (2009-2010) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development).

2. Demands for Grants have been examined by the Committee under Rule 331E (1) (a) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply of the Ministry of Rural Development on 10 November, 2009.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 14 December, 2009.

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

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

NEW DELHI,
16 December, 2009

25 Agrahayana, 1931 (Saka)

SUMITRA MAHAJAN,
Chairperson,
Standing Committee on Rural Development.

ABBREVIATIONS

ACA	-	Additional Central Assistance
ARWSP	-	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme
BE	-	Budget Estimates
CRSP	-	Central Rural Sanitation Programme
DEA	-	Department of Economic Affairs
DLM	-	District Level Monitors
DWSC	-	District Water and Sanitation Committee
DWS	-	Drinking Water Supply
IEC	-	Information Education and Communication
IMIS	-	Integrated Management Information System
IHHL	-	Individual Household Latrines
MIS	-	Management Information System
MPR	-	Monthly Progress Report
NDWM	-	National Drinking Water Mission
NGO	-	Non-Governmental Organisation
NHRDP	-	National Human Resource Development Programme
NRDWP	-	National Rural Drinking Water Programme
O&M	-	Operation and Maintenance
PIA	-	Project Implementing Agency
PRIs	-	Panchayati Raj Institutions
PWS	-	Piped Water Supply
R&D	-	Research and Development
RE	-	Revised Estimates
RGNDWM	-	Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission
TSC	-	Total Sanitation Campaign
UN	-	United Nations
UNICEF	-	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
UT	-	Union Territory

REPORT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

Importance of drinking water and sanitation

Provisioning of safe drinking water is the basic necessity. It is a prime natural resource. Supplying adequate and potable water to the global population is a gigantic task in view of growing industrial and domestic needs. The alarming threat of climate change and global warming has added to the problem of water supply.

1.2 According to UN Report on World Water Development released in March, 2006 currently 1.1 billion people lack access to safe drinking water and 2.6 billion are deprived of basic sanitation facilities in the world. On availability of water, India is becoming one of the most underdeveloped countries in the world. With 16% of world population and 2.45% of world's land resources India has only 1.5% of world's fresh water resources. Further, the per capita fresh water availability of 5,177 cubic meter in the country in 1951 during the last fifty years, has declined to 1,820 cubic meter in 2001. It is feared that it may further deteriorate to 1,341 cubic metre by 2025 *i.e.* after fifteen years from now. In view of the above the subject of availability of drinking water has to be taken up with a sense of urgency.

1.3 The Department of Drinking Water Supply is under Ministry of Rural Development entrusted with the task to help the States in their endeavour to provide safe drinking water and sanitation in rural areas in the country.

Role of the Department of Drinking Water Supply

1.4 To ensure that all aspects of rural water supply and sanitation are adequately addressed, the Department of Drinking Water Supply

inter-alia looks after the following:—

- (i) Rural Water Supply (subject to overall national perspective of water planning and coordination assigned to Ministry and Water Resources);
- (ii) Rural Sanitation, sewage, drainage;
- (iii) Public cooperation with voluntary agencies on rural water supply, sewage, drainage and sanitation in rural areas;
- (iv) Coordination with respect to matters relating to drinking water supply projects and issues which cover both urban and rural areas.

Rural Water Supply is a State subject and as such State Governments are primarily responsible for providing drinking water to the rural habitations in the country. The Department of Drinking Water Supply supplements the efforts made by the States by providing financial and technical assistance under the Centrally Sponsored Schemes.

Schemes for Drinking water and sanitation

1.5 The Department of Drinking Water Supply administers two major Centrally Sponsored Schemes *viz.*, (a) National Rural Drinking Water Programme to assist the States in their endeavour to provide safe drinking water in the rural areas of the country and (b) the Total Sanitation Campaign aimed at achieving 100 per cent rural sanitation coverage.

Rural drinking water is one of the components of Bharat Nirman launched in 2005-2006 for implementation in 4 years for building rural infrastructure. During Bharat Nirman period (2005-06 to 2008-09), 55,067 uncovered and about 3.31 lakh slipped-back habitations were to be covered with provision of drinking water facilities. In addition, 2.17 lakh quality-affected habitations were to be addressed for water quality problems. As reported by the States by the March, 2009, 54,430 uncovered and 3.54 lakh slipped back habitations have been covered with provision of drinking water facility. In about 36,800 quality-affected habitations, potable water is being supplied and in other 1.67 lakh quality-affected habitations, projects have been approved and are at different stages of implementation.

1.6 The detailed Demands for Grants (2009-2010) under Demand No. 82 of the Ministry were laid in Lok Sabha on 10th July, 2009 making a provision of Rs. 9302.84 crore.

1.7 In the present Report, the Committee have examined the implementation of the schemes of drinking water and sanitation and have dealt with related issues as indicated in the aforesaid para in the context of overall budgetary allocation made in the Demands for Grants for the year 2009-10.

CHAPTER II

STATUS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE COMMITTEE IN THE THIRTY-SEVENTH REPORT UNDER DIRECTION 73A OF THE 'DIRECTIONS BY THE SPEAKER', LOK SABHA

2.1 The Thirty-Seventh Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development on Demands for Grants (2008-09) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply was presented to Lok Sabha on 21st April, 2008. The statement with regard to this Report had fallen due on 21st October, 2008. However, the statement on the said Report was made by Hon'ble Minister for Rural Development in Lok Sabha on 26 February, 2009.

2.2 During Fourteenth Lok Sabha, the Committee had presented five original Reports and five Action taken Reports on Demands for Grants of the Department of Drinking Water Supply. As per direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, the Minister concerned shall make once in six months, a statement in the House regarding the status of implementation of recommendations contained in Reports (including those Reports which are on Demands for Grants) of Departmentally Related Standing Committees of Lok Sabha with regard to his Ministry. These Statements have already been laid on the Table of the House.

2.3 On being asked the position of how the Department reviews implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee in their earlier Reports at regular intervals with the States and Union territories and how the Department deals with the implementation of recommendations categorized as 'interim' in the aforesaid Reports of the Committee, the Ministry in a written note stated as under:—

“The Department has reviewed implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee from time to time with States and the relevant Departments. Directions of the Committee are also noted and duly mentioned in the notes for revision of the Programme, such as notes for the Expenditure Finance Committee, etc. The Department will continue to review the implementation of all the recommendations in future also, including those listed as “interim”.”

2.4 The Committee note with dismay that Department of Drinking Water Supply has not been able to comply with the direction 73A of 'Directions by the Speaker'. The Statement by the Minister on the Thirty-Seventh Report of the Committee (2008-09) was required to be made by 21 October, 2008 as per the provisions of this Direction. However, the statement was made only on 26 February, 2009. In Committee's opinion this reflects lack of promptness on the part of Department of Drinking Water Supply on the one hand and retards the consequent action on various recommendations on the other. The Committee recommend that in future it should be ensured that the Statements under Direction 73 A is made within the prescribed time limit.

CHAPTER III

OVERALL ANALYSIS

A. Evolution of Centrally Sponsored Scheme ARWSP now National Rural Drinking Water Programme (NRDWP):

Rural drinking water is a State subject and has been included in the Eleventh Schedule of the Constitution among the subjects that may be entrusted to Panchayats by the States. Taking into account the magnitude of the problem and to accelerate the pace of coverage of problem villages, the Government of India introduced the Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) in 1972-73 to assist States and UTs with 100 per cent grants-in-aid to implement drinking water supply schemes in such villages.

3.2 The entire programme was given a Mission approach when the Technology Mission on Drinking Water Management, called the National Drinking Water Mission (NDWM), was introduced as one of the five Missions in social sector in 1986. NDWM was renamed as Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM) in 1991 and Department of Drinking Water Supply was created in the year 1999.

3.3 The major issues that needed attention of the Department during the Eleventh Plan Period was sustainability of water sources and system, coverage of large number of habitations, addressing water quality related problems, financing O & M cost on equitable basis etc. With this object in mind, the Department has come out with modified ARWSP as NRDWP *w.e.f.* 01.04.2009.

3.4 In order to give effect to the above issues, the Rural Water Supply Guidelines have been revised *w.e.f.* 01.04.2009.

B. Major focus of the Department in the Revised Guidelines

3.5 Under the Revised Guidelines the major focus of the Department will be on the following points;

- Move away from over dependence on single source to multiple sources through conjunctive use of surface water, groundwater and rainwater harvesting.

- Focus on ensuring sustainability in drinking water schemes and prevent slip back.
- Encourage water conservation methods including revival of traditional water bodies.
- Move forward towards achieving household level drinking water security through proper water demand and budgeting.
- Convergence of all water conservation programme at the village level.
- Focus on ensuring household level drinking water.
- Focus on ensuring household level drinking water security through preparation of village water security plans.
- Conscious move to get away from high cost treatment technologies for tackling Arsenic and Fluoride contamination to development of alternative sources in respect of arsenic and alternate sources/dilution of aquifers through rainwater harvesting in respect of tackling fluoride contamination.
- Linkage of National Rural Drinking Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance Programme with the recently approved Jalmani guidelines for implementation of Stand alone drinking water purifications systems in rural schools.

C. Changes incorporated consequent upon enforcement of Revised Guidelines

3.6 Department of Drinking Water Supply has effected the following changes in the existing ARWSP Programme:

- Awarding performance rather than non-performance of States. This is done by removing extra weightage points in the allocation criteria for the Central Govt. assistance to the States in regard to number of uncovered/partially covered habitations and water quality-affected habitations.
- The allocation criteria depends on 2001 census population figure, number of DPAP/HADP blocks. Certain percentage [10%] is allocated as incentive fund for the States as extra weightage points for those which transfer the assets created to the Panchayati Raj Institutions.

- A certain percentage *viz.*, 20% is reserved for implementing projects by the States for bringing in sustainability to drinking water schemes. This 20% is to be fully borne by the Government of India as opposed to 50% in regard to other components of the allocation.
- In order to encourage the difficult States of North-East and J&K, the fund sharing pattern for the States has been liberalized from the existing 50:50 (Centre to State) to 90:10 (Centre to State).

3.7 The Committee note that with 16 per cent of worlds' population and 2.45 per cent of worlds' land resources India has only 1.5 per cent of world's fresh water resources. The Committee are also concerned that per capita availability of water has worsened from the level of 5,177 cubic meter in 1951 to the level of 1,820 cubic meter by 2001 which may further decline to 1,341 cubic meter by 2025 *i.e.* after fifteen years from now. The Committee note that the Revised Guidelines for the modified ARWSP renamed as NRDWP envision to ensure permanent drinking water security in rural areas. However, the impending threat of climate change and global warming in Committee's opinion may also affect rural water supply. In view of the disturbing scenario, the Committee desire that the Department of Drinking Water Supply should prepare a national perspective on the issue of rural water supply in the country.

3.8 The Committee also note that under the aforesaid guidelines the norms of per capita availability of water has been replaced with ensuring drinking water security for all. In the light of declining per capita availability in coming years and in the light of impending effect of climate change and global warming the Committee would like to know as to how in the absence of per capita availability norm, the Department of Drinking Water Supply is going to achieve the aforesaid objective of ensuring permanent drinking water security in rural areas in the country. The Committee are unhappy to observe that the revised guidelines do not spell out the time-frame for achieving the objective. The Committee would like to know a categorical reply in this regard after interaction with the Ministry of Water Resources, if necessary, in order to arrive at a logical conclusion so as to have a better understanding of the subject in view of the Copenhagen Summit on climate change being held during December this year.

D. General Analysis

3.9 The Demands for Grants (2009-2010) of Department of Drinking Water Supply laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on 10th July, 2009 have made a provision of Rs. 9,302.84 crore with Plan component of Rs. 9,300 crore and Non-Plan component of Rs. 2.84 crore. This outlay is Rs. 800.94 crore higher than the budget estimate of Rs. 8,501.90 crore of the previous year and Rs. 700.57 crore higher than RE of Rs. 8,602.27 crore of previous year.

The scheme-wise provisions have been as follows:—

(Rs. in crore)

S.No.	Scheme	Amount
1.	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP)/National Rural Drinking Water Supply Programme (NRDWSP)*	8,000
2.	Total Sanitation Campaign	1,200
3.	Jalmani	100
	Total	9,300

* ARWSP has been modified as NRDWSP for the Eleventh Plan period w.e.f 01.04.2009

The details of the outlay have been given in *Appendix-I*.

(i) Allocation *vis-à-vis* utilization during 10th Plan (2002-2007) and 11th Plan so far

3.10 The Proposed Outlay, Agreed Outlay, Actual Expenditure during 10th Plan and so far during 11th Plan (2007-2012) of the Department is as under:—

(Rs. in crore)

Outlay	10th Plan (2002-2007)	11th Plan (2007-2012)
Proposed	20,748.00	-
Agreed	16,845.00	47,306
Actual	12,834.42 (Releases for NRDWSP and Expenditure for TSC)	16,077.92 (7,501.63—actual during 2007-2008) (8,576.29—actual during 2008-2009)

(ii) Utilisation of funds during Tenth Plan (2002-2007)

3.11 During the course of examination, the Committee observed that there has been big gap of about Rs. 4,000 crore between 10th Plan agreed outlay and expenditure. The proposed outlay in 10th Plan has also been drastically reduced at agreed level.

3.12 On being asked about the reasons for huge shortfall to the tune of Rs. 4,000 crore between outlay and expenditure during 10th Plan, the Department in a written reply stated as under:—

“For rural water supply, during 10th Plan Rs. 16,254.52 crore was released to States, of which the expenditure reported is Rs. 14,709.95 crore, which is 90.50%. As the ARWSP is a continuing programme, the releases made in one year are carried forward and accounted for in the next financial year, when the States report expenditure of the previous year. The Programme itself allows for upto 10% of carry-over of funds as opening balance in the next financial year to the States.”

3.13 About rural sanitation, the Department informed as under:—

“For rural sanitation, during 10th Plan Rs. 2,111 crore was released to States, of which the expenditure reported is Rs. 1,402 crore, which is 66.4%. As per the programme Guidelines, after 60% utilization is reported, next installment can be released, hence upto 40% are always available with the implementing agencies as working funds. Thus it may be noted that the gap between the agreed Plan outlay, actual release by Centre and expenditure reported by States is minimal and within the normal limits of financial propriety and respective scheme guidelines.”

3.14 The Committee while reviewing the utilization position of funds during Tenth Plan (2002-2007) and Eleventh Plan (2007-2012) in rural water supply and rural sanitation sector, find with dismay that there had been under-utilisation in both the sectors to the level of 9.50 per cent and 33.60 per cent respectively. For under-utilisation under rural water supply, the Committee find that the Department has taken the plea of 10 per cent allowable carry over of funds under the guidelines. On rural sanitation, the Committee have been informed that 40 per cent of funds are released when 60 per cent of the funds are utilized so that the projects do not suffer due to want of funds.

Thus, 40 per cent funds are always available as working funds for projects. In the Committee's opinion while such plea may be correct to some extent there has certainly been a degree of complacency on the part of the Department/States. The Committee, therefore, feel that attitudinal changes are desirable for approaching to the entire issue of utilization of funds. They, therefore, recommend that the Department should also set the targets for utilizing 60 per cent of the funds so that next installment is meaningfully utilized during that financial year itself.

(iii) Utilisation of funds during Eleventh Plan (2007-2012) and urgency for higher funds

3.15 Similarly, during 11th Plan the total expenditure during first two years is of Rs. 16,077.92 crore out of total Agreed Outlay of Rs. 47,306 crore. The Committee pointed out that for optimal utilization the expenditure should have been Rs. 18,823 crore in first two years at the rate of Rs. 9,461.5 crore annually.

3.16 On being asked whether there was any under-utilization so far during Eleventh Plan, the Department of Drinking Water Supply has stated that there was no under-utilisation yet in the Eleventh Plan giving the following figures of outlays *vis-à-vis* utilization during first two years *viz.* 2007-08 and 2008-09 of the current Plan:—

Rural water supply:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Budget Outlay	Revised Outlay	Expenditure
2007-2008	6,500	6,400	6,442.76
2008-2009	7,300	7,400	7,398.78
Total	13,800	13,800	13,841.54

Rural sanitation:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Budget Outlay	Revised Outlay	Expenditure
2007-2008	1,060	1,060	996.35
2008-2009	1,200	1,200	1,192.81
Total	2,260	2,260	2,189.16

(iv) Use of funds in Annual Plans

3.17 Budget Outlay, Revised Outlay and Actual Expenditure for 2007-2008 and Budget Outlay for 2009-2010 is as under:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Budget Outlay	Revised Outlay	Actual Expenditure
2007-2008	7,560	7,460	7,501.63
2008-2009	8,500	8,600	8,576.29
2009-2010	9,200		

3.18 The Committee observed that Budget Estimate in 2007-2008 has increased to Rs. 8,500 crore in 2008-2009 making an increase of almost Rs. 1,000 crore over the previous year. The Budget Estimate for 2009-2010 has further gone upto Rs. 9,200 crore with an increase of about Rs. 700 crore.

3.19 On being asked how the Department would plan to utilize the enhanced allocation during 2009-2010 the Department in a written note stated as under:—

“The funds made available to the Department are allocated to all States by a pre-defined criterion. Any increased allocation is thus proportionately disbursed to all States. The timely utilization of funds by States is monitored regularly with special emphasis on poor performing States to utilize the funds on time. There is no increase in the allocation for rural sanitation in 2009-10.”

3.20 During the course of evidence of the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply the issue of higher allocation of funds for the current year and beyond came up for discussion. In this connection, the Committee pointed out the need for increased fund for rural sanitation for completing the task in hand. Replying to the query of the Committee, the Secretary, Department of Drinking Water Supply clarified as under:—

“...So far as budget for Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) Programme is concerned Rs. 1,200 crore we have got for the current year. The projects under implementation are progressing well. Recently, we had reviewed, the position with Planning Commission wherein we had requested that we should get Rs. 500 crore. The reason is our Budget for Eleventh Plan is Rs. 7,816 crore and we have projects in 593 districts. The funding requirement of these

projects comes out to Rs. 17,885 crore. Out of the Central share of Rs. 11,094 crore have so far been released, Rs. 4,700 crore to States. Thus, you will visualize that there is already a shortfall of Rs. 6,300 crore and only two years are left in this Plan period. Therefore, we have urged the Planning Commission that we should get higher funds. This is very essential.”

3.21 Explaining further, the witness informed as under:—

“..... This is very essential in the light of targets we have to achieve. For instance, targets for school coverage are to be achieved by 2010 and target for ‘open-defecation free’ rural India has to be achieved by 2012. These targets can only be achieved if higher funds are allocated, enhancing the quantum of funds is very essential.”

3.22 The Secretary, DWS further added:—

“.....On coming 13th November 2009, we have a review meeting with Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission on this issue. In that meeting, we are going to take up this issue also.”

3.23 While examining the overall Budget of the Department during the last two years viz. 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, the Committee find that there is an enhancement of Rs. 1,000 crore and Rs. 700 crore during the years 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 respectively. The Committee have been informed that funds are allocated to all States by a pre-defined criterion and any increased allocation is thus disbursed to all States. The Committee are unable to comprehend from the cryptic reply of the Department as to how the increased allocation were proportionately disbursed to the State Governments without taking into account their past performance. The Committee desire a categorical reply in this regard.

3.24 While reviewing the allocation *vis-à-vis* expenditure position during Eleventh Plan, the Committee find that as against the agreed outlay of Rs. 47,306 crore, the expenditure was Rs. 16,077 crore during first two years viz. 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 of the Plan. The Committee find that if the Budget estimates of Rs. 9,300 crore for 2009-2010 are added, the total comes to Rs. 25,377 crore. The Committee feel that for optimal utilization of Eleventh Plan allocation, annual expenditure of the order of over Rs. 9,500 crore per annum is desirable. In this connection, the issue of resource crunch on rural sanitation for current year as also for remaining two years viz. 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 has been highlighted before the Committee by the Secretary, DWS. The Committee have been informed that during 2009-2010 with a Budget

of Rs. 1,200 crore for rural sanitation, the Department is facing the resource crunch of the order of Rs. 500 crore. The Committee have been informed that as against Central share of Rs. 11,094 crore required to be made during the Eleventh Plan, Rs. 4,700 crore has so far been released to States indicating a shortfall of Rs. 6,300 crore. The Committee also conclude from the aforesaid analysis that in order to achieve the targets of rural sanitation by 2010 and targets for school coverage by 2012 adequate allocation is not being made. Besides, these schemes of the Department have tremendous impact on improving rural infrastructure. The Committee strongly recommend to the Department to take up the matter with the Ministry of Finance/Planning Commission for getting adequate allocation commensurate with the requirements, with a view to achieve inclusive growth so that the benefits are shared by the poorest of the poor in the country and make sincere efforts to fulfil their mandate of providing safe adequate drinking water to the rural people.

CHAPTER IV

MAJOR ISSUES

A. Current scenario on drinking water and sanitation

As per the Eleventh Plan document, India with 2.4% world's total area has 16% of the world's population but has only 1.5% of the total available fresh water. This clearly indicates the need for water resource development, conservation and optimum use. However sustainable development and efficient management of water is an increasingly complex challenge in India. Further increasing population, growing urbanization and rapid industrialization combined with needs for raising agricultural production generates competing claims over water leading to a water crisis with the following manifestations:—

- (i) Many of rural habitations which had been covered under drinking water programme are now reported slipped-back with target date and completion continuously pushed back;
- (ii) There are pockets where Arsenic, Nitrate and Fluoride in drinking water are posing a serious health hazard;
- (iii) In many parts, the ground water table declines due to over-exploitation;
- (iv) Owing to lack of maintenance the capacity of the older systems seems to be going down;
- (v) The per capita water availability has been declining since 1951 following rise in population and 9 out of 20 river basins with 200 million population are already facing water scarcity; and
- (vi) Similarly on rural sanitation as per Government data a staggering 43% of rural families in the country do not have basic sanitation like sanitary latrines as on 2008.

4.2 The Committee pointed out that the Government of India's major intervention in water sector started through Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) in 1972-73 and rural sanitation since 1986 in the country *i.e.* more than three decades in drinking water and two

and half decades in rural sanitation. However, the Committee observed that the actual flow of funds as shown in the table given below for drinking water started flowing in only after VIIIth Plan (1985-1990) which were doubled Plan after Plan till current Plan period.

Plan Period	Investment made (Rs. in crore)	
	Centre	State
VII (1985-1990)	1,905.64	2,471.53
VIII (1992-1997)	4,139.74	5,084.44
IX (1997-2002)	8,454.57	10,773.11
X (2002-2007)	16,254.42	15,102.42
XI (2007-2012)	39,490.00	49,000.00
Total	70,244.37 (say 70,000)	82,431.50 (say 82,000)

4.3 On being asked about the perception on the magnitude of problem on two issues of drinking water supply and sanitation in rural areas, in view of huge investment, the Department of Drinking Water Supply stated as under:—

“Rural Water Supply

Drinking water is one of the most basic requirements of all forms of life. Preserving the quality of drinking water and ensuring its availability on a sustainable basis are the major challenges that India is facing today. Increased water pollution due to industrial activities, growth of population and increasing requirement of water for the agricultural sector have led to a scenario where access to safe drinking water in some parts of rural areas has become a problem. Despite increasing investments, the infrastructure created for drinking water gets negated as either the source has been depleted due to other sectors, or the service population has increased. Also, there is a general reluctance by States for pricing of water and regulation of its extraction.”

4.4 On rural sanitation, the Department clarified as under:—

“As per the online monitoring system of TSC, the latest coverage figures for rural sanitation are 61% approximately. Thus, only 39% of rural families in the country are to be provided with sanitation facilities by the end of XI Plan. Further, the slow increase in coverage is due to increased population and enhanced project objectives under TSC.”

4.5 The Committee also wanted to know about the achievement of the Department since it was created in areas like sustainability, water quality, maintenance of old water bodies, restoring per capita water availability systems and sanitation in rural areas. The Department in a written note stating achievements with regard to Rural Water Supply stated as under:—

“Rural Water Supply

The primary responsibility of providing drinking water facilities in the country rests with State Governments. The Union Government has been extending policy, technological and financial support through a Centrally Sponsored Scheme — the Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) — under which funds are provided to State Governments for implementing rural water supply schemes. With the 73rd Amendments of Constitution of India, drinking water and sanitation are included in the list of subjects to be devolved to Panchayats. The ARWSP has focused attention on physical coverage of rural habitations with the facility of drinking water as per certain norms fixed for the purpose. According to Census 1991, 55.54 per cent of the population had access to an improved water source. The Census 2001 shows 86.77 per cent of the rural population have access to safe drinking water. The Department’s figures show that in 2006, of the 14.23 lakh habitations, 13.80 lakh habitations (97 per cent) have been provided with some drinking water source. The infrastructure created across the country is over 41 lakh hand pumps installed in the rural habitations and over 2 lakh piped water supply schemes.

Over the years, the Government has been focusing attention on the question of providing safe drinking water to the un-served and under-served rural population through investments and improved technological measures. Despite these efforts, adequate availability, appropriate levels of quality as well as sustainability of drinking water systems/sources continued to be under strain in many parts of the country.”

4.6 As regard rural sanitation the Ministry stated as under:—

“Rural Sanitation

Rural sanitation coverage has more than doubled from 21.9 per cent in 2001 to 61.29 per cent in October, 2009. This phenomenal

progress is a result of the significant achievement under TSC by construction of 5.88 crore individual toilets, 9.24 lakh school toilets and 2.88 lakh Anganwadi toilets.”

4.7 The Committee also pointed out that investment from Centre to the tune of Rs. 70, 000 crore and about Rs. 82,000 crore from States has already been made on this sector. Taking together a total of Rs. 1,52,000 crore has been made. The Department on its own in its Outcome Budget has also revealed that although about Rs. 75,000 crore were invested in this sector, the coverage of rural habitation is only 74%.

4.8 On being asked about the difficulties being faced in implementation of the Central scheme of ARWSP over the years due to which the Department could not achieve 100 per cent coverage of habitations even after colossal investment or whether it was due to slow implementation by States, the Department in a written note stated as under:—

“There are many issues which affect the rural drinking water sector:

- 80% of the rural drinking water supply systems is based on ground water, which was promoted in the past to eradicate infection by guineaworms. Less than 1% of this resource is used for drinking purposes. But its effectiveness is decreased due to overdrawal by other sectors such as irrigation and industries, thereby causing slippages in coverage.
- While developing surface water sources, since only a minor portion of this water resource is used for drinking, the sector is not able to justify huge investments in transport of water from distant sources. It has to wait for development of irrigation sector to access the water for its projects.
- Water being a State subject, the implementation of projects depends on their machinery. Most of the States suffer from shortage of personnel in the field, thereby hampering timely implementation.
- There is also lack of proper technical capacity at both the Center and the States.”

4.9 With limited resources, many of the States face difficulty in assigning adequate funds for the sector.

4.10 The Eleventh Plan document has brought out grave scenario prevailing in the country on Drinking Water and Rural Sanitation characterized by large number of slipped back habitations, huge number of quality-affected habitations, declining ground water table, declining per capita availability of drinking water and staggering 39 per cent of rural population without basic sanitation. The Committee's examination has revealed that even after decades of planning and huge investment of the magnitude of Rs. 15,200 crore in this sector, the actual coverage of rural water supply has reached to the level of only 74 per cent and for rural sanitation it is only 61 per cent as on today. This speaks volumes about actual implementation of various schemes that have been run by the Centre from time to time. The Department has made out their case before the Committee explaining that increased water pollution due to industrial activities, growth of population and increasing requirement of water for agricultural sector have been largely responsible for the above scenario in rural water supply. Coupled with these, the Committee have also been informed that there has been a general reluctance by States for pricing of water and regulating its extraction. Increased population and enhanced infrastructure activities have been given as reasons for slow progress in rural sanitation. The Committee urge the Department to make all out efforts to achieve full coverage in providing safe drinking water and sanitation in rural areas in the country.

4.11 Tracing out the progress in rural water supply, the Committee have been informed that with the Department's sustained efforts, the coverage of drinking water in rural areas has improved from 55.45 per cent in 1991 to the level of 86.77 per cent in 2001. By 2006, as per the Department's information 97 per cent rural coverage has been achieved. Similarly, on rural sanitation, the Committee have been informed that coverage of 21.9 per cent in 2001 has gone upto 61.29 per cent in October, 2009. Thus, two sets of figures have been provided to the Committee in respect of drinking water coverage and rural sanitation. The Committee, express their displeasure over supply of two different sets of data relating to the important schemes of the Department. The Committee are of the opinion that these figures of coverage in terms of rural drinking water supply and rural sanitation are deceptive and are not at all convincing. The Committee, therefore, recommend that a time bound village to village survey should be carried out to arrive at figures of actual coverage at ground level.

4.12 The Committee have been informed that 80 per cent of rural drinking water supply is based on ground water and less than 1 per cent of this, is used for drinking water purposes. The remaining is used for other purposes like irrigation and industries causing slippages in coverage. As a result, transport of drinking water in rural areas has to be made from far flung areas at huge cost. The Department has admitted before the Committee that various other reasons like shortage of technical manpower and resource constraints in most of the States are the reasons for slower progress. In order to address all these issues the Department has come out with a new approach for rural water supply under Revised Guidelines which *inter-alia* envisage a paradigm shift on use of surface water, ground water and rain water in a big way for future needs, enhancing funds for sustainability and operation and maintenance to help the States after taking into confidence different State Governments. In Committee's opinion, since the Programme has been started from April 2009 it is too early to comment on its implementation. However, the Committee feel that the Department should see that the new Programme is implemented in letter and spirit so that the Committee can review the progress under the new approach while examining Demands for Grants (2010-2011) of the Department. In order to overcome the problem of slippages of rural water sources, the Department should hold consultations with other related Ministries like Irrigation and Industry to bring forward a new approach on the pattern of Revised Guidelines so that necessary policy initiatives are taken in those areas also. The Committee would like to know the views of Department in this regard.

Another area that has attracted the attention of the Committee is about State's reluctance on the issue of pricing of water and regulation of its extraction. The Committee feel that since water is a State subject, the need of the hour is to arrive at a consensus on the complex issue of pricing and regulation of extraction of water. The Committee, therefore, would impress upon the Department to start the process among different States on this issue. The Committee may also be apprised of the outcome of the exercise.

B. Policy Interventions

4.13 The Committee during the course of examination also wanted to know about the details of the policy interventions made by the

Department during four Plan periods stated above to salvage the position, the Department in a written note stated are as under:—

“When the ARWSP was first conceived (1972-73), the major thrust of the RWS sector development was to ensure provision of adequate drinking water supply to the rural community through a centralized Public Health Engineering System. With the launching of Technology Mission (1986-87), later renamed as Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission in 1991-92, focus shifted towards tackling water quality, providing appropriate technology intervention, human resource development support and other related activities. In 1999-2000, new initiatives through Sector Reform Projects was introduced to involve community in planning, implementation and management of RWS schemes later scaled up as Swajaldhara in 2002. Accordingly, various components of ARWSP were added at different times:

- (a) ARWSP at 50:50 sharing started in 1978, recognizing that rural drinking water is a State subject and the Government of India would only supplement efforts of the State.
- (b) Special component for DDP areas at 100:0 sharing in 1987-88, to cater to the requirement of cattle and humans, to take care of drinking water problems due to cold and hot ecosystems.
- (c) Special component for Natural Calamity at 100:0 sharing in 2002-03. Past experience had shown that the State/UT Governments invariably seek assistance in the drinking water sector to meet the urgent needs of, and provide succor to, rural areas in the aftermath of a natural calamity or emergent situation.
- (d) Special component for Water Quality at 75:25 ratio since 1999.
- (e) Swajaldhara at 90:10 ratio with community and no State share since 2002, to give incentive to States to promote community participation and responsibility for operation & maintenance.
- (f) NRDWP guidelines give complete flexibility to the States in planning and assigning resources for coverage, quality and sustainability aspects. Also, there is specific allocation for “support” to the Drinking Water Sector. These guidelines are in force since 1st April, 2009.”

4.14 The Committee's examination has revealed that in the area of policy intervention the rural water supply sector has become a testing laboratory of the Department of Drinking Water Supply. The Committee find that starting with ARWSP in 1972-73 for providing adequate drinking water in 1985-86, the Department started with major focus on water quality; in 1999-2002 the Department experimented with Swajaldhara concept involving community participation and in 2009 National Rural Drinking Water Programme (NRDWP) was started. The Committee feel that the new approach is a welcome step in rural water supply. However, the Committee feel that there is no need for frequent policy changes and from now onwards emphasis should be on actual implementation on war footing basis.

C. Goals for 11th Plan period

4.15 The goals for Drinking Water and Sanitation for Eleventh Plan Period as stated by the Department are as under:—

Rural Water Supply :

- (i) To encourage conjunctive use of groundwater, surface water and roof top rain water harvesting systems as means of improving sustainability and drinking water security.
- (ii) To establish an effective Management Information System for knowing the status of water supply in every habitation in the State.
- (iii) To promote individual household rooftop rain water harvesting system.
- (iv) To develop surface water sources where groundwater quality and availability is unsatisfactory. Restoration and building of tanks and other water bodies along with rainwater harvesting structures for recharge and for direct collection at community and household levels constitute an attractive option.
- (v) To involve the community in bringing quality and sustainability to the village level drinking water supply systems.
- (vi) To promote convergence of other programmes to augment funds and bring institutions together for sustainable water supply.

Rural Sanitation

- (i) Universal toilet coverage in rural areas by 2012: To achieve the project objectives in terms of provision of Individual House Hold Latrines (IHHL) and complete implementation of TSC projects in the countryside by 2012. The XI Plan envisages construction of 7.29 crore units of IHHL for achieving universal sanitation coverage in rural areas.
- (ii) School coverage by 2009-10: 100 percent coverage of Government rural schools with toilet facilities by March, 2010. At least one toilet block will be provided in each Government rural school. In the co-educational schools, separate toilet blocks for girls will be constructed.
- (iii) Anganwadi coverage by 2009-10: 100 percent coverage of anganwadis in Government buildings as per project objectives with toilet facilities by March, 2010.

4.16 On being asked about the progress towards realizing the aforesaid goals for drinking water and sanitation during the past two years of the current Plan, the Department in a written note stated as under:—

“Rural Water Supply

The erstwhile Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme has been modified and renamed as National Rural Drinking Water Programme (NRDWP), after incorporating the above elements and duly approved by the Government in 2008. The new guidelines are in force from 01.04.2009. The Integrated Management Information System of the Department has also been now modified to capture habitation-wise details and make it available in the public domain for use in planning, monitoring and promoting transparency.”

Rural Sanitation

Physical achievement under TSC during the past two years and the current year are as below:—

Year	Achievement
2007-08	115 lakh IHHLs
2008-09	116 lakh IHHLs
2009-10	48 lakh IHHLs (till October, 2009)
Total	279 lakh IHHLs”

D. Performance under Bharat Nirman

4.17 The Committee wanted to know the physical performance under Bharat Nirman. The Department has given the following Component-wise details:—

Component	2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010	
	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement
I. Uncovered Habitations	11,897	13,121	18,120	12,440	20,931	11,457	16,753	17,412	624	3
II. Slipped back Habitations	34,373	79,544	40,000	89,580	84,915	75,201	101,743	1,13,653	25,482	439
III. Quality Affected Habitations	10,000	4,550	15,000	5,330	49,653	94,130	99,402	205,930*	75,000	93

* Number of habitations covered 21531.

Number of habitations addressed with projects 184399

4.18 The Committee pointed out, the dismal achievements so far during 2009-10 in all of ARWSP (Bharat Nirman) and wanted to know about the reasons therefor and efforts that are being made by the Department to achieve the targets. The Department in a written note stated as under:—

“The achievements in the first two quarters of the year appear to be on the lower side due the following reasons:

- (i) since 1.4.2009, new guidelines have come into force and States took time to mainstream their activities;
- (ii) since 1.4.2009, online Integrated Management Information System (IMIS) has been modified, which requires alignment of data and various information;
- (iii) with the implementation of the new guidelines, States are to prepare shelf of projects which require approval by the State Level Scheme Sanctioning Committee (SLSC) and this work has been taken up in the first half of the year by many States;

- (iv) during 2009, many States felt scarcity of drinking water due to deficient rainfall and to tackle the problem, had to take emergency measures and plan work suffered. Also, some States faced floods which also diverted manpower of the respective States in tackling post flood situation.”

4.19 The Committee are dismayed to note that performance in rural drinking water supply which is one of the six components of mega programme of Bharat Nirman has not been well so far during 2009-2010 in terms of coverage of uncovered, slipped back and quality-affected habitations. For instance, for uncovered habitations, the Committee find against the target of 624 the achievement is only 3. Similarly, for slipped back habitations against the target of 25,482 the achievement is as low as 439. Coming to quality-affected habitations against the target of 75,000 the achievement has plummeted to 93 only. The Committee have been informed that such dismal performance is owing to variety of reasons like considerable time taken by different State Governments for mainstreaming activities consequent upon enforcement of new guidelines, time taken in tackling natural calamities like drought and floods witnessed early this year in many States. The Committee desire that a separate mechanism be evolved to tackle the natural calamities so that the assigned tasks before the Department relating to the important schemes do not suffer. The Committee would like to be apprised about the steps taken in this regard.

4.20 The Standing Committee had been persistently recommending for achieving of targets in this area. In the Thirty-Seventh Report also (para no. 5.10 refers), the Committee had impressed upon about the same. Though the Department are optimistic about achieving the target, the ground reality in this regard suggest otherwise. The Committee would like the Department to shed their complacent approach and undertake concrete and strict measures to ensure achievement of the targets by the States. The Committee may be apprised of the concrete action taken in this regard.

E. Unspent Balances

4.21 According to the Outcome Budget of the Department, there were staggering unspent balances to the tune of Rs. 2,53,299.34 lakh under ARWSP and Rs. 1,11,124.40 lakh under TSC as on 31.03.2009 with different

States/UTs. The major unspent balances in ARWSP and TSC were in the following States:—

(Rs. in lakh)

Unspent balances				
S.No.	State	ARWSP	State	TSC
1.	Bihar	41,419.98	Uttar Pradesh	26630.19
2.	Maharashtra	41,182.30	Orissa	11016.74
3.	West Bengal	23,971.23	Madhya Pradesh	8437.47
4.	Uttar Pradesh	22,705.35	Bihar	9226.68
5.	Tamil Nadu	14,235.15	Assam	9420.12
6.	Orissa	13,054.95	Maharashtra	3373.13
7.	J&K	17,572.01	Rajasthan	3892.68
8.	Madhya Pradesh	12,355.68	Karnataka	3436.60
9.	Arunachal Pradesh	12,502.16	Jharkhand	3432.99
10.	Chhattisgarh	6344.13	Gujarat	3461.26
	Total	2,05,322.94	Total	82327.86

4.22 The Committee pointed out that a huge unspent balance to the tune of about Rs. 2,88,000 lakh is lying unspent in aforesaid States on ARWSP and TSC. It may also be observed that States like Bihar, Maharashtra, West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh have large amount of unspent balances for ARWSP and similarly for TSC, States like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa are having huge amount of unspent balances as on 31.03.2009.

4.23 On being asked about the reasons for huge unspent balances of the order of Rs. 2,88,000 lakh in the aforesaid States in ARWSP/ TSC funds and since when these are lying unspent, the Department in a written note detailing out unspent balances under ARWSP stated as under:—

“Under ARWSP, Information from the States in respect of expenditure incurred during 2008-09 was not complete at the time of the Outcome Budget 2009-10. As per the information available then, the unspent balance as on 31.3.2009 was as noted above and was indicated as provisional in the Outcome Budget. Since then States have given updated figures and the unspent balance for these States has now reduced to Rs. 841.37 crore. These are outstanding only since 2008-09.”

(Rs. in lakh)

S.No.	States/UTs	Unspent Balance as on 31.3.2009
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	5242.50
2.	Bihar	41419.98
3.	Chhattisgarh	2925.77
4.	J&K	9360.05
5.	Madhya Pradesh	2759.46
6.	Maharashtra	5017.29
7.	Orissa	2160.00
8.	Tamil Nadu	5676.85
9.	Uttar Pradesh	7480.75
10.	West Bengal	2094.30
	Total	84,136.95

4.24 As regard unspent balance on Rural Sanitation the Department gave the following details:—

“TSC is demand-driven programme where funds are released to the project districts based on the utilization of the existing funds as per the eligibility criteria. The districts which complete 60% utilization of available funds become eligible for release of the next installment. The funds reported as unspent balances are actually the working funds available with the districts for smooth and uninterrupted running of the programme till the release of the next installment. Release and expenditure under the programme are continuous process. The figures at the end of any particular month depend up on the releases made and funds utilized. The updated figures and the unspent balance for these States have now reduced to Rs. 792.59 crore. These are outstanding only since 2008-09.

(Rs. in lakh)

S.No.	States/UTs	Unspent Balance as on 31.3.2009
1	2	3
1.	Assam	78,16.77
2.	Bihar	143,62.89
3.	Gujarat	47,04.31
4.	Jharkhand	19,28.77
5.	Karnataka	78,12.36

(1)	(2)	(3)
6.	Madhya Pradesh	124,28.69
7.	Maharashtra	25,34.23
8.	Orissa	86,57.34
9.	Rajasthan	64,53.40
10.	Uttar Pradesh	125,61.18
	Total	792,59.94

4.25 Asked about the role the Department has played in pursuing the erring State Governments to clear these unspent balances and the updated position of unspent balance in ARWSP/TSC balances as on 30.10.2009, the Department gave the details as under:—

“Rural Water Supply

The Department periodically reviews the progress of implementation with all States. Also, the States are penalized by imposing cuts while releasing the 2nd installment of funds, previous unspent balance has not been utilized fully and expenditure during the current year is not up to the mark.”

4.26 The unspent balance or total available fund with the States as on 31.10.2009 is Rs. 3,109.47 crore. This includes the releases made till the end of September, 2009 to all States. The State-wise details are as follows:—

(Rs. in lakh)

S.No.	States/UTs	Unspent Balance as on 31.10.2009
1	2	3
1.	Andhra Pradesh	160,04.42
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	134,11.70
3.	Assam	107,91.55
4.	Bihar	570,37.88
5.	Chhattisgarh	80,66.26
6.	Goa	1,82.00
7.	Gujrat	132,61.42
8.	Haryana	12,43.75
9.	Himachal Pradesh	78,13.53
10.	J&K	159,85.95

(1)	(2)	(3)
11.	Jharkhand	136,12.93
12.	Karnataka	94,83.47
13.	Kerala	52,10.88
14.	Madhya Pradesh	108,81.51
15.	Maharashtra	359,34.29
16.	Manipur	55,55.83
17.	Meghalaya	13,83.42
18.	Mizoram	40,38.47
19.	Nagaland	26,00.00
20.	Orissa	74,21.69
21.	Punjab	52,40.07
22.	Rajasthan	72,58.81
23.	Sikkim	40,47.29
24.	Tamil Nadu	131,83.39
25.	Tripura	23,63.68
26.	Uttar Pradesh	201,72.97
27.	Uttarakhand	92,03.91
28.	West Bengal	63,93.73
29.	A&N Islands	30,78.28
30.	D&N Haveli	0.45
31.	Daman & DIU	0.00
32.	Delhi	0.00
33.	Lakshadweep	0.00
34.	Puducherry	83.00
35.	Chandigarh	0.00
	Total	3,10,946.53

4.27 The Department also stated that the NRDWP releases in the current year amount to Rs. 3,35,129.47 lakh. Hence it will be seen that there is no unspent balance from previous years.

4.28 Informing the detailed position of unspent balance in rural sanitation, the Department has given the following details:—

Rural Sanitation

State-wise position of unspent balance is as under:—

(Rs. in lakh)

S.No.	States/UTs	Unspent Balance as on 31.10.2009
1.	Andhra Pradesh	130,38.73
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	13,99.67
3.	Assam	78,62.20
4.	Bihar	143,62.89
5.	Chhattisgarh	63,39.79
6.	D & N Haveli	1.48
7.	Goa	22.39
8.	Gujarat	47,37.74
9.	Haryana	13,62.93
10.	Himachal Pradesh	9,13.60
11.	Jammu & Kashmir	19,08.60
12.	Jharkhand	19,28.77
13.	Karnataka	78,24.95
14.	Kerala	11,78.51
15.	Madhya Pradesh	126,76.95
16.	Maharashtra	25,34.23
17.	Manipur	3,21.44
18.	Meghalaya	1,66.19
19.	Mizoram	1,88.75
20.	Nagaland	10,58.49
21.	Orissa	86,87.10
22.	Puducherry	18.68
23.	Punjab	8,99.39
24.	Rajasthan	64,53.41
25.	Sikkim	2,46.31
26.	Tamil Nadu	46,28.07
27.	Tripura	2,79.57
28.	Uttar Pradesh	126,57.86
29.	Uttarakhand	13,01.15
30.	West Bengal	109,59.72
	Grand Total	1259,59.58*

* TSC releases in the current year of Rs. 590.23 crore are included in the above figures.

4.29 During the course of evidence of the representatives of Department of Drinking Water Supply, the issue of huge unspent balance under Rural Water Supply and Rural Sanitation came up for discussion. The Committee pointed out that still Rs. 841.37 crore under rural water supply and Rs. 792.59 crore under rural sanitation are lying as unspent in different States. Clarifying the position the Secretary, DWS informed:—

“So far as unspent balance is concerned in fact some money really lies with States. We follow up with such State Governments. We sent you supplementary information that indicates that the balances with them are less than what we have released to them in current year. They have not only liquidated previous balances but also utilized the releases done by us. This is regarding rural water supply.”

4.30 The Secretary, DWS further informed that:—

“However on Total Sanitation Campaign, the situation is not at all improved. Here, this is an issue of 10 per cent spill over already stipulated in the guidelines. Because it happens that first installment is released to States in the first half of a year. Our effort is to release the funds in first half itself. The moment proposals are received from States by April-May these are released. However, it takes some time to utilise the funds. Usually when they come before us for second installment then our effort remains that they come by December every year. However, it does not take place in December. Some States come in December, some come in January next year and others in February and some others in March. Those States who get second installment in March, they will not be able to utilise the same. So it spills over to next year. This is a limitation.”

4.31 The Secretary, DWS further stated:—

“This year there was a problem because natural calamities like drought and floods were also there as a result there was some delay as the entire Department had to handle these. However, the entire attention of the Department is in the directions that the habitations that are uncovered or drought affected, thus water should reach. Thus, in implementation some delay occurs. These are the causes...”

4.32 The Committee are amazed over the fact that on the one hand the coverage of rural drinking water supply is only 74 per cent and for rural sanitation it is still lower at 61 per cent. On the other hand, there are huge unspent balances as on 31.10.2009 to the tune of

Rs. 3109.46 crore for rural water supply and Rs. 1259.59 crore for rural sanitation. The Committee find that this is piquant situation and as such the Committee do not approve of the same. The Committee's examination has revealed that the figures of unspent balances as given in Outcome Budget (2009-10) of the Department laid before Parliament were not updated and were not even indicated to be provisional in the case of rural sanitation. The Committee have now been given updated figures. The Committee, however, feel now that coming with provisional and old figures on the ground that States have not updated these figures, does not augur well with the Department. The Committee, therefore, feel that since Outcome Budget is a public document and authentic source of information, the Department should come out before the Parliament with updated figures.

4.33 The Committee have analysed that there are volumes of unspent balances in rural water supply and rural sanitation. The Committee find in rural water supply as per the latest figures such balances amount to Rs. 3109.47 crore. The major States where these unspent balances are lying are Bihar (Rs. 570.38 crore), Maharashtra (Rs. 359.34 crore), Uttar Pradesh (Rs. 201.73 crore) etc. Similarly, on rural sanitation as per the latest figures of Rs. 1259.60 crore, the major States against which unspent balances are lying are Bihar (Rs. 143.63 crore), Andhra Pradesh (Rs. 130.39 crore), Uttar Pradesh (Rs. 126.58 crore) etc. During the course of evidence, the Committee have been informed by the Secretary, Drinking Water Supply that on the issue of unspent balances some money always lies with States. On the rural water supply, the Committee have also been informed that States have already liquidated unspent balance as per latest information. The Committee appreciate this development. However, in the absence of latest figures, the Committee are unable to comment further on the issue. The Committee desire that the required information be made available to the Committee so as to arrive at a logical conclusion.

4.34 On the issue of unspent balances in rural sanitation, the Secretary, Drinking Water Supply candidly admitted before the Committee that the situation has not at all improved. Various reasons like 40 per cent release after expenditure of 60 per cent of the funds have been advanced in this regard. The Committee, however, recommend that the States be advised to submit timely proposals for releases leaving no room for unspent balances. They also suggest, the States should be asked to furnish specific reasons for unspent balances/non-utilisation of resources. Such mechanism will not only make the States accountable but would also help the Union as well as the State Governments to take remedial measures.

F. Need for tackling water quality

4.35 During the course of briefing the following details of quality affected habitations were given:—

Quality affected Habitations

- Arsenic
 - In 2006, 7067 habitations was reported from W. Bengal, Bihar, Jharkhand, Assam, Tripura, Chhattisgarh
 - In 2009, 10,004 habitations reported from 14 States
- Fluoride
 - In 2006, 29,030 habitations was reported from 17 States
 - In 2009, 33,071 habitations reported from 19 States
- Iron
 - In 2006, 1,04,477 habitations was reported from 24 States
 - In 2009, 1,01,845 habitations reported from 23 States
- Salinity
 - In 2006, 12,425 habitations was reported from 14 States
 - In 2009, 32,497 reported from 17 States
- Nitrate
 - In 2006, 19,387 habitations was reported from 10 States
 - In 2009, 2,571 habitations reported from 9 States

4.36 During the course of examination it came out that the National Rural Drinking Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance Programme is in operation since February 2006 for the purpose of addressing the problem of quality-affected habitations. It may be seen that except for nitrate affected habitations, all other types of affected habitations have increased from 2007 to 2009.

4.37 The Committee wanted to know whether the above huge increases in number of quality-affected habitations did not put a question mark on the effectiveness of three years old National Rural Drinking Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance Programme. The Department in a written reply stated as under:—

“The data projected on number of water-quality affected habitations were entered by the respective States into online Integrated

Management Information System (IMIS) as on 5/10/2009. As reported by the States, the number of water-quality affected habitations in rural areas has increased from the 2006 figures except for nitrate contamination. National Rural Drinking Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance Programme empower the GPs to test their own drinking water sources and get the positively tested samples for confirmation by the district/block level water testing laboratories.”

4.38 The Committee wanted to know the reasons for almost all the quality-affected habitations having increased considerably after the National Rural Drinking Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance Programme was started. The Department in a written note stated as under:—

“Many of the habitations in the country, which are reported as water-quality affected have been addressed with projects and are under various stages of implementation. The State Government indicates the coverage of such habitations only after the project is commissioned and safe drinking water is provided. The survey conducted by States during 2000-2004 and compiled as on 1/4/2005, were based on 5-10% sampling followed by 100% sampling in such blocks where contamination was reported. As National Rural Drinking Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance Programme aims at 100% testing of all drinking water sources in the rural areas of the Country, there is a possibility of new water-quality affected habitations getting reported.

Tackling Arsenic and Fluoride affected habitations has been the priority of the Government. Arsenic-affected habitations are concentrated only in six States of West Bengal, Bihar, Jharkhand, Assam, Tripura and Chhattisgarh. The number of such habitations has increased from 7,067 in 2006 to 10,004 in 2009.”

4.39 On being asked about how the Department defines drinking water contamination, the Department stated as under:—

“The IS-10500 standard published by the Bureau of Indian Standards gives the specification of drinking water quality. Any contamination above the cause for rejection or maximum permissible limits under this Standard is considered as sources affected with water quality problem(s).”

4.40 The Committee also wanted to know about the funds that were allocated and utilized during the period 2006 to 2009 on addressing the water quality problem in five categories as shown above. The Department gave the following details:—

“During 2006-07 and 2007-08, Revised Sub-Mission on water quality was under implementation wherein, 20% ARWSP funds were set apart and released only to such States having water quality problems, based on a set allocation criteria which gave high priority to tackle Fluoride and Arsenic followed by salinity problem. State-wise allocation and amount released during 2006-07 and 2007-08 are given in *Appendix-II*.”

4.41 From 2008-09 onwards, State Governments were asked to tackle water quality problems by utilizing upto 20% of the ARWSP/NRDWP funds released to the State Governments as per their priority.

4.42 On being asked about the reasons for huge increase in Arsenic and Fluoride affected habitations and almost no reduction in Iron affected habitations from 2006 to 2009, the Department stated as under:—

“It is possible that the States might not have anticipated Arsenic in rural drinking water sources in many areas and might not have understood its movement in the aquifers. Fluoride is more evenly distributed across many States and over-exploitation of ground water might have resulted in increase of Fluoride level in drinking water sources. Iron contamination in ground water sources is quite widespread in wherever pyritic rock formation exists.”

4.43 when the Committee enquired about the broad reasons for around three fold increase in salinity-affected habitations, the Department stated as under:—

“Data on water quality-affected habitations has been entered by the States into the online IMIS. Salinity can be of two types. Inland salinity caused by limestone/dolomite and other rock formations which induce dissolved solids into water bodies. Over-exploitation of ground water might have leached more salts into aquifers which are drinking water sources. Salinity can also be induced due to sea water intrusion. Effects like climate change might have also increased the salinity levels especially in coastal areas, though scientific proof is yet to be established.”

4.44 The Committee are disappointed to note that there are large number of quality-affected habitations in the country largely due to problem like arsenic, fluoride, iron, salinity and nitrate even when a full fledged programme of 'National Rural Drinking Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance Programme' for tackling the above problem was in operation since February, 2006. The Committee are also concerned to note that after the launch of the above Programme not only the number of quality affected habitations but the number of States having such habitations has increased from 5 States in 2006 to 14 States in 2009. The Committee also find that the number of quality affected habitations except for nitrate affected habitations has significantly increased. The Committee have been informed that many of the habitations in the country which are reported as water quality affected have been addressed with projects which are under various stages of implementation. The Committee find the reply as very vague since it does not spell out category wise number of quality affected habitations in different States. In the absence of the requisite data the Committee are unable to comprehend about the work actually done in this regard. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Department should furnish detailed data in this regard.

4.45 The Committee are aware that tackling the arsenic and fluoride affected habitations in the country is the priority of the Government. However, the Committee are constrained to note that required work in this regard has not been done in the right earnest. It is needless to point out that contaminated harmful sources of water in rural areas in the country may cause a severe crisis. The Committee emphasize that all the efforts made with regard to improving the coverage status and bringing about sustainability of sources and the systems become meaningless in the absence of clean and safe drinking water. The Committee, therefore, desire that efforts aimed at tackling the contamination of water should be intensified. They would like to be informed of the measures taken in this direction.

4.46 The Committee also find that under the Revised Guidelines, 20 per cent funds are being given for tackling the quality affected habitations with 100 per cent funding from the Centre. The Committee feel with this, there should not be any alibi for not performing in this important area. The Committee has been constantly recommending for expeditious work in their previous Reports and had also dealt with the issue in their latest 37th Report (para no. 5.10 refers). The Committee, therefore, desire that all out and time bound efforts should be made

in this regard. The Committee expect the Department to gear up on these lines.

4.47 The Committee also note with disappointment that even after online Integrated Management Information System (IMIS) monitoring of quality affected habitations and full fledged water quality testing apparatus available in the country, the contaminated water is not being treated in various quality affected habitations. The Committee, therefore, desire that available testing facilities be fully utilized for treating the contaminated quality affected habitations spread over various States of the country. On the issue of salinity affected habitations, the Committee are surprised to hear from the Department that they have no scientific proof about increase in number of such habitations. The Committee wonder how in the absence of such scientific data the Department is going to solve the problem of salinity affected habitations in the country. The Committee, therefore, expect a categorical reply in this regard.

G. Modified ARWSP on Drinking Water

4.48 It came out during the examination that in spite of huge investment of the order of Rs. 75,000 crore, the coverage in drinking water was only 74% due to variety of reasons like constant slippage of habitations which were fully covered earlier by reasons of over exploitation of ground water without adequate recharge, non-exploitation of surface water source and rain water harvesting, etc. Therefore, as per the Department, in the Eleventh Plan, it was decided by the Government to focus on sustainability of water, decentralized approach etc. with complete shift from depending on single source to multiple sources under a modified ARWSP called 'National Rural Drinking Water Programme' (NRDWP) that is in operation *w.e.f.* 1st April, 2009.

4.49 The Committee have also been informed that under the new programme the percentage dependence of 80% on ground water, 18% on surface water and 2% on roof water is being changed to greater dependability on surface water, followed by ground water thereafter on roof water in a big way for future needs. In this connection, the Committee wanted to know the response of different State Government/UTs on the new programme and its above salient features. The Department in a written note stated as under:—

“All States were consulted while drafting the guidelines and their queries discussed and explained in a workshop prior to issue of these guidelines. All States have accepted the revised guidelines.”

4.50 When asked about the component-wise distribution of allocation and sharing of funds between Centre and State under new Programme the Department has given the following details:—

S.No.	Component	Distribution of annual budgetary allocation	Center: State Ratio
1.	RWSP (Coverage)	38%	50:50* 90:10**
2.	RWSP (Sustainability) – Swajaldhara ***	20%	100:0
3.	RWSP (Water Quality)	20%	50:50*
4.	RWSP (Natural Calamity)	5%	100:0
5.	RWSP (DDP Areas)	5%	100:0
6.	RWSP (Support)	2%	100:0
7.	Operation & Maintenance (O&M)	10%	50:50* 90:10**

* For all States/Union Territories except North Eastern States (Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim and Tripura) and Jammu & Kashmir.

** For North Eastern States (Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim and Tripura) and Jammu & Kashmir.

*** Swajaldhara to be continued and subsumed under RWSP (Sustainability) component.

4.51 Further, under the NRDWP higher funds for sustainability have been given. In addition to these the Centre:State ratio has been revised from 50:50 to 100:0 respectively.

4.52 On being asked as to what extent the greater emphasis on surface water is going to solve the problem of water shortage in the country, particularly, rural areas, the Department stated as under:—

“Addition of surface water based water supply schemes to ground water schemes will augment the existing water resources for drinking and domestic purposes. This will also help in tackling water quality problems especially Arsenic and Fluoride. However, in all cases, the aim is to create multiple sources, eliminate over-dependence on single source (ground water) and establish drinking water security through water demand and budgeting by the community.”

4.53 The Committee also wanted to know the criteria for terming a source as sustainable, the Department stated as under:—

“Sustainability of drinking water sources is defined as availability of adequate safe drinking water (from multiple sources) to rural habitations/ Panchayats in the country throughout the year including distress periods. The supply level of drinking water could be decided by the State Governments.”

4.54 At this the Committee also enquired how much funds (State-wise and Union territory-wise) were allocated and utilized on the issue of sustainability during the period 2006 to 2009, the Department stated as under:—

“Till 2009-10, State Governments were asked to utilize upto 5% of funds released to the States under ARWSP for building source sustainability component into rural drinking water supply schemes, on 75:25 fund sharing pattern between Centre and State. With effect from 1.4.2009, funds under sustainability have been increased to 20% under NRDWP guidelines as 100% Central assistance.”

4.55 The Committee, further, wanted to know how far greater allocation of 20% funds for sustainability, water quality and for O&M purposes (10%) are going to improve the present rural drinking water supply scenario in the country. The Department informed as under:—

“20% NRDWP funds under sustainability are meant to ensure that water supply systems installed to provide potable water last its design period and habitation/villages do not slip back. Under sustainability component, such artificial recharge/rainwater harvesting structures can be taken up, which improve the drinking water availability. The aim is to reduce the adverse effects of depletion of ground water so that adequacy of water is ensured for drinking and domestic purposes including water for cattle. Increasing water availability would also dilute the contaminants in the aquifers thereby improving the potability. 10% O&M funds under NRDWP are essentially to maintain system sustainability by undertaking immediate repairs of drinking water supply assets created.”

4.56 On the issue of the per capita availability of drinking water as on 1.04.2009 the State-UT wise in rural areas, the Department has informed that the this Department does not maintain per capita availability of drinking water in States/UTs of the country.

4.57 On the issue of the measures that are being initiated by the Department as on date to provide sustainable source of drinking water, the Department has informed that it has released the technical document called 'Bringing Sustainability to drinking water systems in rural India' through the Hon'ble Prime Minister in 2007. This document which contains specific suggestions on sustainability received from various States was distributed to all States for effective implementation. Also, a document on 'Convergence of various watershed/water conservation' related programmes were distributed to bring sustainability to drinking water sources and systems in the country. Further, State Governments have been advised to converge the sustainability funds under NRDWP with NREGS to a great extent, as water conservation is the first priority under NREGS.

4.58 Apart from this, the Department is engaging the services of NRSC, Hyderabad in preparation of Hydro-Geo-Morphological maps using satellite data and 2,306 such maps have been distributed in 10 States. Similar work is in progress in another 10 States. These maps are useful in increasing bore well drilling efficiency and site appropriate locations for constructing recharge structures.

4.59 The Committee appreciate that a paradigm shift from over dependence on ground water to surface water and roof water for addressing the availability of drinking water in rural areas has been evolved under the modified ARWSP renamed as 'National Rural Drinking Water Programme' (NRDWP) that is being implemented *w.e.f.* 1st April, 2009. The Committee also appreciate that for sustainability and for Operation & Maintenance (O&M) purposes, the distribution of annual budget allocation has been hiked to 20 per cent and 10 per cent respectively. The Committee trust that this will get desired results in covering slipped back habitations as also making available funds for O&M purposes for repairs of existing drinking water supply assets. However, here again the Committee apprehend that in spite of major policy interventions, the ground situation may remain the same and last man in the row in rural areas may not get the benefit of enhanced

funds for rural water supply programme. The Committee, therefore, recommend that mechanism available under the revised guidelines should be put in place in all States in a time bound manner for getting the desired results.

4.60 The Committee also appreciate that under sustainability component of NRDWP, works like artificial recharge/rainwater harvesting structures are to be taken up with a view to improving the drinking water availability in rural areas and also for reducing effects of depletion of ground water. In this connection, the Committee desire that a study be undertaken on the impact of funds released for sustainability and for checking ground water use in the country as the declining ground water is a grave problem at present. The Committee feel that depletion of ground water table is reaching a critical level and unless urgent action is taken to promote conjunctive use of water through ground, surface and rainwater, a situation of extreme water stress and scarcity may emerge. The Committee feel that the Department should work in a pro-active mode to promote rainwater harvesting on a massive scale and simple methods of rainwater harvesting may be disseminated widely.

4.61 The Committee also desire that those responsible for implementing the NRDWP in Central Government and State Governments, Project Implementing Agencies (PIAs) should first be made very clear about the Revised Guidelines for taking the benefits of the NRDWP. Apart from this, more and more advertisements and publicity in radio, T.V. and print media should be done in a big way for dissemination of information at grassroots level on the pattern of NREGA and other social sector schemes like Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan. The Committee also desire that a video film or documentary be shown in every Gram Panchayat at regular intervals to educate the importance of conservation and sustainability of water to rural masses and the necessary literature about the new programme should be made available in the local language of the area to Project Implementing Agencies (PIAs).

4.62 The Committee also learn that the Department has brought out two sets of documents and has forwarded these to States for implementation — one pertains to sustainability captioned 'Bringing Sustainability to drinking water systems in rural India' and the other

on convergence under the caption 'Convergence of various watershed/ water conservation'. The Committee feel that these valuable things do not percolate at grassroots level at all. The Committee, therefore, recommend that such important documents be made available to PIAs for effective implementation of the revised guidelines so that they do not remain on paper.

CHAPTER V

SCHEME-WISE ANALYSIS

Scheme-wise analysis is as under:—

A. ARWSP/National Rural Drinking Water Programme (NRDWP)

The physical performance under ARWSP has already been dealt with under 'Bharat Nirman'. The financial performance of ARWSP during the last two years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 has been as under:—

Year	Financial			Physical		
	Revised Estimates	Actual Release	% Utilisation	Target	Achievement	% Achievement
2007-08	6400.00	6442.76	100.67	1,55,499	1,80,788	116.26
2008-09	7300.00	7298.79	99.98	2,17,898	3,36,995	154.66

5.2 Thus, the achievement during 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 has been 116.26 per cent and 154.66 per cent respectively.

(i) Project Planning and Implementation

5.3 It has been stated by the Department that the projects under Rural Water Supply Programme (RWSP) have a life cycle of 2-3 years and many of these projects are likely to be completed soon.

5.4 When Committee enquired about the number of projects that have been completed till date, the Department has stated that:—

“The State-wise information for 2009-10 shelf of projects completed, ongoing and proposed to be taken up is as follows:—

S.No.	State Name	Total Schemes	PWS Schemes				Other Schemes			
			Ongoing	Complete	Proposed	Total	Ongoing	Complete	Proposed	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	5231	1436	1233	39	2698	1130	1382	37	2533
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	520	515	5	0	520	0	0	0	0
3.	Assam	12138	1472	271	41	1784	5115	3680	1559	10354
4.	Bihar	21510	114	137	8	259	15541	4381	1329	21251
5.	Chhattisgarh	28925	1209	44	361	1614	9588	1605	16118	27311
6.	Goa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.	Gujrat	2015	770	385	400	1555	180	268	12	460
8.	Haryana	971	491	459	0	950	10	11	0	21
9.	Himachal Pradesh	1740	1332	273	107	1712	16	3	9	28
10.	J & K	307	304	3	0	307	0	0	0	0
11.	Jharkhand	25125	107	2	0	109	24059	943	14	25016
12.	Karnataka	21601	5829	8050	396	14275	2042	5064	220	7326
13.	Kerala	32	24	8	0	32	0	0	0	0
14.	Madhya Pradesh	5886	408	167	0	575	3466	1663	182	5311

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
15.	Maharashtra	9237	5709	1583	3	7295	1257	684	1	1942
16.	Manipur	404	343	56	5	404	0	0	0	0
17.	Meghalaya	942	697	47	0	744	178	20	0	198
18.	Mizoram	124	94	17	0	111	13	0	0	13
19.	Nagaland	82	82	0	0	82	0	0	0	0
20.	Orissa	11336	2619	288	185	3092	4062	2290	1892	8244
21.	Puducherry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22.	Punjab	1617	977	329	0	1306	103	208	0	311
23.	Rajasthan	4318	713	505	299	1517	947	1166	688	2801
24.	Sikkim	135	133	0	2	135	0	0	0	0
25.	Tamil Nadu	6046	4120	1922	4	6046	0	0	0	0
26.	Tripura	690	482	34	8	524	140	24	2	166
27.	Uttar Pradesh	326	259	31	0	290	36	0	0	36
28.	Uttarakhand	728	523	171	34	728	0	0	0	0
29.	West Bengal	674	632	41	0	673	0	1	0	1
	Total	162660	31394	16061	1892	49337	67883	23393	22063	113323

5.5 The Committee enquired about the reasons for the Department not fixing any deadline so that the progress can be reviewed, the Department clarified that:—

“The Department has set these deadlines for each year and review is taken on this basis only.”

(ii) Monitoring and Review

5.6 As regards monitoring and review of different programmes of the Department, the Committee were informed that the online monitoring system has been introduced to strengthen monitoring mechanism and transparency whereby State Governments have been urged to report physical and financial progress online on monthly basis and update the habitation with data on yearly basis.

5.7 When asked about the details of States/ UTs where the online monitoring system is in operation as on 30.10.2009, the Department has given the following details:—

“The system is operative in all States/UTs to which NRDWP funds have been released in 2009-10. It is not to be done manually in any State now. As the process of online monitoring has been started only from 1.4.2009, some States are lagging behind in their data entry. The status of reports is as follows:—

S.No.	State	Physical Progress Report	Financial Progress Report	Scheme Report
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	NOT SENT	May-09	NOT SENT
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	Aug-09	Aug-09	Aug-09
3.	Assam	Mar-09	Sep-09	Mar-09
4.	Bihar	Feb-08	Mar-09	Mar-09
5.	Chhattisgarh	Dec-08	Sep-09	Jan-09
6.	Goa	NR	Mar-09	Mar-09
7.	Gujarat	Sep-09	Sep-09	Jun-09
8.	Haryana	Oct-09	Aug-09	Jul-09
9.	Himachal Pradesh	Aug-09	Aug-09	Dec-08

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
10.	J & K	Mar-09	Aug-09	NOT SENT
11.	Jharkhand	Aug-09	Sep-09	Mar-09
12.	Karnataka	Oct-09	Sep-09	Sep-09
13.	Kerala	Dec-08	May-09	Jun-08
14.	Madhya Pradesh	Oct-09	Sep-09	Sep-09
15.	Maharashtra	Oct-09	Mar-09	Aug-09
16.	Manipur	Oct-09	Jan-08	NOT SENT
17.	Meghalaya	Sep-09	Jul-09	Mar-09
18.	Mizoram	Oct-09	Nov-08	NOT SENT
19.	Nagaland	Oct-09	Sep-08	NOT SENT
20.	Orissa	Mar-09	Sep-09	Apr-09
21.	Pondicherry	Feb-09	Mar-09	Mar-09
22.	Punjab	Oct-09	Aug-09	Mar-09
23.	Rajasthan	Jun-09	May-09	May-09
24.	Sikkim	Sep-08	Nov-08	Jun-09
25.	Tamil Nadu	Sep-09	Sep-09	Mar-09
26.	Tripura	Aug-09	Sep-09	Feb-09
27.	Uttar Pradesh	NOT SENT	Sep-09	Mar-09
28.	Uttarakhand	Jun-09	Aug-09	Mar-08
29.	West Bengal	Sep-09	Sep-09	NOT SENT

5.8 While reviewing the project planning and implementation, the Committee are astonished to find that all is not well on this important area also. The Committee find that as per latest figures out of the total of around 1.62 lakh schemes (0.49 lakh PWS schemes and 1.13 lakh other schemes) under the Department, only 39,454 have been completed while the remaining are ongoing or proposed schemes. The Committee are also constrained to note that in PWS scheme the major States that are not performing well are Bihar, Assam, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Orissa and Rajasthan. The Committee have been informed that on line monitoring in all the States is at present available. In view of this, the Committee are unable to understand as to why large number of on-going schemes are still waiting for completion. The Committee desire that all out efforts should be made by the Department for completion of the pending projects.

(iii) World Bank funded drinking water projects

5.9 The Department has stated that:—

“The World Bank Projects currently being run are:

1. **Kerala Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project:** The revised approved assistance to the project is US\$ 55.50 million. The project commenced on 12.02.2001 and was originally scheduled to be completed by 31.12.2007. The date of completion was extended to 30.9.2008. Now the State Government has further requested for extension upto 30.9.2009. The Department has recommended for extension upto 30.9.2009.
2. **Second Karnataka Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project:** The approved assistance to the project is US\$ 136.60 million. The project commenced on 19.04.2002 and was originally scheduled to be completed by 31.12.2007. The date of completion was extended to 17.12.2008. Now the State Government has further requested for extend the extension upto 31.12.2009. The Department has recommended to DEA for extension upto 31.12.2009.
3. **Second Maharashtra Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project:** The approved assistance to the project is US\$ 181.00 million. The project commenced on 29.10.2003 and was scheduled to be completed by June 2007. The State Government has requested for extension of the project upto September 2010 which has been recommended by the Department to DEA.
4. **Uttaranchal Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project:** The approved assistance to the project is US\$ 120.00 million. The project commenced on 30.11.2006 and will close on 30.06.2012.
5. **Punjab Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project:** The approved assistance to the project is US\$ 154.00 million. The project was signed on 26.02.2007 and is scheduled to be completed on 31.03.2012.

5.10 The World Bank Projects that have been completed are:—

1. Karnataka Integrated Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project cost was of US \$ 117.8 million of which

World Bank contribution was US \$ 92 million. The project implementation started in 1993 and was completed in September 2000.

2. Maharashtra Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project cost was US \$ 140.8 million. World Bank contribution was US \$ 97.5 million. The project started in March 1991 and was completed in June 1998.
3. Uttar Pradesh Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project (Swajal) cost was US \$ 71.0 million with World Bank assistance of US \$ 52.4 million. The project implementation started in August 1996 and the project was completed in May 2003.

5.11 The Committee's examination has revealed that various World Bank funded drinking water projects are being implemented in the country out of which some have been completed. The Committee are constrained to note that out of the five projects under implementation, in three such projects in Kerala, Karnataka and Maharashtra there is a time overrun. Two of these were to be completed in 31.12.2007 and the third was to be completed in June, 2007. The Committee have been informed that on the request of the State Governments these projects are surviving on extensions recommended by Department of Economic Affairs (DEA). The Committee would like the Department to ensure completion of these projects in time.

B. Total Sanitation Campaign

5.12 There is direct relationship between water, sanitation and health. Consumption of unsafe drinking water, open disposal of human excreta, lack of personal and food hygiene have a direct bearing on the high infant mortality rate and are also the causes of a host of medical problems. If India is to find a place amongst the developed nations of the world sanitation coverage has to improve.

(i) Investment made in rural sanitation sector

5.13 When the Committee wanted to know about investment so far made in rural sanitation sector in different Plan Periods in the country, the Department in a written note stated as under:—

“Under CRSP, Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) was started in 1999 as a demand driven programme. The project cost is shared between

centre, state and beneficiary in a fixed proportion with a view to make states and beneficiaries accountable in the process of sanitation coverage in rural India with the goal to complete the sanitation coverage in Rural India by 2012. Under TSC, district-wise projects are sanctioned. At present the programme is being implemented in 593 districts with a total project outlay of Rs. 17885.55 crore. This has central share of Rs. 11,094.03 crore, state share of Rs. 4,775.75 crore and a beneficiary share of Rs. 2,015.77 crore. The plan-wise information of centre and state level expenditure against this outlay is as under:

(Rs. in crore)

Plan	Expenditure made	
	Centre	State
VII Plan (1985-1990)	18.52	39.71
Annual Plans (1990-1992)	14.01	62.00
VIII (1992-1997)	244.62	395.58
IX Plan (1997-2002)	344.28	548.48
X Plan (2002-2007)	1402.00	843.37
XI Plan (2007-2012)	*2963.00	*1079.89
Total	4986.43	2969.03

* (provisional) till 5th November 2009."

(ii) Evolution of schemes

5.14 Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) was launched by the Ministry of Rural Development in 1986 with the objective of improving the quality of life of rural people and providing dignity to women. It was re-structured in 1999 by phasing out the allocation based component of CRSP. TSC was launched *w.e.f.* 01.04.1999.

5.15 The Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) is a community-led and people- centered programme. The objective is to make it a demand driven campaign through creation of awareness and provision of sanitary facilities in educational institutions such as schools, anganwadis and in individual houses, which will result in inculcating hygienic practices amongst the young and in adults.

5.16 The goal of the programme is full household coverage by 2012 and reducing by half the number of people without access to sanitation by 2010 and to meet the Millennium Development Goal (MDG).

(iii) Components of Total Sanitation Campaign:

5.17 The components of TSC include start-up activities, IEC, provision of individual house hold latrines, community sanitary complexes, school sanitation and hygiene education, Anganwadi toilets, Solid and Liquid Waste Management, alternate delivery mechanism, in the form of Rural Sanitary marts and production centres and administrative charges. The Total Sanitation Campaign guidelines have been modified following approval given by the Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs with effect from August 1, 2008.

(iv) Unit cost of Individual Household Toilets

5.18 As per the revised TSC guidelines the unit cost of household toilets have been revised to take into consideration price escalation due to inflation. As a result, the cost has been revised from Rs. 1500/- to Rs. 2500/- (Rs. 3000/- for hilly and difficult areas).

(v) Revision in funding pattern for Community Sanitary Complexes

5.19 In order to reduce the burden on the community, the community contribution for construction of Community Sanitary Complexes has been reduced from 20% to 10%. Henceforth, Government of India, State Government and Community share would be in the ratio 60:30:10 for construction of Community Sanitary Complexes for all the Sanitary Complexes taken up for construction *w.e.f.* 1st August, 2008.

(vi) Financial and Physical Performance

5.20 The financial performance under TSC during 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 upto 23rd September, 2009 is as under:—

(Rs. in crore)

Particulars	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10 Till 23.09.2009
Budget Estimates	1060.00	1200.00	1200
Revised Estimates	1060.00	1200.00	
Actual Release	996.35 (93.99 %)	1192.81 (99.40%)	531.34

5.21 The State-wise physical performance under TSC during 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 (as on 31.03.2009) has been given at *Appendix III* and *IV*.

(vii) Some major issues

5.22 During the course of examination, the Committee deliberated at length the following issues concerning different components of TSC Programme. The details are as given below:—

- (i) Under-performance in all the components *viz.* IHHL, School Toilets, Anganwadis Toilets and Community Complex;
- (ii) Need for generation of awareness to the Toilets in rural areas and also in rural schools;
- (iii) Need for enhancing the cost of per unit construction for IHHL and Anganwadis;
- (iv) Convergence of sanitation work in NREGA works and linking health with sanitation; and
- (v) Proper assessment of Nirmal Gram Puraskars.

5.23 The issues have been discussed in succeeding paragraphs:—

(a) Under-performance in all components under TSC

The Department of Drinking Water Supply has informed the following physical performance in different components of TSC upto 1 October, 2009:—

(Rs. in lakh)

Item	Project Objective	Achievement
IHHL	11.98	5.83
School Toilets	11.96	9.15
Anganwadi Toilets	4,38,001	2,86,153
Community Complex	32,887	16,663

During the course of examination, the Committee pointed out that the physical performance in respect of all components except school toilets was not satisfactory. The Secretary, Department of Drinking Water Supply replied during evidence as follows:—

“In Anganwadis we are facing a big problem as there are private buildings. Normally, Government money is not generally spent on

private buildings. Now, State Governments have raised this issue. It is for them to decide how to resolve it. It is for this reason that on this area the progress is slow.”

(b) Need for generation of awareness to use toilets in rural areas and also in schools

During the course of examination, it came out that whatever toilets have been constructed in rural areas are generally not used.

In reply to a query about why the toilets constructed are not used the Secretary, DWS was candid in her admission before the Committee stating as under:—

“About toilets in schools it is commonly seen that all toilets constructed are largely not used because of our weakness. I can say that fault lies with project authorities at field level. In fact, it should be demand-driven. Because first people should understand whether toilets is needed or not? If people will realize the requirement of toilets then comes the issue of their construction then these will be used. However, unfortunately, the position is different with State Governments, there is a target oriented approach that so many toilets are to be constructed from the olden days. After these toilets are constructed these are not used. Here, we have a weakness. The States which have done good work, the toilets have been used. However, the States which are backward I will not name them. However, which are doing good work; I will certainly like to speak. For instance, Haryana has coverage of 92 per cent. Thus, indeed there are States where figures are reported in large numbers but their actual usage is non-visible.”

Explaining the position about the use of toilets in schools, the Secretary of Drinking Water Supply informed that:—

“.....In schools coverage has been achieved. I and my colleagues Sh. Vijay Bhaskar ji visited schools on visit to Rajasthan. There we saw that toilets have been constructed but there is no arrangement of water and sanitation. For this proper arrangement is very much needed. Now, comes to the issue of target oriented approach that is not there. However, through persuasive approach, IEC activities people should realize its requirement. If this is done by students, teachers and villagers and they understand it then these toilets will be used.”

The Secretary, Drinking Water Supply further informed that:—

“... In many States for this they have made proper arrangements. For instance, they have opened a Eco club or a school cabinet wherein students are by rotation deployed to be responsible on day-to-day basis. Thus, a calendar is prepared. By this way, sanitation is done. In some States for sanitation work staff is recruited. However, in some States there is no such system in place. After return from Rajasthan, we have sent a strong letter to Chief Secretary, Government of Rajasthan. We have reviewed the matter with them that proper arrangement is essential for this. For this implementation is essential because in schools it can be done.

(c) Need for enhancing the cost of construction for IHHL and Anganwadis and school toilets

During the course of examination, it also came out that the per unit cost of Individual House Hold Latrines (IHHLs), Anganwadis and rural schools of Rs. 2500, Rs. 5,000 and Rs. 20,000 respectively is barely sufficient and should be suitably enhanced. In this connection, the Secretary of Drinking Water Supply clarifying the position stated as under:—

“We have proposed that the per unit cost for Anganwadis toilets be raised from Rs. 5, 000 to Rs. 8, 000 and for rural schools the per unit cost of construction be enhanced from Rs. 20, 000 to Rs. 32, 000.”

(d) Convergence of sanitation work in NREGA works and linking health with sanitation work

During the course of examination it came out before the Committee that there is a need to converge sanitation work like linking sanitation in NREGA works. In this connection, the Committee enquired as to why whether drainage in rural areas should not be added in list of items in NREGA works. The Committee also wanted to enquire whether sewerage line can be laid in rural areas on the pattern of cities. The Committee also wanted to know whether health can be linked with sanitation. The position, the Secretary, Drinking Water Supply informed:—

“There is a need to link outcome of TSC with health..... So far as linking NREGA works with sanitation; it is to some extent already linked. For instance, the priority under NREGA is water conservation.... About permitting construction of toilets, it has been done as the digging of the pits can be done under NREGA.”

(e) Proper Assessment of Nirmal Gram Puraskar

The innovative incentive scheme of Nirmal Gram Puraskar (NGP) has been launched to encourage Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRI) to take up sanitation promotion. The award is given to those PRIs which attain 100 per cent open defecation free environment. The concept of Nirmal Gram Puraskar has been acclaimed internationally as a unique tool of social engineering and community mobilization and has helped a difficult programme like sanitation to gain momentum. Each Gram Panchayat getting the NGP has a ripple effect in the surrounding villages, a movement sustained by active people's participation. The Nirmal Gram Puraskar has ignited the imagination of Panchayat leaders throughout the country and made them champions of sanitation. It has been the prime mover behind the amazing progress achieved in rural sanitation coverage since 2005.

5.24 During the course of examination the Committee were informed that the Nirmal Gram Puraskar was started in 2005 with 40 Panchayats. This rose to 12,276 Gram Panchayats in 2008. In this connection, the Committee during the course of evidence wanted to know whether any review of the villages which are certified as Nirmal Gram has been done by the Department of Drinking Water Supply, the Secretary clarified:—

“The Department is very much concerned on this issue. We are doing some planning so that review is done in future. Panchayats become slipped back. This should not happen. We want to evolve some system for this. We will try that by March 2010 we will do something like verification. Previously only reporting was done. Therefore, this year verification was done. Applications for Nirmal Gram Puraskar were in large but actually one-third were verified as genuine. It is for this reason that like 12,000 Nirmal Gram Puraskars were given away last year. This year only 5,000 Panchayats are being given this Puraskar because we have started tough measures on these issues.”

5.25 **The Committee wish to emphasise that like rural water supply sector, another equally important sector is rural sanitation since there is a direct relationship between water, sanitation and health. The Committee feel that rural sanitation has to improve if India has to find a place among the developed nations. However, the Committee's examination has revealed that as against the huge investment of around Rs. 8000 crore, the actual rural sanitation has reached only upto 61 per cent in the country. The Department has submitted before the Committee that rural sanitation is being taken care of under**

Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) started in 1999. This is a demand-driven scheme with project cost being shared among Centre, States and beneficiary and the goal of TSC is to achieve full household coverage by 2012. The Committee apprehend whether with the present pace of activities, the project objectives in all the components of TSC like construction of Individual Household Latrine (IHHL), school toilets, Anganwadi and community complex would be achieved as scheduled. For instance, as against the project objective of 11.98 lakh individual household latrines, the achievement is as low as 5.83 lakh. Similarly, for school toilets against the target of 11.96 the achievement was 9.15 lakh and in Anganwadi toilets, against the target of 4.38 lakh, the achievement was 2.86 lakh. The above figures speak volumes about the performance of Department under TSC scheme. The Committee desire that the pace of the Programme should be accelerated keeping in view that only 61 per cent coverage has been achieved with regard to rural sanitation in the country when the target is to achieve full household coverage by 2012.

5.26 About lower performance on Anganwadis the Secretary, Drinking Water Supply expressed her helplessness on this issue as Anganwadis are largely being run in private buildings and State Governments are reluctant to spend Government money on private buildings. In this connection the Committee find that the TSC Guidelines brought out by the Department are very clear on the issue. As per the Guidelines where Anganwadis are being run on private buildings the owner must be asked to construct the toilet as per design, and he/she may be allowed to charge enhanced rent for the building to recover the cost of construction. The Committee desire that the Guidelines on TSC must be followed. The Committee observe that it is a matter of shame for the country that after more than five decades of planned development our children in the school do not have the basic facility of toilet. The Committee again strongly recommend to take all out initiatives to ensure that all the schools in rural areas have the toilet facility within the shortest possible time.

5.27 The other area which in Committees' opinion needs urgent attention is generation of awareness on inculcating the habit of using the toilets by rural masses so that toilets constructed are at least used. In this connection, the Secretary, Drinking Water Supply, agreed with the Committee that non-usage of toilets already constructed largely in schools is due to weakness on the part of project authorities at field level. The Committee feel that there may be several instances where toilets constructed may not have adequate water availability and may become dysfunctional over a period of time or the people do not have the mindset to use the toilets. The Committee urge to the Department

to take steps so that spreading awareness about the use of toilets is included as part of the programme itself.

5.28 The Committee have been informed that necessary awareness can be generated by way of emulating the examples of forming of Eco. Club or School Cabinets amongst school teachers and students for supervising sanitation work. The Committee feel that this is a noble idea. The Committee desire that State-wise details of such mechanism available in different States be furnished to the Committee. At the same time, other States should be advised to move on similar lines for achieving awareness in this regard.

5.29 Another area that came up for discussion during the course of evidence of the representatives of Department of Drinking Water Supply was need for enhancement of per unit cost of construction of Individual Household Latrine (IHHL) and Anganwadis. The Committee have been informed that the existing cost of Rs. 2500/- , Rs. 5000/- and Rs. 20,000/- for IHHL, Anganwadis and school toilets, is barely sufficient and be suitably enhanced. The Secretary, Drinking Water Supply informed the Committee that a proposal for hiking the per unit cost of construction for Anganwadis from Rs. 5000/- to Rs. 8000/- and for rural school from Rs. 20,000/- to Rs. 32,000/- has already been submitted. The Committee would like to know whether similar proposal for hiking the per unit cost of IHHL has also been made. The Committee desire that a final decision on this issue be taken urgently for achieving the school coverage by 2010.

5.30 Two other important issues relate to the convergence of sanitation work in NREGA works and linking health with sanitation; and the verification of Nirmal Grams which have been recipients of Nirmal Gram Puruskar in previous years. On the first issue the Committee have been informed by the Secretary, Drinking Water Supply that by and large, the required convergence has already started as works relating to digging of pits for rural toilets are being done under the NREGA. On the issue of linking sanitation with health the Committee would like to hear the views of the Department.

5.31 On the issue of verification of Nirmal Grams with a view to have an idea of actual Grams sanitized, the Committee have been informed by the Secretary, Drinking Water Supply that this issue is already receiving the attention of the Department and after having found large number of otherwise ineligible applications for receiving the Nirmal Gram Puruskars (NGPs), the Department has curtailed the list of such Gram Panchayats. The Committee desire that a survey be undertaken for this purpose in different States to ascertain whether

recipients of NGPs have actually maintained such standards subsequently also. The Committee may also be apprised of the result of the survey.

C. JALMANI – Stand alone water purification system

5.32 This scheme has been launched with the objective to enable the rural schools to have provision of safe and clean drinking water for children studying in water deficient schools. Keeping in view the kind of contaminants to be treated, suitable water treatment technologies have been identified and States are to select the suitable technology while installing the systems in schools.

5.33 Detailing out salient features of the Programme the Secretary, DWS informed:—

“Last year on 14th November, this scheme was announced for 50,000 schools and it was told that amount of Rs. 100 crore should be distributed in State Governments so that there is some arrangement made in those schools for safe drinking water identifying how much water is polluted or there is problem in water. In some areas where the pathologically contaminated water figures of such water were conveyed to State Government. Thereafter, after procuring requisite units these were to be installed in those schools. So far the progress reports in respect of 1200 schools have come. In many schools there is only bacterial contamination of water. In these schools filters usually used in house is to be installed. It was also decided that in December 2009, the performance will be reviewed. In the light of that again this year decision will be taken how to distribute Rs. 100 crore to State Governments.”

5.34 Explaining further Secretary, DWS added:—

“In this connection, the High level technical Committee, chaired by Secretary, Science & Technology, Government of India, in their recommendation had opined that it would be appropriate to install such units in the schools and we have also circulated the recommendations to State Governments. There is a huge number and it is likely that some States the target may be phenomenally high. Therefore, it took some time. However, State Governments have informed us that by December 2009 they will achieve the target.”

5.35 Secretary, DWS further elaborated as under:—

“There are some cheap alternatives also. Yesterday only UNECEF has sent us some units that can address Fluoride and biological contaminated water that would cost less than Rs. 1000. The water that was treated through these units was also pure.”

5.36 In this connection, the Committee wanted to know the role of the Department in selection of units. The Secretary, DWS clarified:—

“We suggest that we can not fix the rate. This is the work of State Governments. We suggest that this technology is available and it is available in the market. In fact, we have recommended more than 40 items. Now, it is for State Governments to decide.”

5.37 The Committee wanted to know the number of schools that have been actually covered against the 50,000 schools to be covered during 2008-09 the Department informed:—

“As per the Jalmani Online Information System, as on 3/11/2009, 1,734 rural schools have been covered by providing stand alone drinking water purification systems in the States of Bihar (702), Gujarat (23), Madhya Pradesh (288), Meghalaya (23), Mizoram (68), Sikkim (23), Tamil Nadu (892) and Jharkhand (1). Figures in parenthesis indicate the actual number of schools covered under Jalmani programme.”

5.38 On being asked about how much funds have been utilized by the beneficiary States, the Department has informed:—

“As per the Jalmani online Information System, 5 States *viz.*, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram, Sikkim and Tamil Nadu have only reported an expenditure of Rs. 32.34 lakh, as on 3/11/2009.”

5.39 When the Committee wanted to know the action taken by the Department on the Programme they were informed as under:—

“State Governments are being constantly advised in various review meetings to speed up the implementation of Jalmani programme by providing stand alone drinking water purification systems in rural schools. List of suggestive technologies and suppliers as identified by the High Level Technical Committee chaired by Secretary (DST) is also made available online so that they could select appropriate technology/product suitable in their States.”

5.40 The Committee are glad to note that Jalmani stand alone water purification system has been started in November last year to provide safe and clean drinking water to children studying in schools with an allocation of Rs. 100 crore. The Committee have been informed by Secretary, Drinking Water Supply that under the programme, State Governments have been asked to identify schools facing quality related problem. As per latest figures 12,00 schools have been covered and in December, 2009 the progress would be reviewed. However, the Committee find that against the target of 50,000 schools the actual coverage has been only 12,00 so far and only Rs. 32.34 lakh have been spent on the scheme out of Rs. 100 crore. In view of this position, the Committee recommend that greater efforts are necessary for the success of the programme.

5.41 On the issue of quality of drinking water supply for the school going children, the Committee feel that the issue merits serious attention and sincere efforts need to be made in this regard. The information relating to treating polluted water through various techniques and other related issues needs to be incorporated in the syllabus of the school students so that the future generation of the country are saved from the scourge of contaminated drinking water.

NEW DELHI;
16 December, 2009

25 Agraphayana, 1931 (Saka)

SUMITRA MAHAJAN,
Chairperson,
Standing Committee on Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

FINANCIAL REQUIREMENT Summary of Demands for Grants

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	Major Head of Accounts	Budget Estimates 2008-09	Revised Estimates 2008-09	Budget Estimates 2009-10
1.	PLAN				
	Water Supply and Sanitation	2215	2320.00	2352.44*	5807.27*
	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP)	3601	4250.00	4307.56*	1482.73*
	Total : (ARWSP)		6570.00	6660.00	7290.00
2.	Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC)	2215	1080.00	1080.00	1080.00
3.	Lump sum provision for project/schemes for benefits of the North Eastern Region and Sikkim				
	(i) Accelerated Rural Water Supply	2552	730.00	740.00	810.00
	(ii) Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC)	2552	120.00	120.00	120.00
	Total : N.E. Regions		850.00	860.00	930.00
	Total Plan		8500.00	8600.00	9300.00
	NON-PLAN				
1.	Headquarter's Establishment of Department of Drinking Water Supply	3451	1.90	2.27	2.84
	Total : Plan & Non-Plan		8501.90	8602.27	9302.84

* Including Stand-alone water Purification Systems in Rural Schools.

Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM)
Ministry of Rural Development/Department of Drinking Water Supply

FINANCIAL REQUIREMENT

(Rs. in crores)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	Budget Estimates 2007-08	Revised Estimates 2007-08	Actual Expenditure 2007-08	Budget Estimates 2008-09	Revised Estimates 2008-09	Expen- ditue 2008-09	Budget Estimates 2009-10
	Plan Scheme							
1.	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP)	6500.00	6400.00	6441.63	7300.00	7400.00*	7376.29*	8000.00
2.	Total Sanitation Campaign	1060.00	1060.00	1060.00	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00
	Grand Total-Plan	7560.00	7460.00	7501.63	8500.00	8600.00	8576.29	9200.00
	Non-Plan Schemes Headquarter's Establishment of Department of Drinking Water Supply	1.74	1.82	1.71	1.90	2.79	2.67	2.84
	Total Non-Plan	1.74	1.82	1.71	1.90	2.79	2.67	2.84

* Including stand-alone water Purification Systems in Rural Schools

APPENDIX II

STATE-WISE ALLOCATION AND RELEASE OF FUNDS UNDER REVISED SUB-MISSION PROGRAMME ON WATER QUALITY DURING 2006-07 AND 2007-08

(Amount Rs. in crore)

S.No.	Name of States/UTs	2006-07		2007-08	
		Allocation	Release	Allocation	Release
1.	Andhra Pradesh	34.12	33.63	40.37	46.23
2.	Bihar	79.41	22.46	93.85	159.95
3.	Chhattisgarh	13.27	7.33	15.68	17.90
4.	Gujarat	58.38	40.57	69.04	95.45
5.	Haryana	2.98	0.57	3.51	0.78
6.	Jharkhand	21.01	19.52	24.81	26.17
7.	J&K	0.28	0.00	0.35	0.00
8.	Karnataka	125.36	125.37	148.15	148.15
9.	Kerala	3.11	3.11	3.63	24.04
10.	Madhya Pradesh	60.23	22.50	71.15	79.70
11.	Maharashtra	76.34	26.34	90.23	100.11
12.	Orissa	85.16	17.47	100.64	123.03
13.	Punjab	20.36	7.25	24.11	31.85
14.	Rajasthan	206.63	206.00	244.23	292.43
15.	Tamil Nadu	10.63	3.71	12.52	11.70
16.	Uttar Pradesh	50.13	47.69	59.21	53.09
17.	West Bengal	142.00	111.71	167.81	185.18
18.	Arunachal Pradesh	0.69	0.52	1.78	1.78
19.	Assam	44.22	35.90	115.17	115.17
20.	Manipur	0.04	0.04	0.12	0.00
21.	Meghalaya	0.15	0.15	0.39	0.00
22.	Mizoram	0.03	0.03	0.08	0.00
23.	Nagaland	0.16	0.16	0.43	0.43
24.	Sikkim	0.09	0.00	0.02	0.00
25.	Tripura	4.61	3.64	12.01	12.62
26.	A&N Islands	0.06	0.00	0.12	0.00
27.	Puducherry	0.53	0.00	0.59	0.00
	Total	1040.00	735.67	1300.00	1525.77

APPENDIX III

Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC)

PHYSICAL PROGRESS UNDER TSC DURING 2007-2008

Sl.No.	State	Physical Achievement during 04/2007 to 03/2008 (in numbers)							
		IHHL* (BPL)	IHHL** (APL)	IHHL# Total	Sanitary Comp	School Toilets	Balwadi Toilets	RSM^	PC^^
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	193045	198197	389242	337	13888	957	3	0
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	4380	1056	5436	5	936	204	1	0
3.	Assam	66787	20767	87554	1	1548	319	19	12
4.	Bihar	389205	123845	513050	66	11836	474	100	218
5.	Chhattisgarh	258980	247742	506722	38	15812	3173	7	3
6.	D&N Haveli	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.	Goa	310	0	310	0	0	0	0	0
8.	Gujarat	426856	421041	847897	318	2493	5211	2	0
9.	Haryana	166611	491991	658602	386	2292	2347	15	2
10.	Himachal Pradesh	30538	105505	136043	23	1858	484	1	0
11.	J&K	24507	15052	39559	22	1347	12	1	0
12.	Jharkhand	280369	37858	318227	35	16198	885	45	146
13.	Karnataka	328904	391159	720063	188	13700	5985	14	0
14.	Kerala	246152	44033	290185	63	672	1416	2	1

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
15.	Madhya Pradesh	354358	513679	868037	100	12760	4866	39	1
16.	Maharashtra	445077	746566	1191643	587	26562	20558	188	6
17.	Manipur	3244	235	3479	14	154	42	3	2
18.	Meghalaya	12275	11036	23311	28	1104	106	0	0
19.	Mizoram	15653	0	15653	18	2222	350	0	0
20.	Nagaland	12156	0	12156	96	51	40	6	0
21.	Orissa	416309	59595	475904	2	15763	4479	7	85
22.	Pondichery	545	0	545	14	0	0	0	0
23.	Punjab	26416	145297	171713	5	3571	474	0	0
24.	Rajasthan	146350	663126	809476	117	12501	2425	12	1
25.	Sikkim	8085	1116	9201	273	33	1	0	0
26.	Tamil Nadu	554129	94231	648360	24	5627	1489	18	0
27.	Tripura	2941	0	2941	16	31	381	44	0
28.	Uttar Pradesh	852048	1162476	2014524	63	60035	22058	4	6
29.	Uttarakhand	43152	32649	75801	9	320	84	0	0
30.	West Bengal	456048	236208	692256	168	13973	7673	4	10
	Grand Total	5763430	5764460	11527890	3016	237287	86493	535	493

* IHHL (BPL): Individual House Hold Latrines (Below Poverty Line)

** IHHL (APL): Individual House Hold Latrines (Above Poverty Line)

IHHL (Total): Individual House Hold Latrines (Total)

^ RSM: Rural Sanitary Marts

^^ PC: Production Centres

APPENDIX IV

Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC)

PHYSICAL PROGRESS UNDER TSC DURING 2008-2009

		As on 31.03.2009 (amount Rs. in lakh)							
Sl.No.	State	IHHL* (BPL)	IHHL** (APL)	IHHL# Total	Sanitary Comp	School Toilets	Balwadi Toilets	RSM^	PC^^
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	180860	111827	292687	17	30727	1640	0	0
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	3399	0	3399	1	1910	910	0	0
3.	Assam	162328	43928	206256	0	8296	1195	8	99
4.	Bihar	570905	185560	756465	52	15065	272	92	85
5.	Chhattisgarh	149460	155996	305456	63	18511	1906	0	0
6.	D&N Haveli	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.	Goa	1231	17522	18753	0	335	50	0	0
8.	Gujarat	483175	500937	984112	244	3180	1834	3	0
9.	Haryana	98862	268235	367097	115	14	521	1	0
10.	Himachal Pradesh	71452	242420	313872	35	1959	994	6	0
11.	J&K	135858	3557	139415	159	4291	27	0	0
12.	Jharkhand	330201	32372	362573	23	6913	700	11	52
13.	Karnataka	206393	203423	409816	97	790	1173	3	0
14.	Kerala	74297	7568	81865	89	605	713	2	0

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
15.	Madhya Pradesh	452567	953546	1406113	139	23697	8772	6	0
16.	Maharashtra	344397	510166	854563	361	8871	5992	79	0
17.	Manipur	2923	1667	4590	43	885	95	5	0
18.	Meghalaya	12969	17035	30004	20	549	37	0	0
19.	Mizoram	6294	2679	8973	39	0	117	0	0
20.	Nagaland	3713	1830	5543	2	522	35	1	0
21.	Orissa	260884	62918	323802	5	16623	3768	0	8
22.	Pondicherry	227	0	227	9	0	0	0	0
23.	Punjab	39929	223792	263721	1	2176	0	0	0
24.	Rajasthan	159187	730575	889762	51	9796	2196	1	0
25.	Sikkim	3712	0	3712	155	1	75	0	0
26.	Tamil Nadu	370972	50995	421967	54	2919	1443	1	0
27.	Tripura	22007	40964	62971	2	459	132	0	0
28.	Uttar Pradesh	1039797	1375357	2415154	1448	84045	33380	11	11
29.	Uttarakhand	40130	58754	98884	6	870	109	1	0
30.	West Bengal	455505	180917	636422	51	9780	922	4	5
	Grand Total	5683634	5984540	11668174	3281	253789	69008	235	260

* IHHL (BPL): Individual House Hold Latrines (Below Poverty Line)

** IHHL (APL): Individual House Hold Latrines (Above Poverty Line)

IHHL (Total): Individual House Hold Latrines (Total)

^ RSM: Rural Sanitary Marts

^^ PC: Production Centres

APPENDIX V

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2009-2010)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE SECOND SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, THE 6 OCTOBER, 2009

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1800 hrs. in Committee Room No.'139', First Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Smt. Sumitra Mahajan — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Pulin Bihari Baske
3. Shri Kunvarjibhai Mohanbhai Bavalia
4. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
5. Shri Sidhant Mohapatra
6. Shri Gobinda Chandra Naskar
7. Shri Rakesh Pandey
8. Shri P.L. Punia
9. Shri A. Venkatarami Reddy
10. Shri Jagdish Sharma
11. Shri Navjot Singh Sidhu
12. Shri Jagdanand Singh
13. Shri Makansingh Solanki
14. Shri Kodikkunnil Suresh
15. Shrimati Usha Verma

Rajya Sabha

16. Shri Ganga Charan
17. Shrimati Kanimozhi
18. Dr. Ram Prakash
19. Shri P.R. Rajan
20. Shri Bhagwati Singh
21. Shrimati Maya Singh
22. Miss Anusuiya Uikey

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri V.R. Ramesh — *Director*
3. Shri A.K. Shah — *Additional Director*
4. Shri Sundar Prasad Das — *Under Secretary*

WITNESSES

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

1. Smt. Rajwant Sandhu — *Secretary*
2. Dr. Arvind Mayaram — *Additional Secretary and
Financial Adviser*
3. Shri T.M. Vijay Bhaskar — *Joint Secretary*
4. Shri J.S. Mathur — *Joint Secretary*

2. At the outset the Chairperson, informed the members about the sad demise of Shri Pyarelal Khandelwal, a member of Rajya Sabha and a former member of the Standing Committee on Rural Development during 2006-2007, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009. Thereafter, the Committee adopted a resolution condoling the death of Shri Khandelwal wherein they recalled the contributions made by Shri Khandelwal to the deliberations of the Committee and expressed their heart felt condolences to the bereaved family. The members of the Committee

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

APPENDIX VI

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2009-2010)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE SIXTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, THE 10 NOVEMBER, 2009

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1400 hrs. in Committee Room No. 'G-074', Parliament Library Building, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Smt. Sumitra Mahajan — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Pulin Bihari Baske
3. Shri Kunvarjibhai Mohanbhai Bavalia
4. Shri Sanjay Dhotre
5. Shri H.D. Kumaraswamy
6. Shri Rakesh Pandey
7. Shri A. Venkatarami Reddy
8. Shri Jagdish Sharma
9. Shri Navjot Singh Sidhu
10. Shri Jagdanand Singh
11. Shrimati Usha Verma
12. Shri Ramesh Vishwanath Katti

Rajya Sabha

13. Shri Ganga Charan
14. Dr. Ram Prakash

15. Shri P.R. Rajan
16. Shri Bhagwati Singh
17. Miss Anusuiya Uikey

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri V.R. Ramesh — *Director*
3. Shri A.K. Shah — *Additional Director*
4. Shri Sundar Prasad Das — *Under Secretary*

WITNESSES

- (i) Representatives of Department of Drinking Water Supply
(Ministry of Rural Development)
 1. Smt. Rajwant Sandhu — *Secretary*
 2. Shri T. M. Vijay Bhaskar — *Joint Secretary*
 3. Shri J.S. Mathur — *Joint Secretary*
- (ii) *** *** *** *** ***

2. At the outset the Chairperson welcomed the witnesses to the sitting of the Committee convened for taking oral evidence of the representatives of Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2009-2010).

3. Direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker was read out. The Committee, thereafter, took oral evidence of the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2009-2010). The main issues that came out during the course of discussion include, need of higher allocation both for water supply and for sanitation in rural areas for achieving the 11th Plan targets, expeditious utilization of unspent balance, exploring the possibility of linking health with sanitation in rural areas and bringing convergence of rural sanitation works with the implementation of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA), enhancing the amount granted for sanitary toilets under Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) in rural areas, addressing quality related problems in rural areas etc. The

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

APPENDIX VII

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2009-2010)

EXTRACTS OF MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH SITTING OF THE
COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, THE 14 DECEMBER, 2009

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

PRESENT

Smt. Sumitra Mahajan — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Pulin Bihari Baske
3. Shri Kunvarjibhai Mohanbhai Bavalia
4. Shri Sanjay Dhotre
5. Shri Gobinda Chandra Naskar
6. Shri Rakesh Pandey
7. Shri P.L. Punia
8. Shri Kodikkunnil Suresh
9. Shrimati Usha Verma

Rajya Sabha

10. Shri Ganga Charan
11. Shri Silvius Condpan
12. Shrimati Maya Singh

APPENDIX VIII

STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS/ OBSERVATIONS

Sl. No.	Para No.	Recommendations/Observations
1	2	3
1.	2.4	The Committee note with dismay that Department of Drinking Water Supply has not been able to comply with the direction 73 A of 'Directions by the Speaker'. The Statement by the Minister on the Thirty-Seventh Report of the Committee (2008-09) was required to be made by 21 October, 2008 as per the provisions of this Direction. However, the statement was made only on 26 February, 2009. In Committee's opinion this reflects lack of promptness on the part of Department of Drinking Water Supply on the one hand and retards the consequent action on various recommendations on the other. The Committee recommend that in future it should be ensured that the Statements under Direction 73 A is made within the prescribed time limit.
2.	3.7	The Committee note that with 16 per cent of worlds' population and 2.45 per cent of worlds' land resources India has only 4 per cent of world's fresh water resources. The Committee are also concerned that per capita availability of water has worsened from the level of 5,177 cubic meter in 1951 to the level of 1,820 cubic meter by 2001 which may further decline to 1,341 cubic meter by 2025 <i>i.e.</i> after fifteen years from now. The Committee note that the Revised Guidelines for the modified ARWSP renamed as NRDWP envision to ensure permanent drinking water security in rural areas. However, the impending threat of climate change and global warming in Committee's opinion may also affect rural water supply. In view of the

disturbing scenario, the Committee desire that the Department of Drinking Water Supply should prepare a national perspective on the issue of rural water supply in the country.

3. 3.8 The Committee also note that under the aforesaid guidelines the norms of per capita availability of water has been replaced with ensuring drinking water security for all. In the light of declining per capita availability in coming years and in the light of impending effect of climate change and global warming the Committee would like to know as to how in the absence of per capita availability norm, the Department of Drinking Water Supply is going to achieve the aforesaid objective of ensuring permanent drinking water security in rural areas in the country. The Committee are unhappy to observe that the revised guidelines do not spell out the time-frame for achieving the objective. The Committee would like to know a categorical reply in this regard after interaction with the Ministry of Water Resources, if necessary, in order to arrive at a logical conclusion so as to have a better understanding of the subject in view of the Copenhagen Summit on climate change being held during December this year.
4. 3.14 The Committee while reviewing the utilization position of funds during Tenth Plan (2002-2007) and Eleventh Plan (2007-2012) in rural water supply and rural sanitation sector, find with dismay that there had been under-utilisation in both the sectors to the level of 9.50 per cent and 33.60 per cent respectively. For under-utilisation under rural water supply, the Committee find that the Department has taken the plea of 10 per cent allowable carry over of funds under the guidelines. On rural sanitation, the Committee have been informed that 40 per cent of funds are released when 60 per cent of the funds are utilized so that the projects do not suffer due to want of funds. Thus, 40 per cent funds are always available as working funds for projects. In the Committee's opinion while such plea may be correct to some extent there has certainly been a degree of complacency on the part

1	2	3
		of the Department/States. The Committee, therefore, feel that attitudinal changes are desirable for approaching to the entire issue of utilization of funds. They, therefore, recommend that the Department should also set the targets for utilizing 60 per cent of the funds so that next installment is meaningfully utilized during that financial year itself.
5.	3.23	While examining the overall Budget of the Department during the last two years <i>viz.</i> 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, the Committee find that there is an enhancement of Rs. 1,000 crore and Rs. 700 crore during the years 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 respectively. The Committee have been informed that funds are allocated to all States by a pre-defined criterion and any increased allocation is thus disbursed to all States. The Committee are unable to comprehend from the cryptic reply of the Department as to how the increased allocation were proportionately disbursed to the State Governments without taking into account their past performance. The Committee desire a categorical reply in this regard.
6.	3.24	While reviewing the allocation <i>vis-à-vis</i> expenditure position during Eleventh Plan, the Committee find that as against the agreed outlay of Rs. 47,306 crore, the expenditure was Rs. 16,077 crore during first two years <i>viz.</i> 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 of the Plan. The Committee find that if the Budget estimates of Rs. 9,300 crore for 2009-2010 are added, the total comes to Rs. 25,377 crore. The Committee feel that for optimal utilization of Eleventh Plan allocation, annual expenditure of the order of over Rs. 9,500 crore per annum is desirable. In this connection, the issue of resource crunch on rural sanitation for current year as also for remaining two years <i>viz.</i> 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 has been highlighted before the Committee by the Secretary, DWS. The Committee have been informed that during 2009-2010 with a Budget of Rs. 1200 crore for rural sanitation, the Department is facing the resource crunch of the order of Rs. 500 crore. The Committee have been informed that as against Central share of Rs. 11,094 crore required to be made

during the Eleventh Plan, Rs. 4700 crore has so far been released to States indicating a shortfall of Rs. 6300 crore. The Committee also conclude from the aforesaid analysis that in order to achieve the targets of rural sanitation by 2010 and targets for school coverage by 2012 adequate allocation is not being made. Besides, these schemes of the Department have tremendous impact on improving rural infrastructure. The Committee strongly recommend to the Department to take up the matter with the Ministry of Finance/ Planning Commission for getting adequate allocation commensurate with the requirements, with a view to achieve inclusive growth so that the benefits are shared by the poorest of the poor in the country and make sincere efforts to fulfill their mandate of providing safe adequate drinking water to the rural people.

7. 4.10 The Eleventh Plan document has brought out grave scenario prevailing in the country on Drinking Water and Rural Sanitation characterized by large number of slipped back habitations, huge number of quality-affected habitations, declining ground water table, declining per capita availability of drinking water and staggering 39 per cent of rural population without basic sanitation. The Committee's examination has revealed that even after decades of planning and huge investment of the magnitude of Rs. 15,200 crore in this sector, the actual coverage of rural water supply has reached to the level of only 74 per cent and for rural sanitation it is only 61 per cent as on today. This speaks volumes about actual implementation of various schemes that have been run by the Centre from time to time. The Department has made out their case before the Committee explaining that increased water pollution due to industrial activities, growth of population and increasing requirement of water for agricultural sector have been largely responsible for the above scenario in rural water supply. Coupled with these, the Committee have also been informed that there has been a general reluctance by States for pricing of water and regulating its extraction. Increased population and enhanced infrastructure activities have been given as reasons for slow progress in rural
-

1	2	3
		sanitation. The Committee urge the Department to make all out efforts to achieve full coverage in providing safe drinking water and sanitation in rural areas in the country.
8.	4.11	Tracing out the progress in rural water supply, the Committee have been informed that with the Department's sustained efforts, the coverage of drinking water in rural areas has improved from 55.45 per cent in 1991 to the level of 86.77 per cent in 2001. By 2006, as per the Department's information 97 per cent rural coverage has been achieved. Similarly, on rural sanitation, the Committee have been informed that coverage of 21.9 per cent in 2001 has gone upto 61.29 per cent in October, 2009. Thus, two sets of figures have been provided to the Committee in respect of drinking water coverage and rural sanitation. The Committee, express their displeasure over supply of two different sets of data relating to the important schemes of the Department. The Committee are of the opinion that these figures of coverage in terms of rural drinking water supply and rural sanitation are deceptive and are not at all convincing. The Committee, therefore, recommend that a time bound village to village survey should be carried out to arrive at figures of actual coverage at ground level.
9.	4.12	The Committee have been informed that 80 per cent of rural drinking water supply is based on ground water and less than 1 per cent of this, is used for drinking water purposes. The remaining is used for other purposes like irrigation and industries causing slippages in coverage. As a result, transport of drinking water in rural areas has to be made from far flung areas at huge cost. The Department has admitted before the Committee that various other reasons like shortage of technical manpower and resource constraints in most of the States are the reasons for slower progress. In order to address all these issues the Department has come out with a new approach for rural water supply under Revised Guidelines which <i>inter-alia</i> envisage a paradigm shift on surface water, ground water and rain water in a big way for future

needs, enhancing funds for sustainability and operation and maintenance to help the States after taking into confidence different State Governments. In Committee's opinion, since the Programme has been started from April 2009 it is too early to comment on its implementation. However, the Committee feel that the Department should see that the new Programme is implemented in letter and spirit so that the Committee can review the progress under the new approach while examining Demands for Grants (2010-2011) of the Department. In order to overcome the shortage of slippages of rural water sources, the Department should hold consultations with other related Ministries like Irrigation and Industry to bring forward a new approach on the pattern of Revised Guidelines so that necessary policy initiatives are taken in those areas also. The Committee would like to know the views of Department in this regard.

Another area that has attracted the attention of the Committee is about State's reluctance on the issue of pricing of water and regulation of its extraction. The Committee feel that since water is a State subject, the need of the hour is to arrive at a consensus on the complex issue of pricing and regulation of extraction of water. The Committee, therefore, would impress upon the Department to start the process among different States on this issue. The Committee may also be apprised of the outcome of the exercise.

10. 4.14 The Committee's examination has revealed that in the area of policy intervention the rural water supply sector has become a testing laboratory of the Department of Drinking Water Supply. The Committee find that starting with ARWSP in 1972-73 for providing adequate drinking water; in 1985-86, the Department started with major focus on water quality; in 1999-2002 the Department experimented with Swajaldhara concept involving community participation and in 2009 National Rural Drinking Water Programme (NRDWP) was started. The Committee feel that the new approach is a welcome step in rural water supply. However, the Committee feel that there is no need for

1	2	3
		frequent policy changes and from now onwards emphasis should be on actual implementation on war footing basis.
11.	4.19	The Committee are dismayed to note that performance in rural drinking water supply which is one of the six components of mega Programme of Bharat Nirman has not been well so far during 2009-2010 in terms of coverage of uncovered, slipped back and quality-affected habitations. For instance, for uncovered habitations, the Committee find against the target of 624 the achievement is only 3. Similarly, for slipped back habitations against the target of 25,482 the achievement is as low as 439. Coming to quality-affected habitations against the target of 75,000 the achievement has plummeted to 93 only. The Committee have been informed that such dismal performance is owing to variety of reasons like considerable time taken by different State Governments for mainstreaming activities consequent upon enforcement of new guidelines, time taken in tackling natural calamities like drought and floods witnessed early this year in many States. The Committee desire that a separate mechanism be evolved to tackle the natural calamities so that the assigned tasks before the Department relating to the important schemes do not suffer. The Committee would like to be apprised about the steps taken in this regard.
12.	4.20	The Standing Committee had been persistently recommending for achieving of targets in this area. In the Thirty-Seventh Report also (para no. 5.10 refers), the Committee had impressed upon about the same. Though the Department are optimistic about achieving the target, the ground reality in this regard suggest otherwise. The Committee would like the Department to shed their complacent approach and undertake concrete and strict measures to ensure achievement of the targets by the States. The Committee may be apprised of the concrete action taken in this regard.
13.	4.32	The Committee are amazed over the fact that on the one hand the coverage of rural drinking water supply is only 74 per cent and for rural sanitation it is still

lower at 61 per cent. On the other hand, there are huge unspent balances as on 31.10.2009 to the tune of Rs. 3109.46 crore for rural water supply and Rs. 1259.59 crore for rural sanitation. The Committee find that this is piquant situation and as such the Committee do not approve of the same. The Committee's examination has revealed that the figures of unspent balances as given in Outcome Budget (2009-10) of the Department laid before Parliament were not updated and were not even indicated to be provisional in the case of rural sanitation. The Committee have now been given updated figures. The Committee, however, feel now that coming with provisional and old figures on the ground that States have not updated these figures, does not augur well with the Department. The Committee, therefore, feel that since Outcome Budget is a public document and authentic source of information, the Department should come out before the Parliament with updated figures.

14. 4.33 The Committee have analysed that there are volumes of unspent balances in rural water supply and rural sanitation. The Committee find in rural water supply as per the latest figures such balances amount to Rs. 3109.47 crore. The major States where these unspent balances are lying are Bihar (Rs. 570.38 crore), Maharashtra (Rs. 359.34 crore), Uttar Pradesh (Rs. 201.73 crore) etc. Similarly, on rural sanitation as per the latest figures of Rs. 1259.60 crore, the major States against which unspent balances are lying are Bihar (Rs. 143.63 crore), Andhra Pradesh (Rs. 130.39 crore), Uttar Pradesh (Rs. 126.58 crore) etc. During the course of evidence, the Committee have been informed by the Secretary, Drinking Water Supply that on the issue of unspent balances some money always lies with States. On the rural water supply, the Committee have also been informed that States have already liquidated unspent balance as per latest information. The Committee appreciate this development. However, in the absence of latest figures, the Committee are unable to comment further on the issue. The Committee desire that the required information be made available to the Committee so as to arrive at a logical conclusion.

1	2	3
15.	4.34	<p>On the issue of unspent balances in rural sanitation, the Secretary, Drinking Water Supply candidly admitted before the Committee that the situation has not at all improved. Various reasons like 40 per cent release after expenditure of 60 per cent of the funds have been advanced in this regard. The Committee, however, recommend that the States be advised to submit timely proposals for releases leaving no room for unspent balances. They also suggest, the States should be asked to furnish specific reasons for unspent balances/non-utilisation of resources. Such mechanism will not only make the States accountable but would also help the Union as well as the State Governments to take remedial measures.</p>
16.	4.44	<p>The Committee are disappointed to note that there are large number of quality-affected habitations in the country largely due to problem like arsenic, fluoride, iron, salinity and nitrate even when a full fledged programme of 'National Rural Drinking Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance Programme' for tackling the above problem was in operation since February, 2006. The Committee are also concerned to note that after the launch of the above Programme not only the number of quality affected habitations but the number of States having such habitations has increased from 5 States in 2006 to 14 States in 2009. The Committee also find that the number of quality affected habitations except for nitrate affected habitations has significantly increased. The Committee have been informed that many of the habitations in the country which are reported as water quality affected have been addressed with projects which are under various stages of implementation. The Committee find the reply as very vague since it does not spell out category-wise number of quality affected habitations in different States. In the absence of the requisite data the Committee are unable to comprehend about the work actually done in this regard. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Department should furnish detailed data in this regard.</p>

1	2	3
17.	4.45	<p>The Committee are aware that tackling the arsenic and fluoride affected habitations in the country is the priority of the Government. However, the Committee are constrained to note that required work in this regard has not been done in the right earnest. It is needless to point out that contaminated harmful sources of water in rural areas in the country may cause a severe crisis. The Committee emphasize that all the efforts made with regard to improving the coverage status and bringing about sustainability of sources and the systems become meaningless in the absence of clean and safe drinking water. The Committee, therefore, desire that efforts aimed at tackling the contamination of water should be intensified. They would like to be informed of the measures taken in this direction.</p>
18.	4.46	<p>The Committee also find that under the Revised Guidelines, 20 per cent funds are being given for tackling the quality affected habitations with 100 per cent funding from the Centre. The Committee feel with this, there should not be any alibi for not performing in this important area. The Committee has been constantly recommending for expeditious work in their previous Reports and had also dealt with the issue in their latest 37th Report (para no. 5.10 refers). The Committee, therefore, desire that all out and time bound efforts should be made in this regard. The Committee expect the Department to gear up on these lines.</p>
19.	4.47	<p>The Committee also note with disappointment that even after online Integrated Management Information System (IMIS) monitoring of quality affected habitations and full fledged water quality testing apparatus available in the country, the contaminated water is not being treated in various quality affected habitations. The Committee, therefore, desire that available testing facilities be fully utilized for treating the contaminated quality affected habitations spread over various States of the country. On the issue of salinity affected habitations, the Committee are surprised to hear from the Department that they have</p>

no scientific proof about increase in number of such habitations. The Committee wonder how in the absence of such scientific data the Department is going to solve the problem of salinity affected habitations in the country. The Committee, therefore, expect a categorical reply in this regard.

20. 4.59 The Committee appreciate that a paradigm shift from over dependence on ground water to surface water and roof water for addressing the availability of drinking water in rural areas has been evolved under the modified ARWSP renamed as 'National Rural Drinking Water Programme' (NRDWP) that is being implemented *w.e.f.* 1st April, 2009. The Committee also appreciate that for sustainability and for Operation & Maintenance (O&M) purposes, the distribution of annual budget allocation has been hiked to 20 per cent and 10 per cent respectively. The Committee trust that this will get desired results in covering slipped back habitations as also making available funds for O&M purposes for repairs of existing drinking water supply assets. However, here again the Committee apprehend that inspite of major policy interventions, the ground situation may remain the same and last man in the row in rural areas may not get the benefit of enhanced funds for rural water supply programme. The Committee, therefore, recommend that mechanism available under the revised guidelines should be put in place in all States in a time bound manner for getting the desired results.
21. 4.60 The Committee also appreciate that under sustainability component of NRDWP, works like artificial recharge/rain water harvesting structures are to be taken up with a view to improving the drinking water availability in rural areas and also for reducing effects of depletion of ground water. In this connection, the Committee desire that a study be undertaken on the impact of funds released for sustainability and for checking ground water use in the country as the declining ground water is a grave problem at present. The Committee feel that depletion of ground water table is reaching a critical level and unless urgent

1	2	3
		<p>action is taken to promote conjunctive use of water through ground, surface and rain water, a situation of extreme water stress and scarcity may emerge. The Committee feel that the Department should work in a pro-active mode to promote rain water harvesting on a massive scale and simple methods of rain water harvesting may be disseminated widely.</p>
22.	4.61	<p>The Committee also desire that those responsible for implementing the NRDWP in Central Government and State Governments, Project Implementing Agencies (PIAs) should first be made very clear about the Revised Guidelines for taking the benefits of the NRDWP. Apart from this, more and more advertisements and publicity in radio, T.V. and print media should be done in a big way for dissemination of information at grassroots level on the pattern of NREGA and other social sector schemes like Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan. The Committee also desire that a video film or documentary be shown in every Gram Panchayat at regular intervals to educate the importance of conservation and sustainability of water to rural masses and the necessary literature about the new programme should be made available in the local language of the area to Project Implementing Agencies (PIAs).</p>
23.	4.62	<p>The Committee also learn that the Department has brought out two sets of documents and has forwarded these to States for implementation — one pertains to sustainability captioned 'Bringing Sustainability to drinking water systems in rural India' and the other on convergence under the caption 'Convergence of various watershed/water conservation'. The Committee feel that these valuable things do not percolate at grassroots level at all. The Committee, therefore, recommend that such important documents be made available to PIAs for effective implementation of the revised guidelines so that they do not remain on paper.</p>
24.	5.8	<p>While reviewing the project planning and implementation, the Committee are astonished to find that all is not well on this important area also. The</p>

Committee find that as per latest figures out of the total of around 1.62 lakh schemes (0.49 lakh PWS schemes and 1.13 lakh other schemes) under the Department, only 39,454 have been completed while the remaining are ongoing or proposed schemes. The Committee are also constrained to note that in PWS scheme the major States that are not performing well are Bihar, Assam, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Orissa and Rajasthan. The Committee have been informed that on line monitoring in all the States is at present available. In view of this, the Committee are unable to understand as to why large number of on-going schemes are still waiting for completion. The Committee desire that all out efforts should be made by the Department for completion of the pending projects.

25. 5.11 The Committee's examination has revealed that various World Bank funded drinking water projects are being implemented in the country out of which some have been completed. The Committee are constrained to note that out of the five projects under implementation, in three such projects in Kerala, Karnataka and Maharashtra there is a time overrun. Two of these were to be completed in 31.12.2007 and the third was to be completed in June, 2007. The Committee have been informed that on the request of the State Governments these projects are surviving on extensions recommended by Department of Economic Affairs (DEA). The Committee would like the Department to ensure completion of these projects in time.
26. 5.25 The Committee wish to emphasise that like rural water supply sector, another equally important sector is rural sanitation since there is a direct relationship between water, sanitation and health. The Committee feel that rural sanitation has to improve if India has to find a place among the developed nations. However, the Committee's examination has revealed that as against the huge investment of around Rs. 8,000 crore, the actual rural sanitation has reached only upto 61 per cent in the country. The Department has submitted before the Committee that rural sanitation is being

taken care of under Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) started in 1999. This is a demand-driven scheme with project cost being shared among Centre, States and beneficiary and the goal of TSC is to achieve full household coverage by 2012. The Committee apprehend whether with the present pace of activities, the project objectives in all the components of TSC like construction of Individual Household Latrine (IHHL), school toilets, Anganwadi and community complex would be achieved as scheduled. For instance, as against the project objective of 11.98 lakh individual household latrines, the achievement is as low as 5.83 lakh. Similarly, for school toilets against the target of 11.96 lakh the achievement was 9.15 lakh and in Anganwadi toilets, against the target of 4.38 lakh, the achievement was 2.86 lakh. The above figures speak volumes about the performance of Department under TSC scheme. The Committee desire that the pace of the Programme should be accelerated keeping in view that only 61 per cent coverage has been achieved with regard to rural sanitation in the country when the target is to achieve full household coverage by 2012.

27. 5.26 About lower performance on Anganwadis the Secretary, Drinking Water Supply expressed her helplessness on this issue as Anganwadis are largely being run in private buildings and State Governments are reluctant to spend Government money on private buildings. In this connection the Committee find that the TSC Guidelines brought out by the Department are very clear on the issue. As per the Guidelines where Anganwadis are being run on private buildings the owner must be asked to construct the toilet as per design, and he/she may be allowed to charge enhanced rent for the building to recover the cost of construction. The Committee desire that the Guidelines on TSC must be followed. The Committee observe that it is a matter of shame for the country that after more than five decades of planned development our children in the school do not have the basic facility of toilet. The Committee again strongly recommend to take all out initiatives to ensure that all the schools in rural areas have the toilet facility within the shortest possible time.

1	2	3
28.	5.27	The other area which in Committees' opinion needs urgent attention is generation of awareness on inculcating the habit of using the toilets by rural masses so that toilets constructed are at least used. In this connection, the Secretary, Drinking Water Supply, agreed with the Committee that non-usage of toilets already constructed largely in schools is due to weakness on the part of project authorities at field level. The Committee feel that there may be several instances where toilets constructed may not have adequate water availability and may become dysfunctional over a period of time or the people do not have the mindset to use the toilets. The Committee urge to the Department to take steps so that spreading awareness about the use of toilets is included as part of the programme itself.
29.	5.28	The Committee have been informed that necessary awareness can be generated by way of emulating the examples of forming of Eco Club or School Cabinets amongst school teachers and students for supervising sanitation work. The Committee feel that this is a noble idea. The Committee desire that State-wise details of such mechanism available in different States be furnished to the Committee. At the same time, other States should be advised to move on similar lines for achieving awareness in this regard.
30.	5.29	Another area that came up for discussion during the course of evidence of the representatives of Department of Drinking Water Supply was need for enhancement of per unit cost of construction of Individual Household Latrine (IHHL) and Anganwadis. The Committee have been informed that the existing cost of Rs. 2,500/- , Rs. 5,000/- and Rs. 20,000/- for IHHL, Anganwadis and school toilets, is barely sufficient and be suitably enhanced. The Secretary, Drinking Water Supply informed the Committee that a proposal for hiking the per unit cost of construction for Anganwadis from Rs. 5,000/- to Rs. 8,000/- and for rural school from Rs. 20,000/- to Rs. 32,000/- has already been submitted. The Committee would like to know whether similar

1	2	3
		proposal for hiking the per unit cost of IHHL has also been made. The Committee desire that a final decision on this issue be taken urgently for achieving the school coverage by 2010.
31.	5.30	Two other important issues relate to the convergence of sanitation work in NREGA works and linking health with sanitation; and the verification of Nirmal Grams which have been recipients of Nirmal Gram Puruskar in previous years. On the first issue the Committee have been informed by the Secretary, Drinking Water Supply that by and large, the required convergence has already started as works relating to digging of pits for rural toilets are being done under the NREGA. On the issue of linking sanitation with health the Committee would like to hear the views of the Department.
32.	5.31	On the issue of verification of Nirmal Grams with a view to have an idea of actual Grams sanitized, the Committee have been informed by the Secretary, Drinking Water Supply that this issue is already receiving the attention of the Department and after having found large number of otherwise ineligible applications for receiving the Nirmal Gram Puruskars (NGPs), the Department has curtailed the list of such Gram Panchayats. The Committee desire that a survey be undertaken for this purpose in different States to ascertain whether recipients of NGPs have actually maintained such standards subsequently also. The Committee may also be apprised of the result of the survey.
33.	5.40	The Committee are glad to note that Jalmani stand alone water purification system has been started in November last year to provide safe and clean drinking water to children studying in schools with an allocation of Rs. 100 crore. The Committee have been informed by Secretary, Drinking Water Supply that under the programme, State Governments have been asked to identify schools facing quality related problem. As per latest figures 1,200 schools have been covered and in December, 2009 the progress would be reviewed. However, the Committee find that against the target

1	2	3
34.	5.41	<p data-bbox="394 172 1039 336">of 50,000 schools the actual coverage has been only 1,200 so far and only Rs. 32.34 lakh have been spent on the scheme out of Rs. 100 crore. In view of this position, the Committee recommend that greater efforts are necessary for the success of the programme.</p> <p data-bbox="394 359 1039 654">On the issue of quality of drinking water supply for the school going children, the Committee feel that the issue merits serious attention and sincere efforts need to be made in this regard. The information relating to treating polluted water through various techniques and other related issues needs to be incorporated in the syllabus of the school students so that the future generation of the country are saved from the scourge of contaminated drinking water.</p>