

TWENTY-FIRST REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2001)

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

DEMAND FOR GRANTS
(2001-2002)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 20.4.2001

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 20.4.2001



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 2001/Chaitra, 1923 (Saka)

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2001)

Corrigenda to the 21st Report (13th Lok Sabha)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Para</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
13	3.27	6 from top	non-lapsa-el	Non-lapsabic
25	2.67	3 from bottom	Crores	Cröre
28	2.77	2 from bottom	Continue	Continuing
37	3.10	11 from top	sixth	sixth
	3.11	4 from top	am	made
40	Row 2 from bottom	Col.12	140.00	92.00
	Row 2 from bottom	Co.13	92.00	140.00
42	Row 7 from bottom	Col.7	1000.00	10,000.00
	Row 6 from bottom	Col.6	4033.00	9033.00
43	Row 2 from top	Col.11	369.00	1369.00
49.	Row 1	Col.2	5033.00	5833.00

CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	
ABBREVIATIONS	
INTRODUCTION	

REPORT

CHAPTER I	Introductory
CHAPTER II	An overall analysis of the Demand for Grants for the year 2001-2002 of the Department of Drinking Water Supply
CHAPTER III	Central Rural Sanitation Programme

APPENDICES

I.	Statement indicating Plan outlay, Actual expenditure, Proposed outlay as agreed to by Planning Commission, Budget Estimates and Revised Estimates during 8th and 9th Plan
II.	Statement indicating Non-plan outlay, Actual expenditure, Proposed outlay as agreed by Planning Commission, Budget Estimates, Revised Estimates during 8th and 9th Plan
III.	Statement indicating year-wise financial requirement under ARWSP
IV.	Statement indicating funds sanctioned/released to sector reform Pilot districts
V.	Statement indicating financial achievement under PMGY (Rural Drinking Water)
VI.	Minutes of the Seventh Sitting of the Committee held on 27.03.2001
VII.	Minutes of the Thirteenth Sitting of the Committee held on 11.04.2001

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2001)

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Padmanava Behra
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishoni
5. Shri Ambati Brahmaniah
6. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
7. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
8. Shri Bal Krishna Chauhan
9. Prof. Kailasho Devi
10. Shrimati Hema Gamang
11. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
12. Shri R.L. Jalappa
13. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
14. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
15. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
16. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
17. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
18. Shri Punmulal Mohale
19. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
20. Shri Ramchandra Paswan
21. Shri Chandresh Patel
22. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
23. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
24. Shri Rajesh Ranjan
25. Shri Nikhilaranda Sar
26. Shri Maheshwar Singh
27. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
28. Shri Sunder Lal Tiwari
29. Shri D. Venugopal
30. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

(iv)

Rajya Sabha

31. Shri S. Agniraj
32. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
33. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
34. Shri N.R. Dasari
35. Shri R.S. Gavai
36. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
37. Shri C. Apok Jamir
38. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
39. Shri Orward L. Nongtdu
40. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan
41. Shri N. Rajendran
42. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
43. Shri Man Mohan Samal
44. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
45. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri K. Chakraborty — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

ABBREVIATIONS

ACA	—	Additional Central Assistance
AE	—	Actual Expenditure
ARWSP	—	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme
BE	—	Budget Estimates
CAP	—	Comprehensive Action Plan
CRSP	—	Central Rural Sanitation Programme
CSIR	—	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
DRDA	—	District Rural Development Agency
DWSM	—	District Water and Sanitation Mission
FC	—	Fully Covered
HRD	—	Human Resource Development
IEC	—	Information Education and Communication
LPCD	—	Litre Per Capita Per Day
MNP	—	Minimum Needs Programme
NAG	—	National Agenda for Governance
NC	—	Not Covered
NCERT	—	National Council for Education Research and Training
NGO	—	Non-Government Organization
O&M	—	Operation and Maintenance
PC	—	Partially Covered
PMGY	—	Pradhan Mantri Gramodaya Yojana
PRIs	—	Panchayati Raj Institutions
RCRSP	—	Restructured Central Rural Sanitation Programme
RD	—	Rural Development
R&D	—	Research and Development
RE	—	Revised Estimates
TSC	—	Total Sanitation Campaign
UTs	—	Union Territories
VWSC	—	Village Water and Sanitation Committees

INTRODUCTION

1. the Chairman of Standing Committee on Urban & Rural Development (2001) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Twenty-first Report on the Demand for Grants (2001-2002) of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply).

2. Demand for Grants has 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 Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply) on 7th March, 2001.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 11th April, 2001.

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

6. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officers of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply) who appeared before the Committee and placed their considered views.

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

NEW DELHI;
19 April, 2001
29 Chaitra, 1923 (Saka)

ANANT GANGARAM GEETE,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban and Rural Development.

REPORT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

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

1.2 The Department of Drinking Water Supply implements the following important programmes:

- (i) Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP); and
- (ii) Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP).

1.3 The overall Demand for Grants of the Department for 2001-2002 are for Rs. 2161.35 crore.

1.4 The Demand for Grants of the Department are presented to Parliament under Demand No. 67.

1.5 The detailed Demand for Grants of the Department were laid in Parliament on 20th March, 2001.

1.6 In the present Report, the Committee have examined the implementation of Centrally sponsored schemes/programmes viz. (i) Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme, and (ii) Central Rural Sanitation Programme in the context of the budgetary allocation in Demand for Grants for the year 2001-2002.

CHAPTER II

AN OVERALL ANALYSIS OF DEMAND FOR GRANTS FOR THE YEAR 2001-2002 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY (MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)

2.1 Comparative position of the outlay of the schemes/programmes of the Department *i.e.* Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) and Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) during 8th Plan (outlay sanctioned and actual expenditure) and 9th Plan (outlay proposed, outlay agreed, BE 1998-1999, RE 1998-1999, Actual expenditure 1998-1999, BE 1999-2000, RE 1999-2000, Actual expenditure 1999-2000, BE 2000-2001, RE 2000-2001, Actuals 2000-2001, outlay proposed and BE 2001-2002) under Plan and Non-Plan heads are given at Appendices I and II respectively.

Drinking Water Supply

Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) and Minimum Needs Programme (MNP)

Overall analysis of the outlay earmarked for ARWSP

Plan Schemes

2.2 The following observations are made from the data indicated at Appendices I and II.

Appendix I (Plan Schemes)

- (i) There is an underspending of Rs. 957.29 crore out of the outlay earmarked during 8th Plan.
- (ii) The outlay proposed during 9th Plan was almost three and a half times of the outlay of 8th Plan.
- (iii) The outlay earmarked for 9th Plan is Rs. 3050 crore more than that of the outlay of 8th Plan.
- (iv) There is marginal cut of Rs. 15 and Rs. 85 crore during 1998-1999 and 1999-2000, respectively. However, during 2000-2001 there is no cut at RE stage.

- (v) The actual expenditure is almost 100% if compared to the RE during 1998-1999 and 1999-2000.
- (vi) There is underspending of Rs. 91.29 crore during 2000-2001. However, the expenditure position is reported up to 21.03.2001.
- (vii) BE 2001-2002 is one-third of the outlay proposed.
- (viii) Percentage increase in outlay as compared to previous year is 10.63 during 1999-2000, 8.89 during 2000-2001 and 2.55 during 2001-2002.
- (ix) If the outlay earmarked during the first four years of the 9th Plan is deducted out of the agreed outlay of 9th Plan, it comes to Rs. 1853 crore for the last year of 9th Plan *i.e.* 2001-2002 and it would be Rs. 157 crore lesser than the outlay earmarked during the previous year.

Non-Plan Schemes

- (i) The expenditure during 8th Plan is mere Rs. 00.45 crore.
- (ii) The BE 1999-2000 is little lesser than BE 2000-2001. However, BE 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 are more than the BE of previous year.

2.3 As regards the outlay earmarked for ARWSP during 2001-2002, Rs. 2010 crore have been allocated for the purpose whereas the funds sought by the Department on the basis of Comprehensive Action Plan (CAP) were Rs. 6190 crore. During 9th Plan, the Central outlay is Rs. 8150 crore against the proposed outlay of Rs. 18000 crore. When asked about the steps taken by the Government to convince the Ministry of Finance for the need to provide sufficient allocations for one of the most priority programme, the Government have submitted that the then Ministry of Rural Development, while forwarding the CAP to Ministry of Finance, had explained in detail the importance and necessity for the need to provide sufficient allocation for the sector as per the requirement indicated in the CAP to ensure effective implementation of the programme and to achieve the objectives earmarked in the NAG.

2.4 When asked for the details regarding the high level political coordination meetings as recommended by the Committee (see 11th Report, 13th Lok Sabha, para 2.2) held on the said issue in the financial year 2000-2001 and the schedule of meetings for the year 2001-2002, it has been clarified by the Government that Chief Ministers of the States and the Ministers concerned with the rural drinking water supply during their visits to New Delhi often visit Hon'ble Rural Development Minister and *inter-alia* exchange their views regarding the implementation of various rural development programmes including drinking water supply, various bottlenecks faced in the implementation of the programme and possible solutions for them. Similar discussions are also held when the Hon'ble Rural Development Minister visits the various States and meet their respective Chief Ministers and Ministers in-charge of Rural Water Supply. These meetings achieve high level political coordination to a great extent. Similar discussions are also held during the meeting of Consultative Committee attached to the Ministry. These meetings are not structured and as such no schedule has been drawn up for the purpose. Further it is submitted by the Government that there is no structured scheme of high level political co-ordination between the Centre and State to achieve the time-bound programme.

2.5 The Committee observe that the allocation needed for one of the most priority programme, ARWSP, is not sufficient to achieve the targets fixed during the 9th Plan as well as in the National Agenda for Governance. In spite of repeated emphasis on adequate allocation under the programme, the Committee note with dismay that the allocation earmarked is a mere one-third of what is required to achieve the targets set in the Comprehensive Action Plan made by the Government in pursuance of the National Agenda for Governance (NAG). The Committee note that the whole exercise of preparing action plans to achieve the aforesaid targets is defeated for want of adequate outlay. The Committee regret that even after passing of more than five decades after independence, the rural masses are still not assured of adequate and uninterrupted supply of drinking water. In view of the top most priority provided to the Centrally Sponsored Programme of Drinking Water, it is felt that the Programme cannot wait for want of sufficient funds and in view of it, the Committee strongly recommend for enhancement of outlay as required in the Comprehensive Action Plan set by the Government by high level political co-ordination between the Centre and States.

2.6 As far as high level coordination between the Centre and States to achieve the time bound target is concerned, the Committee were informed that Chief Ministers of the States and the Ministers concerned with the Rural Drinking Water Supply during their visits to New Delhi often visit Hon'ble Union Rural Development Minister and *inter alia* exchange their views regarding the implementation of various rural development programmes including drinking water supply, various bottlenecks faced in the implementation of the programme and possible solution for them. Similar discussions are also held when Hon'ble Union Rural Development Minister visits to various States and meet their respective Chief Ministers and Ministers in charge of Rural Water Supply. While Committee appreciate such moves, but the effect of such high level contacts is not properly reflected in the results achieved. The Committee would like to be informed about the frequency of such meetings held upto now detailing about the clear cut agenda and the proposals made during such meetings with follow up action taken. Mere holding of meetings may not be enough if the recommendations of such high level meetings are not implemented earnestly without hesitation and the results are perceived by the beneficiaries. The Committee also feel that to make the visit of Hon'ble Union Rural Development Minister to States fruitful, the local MPs should be informed well in advance of such visit to enable them to interact with the Hon'ble Union Minister and to apprise him of the ground realities. The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation that a high-level conference of the Planning Commission with all Central Ministers and State Ministers concerned be convened to find financial resources commensurate with the requirements of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply) to attain the ambitious priority targets in respect of drinking water supply which have been set in the National Agenda for Governance.

2.7 The Committee are distressed that there is no structured scheme of high level political coordination between the Centre and States to achieve the time bound programme. The Committee fail to understand why it is so particularly concerning such a matter of vital importance where bulk of the people are involved. The Committee are of the view that the Government have not paid adequate attention to this aspect resulting in inept handling. The Committee cannot reconcile to such indifference and urge the Government to evolve a structured scheme of high level political coordination between the Centre and States to realise the time bound programme.

Status of coverage of habitations

2.8 While presenting the scenario of coverage of habitations in the country, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted before the Committee as below:

"The present status of coverage which we have got from the States is that we have about 22,672 not covered habitations which is roughly 1.6% of the total, partially covered habitations are 1,81,949 which is 12.8% of the total and the remaining 85.6% are fully covered. By fully covered we mean 40 litres per capita per day availability in the rural areas. Now the actual grant position may be different during the different reasons. This is based on the 1991 survey as updated subsequently. So, there may have been an increase in population and an increase in habitations in this period."

Coverage of habitations as on:

01.04.1999	—	1430543
01.04.2000	—	1422664

Habitations covered between the period:

01.04.1999 to 01.04.2000	—	7889
Targets during 1999-2000	—	90061
Targets during 2000-2001	—	79468

2.9 As regards the reduction in targets during 2000-2001 as compared to previous year, the Government have clarified that during 2000-2001, approximately 44,086 rural schools were also targeted for coverage with drinking water supply facilities in addition to 79468 rural habitations. Hence in real sense, there is no reduction in targets. As regards the position of coverage during 1999-2000, approximately 74637 rural habitations were covered during 1999-2000. The targets for the year 2001-2002 are yet to be intimated by the State Governments.

2.10 When asked about the habitation-wise details of the not covered habitations, the Government have submitted that district/habitation wise coverage is not maintained at the Central level. The State-wise details of the non-covered habitations as per information received from the States till 31.1.2001 indicates the number as 23282. As regards the position of coverage of habitations during the year

2000-2001, it is submitted that as per information received from the State Governments till 31.01.2001, the number of not covered and partially covered habitations covered during the year is as under:

Total	Partially Covered	Not Covered
28927	26012	2915

2.11 The Committee find that not only there is reduction in the targets during 2000-2001 as compared to the previous year but the achievement of targets during 2000-2001 is far less than that of 1999-2000. The Committee are further disturbed to note the way the Government have tried to justify the reduction in targets during 2000-2001. The overall conclusion made by the Committee is that to provide allocation for a sector, the targets are reduced in the other sector and as such minor adjustments are being made. Another disturbing feature noted by the Committee is that there is lack of proper planning on the part of Government to cover the covered and partially covered habitations. Till date, the Government have not received the targets for the year 2001 from the State Governments. They fail to understand how the allocations for a particular year are being made without having the clear picture of targets from the State Governments. The Committee strongly disapproves the way the Government have taken up one of the top most priority programme and urge that serious attention should be paid to the implementation of the programme. There should also be some structured mechanism for getting the information from the State Governments to enable the Central Government to make a realistic assessment of the outlay required during a particular year.

Re-emergence of FC habitations into PC and NC habitations

2.12 As per information furnished by the Government, the State Governments have been requested to furnish annually the information in respect of fully covered habitations slipping back into not-covered and partially covered categories.

2.13 When asked about as to how many States/UT Governments have so far furnished the said information, the Government in their written note have submitted that the State Governments have been requested to furnish annually information regarding the number of fully covered habitations slipping back into not covered and partially covered category. As this initiative was taken during this financial year only, the first half of such annual reports is likely to be received only after the completion of the current financial year. All States/UTs have been reminded to expedite furnishing of the said information.

2.14 In the Mid Term Appraisal of the 9th Plan by the Planning Commission, it has been submitted that although the Ministry of Rural Development claims more than 95% coverage, independent reports show scarcity of drinking water in about half of the villages of India. What is even more distressing is that this gap has been increasing over the years, despite heavy investment. When asked for the comments of the Government in this regard, the Government in their written note have submitted that status with regard to slippage/reverse coverage of fully covered habitations getting into partially covered and not covered and the partially covered ones becoming not covered habitations is not reflected in the coverage status furnished by the State Governments. Coverage estimates may vary at any given point of time due to the following reasons:

- (i) Increase in population/number of habitations.
- (ii) Systems having outlived their life span or becoming defunct due to poor maintenance.
- (iii) Sources going dry due to depletion of ground water level.
- (iv) Sources becoming quality affected.
- (v) Natural calamities like drought, flood cyclone, earthquake, etc.

2.15 Further, while indicating the ground reality in respect of the coverage of habitations under the programme, the Secretary during the oral evidence stated as below:

“We took a survey also about a year and half back to find out as to actually what is the ground position of the systems which are defunct and not working and the rough average of that was about ten percent of the hand pumps and five percent of the piped water supply schemes which were not functional at any given part of time.”

2.16 The result of study for 74 districts in 1998 as per the Mid Term Appraisal of the 9th Five Year Plan (page-297) is given as below:

- * 59% people felt supply was inadequate.
- * 12% households said that the quality of water was not potable.

- * 98% households reported that there was no regular quality testing of drinking water sources.
- * 20% sources non-functional at any time.
- * Of these, half have minor defects.
- * 35% defects remain unattended for more than a month.
- * 83% people had never met a water official.
- * 54% villages willing to pay for water.

2.17 When asked for the comments of the Government in this regard, it is stated that the figures regarding coverage of habitations are maintained on the basis of Nation-wide habitation survey conducted through State Governments in 1991, revalidated in 1994 and updated in 1997 and the subsequent coverage intimated by the State Governments. For the purpose of collecting and compiling information, the State Governments are the most appropriate source of data and there should be no reason to doubt the information furnished by them. While the studies conducted by various agencies are helpful in giving a broad feedback on the implementation of the scheme, it would not be appropriate to generalise the findings and draw conclusions from them because the samples taken for these studies were rather small in size. The information furnished by the State Governments is based on 1991 Census and 1991 Survey, whereas the population has since then increased, leading to emergence of new habitations. New habitations also emerge due to natural disasters like earthquake, flood, cyclone, etc. These together with non-sustainability of sources and systems due to variety of reasons may cause re-emergence of uncovered and partially covered/quality problem habitations, negating efforts of the Government initiative.

2.18 The Committee are disturbed to note the findings of Mid Term Appraisal made by the Planing Commission, according to which there is scarcity of drinking water in about half of the villages in India whereas the Government claims to have covered 95% of the habitations in rural India. It has been further observed by the said Appraisal that this gap is increasing over the years despite heavy investment. In view of the scenario presented by the Mid Term Appraisal, the Committee feel that the Government should seriously think over the issue of re-emergence of FC habitations into PC and NC habitations due to various reasons. The Committee urge that the

Government should conduct a survey by independent evaluators to find out the ground reality in respect of actual coverage of habitations in the country. They also feel that there should be an in-built mechanism in the programme for such a survey after a specified period of time by independent evaluators and the cost of such surveys should not be deterrent to the Government. In the absence of knowledge of ground reality, the target chasing exercise of the Government is of no use. The Committee feel that the Government should seriously consider this issue in the light of the above mentioned observations. The Committee would also urge the Government to ponder over the deficiencies pointed out in the Mid Term Appraisal of the 9th Five Year Plan and put forward suitable proposal to weed out such deficiencies.

Comprehensive Action Plan based on the action plan submitted by the respective States/UTs in consonance with the National Agenda for Governance

2.19 The Government in their written note have stated that the Comprehensive Action Plan (CAP) was submitted to the Ministry of Finance/Planning Commission in June, 2000. The then Minister of Rural Development had requested the Hon'ble Finance Minister and Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission to provide funds for the Rural Water Supply sector as estimated in the CAP. As per the Comprehensive Action Plan (CAP) prepared during 2000-2001 on the basis of information furnished by the State Governments in consonance with the National Agenda for Governance (NAG), the total estimated requirement of Central share of funds alone to achieve the objective of providing safe drinking water to all rural habitations by the year 2004 is Rs. 25,450 crore. Accordingly, the year-wise requirement of Central funds for Rural Water Supply, as per the CAP, is as follows:

The year-wise requirement of outlay under ARWSP for covering the remaining NC/PC habitations as indicated by respective States/UTs is given at Appendix III.

Year	Central Outlay (Rs. in crore)
1999-2000	Rs. 1800 (already provided in the outlay for the year)
2000-2001	Rs. 1960 (already provided in the outlay for the year)
2001-2002	Rs. 6190 (Rs. 2010 crore has been provided as outlay for the year)
2002-2003	Rs. 7200
2003-2004	Rs. 8300
Total	Rs. 25450

2.20 When asked whether the outlay earmarked would be sufficient, the Government have stated that the Central Plan outlay provided for Rural Water Supply during 2001-2002 would be insufficient to achieve the objective contained in the NAG.

2.21 While appreciating the objective of National Agenda for Governance to provide safe drinking water to all rural habitations by the year 2004, the Committee are sceptical about the achievement of the objective in view of the inadequate allocation made under the programme. As could be seen from the outlay earmarked for 2001-2002 less than one-third of what has been required is being allocated by the Government. The Committee strongly recommend that the adequate allocation for the programme should be made to achieve the objective set under the National Agenda for Governance.

Targets and Achievements during 9th Plan

2.22 The 9th Plan strategy was to attain universal coverage. However, annual targets are fixed at the beginning of each financial year based on the outlay for that year for the sector. The targets set and achievements made during the 9th Plan (1997-1998 to 2000-2001) are follows:

Year	Target	Achievement
1997-1998	99613	116994
1998-1999	104902	112933
1999-2000	90061	74637
2000-2001	79468	28927 (Provisional)*

*As per the information received from the States upto 31.01.2001.

2.23 The Committee note that while the targets fixed for the year 1997-98 and 1998-1999 could be achieved more than one hundred percent, however, the Government not only lowered the targets fixed for 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 but also could not meet them. According to the targets fixed for the year 2000-2001 and achievement made till 31st January, 2001, it is observed that only thirty six percent target could be achieved during 10 months period. Even one-fifth of the achievement is made during the remaining two months, the annual percentage of achievement would amount to only about forty percent of the target.

Therefore, the Committee record their deep distress at the lowering of targets and the dismal performance during the year 2000-2001. They urge the Government as a whole to fix annual targets in consonance with objectives set under National Agenda for Governance and ensure that adequate financial and other resources are made available to ensure the attainment of NAG objectives. In this connection, the Committee underline the over-arching importance of de-bureaucratising the delivery system and ensuring that drinking water supply programmes are administered in close association with, or preferably through, elected local bodies.

Allocation to North-Eastern States

ARWSP allocation to North-Eastern States during 2000-2001

2.24 10% of the total outlay of the Department was earmarked for North-Eastern States and Sikkim during 2000-2001 as per the Ministry of Finance instructions and subsequently during 2001-2002, 10% of 216 crore *i.e.* 10% of the total outlay has been earmarked for North-Eastern States and shown separately in the Budget under Head 2552 in Demand No. 67.

2.25 Details regarding ARWSP allocation made to North-Eastern States during 2000-2001 and the expenditure reported during 2000-2001 are as follows:

(Rs. in lakh)		
State	ARWSP allocation	Expenditure reported under ARWSP (Provisional)*
Arunachal Pradesh	4365.00	1286.71
Assam	7372.00	3996.93
Manipur	1475.00	17.07
Meghalaya	1716.00	281.53
Mizoram	1226.00	111.85
Nagaland	1275.00	375.93
Sikkim	650.00	323.34
Tripura	1521.00	608.00

*As per the reports received from the State Governments upto 31.01.2001.

2.26 When asked for the reason for huge underspending in the North-Eastern States, the Government have submitted that the underspending is due to the habitations being in difficult terrain and due to civil disturbances etc.

2.27 It has been stated in the written note that the Comprehensive Action Plan prepared by this Ministry includes the action plans in respect of North-Eastern States for the year 2000-2001. However, no detailed annual action plan from North-Eastern States in respect of absorption of resources earmarked for them has been asked for. The unutilised funds are to be placed in the non-lapsable pool of resources for North-Eastern States administered by the Planning Commission. When asked for the steps taken by the Government to ensure cent percent utilisation of resources, the Government have submitted that the resources meant for North East would not lapse and would be utilised only for them.

2.28 The Committee are concerned to note the huge underspending of special outlay of 10% earmarked for North Eastern States during 2000-2001. They are not inclined to accept the plea extended by the Government that the underspending is due to habitations being in difficult terrain etc. Further it is noted with concern that instead of taking steps to utilise the special allocation, the Government have tried to justify the underutilisation by saying that the unspent amount will go to non-lapsable pool and would be used only by North Eastern States. In spite of Committee's earlier recommendation to ensure cent percent utilisation of scarce resources by the North Eastern States, the Government have not thought of getting detailed annual action plans from these States. The Committee are deeply disturbed by the manner in which the Government have taken the serious problem of non-utilisation of scarce resources by North Eastern States. They strongly recommend that the stress of the Government should be on full utilisation of resources and achievement of targets in the absence of which the whole exercise of planning would be a sheer waste.

Coverage of schools

2.29 The coverage of schools under ARWSP has been indicated in the guidelines for implementation of the programme since 1999. As per the information provided by the Government, as per the Sixth All India Educational Survey (September 1993) there are about 6.37 lakh rural primary/upper primary schools in the country. Further, as per the above survey results, 2.85 lakh rural primary/upper primary schools have drinking water facilities. When asked about the number of schools covered during 2000-2001, it has been stated by the Government that as per the information received from the State Governments 3311 rural schools have been provided with drinking water facilities till 31.01.2001. As regards the targets during 2001-2002, the same are yet to be intimated by the State Governments. When asked whether any time bound programme has been made to cover all the schools, it is stated by the Government that it was estimated that there were about 3.50 lakh rural primary/upper primary schools which were yet to be provided with drinking water supply facilities. About 12.50 lakh rural primary/upper primary schools are proposed to be covered under ARWSP in five years, the requirement of funds for which has been included in the CAP prepared by the Ministry according to which the total requirement of funds is Rs. 900 crore i.e. Rs. 450 crore equally shared by Centre and States. The annual requirement of funds would be Rs. 225 crore i.e. Rs. 112 crore equally shared by Centre and States. The remaining schools would have to be covered with funds available under other schemes.

2.30 As could be seen from the Performance Budget (2001-2002), the performance in respect of coverage of schools is very poor in all the States excepting Mizoram and Tamil Nadu. When asked for the reasons for such a dismal performance, it has been submitted to the Committee that the coverage of schools under RWS Programme has been included in the guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme only from 1999 onwards. Specific targets were fixed only from the financial year 2000-2001. As such, the coverage of rural schools is yet to effectively pick up. The targets for coverage of schools during the year 2001-2002 are yet to be intimated by Mizoram and the UT of Dadar and Nagar Haveli. As per the written reply of the Government, other States/UTs from whom targets have been received, have been reminded to expedite submission of annual action plan for the year, which will *inter-alia* include targets for coverage of rural schools during 2001-2002.

2.31 The Committee are not convinced about the reasons advanced for the dismal performance in respect of coverage of schools under RWS Programme. The Committee are dissatisfied with the implementation of coverage of schools during 2000-2001. It is really pathetic to note that more than 50% of the schools still do not have access to the safe drinking water. While appreciating the initiative taken by the Government to indicate coverage of schools under ARWSP, the Committee feel that mere allocation of outlay would not be sufficient. The Government should stress upon the State Governments the importance of providing drinking water to schools and a time bound programme should be chalked out in this regard. The Committee also recommend that to ensure regular supply of drinking water in schools, when functioning, storage tanks should be constructed to ensure uninterrupted supply of water.

Financial and Physical achievement of Accelerated rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) and Minimum Needs Programme (MNP) during 1999-2000

Physical Achievement

2.32 As per Performance Budget, 2001-2002 of the Department (Annexure-I), the total achievement of number of habitations/villages covered in 74637, out of a target of 90061 habitations/villages. Besides, 12 States/UTs have achieved around 50% target.

2.33 When asked for the reasons for slippage of targets overall as well as State-wise, the Government have stated that the reasons for slippage are due to the fact that the left over habitations are mostly no source/insufficient source habitations or are in difficult terrain, desert regions, hard rock areas, etc. or the sources are quality affected rendering the schemes capital-intensive. Preference for costlier piped water supply schemes as compared to hand pumps also enhances the capital cost, thereby decreasing the number of habitations covered with the funds provided. Further, the indiscriminate and uncontrolled drawl of ground water for purposes other than drinking water is one of the major sector contributing towards rapid depletion of ground water level during the recent years. This on the one hand necessitates additional investment for drinking water and on the other hand, increases the probability of more and more water sources becoming quality affected, which also contribute towards decrease in habitations covered. Apart from the above, inflation and natural calamities could also have contributed towards the decrease in habitations covered.

Financial Achievement

- ARWSP — Opening balances as on 01.04.1999—Rs. 34786.25 lakhs
Expenditure as percentage of available fund—91.44%
- MNP — Expenditure as percentage of provision—90.50%

2.34 Whereas the overall financial achievement has been stated to be quite satisfactory, the achievement in States like Punjab, Mizoram, Bihar, Utar Pradesh, Kerala, Orissa and Daman and Diu, is less than 80%.

2.35 As regards the reasons for mis-match between physical and financial achievement during 1999-2000 the Government have clarified that most of the piped water supply schemes have a gestation period of minimum of 1-3 years. The financial and physical achievement will not match in a particular financial year. This is basically due to the fact that financial commitment and physical commissioning of the schemes are carried out over a different period of time in phases.

2.36 Further so far as underspending in the above mentioned States/UTs is concerned, the reasons submitted by the Government are the same as stated for the shortfall in physical achievement.

2.37 When asked for the steps being undertaken to contain the unspent balances, it is stated that the States and UTs are requested to undertake various rural water supply programmes vigorously with the funds allocated under ARWSP and the matching provision from the State resources. After release of the funds, the Chief Ministers are personally addressed by the Minister (RD), requesting them to ensure optimum utilisation of funds.

2.38 While releasing funds in the subsequent year, the unspent balance beyond 15% of the allocation is generally deducted as disincentive for States for keeping funds unspent. During 1999-2000, deduction were made from the second installment of ARWSP funds released to the States of Gujarat, Haryana and Karnataka for having unspent balance beyond 15%. Likewise deductions were made from the funds released to the States of Assam, Karnataka, Kerala, Meghalaya, Nagaland and Punjab during 2000-2001.

Financial and Physical achievement of Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) and Minimum Needs Programme (MNP) during 2000-2001

Physical Achievement

2.39 The overall achievement as mentioned in Performance Budget (Annexure-III of Performance Budget) in respect of coverage of habitations is 41.65% whereas the achievement in respect of targets of schools is very poor being 8.87% only. The overall performance in all the States excepting Tamil Nadu and Haryana is very poor. As regards coverage of school the performance is very poor in all the States excepting Mizoram and Tamil Nadu.

Financial Achievement

2.40 The overall expenditure as percentage of provision is 54.46% whereas expenditure as percentage of funds is 44.27%. The performance as regards financial achievement in all the States excepting Maharashtra, Haryana and Goa is very poor. When asked for the reasons for poor physical and financial achievement during 2000-2001, the Government have repeated the information as indicated above. When asked whether the Government have ever tried to analyse the specific reasons from each of the States where underspending is a regular practice, it is stated that no such exercise has been undertaken by the Ministry. However, during the past few years it has been observed that the utilisation of ARWSP funds has been poor in the States like Bihar, J&K, Goa, Manipur, Nagaland, Orissa, etc. These States have been reminded several time to improve their performance in regard to fund utilisation and coverage of habitations.

2.41 The Committee find that not only the allocation under ARWSP is inadequate but the outlay allocated under the programme is not being spent meaningfully. They are disturbed to note the physical achievement made during 2000-2001 according to which the overall coverage of habitations is 41.65% and in schools the position is further worse where the overall achievement indicated is 8.87% only. The apathy and lethargy displayed by the Government in respect of such an important programme is a deeply disturbing matter of great concern to the Committee. In spite of underspending being a regular practice in some of the States/UTs, the Government have never felt the urgency to analyse the specific reasons. Whenever asked for the reasons, a routine reply stating the not-covered habitations being in the difficult terrains is furnished. The plea of

the Government that NC habitations are in a difficult terrain has become a cliché and no longer holds any ground in the twenty-first century. In these days of such a tremendous scientific advance, no terrain is difficult. The Committee feel that it is high time that the Government should be serious about the implementation of the programme. They should not be contented only with releasing money to the State Governments but they should try to ensure that each rupee meant for the rural poor is meaningfully and timely spent. On the basis of the feed back received by the Committee during their field visits, the Committee feel that to ensure proper utilisation of funds, proposals should be invited from State Governments well before the commencement of the financial year so that the same could be examined, approved and funds released immediately on the commencement of the financial year.

Pilot Districts

2.42 The Government of India approved revamping of the Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme, which includes the proposal to institutionalise community-based, demand driven Rural Water Supply Programme, gradually replacing the current Government driven centrally monitored non-people participating Rural Water Supply Programme.

20% of the annual outlay under ARWSP is earmarked for providing incentives to States which implement projects to institutionalise community based rural water supply systems.

2.43 The State Governments have identified 63 districts for implementing the Sector Reform projects on a pilot basis, of which 57 projects have already been sanctioned for implementation.

2.44 A statement indicating total amount of funds sanctioned, Government of India share, amount released and expenditure reported in respect of 20 pilot districts to which funds have been released is at Appendix IV.

2.45 When asked for the reasons for such a dismal performance in the pilot districts it is clarified by the Government that funds for implementation of the sector reform pilot projects in respect of 20 pilot districts, including the twelve districts indicated above, were only sanctioned/released during the year 2000-2001, the project implementation has commenced only recently and is yet to pick up. The main objective of the sector reform project is not just physical

implementation of a water supply scheme, but to institutionalise a new concept which envisages to enhance the awareness among the rural people by demystifying various possible rural water supply technology options, the merits and demerits their cost differences, the importance of people's participation in planning partially funding, sanctioning, implementing operating and maintaining the rural water supply schemes of their own choice to meet their own satisfactory levels and to equip the rural people to achieve the above. This being rather difficult and challenging initiative, it is expected that there would be some teething problems in the beginning and is likely to gain momentum only after awareness generation and capacity building activities progress. As this happens, the concept is likely to get popular and take deep roots, thereby enabling the project implementation to pick up and progress faster. The Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted that in the pilot districts 10% of the cost of the water scheme has to be borne by the community.

2.46 It could be seen from the Appendix that twelve districts have not reported the data, whereas the performance in other districts is very dismal. Further out of 58 districts, the funds could be released only to 20 districts. When asked about the achievement in each of the pilot projects during 2000-2001, it has been stated in the written note that various districts are in different stages of implementation.

2.47 The Committee are unable to appreciate the reform initiatives undertaken by the Government in the pilot districts in view of the dismal performance as could be gauged from the paras above. As observed earlier by them in their [11th Report (13th Lok Sabha)], the Committee feel that the criteria for allocating outlay to all the districts should be same and no district should be favoured at the cost of the other district and the reform initiatives set by the Government should be uniform for all the States/districts. The Committee urge the Government, to review the reform initiatives in the light of their earlier recommendation as well as the unsatisfactory performance of these initiatives in the pilot districts.

2.48 As regards the issue of bearing 10% of the costs of the project by the community themselves in the pilot districts, the Committee note that the said criteria should not be uniform for all the districts as an individual being in a district having low density of population has to pay more as compared to an individual residing in a thickly populated district. The Committee feel that the percentage of contribution by the community should be per capita based. The Committee, therefore, urge the Government to review the guidelines.

Human Resource Development

2.49 The reported expenditure under HRD during 1999-2000 is Rs. 4.86 crore and Rs. 4.91 crore (provisional) against the releases of Rs. 5.66 crore and Rs. 6.70 crore respectively. When asked for the number of persons who got training under the programme, it is stated by the Government that at Government of India level information regarding number of people trained is not being maintained. Further it is stated that no seminar/workshop was arranged during the last two years exclusively for the people. The Government have further stated that these projects are process projects. As such, the progress is envisaged to be slow at the beginning. It would pick up only as the implementation progresses. The project envisages a heavy component of Information Education and Communication (IEC), Human Resource Development (HRD) activities before actual implementation of specific schemes commences. Many of the districts are going through the IEC/HRD programmes. Actual physical implementation is taken up thereafter on the basis of demand generated.

2.50 While appreciating the initiative taken by the Government to have a separate allocation for Human Resource Development, the Committee feel that the Government should monitor the implementation of the programme and it should be ensured that the outlay earmarked is spent for updating skills of the implementing officials in the respective States. The State Governments should be requested to arrange regular seminars/workshops and to impart proper training to make the programme successful.

Contamination of Water

2.51 As per information furnished by the State Governments, the number of habitations affected by various quality problems, as on 1.4.1999, was as follows:

Nature of quality problem	No. of affected habitations
Excess Fluoride	36988
Excess Arsenic	3553
Excess Salinity	32597
Excess Iron	138670
Excess Nitrate	4003
Other reasons	1400
Total	217211

2.52 As far as fluoride is concerned about 660 lakhs people are estimated to be at risk. Regarding arsenic, about 53 lakh people are at risk and population showing arsenic related skin manifestation is estimated to be around 2 lakh. As health hazard due to brackishness and excess iron is not severe, no estimation regarding population affected by iron and brackishness has been made.

2.53 When asked for the details of the outlay earmarked and expenditure met on the quality aspect, it is submitted by the Government that upto 20% of ARWSP funds can be utilised by the State Governments for tackling quality problems under Sub-Mission programmes. The power to plan, sanction and implement Sub-Mission projects have been delegated to the State Government with effect from 1.4.1998. As such, details of outlay and expenditure incurred by the States are included in the overall outlay and expenditure reported under ARWSP. It is stated by the Government in the written note that the State-wise details of various projects/schemes taken up under sub-Mission programme are not maintained at the Central level.

2.54 As pointed out in Planning Commission's Mid Term Appraisal of 9th Five Year Plan, the level of natural contaminant such as fluoride and arsenic and chemical pollutants such as pesticides and insecticides is high and rising. Fluoride contamination affects 150 districts in 15 States and excess arsenic affects 8 districts of West Bengal. Fluoride levels are high in Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and U.P. and iron levels are high in Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka, Punjab, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu. The quality affected habitations with excess fluoride/arsenic/salinity/iron etc. based on 1% stratified sampling numbered about 1.54 lakh. The number of such habitations is increasing due to a variety of natural and man-made reasons, particularly due to unscientific and over exploitation of ground water for different uses including agriculture. Although several studies and pilot programmes (sponsored by both the Government and various external funding agencies) are underway, proposed solutions have had mixed success. Technologies developed and tested to remove fluoride and iron have shown satisfactory results in a laboratory environment. The complexity, high cost and inconvenience of these technologies, however, have constrained their implementation and sustainability.

2.55 When asked for the comments of the Government in this regard, they have stated that they are in agreement with the above observation made in the Mid-Term Appraisal of 9th Five Year Plan.

Water Treatment Plants in the Country

2.56 The details of the water treatment plant in the country are as follows:

1. Deflouridation plants installed	—	825
2. Desalination plants installed	—	150
3. Iron Removal plants installed	—	9445

Operation, maintenance and upkeep of the plants installed are the responsibility of the State Governments and their expenditure is met from the funds available with them. As such, the details of their working, expenditure, etc. are not available with the Central Government. Since, 1.4.1998, power to plan, sanction and implement new Sub-Mission projects have been delegated to the State Governments.

2.57 When enquired about the information regarding water treatment plants going defunct, the Government have stated that operation, maintenance and upkeep of the plants installed are the responsibility of the State Governments. As such, the details of their working are not available with the Central Government. Since 1.4.1998, powers to plan, sanction and implement new sub-Mission projects have been delegated to the State Governments. Further since water treatment plants are part of schemes/projects, which have a number of components and it is not possible to monitor each project/scheme at Central level.

2.58 As regards the plea of the Government to solve the problem of contamination of water, it is stated that the State Governments can take up sub-Mission programmes for tackling quality problems and sustainability issues in drinking water under the ARWSP for which 20% of the funds can be used.

2.59 The Government of India have also requested the State Governments to carry out a 5-10% stratified random sample survey with block as the unit to be followed by a 100% survey in blocks found affected with quality problems so as to assess the exact magnitude of the problem. Further strategy will be adopted based on the outcome of the survey.

2.60 The Committee feel that adequate attention is not being paid to the problem of contamination of water. As observed by the Planning Commission in their Mid Term Appraisal of 9th Plan, the level of contamination in respect of States/Districts is high and rising. The Committee find that although 20% of ARWSP funds could be utilised by the State Governments for solving the problem of contamination of water as per the guidelines, they have their own doubts regarding the utilisation of the said outlay for the specific purpose. In view of it, the Committee feel that the Government should monitor the position of expenditure made by the Government on the said issue. Besides, the Committee urge that a survey by some independent evaluator should be made to have an idea of the extent of contamination of drinking water in rural areas. Further, the Committee understand that the issue of contamination of water is related to various Ministries like Agriculture and Water Resources. They feel that a coordinated approach to solve this problem is required. In view of it, they urge that the Department of Drinking Water Supply should formulate a strategy in consultation with the concerned Ministries and State Governments to find out the means to tackle this issue. The Committee understand from the replies furnished by the Government that the Government do not have information in respect of the water treatment plants going defunct. The Committee feel that the Government should monitor the position of water treatment plants in the country since the funds for that purpose are allocated by the Government.

Maintenance of Assets created under ARWSP and MNP

2.61 When enquired whether the Government have ever tried to get the information regarding the number of drinking water system becoming defunct in various States/UTs, the Government in the written note have submitted that the number of drinking water systems becoming defunct is constantly fluctuating. Moreover the State Government is responsible for the upkeep of the water supply systems. As such, details of systems getting defunct and their repair are not normally maintained at the Government of India level. However, an onetime exercise was carried out to assess the number of defunct system at a particular time during 1999. The results of the exercise indicated that at the time of assessment approximately 10% handpumps, 5% mini-piped water supply schemes, 33% multi-village piped water supply schemes and 3% of the public standposts were found to be not working.

2.62 The Secretary while explaining the problem of sustainability of the system stated as below:

"The systems have been built up with huge investments since the first Five Year Plan and an amount of almost Rs. 30,000 crore has been invested by the Government. The service level has not been upto the expectation. The operation and maintenance have not been upto the expectation and this was detected by the Government at the highest level and it was decided that the only solution to this problem is total decentralisation with the entire management and the operation and maintenance being given to the community themselves."

2.63 As regards steps being undertaken by the Government to ensure the sustainability of water sources, it is submitted by the Government that the States/UTs can utilise up to 20% of the ARWSP funds for Sub-Mission programmes meant for tackling quality problems and sustainability issues in respect of rural drinking water. The expenditure for implementation of Sub-Mission projects is shared between the Central and States/UTs in the ratio of 75:25. Keeping in view the relevance of sustainability measures for checking the fast depleting ground water, the State Governments have been requested to ensure that 20% of ARWSP funds permissible for taking up sub-Mission projects, be spent exclusively on sub-Mission projects relating to sustainability of water sources from the financial year 2000-2001.

2.64 Under the PMGY—Rural Drinking Water, provision has been made for the utilisation of minimum 25% of the total allocation for the component by the respective States/UTs on projects/schemes for water conservations, water harvesting, water recharge and sustainability of the drinking water resources in respect of DDP/DPAP areas, over-exploitation dark/grey blocks and other water stress/drought affected areas.

2.65 Guidelines for implementation of schemes and projects on sustainability under ARWSP and PMGY—Rural Drinking Water have also been issued.

2.66 Further, in order to ensure sustainability of the systems and sources in rural water supply sector, the Government have decided to institutionalise community based, demand driven programmes in identified pilot districts. The community will share part of the capital cost and full O&M/replacement cost in these districts thereby ensuring sustainability.

2.67 The Committee in their 11th Report (13th Lok Sabha) (refer para No. 2.75) observed that the existing guidelines of making expenditure up to 15% on O&M should be suitably revised. The Government in their action taken reply have submitted that the 11th Finance Commission had been requested to provide additional funds for the purpose. When asked for the details regarding the extent to which the 11th Finance Commission's Report reflect the requirement of the Ministry, it is stated in the reply that in the Memorandum submitted by the Ministry of Rural Development to the Eleventh Finance Commission it was stated that the Eleventh Finance Commission may consider devolution of funds to the tune of Rs. 1500 crores per annum so that the resource gap in the requirement on O&M of rural water supply schemes could be filled. It was also stated that the devolution of funds could be made directly to the PRIs in the States where the responsibility of drinking water supply and maintenance of assets has been transferred to the PRIs. In the remaining States, they could be routed through the concerned Departments of the State Governments responsible for operating and maintaining the rural water supply schemes. However, the Eleventh Finance Commission have recommended that, in general, the amounts of Rs. 1600 crores and Rs. 400 crores may be distributed among the States according to the prescribed criteria to be provided for the Panchayats and municipalities respectively.

2.68 The Committee find that the poor operation and maintenance of different drinking water systems is a serious problem which needs to be taken up on priority basis. As acknowledged by the Secretary during the course of his oral evidence, the operation and maintenance have not been up to the expectations. The Committee feel that the basic reason for water systems being defunct is the poor operation and maintenance. While appreciating the stand taken by the Government to decentralise the entire management, operation and maintenance to the community themselves, the Committee feel that before taking any decision in this regard, the capability of the community to bear the burden needs to be ensured. While appreciating the stand taken by the Government to recommend to the 11th Finance Commission for devolution of sufficient funds to PRIs directly, the Committee find that Rs. 1600 crore has been recommended by the 11th Finance Commission to be distributed among the States as per the prescribed criteria. In view of the recommendation made by the 11th Finance Commission, the Committee would like to be apprised whether any allocation in this regard has been made during 2000-2001, and is proposed to be made during 2001-2002. They would also like to be apprised of the criteria for distribution of funds in this regard.

Participation of Panchayats

2.69 When asked whether the Government have thought of handing over the responsibility of implementation, execution and maintenance of ARWSP and MNP to Panchayats in respective States, it is stated that as per article 243G of the Constitution, the Legislature of a State may, by law, endow the Panchayats with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as institutions of self-Government and such law may contain provisions for the devolution of powers and responsibilities upon Panchayats at the appropriate level subject to such conditions as may be specified therein, with respect to—(a) the preparation of plans for economic development and social justice, and (b) the implementation of schemes of economic development and social justice as may be entrusted to them including those in relation to the matters listed in the Eleventh Schedule which, *inter-alia*, includes Drinking Water and Maintenance of community assets.

2.70 As such, the responsibility of endowing the above mentioned powers with the Panchayats is with the State Government. However, the guidelines for implementation of ARWSP provide for involvement of PRIs in the implementation of various rural water supply schemes particularly in selecting the location of standpost, spot sources, operation and maintenance, fixing of cess/water tariff, etc. The implementation of the sector reform projects in the identified pilot districts, are also to be carried out either by the District Panchayats or through District Water and Sanitation Mission (DWSM) which is to be a registered society under the supervision, control and guidance of the District Panchayat (Zila Parishad).

2.71 In respect of sector reform pilot projects introduced to institutionalise community participation in Rural Water Supply Programme, through demand driven approaches, the project implementation at the district level is to be carried out by the DWSM. Wherever Panchayati Raj Institutions are themselves firmly in place and are ready and willing to take up the responsibility of effective implementation of sector reform projects, and are strong enough to do so, they may implement the projects themselves instead of the DWSM. At the village level, the individual Rural Water Supply schemes are to be implemented through Village Water and Sanitation Committees (VWSC) which should be a sub-committee of the Gram Panchayat.

2.72 The Government when requested to furnish the details regarding State-wise evaluation of the extent of devolution of the implementation of rural water schemes to Panchayats, have clarified that no specific evaluation in this regard has been made. Further as regards the position of pilot projects, the same should be implemented by the PRIs themselves directly, wherever the PRIs are firmly in place and are ready and willing to take up the responsibility of effective implementation of the project and are strong enough to do so.

2.73 The Committee are constrained to find that the Government have never felt the need to evaluate the extent of devolution in respect of implementation of the rural water schemes to Panchayats, whereas the execution and implementation of the programmes has to be handed over to the Panchayats as per the Constitution (73rd Amendment) Act. They are further disturbed to note the constitution of parallel bodies to Constitutionally mandated tiers of Panchayati Raj Institution. The Committee urge that the guidelines should be suitably amended whereby the responsibility of execution and implementation of drinking water supply programme is directly entrusted to Panchayats and the money is also directly released to them. The Committee feel that State-wise evaluation of the extent of devolution of the implementation of rural water schemes to Panchayats is absolutely necessary and the Government should seriously ponder over it when the guidelines are eloquent about it and there is a clear cut sanction of the Constitution. The Committee would like to hear from the Government in this regard expeditiously.

Role of elected MPs and MLAs in Rural Water Supply Programme

2.74 As per the written reply furnished by the Government, the present MPs/MLAs of the district are nominated as the members of the District Level Vigilance and Monitoring Committee and Block Level Committee constituted to supervise, exercise vigilance and monitor the implementation of all programmes implemented by the Rural Development Ministry in the district.

2.75 Sector Reforms have been introduced in identified pilot districts for institutionalising community participation in implementation of rural water supply schemes. These projects are implemented through the Zilla Parishad or the District Water and Sanitation Mission (DWSM) set up for the purpose. All MPs/MLAs of the districts are members of the DWSM so as to ensure that they contribute to the proper implementation of the programme.

2.76 While noting that all MPs/MLAs of the districts are members of the District Water and Sanitation Mission (DWSM) to be constituted for implementation of pilot projects under ARWSP and other bodies like District Level Vigilance and Monitoring Committees and Block Level Committees etc., the Committee desire that the sittings of the said Mission/Committees should be convened, as far as possible, after seeking the convenience of the respective MPs/MLAs so as to ensure their effective involvement. Besides, the minimum number of sittings to be conducted by such committees during a particular year should be fixed to ensure that sufficient meetings are held. Necessary instructions in this regard should be given to the State Governments.

Monitoring of the Drinking Water Supply Programme

2.77 When asked whether the State Governments are asked for the explanation when the schemes after completion of the substantial part are left midway, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated that:

"They are concerned with the utilisation certificates only. We do not know which scheme is left and which is continuing. It is a State subject."

2.78 The Committee are deeply disturbed to note that there is no effective mechanism for monitoring one of the top most priority programme meant to provide drinking water to rural masses for which huge investment is being made by the Central Government. They are further disturbed to find that the Central Government have tried to wash their hands of once the releases are made for the programme. They further understand that the important part of the monitoring mechanism i.e. Area Officer Schemes which is an important part of the Department of Rural Development has found no place in the Department of Drinking Water Supply. The Committee take serious note of it and strongly recommend that a fool proof mechanism to monitor such an important programme should be evolved. Besides, the surprise checks by the officers from the Central Government should be made at the sites to ensure the proper implementation of the programme. The necessary mechanism should further be evolved to check that the schemes are actually implemented in the field and are not on papers only. The Committee urge that on the line of Department of Rural Development,

Department of Drinking Water Supply should also consider to create a special cell under the charge of a senior officer to monitor the implementation of drinking water supply schemes/programmes particularly in North Eastern States and Sikkim and also in difficult States/areas. Considering the aspects as mentioned above, the Committee urge the Government to review the guidelines immediately and the Committee be apprised accordingly.

Prime Minister Gramodaya Yojana—Rural Drinking Water

2.79 As per the Performance Budget, Rs. 2500 crore have been allotted during 2000-2001 as an additional Central assistance to respective States/UTs for primary health, primary education, shelter, drinking water and nutrition. The minimum of 15% of the total Additional Central Assistance (ACA) has to be allotted to each of the five components and with respect to the remaining 25%, the States will have flexibility to allot among five components as per their priority. Minimum of Rs. 375 crore have been earmarked to Rural Drinking Water component. It is further mentioned in the Performance Budget that the Department of Drinking Water Supply is the nodal Department for the operation of the Programme and guidelines in this regard have already been issued to respective States/UTs.

2.80 As per written reply, the allocation of Rs. 2,500 crore of Additional Central Assistance (ACA) for the said States/UTs for the annual plan 2000-2001 was allocated by the Planning Commission. ACA comprises of 70% loan and 30% grant component for the non-special category States, and 90% grant and 10% loan for special category States. The payments to State Governments are adjustable in the account of the Central Government in the books under the sub head indicated as below.

Loan	Grants
Demand No. 30	Demand No. 30
7601—Loans & Advances to State Governments	3601—Grants-in-Aid to State Governments
02—Loans for State Plan Schemes	02—Grants for State Plan Schemes
02.101—Block Loans	02.101—Block Grants
17—Other Programmes of Gramodaya	18—Other Programmes Gramodaya
17.00.55—Loans & Advances	18.00.31—Grants-in-Aid

2.81 When asked for the need for starting another programme in the presence of a comprehensive programme like ARWSP, the Government have submitted that they have accorded a very high priority to drinking water and a commitment has been made in the National Agenda of Governance to provide drinking water to all within five years. In order to achieve the objectives of sustainable human development at the village level, it was decided to introduce a new initiative in the form of Prime Minister's Gramodaya Yojana (PMGY) starting from 2000-2001. The Department of Drinking Water Supply is the nodal Department for the drinking water component of the PMGY. The Prime Minister's Gramodaya Yojana (PMGY) has essentially been introduced to replace the erstwhile ACA for Basic Minimum Services (BMS). It is envisaged that this programme will give further impetus to ongoing rural water supply programme.

2.82 As per the written reply, fifteen States/UTs have not reported in respect of expenditure made under PMGY. When asked for the reasons for the same, it is submitted by the Government that 2000-2001 being the first year of the scheme, State/UTs took time to operationalise and formulate scheme/programme under PMGY.

2.83 When asked whether any thinking has been given to bring all the schemes like ARWSP, MNP and PMGY under one umbrella, it is stated that water supply being a State subject, the Rural Water Supply Programme in the States is implemented by the State Governments with their own resources, which includes funds provided under the ARWSP and PMGY—Rural Drinking Water. At this stage, there is no proposal in the Department of Drinking Water Supply to merge the above programmes.

2.84 As regards the issue of coordination with other programmes, the Committee were informed that the Department of Drinking Water Supply, which look after ARWSP is also the nodal department for the PMGY-Rural Drinking Water. The project/schemes under the PMGY-Rural Drinking Water would be sanctioned by the same State level Projects/Schemes Sanctioning Committee as in the case of ARWSP. In view of this, problem of coordination and mis-management is not anticipated.

2.85 When enquired about the criteria for allocating funds to States/UTs, it has been stated by the Government that Planning Commission decides about the inter-States/UTs allocation.

Financial Achievement under PMGY (Rural Drinking Water)

2.86 The position of total allocation, funds released and expenditure reported are given in Appendix V. It could be seen there from that 19 States/UTs have not reported the expenditure position. In 10 States/UTs, although allocation has been made, but the funds released are nil. The expenditure position is also not very encouraging in the States/UTs, where funds were released excepting Bihar, Orissa and Pondicerry.

2.87 The Committee fail to understand launching of another Programme viz Prime Minister's Gramodaya Yojana-Rural Drinking Water, in the presence of already established programmes *i.e.* ARWSP and MNP. They are not able to appreciate the logic given by the Government that this programme has essentially been introduced to replace the erstwhile additional ACA for basic minimum services. The Committee have repeatedly been recommending to bring the allocation under the different related schemes/programmes under one scheme/programme. In spite of that the Government is introducing multiple schemes for achievement of a single objective. In view of it they strongly recommend that all the allocations made for drinking water supply to rural areas should be brought under one programme.

2.88 The Committee note with concern that certain States/UTs are yet to report about the expenditure. In 10 States/UTs, although allocation has been made, but funds are yet to be released. The Committee fail to understand that in spite of allocation having been made, funds are yet to be released. The Committee also learn that expenditure position is not encouraging in certain States. The Committee hope that the Government would release the funds soon, and the States will fruitfully utilise the funds released and submit a report concerning the expenditure.

The steps to be taken to stop depletion of ground water level

2.89 While giving the position of ground water level, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted as below:

"The systems become dry due to depletion in the ground water level which is happening now, specially in the context of drought. The sources also, in many cases, when the heavy drawl of water is there, become quality-affected. So, the actual ground position on any day will differ from this."

The Secretary further stated as under:

“The other major problem which we are encountering is rapid depletion of ground water which is making a lot of our systems defunct. As you know, only about 5 per cent of the ground water is used for drinking water and 85 per cent of our systems are dependent on ground water. So, any excess drawl of water for any other purpose, mainly, of course, irrigation leads to depletion in ground water level and consequently affects drinking water supply.”

2.90 While explaining the steps taken by the Government to ensure the sustainability of drinking water resources, the Secretary further stated:

“In this regard 25 percent of the submission funds which we earmark, have been earmarked for sustainability projects. We have issued detailed guidelines on sustainability. We have requested the Ministry of Urban Development & Ministry of Water Resources to make rooftop water harvesting mandatory in urban areas and to promote water harvesting measures in rural areas.”

Dual Policy for Supply of water

2.91 The Government have adopted the dual policy for supply of water. The break up norms of 40 litres is as follows:

Purpose	Quality (Lpcd)
Drinking	3
Cooking	5
Bathing	15
Washing utensils and house	7
Ablution	10

Accordingly, the requirement of non-treated water for other than drinking and cooking purposes works out to about 32 lpcd.

2.92 When asked whether the Government have any national policy on desalinisation of sea water the Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted:

"Whatever funds we have given to the States, if they set up one desalinisation plant, probably the entire funds given to the State will go to only one plant. It is so costly. We have a rough estimate that a plant with 12000 cubic metres per day capacity of desalinisation would cost Rs. 100 crore.... It will be very costly proposition unless it is linked to waste heat generating industry. The Reliance Petrochemical in Jamnagar had waste heat and, therefore, they have set up the plant. It is cost effective, otherwise it will run into hundreds of crore, which is too costly."

2.93 In view of the fact that the stock of water is limited, the Committee recommend:

- (i) The Government should pay more attention to sustainability of projects. While appreciating that 25% of PMGY funds are earmarked for sustainability, the Committee would like the Government to ensure that the requisite allocation should be made for the specific purpose and to achieve the results in this regard.
- (ii) The Government should give more stress to the schemes related to rain water harvesting including traditional methods of harvesting water. To achieve the desired results, the Government should think of launching some scheme to provide loans to the individuals and Self Help Groups (SHGs) who want to have their private rain water harvesting structure. Every step should be taken to conserve each and every drop of water to prevent water wastage. Since the Ministry of Water Resources and Agriculture are mainly related to this problem, the Government should coordinate with the said Ministries to take the necessary initiative in this regard.
- (iii) While appreciating the dual policy for supply of water by the Central Government, it is urged that, it should be ensured that the supply of water is made according to the said norms. Necessary instructions in this regard should be issued to the State Governments.

- (iv) Rural masses should be made aware of the importance of preventing wastage of water. Necessary publicity by media and other programmes should be done in this regard.
- (v) The Government should seriously consider the involvement of NGOs in the rural drinking water programmes.
- (vi) India has a vast coast line and profuse sea water. The scarcity of water can be resolved by purification of sea water for drinking purposes and other uses. The plea for not purifying the sea water is its exorbitant cost. The Committee, therefore, feel that Government should give serious thought to desalinisation projects and conduct in depth research to make the technology cheaper in consultation with Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) particularly when the water level is going very low and the Government have to work out alternate ways of making available drinking water. Stress should also be given to launch projects where the waste-heat is available as it is cost effective as acknowledged by the Secretary during his evidence. The Committee also urge the Government to think of utilising wind energy for desalinisation projects in coastal areas.

Special Allocation of Funds for Gujarat due to recent Earthquake

2.94 The Government in their written reply have informed that the entire allocation of Rs. 74.85 crore for the current year under ARWSP has already been released to the Government of Gujarat. Further, in the wake of earthquake/drought an additional sum of Rs. 100 crore under ARWSP has also been released to Gujarat for providing drinking water in the rural areas of the State.

2.95 While appreciating the step taken by the Government to provide an additional sum of Rs. 100 crore under ARWSP to earthquake affected Gujarat, the Committee urge the Government to monitor the utilisation of money to ensure that the additional allocation is meaningfully utilised.

CHAPTER III

CENTRAL RURAL SANITATION PROGRAMME—CRSP

Overall analysis of the outlay earmarked for CRSP during 2001-2002

	(Rs. in crore)
Outlay during 1999-2000	110
Outlay during 2000-2001	140
Outlay during 2001-2002	150
	Percentage
Financial Achievement 1999-2000	83.64
Financial Achievement 2000-2001	63.29

3.2 It has been mentioned in the Performance Budget that due to financial crunch, the Planning Commission in its Mid Term Appraisal has reduced the targets from 50% to 25%.

3.3 When asked for the reasons for giving such a low priority to Rural Sanitation Programme keeping in view the allocation of funds, the Government have stated in the written note that the Working Group for the 9th Plan recommended a provision of Rs. 6251 crore for the Plan period. Considering that the amount is hard to find, this Ministry requested for Rs. 330 crore per annum during the 9th Plan. However, the outlay for 1997-98 was Rs. 100 crore, during 1998-99 it was Rs. 100 crore, which was subsequently reduced to Rs. 67 crore at RE stage. The outlay provided for 1999-2000 has been reduced from Rs. 110 crore to Rs. 92 crore at RE stage. An amount of Rs. 140 crore and Rs. 150 crore has been provided for 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 respectively. It would be seen that inspite of financial crunch, the allocation under Rural Sanitation has been increased. In fact, high priority is being accorded to the Programme.

Physical achievement under CRSP during 1999-2000 and 2000-2001
1999-2000

3.4 The following observations could be made from the statement indicating opening balance as on 01.04.1999 release and expenditure made during 1999-2000 as given in the written reply:

- (i) In 11 States/UTs the position of expenditure made during the year is nil.
- (ii) In 16 States/UTs no releases could be made.
- (iii) In 23 States/UTs the expenditure position is very dismal i.e. below 50%.

2000-2001

3.5 As per the information furnished by the Government an amount of Rs. 102.15 crore out of a total outlay of Rs. 140 crore has been released. As regards position of physical achievement in respective States/UTs, the following observations could be made from the statement enclosed with the written reply:

- (i) In 20 States/UTs the funds released are stated as nil.
- (ii) In 18 States/UTs the expenditure reported is stated to be nil.
- (iii) In all the States/UTs excepting Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry and West Bengal the expenditure position is very poor.

3.6 When asked for the reasons for underspending in respective States/UTs, the Government in their written reply have stated that the programme has been restructured w.e.f. 01.04.1999. The project proposals from the State Governments were received late hence the funds were released during December 1999 to March 2000 resulting in low expenditure. The implementation of the programme is now picking up. It has further been stated that the Government have so far approved 83 projects of total sanitation campaign.

Pilot districts under CRSP

3.7 It could be seen from the Performance Budget 2001-2002 that the position of expenditure in all the pilot district during 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 is nil. When asked for the reasons for such a dismal performance in pilot districts, the Government have repeated the information as given above.

Criteria for selecting a pilot district

3.8 As per the information furnished by the Government selection of pilot districts is done by the respective States.

Ratio of allocation of outlay to pilot districts

3.9 As per the information furnished by the Government initially 58 pilot districts were identified and now the number has increased to 150. The total allocation during current financial year for total sanitation campaign is about Rs. 100 crore.

School sanitation

3.10 As per the Performance Budget, school sanitation is a vital component of sanitation. While recognising the need for school sanitation, both from the point of view of children's right and the fact that school children have potential for acting as the most persuasive advocates of sanitation in their own households, it is proposed to construct toilets in all the rural school (separate complex for boys and girls) by the end of 9th Plan and the level of subsidy has been fixed in the ratio of 60:30:10 for Centre, State and Panchayats/Schools respectively. 10% of the funds under Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) will be earmarked for school sanitation. The Government have informed that as per the Sixth All India Educational Survey (1993) conducted by NCERT, out of 507581 rural primary schools in the country, 71188 rural primary schools have urinal and 32463 have lavatory facility. Similarly out of 129246 rural upper primary schools, 52,444 rural upper primary schools have urinal and 25812 have lavatory facility. When asked for the data regarding separate toilets for boys and girls in co-ed schools in rural areas, the Government have stated that this figure is not available. However, Ministry has requested all the States/UTs to ensure that a separate toilet for the girl students is provided invariably in co-ed schools.

Targets for school sanitation

3.11 When asked for the targets fixed during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 in respect of school sanitation, the Government have stated that under the restructured programme, it is proposed to provide toilets subject to maximum cost of Rs. 20,000/- per unit in rural schools in the country. When inquired whether any time bound programme has been made to provide separate toilets for boys and girls in all the schools in rural India, the Government have stated that while efforts will be am for maximum recovery under restructured Central Rural Sanitation Programme, this will however, have to be supplemented by construction of toilets in the schools under the programmes of the other Departments.

Holistic Approach to Rural Sanitation Programme

3.12 Planning Commission in their Mid Term Appraisal of 9th Plan has observed that majority of villagers were unaware of the concept of sanitation and importance of it because of poverty and illiteracy. As per the Government data the total sanitation coverage is presently 16 to 20% of the total rural households in the country. As regards the issue of holistic approach of Rural Sanitation Programme, the Government in their written reply have submitted that there is a shift from high subsidy to a low subsidy regime, greater household involvement, choice of technology according to customer preferences, stress on software, IEC, development of back up services-trained masons, building materials through Rural Sanitary Marts/Production Centres, intensive IEC campaign and emphasis on school sanitation. As a result thereof, the Rural Sanitation Programme has been restructured w.e.f. 01.04.99. It moves away from the principal of State-wise allocation primarily based on poverty criteria to a "demand driven" approach and is presently implemented on a project mode.

3.13 The Committee find that inspite of their recommending repeatedly for according priority to Central Rural Sanitation Programme, the Government have not given serious attention to the programme. It is really sorry to find that after more than five decades of independence, only 16 to 20% of the total rural households in the country could be covered by the sanitation programme. Further disturbing is the scenario of school sanitation where only about 14% of rural primary schools have urinal facility whereas lavatory facility is available only in 6.39% of schools. As regards rural upper primary schools, about 40.57% have urinal and lavatory facility is available to 19.97%. As regards the question of providing separate toilets for boys and girls in co-ed schools which should have been accorded a top most priority, it appears that the same has not been given adequate attention by the Government, which is clear from the fact that the Government have not bothered even to maintain the data in this regard. The Committee are further constrained to note that instead of providing adequate allocation to achieve the targets set during 9th Plan, the Planning Commission have rather reduced the targets to commensurate the allocation being made under the programme. Another noticeable feature of the programme is that not only the allocation made under the programme is inadequate, but the meagre releases made to the State Governments have not been spent fully which could be seen from the dismal performance of the programme in respective States/UTs as given in the preceding

paragraphs. In view of such a disturbing scenario, the Committee strongly recommend:

- (i) The allocation under the programme should be increased during 2000-2001, 2001-2002 the remaining years of 9th Plan to achieve the set targets *i.e.* 50% during 9th Plan.
- (ii) Whatever allocation is made it should be ensured that there is full utilisation of money. The Government should not only be contended with the releases made under the programme, but it should also be ensured that the money is utilised to achieve the set objectives.
- (iii) Sanitation in schools should be given top most priority as it is rather better to inculcate the habit of sanitation in the early years of childhood. Sanitation in schools can not wait further. As such the Government should ensure that the targets of covering all the schools during 9th Plan are not spilled over. Besides, the Government should ensure that separate toilets are available to girls in co-ed schools.
- (iv) Necessary steps should be taken to educate the rural masses about the need for sanitation. To achieve this the Government should launch awareness programmes in the rural areas. Separate allocation for this should be provided in the Budget.
- (v) The sanitation aspect should not merely be confined to provide toilets but a holistic approach in this regard should be adopted and the programme should be restructured accordingly.
- (vi) While appreciating the thrust of the Government on flush latrines, the Committee feel that there are large number of areas, specifically in the hilly areas, where sewerage facility is not available. The Government should think of providing dry latrines in such area according to local conditions.

NEW DELHI;
19 April, 2001
29 Chaitra, 1923 (Saka)

ANANT GANGARAM GEETE,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban and Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

STATEMENT INDICATING PLAN OUTLAY, ACTUAL EXPENDITURE, PROPOSED OUTLAY AS AGREED TO BY PLANNING COMMISSION, BUDGET ESTIMATES AND REVISED ESTIMATES DURING 8TH AND 9TH PLAN

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

(Rs. in crores)

Sl. No.	Name of Scheme	8th Plan		9th Plan		1984-85		1985-86		1986-87		2001-02		2002-03		
		Outlay	Outlay (Proposed)	B.E.	Actual Expend.	B.E.	Actual Expend.	B.E.	Actual Expend.	B.E.	Actual Expend.	B.E.	Actual Expend.	B.E.	Actual Expend.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Plan Schemes																
1.	Rural Water Supply Programme	5100.00	6142.71	14000.00	8150.00	1627.00	1632.00	1611.05	1600.00	1775.00	1777.51	1980.00	1960.00	1660.71	6700.00	2000.00
2.	Rural Sanitation	300.00	253.77	3150.00	500.00	10.00	67.00	64.85	100.00	92.00	92.00	140.00	140.00	101.15	482.00	150.00
	Total DWSS	5400.00	6396.48	27150.00	12650.00	1727.00	1699.00	1675.90	1700.00	1867.00	1869.51	2120.00	2100.00	1761.86	6772.00	2150.00

APPENDIX II

STATEMENT INDICATING PLAN OUTLAY, ACTUAL EXPENDITURE, PROPOSED OUTLAY AS AGREED BY PLANNING COMMISSION, BUDGET ESTIMATES AND REVISED ESTIMATES DURING 8TH AND 9TH PLAN

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

(Rs. in Crores)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	8th Plan		9th Plan		1998-99			1999-2000			2000-2001			2001-2002	
		Outlay	Expenditure*	Outlay (Proposed)	Outlay (Agreed)	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Exptr.	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Exptr.	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Exptr. (21.3.2001)	Outlay (Proposed)	B.E.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Non-Plan Schemes																
1.	Headquarters Estt. of Deptt. of Drinking Water Supply & Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme	3.41	3.86	Not Applicable to Non-Plan	Not Applicable to Non-Plan	1.30	1.18	1.04	1.23	1.17	1.06	1.29	1.22	1.07	Not Applicable to Non-Plan	1.35
	Total-Non-Plan	3.41	3.86			1.30	1.18	1.04	1.23	1.17	1.06	1.29	1.22	1.07		1.35

APPENDIX III

COMPREHENSIVE ACTION PLAN

Statement indicating status of coverage as on 1.4.1999 and year-wise financial requirement under ARWSP for covering the remaining NC/PC habitations

S.No.	Name of the State	Number of Habitations as on 1.4.1999 (as per CAP)				Year-wise breakup					Total (Rs. in lakh)
		NC	PC	FC	Total	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.	Andhra Pradesh	0	24683	49049	69732	Note 9143.00	22000.00	26800.00	30000.00	36500.00	124143.00
2.	Assam Pradesh	997	1227+	2674	4296	#1 2476.00	1240.00	1240.00	1240.00	1245.00	7441.00
3.	Assam	3871-	25530+	41268	70669	#2 3192.00	1661.00	1519.00	1614.00	1507.00	9493.00
4.	Bihar	1069	564	203803	205436	0.00	3800.00	4000.00	4500.00	5000.00	17300.00
5.	Goa	34+	34-	328-	396	#3 465.23	500.00	1000.00	500.00	500.00	2965.23
6.	Gujarat	437	4639	25193	30269	10; 090.	25000.00	28000.00	30000.00	31700.00	124700.00
7.	Haryana	32+	576-	6137-	6745	#4 1883.41	1900.00	1800.00	1750.00	1700.00	4033.00
8.	Himachal Pradesh	3750	13892	28025	45367	3200.00	7900.00	12780.00	16860.00	24890.00	65330.00
9.	J&K	2430	4047-	4707	11184	#5 6400.00	7000.00	7500.00	8000.00	8600.00	37500.00
10.	Karnataka	845+	25037-	30800	56682	#6 15000.00	40000.00	40000.00	40000.00	46200.00	161200.00
11.	Kerala	890+	6921-	1962	9763	#7 2359.00	5977.00	10206.00	12155.00	14197.00	44894.00
12.	Madhya Pradesh	3563	17709	138596	159868	9444.00	11064.00	12500.00	5590.00	00.00	38600.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
13.	Maharashtra	+	3171+	32119+	50640+	85930 #8	13600.00	13600.00	13600.00	13600.00	13600.00	64000.00
14.	Manipur		77	510	2204	2791	611.00	1200.00	1340.00	1340.00	1340.00	5620.00
15.	Meghalaya	+	874	1276-	6489	8639 #9	633.10	1150.00	1280.00	1250.00	1300.00	5533.10
16.	Mizoram		2	624	285	911	696.00	1250.00	1350.00	3100.00	3004.00	9400.00
17.	Nagaland		428	708	394	1525	724.00	1562.00	1590.00	1014.36	1014.36	5994.76
18.	Orissa		1978-	4660+	107461	114099 #10	9792.00	6139.62	702.50	702.50	702.50	16074.12
19.	Punjab	-	2266	5123	8060	13449 #11	1462.00	5100.00	5162.00	5163.00	5163.00	22850.00
20.	Rajasthan	+	18076-	32789-	51081-	93946 #12	10900.00	11000.00	11000.00	11000.00	11000.00	71400.00
21.	Sikkim		0	732	947	1679	660.00	660.00	660.00	660.00	660.00	2300.00
22.	Tamil Nadu	0+	17002-	49629	66631 #13	6334.00	28700.00	26000.00	17500.00	17500.00	17500.00	96234.00
23.	Tripura		726	1604	5082	7412	1670.00	2655.00	2021.00	1642.00	1061.00	8649.00
24.	Uttar Pradesh	+	845+	20158-	233638	274641 #14	12389.00	16150.00	18043.00	19125.00	19125.00	83004.00
25.	West Bengal	0+	28101-	50935-	79036 #15	7000.00	15500.00	15900.00	22500.00	22500.00	24900.00	85004.00
26.	And Islands	-	0+	176-	328	504 #16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
27.	And Islands	-	74+	259-	183	516 #17	0.00	300.00	200.00	200.00	100.00	800.00
28.	Daman and Diu		0	1+	31+	32 #18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
29.	Delhi		0	0+	219+	219 #19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
30.	Lakshadweep		0	10	0	10 #20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
31.	Pondicherry	+	40+	90-	137-	267 #21	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	100.00
32.	Chandigarh		0	0-	18-	18 #22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total			38065	268496	1116103	1422664	130023.94	232850.42	245190.50	250830.88	288562.88	1147458.62

- #1. Increase in NC & FC habitations and increase in total no. of habitations.
#2. Decrease in NC & PC and increase in FC habitations.
#3. Increase in PC & decrease in FC habitations. Decrease in total no. of habitations.
#4. Increase in PC & decrease in FC habitations. Decrease in total no. of habitations.
32 NC habitations are non census villages and they are slippage from PC habitations.
#5. Decrease in FC habitations. Decrease in total no. of habitations.
#6. Decrease in NC & FC habitations and increase in PC habitations.
#7. Increase in PC & decrease in FC habitations.
#8. Increase in NC, PC & FC habitations. Increase in total no. of habitations.
#9. Increase in PC & increase in FC habitations.
#10. No Information furnished along with CAP. Information given above is as per the response to Secy's letter dt. 17.11.99. Decrease in PC & increase in FC habitations.
#11. Decrease in NC habitations. Total no. of habitations in the State is 13449.
Remaining 3579 habitations are Non-Problem habitations, hence added to FC category.
#12. Increase in NC and decrease in PC & FC habitations. Decrease in total no. of habitations.
#13. Increase in PC & decrease in FC habitations.
#14. Increase in NC & PC habitations and decrease in FC habitations.
#15. Increase in PC & decrease in FC habitations. Decrease in total no. of habitations.
#16. Decrease in NC & FC habitations and increase in PC habitations.
#17. Decrease in NC & FC habitations and increase in PC habitations.
#18. No information furnished along with CAP. Information given is as per the response to Secy's letter dt. 17.11.99.
Increase in FC habitations. Increase in total no. of habitations.
#19. Increase in FC habitations. Increase in total no. of habitations.
#20. Information not furnished in the format. Requirement of funds not spelt.
#21. Increase in NC & PC habitations and decrease in FC habitations. Decrease in total no. of habitations.
#22. Information not furnished in the format. Requirement of funds not spelt.
Decrease in FC habitations. Decrease in total no. habitations.

APPENDIX IV

**AMOUNT OF FUNDS SANCTIONED/RELEASED TO SECTOR REFORM PILOT DISTRICTS AND
EXPENDITURE REPORTED DURING 2000-2001**

							Rs. in lakh
S.No.	District	Name of the State	Amount Sanctioned	GOI Share	Amount Released	Expenditure reported	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1.	Chittoor	Andhra Pradesh	4000.000	3740.000	1122.000	3.000	
2.	Khammam	Andhra Pradesh	3753.000	3509.000	1052.700	Not reported	₹
3.	Nalgonda	Andhra Pradesh	4000.000	3740.000	1122.000	Not reported	
4.	Prakasam	Andhra Pradesh	4000.000	3740.000	1122.000	0.000	
5.	Kasaragod	Kerala	4000.000	3740.000	1122.000	Not reported	
6.	Hoshangabad	Madhya Pradesh	4000.000	3740.000	1122.000	Not reported	
7.	Narsinghpur	Madhya Pradesh	4000.000	3740.000	1122.000	Not reported	
8.	Raisen	Madhya Pradesh	4000.000	3740.000	1122.000	Not reported	
9.	Balasore	Orissa	4000.000	3740.000	1122.000	Not reported	
10.	Sudergarh	Orissa	4000.000	3740.000	1122.000	Not reported	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	Muktsar	Punjab	3992.800	3733.268	1119.980	Not reported
12.	Alwar	Rajasthan	4000.000	3740.000	1122.000	Not reported
13.	Jaipur	Rajasthan	4000.000	3740.000	1122.000	Not reported
14.	Sikkar	Rajasthan	2171.000	1986.050	595.815	Not reported
15.	Perambalur	Tamil Nadu	4000.000	3740.000	1122.000	1.570
16.	Agra	Uttar Pradesh	3000.000	2805.000	841.500	3.600
17.	Chandauli	Uttar Pradesh	2500.000	2337.500	701.250	0.015
18.	Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh	4000.000	3740.000	1122.000	14.880
19.	Mirzapur	Uttar Pradesh	3000.000	2805.000	841.500	2.930
20.	Sonebhadra	Uttar Pradesh	2500.000	2337.500	701.250	0.330
Total			72916.800	68133.318	20439.995	26.325

APPENDIX V

PMGY—RURAL DRINKING WATER

(Rs. in lakhs)

Name of the States/UTs	Total Allocation under PMGY	15% Earmarked Allocation for PMGY -RDW	*Allocation for RDW out of remaining 25%	*Total Allocation for PMGY -RDW	Funds released for RDW under PMGY	*Reported Expenditure
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Andhra Pradesh	14206.00	2130.90	710.00	2840.90	1065.45	NR
2. Arunachal Pradesh	6817.00	1022.55	1527.45	2550.00	511.28	1380.75
3. Assam	17957.00	2693.55	607.45	3300.00	1346.78	NR
4. Bihar	21946.00	3291.90	NR	3291.90	2154.37	NR***
5. Chattisgarh	3140.00	471.00	0.00	471.00	0.00	NR
6. Goa	78.00	11.70	19.50	31.20	5.85	NR
7. Gujarat	6479.00	971.85	1619.00	2590.85	485.92	2933.70
8. Haryana	1678.00	251.70	219.50	471.20	125.85	282.93

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Himachal Pradesh**	7061.00	1059.15	2017.85	3077.00	529.58	1759.78
10. Jammu and Kashmir	17158.00	2573.70	NR	2573.70	1286.85	NR
11. Jharkhand	6779.00	1016.85	NR	1016.85	0.00	NR
12. Karnataka	7513.00	1127.00	0.00	1127.00	563.47	NR
13. Kerala	6908.00	1036.20	363.80	1400.00	518.10	NR
14. Madhya Pradesh	8237.00	1235.55	471.00	1706.55	853.27	853.27
15. Maharashtra	9913.00	1486.95	927.05	2414.00	743.47	743.47
16. Manipur	4856.00	728.40	NR	728.40	364.20	NR
17. Meghalaya	4059.00	608.85	391.15	1000.00	304.43	304.43
18. Mizoram	4041.00	606.15	399.85	1006.00	303.08	303.08
19. Nagaland	4113.00	616.95	705.05	1322.00	308.48	308.48
20. Orissa	9855.00	1478.25	1000.00	2478.25	2478.00	604.43
21. Punjab	4040.00	606.00	1010.00	1616.00	1616.00	291.17
22. Rajasthan	9640.00	1446.00	712.00	2158.00	723.00	723.00
23. Sikkim	2811.00	421.65	178.35	600.00	210.83	300.00
24. Tamil Nadu	10479.00	1571.85	0.00	1571.85	785.92	785.92

क

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Tripura	5933.00	762.45	565.55	1328.00	381.22	440.80
26. Uttar Pradesh	33635.00	5045.25	420.45	5465.70	2616.82	2616.82
27. Uttaranchal	1256.00	188.40	NR	188.40	0.00	NR
28. West Bengal	16782.00	2517.30	3355.70	5873.00	1258.65	NR
29. A&N Islands	1027.00	154.00	0.00	154.00	0.00	NR
30. Chandigarh	456.00	68.40	50.80	119.20	0.00	NR
31. Delhi	1105.00	165.75	34.25	200.00	0.00	NR
32. D&N Haveli	132.00	19.80	18.00	37.80	0.00	NR
33. Daman & Diu	106.00	15.90	38.60	54.50	0.00	NR
34. Lakshadweep	177.00	26.55	67.45	94.00	0.00	NR
35. Pondicherry	477.00	71.55	0.00	71.55	0.00	NR
Total	250000.00	37500.00	17429.80	54928.80	21540.87	14632.03

RDW—Rural Drinking Water

NR—Not Received

* Provisional figures

** In case of Himachal Pradesh, extra allocation has been made to Rural Drinking Water by the State Government as per their priority.

*** Expressed inability to utilise during current financial year.

APPENDIX VI

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2001)

MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, THE 27TH MARCH, 2001

The Committee sat from 11.00 hrs. to 13.00 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
3. Shri Ambati Brahmaniah
4. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
5. Shrimati Hema Gamang
6. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
7. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
8. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
9. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
10. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
11. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

12. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
13. Shri N.R. Dasari
14. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
15. Shri C. Apok Jamir
16. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
17. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan
18. Shri N. Rajendran
19. Shri Man Mohan Samal
20. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri K. Chakraborty — Deputy Secretary
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — Under Secretary

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

1. Shri S.K. Tripathi — Secretary
2. Shri Lalit Mathur — Addl. Secy & Financial Adviser
3. Shri Anil Kumar — Joint Secretary
4. Shri Satish Chandra — Joint Secretary
5. Shri P.K. Chakraborty — Addl. Adviser

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee. The Committee were informed that at their sitting held on 12th March, 2001, the Committee had considered draft Reports regarding action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in their 11th and 13th Reports. During that sitting Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, member, while broadly agreeing with the draft Reports made certain suggestions to these Reports and requested the Committee that the same, if approved by the Committee, be incorporated suitably in the Reports. After some consideration, the Committee while adopting the draft Reports authorised the Chairman to finalize the Reports after considering suggestions made by Shri Aiyar. Accordingly, the draft Reports have been modified after incorporating the suggestions made by the member wherever necessary. Some of his suggestions which sought further information regarding Demands for Grants for 2001-2002 have been utilized while preparing list of points for examination of Demands for Grants for the year 2001-2002.

3. The Committee agreed.

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

4. The Chairman then welcomed the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply to the sitting. He then drew the attention of the witnesses to the provision of Direction 55 (1) of the Directions by the Speaker.

5. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of the said Ministry/Department on Demand for Grants (2001-2002).

A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX VII

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2001)

MINUTES OF THE THIRTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 11TH APRIL, 2001

The Committee sat from 11.00 hrs. to 12.00 hrs. in Room No. '62',
First Floor, Parliament House, New Delhi

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
3. Shri Ambati Brahmaniah
4. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
5. Shrimati Hema Gamang
6. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
7. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
8. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
9. Shri Ramchandra Paswan
10. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
11. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
12. Shri Maheshwar Singh

Rajya Sabha

13. Shri S. Agniraj
14. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
15. Shri C. Apok Jamir
16. Shri N. Rajendran
17. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
18. Shri Man Mohan Samal

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.C. Rastogi | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri K. Chakraborty | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |

2. The Committee took up for consideration the draft Report on Demand for Grants (2001-2002) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development).

3. The Committee adopted the said draft Report on Demand for Grants (2001-2002) with certain modifications as indicated in *Annexure*.

4. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the said Report after getting it factually verified from the Department concerned and present the same to the Houses of Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE

[See Para 3 of Minutes dated 11.4.2001]

Sl. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Line No.	Modifications
1	2	3	4	5
1.	6	2.5	6	<i>For "almost" substitute "a mere"</i>
2.	6	2.6	—	<p><i>Add at the end:</i></p> <p>"The Committee also feel that to make the visit of Hon'ble Union Rural Development Minister to States fruitful, the local MPs should be informed well in advance of such visit to enable them to interact with the Hon'ble Union Minister and to apprise him of the ground realities. The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation that a high-level conference of the Planning Commission with all Central Ministers and State Ministers concerned be convened to find financial resources commensurate with the requirements of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply) to attain the ambitious priority targets in respect of drinking water supply which have been set in the National Agenda for Governance."</p>
3.	19	2.23	7	<p><i>For</i></p> <p>'Even one-fifth of the achievement is made during the remaining two months. Then the percentage achievement would come to about forty percent only.'</p>

1

2

3

4

5

The Committee would, therefore, like to know the reasons for not only lowering the targets but also for the dismal performance during the year 2000-2001. They urge the Government to be realistic in fixing the targets and should make all out efforts to achieve the targets so fixed.'

Substitute

"Even one-fifth of the achievement is made during the remaining two months, the annual percentage of achievement would amount to only about forty percent of the target.

Therefore, the Committee record their deep distress at the lowering of targets and the dismal performance during the year 2000-2001. They urge the Government as a whole to fix annual targets in consonance with objectives set under National Agenda for Governance and ensure that adequate financial and other resources are made available to ensure the attainment of NAG objectives. In this connection, the Committee underline the overarching importance of de-bureauratising the delivery system and ensuring that drinking water supply programmes are administered in close association with, or preferably through, elected local bodies."

1	2	3	4	5
4.	25	2.31	—	<p><i>Add at the end:</i></p> <p>"The Committee also recommend that to ensure regular supply of drinking water in schools, when functioning, storage tanks should be constructed to ensure uninterrupted supply of water."</p>
5.	30	2.41	6	<p><i>For</i></p> <p>'The reaction of the Government to such an important programme is of great concern.'</p> <p><i>Substitute</i></p> <p>"The apathy and lethargy displayed by the Government in respect of such an important programme is a deeply disturbing matter of great concern to the Committee."</p>
6.	30	2.41		<p><i>Add at the end:</i></p> <p>"On the basis of the feed back received by the Committee during their field visits, the Committee feel that to ensure proper utilisation of funds, proposals should be invited from State Governments well before the commencement of the financial year so that the same could be examined, approved and funds released immediately on the commencement of the financial year."</p>
7.	49	2.77	2 from bottom	<p><i>Insert before last sentence:</i></p> <p>"Besides, the minimum number of sittings to be conducted by such committees during a particular year should be fixed to ensure that sufficient meetings are held."</p>

1	2	3	4	5
8.	51	2.79	4	<p><i>Insert before last sentence: from bottom</i></p> <p><i>"The Committee urge that on the line of Department of Rural Development, Department of Drinking Water Supply should also consider to create a special cell under the charge of senior officer to monitor the implementation of drinking water supply schemes/ programmes particularly in North Eastern States and Sikkim and also in difficult States/areas.</i></p>
9.	59	2.94	13	<p><i>After "individuals" Insert "and Self Help Groups (SHGs)".</i></p>
10.	60	2.94	3	<p><i>Add after para 2.94 (iv):</i></p> <p><i>"(v) The Government should seriously consider the involvement of NGOs in the rural drinking water programmes."</i></p>
11.	70	3.13	—	<p><i>Add at the end:</i></p> <p><i>"(vi) While appreciating the thrust of the Government on flush latrines, the Committee feel that there are large number of areas, specifically in the hilly areas, where sewerage facility is not available. The Government should think of providing dry latrines in such areas according to local conditions."</i></p>