

7

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1999-2000)**

THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA

SEVENTH REPORT

**MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(1999-2000)**



*Presented to Lok Sabha on 16.3.2000
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 16.3.2000*

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**
March, 2000/Phalguna, 1921 (Saka)

CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I Report

CHAPTER II Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government

CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies

CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee

CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited

APPENDICES

- I. Minutes of the 5th Sitting of the Committee held on 7.03.2000
- II. Details of Roads sanctioned in the State of Madhya Pradesh under the Scheme "Roads in Special Problem Areas
- III. Details of Roads sanctioned in the State of Rajasthan under the Scheme "Roads in Special Problem Areas
- IV. Analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 26th Report of the Committee (12th Lok Sabha)

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1999-2000)

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete - *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Padmanava Behera
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
5. Shri A. Brahmanaiiah
6. Shri Swadesh Chakrabortty
7. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
8. Shri Bal Krishna Chauhan
9. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
10. Prof. (Smt.) Kailasho Devi
11. Shrimati Hema Gamang
12. Shri Vijay Goel
13. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
14. Shri R.L. Jalappa
15. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
16. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
17. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
18. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
19. Shrimati Ranee Narah
20. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
21. Shri Ramchandra Paswan
22. Shri Chandresh Patel
23. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel

24. Prof. (Smt.) A.K. Premajam*
25. Shri Rajesh Ranjan
26. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
27. Shri Maheshwar Singh
28. Shri Sunder Lal Tiwari
29. Shri D. Venugopal
30. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

31. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
32. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
33. Shri N.R. Dasari
34. Shri C. Apok Jamir
35. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
36. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
37. Shri Jagdambi Mandal**
38. Dr. Mohan Babu
39. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
40. Shri N. Rajendran
41. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
42. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
43. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

- | | | | |
|----|----------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 1. | Shri S.C. Rastogi | - | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. | Smt. Sudesh Luthra | - | <i>Under Secretary</i> |
| 3. | Shri A.K. Srivastava | - | <i>Committee Officer</i> |

* Nominated *w.e.f.* 24.1.2000

** Died on 13.01.2000

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1999-2000) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Seventh Report on Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 26th Report of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (Twelfth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Department of Rural Development of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment (Now known as Ministry of Rural Development).

2. The Twenty-sixth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 22nd April, 1999. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 2nd September, 1999.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 7th March, 2000.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 26th Report of the Committee (Twelfth Lok Sabha) is given in Appendix IV.

NEW DELHI;
15 March, 2000
25 Phalguna, 1921 (Saka)

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

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Urban & Rural Development (1999-2000) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Twenty-sixth Report on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment now known as Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Rural Development) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 22nd April, 1999.

2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 33 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:

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

Para Nos.2.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.15, 3.16, 3.18, 3.21, 3.25, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.13, 5.8, 5.9, 5.10, 6.5, 6.5(a), 6.10, 7.4, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8, 7.9, 8.4 and 9.4.

- (ii) Recommendations/observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue:

Para Nos.3.31, 3.32 and 5.11.

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

Para Nos.3.19 and 3.33.

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

Para Nos.3.17 and 10.4

3. The Committee desire that final replies in respect of the recommendations for which only interim replies have been given by the Government should be furnished to the Committee within three months of the presentation of the Report.

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

A. Under-utilisation of Funds under ARWSP

Recommendation (Para No.3.7)

5. The Committee had recommended as under:

“.....They are disturbed to find that one of the reasons for under-spending as mentioned in the written note is late release of funds to the implementing agencies. They, therefore, recommend that monitoring of the programme should further be strengthened and State Governments should be impressed upon to release the funds timely to the implementing agencies to ensure 100% utilisation of funds.”

6. The Government in their reply have stated:

“The guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme have been revised. The revised guidelines, which have been issued to all the States/UTs, have come into effect from April, 1999 onwards. As per the revised guidelines, the States/UTs are to release the entire amount of Central assistance received along with the matching MNP share to the executing agency(s) without any delay, and in any case not later than 15 days after its receipt.

The State Governments have been requested once again to initiate appropriate action and to follow up with the respective finance departments to get the Central funds released to the implementing agencies at the earliest.”

7. The Committee note that the Government, with a view to ensuring 100% utilization of funds by State Governments for ARWSP, have revised the guidelines. It is hoped that the Central Government will regularly monitor the adherence to the guidelines by the State Governments.

B. Revamped Rural Water Supply Programme

Recommendations (Para Nos.3.15 and 3.16)

8. The Committee had recommended as under:

“While noting the laudable objective of coverage of all the remaining not covered habitations in the 9th Plan, the Committee express their doubts in view of the lower budgetary allocation than required. They appreciate the efforts of Tamil Nadu Government by availing financial support from LIC and the revised policy of the Government to involve the user for sharing the cost of the resources and shifting of 100% operation & maintenance cost on the user.” (3.15)

9. “To achieve the laudable objective of providing water to each and every habitation during 9th Plan, the Committee would like to recommend that the budgetary allocation should be adequately enhanced. The Committee urge that State Governments should also be requested to involve the users in the implementation of the programme and bearing of capital and Organisation and Management cost to the extent possible. But where the user belongs to the poorest of the poor category, the subsidy should be ensured.” (3.16)

10. The Government in their reply have stated as under:

“The Revamped Rural Water Supply Programme (RWSP) approved by the Union Cabinet aims at institutionalisation of community based RWSP which, among other things, involves partial capital cost sharing and full Operation & Maintenance by the stakeholders. The sector reforms, when implemented, is expected to bring down the budgetary requirements for rural water supply sector both at the Central and State levels.” (3.15)

11. “As per action plans prepared by the State Governments all the rural habitations in the country except a few in Rajasthan would be provided with access to safe drinking water during the Ninth Plan, subject to availability of funds. The Ministry is seized of this matter and the Planning Commission is being repeatedly requested to increase the outlay for rural water supply during the Ninth Plan.

The guidelines for the implementation of the Rural Water Supply Programme have been revised. The revised guidelines, which have come into effect from April, 1999, envisage institutionalisation of community based Rural Water Supply Programme, involving the local communities in the planning and execution of rural water supply schemes. The guidelines also entail partial sharing of capital cost and full O & M cost by the stakeholders. These measures are expected to ensure sustainability of the sources and systems.

Various field studies have shown that even the poorest of the poor is willing to pay provided he gets satisfactory services. Their contribution can be either in cash or in kind (through labour).” (3.16)

12. The Committee take note of the revised guidelines involving local communities in the planning and execution of the Rural Water Supply Programme and appreciate that the poorest of the poor is ready to contribute his mite in this regard.

C. Involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions in ARWSP

Recommendation (Para No.3.17)

13. The Committee had recommended as under:

“To bring the improvement in the operation and maintenance of the assets, the Committee feel that as envisaged in the objective of 9th Plan, the best alternative is Panchayat. To enable the Panchayats to fulfil these obligations, the Committee would like to recommend that Governments should think of strengthening the capacity of Panchayats.

14. The Government in their reply have stated:

“...The States have been instructed to transfer the ownership of assets and responsibility of its maintenance to Panchayati Raj Institutions and local communities during the first meeting of the Empowered Committee held on 1.2.96. Through this the Panchayati Raj Institutions will be adequately empowered and provided with financial and technical resources. The Ministry has already requested all the Chief Ministers of the States to provide enough financial support to the State Governments by suitably

taking up the matter with the respective State Finance Commissions for devolution of funds to Panchayats for carrying out operation and maintenance of Rural Water Supply Schemes. This Ministry has also suggested to the Eleventh Finance Commission to consider the possibility of the funds being made available to the Panchayats directly.”

15. While appreciating the steps taken by the Government for the empowerment of Panchayati Raj Institutions with financial and technical resources the Committee would like to be apprised of the response of Eleventh Finance Commission to the suggestion made by the Government of making funds available to the Panchayats directly.

D. Coverage of Population under ARWSP

Recommendation (Para No.3.19)

16. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee have their doubts about the coverage of rural habitations *i.e* 1060921 out of the total habitations 1430663. Keeping in view the ground reality, they feel that while calculating the number of covered habitations, the number of habitations having contaminated water supply is included. Further in most of the habitations, the minimum requirement of 40 litre of safe drinking water per capita is not fulfilled throughout the year. In some areas the source could have dried due to the water-table going down. The Committee feel that if all these factors are taken into consideration, the actual coverage would be lesser than as claimed by the Government as per their data. The Committee therefore, strongly recommend that a habitation should be considered as being covered habitation only if safe drinking water is provided as per the minimum required norms. It is further urged that Government should verify the data from respective States/UTs to have a realistic picture about the position of water supply in the rural areas of the country.”

17. The Government in their reply have stated:

“In the revised guidelines for the implementation of the Rural Water Supply Programme, issued to all the States/UTs, the criteria for identification of Not Covered (NC)/No Safe Source (NSS) habitation has been prescribed as below:

- (a) The drinking water source/point does not exist within 1.6 km of the habitations in plains or 100 meter elevation in hilly areas. The source/point may either be public or private source may be deemed as covered only when the water is safe, of adequate capacity and, is accessible to all;
- (b) Habitations which have a water source but are affected with quality problems such as excess salinity, iron, fluoride, arsenic or other toxic elements or biologically contaminated; and
- (c) Habitation where the quantum of availability of safe water from any source is not enough to meet drinking and cooking needs. Hence, in quality affected habitations, even if they are fully covered as per the earlier norms, it would be considered as a NSS habitation if it does not provide safe water at least for the purpose of drinking and cooking.”

18. While noting the criteria for identification of NC, NSS habitations, the Committee find that the Government have not furnished reply to their observation about verification of data from respective States/UTs. The Committee are of the view that for the success of any scheme the relevant data is a basic need. They, therefore, urge the Government to carry out necessary verification of data with State Governments/UTs administrations at the earliest.

E. Sustainability of Habitations affected by Water Quality

Recommendation (Para No.3.25)

19. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee note that as per the written information made available to the Committee, out of the total 1430663 habitations in the country, 145804 habitations *i.e.* around 10% are affected by the quality problem. They feel that the data given by the Government is not realistic as admitted by the representatives of the Department during the course of oral evidence, the quality

problem villages have actually been included in the covered habitations. They are, therefore, constrained to note that even after 50 years of independence, the Government have not given adequate importance to the quality aspect and would like that States/UTs Government should be requested to accord adequate priority to this aspect and adequate funds should be provided to tackle the problem.”

20. The Government in their reply have stated:

“...The guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme have been revised. The revised guidelines, which have been issued to all the States/UTs, have come into effect from April, 1999. As per the guidelines 20% of the ARWSP outlay is being kept aside for the implementation of the above pilot projects. The guidelines also envisage a “Catchment Area Approach” by involving various grass root level educational and technical institutions by utilising existing resources and strengthening them by providing with additional financial resources for effective functioning. This may be implemented at three levels consisting of a Nodal Unit at the top level in the catchment like a premier technical institution, university etc., intermediary level units like district laboratories, polytechnics, etc. and grass root level units like (+2) level educational institutions, labs etc. Activities relating to preliminary water testing etc. could be carried out at the grass-root level itself and more complicated cases could be referred to higher levels in such a way that only focussed cases of complex nature and of value and utility at State level reach the nodal unit. The nodal units will be networked with the State headquarters (PHED), 100% funding, as per the approved norms, would be provided to the States for strengthening water quality monitoring facilities, based on projects received from the State Governments. State Health Departments will also be involved in this arrangement; and the health staff will be entrusted with the task of quality surveillance. A two-way communication between the State PHED/Board and health departments will be established.”

21. The Committee note the revised guidelines issued by the Government to tackle the quality aspect under ARWSP. They desire that implementation of revised guidelines by the respective State Governments should be closely monitored by the Government.

F. Conservation of rain water

Recommendation (Para No.3.33)

22. The Committee note that adequate attention has not been paid to store the rain water. It is recommended that Government should think of launching some scheme to provide subsidy to individuals for conservation of rain water. They would also like that different methods for conservation of rain water should be publicised by the media to disseminate the information.

23. The Government in their reply have stated:

“...To popularise the concept of rain water harvesting, the Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission has brought out in 1997 a booklet on “Guide on Sustainability of Drinking Water Sources” for implementers and users at the grass-root level. In order to crystallize knowledge on the subject, a techno-economic manual on “Water Harvesting Systems and Their Management” was prepared by the Mission for use by the State Governments and other related agencies for developing practical schemes and packages for implementation.”

24. The Committee are not inclined to accept the vague reply of the Government. They find that the Government have not replied to the specific issues raised in their recommendation *i.e.* the Government should think of launching some scheme to provide subsidy to individuals for conservation of rain water and to publicise by media the different methods of conservation of water. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation and would like the specific reply of the Government in this regard.

G. Slow implementation of NSAP

Recommendation (Para No.5.9)

25. The Committee had recommended as under:

“While recommending for higher outlay the Committee would like that Government should try to find out the reasons for the slow implementation of the programme specifically the NFBS & NMBS components and to take remedial measures.”

26. The Government in their reply have stated:

“Evaluation Studies on NSAP including all the three components, viz. NOAPS, NFBS and NMBS have been entrusted to the reputed Research Organisations to review the various measures adopted in implementing the schemes and to find out the shortcomings so that corrective measures can be taken accordingly.”

27. The Committee would like to be apprised of the status of the said studies and hope that Government would take necessary corrective measures in the light of findings of the evaluation studies.

H. Computerisation of Land Records

Recommendation (Para No.6.10)

28. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee feel that the basic land records are the main input for the scheme of Computerisation of Land Records. The Programme cannot be implemented successfully unless the country is ready with the correct updated basic maps. It is regretted to note that even districts in North Eastern States do not even have the basic land records. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that more attention should be paid to have the correct and updated map of every district in the country.”

29. The Government in their reply have stated:

“...With a view to having an on-line land management of computerised land records, States have been requested for taking up survey/resurvey and settlement operations and pilot projects on digitization of cadastral maps have also been sanctioned.

To develop an appropriate land records system in the North Eastern States and to assess the financial requirement for the purpose, pilot projects on survey & settlement have been taken up in the States of Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram. The progress made under these projects was reviewed by the High Powered Technical Committee under the Chairmanship of Secretary (RD) on 17th June, 1999. Certain details have been sought from these State Governments for taking a decision to extend the survey operations in these States.

Steps have been initiated for creation of land records in all the North Eastern States and for updation as well as preparation of cadastral maps.”

30. While hoping that the requisite information from the States of Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram would have been furnished by now, the Committee would like that early action may be taken for creation of land records and purchase of Cadastral maps in all the North Eastern States.

I. Roads in Special Problem Areas

Recommendation (Para No.10.4)

31. The Committee had recommended as under:

The Committee note that the Government on the basis of a review of the scheme made in 1991-92, came to a conclusion that the progress of works under the scheme was not satisfactory. On the basis of the same review, it was decided not to take up any new work under the Scheme. The Committee will take to be informed.

- (i) How many projects were sanctioned under the scheme in the States of U.P., M.P. and Rajasthan;
- (ii) What was the total length of the roads which was to be constructed in each State;
- (iii) When these projects were sanctioned and the target, fixed, if any, for their completion;
- (iv) What is the present status of each road under construction in each of these States; and
- (v) The amount spent so far and the amount which will be required to complete the work.

32. The Government in their reply have stated:

“A total of 104 projects with a total road length of 1,333.94 kms in Uttar Pradesh, 15 projects with a total road length of 297.32 kms in Madhya Pradesh and 31 projects with a total need length of 389.05 kms in Rajasthan were sanctioned under the Scheme, ‘Roads in Special Problem Areas’.

A decision whether or not to dispense with the scheme is under consideration of the Government. Further details on points raised by the Committee have been furnished in Appendix II (Madhya Pradesh) and III (Rajasthan).

Details in respect of the State of Uttar Pradesh have not been received and will be furnished as soon as they are received along with final decision of the Government regarding whether or not to dispense with the Scheme.

33. The Committee hope that necessary information might have been received from the U.P. Government. They would like to be apprised of the final decision, as and when taken by the Government about the continuance of the scheme.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Para No.2.5)

The Committee note that around 9% increase in B.E. 1999-2000 over B.E. 1998-99 will hardly be able to cover the increase in cost due to inflation. They also find that due to inadequate allocation the targets for the different programmes specifically the priority programmes like Rural Water Supply Programme and National Social Assistance Programme would have to be spilled over. They therefore, would like to recommend that the allocation for the different programmes/specifically the programmes under the priority sector should be adequately enhanced so as to cover the targets fixed for these programmes during 9th Plan.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry have been requesting Planning Commission that considering the high priority accorded to Social Sector programmes and poverty alleviation schemes the allocation made to this Ministry is quite inadequate for meeting its commitments and there is, therefore, dire need to enhance the allocation. In fact, the Hon'ble MoS(IC) has written to Planning Commission as well as to Finance Minister pleading for additional allocation. This Ministry has again written to Planning Commission emphasising the concern expressed by the Committee and requesting for additional allocation.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC (P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.3.6)

The Committee note that the percentage increase in allocation during 1999-2000 over the allocation of previous year is quite less as compared to the position in 1997-98 and 1998-99. Further, out of the estimated outlay for the scheme to the tune of Rs.3,000 crore. Planning Commission has allocated only Rs.1800 crore during 1999-2000. They feel that in view of the inadequate outlay, the targets would have to be spilled over. It is strongly recommended that sufficient funds should be provided for the programme specially when it is the most priority programme under the National Agenda for governance. They would like that Planning Commission should be pursued further for enhancing the allocation for ARWSP.

Reply of the Government

The Government of India has accorded top priority in providing safe drinking water to all rural habitations in the country during the Ninth Plan. Planning Commission has been time and again impressed upon the need to increase the outlay for the rural water supply sector in order to achieve this objective. Several communications were made to the Planning Commission at the highest levels and the last one in this regard was written in May, 1999.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.3.7)

The Committee further find that not only there was inadequacy of allocation but the scarce resources allocated to State Governments were not utilised fully by the implementing agencies. They are disturbed to find that one of the reasons for underspending as mentioned in the written note is late release of funds to the implementing agencies. They, therefore, recommend that monitoring of the programme should further be strengthened and State Governments should be impressed upon to release the funds timely to the implementing agencies to ensure 100% utilisation of funds.

Reply of the Government

The guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme have been revised. The revised guidelines, which have been issued to all the States/UTs, have come into effect from April, 1999 onwards. As per the revised guidelines, the States/UTs are to release the entire amount of central assistance received along with the matching MNP share to the executing agency(s) without any delay, and in any case not later than 15 days after its receipt.

The State Governments have been requested once again to initiate appropriate action and to follow-up with the respective finance departments to get the Central funds released to implementing agencies at the earliest.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Comments of the Committee

(Please *see* Para No.7 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para Nos.3.15 and 3.16)

While noting the laudable objective of coverage of all the remaining not covered and partially covered habitations in the 9th Plan, the Committee express their doubts in view of the lower budgetary allocation than required. They appreciate the efforts of Tamil Nadu Government by availing financial support from LIC and the revised policy of the Government to involve the user for sharing the cost of the resources and shifting of 100% operation & maintenance cost on the user. (3.15)

To achieve the laudable objective of providing water to each and every habitation during 9th Plan, the Committee would like to recommend that the budgetary allocation should be adequately enhanced. The Committee urge that State Governments should also be requested to involve the users in the implementation of the programme and bearing of capital and Organisation and Management cost to the extent possible. But where the user belong to the poorest of the poor category, the subsidy should be ensured. (3.16)

Reply of the Government

The revamped Rural Water Supply Programme (RWSP) approved by the Union Cabinet aims at institutionalisation of community based RWSP which, among other things, involves partial capital cost sharing and full Operation & Maintenance by the stakeholders. The sector reforms, when implemented, is expected to bring down the budgetary requirements for rural water supply sector both at the Central and State levels. (3.15)

As per action plans prepared by the State Governments all the rural habitations in the country except a few in Rajasthan would be provided with access to safe drinking water during the Ninth Plan, subject to availability of funds. The Ministry is seized of this matter and the Planning Commission is being repeatedly requested to increase the outlay for rural water supply during the Ninth Plan.

The guidelines for implementation of the Rural Water Supply Programme have been revised. The revised guidelines, which have come into effect from April, 1999, envisage institutionalisation of community based rural water supply programme, involving the local communities in the planning and execution of rural water supply schemes. The guidelines also entail partial sharing of capital cost and full O & M cost by the stakeholders. These measures are expected to ensure sustainability of the sources and systems.

Various field studies have shown that even the poorest of the poor is willing to pay provided they get satisfactory services. Their contribution can be either in cash or in kind (through labour) (3.16)

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC (P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation (Para No.3.18)

While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee note with concern the under spending in some of the States/UTs.

Reply of the Government

Under spending under the Rural Water Supply Programme (RWSP) in some of the States has been due to factors like natural calamities, terrorist activities, etc. From time to time the State Governments are urged upon to utilise the maximum amount of Central funds allocated for RWSP. In order to encourage full utilisation of ARWSP funds by the State Governments within the financial year, the Government of India has imposed the following conditions for release of 2nd instalment of ARWSP funds to the states. Proposals for release of 2nd instalment of ARWSP funds, complete in all respects, received in the Mission by

the 31st December will be entitled for full allocated amount under the ARWSP. Proposals received after the 31st December will be subjected to progressive cuts as indicated below:-

Month of receipt of Proposal for release of second instalment of ARWSP fund	Cut on the total allocated amount of ARWSP fund
December	Nil
January	10%
February	20%
March	30%

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.3.21)

The Committee are concerned to know that around 50% of the Primary Schools in the country do not have access to safe drinking water inspite of the fact that safe drinking water in every rural primary school is one of the priorities under Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission. They strongly recommend that State Governments should be impressed upon to give the priority to schools and sufficient funds should be provided for the purpose. It is also desired that the Government should monitor the position of supply of safe drinking water in the Primary Schools in rural areas and the Not Covered Schools should be covered within the minimum possible time.

Reply of the Government

The Union Cabinet has approved the revised guidelines for revamping the Rural Water Supply Programme. The revised guidelines, issued to all the States/UTs, urged to initiate immediate measures to cover all rural schools with drinking water facilities by the end of the Ninth Plan.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.3.25)

The Committee note that as per the written information made available to the Committee, out of the total 1430663 habitations in the country, 145804 habitations *i.e.* around 10% are affected by the quality problem. They feel that the data given by the Government is not realistic as admitted by the representatives of the Department during the course of oral evidence, the quality problem villages have actually been included in the covered habitations. They are, therefore, constrained to note that even after 50 years of independence, the Government have not given adequate importance to the quality aspect and would like that States/UTs Government should be requested to accord adequate priority to this aspect and adequate funds should be provided to tackle the problem.

Reply of the Government

The Government is seized of the matter regarding increasing incidence of drinking water quality problems. Even though the coverage has been impressive over the last decade, various studies indicate that there is no institutionalised water quality monitoring and surveillance system in the country. The National Workshop held in August, 1997 recommended that there is need to institutionalise water quality monitoring and surveillance systems in the country. Establishing of water quality labs could be only one of the components of the programme.

Government has already initiated action to achieve this objective. Five regional workshops were held at Jaipur, Bangalore, Chandigarh, Guwahati and Calcutta. Representatives of the State Governments, Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission, External Supporting Agencies, NGOs, reputed Research Institutes, district level officers, etc. participated in these workshops. During these workshops, 57 pilot districts were identified and action plans to institutionalise community participation in Operation & Maintenance (O & M), Capital cost sharing and Water Quality Monitoring & Surveillance (WQM&S) in the identified pilot districts were finalised.

The guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme have been revised. The revised guidelines, which have been issued to all the States/UTs, have come into effect from April, 1999. As per the guidelines 20% of the ARWSP outlay is being kept

aside for implementation of the above pilot projects. The guidelines also envisage a “Catchment Area Approach” by involving various grass root level educational and technical institutions by utilising existing resources and, strengthening them by providing with additional financial resources for effective functioning. This may be implemented at three levels consisting of a Nodal Unit at the top level in the catchment- like a premier technical institution, university, etc., intermediary level units like district laboratories, polytechnics, etc. and grass-root level units like (+2) level educational institutions, labs etc. Activities relating to preliminary water testing etc. could be carried out at the grass-root level itself and more complicated cases could be referred to higher levels in such a way that only focussed cases of complex nature and of value and utility at State level reach the nodal unit. The nodal units will be networked with the State headquarters (PHED). 100% funding, as per the approved norms, would be provided to the States for strengthening water quality monitoring facilities, based on projects received from the State Governments. State Health Departments will also be involved in this arrangement; and the health staff will be entrusted with the task of quality surveillance. A two-way communication between the State PHED/Board and health department will be established.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation (Para No.4.8)

The Committee note that inspite of their recommending strongly in their earlier reports for enhancement of outlay and take other measures to improve the sorry state of affairs, nothing substantial has been made on this account. It is really pathetic to note that even today when the nation have celebrated 50 years of Independence so gloriously, 86% of the rural households don't have access to sanitary latrines, not to talk of the total sanitation. It is again strongly recommended that Government should pay more attention to this issue.

Reply of the Government

In order to achieve atleast 50% coverage during 9th Plan period, major policy changes have been brought out in the Programme from 1999-2000 onwards with special emphasis on Information, Education and Communication (IEC) activities, a much higher degree of beneficiary participation. Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) approach will be introduced as has been successfully employed in Literacy and Immunization Missions. The Programme will be implemented as community led and people centered. A demand driven approach will be adopted with increased stress on awareness building and meeting the demand with alternate delivery mechanism. Subsidy for individual units will be progressively phased out and school sanitation included as a major component.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC (P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.4.9)

They urge that substantial funds should be earmarked for the programme. Whatever meagre allocation is made, it should not be reduced at RE stage at any cost.

Reply of the Government

A provision of Rs.110 crore has been made for the Programme during 1999-2000, which is far less than our requirement of Rs.330 crore per annum, in order to cover atleast 50% of rural population with sanitation facilities. Therefore, it is reiterated that the meagre allocation of Rs.110 crore should not be reduced further at RE stage.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.4.10)

It is further felt that allocating more funds is not sufficient. The need is to make the people aware of the need for sanitation. They find that the worst sufferers, due to the lack of the sanitation, are women. It is therefore recommended that the Sanitation Programme

should be linked with other women related programmes like DWCRA. Further rural people have to be made aware of the need of sanitation through various mediums. A community based approach on the account is required.

Reply of the Government

As already stated, the Programme will be implemented as community led and people centered. Recognising the need for sanitation facilities for women, 5% of the funds under allocation based Rural Sanitation Programme has been earmarked for Women's Complexes. Further, Women Groups such as DWCRA, Rashtriya Mahila Kosh etc. will be involved under the TSC. Stress will be laid on software-intensive IEC campaign, closer liaison with Prasar Bharti and other media.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.4.11)

The Committee further note that in some countries, good work on this account has been done. They recommend that the Department should study such programmes and launch a micro-credit movement with the involvement of women. Besides, it is also found that very good work has been done in many districts in our country. They urge that such districts should be considered as model and other districts in different States should be encouraged to make improvement on this account.

Reply of the Government

Among the developing countries, Thailand and Mauritius have achieved the distinction of covering more than 75% of its population with sanitation facilities. Even Bangladesh has done good work in the sanitation sector with assistance from International Organisations and through bilateral help. As recommended by the Committee, a study will be undertaken at the appropriate time for launching a micro-credit movement with the involvement of women.

With in our country, in Midnapur District of West Bengal, Ramakrishna Mission has done tremendous work by involving local community based Institutions like Youth Clubs etc., providing emphasis on intensive advocacy of the benefits of adopting sanitary way of life,

offering wider range of Technical options. Further, UNICEF has been supporting pilot projects in the districts like Mysore in Karnataka, Kamrup in Assam etc., under sanitation alongwith support for developing suitable models and other practices under sanitation. All these projects/programmes are being taken up for replication in other districts in the respective States.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.4.13)

The Committee would like that to improve the position of sanitation in the country, more stress need to be given to school sanitation. It is felt that the children are the best trained in this regard. It is urged that more steps should be given to school sanitation and sufficient funds should be allocated for the purpose.

Reply of the Government

Considering that the children play an effective role in popularising new ideas and concepts and to tap their potential as the most persuasive advocates of the benefits of good sanitation practices in their own households, a new component *viz.* "School Sanitation" has been introduced under the Restructured Central Rural Sanitation Programme (RSRSP). Upto 10% of funds under Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) will be allocated for school sanitation. The aim is to provide separate urinals for boys and girls and atleast one toilet per school in the rural areas in the country by the end of 9th Plan.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC (P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.5.8)

The Committee find that whatever allocation was made under NSAP it was further reduced at RE stage. As indicated at Para No.2.3 of the Report, the requirement of funds under NSAP has gone up to Rs.1586 crore with the projected population for 1998 and New Poverty Ratio indicated by the Planning Commission where as the allocation made during 1999-2000 is Rs.725 crore only. It is strongly recommended that the allocation for the scheme should be substantially stepped up. Further whatever allocation is made, it should not be reduced at RE stage.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry would like to welcome the recommendation. In fact, the Hon'ble MOS(IC) has written to Planning Commission as well as to Finance Minister pleading for additional allocation. This Ministry has again written to Planning Commission emphasising the concern expressed by the Committee and requesting for additional allocation.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.5.9)

While recommending for higher outlay the Committee would like that Government should try to find out the reasons for the slow implementation of the Programme specifically the NFBS & NMBS components and take remedial measures.

Reply of the Government

Evaluation Studies on NSAP including all the three components, viz. NOAPS, NFBS and NMBS have been entrusted to the reputed Research Organisations to review the various measures adopted in implementing the Schemes and to find out the shortcomings so that corrective measures can be taken accordingly.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation (Para No.5.10)

It is felt that the main reason for the slow progress of the scheme as admitted by the Government is inadequate publicity. The Committee in their 4th Report 1998-99 had recommended to publicise the scheme through print and electronic media and by fixing bill boards in local language at the important public places like Village Panchayats, railway stations, bus stops etc. They would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry has since taken appropriate action for in the publicity front as detailed below:-

The Budgetary allocations available for Media activities under the Communication Cell of the Ministry and the funds allocated for IEC activities under different programmes separately are pooled together and utilised by the Media Division for creating awareness about different programmes of the Ministry in a holistic manner.

Based on the total funds available for media activities during a particular year, an action plan for the media activities is drawn up which after approval by the Standing Committee on Media is implemented by the Media Division.

Most of the modes of communication such as Electronic Media, *i.e.* Radio and TV, Outdoor Publicity through hoardings, kiosks, wall paintings, computer animation, field level communication campaigns through Directorate of Field Publicity and Song & Drama Division are being used to create awareness about different programmes of the Ministry.

During the year 1998-99, the Ministry continued to disseminate information on all the programmes including NSAP of the Ministry through the sponsored radio programmes, namely Chalo Gaon Ki Ore and Gaon Vikas Ki Ore. These two weekly programmes are being broadcast over 30 Commercial Broadcasting Stations (CBS) and 15 Primary Stations in North East. The sponsored programmes produced in 20 languages are broadcast twice a week on every Sunday at 2.15 p.m. and every Tuesday at 8 p.m.

Besides the sponsored radio programmes, several radio spots of 30 second duration of NSAP were produced and broadcast over CBS and primary channels of All India Radio. The medium of Television was also used to spread the message on NSAP. Six Video Spots on PR and NSAP besides three video spots on NSAP for North East region were produced. The spots were telecast over Doordarshan National Hookup and regional channels. Information was also disseminated through CCTV on six railway stations in Tamil Nadu and Howrah in West Bengal.

Outdoor publicity channels such as Bus back panel, wall paintings, kiosks, hoardings, cinema slides etc. were utilised to disseminate information on the programmes of the Ministry including NSAP to the target groups.

Directorate of Field Publicity (DFP) and Song and Drama Division organised long intensive campaigns on the theme of NSAP. With the help of its field units, DFP organised group discussions, public meetings, seminars, poster exhibition and film shows and distributed literature to the people at the grass root. 4970 film shows, 6233 oral communications, 2963 photo exhibitions, 944 special programmes were organised by DFP.

The Song & Drama Division conducted extensive communication activities at the community level using performance arts. Folk media traditional arts, puppetry etc. from April to June 1998. The Song & Drama Division presented 1481 programmes.

During the year, a quarter page advertisement on NSAP and its three components in Hindi, English and all major regional languages was also issued.

One million postcards each in Hindi, English and 11 regional languages with messages on different components of NSAP were got printed through Department of Post during the year.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC (P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.6.5)

The Committee note that a good start by way of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Upgradation of rural maps was made but the reduced allocation over the years show that not much importance is being imparted to the Scheme. They feel that land records are the basic documents for planning and other purposes and the lack of land records is the basic reason for high number of land related court cases. It is recommended that serious attention should be paid to the Scheme and sufficient funds allocated for its implementation.

Reply of the Government

The Department fully agrees with the recommendations of the Committee. In fact, this Ministry had sought increased allocation under the Scheme during 1999-2000 while formulating the Annual Plan proposals. However, since the requirement under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Computerisation of Land Records was higher, the budget provision for SRA & ULR Scheme had to be reduced.

Though it might not be possible to get any additional outlay under the Scheme during the current financial year, necessary action has been initiated seeking enhanced outlay under the Scheme for the remaining period of the Ninth Five Year Plan.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation [Para No.6.5(a)]

While appreciating budgetary constraints, the Committee note that the Scheme should be implemented by selecting field areas during a particular year so as to make an impact rather than spreading the resources so thinly.

Reply of the Government

While agreeing with the recommendation of the Committee regarding implementation of the Scheme in selected field areas so as to make an impact rather than spreading the resources so thinly, it may be pointed out that funds are released under the Scheme to the State Governments on the recommendations of the High Powered Technical Committee headed by the Secretary (RD). The recommendation of the Committee will be kept in view while releasing funds to the State Governments.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.6.10)

“The Committee feel that the basic land Records are the main input for the Computerisation of Land Records. The Programme cannot be implemented successfully unless the country is ready with the correct updated basic maps. It is regretted to note that even Districts in North Eastern States do not even have the basic land records. The Committee therefore strongly recommend that more attention should be paid to have the correct and updated map of every District in the country.

Reply of the Government

Computerisation of updated land records as well as existing land records has been taken up under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Computerisation of Land Records. Once data entry is complete, it is felt that updation of land records should become easy and also less time consuming. With a view to having an on-line land management of computerised land records, States have been requested for taking up survey/resurvey and settlement operations and pilot projects on digitization of cadastral maps have also been sanctioned.

To develop an appropriate land records system in the North Eastern States and to assess the financial requirement for the purpose, pilot projects on survey & settlement have been taken up in the States of Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram. The progress made under these projects was reviewed by the High Powered Technical Committee under the Chairmanship of Secretary (RD) on 17th June, 1999. Certain details have been sought from these State Governments for taking a decision to extend the survey operations in these States.

Steps have been initiated for creation of land records in all the North Eastern States and for updation as well as preparation of cadastral maps.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation (Para No.7.4)

The Committee express their concern over the release of substantial amount of outlay at the fag end of the year. They strongly recommend that outlay should be released in a phased manner throughout the year to ensure proper utilisation.

Reply of the Government

A revised release procedure has been finalised and henceforth the funds under PC, OB and ARTS schemes will be released to CAPART in two instalments in the months of April and October.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.7.6)

While appreciating the efforts made by the Government to revise the strategy of CAPART, the Committee hope that substantial improvement could be made in the funding of different NGOs. Further to bring more transparency, they would like to recommend that some sort of coordination should be maintained between CAPART and Panchayats.

Reply of the Government

With a view to achieving substantial improvement in the process of funding, selection of VOs and various other related matters, a set of policy guideline for functioning of CAPART has been issued. Copy of the sanction letters issued by CAPART to VOs is being sent to the District Magistrates of the concerned Districts and also the concerned Panchayats in the interest of transparency. In some schemes like Watershed, signatures of 2/3 of the Gram Sabha Members are also obtained before sanctioning of the project.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.7.7 & 7.8)

The Committee further urge that with the revised strategy, it should be ensured that the different programmes reach to the poorest of the poor in the country. This can be achieved by providing training to the poor people. (Para No.7.7)

The Committee note that the poorest of the poor in the country are not literate and they do not know how to get benefits of the different Rural Development Schemes. In view of it, they would like that CAPART should earmark some specific outlay to educate the people about different programmes being implemented for their betterment (Para No.7.8)

Reply of the Government

The guidelines of the scheme-organisation of Beneficiaries (OB) – have been revised to provide for support to poor people to organise themselves for betterment of their economic status and social power. Similarly, the guidelines of the scheme – Promotion of Voluntary Schemes and Social Action Plan (PC) – have been revised so as to enable the VOs to integrate rural development activities through experimental and innovative efforts. Thus, training of rural poor, their education and generating awareness among them about all the rural development programmes have been facilitated through these revised guidelines.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.7.9)

The Committee find that while some reputed NGOs are getting grants regularly over the years, no weightage is being given to fresh applicants. They would like that CAPART should consider and encourage new NGOs who want to do some good work for the rural poor.

Reply of the Government

As per new policy guidelines issued by the Ministry of Rural Development on the functioning of CAPART, CAPART has laid special emphasis on taking a proactive role to help smaller and newer VOs to get access to CAPART assistance. The Council through its Regional Committees is conducting workshops throughout the country to inform the smaller VOs about CAPART schemes and how to get access to CAPART funds. The new guidelines provide that VOs which have the commitment, professionalism and integrity and especially those who have a proven track record of having successfully developed local leadership and having improved the capability of the rural people with effective people's participation, should be encouraged by CAPART to access its funds.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.7.9)

While appreciating the above mentioned efforts made by the Government for the capacity building of Panchayats, the Committee feel that the reports submitted by the various State Finance Commissions need to be implemented expeditiously. For this purpose, they would urge the Central Government to persuade the State Governments to implement the recommendations made by their own State Finance Commissions.

Reply of the Government

The suggestions made by the Committee have been noted. On 29th June, 1999 the Minister of State (Independent Charge) for Rural Development has addressed a letter to

all Chief Ministers/Administrators requesting them to review the recommendations of the State Finance Commission at the earliest and take necessary steps for its implementation in letter and spirit. The State Governments will be reminded from time to time if no further devolution of financial powers upon Panchayats is made by them within a reasonable time.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.9.4)

The Committee note that the outlay provided to the national, State level institutes for training is very meagre. They recommend that it should be enhanced suitably.

Reply of the Government

Training is an important tool for performance improvement as well as upgradation of knowledge and skills of the personnels. For the successful implementation of rural Development programmes an efficient and motivated stream of Government as well as non-Government functionaries is required, which is a very challenging task. To meet this, the Ministry has been demanding higher allocation but the Planning Commission had not approved the same. The Scheme-wise projections made by the Ministry and the outlays finally approved by the Planning Commission for the year 1999-2000 are as under:

(Rs. in crore)

Name of the Schemes	Funds asked by the Ministry	Funds approved by the Planning Commission
1. N.I.R.D.	7.00	5.00
2. S.I.R.D.	7.00	4.25
3. E.T.C.	3.00	3.00
4. O.T.C.	0.75	1.25
Total:	17.75	13.50

The Ministry would again request Planning Commission to enhance the outlay for Training Scheme in future.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

CHAPTER III

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

Recommendation (Para No.3.31)

The Committee find that adequate attention has not been paid towards the issue of sustainability of drinking water resources. They appreciate that a few States have enacted legislation for control and conservation of ground water. They, however, feel that merely enacting legislation is not sufficient. The Committee would like that the position of the implementation of the Act should also be monitored by the Government. It is also desired that the remaining States should be requested to enact such legislation.

Reply of the Government

Control and proper utilisation of drinking water resources is a component of the National Water Policy brought out by the Ministry of Water Resources, Government of India in 1987. The National Water Policy, 1987 has given top priority to drinking water in the allocation of priorities. A Model Bill for the regulation of ground water resources has been circulated by the Ministry of Water Resources, Government of India to all States for enacting their own legislations based on the model bill. The Central Ground Water Authority is the nodal agency for monitoring the progress in the enactment of legislation by the State Governments. The recommendation of the Committee has been forwarded to the Ministry of Water Resources for initiating necessary action to their end.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.3.32)

The Committee feel that to stop the over exploitation of ground water resources, some policy initiative needs to be taken. They in their 4th Report (1998-99) on Demand for Grants of the Department had recommended for a National Water Policy. Since various Ministries like Water Resources, Agriculture and Science & Technology etc. are involved in the issue; they would like that there is a need for a coordinated approach to solve this problem. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation to chalk out a National Water Policy in consultation with the other Ministries/Departments and States/UTs involved.

Reply of the Government

A Committee under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary, Ministry of Water Resources, involving othe user Ministries like Rural Development, Urban Development, Industry and Agriculture as members, has been constituted with a view to coordinating the inter-sectoral requirements and allocation of water for various uses. The Committee will also take into consideration the status of Ground water development in different parts in the country.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.5.11)

The Committee feel that to make the scheme really successful, the Government should think of implementing the Scheme through Panchayats and Gram Sabha.

Reply of the Government

The revised guidelines on NSAP have already made provision for more and greater involvement of the Panchayati Raj Institutions. Implementation of the Scheme is expected to improve with active and constructive participation of the Panchayati Raj functionaries.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

CHAPTER IV

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

Recommendation (Para No.3.19)

The Committee have their doubts about the coverage of rural habitations *i.e.* 1060921 out of the total habitations 1430663. Keeping in view the ground reality, they feel that while calculating the number of covered habitations, the number of habitations having contaminated water supply are included. Further in most of the habitations, the minimum requirement of 40 litre of safe drinking water per capita is not fulfilled throughout the year. In some areas the source could have dried due to the water-table going down. The Committee feel that if all these factors are taken into consideration, the actual coverage would be lesser than as claimed by the Government as per their data. The Committee therefore, strongly recommend that a habitation should be considered as being covered habitation only if safe drinking water is provided as per the minimum required norms. It is further urged that Government should verify the data from respective States/UTs to have a realistic picture about the position of water supply in the rural areas of the country.

Reply of the Government

In the revised guidelines for the implementation of the Rural Water Supply Programme, issued to all the States/UTs, the criteria for identification of Not Covered (NC)/No Safe Source (NSS) habitation has been prescribed as below:

- (a) The drinking water source/point does not exist within 1.6 Km of the habitations in plains or 100 meter elevation in hilly areas. The source/point may either be public or private source may be deemed as covered only when the water is safe, of adequate capacity and, is accessible to all.
- (b) Habitations which have a water source but are affected with quality problems such as excess salinity, iron, flouride, arsenic or other toxic elements or biologically contaminated.
- (c) Habitation where the quantum of availability of safe water from any source is not enough to meet drinking and cooking needs. Hence, in quality affected habitations, even if they are fully covered as per the earlier norms, it would be considered as a NSS habitation if it does not provide safe water at least for the purpose of drinking and cooking.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation (Para No.3.33)

The Committee note that adequate attention has not been paid to store the rain water. It is recommended that Government should think of launching some scheme to provide subsidy to individuals for conservation of rain water. They would also like that different methods for conservation of rain water should be publicised by the media to disseminate the information.

Reply of the Government

Under the Mini-Mission and Sub-Mission Programme of Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission, Rainwater Harvesting schemes were approved for 17 States/UTs at an estimated cost of about Rs.31.00 crore. The State Governments have been delegated with the powers to take up Sub-Mission Project including Rainwater Harvesting systems under the ARWSP *w.e.f.* 1-4-98. In addition to this, the States are also expected to utilise funds under allied programmes of the Ministry, like EAS & JRY for this purpose.

To popularise the concept of rain water harvesting, the Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission has brought out in 1997 a booklet on “Guide on Sustainability of Drinking Water Sources” for implementers and users at the grass-root level. In order to crystallize knowledge on the subject, a techno-economic manual on “Water Harvesting Systems and Their Management” was prepared by the Mission for use by the State Governments and other related agencies for developing practical schemes and packages for implementation.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Comments of the Committee

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

CHAPTER V

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

Recommendation (Para No.3.17)

To bring the improvement in the operation and maintenance of the assets, the Committee feel that as envisaged in the objective of 9th Plan, the best alternative is Panchayat. To enable the Panchayats to fulfil these obligations, the Committee would like to recommend that Government should think of strengthening the capacity of Panchayats.

Reply of the Government

There is a general agreement that, if through adequate financial devolution package, the Panchayati Raj Institutions are empowered to generate resources as well as provided with sufficient loans and grants, they would be in a position to mobilise users contribution as well as would be in a position to contribute from their own sources.

Field studies have shown that operation and maintenance cost and replacement cost of the rural water supply systems is within the reach of vast majority of the rural population. It is also possible for the beneficiaries to share, at least portion of the capital cost which would also inculcate a sense of ownership of the systems among the stakeholders. The experiences of World Bank assisted projects in Karnataka, Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh show that it is possible to institutionalise community based rural drinking water supply programme.

The States have been instructed to transfer the ownership of assets and responsibility of its maintenance to Panchayati Raj Institutions and local communities during the first meeting of the Empowered Committee held on 1-2-96. Through this the Panchayati Raj Institutions will be adequately empowered and provided with financial and technical resources. The Ministry has already requested all the Chief Ministers of the States to provide enough financial support to the State Governments by suitably taking up the matter with respective State Finance Commissions for devolution of funds to Panchayats for carrying out operation and maintenance of Rural Water Supply Schemes. This Ministry has also suggested to the Eleventh Finance Commission to consider the possibility of the funds being made available to the Panchayats directly.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation (Para No.10.4)

The Committee to note that the Government on the basis of a review of the scheme made in 1991-92, came to a conclusion that the progress of works under the scheme was not satisfactory. On the basis of the same review, it was decided not to take up any new work under the Scheme. The Committee will like to be informed:

- (i) How many projects were sanctioned under the scheme in the States of U.P., M.P. and Rajasthan;
- (ii) What was the total length of the roads which was to be constructed in each State;
- (iii) When these projects were sanctioned and the target, fixed if any for their completion;
- (iv) What is the present status of each road under construction in each of these States;
- (v) The amount spent so far and the amount which will be required to complete the work.

Reply of the Government

A total of 104 projects with a total road length of 1,333.94 kms in Uttar Pradesh, 15 projects with a total road length of 297.32 kms. in Madhya Pradesh and 31 projects with a total road length of 389.05 kms in Rajasthan were sanctioned under the Scheme, 'Roads in Special Problem Areas'.

A decision whether or not to dispense with the Scheme is under consideration of the Government. Further details on points raised by the Committee have been furnished at Appendix II (Madhya Pradesh) and Appendix III (Rajasthan).

Details in respect of the State of Uttar Pradesh have not been received and will be furnished as soon as they are received along with the final decision of the Government regarding whether or not to dispense with the Scheme.

[Ministry of Rural Development O.M. No.H-11020/7/99-GC(P) Dated 30.8.1999]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No.33 of Chapter I of the Report)

NEW DELHI;
15 March, 2000
25 Phalguna, 1921 (Saka)

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

APPENDIX I

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT(1999-2000)

MINUTES OF THE FIFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, THE 7TH MARCH, 2000

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1645 hrs. in Committee Room 'D'
Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete – *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Padmanava Behera
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
5. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
6. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
7. Prof. Kailasho Devi
8. Shrimati Hema Gamang
9. Shri Vijay Goel
10. Shri R.L. Jalappa
11. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
12. Shri P.R. Kydiah
13. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
14. Shrimati Ranee Narah
15. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
16. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
17. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
18. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
19. Shri Maheshwar Singh
20. Shri Sunder Lal Tiwari
21. Shri D. Venugopal
22. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

23. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
24. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee

25. Shri C. Apok Jamir
26. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
27. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
28. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
29. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
30. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
31. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi - *Joint Secretary*
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra - *Under Secretary*
3. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy - *Assistant Director*

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

Consideration of draft Action Taken Reports

- | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 3. | *** | *** | *** |
| 4. | *** | *** | *** |

***Minutes regarding Memorandum No.3, 7, 8 and 9 have been kept separately.

5. The Committee then considered Memorandum No.6 regarding draft report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twenty-Sixth Report of the Committee (12th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Department of Rural Development of the then Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment. After some discussion, the Committee adopted the draft action taken Report.

- | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 6. | *** | *** | *** |
| 7. | *** | *** | *** |

8. The Committee authorised the Chairman to finalise the draft action taken Reports on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Ministries/Departments and to present the same to Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX II

DETAILS OF ROADS SANCTIONED IN THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH
UNDER THE SCHEME, "ROADS IN SPECIAL PROBLEM AREAS"

Roads Sanctioned	Length of each Road in Kilometres		How many projects were sanctioned under the Scheme in the State	What was the total length of roads which were to be constructed in the State Km.	When these projects were sanctioned and the targets fixed for their completion		What is the present status of each road under construction	The amount spent so far and the amount which will be required to complete the work	
	Sanctioned	Actual			Sanction No. & Date	Completion		Amount spent Rs. in Lakh	Amount required to complete works Rs. in Lakh
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Rangawan-Nakarial-Sujhar-Deogarh Road	25.50	25.00	15	297.32	October 1986	June 2000	In progress	154.87	-
2. Danda Khirat Tinga Road	34.00	34.00			- do -	Mar 2001	- do	129.70	150.00
3. Gijora Deogarh Road	14.40	15.00			- do -	- do -	- do -	86.95	35.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4. Bharoli Amayan Road	16.20	15.00			March 1985	June 2000	- do -	168.30	32.00
5. Daboh Khajuri Road	18.00	17.40			October 1986	Oct.2000	- do -	99.72	40.55
6. Seondha Pandri Tehangur Sandor Road	29.00	24.00			October 1986	-	- do -	25.80	30.00
7. Govardhan Umri Road	13.50	11.50			-	-	-	80.53	60.00
8. Bairad Dhoriya Road	13.50	13.50			-	-	-	92.88	35.00
9. Rajpura Silapuri Bajna Road	12.60	12.60			October 1986	-	- do -	100.75	10.00
10.Kerbana Bamhori Road	12.60	12.60			- do -	-	- do -	95.60	10.30
11.Chauraiya Shahgarh Road	5.720	4.00			October, 1986	-	In progress	57.29	8.00
12.Bargawan Palpur Road	35.00	25.00			- do -	-	- do -	64.11	80.00
13. Paharpur Nirar Road	25.00	25.00			- do -	-	- do -	150.00	76.00
14. Kishangarh Palkuan Road	26.70	26.20			- do -	-	- do -	143.71	70.00
15. Salaiya Silon Bhusor Road	14.40	-			June 1995	-	- do -	80.65	-

APPENDIX III

DETAILS OF ROADS SANCTIONED IN THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

UNDER THE SCHEME, "ROADS IN SPECIAL PROBLEM AREAS"

Roads Sanctioned	Length of each Road in Kilometres		How many projects were sanctioned under the Scheme in the State	What was the total length of roads which were to be constructed in the State Km.	When these projects were sanctioned and the targets fixed for their completion		What is the present status of each road under construction	The amount spent so far and the amount which will be required to complete the work	
	Sanctioned	Actual			Sanction No. & Date	Completion		Amount spent Rs. in Lakh	Amount required to complete works Rs. in Lakh
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
District Dholpur									
1. Basai Dang-Nagar L-13	9.00	9.00	31	389.05 km	March 1986	-	Completed	53.27	-
District Sawai Madhopur									
2. Chandelipur-Ondh F.R.5	10.00	3.00			- do -	No target	Incomplete	50.24	25.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3.	Mandrai-Ondh L.R. 61	15.00	12.00		-	-	Completed	81.26	-
4.	Lateral Roads Nagar to Sehron L.R.14	5.00	11.80		July 1986	-	Completed	69.07	-
5.	Sehron to Maroli L.R.15	6.00	6.00		- do -	-	- do -	61.10	-
6.	Machkund to Maroli L.R. 16	7.00	10.00		- do -	-	- do -	52.38	-
7.	Dholpur to Basroli L.R.17	5.00	6.00		- do -	-	- do -	27.46	-
8.	Basroli to Bhasina L.R. 18	5.00	5.00		- do -	-	- do -	54.51	-
9.	Bhasina to Kuthiama L.R. 19	5.00	5.00		- do -	-	- do -	181.33	-
10.	Baler to Utgir L.R. 20	16.00	11.60		- do -	-	- do -	96.20	44.20
11.	Utgir to Karanpur L.R.3	14.00	9.00		- do -	-	Incomplete	61.92	40.00
12.	Karanpur to Rondhai L.R. 4	28.00	24.35		- do -	-	Incomplete	221.93	-
13.	Rondhai to Mandrol L.R. 5	14.00	10.35		July 1986	-	Complete	67.67	-
14.	Ondh to Bhompura L.R. 7	7.00	7.50		- do -	-	Complete	75.61	-
15.	Sirmathura to Sone Ka Gurja F.R. 8	27.00	22.00		- do -	-	Complete	91.35	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
16. Sewerpali to Sone Ka Gurja F.R. 10	8.00	8.20			- do -	-	Complete	37.33	-
17. Gajpur to Basai Dang F.R. 13	10.00	10.50			- do -	-	Incomplete	53.27	18.00
18. Rajakhera to Samona F.R. 16	8.00	8.50			- do -	-	Complete	29.40	-
19. Rajakhera to Silawat F.R. 17	8.00	8.00			- do -	-	Complete	26.30	-
20. Chandelipura to Simathura F.R. 6	14.00	16.00			- do -	-	Complete	65.00	-
21. Kaladevi to Karanpur Marg F.R. 8	24.00	24.00			- do -	-	Complete	146.05	-
Bharatpur District									
22. Basai Dang to Barpura L.R. 12	8.00	10.00			January 1989	-	Complete	84.48	-
Dholpur District									
23. Kuthiana Tocheelpura L.R.	7.20	7.20			- do -	-	Complete	43.24	-
24. Machhiara to Basaikaran F.R. 15	3.85	3.85			- do -	-	Complete	22.60	-
25. Deholi to Anodwa F.R. 14	10.30	7.00			- do -	-	Complete	86.39	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sawai Madhopur District									
26. Kaladevi-Langola-Jai Bhadarpur-Chobeki Gwari R.R. 15	30.00	1.00			- do -	-	Incomplete	73.78	182.09
27. Chandelipura to Teen Pokhar Jangra F.R.15	17.40	17.50			March 1990	-	Complete	91.61	-
Sawai Madhopur District									
28. Tali to Siloti F.R. 20	14.00	14.00			- do -	-	Complete	76.81	-
29. Kotri to Gadoli F.R. 22	8.00	8.00			- do -	-	Complete	67.81	-
30. Langra Kaladhet F.R. 2	26.00	17.60			September 1990	-	Complete	232.33	-
31. Cholpura Chilpura to Basaikaren	10.30	5.20			- do -	-	Incomplete	131.63	18.00

APPENDIX IV

[Vide Para 4 of the Introduction]

*Analysis of the Action Taken by Government on the Recommendations
contained in the 26th Report of the Standing Committee on
Urban and Rural Development (12th Lok Sabha)*

I.	Total number of Recommendations	33
II.	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government Para Nos.2.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.15, 3.16, 3.18, 3.21, 3.25, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.13, 5.8, 5.9, 5.10, 6.5, 6.5(a), 6.10, 7.4, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8, 7.9, 8.4 and 9.4	26
	Percentage to Total Recommendation	78.79
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies Para Nos.3.31, 3.32 and 5.11	3
	Percentage to Total Recommendation	9.09
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee Para Nos.3.19 and 3.33	2
	Percentage to Total Recommendation	6.06
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited Para Nos.3.17 and 10.4	2
	Percentage to Total Recommendation	6.06