

THIRTY-SECOND REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2002)

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2002-2003)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 24.4.2002
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 24.4.2002

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 2002/Vaisakha, 1924 (Saka)

CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION

REPORT

CHAPTER I	Introductory
CHAPTER II	An overall analysis of Demands for Grants for the year 2002-2003 of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development)
CHAPTER III	Central Rural Sanitation Programme

Statement of Observations/Recommendations

**COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2002)**

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete - Chairman

**MEMBERS
LOK SABHA**

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Ranen Barman
4. Shri Padmanava Behera
5. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
6. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
7. Shri Shriram Chauhan
8. Shri Shamsheer Singh Dullo
9. Shrimati Hema Gamang
10. Shri G. Putta Swamy Gowda
11. Shri Basavanagoud Kolor
12. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
13. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
14. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
15. Dr. Laxminarayanan Pandey
16. Shri Sukhdeo Paswan
17. Shri Chandresh Patel
18. Shri Laxmanrao Patil
19. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
20. Shri Rajesh Ranjan
21. Shri Gutha Sukender Reddy
22. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
23. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
24. Shri Maheshwar Singh
25. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
26. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
27. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
28. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma
29. Shri D. Venugopal
30. Shri Dinesh Chandra Yadav

RAJYA SABHA

31. Shri S. Agniraj
32. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
33. Shri N.R. Dasari
34. Ven'ble Dhammaviriyo*
35. Shri H.K. Javare Gowda
36. Shri Maurice Kujur\$
37. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana

38. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu@
39. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan
40. Shri Nabam Rebia
41. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy*
42. Shri Man Mohan Samal
43. Shri Devi Prasad Singh
44. Shri Prakanta Warisa*
45. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

- | | | | |
|----|------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1. | Shri P.D.T. Achary | - | Additional Secretary |
| 2. | Shri S.C. Rastogi | - | Joint Secretary |
| 3. | Shri K. Chakraborty | - | Deputy Secretary |
| 4. | Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | - | Under Secretary |
| 5. | Shri N.S. Hooda | - | Assistant Director |

\$ Retired from the Committee consequent upon his retirement from Rajya Sabha on 2.4.2002

* Retired from the Committee consequent upon his retirement from Rajya Sabha on 9.4.2002

@ Retired from the Committee consequent upon his retirement from Rajya Sabha on 12.4.2002

ABBREVIATIONS

ACA	-	Additional Central Assistance
ARWSP	-	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme
BE	-	Budget Estimates
BMS	-	Basic Minimum Services
CRSP	-	Central Rural Sanitation Programme
DWSC	-	District Water and Sanitation Committees
DWSM	-	District Water and Sanitation Management
DDP	-	Desert Development Programme
FC	-	Fully Covered
HRD	-	Human Resource Development
IEC	-	Information Education and Communication
MIS	-	Management Information System
MNP	-	Minimum Needs Programme
NC	-	Not Covered
NGO	-	Non-Government Organization
NHRDP	-	National Human Resource Development Programme
O&M	-	Operation and Maintenance
PC	-	Partially Covered
PMGY-RDW	-	Pradhan Mantri Gramodaya Yojana – Rural Drinking Water
PRIs	-	Panchayati Raj Institutions
RE	-	Revised Estimates
RGNDWM	-	Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission
SWACH	-	Sanitation Water and Community Health
TSC	-	Total Sanitation Campaign
UNICEF	-	United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund
UT	-	Union Territory
WHO	-	World Health Organisation

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (2002) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Thirty-Second Report on Demands for Grants (2002-2003) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development).

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

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) on 4th April, 2002.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on the 16th April, 2002.

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

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

NEW DELHI;
23 April, 2002
3 Vaisakha, 1924(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.

The Department of Drinking Water Supply, which was created in 1999 to strengthen the rural water supply programme, at present implements the following main schemes/programmes:-

- (i) Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) and Minimum Needs Programme(MNP);
- (ii) Pradhan Mantri Gramodaya Yojana –Rural Drinking Water (PMGY – RDW); and
- (iii) Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP)

1.2 The Demands for Grants of the Department are presented to the Parliament under Demand No. 69.

1.3 The overall Demands for Grants of the Department for 2002-2003 are Rs.2401.33 crore

1.4 The detailed Demands for Grants of the Department were laid in Parliament on 19th March, 2002

1.5 In the present Report, the Committee have examined the implementation of Centrally sponsored schemes/programmes viz. (i) ARWSP and MNP; (ii) PMGY – RDW and (iii) CRSP in the context of overall budgetary allocation in Demands for Grants for the year 2002-03.

CHAPTER II

An overall analysis of Demands for Grants for the year 2002-2003 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. (i) Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) and Minimum Needs Programme(MNP); (ii) Pradhan Mantri Gramodaya Yojana – Rural Drinking Water (PMGY – RDW); and (iii) Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) during 9th Plan overall, BE 1999-2000, RE 1999-2000, Actual 1999-2000, BE 2000-2001, RE 2000-2001, Actual 2000-2001, proposed outlay 2002-2003 and BE 2002-2003 under plan and non-plan head are given at Appendix I. The percentage increase during each of the years, as compared to previous year during 9th Plan in ARWSP and CRSP, has been indicated in Appendix II.

Drinking Water Supply

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

2.2 Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) is the main programme in the rural water supply sector. This programme was initially launched in 1972-73 to assist the States and Uts with 100% grants-in-aid for the provision of safe drinking water to rural areas. Under ARWSP, funds are provided to the States/Union territories (Uts) by the Centre. The State Governments are required to release matching share of funds. Implementation of the programme is monitored both at the State and Central Government levels through progress reports. Besides, progress is also reviewed at annual review meetings participated by State Secretaries and Chief Engineers in charge of Rural Water Supply Programme.

Overall analysis of the outlay earmarked for ARWSP

2.3 The following observations are made from the data indicated at Appendix I.

- (i) There is an underspending of Rs. 324.14 crore out of the total outlay of Rs.8,699 crore earmarked for the 9th Plan period;
- (ii) The outlay proposed during the 10th Plan is about three times of the 9th Plan outlay;
- (iii) The outlay earmarked for the 10th Plan is Rs. 16101 crore more than that of the 9th Plan outlay;
- (iv) There was a cut of Rs.85 crore in Revised Estimate as compared to Budget Estimate during the year 1999-2000, while in 2000-01, there was no reduction at RE stage. However, during 2001-02, RE was Rs.35 crore less than BE.

- (v) There is an underspending of Rs.83.08 crore as against the RE of Rs.1,975 crore during 2001-02 (expenditure figure reported up to 18th March, 2002).
- (vi) There is a huge gap of Rs.1865 crore between the outlay proposed and BE during 2002-03.
- (vii) Percentage increase in outlay as compared to previous year is 8.89% during 2000-01, 2.55% in 2001-02 and 11.19% in 2002-03.

Financial Progress under ARWSP and MNP

2.4 As regards the outlay earmarked for ARWSP during 2002-2003, Rs. 2235 crore have been allocated whereas as per the Comprehensive Action Plan, the estimated requirement of Central share of funds to achieve the objective of providing safe drinking water to all rural habitations by the year 2004 as per National Agenda for Governance is Rs.7,200 crore. When asked whether the proposed allocation would be sufficient to fulfill the set targets, the Government replied in the negative. The Government have further quoted the CAP figures which are required for coverage of all rural habitations. For the coverage of all rural habitations under the provision of potable drinking water by the year 2004, the estimated requirement of funds as per CAP comes to Rs.43,900 crore including the State share of Rs.18,450 crore.

2001-2002

2.5 As per the data furnished by the Department as indicated in Appendix I the expenditure position under ARWSP during 2001-02, shows a shortfall of Rs.96.57 crore. Moreover, the Performance Budget shows a huge opening balance of Rs.306.83 crore as on 1st April, 2001 (Appendix III). When asked about the reasons for huge underspending in the Central outlay as well as allocation released to States/Uts, it is stated by the Department that the expenditure reports of the States are received late and hence the data regarding expenditure gets updated periodically. The Government also laid out a number of steps as indicated below, that have been taken to encourage the States/Uts to spend the available funds and thereby contain huge opening balance:

- (i) The States and Uts undertake rural water supply programmes with the funds allocated under ARWSP and the matching provision from the State resources. 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;
- (ii) During 2001-02, special steps were taken to get 2nd installment claims from the State Government's in time; and
- (iii) Nodal Officers visited States to expedite the same. Since release in March become the opening balance in April, the Department took special initiative to release funds by the end of February.

2000-2001

Year	Outlay	(RS. IN CRORE)	
		Release	Expenditure

2000-2001	ARWSP	1960.00	1869.55	1653.85
	State share (MNP)	2696.33	2431.02	2366.41

2.6 When compared to the amount released, the expenditure position under ARWSP during 2000-2001 shows an underspending to the tune of Rs.242.70 crore. The Performance Budget shows a huge opening balance of Rs.363.79 crore as on 1st April, 2000. The overall percentage of expenditure was 72.89% (Appendix IV).

2.7 The Government have stated that short release under ARWSP during 2000-2001 was due to the fact that out of Rs.196 crore (10% of the outlay for ARWSP) earmarked for North-Eastern region including Sikkim, an amount of Rs. 61.82 crore had to be surrendered for placing in non-lapsable pool of resources for NE States due to non-receipt of adequate number of proposals from these States during the year.

Overall analysis of physical progress under ARWSP

2.8 The State/Ut wise position of coverage of habitations under ARWSP and MNP during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 has been indicated in Appendices V and VI respectively. During 2000-2001, against the set target to cover 79,468 NC and PC habitations, 68618 habitations were covered, i.e. 86.35% coverage. Further, whereas the achievement exceeded targets in Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu, achievement was less than 50% of the targets in 15 States/Uts. However, in 2001-02, the performance dipped further with only 53.95% coverage of the set target. Out of a targeted number of 45,526, only 24,561 habitations were covered. When asked about the reasons for this dismal performance under ARWSP, the Government stated a number of reasons such as most of the remaining NC and PC habitations are located in the difficult terrain, the time taken for implementation of the scheme is generally long and the cost of these schemes are comparatively high. The late release of funds by the respective State Finance Department has also been cited as one of the reasons for the low level of performance.

Coverage of NC and PC Habitations

2.9 The Department has furnished, the following details of the total NC and PC habitations – habitation-wise in the rural areas of the country which have been covered:

8 th Plan	3,39,705 habitations/villages
9 th Plan	4,02,119 habitations/villages

When asked about the present position of coverage of rural habitations in the country, the Department has stated as under:

“As per the information received from State Governments till 19.3.2002, out of the total 14,22,664 rural habitations, 12,61,590 have been fully covered, 1,43,577 have been partially covered and 17,497 rural habitations are yet to be covered with drinking water supply facilities.

The status with regard to slippage of fully covered habitations into partially covered and not covered category and the partially covered ones becoming not covered habitations is not reflected in the coverage. Ground position may be different due to:

- * Increase in population and number of habitations
- * Systems having outlived their life span or becoming defunct due to poor maintenance.
- * Sources going dry due to depletion of ground level.
- * Sources have become quality affected.”

The Department has further stated that the proposed target for the year 2002-03 regarding coverage of habitations, was to cover nearly 17,497 NC habitations and 50,000 PC habitations.

2.10 When asked how the Government is going to achieve the target of providing drinking water to all habitations by 2004, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated as under:

“We are trying to cover these NC and PC villages, in the next two years and thereafter in an intensive manner go for quality. We will also rope in international agencies. All of them are coming forward. For example, in Maharashtra, I mentioned that the World Bank is ready to assist”.

Further he also pointed out that in Tamil Nadu, World Bank is ready to assist while for Kerala there are several proposals from the Danish Government. Many State Governments are also taking a lot of interest in achieving the target.

2.11 The Planning Commission in the Mid-term Appraisal of the 9th Plan has mentioned that despite the Government’s claim of more than 95 per cent coverage, independent reports indicate scarcity of drinking water in about half of the villages of India. The figures regarding coverage of habitations are maintained on the basis of Nation-wide habitation survey conducted through the State Governments, in 1991, revalidated in 1994 and updated in 1997 and the subsequent coverage intimated by the State Governments. While there should be no reason to doubt on the information furnished by the State Governments, these figures are based on 1991 Census and 1991 Survey and the increase in population leading to emergence of new habitations has not been taken into account while arriving at the figures.

2.12 The ultimate objective of the Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) is to cover all rural habitations in the country. There is need to bridge the gap between the figures reported by the State Governments regarding coverage of habitations and the ground reality, regardless of the factors

responsible for such divergence. It is necessary for the implementing agencies to make a reassessment of the actual ground position of NC, PC and FC habitations. The States may be requested to collect the latest data in this regard as on 1st April 2002. The position regarding total number of habitations will be reviewed only after a minimum period of five years, thereby implying that the data relating to the total number of habitations now being assessed and furnished by the States will be frozen for a period of five years. Regarding slippage of FC habitations to PC and NC categories and PC habitations to NC category, the position should be assessed. This issue of fresh survey of habitations was discussed in the Conference of State Ministers held on 19-20 October 2001, which had recommended to launch a fresh survey of all habitations during 2002.

2.13 While a clear picture on the extent of slippage will become available only after the proposed survey, it is reasonable to presume that about 20% of the habitations amounting to nearly 2.80 lakhs would fall in the category of slippage in coverage. This issue would be addressed during the last three years of the 10th Plan period, (2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-2007).

2.14 During the course of oral evidence, the Secretary clarified that for the said sample survey, tenders have been called for and it would be launched in a couple of days throughout the country to find out the status of coverage of habitations, of the so-called fully and partially covered habitations. This would go a long way in cross-checking data and statistics regarding coverage.

2.15 Replying to the query regarding the time frame within which the said survey of all habitations would be completed, the Department replied that in the State Ministers' Conference it was decided that the States would conduct the survey and the data collected thereby would be evaluated by an independent agency. Further, the survey on slippage of habitations from FC to NC and PC and PC to NC would be completed by the end of July 2002.

2.16 After going through the information as submitted by the Department and as given in the preceding paragraphs, the Committee find that there are certain disturbing features with regard to the implementation of one of the top most priority programmes of the Government i.e. to provide potable drinking water to the rural population. The various shortcomings as noticed by the Committee are as below:

- (i) The Department is not getting the adequate allocation. The availability of funds is less than one-third of the estimated requirement in the Comprehensive Action Plan. In view of the inadequate allocation, the Committee express their doubt about the fulfillment of the set targets in the National Agenda for Governance of coverage of all rural habitations by 2004.**
- (ii) Not only there is inadequate allocation to the Department, but what is provided at BE stage is reduced at RE stage.**

- (iii) Whatever allocation is provided it is not being meaningfully utilised. There is huge underspending as regards the releases of funds by the Centre to State Governments. Besides, the position is alarming when the States' physical and financial progress is analysed.
- (iv) There are huge underspending with the State Governments.

2.17 The Committee feel that under-utilisation of resources is the main reason for getting the lesser allocation from Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance. Besides, they find that the Department is not serious in analysing the reasons for the dismal performance of such an important programme. Whenever asked about the reasons for slippage of targets, routine reply stating that NC and PC habitations are located in the difficult terrain etc., is furnished. The Committee have been receiving this type of reply for the last two to three years. This shows the casual approach of the Government. Further, they are unhappy to note the reply of the Government that underspending is due to surrendering of Rs.61.82 crore to non-lapsable pool of resources for North-East. After going through the data, the Committee find that Rs.61.82 crore was surrendered to the said non-lapsable pool of resources whereas the total underspending during 2000-2001 was Rs.63.43 crore. The Committee would like to be apprised about the steps taken by the Department for proper implementation of programme in the North-East. Besides, the Committee find that the targets set during each of the year are somehow unrealistic. The Department has set the targets to cover 17,497 NC habitations, whereas they could cover 6,655 and 1,627 NC habitations during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 respectively.

2.18 Keeping in view the above mentioned scenario, the Committee strongly recommend for adequate allocation under the most important programme of rural areas i.e. ARWSP. While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee stress that the Government should take the necessary corrective steps to ensure cent per cent utilisation of scarce resources. Besides, the various points as mentioned above need to be addressed by the Department seriously and the Committee apprised about the action taken accordingly.

2.19 What has been stated above with regard to chasing of numbers in respect of coverage of habitations, the Committee find that the actual ground reality in respect of coverage of habitations is something different. They have repeatedly been stressing on the Government to find out the ground reality in this regard by conducting survey by independent agencies. Besides, they have also been recommending to have some inbuilt mechanism for such a survey after a fixed period of time. They find that the Government have agreed to their recommendation and steps are being undertaken in this regard. Besides, the Department has also agreed for such a survey after a period of five years. They hope that such a survey will be started very soon

and the Committee be apprised of the details from time to time. They would also like that the position of slippage of FCs category to NC and PC categories and PC to NC category is also taken care of during the said survey and the data when collected, furnished to the Committee.

Coverage of schools

2.20 As per the data indicated in the Performance Budget 2002-2003 of the Department, the position of school coverage is very dismal. The performance of targets and coverage during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 is as below:

	2000-01	2001-02
Target	44086	39356
Coverage	11879	8663
Percentage of coverage	26.95	22.01

As could be seen from Appendices V and VI, during 2000-01, the percentage of coverage of schools in 17 States/Uts is nil, whereas in 5 States/Uts, the coverage is less than 50%. Similarly, for 2001-02, in 18 States/Uts, the percentage achievement of schools is nil. When asked about the overall position of coverage of schools, the Department has stated that as per the Sixth all India Education Survey (September 1993), there are 6.37 lakh rural primary and upper primary schools in the country, out of which, 2.85 lakh have drinking water facilities.

2.21 When asked about the number of schools that have been actually covered since school coverage was taken up under ARWSP, the Department has stated that during the last two years upto February, 2002, 24536 rural schools have been covered.

2.22 Notwithstanding this dismal performance, the Government have stated a far-fetched target to cover 30,000 primary and upper primary schools during 2002-03. As regards the question of the existence of any time-bound programme to cover all schools with drinking water supply, the Department has responded as follows:

“It was estimated that there were about 3.52 lakh rural primary and upper primary schools which were yet to be provided with drinking water supply facilities. About 1.50 lakh rural primary and upper primary schools are proposed to be covered under the ARWSP. During the last 2 years 24536 rural primary and upper primary schools have been covered. Balance 125464 will be covered during 10th plan period. The remaining 2.02 lakh schools would be covered with funds available under schemes of other Ministries including Elementary Education Department.”

2.23 The Committee have been recommending repeatedly to provide drinking water to each and every school within a stipulated period of time. It is really a matter of concern that after more than five decades of independence and of the plan development in the country, most of our

schools are yet to be provided the facility of drinking water, which is the basic necessity of life. The Department's claim to cover all the habitations by 2002-2003 by providing drinking water seems unrealistic when the overall position of coverage of schools is analysed. Even if the Government's data is believed, about 44% of the schools could only be provided drinking water so far. They also find that the data as given by the Department may be only of Government schools. When the data regarding other schools i.e. private and public is included, the situation may further be alarming. While the school coverage was taken into consideration under ARWSP since 1999-2002, the performance is very dismal as could be seen from the data indicated above. In view of this scenario, the Committee strongly recommend to give top priority to coverage of schools and all the schools should be provided drinking water within the minimum possible time.

Comparative analysis of outlay during 8th, 9th and 10th Plans

2.24

	<u>Central</u>	<u>State</u>
8 th Plan outlay	5100	4954.52
9 th Plan outlay	8150	5400.40
Proposed 10 th Plan outlay (3 fold increase)	24800	15630

Outlay provided during the first year of Tenth Plan i.e. 2002-2003 Rs. 2235 crore

Proposed Tenth Five Year Plan outlay – Rural Water Supply

2.25 Considering the recommendations of the Working Group on Rural Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation for formulation of the Tenth Plan, it is felt that Rs.40,430 crore would be required for rural drinking water sector out of which an outlay of Rs.15,630 crore would be from States. An outlay of Rs.24,800 crore as Central share alone would be required for the following activities under the Rural Water Supply Programme during the Tenth Five Year Plan.

S.No.	Activity/Programme	Outlay (in Rs. crore)
1.	Coverage of rural habitations	12,300.00
2.	Sector Reforms – community participation in Rural Water Supply Programme and related policy issues, Sustainability of systems and sources, Role of PRIs and NGOs, Restructuring and Re-orientation of the Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking water Mission.	2,000.00

3.	Water Quality, Sub-Missions including that on Sustainability, Research and Development, Technology and Integrated Water Resource Management.	10,000.00
4.	Other activities like Human Resource Development (HRD), Information, Education and Communication (IEC), Management Information System (MIS), Monitoring and Evaluation, Fresh Habitation Survey and Validation of Data	500.00
	TOTAL	24,800.00

2.26 When asked about the planning of the Government to achieve the various objectives set during the 10th Plan, the Department stated as below:

“Three major objectives are set for the Tenth Plan *viz.* (i) Coverage of habitations; (ii) Drinking Water quality problem mitigation; and (iii) Sustainable drinking water supply through Sector Reforms.

(a) It is proposed to cover all the existing Not Covered and Partially Covered habitations in the rural areas by 2004 i.e. during the first two years of the 10th Plan. During the next three years the habitations, which have slipped from Fully Covered to Not Covered or Partially Covered and from Partially Covered to Not Covered will be targeted for coverage. (b) During the 10th Plan period the quality problems will be tackled, based on the number of habitations that emerge as quality affected as per the on-going survey. (c) Strengthening of Sector Reforms initiatives in 63 districts and up-scaling to appropriate number will be aimed in 10th Plan.

2.27 When asked about the justification of the outlay of Rs.2,235 crore during the first year of the 10th Plan, i.e. 2002-03 as against the huge allocation of Rs.24,800 crore proposed by the 10th Plan Working Group for the period of five years, the Department conceded that the allocated amount for 2002-03 is inadequate for achieving the objective of coverage of all rural habitations with drinking water. However, in the context of general resource position, there is need to prioritise the demands of different sectors. Further, in view of the outlay which is less than the required outlay for 2002-03, it is a tall task to achieve the objectives set during the 10th Plan unless allocation in the subsequent years is enhanced substantially.

2.28 As per the 10th Plan Working Group, a huge outlay of Rs.24,800 crore under the Central share has been set about for the drinking water supply sector. When the Department was asked how they would meet this huge outlay, which saw a three-fold increase as compared to the 9th Plan outlay, they replied as below:

“The objective of covering all rural habitations with potable drinking water can be achieved only if sufficient funds are available. The increased requirement of funds was also felt during the previous Plans.”

2.29 The Committee find that the projections of 10th Plan in respect of proposed targets under drinking water supply programme are three times of what was allocated during 9th Plan. In view of the overall resource crunch, the Committee have their doubts about getting the adequate allocation from the Government funding. The actual allocation during the first year of 10th Plan is an example in this regard. The Government have provided nearly one-third of what was projected during 2002-2003. If similar trend is followed, the Department would be getting more or less the same of what they got during 9th Plan. In view of this position there is doubt in achieving the laudable targets set during 10th Plan. The Committee, therefore, urge the Government to persuade the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance to accept the urgency of providing adequate outlay for this sector. Besides, they also find that as stated by the Secretary during the course of oral evidence some efforts are being made to get the funds from various international agencies like World Bank. The Committee would like that more efforts should be made in this regard so as to enable the Government to get more and more funding from international agencies to enable them to achieve the set targets.

States' share (MNP)

2.30 As per the guidelines for ARWSP, States are required to provide funds from the States' share at least to match the Central allocation under ARWSP. It is also necessary to ensure that the utilisation of funds from the said resources (MNP) is at least equal or more than the ARWSP expenditure. It has further been mentioned that all these conditions are strictly adhered to during the programme implementation. When the Department was asked to justify the lesser allocation during 8th, 9th and 10th Plans in the State share as compared to the Central share in view of the strict provision for matching share in the guidelines, the Department stated as below:

“Funds are allocated to the States under normal ARWSP strictly on matching provision being made by the States. However, funds under programmes like Management Information System (MIS), Information, Education and Communication (IEC), Human Resources Development (HRD), Sector Reforms Projects (SRP) and ARWSP activities in Desert Development Programme (DDP) areas do not require States providing for matching provision.”

2.31 Pursuant to the recommendation made by the Committee in their earlier report [refer Para no.2.7 of 21st Report (13th Lok Sabha)] to have high level political co-ordination between the Centre and States for enhancement of outlay for rural drinking water supply and to pursue the matter further with the Planning Commission, the Department in their action taken reply had proposed as below:

- “(i) Convene meeting of all the State Ministers in charge of rural drinking water supply under the Chairmanship of Minister (Rural Development) at least once a year.
- (ii) Convene meeting of State Secretaries in-charge of rural drinking water supply and Chief Engineers of the concerned Departments under the Chairmanship of Secretary (Drinking Water Supply) at least once a year.”

2.32 When the Department was asked about the outcome of said meetings conducted from time to time they replied as under:

“A conference of State Ministers in-charge of Rural Drinking Water Supply was held on 19th and 20th October, 2001 under the Chairmanship of Minister (RD), which was also attended by Secretaries in-charge of Rural Drinking Water Supply.” A copy of the recommendations of the conference is at Appendix VII.

2.33 ARWSP is guided by certain norms with the aim of ensuring water supply to all rural habitations in the country. The norms are:

- (i) 40 lpcd (liter per capita per day) of drinking water for human beings;
- (ii) 30 lpcd of additional water for cattle in areas under the DDP;
- (iii) One handpump or standpost for every 250 persons; and
- (iv) Availability of water source in the habitation or within 1.6. km in the plains and 100 m elevation in hilly areas.

2.34 These norms have been in place ever since the start of the programme. When the Government was asked about revising of these norms, the reply was as below:

“Norms have been the same ever since the start of the Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme in 1972-1973. There is no proposal to revise these norms. However, once the task of providing every habitation with safe drinking water source is completed as per the existing norms and criteria, the State Government can consider relaxation of norms with the prior approval of the Government of India, subject to the condition that beneficiaries of the relaxed norms are willing to share a part of the capital cost and shoulder full responsibility of subsequent O&M, etc. The State Ministers’ Conference on Rural Drinking Water held on 19th and 20th October 2001 has also recommended that once the coverage of rural habitations in any State is achieved, the norms for coverage may be relaxed to provide for 55 litres per capita per day with a source within 0.5 km in plains or 50 metres elevation in the hills subject to the condition that at least 10% of the capital cost and responsibility of operation and maintenance are to be borne by the community.”

2.35 The Committee find that the various issues with regard to providing drinking water to rural masses were discussed in detail in the recent Conference of State Ministers in charge of rural drinking water supply and various valuable recommendations were made in this regard. They note that

one of the recommendations was to revise the norms which were fixed years back during 1972-1973. The Committee also feel that a new thinking should be given to revise the said norms. However, keeping in view the existing scenario, as given in the preceding paras of the Report, they appreciate the inadequacy of resources available for tackling this problem. Hence, while recommending for revision of the said norms, the Committee would like that first priority is accorded to cover all rural habitations within the existing norms. Besides, they would also like that the various recommendations made by the said Conference are taken into consideration by the Government and the Committee apprised about the steps taken in this regard.

At the Conference of State Ministers in October, 2001 it was recommended that 5% of the total ARWSP funds be specifically earmarked for meeting contingencies arising out of natural calamities in the rural water supply sector. The Government had promised to consider the above recommendation. The Committee would like to be apprised about the action taken in pursuance of the aforesaid recommendation and whether funds that remained unutilised up to November were ploughed back into the normal programme thereafter as per provision.

Sector Reforms Pilot Projects

2.36 ARWSP was restructured in April, 1999 to include proposals to mobilise community participation in rural water supply programmes. The idea was to institutionalise community-based demand-driven programme in place of the Centrally monitored, supply-driven, non-people participative rural water supply programme. Under ARWSP, 20% of the annual outlay is earmarked for providing funds for such projects. 63 districts in 26 States have been identified for implementing these sector reform projects on a pilot basis. As stated by the Government in Annual Plan, these projects do not aim at implementing a physical scheme, rather their purpose is to implement a new concept and principle.

2.37 As indicated in the Performance Budget, it has been decided to implement the sector reform projects in 63 districts on a pilot basis, of which 62 projects have already been sanctioned and funds have been released for 61 projects for implementation.

2.38 The progress of sector reform projects under implementation at this stage in terms of funds released by the Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission and funds utilized by the District Water and Sanitation Mission (DWSM)/Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRI) concerned is indicated at Appendix VIII. It could be seen from the said appendix that the position of reported expenditure in various districts is very poor. In 13 districts the expenditure reported is nil.

2.39 As per the written note furnished by the Department, the pilot districts for implementation of sector reform projects were identified by the concerned State

Governments. The Central Government only examined and sanctioned the project for a district identified by the State Government. However, the Government of India had suggested to the State Governments to identify those districts, where the chances of success of implementation of reforms are highest in the opinion of the State Government.

2.40 Further it has been stated that the provisional project cost sanctioned for implementation of 62 out of 63 projects was Rs.1860.45 crore. The 63rd project has also now been sanctioned at a provisionally estimated cost of Rs.40 crore. Hence the total sanctioned cost has risen to Rs.1900.45 crore. As these are process projects, the exact requirement of funds would become clearer only when the project implementation nears completion. As the sanctioned cost may either decrease or increase from the present level, the sanctioned cost of the project is provisional at the sanctioning stage.

2.41 The Sector Reform Projects envisage that community should organize themselves and then with all the awareness and information provided by the facilitators, they should themselves decide about the water supply schemes of their choice which is acceptable, adaptable and affordable to them. The community is to be motivated and encouraged to plan and commence implementation with their own resources. The Government still support their effort by providing up to 90% of the capital cost involved from the projects funds. As such the Government of India share of funds includes the requirement of funds for entire software component and a maximum of 90% of the hardware component which for 63 projects is to cost about Rs.1733.25 crore.

2.42 During the course of oral evidence, the Secretary stated that one district has been recently added taking the number to 64. There is going to be a further addition of 11 or 12 districts to make it a total of 75.

2.43 In the State-wise data as given in the Performance Budget (Appendix IX), funds released as second instalment to each of the districts have been indicated as nil, whereas the total funds released as second instalment have been given as Rs.74.45 lakh. When the Department was asked to clarify the said anomaly, the reply was as follows:

“The second instalment released is not out of allocation but from the 20% of ARWSP funds earmarked for implementation of Sector Reforms. The second instalment is released after 60% of funds available with Sector Reforms implementing agency are utilized, audit report for the scheme is submitted and the team of experts recommend release of second instalment.”

2.44 Further, stating the latest position, the Department stated that the second instalment has been released to Coimbatore and Vellore (Tamil Nadu) and West Siang district (Aurnachal Pradesh). For other districts, second instalment was not released since they did not fulfill the requirements as stated above.

2.45 When the Department's attention was drawn to the fact that reform initiatives should be uniform for all States/districts and the criteria for allocating outlay should be the same, the Department denied of giving any favourable treatment to these pilot districts. They said that these projects are now being implemented on a pilot basis and when successful, the reform principles will be extended.

2.46 However, while analyzing the performance of these pilot districts as indicated at Appendix VIII, the Department was asked to furnish details regarding this aspect and the reply was as stated below:

“The Government is reasonably satisfied with the implementation of Sector Reform Projects in Serchhip (Mizoram), Coimbatore and Vellore (Tamil Nadu), Chittoore and Khammam (Andhra Pradesh). More than 60% of available funds have been reported as utilized in pilot districts of Moga and Bhatinda (Punjab) and Dimapur (Nagaland). But whether the process of implementation of the project is satisfactory in these districts is yet to be confirmed. The implementation in the remaining pilot districts is slow. The project implementation is slowly picking up in the right direction in many States.”

2.47 The Secretary, during the course of oral evidence stated that what is required to make these projects successful is to change the mind set of people through IEC. To involve the people in these projects, to encourage participatory approach, there is need for training and capacity building at the grass root level. The total project period is of nearly three years, out of which the first phase is of institutionalization (3 months), secondly sensitisation and identification phase (12 months), thirdly scheme and system planning (9 months) and finally actual implementation and commissioning hand over (12 months).

2.48 The Committee are concerned to note the dismal performance of Sector Reform pilot projects as could be seen from the data given by the Department. They are further disturbed to note the reply furnished by the Department whereby on the one hand, it has been stated that they are reasonably satisfied with the implementation of Sector Reform Projects, on the other hand, it has been submitted that whether the process of implementation of these projects is satisfactory or not in these districts, is yet to be confirmed. They fail to understand how the Department could be contended with such a slow progress of the pilot districts. This needs to be explained properly.

2.49 The Committee find that the Secretary during the course of oral evidence has acknowledged that to make these pilot projects successful, there is a need to change the mind set of the people. They also find that to make the people participatory in sharing the cost of these projects, they have to be convinced. Sectoral Reforms which seeks to build up concepts in the participative direction is a technical term which needs proper understanding, maturity and correct handling by the implementing agencies. While the

Government's initiative is laudable, they should see the practical aspects also and whether it really hits the target. As such much home work is required on the part of the Government with necessary guidelines for Ministry and modus operandi of operations. The Committee would like to be apprised of the efforts made by the Department in this regard.

Release of outlay for North-Eastern States

2.50 As per Ministry of Finance instructions, 10% of the total outlay is to be shown separately in the Budget as 'lump-sum provision for the benefit of North-Eastern region and Sikkim'. Accordingly, 10% provision which totals up to Rs.240 crore of Central plan for the year 2002-2003, has been taken out from each scheme and shown separately in the Budget under Major Head '2552'

2.51 The details of the outlay earmarked and expenditure met, in each of the North-Eastern States including Sikkim for the years since the policy of 10% of total allocation to North-Eastern States has been adopted, have been given at Appendix X.

2.52 As could be seen from the said appendix, during the year 2001-2002, as against the released amount of Rs.8.21 crore approx. for the State of Manipur, Rs.0.18 crore has been shown as expenditure. Even for States like Assam, Mizoram and Nagaland, expenditure is nearly 50% of the amount released. The total expenditure figure for 2001-02 is Rs.82.89 crore i.e. Rs.61.24 crore short of released amount i.e., Rs.144.13 crore.

2.53 Further in the Performance Budget, the Government have stated that an amount of Rs.61.82 crore had to be surrendered in the non-lapseable pool of resources for North Eastern States due to non-receipt of adequate number of proposals from them during the year 2000-2001.

2.54 When the Government was asked about the reasons for non-utilisation of funds earmarked for North Eastern States under ARWSP, it was stated as below:

“As most of the remaining Not Covered and Partially Covered habitations are located in difficult terrain like hilly areas, deserts, hard-rock region, etc. the time taken for implementation of the scheme is generally long and cost of these schemes are comparatively high. Besides this, the low achievement in terms of fund utilisation is due to civil disturbances and late release of funds by the respective State Finance Departments.”

2.55 On being asked, what steps the Government plan to undertake to ensure that the scarce resources meant for North Eastern States are meaningfully utilised, the Department replied as follows:

“10% of the total funds are earmarked specially for the North Eastern States and Sikkim. The unutilised amount of the allocation for North Eastern States and Sikkim does not lapse and is placed in the non-lapseable pool of

resources for North Eastern States. As such, the funds meant for these States remain available to these States only.”

2.56 As per the written reply of the Government, various reasons have been attributed to non-receipt of adequate number of proposals from the North Eastern States. On being asked whether the Government have given a serious thought to it and if so the conclusions drawn therefrom, the Department replied that the power to plan, sanction and implement rural drinking water supply projects under Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) has been delegated to States and Uts and as such States are not required to submit projects/proposals for approval.

2.57 During the course of oral evidence, the Secretary pointed out as below:

“... a long term plan must be made for each of the States. The Village Committee Organisation must be built upon and strengthened. You are aware that in several of these States there are systems of *Gram Budas* i.e., village elders.The idea is to see whether this can be strengthened and built up, and finally empowered and given the responsibility of execution of some of the schemes.” Further it was pointed out that the pattern of the sharing of the North Eastern States is to be changed from 75:25 to 90:10, that is a higher percentage of share from the Central Government. The Ministry have agreed to this and have forwarded the said proposal to the Planning Commission.” The Secretary further stated that the same sharing pattern may be adopted for similarly situated and disadvantaged States in other parts of the country.

When the attention of the representatives of the Department was drawn to the dismal position of drinking water facilities in various schools in North-East the Secretary during his evidence stated as below:

“I have some figures, I don’t dispute these figures. So far as schools are concerned in 2001 our achievement has been 327 only; for 2001-2002, the figures have not yet come.”

When the attention of the representative of the Department was drawn towards the peculiar problem being faced in North-East where pipes were purchased and delivered the villages but were not being connected with the source of the water, Secretary stated as below:

“This is a very disturbing thing but we are taking some measures.”

2.58 The Committee find that the outlay earmarked for North-Eastern States could not be utilized fully during the year 2000-2001 Rs.61.82 crore had to be surrendered in the non-lapsable pool of resources of such States. Similar is the position of underspending during the year 2001-2002 as could be seen from the preceding paras. The Committee are unhappy to find that when asked for the reasons for under utilisation of outlay, routine reply is coming from the Department. It seems that the Department never tried to analyse the particular problems faced by the respective States in implementation of the programme. Another disturbing fact is the strategy of the Government, Central as well as States, to chase the figures regarding

coverage of habitations. There is variation between availability and accessibility of drinking water. They find that this is a serious matter and need to be probed urgently. They urge the Government to take into consideration this aspect in the recent survey being undertaken in various States.

2.59 The Committee are disturbed to note the position of availability of drinking water in various schools in North-East as acknowledged by the Secretary. Very few schools could be provided with the facility of drinking water. They strongly recommend that topmost priority be given to schools in the Centrally sponsored programme of drinking water. They also urge the Government to verify the data of availability of drinking water in various schools including private and public schools of North-East and apprise the Committee accordingly.

2.60 The Committee note that the Department has forwarded a proposal to the Planning Commission to change the funding pattern in case of States of North East, from 75:25 to 90:10. Similarly, it has been stated by the Secretary that the same funding pattern i.e. 90:10 should be adopted for similarly situated and disadvantaged States in other parts of the country. The Committee during their on the spot study-visit to Jammu and Kashmir were also requested for higher allocation under different schemes keeping in view the peculiar situation of that State. The Committee recommend to the Government to pursue the matter with the Planning Commission. The Committee find that the concept of higher allocation to such States has already been agreed to in principle by the Department. They would like that a proposal in this regard should be forwarded to the Planning Commission for their consideration, at the earliest.

Ensuring sustainability and Drinking Water Quality

2.61 Ensuring sustainability of water sources is an important sub-Mission for the success of water supply schemes on a long-term basis. As per the Annual Report 2001-02, under water conservation measures, projects worth Rs.30.75 crore have been approved, against which Rs.26.10 crore have been released. However, during the course of oral evidence, the Secretary stated that uncontrolled extraction of ground water has been continuing as a result of which water table in many parts of the country has reached a precarious situation. He further pointed out that on an average out of the total ground water extracted, 20% is used for drinking purpose and the rest 80% for other miscellaneous purposes. Chief Ministers of all the States have been asked to enact regulations on this matter.

2.62 Rejuvenation of traditional water resources was referred to as a means to amend the situation. Groundwater sources have to be strengthened, measures such as rainwater harvesting, watershed development have to be taken to contain

the serious situation. In some States *pani roko abhiyaan* has been started to stop the rainwater from flowing away. If the water source is not sustained and it dries down, then the existing schemes will fail. In desert areas, there should be rainwater conservation and roof water collection. The Secretary also referred to community schemes whereby in hilly areas, in some districts, rain water is being collected in rock cavities which is taken out during the summer season.

It was further pointed out that the rain water harvesting is doing very well in Maharashtra (Ralegaon and Siddhi), Madhya Pradesh and Alwar in Rajasthan. Mizoram is also one of the pioneering States where almost every house has rainwater harvesting system. In Andhra Pradesh, there is a programme called *neeru meeru* which is being run in all the districts, with Nalgonda and Chittoor particularly playing an active part. In Madhya Pradesh, the *pani roko* programme is being implemented.

2.63 Lack of potable water in coastal areas of the country is a major challenge facing the Government. On enquiring as to how many desalination plants in rural areas have been installed, the Government replied that out of 194 desalination plants that have been approved, only 150 were established and 77 plants are functioning. Further, the Government have stated that the plants installed are based on Reverse Osmosis (RO) and Electrodialysis. The existing plants based on distillation technology are large scale plants involving substantial financial outlay which is not cost-effective.

2.64 Regarding the proposed policy of the Government for setting said plants during the Tenth Plan, the reply was as below :-

“Government of India policy is to allow the State Government to decide the necessity for setting up desalination plants. Under the sub-Mission component of ARWSP, the funds are placed with the State Government to utilise the same for establishment of desalination plant. The power to sanction such plants has been delegated to the State Governments who can spend upto 20% of the ARWSP allocation for tackling water quality problems.

2.65 As per the information furnished by the State Governments, about 2.17 lakh rural habitations were affected with quality problem of drinking water as on 1st April, 1999. In the Annual Report, the Government have furnished the following data:

Quality problem	Affected habitations (nos.)
Fluoride	36,988
Arsenic	3,553
Salinity	32,597
Iron	1,38,670
Nitrate	4,003
Other reasons	1,400
Total	2,17,211

* As per information furnished by the State Governments as on 1.4.1999.

2.66 The important objective of sub-Mission programmes is to tackle the problem of water contamination. As per the Annual Plan, 20% of the annual outlay under ARWSP can be utilised by the State Governments to take up projects under the sub-Mission programme to tackle water quality problems like fluoride, arsenic, brackishness, etc. and to ensure source sustainability. The power to plan, sanction and implement these programmes has been delegated to the State Governments with effect from 1st April, 1998. It is also stated by the Department that the State-wise details of various projects/schemes taken up under sub-Mission Programme are not maintained at the Central level.

2.67 In order to assess the actual scenario with regard to quality problem, the State Governments are carrying out a two-stage survey, namely 5-10% Stratified Random Sample Survey, with block as unit, in the first instance followed by 100% survey in blocks found affected with quality problem. The exact magnitude of the problem could be assessed only after the results of the survey are available. When the Government was asked about the time frame of the said survey, the reply was as below:

“The first phase survey has been completed in all except eight States-Assam, Manipur, Nagaland, Tripura, Jharkhand, Kerala, Sikkim and Jammu & Kashmir. These State Governments were advised to complete survey and submit reports by 31st March, 2002. The second phase detailed survey has been completed in four States (Punjab, Haryana, Mizoram and Tamil Nadu in respect of power pump sources). In respect of other states, second phase survey is under progress. The whole exercise is expected to be completed by 30th April, 2002.”

2.68 In the note on the Planning for the Tenth Five Year Plan, the Government have submitted that even though the coverage has been impressive over the last decade, various studies indicate that there is no institutionalised quality monitoring and surveillance system in the country. This would be critical to the entire water supply sector. Establishing of water quality labs could be only one of the components of the programme. A ‘Catchment Area Approach’ would be adopted by involving various grass root level institutions. This may be implemented at three levels consisting of nodal units at the top level, intermediary level units like districts labs etc. and grass root level units. A multi-pronged strategy to tackle drinking water quality problem is to be used as enumerated below:

- (a) Draw water from alternate sources, installing water plants etc.;
- (b) Encourage research to identify appropriate technology adaptable to the rural community for treatment of chemical contamination;
- (c) Setting up plants for distillation of saline sea water for conversion to potable water ; and

- (d) A Dual Water Supply Policy may be adopted for rural habitation facing acute water quality problems. In these habitations even if safe water is provided upto 10 lpcd sufficient for drinking and cooking, it may be considered as habitation with a safe source of drinking water.

An in depth study needs to be carried out to meet the challenges of provision of safe water supply in quality affected villages. It is apparent that no single solution will be feasible to tackle this problem. Site and location specific solutions utilising a mix of methodology based on rainwater harvesting, recharge, water supply from nearby sources, use of traditional sources after adequate disinfection and adoption of treatment methods in that order has to be resorted to.

2.69 When the Government was asked regarding the steps to be undertaken to achieve the objectives of an institutionalised quality monitoring and surveillance system in the country, the Department replied as below:

“In each district Water Testing Laboratory has to be set up for testing of water quality. Accordingly, Water Testing Laboratories in 567 districts have been sanctioned. In order to expedite testing of water quality, a new strategy of catchment area approach is being propagated. This strategy is proposed to be adopted in three Pilot Districts in the country.”

2.70 On the issue of domestic water filters provided under pilot project in some parts of Rajasthan which are functioning successfully, the Department has stated that as per Sanitation, Water and Community Health (SWACH), Udaipur, cost of each domestic water filter distributed in Rajasthan is Rs.950. Cost of 5 kg. of activated alumina is also charged taking the total cost to Rs.1480, which is being provided under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme of ARWSP. Out of 18,000 filters procured, 10,000 filters have been distributed as on February, 2002 at the rate of 1 filter per family in 220 villages in parts of Rajasthan.

2.71 Regarding the maintenance of water filters provided to the beneficiaries, the Department stated that operation and maintenance is ensured through extensive IEC about the adverse impact of fluorosis problem and the need for preventive measures through extensive capacity building programme. Through this process, the community has become conversant with O&M of domestic water filters. The O&M charges at the rate of about Rs.10 per family per month are being recovered. According to Sanitation Water and Community Health (SWACH) project, the rural people have been motivated with awareness campaign. Hence, they are coming forward to take the domestic water filters for getting the advantages of these filters for drinking and cooking purposes. The domestic filter users have reported about their relief from non-skeletal fluorosis. The SWACH from the very beginning initiated measures for contribution from the beneficiaries towards domestic filter to inculcate a sense of belonging and ownership amongst the beneficiaries. According to SWACH, by implementing this policy, the demands for the domestic filter has been created amongst the community affected with fluorosis problem.

2.72 When the Government was asked as to what steps are being undertaken to encourage and promote the use of domestic water filters in other States in the country, it was stated that there is a proposal to encourage the use of domestic water filters for removal of chemical contaminants in States affected with quality problem such as excess arsenic and fluorosis as a short term measure for providing immediate relief especially in areas with limited availability of fresh water. Moreover, for tackling quality problems, upto 15% of the ARWSP outlay are utilised by the States Governments. The power to plan and execute schemes as per necessity has been delegated to the State Governments who can select appropriate technology and sanction such schemes to provide domestic water filters in quality affected areas.

2.73 However, inspite of these tall claims by the Government, the data furnished by them show that funds released during the year 2001-02, i.e. Rs.70.93 crore shows a sharp decline when compared with the previous year's released amount of Rs.132.09 crore. Thus, there has been nearly a fall of Rs.61.15 crore. Year-wise details of funds released to States under Sub-Mission programme to tackle quality problem in drinking water during 8th and 9th Plan are given below;

8th Five Year Plan

1.	1992-93	Rs.982.970 lakh
2.	1993-94	Rs.7539.994 lakh
3.	1994-95	Rs.10092.00 lakh
4.	1995-96	Rs.11642.810 lakh
5.	1996-97	Rs.10200.00 lakh

9th Five Year Plan

1.	1997-98	Rs.12200.410 lakh
2.	1998-99	Rs.15622.689 lakh
3.	1999-2000	Rs.6140.338 lakh
4.	2000-2001	Rs.13209.625 lakh
5.	2001-2002	Rs.7093.340 lakh

Despite this decline in fund availability during the last two consecutive years, as per the written note of the Government, the 10th Plan Working Group has recommended for Rs.10,000 crore exclusively to deal with quality problems in drinking water.

2.74 When asked about the major areas where proposed Rs.10,000 crore are to be spent during the 10th Plan period, the Government replied as below:

- Tenth Plan outlay on quality problem will be utilised for the purposes of
- (a) Mitigation of water quality problem like arsenic, fluoride, brackishness, iron and nitrate;
 - (b) Research and development in water quality problem areas;

- (c) Establishment of National Resource Centre for mitigation of arsenic and fluorosis;
- (d) Establishment of water quality treatment laboratories; and
- (e) Implementation of water quality monitoring and surveillance through 'catchment area approach'.

When enquired about the information regarding water treatment plants going defunct, the Government stated that out of 17,423 plants approved, 10,291 were established, 6,052 are functioning and remaining 4,239 are defunct i.e. approximately 41%. Further, the Government informed that 22 mobile water testing laboratories are available in the States and there is a further proposal to provide mobile water testing laboratories at district level where the stationary laboratories are not available.

2.75 As per information received from the States, the status of sub-Mission projects to tackle quality problem in drinking water is given below:

2.76

Sl. No.	Sub-Mission	Approved	Number of Plants installed		
			Upto 31.3.2001	During 2001-2002	Total
1.	Defluoridation Plants	845	632	-	632
2.	Desalination plants	194	150	-	150
3.	Iron Removal Plants	16384*	9524	-	9524
4.	Water Quality Lab.				
	i. Stationary	567	215	1	216
	ii. Mobile	22	22	-	22
5.	Solar Photovoltaic Pumps (SPV)	325	308	-	308

* Including 1875, 2467 and 43 IR Plants set up in Assam, MP and UP respectively in other schemes.

As per above data, the column indicating number of plants installed during 2001-2002 does not have any entry except for stationary water quality labs. However, the Government have further stated that there are research institutes and nodal laboratories dealing with water quality research and development, but these do not exclusively handle the water quality R&D. During the course of oral evidence, the Secretary said that the Government have proposed to set up a Centre for Excellence for arsenic in Kolkata.

2.76 Regarding the query on technology being harnessed for providing safe drinking water, the Secretary replied that though desalination plants are being

used in coastal areas, they are not very cost effective. But experiments are going on in this direction, and the organisation called TERI is conducting solar energy based desalination in the Kutch region on an experimental basis.

2.77 The Committee observe that ensuring sustainability of drinking water sources is the major challenge that has to be faced by the country in the coming years. They find that due to uncontrolled extraction of ground water in various parts of the country, water table has reached a precarious situation as acknowledged by the Secretary during the course of oral evidence. They also note that the various Centrally sponsored schemes of the Centre depend totally on ground water. Sufficient attention has not been given to the alternate sources of water. They, therefore, recommend that as suggested by the Department, multi-pronged strategy has to be adopted to tackle the water problem. More stress needs to be given to alternate sources of water like, maintaining traditional sources of water and rain water harvesting, etc. While noting that some of the States have done excellent work in this regard, specifically Mizoram, which has done pioneering work, the Committee urge the Government to make the other States aware of the success stories of these States and motivate them to come forward in this regard.

2.78 The Committee observe that future of India, so far water resources are concerned, lies rooted in sea. India has a huge coastal belt and sea water should be exploited for drinking and other purposes. The plea that it is not cost-affective, used as a deterrent not to explore further, does not hold any ground for future. The Government have to explore even if it is costly initially. We have to learn from countries which have resorted to desalination and take a leaf from their experience. If found necessary, experts should be called from those States to assist us. How long the country will tolerate drought and water famine. The country has to rise to the occasion and gear up resources and plunge. A concerted effort to overcome the inertia is necessary and the Committee expect that the Government would take earnest steps in this respect without further delay.

2.79 The Committee find that the problem of sustainability of water resources is being tackled by different Central Ministries like Rural Development, Agriculture, Water Resources. They recommend that the Department of Drinking Water should coordinate with these Ministries and take desired initiatives in this regard and apprise the Committee accordingly.

2.80 The Committee in their 21st Report, [13th Lok Sabha {refer 2.93 (vi)}] had stressed for giving more attention to purification of sea water for drinking purposes and other uses. They had also recommended to conduct an in depth research to make the technology cheaper in consultation with Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR). While going through the replies furnished by the Government, the Committee note that adequate

work has not been done in this regard. Even when only 150 projects were sanctioned, out of that only 51% are functioning. The Committee strongly recommend to pay more attention in this regard specifically when the ground water sources are drying up.

2.81 While recommending for various issues that need to be addressed to ensure the sustainability of water resources, the Committee find that the strategy of the Government should be according to the condition of a particular area in a State. In coastal areas there is need to give emphasis on desalination projects. Similarly in plains emphasis has to be given on recharge of water and use of traditional sources of water like ponds, etc. In hilly areas more attention has to be paid to collection of water in rock cavities, etc. Likewise they urge that the problem has to be tackled according to site and location specific solution.

2.82 As regards the quality of drinking water, the Committee find that sufficient attention is not being paid in this regard. They are constrained to find the huge number of water treatment plants going defunct. They urge the Government to find out the reasons for the water treatment plants going defunct. They also recommend that further emphasis should be given for having a mobile water testing laboratory in each district in the country.

2.83 While going through the data furnished by the Department with regard to the expenditure made during 8th and 9th Plans on sub-mission programmes to tackle quality problem, the Committee conclude that much emphasis is not being given in this regard. They also find that 10th Plan Working Group has recommended for Rs.10,000 crore exclusively to deal with quality problem in drinking water. Keeping in view the lesser expenditure during 8th and 9th Plans, the Committee strongly recommend to the Government to pay more attention to the quality problem during 10th Plan and ensure that adequate allocation is provided in each year of 10th Plan for the said purpose.

2.84 The Committee note that in Rajasthan, to tackle the quality problem on a temporary basis, domestic water filters have been provided under ARWSP. They would like that the similar approach should be adopted in other States where the problem of contamination of water is acute.

2.85 The Committee are concerned to note that there is no research institute or nodal laboratory dealing exclusively with water quality R&D. They also note that the Government have proposed to set-up a Centre for Excellence for arsenic in Kolkata. They strongly recommend to the Government to pay more attention to water quality R&D and set-up research institutes and laboratories exclusively for this purpose. Besides, sufficient outlay should be provided during 10th Plan for this purpose.

2.86 The Committee find that the major pollutant of drinking water is fluoride. To tackle this problem they feel that the adequate steps have not been taken by the Government. They, therefore, would like to recommend that the Government should set-up a fluorosis control cell at the Central level comprising of officials of both Rural and Urban Ministries and other concerned Ministries like Health, Water Resources.

Human Resources Development

2.87 The National Human Resources Development Programme (NHRDP) was launched in 1994, with its primary focus on capacity building, especially of rural beneficiaries to promote community participation and on improving performance and productivity levels of sector professionals. As per Performance Budget, out of 28 States, 24 States have taken action for setting up State HRD cells. States like J&K, Tripura, Jharkhand and Uttaranchal are yet to set up HRD Cells (Appendix XI).

2.88 During 2001-2002, 23 States have submitted action plan, out of which the Ministry has already approved action plan for 21 States. The action plans in respect of West Bengal and Uttaranchal are yet to be approved since these States have delayed submitting their action plans. These are under consideration. States like J&K, Jharkhand, Maharashtra, Sikkim and Tripura have not furnished annual action plans for approval to the Ministry. They have identified seven key institutes, namely, ESI Ahmedabad, SJE Mysore, AIIH and PH Kolkata, GGRI Gandhigram, GJTI Gandhinagar, IRET Ahmedabad and MLNREC Allahabad. These key institutes organize various professional training courses. An amount of Rs.200 crore has been estimated for HRD activities during the 10th Plan period. However, the performance of various States as per the data furnished by the Government show that optimum utilisation of available funds is not being made leading to a large gap between amount released, expenditure and physical achievement.

2.89 As per the data giving State-wise details of financial and physical progress under NHRD (see Appendix XI), expenditure for the States of Goa, Sikkim and Tripura has been shown as nil, though amount released for each of these States since inception of the programme i.e. 1994-95 is Rs.37.90 lakh, Rs.9.35 lakh and Rs.18.54 lakh respectively. Even for a big and populous State like West Bengal, number of people trained till June 2001 is an abysmally low i.e. 250. Also expenditure as reported is nearly 40% of the total amount released.

2.90 When asked about the steps that are being undertaken to ensure that HRD Cells are set up in the States where they haven't been set up so far, the Government replied as below:

“Out of 28 States, 24 States had set up HRD Cells. Four States i.e. Jharkhand, Jammu and Kashmir, Tripura and Uttaranchal have not set up. The proposals have been received from Jharkhand and Uttaranchal which are newly

created States. Rs.24.20 lakh to Jharkahand and Rs.43.00 lakh to Uttaranchal have been released. The HRD Cells in these States will be set up shortly. Rs.18.54 lakh has already been released to Tripura during 1995-96 to 97-98. State Government is being pursued to set up the Cell immediately. No proposal has been received form Jammu and Kashmir Government. Matter is being pursued with the State Government.”

2.91 The Committee note that the success of the various reform initiatives started by the Department as addressed separately in the Report depends specifically on the capacity building of rural beneficiaries. Herein lies the importance of HRD programme. Although the initiative has been taken by the Department in this regard, the physical and financial position is not satisfactory in respective States/Uts. They, therefore, recommend that more stress be given on training of beneficiaries, during the coming years.

Role of Panchayati Raj Institutions

2.92 As per the recommendations of the 10th Plan Working Group, it is not possible for the Government alone to take the responsibility of O&M of the various programmes with the limited resources available. There is a need to involve the communities for ensuring that programmes are in tune with their needs as well as for proper upkeep of the assets already created. The Sector Reforms Projects aiming at demand-driven, participative programmes have been a step in this direction. Through demand driven approach, the community is involved in the planning and implementation of water supply schemes by sharing full O&M cost and part of the capital cost. The ultimate solution of sustaining the system created is the replication of sector reform concept in all districts.

2.93 When enquired about capacity building of Panchayats to enable them to include the responsibility of O&M, the Government responded that the capacity building of Panchayats to enable them to handle the responsibility of Operation and Maintenance (O&M) is one of the objectives. It is a process which could take time. In Sector Reform Districts, building the capacity of grass-root level functionaries and the rural community for ensuring the success of the reform principles in Rural Water Supply sector is being pursued by the Government.

2.94 When the Government was asked about their policy with regard to handing over the responsibility of implementation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes through Panchayati Raj System in consonance with the provision of the Constitution during the 10th Plan, the reply was as below:

“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 provision 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 for 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.”

As such, the responsibility of endowing the above mentioned powers with the Panchayats is with the State Governments. However, the guidelines for implementation of ARWSP provide for involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions in the implementation of various rural water supply schemes particularly in the selection 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 the District Water and Sanitation Missions, which are to be registered societies under the supervision, control and guidance of the District Panchayats (Zilla Parishad).

2.95 On the issue of releasing money allocated under ARWSP directly to Panchayats, the Government stated that funds under ARWSP are released to State Governments. However, 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 District Water and Sanitation Mission (DWMS). The DWMS functions under the supervision, control guidance of the District Panchayats. 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 implement the projects themselves instead of the DWMS. Funds of the Sector Reform Projects are transferred directly to the District Panchayat / District Water and Sanitation Mission (DWMS). 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 Committee of the Gram Panchayat.

2.96 Since the implementation of Part IX of the Constitution is responsibility of the Union Government they should ensure that the schemes relating to drinking water are entrusted to Panchayats. If there is any legal hurdle in the implementation, the Government should put forward suitable proposal. They are also unable to comprehend the rationale of transferring O&M to Panchayats without taking the desired steps for their capacity building. The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation to revise the guidelines and entrust the total responsibility of execution and implementation of ARWSP to Panchayats.

Monitoring of Drinking Water Supply Programme

2.97 As per the Tenth Plan Note, the Government have stated that a continuous monitoring and effective evaluation at the State and district level for the various rural water supply projects and sector Reforms Projects is needed. Project

implementation would require not only progress monitoring but also process monitoring. Replying to the query as to what steps are being initiated to strengthen the existing monitoring system of ARWSP and MNP, the Government replied as below:

“The ARWSP and MNP programmes are being monitored regularly in the following manner:

1. Periodical progress report
2. Area Officers visit
3. Field visit by Government Officers
4. Evaluation study/sample survey

The physical and financial progress reports relating to ARWSP and MNP are being furnished by the State Governments on monthly/quarterly and annual basis. The MPR is received from all the States. Area Officers and officers of the Central Government visit the various States and undertake field visits. The evaluation studies in 59 districts of 13 States have been completed, and in 31 districts of 14 States (evaluation studies) are proposed to be conducted.”

2.98 When asked about the various steps that are being undertaken to bring the transparency in the implementation of various drinking water schemes by using latest available technology, the Government stated that a new web site of the Department is being developed containing all relevant information of the Department which can be easily accessed by people. The web-site will also include progress reports of different schemes for information.

As per the Tenth Plan Working Group proposal about Rs.30 crore would be required for monitoring and evaluation activities during the Tenth Plan.

Restructuring of Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission

2.99 Rural Water supply and sanitation Programme, which has been continuing since 1954 was given a Mission approach in 1986, when a Technology Mission on Drinking Water Management called the NDWM was introduced. This was renamed as RGNWM in 1991. As per the written reply of the Government, the main activities of RGNDWM are as follows:

- (a) Release of funds for implementation of ARWSP to State Governments;
- (b) Release of funds for implementation of Sector Reform Projects to Districts;
- (c) Release of funds for implementation of Drinking Water Supply component or Pradhan Mantri Gramodaya Yojana;
- (d) Implementation of support activities of ARWSP like R&D, HRD, MIS, IEC etc;
- (e) Monitoring of utilisation of funds released by the Mission; and
- (f) Monitoring of number of rural habitations covered with drinking water facilities.

2.100 However, as per written note the Government had submitted, an assessment of the strength of RGNDWM indicates that the Mission needs to be restructured and reoriented into a cohesive, committed and competent unit, comprising of sincere, skillful and sustainable workforce, so as to enable them to implement an innovative and complex agenda on such a large scale. The newly created Department of Drinking Water Supply in the Ministry of Rural Development has been given the mandate of achieving the target of providing safe and sustainable drinking water supply facilities to all rural habitations. However, the creation of the Department has not been followed-up with requisite augmentation of staff and infrastructure to enable its functioning as a full-fledged Department. Hence, there is an urgent need to augment the staff and infrastructure of the Department. There is also a need for strengthening manpower available in the Department of Drinking Water Supply in the wake of the sector reform initiatives, especially with reference to the need for effective monitoring and evaluation. A detailed note has been furnished by the Government as to how the shortage of staff and infrastructure have affected the functioning of the Department. For example, with the restructuring of ARWSP from April, 1999 aiming to mobilise community participation in rural water supply programme, Sector Reforms Pilot Projects in the States were emphasised upon. The work relating to supervision and monitoring of these pilot projects in present 63 identified districts of the country needs to be ensured. The number of existing pilot districts is likely to be increased. Similarly, the number of villages where Total Sanitation Campaign is being carried out at present is 149. The same is to be increased to 250. Prompt and regular monitoring of these activities could not be carried out due to shortage of staff. The existing staff strength is at Appendix XII.

2.101 The Department is operating from three different buildings. Secretary (Drinking Water Supply) is in Nirman Bhavan. The officers and staff are located in Paryavaran Bhavan and Block 11 of C.G.O. Complex, Lodi Road. The main Ministry of Rural Development operates from Krishi Bhavan. For establishment matters, budget/account and cash matters this Department is dependent on the Ministry. Integrated Finance Division is also located in the Krishi Bhavan. The officers have to commute between various buildings for various official work, thereby a lot of time is wasted. The Government have also stated that Cabinet approval was obtained to ensure restructuring of the Mission within the existing budget provision. However, the decision of the cabinet could not be operationalised.

2.102 While noting the system of monitoring of rural drinking water supply programme, the Committee feel that the existing monitoring mechanism of the Department has to be revamped. The Committee would like to recommend that the Department should think of devising a mechanism of having periodic meetings of concerned Union Ministers along with Central

officials with concerned State Ministers and officials. They should also think of inviting MPs/MLAs of that State at the said meetings.

2.103 The Committee find that the Department of Drinking Water is facing the problem of shortage of staff and infrastructure which according to them is hampering in the effective monitoring of the scheme. They also note that the Cabinet approval has already been obtained for restructuring of the mission within the existing Budget provision. They, therefore, recommend that necessary steps should be taken to implement the above decision expeditiously. While recommending for adequate staff and infrastructure for better operation of the Department, the Committee also emphasise that the optimum utilisation of the existing resources should be ensured.

Pradhan Mantri Gramodaya Yojana

2.104 PMGY was launched in 2000-01 by the Government of India. It envisages an Additional Central Assistance (ACA) for selected basic minimum services to focus on certain priority areas. Initially, it had 5 components – primary education, primary health, rural shelter, rural drinking water and nutrition and in 2001-2002, a new component of rural electrification was added. The Planning Commission works out State-wise allocation of ACA in the beginning of the financial year and the same is communicated to all concerned. 10% of PMGY funds have been earmarked each for rural water supply and the four other components, while 15% of the ACA has been kept for nutrition. The remaining 35% of ACA has been placed at the discretion of the States/UTs to be allocated according to their own priorities.

2.105 The PMGY(RDW) Programme is to be implemented in accordance with the guidelines issued by the Government of India. Under this Scheme, minimum 25% of the total allocation for the component is to be utilised by the respective States/UTs on Projects/Schemes for water conservation, water harvesting, water recharge and sustainability of the drinking water sources in respect of DDP/DPAP areas, over-exploited dark/grey blocks and other water stress/drought affected areas and the balance 75% of the allocation can be used for tackling water quality and coverage of Not-Covered (NC) and Partially Covered(PC) habitations. It has been envisaged that the same State Level Projects and Schemes Sanctioning Committee as in the case of ARWSP would sanction these projects and schemes.

2.106 When the Government was asked to clarify the justification for starting a new programme in the presence of a well established programme of ARWSP – MNP for providing drinking water in rural areas, the Government replied as below:

“The Government has 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 earlier Basic Minimum Services (BMS).

2.107 As per the data furnished by the Government regarding physical and financial progress under PMGY-RDW (2000-2001), some States show a huge gap between funds released and expenditure reported. For example, Assam showed only 12.47% expenditure of the funds released, Karnataka 36.9%, Punjab 28.13%, Uttar Pradesh 38.9% among others. Moreover, the figures stated under the column number of habitations covered present a dismal picture; for Uttar Pradesh this figure has been indicated as nil. Out of 35 States/Uts, physical progress has been indicated only for 14 States/Uts. (Appendix XIII).

2.108 The financial and physical progress during 2001-2002 shows no better picture. States like Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Mizoram, Nagaland, Orissa, Tripura, West Bengal, Daman and Diu, Lakshadweep, Goa show expenditure figures less than 50% of the total available funds, while Bihar, Uttar Pradesh performed dismally with 0.56% and 6.94% expenditure respectively of the total available funds. Similarly, out of 35 States/Uts, only 16 have entry under the column of physical progress. For most other States such as Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Haryana, Maharashtra, Punjab, etc. the figures are dismal. (Appendix XIV). The Government have stated in the written note that second instalment of funds could not be released to five States i.e. Bihar, Chhatisgarh, Jharkhand, Maharashtra and Manipur as these States could not utilise the first instalment and submit the claim for the second instalment. (Appendix XV).

2.109 Regarding the allocation under PMGY-RDW during the 10th Plan and 2002-03, the Government indicated a change of strategy. Planning Commission which indicates the allocation for the Rural Drinking Water component under PMGY, has informed that during 2002-2003 and the Tenth Plan, a decision has been taken to revert back to Basic Minimum Services (BMS) pattern of allocation under which freedom and flexibility will be allowed to the State Governments to decide their own inter-se allocations of Additional Central Assistance (ACA) among six PMGY components depending on their own priorities.

2.110 The Committee are constrained to note that though everybody acknowledges the importance of water in living beings' lives, no effort is being made by the implementing agencies to ensure its supply, as could be seen from the utilisation of funds and also from the physical achievements reported by the Government. It hardly needs to be emphasized that the shortage of funds is not the main reason for many problems being faced by the people, rather the improper management and non-utilisation of available resources are the main reasons for our failure. The Committee, therefore,

urge the Government to impress upon the implementing agencies to ensure full and proper utilisation of scarce resources, particularly when it affects the poorest of the poor, who are compelled to live in this condition even after lapse of 50 years of planned development. If the State Governments/Uts do not rise to the occasion, the Government should review these schemes and devise some ways and means which could move out the implementing agencies from their slumber.

The Committee are also unhappy of the manner in which the Government instead of improving of existing schemes and consolidating their gains, if any, go on launching new schemes which again suffer for want of proper infrastructure as admitted by the Government in their written note.

CHAPTER III

Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP)

3.1 The CRSP was launched in 1986 with the aim to provide fully subsidized sanitary latrines to socially disadvantaged families and people below the poverty line. The Central assistance under the programme was subject to matching provisions/expenditure by the State Governments. As per the Annual Report, CRSP was improved with effect from April 1999 with a shift from the principle of State-wise allocation based on poverty criteria to a demand-driven approach in a phased manner, community-led and people-centred. The aim was to achieve at least 25% coverage of rural population by the end of 9th Plan. According to the revised criteria for 2001-02, 90% of allocation is for Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) in the identified districts and the remaining 10% of allocation is for allocation-based programme.

As part of planning, Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) approach has been adopted with increased stress on awareness building and meeting the demand with alternative delivery mechanism.

Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC)

3.2 TSC is being implemented in phases with some start up fund made available for preliminary IEC work. The actual physical implementation will have to be oriented towards satisfying the felt-need and using the vertical upgradation concept, wherein individual beneficiaries get to choose from a flexible menu of options that allow upgradation depending on their requirements and financial position. While appreciating the campaign approach, which envisages a synergistic interaction between the Government machinery, active NGO participation, intensive IEC, the provision of an alternative delivery system and more flexible, demand-oriented construction norms are also stressed. 200 districts have been allotted to States/Uts throughout the country for implementing TSC. So far 111 projects have been sanctioned in 26 States/Uts.

Overall analysis of the financial progress

3.3 Overall analysis of financial and physical progress under CRSP and MNP have been given in Appendix XVI. The financial progress under TSC during 2001-2002 has been given in Appendix XVII.

3.4 The Government have stated various reasons for the under-utilisation of funds during the financial years 1999-2000 and 2000-2001. Since an amount of Rs. 15511.55 lakh under Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) of Restructured Centrally sponsored Rural Sanitation Programme (which has come into being w.e.f. 1.4.99) was released during the financial year 1999-2000 and 2000-2001, State/Districts could not utilise the same during the years as the District Implementing Agencies have to take up the Start-up activities and intensive IEC in the first phase of the implementation of the TSC resulting in less expenditure in

both the financial years. TSC is sanctioned to be implemented over the period between 24 to 30 months in 3 financial years. Implementation under TSC has now started picking up with start up activities and awareness campaign which will help to improve physical and financial progress of the programme. Further, expenditure will pick up once the hardware works are taken up. It is expected that during the next few years parity in release and expenditure figures will be achieved.

3.5 However, as per the data furnished by the Government, it is evident that even during the year 2001-02 expenditure has been much below the amount released under the programme. On being asked as to how does the Government plan to ensure full utilization of the released amount in the remaining few months, the Government stated that to achieve this purpose, the States/Uts/District Implementing Agencies are periodically advised for speedy implementation of the programme in order to utilise the funds already available with them and to reduce unspent balance. Further, it was stated that the release of 2nd installment of funds under the Programme is made only after the State Government furnish the utilisation of 60% of the available funds and submission of requisite documents like Utilisation Certificates and AG Certificate of expenditure.

3.6 The 10th Plan Working Group has recommended a provision of Rs.3663 crore for the Plan period for the purpose of rural sanitation. However, during 2002-03, i.e. the first year of the 10th Plan, Rs.165 crore has been earmarked under rural sanitation. When the Government was asked about the main objectives for which Rs.3663 crore has been projected for the 10th Plan by the Working Group, the following were mentioned:

(i) Coverage of all the districts of the country under the Total Sanitation Campaign; (ii) Intensive Information, Education and Communication activities to create more awareness, developing a qualified and motivated manpower in organisations and at all levels, which includes training and education, manpower, utilization plans and also creation of an appropriate culture in the implementing agencies in particular and in the community in general and involvement of NGO/VO at National/State level Institutions to study the present technology of human excreta and waste disposal system in the rural areas. The research outcome would provide affordable low cost technologies to suit the requirements of different geo-hydrological conditions for ecologically sustainable long-term solution for disposal of wastes.

3.7 On being asked as to how the Government would achieve the set objectives in view of the present allocation i.e. only Rs.165 crore during 2002-03, it was stated that in order to cover all the districts in the country allocation as projected in the Working Group report is required. However, in view of present allocation, coverage of districts will be reduced. In addition to this, Government is also trying to get assistance from External Support Agencies for Water supply and Sanitation.

CRSP during 2000-01

(Rs. In Lakhs)

Item	Opening Balance	Budget Estimates	Revised Estimates	Release	Expenditure (provisional)
CRSP	4117.08	3945.00	3945.00	2169.36	2664.88
Total Sanitation Campaign(TSC)	4599.96	9970.00	9970.00	10911.59	0.00
Monitoring & Evaluation		50.00	50.00	5.01	
Research		5.00	5.00		
HRD		5.00	5.00		
RMK	71.49	10.00	10.00		37.47
Assistance from UNICEF/WHO		15.00	15.00		
Total	8788.53	14000.00	14000.00	13085.96	2702.35

3.8 As per the Performance Budget, one of the main aims of the Restructured CRSP (with effect from April 1999) has been to achieve at least 50% coverage of rural population by the end of the 9th Plan. However, due to financial crunch, the Planning Commission in its Draft Mid-Term Appraisal has reduced the target to 25%. However, as per the data furnished by the Government in their written reply, expenditure has been abysmally low; even the available funds could not be properly utilised. When asked about this discrepancy between expenditure and amount released, the Government stated the reasons for under utilisation as follows:

(i) During 2000-2001 Rs.130.86 crore were released to State/UTs, of which Rs.109.12 crore were under the Total Sanitation Campaign and Rs.21.74 crore under the allocation based programme. (ii) The TSC is a process project involving social mobilization, IEC, and demand generation. This first phase of the implementation of the Total Sanitation Campaign by the States and District Implementing Agencies takes more time. These agencies have also taken up the activities like identification of beneficiaries, publicity, awareness generation etc., (iii) There are projects where hardware works like toilet construction takes time. These activities are time consuming. (iv) These projects continue for a period of about 36 months. The Government further stated that some States/Uts have not furnished their monthly progress reports for the month of March 2001, and as such the Government had to furnish provisional figures for the year 2000-01.

3.9 It has been stated that during the financial year 2000-01, the North Eastern States have not lifted the installment amount and have not submitted project proposals as well. This is in direct contrast to the stated objective of the programme to accelerate the coverage of backward areas. When the Government was asked as to what steps are being undertaken to ensure that 10% of the allocation earmarked for North Eastern States is meaningfully utilised, it was stated that allotment of districts for implementing the Total Sanitation Campaign is being done primarily on the basis of rural population in respective States:

- (i) North Eastern States have been allocated total 35 districts out of which 27 district proposals have been sanctioned having an outlay of Rs. 8876.69 lakh;
- (ii) We are also considering to sanction more projects for North Eastern States; and

- (iii) In addition, monitoring will be done to ensure proper and timely implementation and utilisation of funds.

3.10 Moreover, to persuade the State Government to expand project proposals, the Government stated that the allocation based programme of the CRSP is being phased out by the end of March, 2002. The entire allocation of 2002-03 will be available for the Total Sanitation Campaign. Hence, 100 more districts are being allocated to States and UTs for implementing the Total Sanitation Campaign projects.

CRSP during 2001-2002

(Rs. In Lakhs)

Item	Opening Balance	Budget Estimates	Revised Estimates	Release (upto 31.1.02)	Expenditure (provisional)
CRSP	3621.56	1492.00	1300.00	475.63	1226.58
Total Sanitation Campaign(TSC)	15511.55	13428.00	12150.00	6763.09	3882.06
Monitoring & Evaluation		50.00	32.82	12.99	
Research		10.00	0.00		
HRD		5.00	0.00		
RMK	34.02	10.00	12.18		
Assistance from UNICEF/WHO		5.00	5.00		
Total	19167.13	15000.00	13500.00	7251.71	5108.64

3.11 When asked about the reasons for this mismatch between BE, RE, Release and expenditure, the Government replied that the outlay for 2001-2002 is Rs.150 crore, which in RE was reduced to Rs. 135 crore. As on 22nd March, 2002 the release position is Rs. 129.74 crore. Out of Rs. 135 crore. Rs. 15 crore was earmarked for North-Eastern States. Despite best efforts Rs. 10.11 crore could be released to North-Eastern States. Balance Rs. 4.89 crore will be transferred to non-lapsable pool for North-Eastern states.

3.12 As per the Performance Budget, the provision of construction of sanitary latrines under CRSP during 2000-01, 2001-02 is very dismal as indicated in appendices XVIII and XIX. Under Allocation Based Programme, for 2000-01, 14 States/UTs have nil achievement. Similarly, for 2001-02, nearly 27 States/UTs have nil achievement. When asked to explain such a dismal performance of sanitation programme in rural areas, it was informed that this dismal performance is due to low level of expenditure for which the following reasons are responsible:

- (i) State Governments and Panchayat Raj Institutions are to show more commitment for demand responsive Total Sanitation Campaign;
- (ii) Rate of subsidy per household toilet has been reduced from Rs. 2000 to Rs. 500. This change of subsidy rate has slowed the implementation process; and
- (iii) To change mindset of people through IEC takes time.

Role of external agencies

3.13 When the Government was asked regarding the steps being undertaken to get assistance from outside agencies like WHO/UNICEF, it was stated that efforts are being made to take assistance from UNICEF and WHO for water supply and sanitation programmes. The Biennium Budget of WHO for year 2002-2003 is US\$ 1,50,000 with focus on water quality monitoring and surveillance and participatory approach to hygiene and sanitation in rural areas.

Estimated programme budget of UNICEF during 2003-2007 is US\$ 64 million for drinking water, sanitation and hygiene. The UNICEF will be providing support in the areas of hygiene and sanitation education including Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) and Sector Reforms districts, Schools and Anganwadis sanitation, community management of water and sanitation, policy development in sanitation, water quality system strengthening, etc.

School Sanitation

3.14 While recognizing the need for school sanitation as a vital component of the sanitation programme, in the Annual Report 2001-02, the Government have proclaimed that it was proposed to construct toilets in all rural schools (separate complexes for boys and girls) by the end of the 9th Plan. However, in its written reply the Department has stated that only 0.58 lakh out of a total of 6.37 lakh primary and upper primary schools (as per the Sixth All India Education Survey, 1993) have lavatory facilities, i.e. only around 9%. As per the Annual Report, CRSP was restructured in April 1999 and rural school sanitation was introduced as a major component. However, when asked to furnish year-wise data regarding coverage of schools under CRSP, the Department has provided the figure of 4477 only for the year 2002 as indicated in Appendix XX.

3.15 When asked about the Government's action plan to provide toilets to all the schools, the Government stated that:

- (i) It is planned to provide toilets to all schools in rural areas;
- (ii) For this purpose more than 10% of the fund of TSC may be utilized;
- (iii) Recently, it has been decided to cover all high and higher secondary schools also.

Further it was also stated by the Government that as per the guidelines of the Central Rural Sanitation Programme, school sanitation is one of the important components and thrust is being given on construction of separate toilets for girl students. As per 6th All India Survey, 24,151 primary and upper primary schools were having separate toilets for girls. In the TSC, 1,26,953 toilets have been sanctioned for schools. The implementing agencies have been asked to give priority to separate toilets for girls.

3.16 Though the Committee have repeatedly been recommending that the Central Rural Sanitation Programme be given more importance and adequate outlay should be provided for the purpose, the following facts speak otherwise:

- (i) The targets fixed during 10th Plan to cover 50% of the population in rural areas were reduced to 25%;
- (ii) The outlay provided during 2002-2003 i.e. the first year of 10th Plan is nearly 1/5th of the proposed outlay;
- (iii) During the period 1986 to 1999, the construction of toilets showed an increasing trend whereas from 2000 onwards the number of toilets constructed is showing a downward trend. [Please see appendix XX];
- (iv) Only around 9% of the schools could be provided with lavatory facilities and out of that only one half of the schools could be provided separate toilets for girls;

While the Committee would strongly recommend to the Government to persuade Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance for adequate outlay for the programme, at the same time they would urge the Department to find out ways and means so that whatever resources are allocated for the programme are properly and fully utilised for the proper utilisation of scarce resources.

School sanitation is a hygienic aspect of the national health of the younger generation. However, the attention given to it has not been to the optimum level. It is disheartening to note that the Government is playing with statistics only, whereas on the ground, very negligible work has been done. A school without a toilet and washing facilities is unthinkable and below any civilised norms of the society. The Government have to think deeply and work hard practically with visible results. Much in paper has been done. It is high time that they should come forward with result-oriented action and visible progress to ensure good health for the younger generation.

NEW DELHI;
23 April, 2002
3 Vaisakha, 1924(Saka)

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

STATEMENT OF OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Sl.No.	Para	Observation/Recommendation
1	2	3
1.	2.16	<p>After going through the information as submitted by the Department and as given in the preceding paragraphs, the Committee find that there are certain disturbing features with regard to the implementation of one of the top most priority programmes of the Government i.e. to provide potable drinking water to the rural population. The various shortcomings as noticed by the Committee are as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) The Department is not getting the adequate allocation. The availability of funds is less than one-third of the estimated requirement in the Comprehensive Action Plan. In view of the inadequate allocation, the Committee express their doubt about the fulfillment of the set targets in the National Agenda for Governance of coverage of all rural habitations by 2004.(ii) Not only there is inadequate allocation to the Department, but what is provided at BE stage is reduced at RE stage.(iii) Whatever allocation is provided it is not being meaningfully utilised. There is huge underspending as regards the releases of funds by the Centre to State Governments. Besides, the position is alarming when the States' physical and financial progress is analysed.(iv) There are huge underspending with the State Governments.
2.	2.17	<p>The Committee feel that under-utilisation of resources is the main reason for getting the lesser allocation from Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance. Besides, they find that the Department is not serious in analysing the reasons for the dismal performance of such an important programme. Whenever asked about the reasons for slippage of targets, routine reply stating that NC and PC habitations are located in the difficult terrain etc., is</p>

furnished. The Committee have been receiving this type of reply for the last two to three years. This shows the casual approach of the Government. Further, they are unhappy to note the reply of the Government that underspending is due to surrendering of Rs.61.82 crore to non-lapsable pool of resources for North-East. After going through the data, the Committee find that Rs.61.82 crore was surrendered to the said non-lapsable pool of resources whereas the total underspending during 2000-2001 was Rs.63.43 crore. The Committee would like to be apprised about the steps taken by the Department for proper implementation of programme in the North-East. Besides, the Committee find that the targets set during each of the year are somehow unrealistic. The Department has set the targets to cover 17,497 NC habitations, whereas they could cover 6,655 and 1,627 NC habitations during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 respectively.

3. 2.18

Keeping in view the above mentioned scenario, the Committee strongly recommend for adequate allocation under the most important programme of rural areas i.e. ARWSP. While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee stress that the Government should take the necessary corrective steps to ensure cent per cent utilisation of scarce resources. Besides, the various points as mentioned above need to be addressed by the Department seriously and the Committee apprised about the action taken accordingly.

4. 2.19

What has been stated above with regard to chasing of numbers in respect of coverage of habitations, the Committee find that the actual ground reality in respect of coverage of habitations is something different. They have repeatedly been stressing on the Government to find out the ground reality in this regard by conducting survey by independent agencies. Besides, they have also been recommending to have some inbuilt mechanism for such a survey after a fixed period of time. They find that the Government have agreed to their recommendation and steps are being undertaken in this regard. Besides, the Department has also

agreed for such a survey after a period of five years. They hope that such a survey will be started very soon and the Committee be apprised of the details from time to time. They would also like that the position of slippage of FCs category to NC and PC categories and PC to NC category is also taken care of during the said survey and the data when collected, furnished to the Committee.

5. 2.23

The Committee have been recommending repeatedly to provide drinking water to each and every school within a stipulated period of time. It is really a matter of concern that after more than five decades of independence and of the plan development in the country, most of our schools are yet to be provided the facility of drinking water, which is the basic necessity of life. The Department's claim to cover all the habitations by 2002-2003 by providing drinking water seems unrealistic when the overall position of coverage of schools is analysed. Even if the Government's data is believed, about 44% of the schools could only be provided drinking water so far. They also find that the data as given by the Department may be only of Government schools. When the data regarding other schools i.e. private and public is included, the situation may further be alarming. While the school coverage was taken into consideration under ARWSP since 1999-2002, the performance is very dismal as could be seen from the data indicated above. In view of this scenario, the Committee strongly recommend to give top priority to coverage of schools and all the schools should be provided drinking water within the minimum possible time.

6. 2.29

The Committee find that the projections of 10th Plan in respect of proposed targets under drinking water supply programme are three times of what was allocated during 9th Plan. In view of the overall resource crunch, the Committee have their doubts about getting the adequate allocation from the Government funding. The actual allocation during the first year of 10th Plan is an example in this regard. The Government have provided nearly one-third of what was projected during 2002-2003. If similar trend is followed, the Department would be

getting more or less the same of what they got during 9th Plan. In view of this position there is doubt in achieving the laudable targets set during 10th Plan. The Committee, therefore, urge the Government to persuade the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance to accept the urgency of providing adequate outlay for this sector. Besides, they also find that as stated by the Secretary during the course of oral evidence some efforts are being made to get the funds from various international agencies like World Bank. The Committee would like that more efforts should be made in this regard so as to enable the Government to get more and more funding from international agencies to enable them to achieve the set targets.

7. 2.35

The Committee find that the various issues with regard to providing drinking water to rural masses were discussed in detail in the recent Conference of State Ministers in charge of rural drinking water supply and various valuable recommendations were made in this regard. They note that one of the recommendations was to revise the norms which were fixed years back during 1972-1973. The Committee also feel that a new thinking should be given to revise the said norms. However, keeping in view the existing scenario, as given in the preceding paras of the Report, they appreciate the inadequacy of resources available for tackling this problem. Hence, while recommending for revision of the said norms, the Committee would like that first priority is accorded to cover all rural habitations within the existing norms. Besides, they would also like that the various recommendations made by the said Conference are taken into consideration by the Government and the Committee apprised about the steps taken in this regard.

At the Conference of State Ministers in October, 2001 it was recommended that 5% of the total ARWSP funds be specifically earmarked for meeting contingencies arising out of natural calamities in the rural water supply sector. The Government had promised to consider the above recommendation. The Committee would like to be apprised about the action taken in pursuance of the

aforesaid recommendation and whether funds that remained unutilised up to November were ploughed back into the normal programme thereafter as per provision.

8. 2.48

The Committee are concerned to note the dismal performance of Sector Reform pilot projects as could be seen from the data given by the Department. They are further disturbed to note the reply furnished by the Department whereby on the one hand, it has been stated that they are reasonably satisfied with the implementation of Sector Reform Projects, on the other hand, it has been submitted that whether the process of implementation of these projects is satisfactory or not in these districts, is yet to be confirmed. They fail to understand how the Department could be contended with such a slow progress of the pilot districts. This needs to be explained properly.
9. 2.49

The Committee find that the Secretary during the course of oral evidence has acknowledged that to make these pilot projects successful, there is a need to change the mind set of the people. They also find that to make the people participatory in sharing the cost of these projects, they have to be convinced. Sectoral Reforms which seeks to build up concepts in the participative direction is a technical term which needs proper understanding, maturity and correct handling by the implementing agencies. While the Government's initiative is laudable, they should see the practical aspects also and whether it really hits the target. As such much home work is required on the part of the Government with necessary guidelines for Ministry and modus operandi of operations. The Committee would like to be apprised of the efforts made by the Department in this regard.
10. 2.58

The Committee find that the outlay earmarked for North-Eastern States could not be utilized fully during the year 2000-2001 Rs.61.82 crore had to be surrendered in the non-lapseable pool of resources of such States. Similar is the position of underspending during the year 2001-2002 as could be seen from the preceding paras. The Committee

are unhappy to find that when asked for the reasons for under utilisation of outlay, routine reply is coming from the Department. It seems that the Department never tried to analyse the particular problems faced by the respective States in implementation of the programme. Another disturbing fact is the strategy of the Government, Central as well as States, to chase the figures regarding coverage of habitations. There is variation between availability and accessibility of drinking water. They find that this is a serious matter and need to be probed urgently. They urge the Government to take into consideration this aspect in the recent survey being undertaken in various States.

11. 2.59

The Committee are disturbed to note the position of availability of drinking water in various schools in North-East as acknowledged by the Secretary. Very few schools could be provided with the facility of drinking water. They strongly recommend that topmost priority be given to schools in the Centrally sponsored programme of drinking water. They also urge the Government to verify the data of availability of drinking water in various schools including private and public schools of North-East and apprise the Committee accordingly.

12. 2.60

The Committee note that the Department has forwarded a proposal to the Planning Commission to change the funding pattern in case of States of North East, from 75:25 to 90:10. Similarly, it has been stated by the Secretary that the same funding pattern i.e. 90:10 should be adopted for similarly situated and disadvantaged States in other parts of the country. The Committee during their on the spot study-visit to Jammu and Kashmir were also requested for higher allocation under different schemes keeping in view the peculiar situation of that State. The Committee recommend to the Government to pursue the matter with the Planning Commission. The Committee find that the concept of higher allocation to such States has already been agreed to in principle by the Department. They would like that a proposal in this regard should be

forwarded to the Planning Commission for their consideration, at the earliest.

13. 2.77

The Committee observe that ensuring sustainability of drinking water sources is the major challenge that has to be faced by the country in the coming years. They find that due to uncontrolled extraction of ground water in various parts of the country, water table has reached a precarious situation as acknowledged by the Secretary during the course of oral evidence. They also note that the various Centrally sponsored schemes of the Centre depend totally on ground water. Sufficient attention has not been given to the alternate sources of water. They, therefore, recommend that as suggested by the Department, multi-pronged strategy has to be adopted to tackle the water problem. More stress needs to be given to alternate sources of water like, maintaining traditional sources of water and rain water harvesting, etc. While noting that some of the States have done excellent work in this regard, specifically Mizoram, which has done pioneering work, the Committee urge the Government to make the other States aware of the success stories of these States and motivate them to come forward in this regard.

14. 2.78

The Committee observe that future of India, so far water resources are concerned, lies rooted in sea. India has a huge coastal belt and sea water should be exploited for drinking and others purposes. The plea that it is not cost-affective, used as a deterrent not to explore further, does not hold any ground for future. The Government have to explore even if it is costly initially. We have to learn from countries which have resorted to desalination and take a leaf from their experience. If found necessary, experts should be called from those States to assist us. How long the country will tolerate drought and water famine. The country has to rise to the occasion and gear up resources and plunge. A concerted effort to overcome the inertia is necessary and the Committee expect that the Government would take earnest steps in this respect without further delay.

15. 2.79

The Committee find that the problem of sustainability

of water resources is being tackled by different Central Ministries like Rural Development, Agriculture, Water Resources. They recommend that the Department of Drinking Water should coordinate with these Ministries and take desired initiatives in this regard and apprise the Committee accordingly.

16. 2.80 The Committee in their 21st Report, (13th Lok Sabha [refer 2.93 (vi)]) had stressed for giving more attention to purification of sea water for drinking purposes and other uses. They had also recommended to conduct an in depth research to make the technology cheaper in consultation with Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR). While going through the replies furnished by the Government, the Committee note that adequate work has not been done in this regard. Even when only 150 projects were sanctioned, out of that only 51% are functioning. The Committee strongly recommend to pay more attention in this regard specifically when the ground water sources are drying up.
17. 2.81 While recommending for various issues that need to be addressed to ensure the sustainability of water resources, the Committee find that the strategy of the Government should be according to the condition of a particular area in a State. In coastal areas there is need to give emphasis on desalination projects. Similarly in plains emphasis has to be given on recharge of water and use of traditional sources of water like ponds, etc. In hilly areas more attention has to be paid to collection of water in rock cavities, etc. Likewise they urge that the problem has to be tackled according to site and location specific solution.
18. 2.82 As regards the quality of drinking water, the Committee find that sufficient attention is not being paid in this regard. They are constrained to find the huge number of water treatment plants going defunct. They urge the Government to find out the reasons for the water treatment plants going defunct. They also recommend that further emphasis should be given for having a mobile water testing laboratory in each district in the country.
19. 2.83 While going through the data furnished by the

Department with regard to the expenditure made during 8th and 9th Plan on sub-mission programmes to tackle quality problem, the Committee conclude that much emphasis is not being given in this regard. They also find that 10th Plan Working Group has recommended for Rs.10,000 crore exclusively to deal with quality problem in drinking water. Keeping in view the lesser expenditure during 8th and 9th Plan, the Committee strongly recommend to the Government to pay more attention to the quality problem during 10th Plan and ensure that adequate allocation is provided in each year of 10th Plan for the said purpose.

20. 2.84 The Committee note that in Rajasthan, to tackle the quality problem on a temporary basis, domestic water filters have been provided under ARWSP. They would like that the similar approach should be adopted in other States where the problem of contamination of water is acute.
21. 2.85 The Committee are concerned to note that there is no research institute or nodal laboratory dealing exclusively with water quality R&D. They also note that the Government have proposed to set-up a Centre for Excellence for arsenic in Kolkata. They strongly recommend to the Government to pay more attention to water quality R&D and set-up research institutes and laboratories exclusively for this purpose. Besides, sufficient outlay should be provided during 10th Plan for this purpose.
22. 2.86 The Committee find that the major pollutant of drinking water is fluoride. To tackle this problem they feel that the adequate steps have not been taken by the Government. They, therefore, would like to recommend that the Government should set-up a fluorosis control cell at the Central level comprising of officials of both Rural and Urban Ministry and other concerned Ministries like Health, Water Resources.
23. 2.91 The Committee note that the success of the various reform initiatives started by the Department as addressed separately in the Report depends specifically on the capacity building of rural beneficiaries. Herein lies the importance of HRD programme. Although the initiative has been taken by the Department in this regard, the physical and financial position is not satisfactory in respective States/Uts. They, therefore, recommend that

more stress be given on training of beneficiaries, during the coming years.

24. 2.96 Since the implementation of Part IX of the Constitution is responsibility of the Union Government they should ensure that the schemes relating to drinking water are entrusted to Panchayats. If there is any legal hurdle in the implementation, the Government should put forward suitable proposal. They are also unable to comprehend the rationale of transferring O&M to Panchayats without taking the desired steps for their capacity building. The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation to revise the guidelines and entrust the total responsibility of execution and implementation of ARWSP to Panchayats.
25. 2.102 While noting the system of monitoring of rural drinking water supply programme, the Committee feel that the existing monitoring mechanism of the Department has to be revamped. The Committee would like to recommend that the Department should think of devising a mechanism of having periodic meetings of concerned Union Ministers along with Central officials with concerned State Ministers and officials. They should also think of inviting MPs/MLAs of that State at the said meetings.
26. 2.103 The Committee find that the Department of Drinking Water is facing the problem of shortage of staff and infrastructure which according to them is hampering in the effective monitoring of the scheme. They also note that the Cabinet approval has already been obtained for restructuring of the mission within the existing Budget provision. They, therefore, recommend that necessary steps should be taken to implement the above decision expeditiously. While recommending for adequate staff and infrastructure for better operation of the Department, the Committee also emphasise that the optimum utilisation of the existing resources should be ensured.
27. 2.110 The Committee are constrained to note that though everybody acknowledges the importance of water in living beings' lives, no effort is being made by the implementing agencies to ensure its supply, as could be seen from the utilisation of funds and also from the physical achievements reported by the Government. It hardly needs to be emphasized that the shortage of funds is not the main

reason for many problems being faced by the people, rather the improper management and non-utilisation of available resources are the main reasons for our failure. The Committee, therefore, urge the Government to impress upon the implementing agencies to ensure full and proper utilisation of scarce resources, particularly when it affects the poorest of the poor, who are compelled to live in this condition even after lapse of 50 years of planned development. If the State Governments/Uts do not rise to the occasion, the Government should review these schemes and devise some ways and means which could move out the implementing agencies from their slumber.

The Committee are also unhappy of the manner in which the Government instead of improving of existing schemes and consolidating their gains, if any, go on launching new schemes which again suffer for want of proper infrastructure as admitted by the Government in their written note.

28. 3.16

Though the Committee have repeatedly been recommending that the Central Rural Sanitation Programme be given more importance and adequate outlay should be provided for the purpose, the following facts speak otherwise:

- (i) The targets fixed during 10th Plan to cover 50% of the population in rural areas were reduced to 25%;
- (ii) The outlay provided during 2002-2003 i.e. the first year of 10th Plan is nearly 1/5th of the proposed outlay;
- (iii) During the period 1986 to 1999, the construction of toilets showed an increasing trend whereas from 2000 onwards the number of toilets constructed is showing a downward trend. [Please see appendix XX];
- (iv) Only around 9% of the schools could be provided with lavatory facilities and out of that only one half of the schools could be provided separate toilets for girls;

While the Committee would strongly recommend to the Government to persuade Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance for adequate outlay for the programme, at the same time they would urge the Department to find out ways and means so that whatever resources are allocated for the programme are properly and fully utilised for the proper utilisation of scarce resources.

School sanitation is a hygienic aspect of the national health of the younger generation. However, the attention given to it has not been to the optimum level. It is disheartening to note that the Government is playing with statistics only, whereas on the ground, very negligible work has been done. A school without a toilet and washing facilities is unthinkable and below any civilised norms of the society. The Government have to think deeply and work hard practically with visible results. Much in paper has been done. It is high time that they should come forward with result-oriented action and visible progress to ensure good health for the younger generation.