

FIFTY-SECOND REPORT  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN  
AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2004)

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2003-2004)

*[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained  
in the Forty-sixth Report (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing  
Committee on Urban and Rural Development]*

*Presented to Lok Sabha on .....*

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on .....*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*January, 2004/Pausa, 1925 (Saka)*

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2004) .....	(iii)
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2003) .....	(v)
INTRODUCTION .....	(vii)
CHAPTER I. Report .....	1
CHAPTER II. Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government. ....	35
CHAPTER III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies. ....	60
CHAPTER IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee. ....	61
CHAPTER V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited. ....	72

### APPENDICES

I. Extract of minutes of the sitting the Committee held on 30.12.2003. ....	77
II. Extract of minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 13.01.2004 .....	81
III. Analysis of Action Taken by the Government of the recommendation contained in the Forty-sixth Report of the Committee (Thirteenth Lok Sabha). ....	83

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2003)

Shri Chandrakant Khaire — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

- \*2. Shri Yogi Aditya Nath
3. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
4. Shri S. Ajaya Kumar
5. Shri Ranen Barman
6. Shri Padmanava Behera
7. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
8. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
9. Shri Shriram Chauhan
10. Shri Shamsheer Singh Dullo
11. Shrimati Hema Gamang
12. Shri G. Putta Swamy Gowda
13. Shri Jaiprakash
14. Shri Hassan Khan
15. Shri Basavanagoud Kolar
16. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
17. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
18. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra
19. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
20. Shri Mahendra Singh Pal
21. Shri Chandresh Patel
22. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
23. Shri Nawal Kishore Rai
24. Shri Gutha Sukender Reddy
25. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
26. Shri Maheshwar Singh
27. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
28. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
29. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma
30. Shri Pradeep Yadav

---

\* Nominated *w.e.f.* 17.7.2003 *vice* the vacancy caused in the place of Shri Chinmayanand Swami, ceased to be a member of the Committee consequent upon his retirement as Minister in the Council of Ministers *w.e.f.* 24 May 2003.

*Rajya Sabha*

31. Shri S. Agniraj
- \*\*32. Vacant
33. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
- \*\*\*34. Shri Prasanta Chatterjee
35. Shri N.R. Dasari
36. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
37. Shrimati Gurcharan Kaur
38. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
39. Shri Rumandla Raamachandrayya
40. Shri Harish Rawat
41. Shri Man Mohan Samal
42. Shri G.K. Vasani
- \*\*\*\*43. Vacant
44. Vacant
45. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N.K. Sapra — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri K. Chakraborty — *Director*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

---

\*\* Vacancy caused consequent upon retirement of Shrimati Shabana Azmi, M.P. (R.S.) from the membership of Rajya Sabha w.e.f. 26.8.2003.

\*\*\* Nominated vice Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan ceased to be a member w.e.f. 4.5.2003.

\*\*\*\* Vacancy caused consequent upon appointment of Shri Rajnath Singh M.P. (R.S.) as Minister w.e.f. 24.5.2003.

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004)

Shri Chandrakant Khaire — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Yogi Aditya Nath
3. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
4. Shri S. Ajaya Kumar
5. Shri Ranen Barman
6. Shri Padmanava Behera
7. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
8. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
9. Shri Shriram Chauhan
10. Shri Shamsheer Singh Dullu
11. Shrimati Hema Gamang
12. Shri G. Putta Swamy Gowda
13. Shri Jaiprakash
14. Shri Hassan Khan
15. Shri Basavanagoud Kolar
16. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
17. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
18. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra
19. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
20. Shri Mahendra Singh Pal
21. Shri Chandresh Patel
22. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
23. Shri Nawal Kishore Rai
24. Shri Gutha Sukender Reddy
25. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
26. Shri Maheshwar Singh
27. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
28. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
29. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma
30. Shri Pradeep Yadav

(iv)

*Rajya Sabha*

31. Shri S. Agniraj
32. Shri Urkhao Gwra Brahma
33. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
34. Shri Prasanta Chatterjee
35. Shri N.R. Dasari
36. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
37. Shrimati Gurcharan Kaur
38. Shri Vidya Nivas Misra
39. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
40. Shri Rumandla Raamachandrayya
41. Shri Harish Rawat
42. Shri Man Mohan Samal
43. Shri G.K. Vasani
44. Vacant
45. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N.K. Sapra — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri K. Chakraborty — *Director*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (2004), having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Fifty-second Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Forty-sixth Report (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (2003) on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply).

2. The Forty-sixth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 22 April 2003. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 28 July 2003.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee (2003) at their sitting held on 30 December 2003. However, the term of the Committee expired on 31 December, 2003 before the Report could be presented to the Parliament. The Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development were reconstituted on 1 January 2004, which again considered and adopted the Report at their sitting held on 13 January 2004.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Forty-sixth Report (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee (2003) is given in *Appendix III*.

NEW DELHI;  
20 January, 2004  
30 Pausa, 1925 (Saka)

CHANDRAKANT KHAIRE,  
*Chairman,*  
*Standing Committee on*  
*Urban and Rural Development.*

## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Urban and Rural Development (2003) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Forty-sixth Report on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 22 April 2003.

2. Action taken notes were received from the Government in respect of all the 42 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:

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

Para Nos. 2.12, 2.13, 3.3, 3.21, 3.33, 3.35, 3.47, 3.48, 3.49, 3.50, 3.51, 3.61, 3.72, 3.74, 3.100, 3.102, 3.104, 3.105, 3.106, 3.107, 3.111, 3.112, 3.122, 4.22, 4.25 and 4.26.

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

Nil

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

Para Nos. 2.11, 3.59, 3.60, 3.103, 3.108, 3.117, 3.128, 4.19, 4.20 and 4.21

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

Para Nos. 3.34, 3.62, 3.73, 3.75, 3.101 and 3.129.

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

**A. Implementation of Centrally-sponsored Rural Drinking Water Supply Schemes: Some pertinent issues.**

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.11)**

5. The Committee had recommended as below:

“The Committee express a deep sense of outrage that 55 years after Independence, the respective Governments have not been able to provide safe drinking water to all people. The Committee find the Government’s claim that more than 90 per cent of all rural habitations have been fully covered with drinking water facilities as completely unacceptable. The Committee wish to reiterate that coverage should not mean only accessibility, rather it should be redefined to include availability and quality of water along with accessibility. While the Committee have examined the issues of accessibility versus availability, contamination of water, sustainability of sources and systems, etc., in detail in the succeeding chapters of the Report, they may like to highlight here that there is a hiatus between Government statistics regarding coverage and actual ground reality. In this context, the United Nation’s survey report as per which India ranks 133rd out of 185 countries with regard to drinking water availability and 120th out of 122 countries in respect of drinking water quality, is very disturbing and poses a question on the authenticity of the Government’s proclamation that 100 per cent coverage would be achieved by 2004. The Committee are of the view that rather than trying to portray a favourable picture by manipulating data, the Government should concentrate on quality work, whereby the provision of safe and sustainable sources of drinking water is made to the rural masses. The Committee feel that focus should be on ensuring sustainability of sources and systems, so that once covered habitations do not revert back to not covered categories within a short span of time, thereby dissipating resources invested so far. Moreover, assessment of the actual ground position of NC, PC, and FC habitations should be made a regular and frequent feature with the help of latest information technology methods, whereby data is regularly updated and is easily made available.”

6. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“The position regarding coverage of rural habitations with the facility of drinking water has been indicated based on the reports received from the State Governments. As per the Constitutional provision (State list) water is a State subject and the States have the powers to plan, design and implement water supply schemes in the rural areas. The complete machinery for implementation of the water supply schemes in the country is with the State Government. Government of India, however, support the endeavours of the State Governments by providing additional funds and latest technologies in its water supply, conservations, etc. As such, the figures reported by the State Government are taken into account for arriving at the status regarding coverage of the habitations. Admittedly, the coverage has become a dynamic feature due to a variety of reasons like the sources going dry due to over-exploitation of ground water, poor maintenance of handpumps, increasing pollution, thereby water getting contaminated, caused by depleting ground water, increase in population, industrialisation, competing demands on ground water, leaching agricultural wastes into water bodies, etc.

A fresh survey is also underway to assess the actual position. There is no reason to doubt about the figures reported by the State Governments. The Government of India have already taken measures for ensuring sustainability of sources and systems to ensure that the habitations once ‘covered’ do not slip back to ‘not covered’. This can only be tackled if there is a judicious distribution of available water based on priorities. The State Governments have already been requested to enact legislation on control and extraction of the ground water, on which the rural water supply systems entirely depend.”

7. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply furnished by the Government as it smacks of a lackadaisical attitude. While admitting that drinking water supply is a State subject, the Committee feel that Union Government are required to play a for more proactive role in this regard. Merely making the State Governments responsible for provision of drinking water supply would not yield concrete results, especially when the Union Government are spending huge amount of funds year after year for such Centrally-Sponsored Schemes. Responsibility/accountability

should be fixed and unsatisfactory implementation/progress of such a priority programme should be seriously taken note of. Since slippage of habitations from 'covered' to 'not covered' or 'partially covered' habitations has been identified as a major problem hindering the implementation of drinking water supply scheme, the Committee would like to know about the specific steps being taken by the Government regarding tackling this specific problem. They may also be informed about the results of the fresh survey as mentioned by the Government, which is being carried out at present to assess the actual position regarding coverage of rural habitations with drinking water supply facilities.

B. Utilization of groundwater for drinking purpose

Recommendation (Para No. 2.12)

8. The following recommendation was made by the Committee:

"The Committee feel that in the years to come, ensuring sustainability and quality of drinking water sources will be the biggest challenge before the country. While the concerns relating to adequate outlay to be provided during the Tenth Plan have been dealt with in the next chapter of the Report, the Committee seeing the overall position would like to recommend that substantial allocation should be made during the Tenth Plan period under Sub-Missions dealing with sustainability and water quality. Further, the Committee note with concern that while the Government have been stating time and again that groundwater sources are fast depleting causing serious environmental and health problems, various Centrally sponsored schemes focus on the utilisation of groundwater, for example, through installing hand pumps or digging bore-wells, which often go dry after a short span of time or become contaminated. Though the Committee understand that hand pumps or bore-wells are a cost-effective way to provide drinking water, in view of the consequent hazards, thought should be given towards developing some alternative and cost effective technology."

9. The Government have, in their Action Taken Reply, stated:

"There are about 3.7 million handpumps and 1,45,000 of piped water supply schemes in the country. About 85 per cent of rural

drinking water supply is dependent on ground water and 15 per cent have surface water source. In places where surface water is not available, the drinking water schemes will have to depend upon ground water. In fact, only 5 per cent of the ground water is used for drinking water purposes. However, the State Governments and Panchayats adopt conjunctive use of ground and surface drinking water sources for drinking water purposes. Use of traditional sources like wells, ponds, bawdis, etc. as drinking water sources have declined. The scheme as implemented provides for taking measures for ensuring sustainability of water sources through rain water harvesting, arresting run-offs, artificial and natural water recharge, etc., known technologies are also adopted for reducing chemical and biological contamination in the drinking water R&D projects for developing water purification techniques and wherever water contamination cannot be reduced due to physical constraints, alternate supply of water is also suggested. The Government have decided to revive one lakh traditional drinking water sources in the country during the two years (2003-2005).

10. While noting the initiatives taken by the Government, the Committee would like to point out that the picture regarding extraction of ground water for drinking water purpose as well as the policy of the Government in this regard is not clear. The Committee find that depletion of ground water sources has been identified as a major problem affecting drinking water quality and availability. Further, it has been held responsible for causing serious environmental and health problems. Exploitation of ground water sources is endorsed by the fact that 85 per cent of rural drinking water supply schemes depend on ground water sources, which is corroborated by the Government's statistics that there are about 37 lakh handpumps whereas only 1.45 lakh piped water supply schemes are available in the country. However, the figures furnished by the Government in their reply regarding ground water extraction do not reflect this actual ground reality, whereby it has been stated that only 5 per cent of ground water is used for drinking purpose. In view of this vague and discrepant scenario, the Committee would like the Government to clarify the actual position pertaining to groundwater extraction for drinking purposes.

The Committee also note that the Government have decided to revive one lakh traditional drinking water sources in the country

during the two years (2003-2005). While appreciating this move, the Committee would like to know more about it with details of States where the traditional sources will be revived and to what extent the users will be benefited by it.

C. Financial performance of ARWSP and MNP.

Recommendation (Para No. 3.21)

11. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee note with concern that the financial position of one of the top-most priority programmes of the Government, i.e. to provide potable water to the rural masses is plagued by various shortcomings:

- (1) Under-utilisation of available funds has become a regular feature. For the Eighth Plan period, underspending of about Rs. 957 crore has been reported, while for the Ninth Plan period, expenditure was Rs. 109 crore less than the outlay;
- (2) Going by the Tenth Plan Working Group proposal, inadequate allocation has been made for rural drinking water supply, whereby around 50% of what was proposed has been finally sanctioned by the Planning Commission.
- (3) There is huge underspending of the funds released by the Centre to State Governments under this Scheme.
- (4) There is decrease in allocation, release and expenditure under the State sector Minimum Needs Programme.

The Committee find that whenever the attention of the Department is drawn towards underutilisation or huge opening balances with the different State Governments, a routine reply stating poor financial position of the State Governments, non-furnishing of utilisation certificates, late release of funds to the implementing authorities etc., has been furnished. The Committee have been receiving the same type of reply for the last four-five years. The Committee are unhappy over the way the Department is giving reply to their recommendation relating to such a priority programme, i.e. providing drinking water to rural masses. They feel that instead of analysing the State-wise position and finding the problems being faced by each of the State Governments, with regard to implementation of the programme, the

Department is simply sidetracking the main issues by furnishing a routine reply. The Committee would like that the reasons for under utilisation should be analysed for each of the States and the Committee apprised about the details in this regard. Not only that, the Government should find different ways and means to ensure proper utilisation of scarce resources and efforts should be made to contain unspent balances. As regards the late release of funds, the Committee find that this is the problem being faced in almost all schemes of the Department of Rural Development. They find that late release of money lead to huge underspending and wastage of money and feel that this trend has to be checked to ensure proper utilisation of funds. As regards the problems with regard to providing matching share by some of the State Governments, the Committee would like that the position with regard to each of the States should be critically analysed and the information furnished to the Committee. By the mixed tactics of persuasion and compulsion, the State Governments should be impressed upon to properly utilise the resources. Innovative mechanism for cent percent utilization of the resources is not forthcoming from many States. Though they need money, many of them do not know how to channelize them for a fruitful purpose. Under-utilization makes it more pronounced. Many States require a direction from the Centre which is not forthcoming. There is no zeal either to do so. However, something needs to be done. In this context, the Committee would like the Union Government to play a more proactive role, with regular visits of the Central Government officials to monitor and evaluate the various schemes and also to assist and guide the State Governments in selection of viable projects. The Committee strongly feel that the Government cannot abdicate their responsibility by simply indicating the oft-quoted causes. Much is expected out of them. The Committee hope to see something in the near future.

12. The Government, in their Action Taken Reply, have stated:

“It is stated that the reply furnished by the Government is not a routine one but is one based on facts. The fact that when the reasons for under-utilisation remain the same, the same reply is given every year. The States are requested again and again to utilize the funds released to them on time so that rural water supply schemes are implemented fruitfully. These points are repeatedly brought home to the States during review meetings,

visit of officers to the States and other fora including visits of various Ministers to the States and the discussion by State Ministers and sometimes even with the Chief Ministers of the State when they visit the Ministry. As far as Government of India is concerned, funds are released on time wherever proposals are received from the State Government complete in all respects. When the utilization certificates and AG certificates and other details requiring sanction of funds are not being provided by the State Governments, this has to be insisted upon for ensuring financial discipline. Delay on the part of the State Governments in furnishing these details naturally result in delay in the release of funds. As recommended by the Committee, tactics of persuasion and compulsions are all the time used to impress upon the States the need for proper utilization of resources. Directions from the Central Government in the matter were always forthcoming. In fact, this point and also the observations by the Committee on this are always brought to the notice of the States, every time as mentioned. Central Government play a pro-active role with regular visits of the Central Government officers to evolve various schemes and, also to assist and guide the State Governments in the selection of viable projects. The responsibility of the Government in this regard is clearly understood and never ever abdicated by simply indicating the oft-quoted causes, which are indicated, and they are the actual reasons for under spending by the States.

The States, which send, complete proposals before December were released funds immediately. The delay was only in respect of some States, which submit proposals either late or in incomplete form.”

13. The Committee have noted the Government’s reply indicating their role in persuading the State Governments to implement the drinking water supply schemes optimally. However, the Committee would like to point out the fact that reasons for under-utilization of funds by the State Governments remain the same year after year. This implies that the steps taken by the Union Government are either ineffective or not adequate enough to change the situation. Fund utilization during the last few years as given in the Performance Budget corroborate this fact, whereby a number of States show a distressing gap between outlay and expenditure.

Further, the Committee would like to stress that for tackling the problem of under utilization by State Governments, identifying only a few generalized causes will not serve the purpose. Efforts should rather be on analyzing the situation State-wise and giving a location and site-specific treatment to various States.

D. Slippage of habitations from 'covered' to 'not covered' categories

Recommendation (Para No. 3.34)

14. The Committee noted as below:

"The Committee further note that besides the challenge of covering not covered or partially covered habitations, the main problem the country would face in the coming years is sustainability of sources. While this issue has been addressed in detail in the subsequent chapter, the Committee find that the Department is conducting a survey to ascertain the position of slippage of fully covered habitations into partially covered and not covered habitations. They also note that the State Governments have been requested to complete the survey by 31 March, 2003. They hope that the survey has been completed by now and would like to be apprised about the results, so as to know the ground situation in this regard in the country."

15. The Government, in their Action Taken Reply, have stated:

"The survey to identify fully covered, partially covered and not covered habitations is going on. Information from the States is yet to come in. Identifying lack of finances as one of the reasons for the unsatisfactory progress of the survey, a decision has subsequently been taken to financially support the States upto 50 per cent of the expenditure; and it has since improved the pace of the survey. They have been requested to complete the survey by 30.09.2003.

16. The Committee find that the State Governments had been given extension till 30 September, 2003 to complete the Survey to identify the 'covered', 'partially covered' and 'not covered' habitations. Further, the Committee appreciate the Union Government's initiative to supplement the States' efforts by providing 50 per cent of the expenditure for the Survey. The Committee hope that the said Survey might have been completed by now and would like to be apprised of its results.



E. Revised norms for provision of drinking water.

Recommendation (Para No. 3.35)

17. The following was the observation of the Committee:

“The Committee further find that the Department has proposed to revise the existing norms to provide 40 litres per capita per day (lpcd) with a source within 1.6 kilometres in the plains and 100 metres elevation in the hills to 55 lpcd with a source within 0.5 kilometres in the plains and 50 metres elevation in the hills after the coverage of all NC and PC rural habitations. They welcome the revised norms but express serious doubt about its feasibility, taking into account ground realities at present. In fact, during the course of oral evidence, the Secretary submitted that in certain parts of Rajasthan, water has to be carried from a distance of 20-30 kilometres. The Committee wish to emphasize that greatest priority must be accorded to ensure that every habitation and individual is covered in rural areas according to the revised norms.”

18. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“The Department has already revised the existing norms only for the States where all existing habitations are fully covered with 40 lpcd water service level from 40 lpcd with a source within 1.6 km. in the plains 100 metres elevation in the hills to 55 lpcd with a source within 0.5 km. in the plains and 50 metres elevation in the hills. However, the States have been cautioned about the progressively depleting ground water sources and take a decision to relax the norm with extreme care and evaluating the ground realities. Even after the habitations are covered with a source within 1.6 km. during the summer season, many of the sources may dry resulting in the shortage of drinking water. The sources already provided become defunct in such cases. In extreme summer months and drought conditions, drinking water is transported from far off sources by rail and road tankers to ensure minimum supply to the rural population. In the absence of perennial sources, this has to be resorted to. Increasing use of water conservation measures would, however, help to some extent improve the ground water levels when rainfall is normal. However, successive years of drought aggravate the problem in many parts of the country, including Rajasthan, resulting in the need for transportation of water.”

19. The Committee note the initiative taken by the Government to revise existing norms to provide 40 litres of water per capita per day (lpcd) with a source within 1.6 kms. in the plains and 100 metres elevation in the hills to 55 lpcd with a source within 0.5 kms. in the plains and 50 metres elevation in the hills for the States where all existing habitations are fully covered. While appreciating that the said step of the Department would be an incentive to the best performing States the Committee feel concerned about the deplorable condition in the least performing States and the States where drought is a recurrent problem. The Committee also take note of the concern expressed by the Department about tackling the problem of sustainability. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee would like to emphasize that priority should be given to cover NC and PC habitations and also in tackling the problem of sustainability of existing water sources, because no benefits of the revised norms will accrue to the rural masses if existing sources go dry or become defunct.

F. Dismal coverage of rural schools with drinking water supply facility .

#### Recommendation (Para No. 3.59)

20. The Committee had recommended as below:

“The Committee find that even after five decades of planned development, provision of safe drinking water in schools in rural areas could not be ensured. Even taking the figures collected and compiled nearly ten years back regarding number of schools, it can be seen that 3.51 lakh rural primary and upper primary schools are yet to be provided with potable water supply. Moreover, analysing the performance of the Government in this respect, the Committee feel that they are not serious enough in fulfilling the target of school coverage. Every year there is a huge shortfall in the achievement of target. Moreover, the Committee find that out of the 2.02 lakh schools to be covered under schemes of other Ministers, the Ministry of Human Resource Development has proposed to cover all these schools under Sarva Siksha Abhiyan within a period of ten years, which is a long time period. The Committee are unhappy at this slackened pace of coverage of schools, and observe that if it continues in the same pace, many more years will be taken to make safe drinking water available to

all school children. Therefore, the Committee recommend that Government should take up school coverage with utmost sincerity and work out a plan of action to provide drinking water in schools within a limited time frame, as the school children cannot wait for a decade or so, to have drinking water in the schools, which is a basic necessity of life. Moreover, as done for other programmes under ARWSP, a certain percentage of ARWSP and MNP funds should be kept for this purpose.”

21. The Government have stated:

“The State Governments have been requested to take steps to ensure that all rural schools are provided with the facility of drinking water within a period of two years, i.e. 2003-04 and 2004-05. The Department of Drinking Water Supply in the Ministry of Rural Development and the Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development have agreed to work jointly to ensure proper coordination of efforts being taken in the rural drinking water supply sector. States have also been addressed to coordinate the action taken by the two Departments at the State and field levels. They have also been asked to furnish an action plan to cover all the schools within a period of two years. It is proposed to monitor this aspect intensively, independently and jointly by the two Departments at regular intervals. In addition to the on-going schemes, it has also been decided to cover 1 lakh schools during 2003-04 and 2004-05 as per the Independence Day (15.08.2002) announcement made by the Prime Minister on 15.08.2002. Funds for the purpose have been separately released to the State Governments.”

22. While noting the efforts being made by the Government, the Committee would like to reiterate the need for giving priority to coverage of schools with drinking water supply facility at the earliest. In this context, the Committee would like to point out that as per the information furnished by the Government earlier, 2.02 lakh rural schools which were to be covered under the Sarva Siksha Abhiyan by the Ministry of Human Resource Development, would take a period of about ten years. Moreover, as per the data furnished by the Ministry during the examination of Demands for Grants of the Department (2003-04), the Committee found that 1.50 lakh schools were to be covered under ARWSP during the period of five years

starting from 2000-01. But, the actual coverage figure during the last three years shows a dismal picture, whereby only 27 per cent was achieved during 2000-01. Further, during 2001-02 and 2002-03, the achievement was 77.86 and 41 per cent, respectively.

In spite of this dismal scenario, the Government in their reply have stated that all schools would be covered within the next two years. Judging by the performance of the Government so far, the Committee find this an impossible target. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation to give top priority to school coverage especially to primary schools within a limited time-frame and keep a certain percentage of ARSWP and MNP funds for school coverage. Further, they would like to stress that action plans should be practical and targets be fixed logically in order to yield concrete results.

G. Coverage of schools under Swajaldhara : Need for flexible guidelines.

#### Recommendation (Para No. 3.60)

23. The Committee had observed as below:

“The Committee further observe that on the one hand, the Government propose to provide free primary education, but on the other hand, even for a basic amenity like drinking water in schools, students are being charged. The Committee, therefore, recommend that under the Sector Reform principle or Swajaldhara programme, guidelines should be made a little flexible regarding school coverage. Provision should be made so that the 10 per cent beneficiary share of funds can be contributed from the MPLAD funds. They would like that the Department should interact with the concerned authorities to make suitable amendment in the guidelines of MPLAD Scheme. Besides, the Committee are of the view that Government-aided schools should also be brought under the purview of the Government’s school coverage programme.”

24. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“Involvement of the community is an essential ingredient in the successful implementation, operation and maintenance of the rural water supply schemes. The community will have a sense of ownership only when they contribute towards capital cost and

involve themselves in planning, designing, implementing, operating and maintaining the schemes of their choice. Swajaldhara Guidelines provide for 10 per cent contribution by way of cash, kind or labour so that the community need not burden itself with cash contribution alone. MPLAD programme is another form of Government of India funding. Therefore, contribution from MPLAD programme cannot be a substitute of community contribution. Such contribution can be over and above the prescribed per cent of community contribution.

Government aided schools are privately managed schools. Private management has the responsibility to provide drinking water in the schools. Therefore, Government funding has been basically confined to the Government schools only.”

25. The Committee feel that the Government have not seriously addressed the apprehension of the Committee regarding the issue of community contribution in case of provision of drinking water supply to schools under the Swajaldhara Scheme. Though the Committee fully agree with the Government’s perspective that involvement of community is an essential ingredient in the successful implementation, operation and maintenance of rural water supply schemes, the ground realities are such that expecting contribution from students for provision of drinking water in schools, especially in the poverty-stricken, inhospitable terrains of the country is unacceptable. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee in their earlier recommendation had desired that the Department should interact with the concerned authorities to make suitable amendment in the guidelines of MPLAD Schemes, so that 10 per cent beneficiary share of funds can be contributed from MPLAD funds. They are least satisfied with the reply furnished by the Department stating that MPLAD programme is another form of Government of India funding and hence cannot be a substitute of community programme. The Committee find that during the course of oral evidence, the Secretary of the Department had also endorsed the view of the Committee that community contribution could also be taken up from MPLAD funds. The Committee feel that Government school coverage should not be treated at par with coverage of habitations as per the normal programme, so far as 10 per cent community contribution is concerned. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation that as a special case for school coverage, Swajaldhara Guidelines should be made flexible,

so that 10 per cent community contribution could be provided from MPLAD funds.

On the issue of providing drinking water to Government-aided schools, the Committee note the reply of the Department that such schools are privately managed schools and it is the responsibility of private management to provide drinking water in the schools. The Committee would still like to be apprised about the overall position of drinking water in the Government-aided schools in order to assess the position in the right perspective.

H. Conducting of All India Educational Survey after regular time interval.

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.62)**

26. The Committee recommended as below:

“The Committee, further, note that the Sixth All India Educational Survey was done during the year 1993 and after that the Seventh All India Educational Survey is being conducted at present, the results of which are still awaited. They find that such an important survey is conducted after an interval of ten years. They also note that actual estimation of ground situation is the basic factor on which implementation of a programme depends and for such a priority sector like schools, ten years is a long period, because the number of schools changes from year to year. To overcome this problem, the Committee would like that some periodic State-wise survey should be conducted to have latest information about the number of schools, so that no school is deprived of the benefit of drinking water supply scheme.”

27. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“The recommendation of the Committee has been brought to the notice of Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development for taking necessary action.”

28. The Committee are pleased to note that their concern regarding undertaking All India Educational Survey after a long gap of one decade has at last been brought to the notice of the concerned

Department of Elementary Education and Literacy (Ministry of Human Resource Development). The decision/action taken by the Department in this regard may be communicated to this Committee at the earliest.

I. Survey regarding availability of drinking water supply in rural habitations.

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.73)**

29. The Committee recommended as below:

“The Committee note that though the Government have portrayed a favourable picture regarding the status of coverage with drinking water facility, by stating that only 322 Not Covered and 16,876 Partially Covered habitations are left, which would be covered by 2004, there is a great variation between availability and accessibility of drinking water sources, especially in these hilly and difficult terrain of the North East. Keeping this in view, the results of fresh surveys to ascertain the latest status of rural habitations with regard to availability of drinking water supply as on 1st January, 2003, should be compiled at the earliest and in the light of this, a fresh assessment of targets should be made. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the survey report, which all the States have been requested to complete by 31st March, 2003.”

30. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“All States including NE States have been requested to carry out the survey regarding the status of availability of drinking water. Information from the States in expected to reach Government of India before 30 September, 2003.”

31. The Committee find that as per the reply of the Government, information from the States regarding the results of the latest survey was expected to be available by 30 September 2003. The Committee expect that the results of the said survey must be available by now and would like to be apprised of the same. The Survey report, alongwith comments/observations of the Government on the findings, may be provided to this Committee at the earliest.

J. Coverage of schools in the North-Eastern States.

Recommendation (Para No. 3.75)

32. The Committee had recommended as below:

“The Committee find that provision of drinking water in the schools of the North-Eastern States show a dismal scenario. In the year 2001-2002, only 280 schools were provided drinking water facility, *i.e.* 17 per cent of the set target, while upto December 2002, 22 per cent coverage has been achieved with 467 schools. The Committee are not convinced by the arguments put forth by the Department in this regard, that inadequate resources and lack of technical capacity are mainly responsible for such low coverage, especially in view of the fact that every year, a substantial amount is surrendered to the non-lapseable pool of resources due to underspending of available funds. The Committee recommend that first of all a proper assessment should be made regarding the number of schools, especially the terrain where they are located. Thereafter, the facts regarding coverage should be ascertained to find out the number of not covered schools and also whether sources and systems once installed are still sustainable or not. Only after getting the picture of actual ground reality, a practicable action plan within a time frame can be worked out. In this context, the Committee urge the Government that results of the Seventh All India Educational Survey, which is being conducted at present, should be compiled at the earliest and utilised to assess the actual ground reality.”

33. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“All States included those in the NE States have been requested to make proper assessment of the schools in the rural areas to be covered with drinking water supply during this year and next year. It has also been brought to their notice that action being taken under District Primary Education Programme, Sarva Siksha Programme of the Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development should be coordinated with those of the Drinking Water Supply Department to avoid duplication of efforts. States have been asked to draw an action plan accordingly. Separately, the Ministry of Human Resource Development has already been requested to come out with the



Seventh All India Education Survey based on which the actual ground reality can be assessed. Department of Drinking Water Supply will, however, help the States to provide water right upto the higher secondary level schools.”

34. The Committee feel that in the absence of actual facts and figures, it would be difficult to evaluate the implementation of any particular scheme or programme and benefits accruing from any such programme. In this context, the Committee would like to be apprised of the results of the assessment of schools in the rural areas to be covered with drinking water supply for the current year. Also, the results of the Seventh All India Educational Survey should be compiled and provided to the Committee at the earliest and utilized to assess the actual ground reality.

#### K. Ensuring drinking water quality and sustainability

##### Recommendations (Para Nos. 3.100 & 3.106)

35. The Committee recommended as below:

“The Committee find that as per the guidelines/directions issued by the Union Government, 20 per cent of ARWSP funds are earmarked for new projects under the Sub Mission activities. Besides, even the States can utilise more funds to tackle quality problems after taking the concurrence of the Union Government in this regard. They further note that out of 20 per cent of ARWSP funds, 15 per cent explicitly has been earmarked for water quality. While going through the information furnished by the Department, they find that only eight States have sanctioned the projects under Sub Mission for water quality problems. Keeping in view the lack of interest taken by the various State Governments towards the quality problem in drinking water, the Committee feel that only earmarking funds under Sub-Mission will not be sufficient. The State Governments should be sensitised about the need to sanction more projects to tackle the quality problem in drinking water as analysed in the preceding para, this being the biggest challenge the country will be facing in the coming years.”

(Para No. 3.100)

36. The Committee recommended as below:

“The Committee further note that only 5 per cent of the outlay has been earmarked for tackling the problem of sustainability. They find that although the Secretary has admitted that this has emerged as a major problem, adequate allocation has not been earmarked for the purpose. They also note that as per the 10th Plan projections, after tackling the problem of NC and PC habitations, stress would be given to water quality and sustainability. They further note that second year of 10th Plan is going on and as admitted by the Department given in the preceeding paras of the Report, the tackling of NC and PC habitations would need more allocation and time due to being in difficult terrain areas. Keeping in view this overall scenario that is emerging, the Committee find that this is high time the Department should give priority to the issue of sustainability of sources without waiting for NC and PC habitations to be covered fully in the country.”

(Para No. 3.106)

37. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“States have been impressed upon the need for making use of the 15 per cent funds under ARWSP for quality protection and 5 per cent for sustainability issues. In fact, in the sanction issued during 2003-04, breakup of funds to be utilized exclusively on normal programmes, quality issues and sustainability measures have been given with the direction that funds be utilized as per the breakup. During interaction with the States through review meetings and officers’ visit, this factor is repeatedly being focussed so that States are sensitized on the need to sanction more projects to tackle the quality problems in drinking water.”

(Reply to Recommendation at Para No. 3.100)

38. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“To tackle the problem of sustainability, the mission has earmarked 5 per cent of ARWSP outlay for undertaking Sub-Mission projects on Sustainability. However, State Governments can use more funds on sustainability depending upon the requirement. As such, there

is no stipulation that more than 5 per cent funds cannot be spent on sustainability. The Committee's view that sustainability should be given priority without waiting for NC and PC coverage will be brought to the notice of State Governments."

(Reply to Recommendation at Para No. 3.106)

39. While noting the steps being taken by the Government to ensure that the States use 15 per cent funds under ARWSP for tackling water quality problem and 5 per cent of the funds for addressing sustainability issues, the Committee suggest that while providing data in the Performance Budget in the next financial year, State-wise break-up of funds sanctioned and funds utilized on normal drinking water supply programmes, drinking water quality issues and sustainability measures should be furnished to the Committee.

L. Assessment regarding drinking water quality affected habitations

Recommendation (Para No. 3.101)

40. The Committee had recommended as below:

"The Committee find that as regards the assessment regarding quality affected habitations, a survey was done in April 1999. Further, they also note that the State Governments are carrying out 5-10 per cent stratified sampling survey taking block as a unit, the results of which are still awaited from most of the States. They also find that some of the States have completed the survey. The Committee would like to be apprised about the details/status of the findings of the said survey."

41. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

"The Committee would be apprised of the details/status of findings of water quality survey once it is completed. The States have been requested to complete the survey by 30.09.2003."

42. The Committee hope that a Survey to assess drinking water quality affected habitations might have been completed by now and would like to be apprised of the findings of the said Survey. They would also like that a copy of the Report of the Survey may be provided to them expeditiously. Further, in this context, the

Committee would like to stress that such type of surveys should be conducted at regular intervals, so that there is no contradiction between Government's statistics and actual ground reality.

**M. Provision of mobile water testing laboratories**

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.103)**

43. The Committee had recommended as below:

"The Committee further note that though it was initially decided to provide mobile water testing laboratories to each district of the country, so far only 23 such laboratories have been provided in various States. Though the Secretary during the course of oral evidence has stated that due to mismanagement and misutilisation, they have stopped sanctioning funds for mobile laboratories, the Committee feel that mobile laboratories are the most effective means to check water quality, especially in difficult and inhospitable terrain. Moreover, to keep a watch on the functioning of these mobile laboratories, the Committee feel that a proper monitoring mechanism should be evolved at the Panchayat level to keep a tab on the number of water sample tested per day/year by these mobile laboratories."

44. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

"It was decided to establish water quality testing labs in each district of the country. It is also planned to provide 23 mobile water testing labs in difficult and inhospitable terrains. The recommendation of the Committee that proper monitoring mechanism should be evolved at the Panchayat level to keep a tab on the number of water samples tested per day/year by these mobile labs, will be examined."

45. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply furnished by the Government. It is not clear from the reply whether the scheme of providing mobile water testing laboratories is being continued or the Government have stopped sanctioning funds for mobile laboratories. While examining Demands for Grants, the Secretary had informed that due to mismanagement and misutilisation, they had stopped sanctioning funds for mobile laboratories. However, as per the action taken reply, the Government have stated that they plan to provide 23 mobile water testing labs in difficult and

inhospitable terrains, which indicates that the Scheme is in operation in difficult terrains. The Committee would like to be apprised clearly whether the Government have decided to continue the Scheme only in difficult terrains or it is applicable to all the districts in rural areas. In this context, the Committee would like to reiterate that the Government should strive to implement the Scheme of providing mobile water testing laboratories in each district of the country as they feel that such mobile labs are the most effective means to check water quality, especially in difficult and inhospitable terrains.

The Committee hope that the Government will examine expeditiously the monitoring mechanism to be evolved at the Panchayat level to keep a tab on the number of water samples tested per day/year by the mobile labs. The Committee should be kept informed about the outcome.

#### N. Making water sources sustainable

##### Recommendation (Para No. 3.107)

46. The Committee had recommended as below:

“The Committee further feel that to tackle the problem of water table going down, a multi-pronged strategy should be adopted. While on the one hand the Government should give stress to rain water harvesting, on the other hand they should also encourage traditional sources of water like ponds etc. They also note that in India, there is no dearth of rain water, but the need is to use the rain water for re-charging of water as well as for using the rain water after storage. They also note that in some States very good work has been done in this regard. They also find that the Ministry of Water Resources is mainly tackling this issue. They would like that in consultation with the concerned Ministries, the Department should chalk out some strategy to solve the issue of sustainability of sources.

47. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“The recommendation of the Committee that Department of Drinking Water Supply should chalk out some strategy to solve the issue of sustainability of sources in consultation with the Ministry of Water Resources is accepted and efforts will be made to bring in better coordination. This Department is also contributing

its might to put up water holding structure, to arrest the run offs, recharge of ground water under the ARWSP. A scheme to take up 1 lakh traditional sources especially in the drought affected areas in the country as announced by the Prime Minister in his Independence speech on 15.08.2002 will also be undertaken and implemented during this and the next year. A sum of Rs. 700 crore has been provided for the same and the allocation for the current year to the States has also been made.”

48. The Committee are pleased to note that the Department is making sincere efforts to promote various water conservation measures. They also note that the Government are committed to undertake the Scheme to revive one lakh traditional sources in the drought affected areas in the country as announced by the Prime Minister in his Independence Day speech on 15 August 2002. In this context, the Committee urge that the details of the new Scheme including its objectives, implementing agency, reviewing authority, proposed allocation, strategy of implementation, etc. may be furnished to them expeditiously. Further, the Committee would like to be apprised about the present status of implementation of the aforesaid Scheme. In this regard, they would like to be informed about the number of traditional water sources identified so far, which are proposed to be revived.

#### O. Utilization of sea water for drinking purpose

##### Recommendation (Para No. 3.108)

49. The Committee had recommended as below:

“The Committee for the last two years have been drawing the attention of the Department, for the need of the hour to accept sea water for drinking and other purposes. They in their earlier recommendation (refer para 2.78 of 32nd Report) had drawn the attention of the Department about the need to explore cost effective technologies in this regard. From the data, the Department has given, the Committee find huge difference between the approved plants, installed plants and those that are functioning. They are appalled to know that only around 50 per cent of the plants are functional. They would like to be apprised about the reasons for such a high percentage of plants going defunct. Besides, as recommended in their earlier Reports made during the last two

years, the Committee would like to stress that Government should give more thrust on exploitation of sea water for drinking and other purposes.”

50. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“The Committee’s recommendation for the last two years about acceptance of sea water for drinking purposes has been taken note of by the Department. The various techniques available have been collected and provided to the States and they have been advised to use such processes to desalinate sea water and provide it for drinking purposes, in areas where fresh water is not available.”

51. The Committee feel that the Government have furnished a lackadaisical reply. On the one hand, the Government have stated that the Committee’s recommendations for the last two years have been taken note of, on the other hand, the figures regarding installation and subsequent functioning of desalination plants show a dismal scenario, totally incompatible with the Government’s statement. Further, the Committee find that the Government have sidetracked the issue regarding analysis of the reasons for about 50 per cent of the installed desalination plants going defunct. They would like to be apprised of the reasons for non-functioning of such a high percentage of plants. Further, the Committee would also like to be informed about the action being taken by the State Governments initiating measures to desalinate sea water and provide it for drinking purposes.

P. Prevention of wastage of precious drinking water

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.111)**

52. The Committee had recommended as below:

“The Committee find that besides addressing the issues like accessibility, availability, contamination of water and sustainability of sources, *i.e.*, as dealt in preceding paras of the Report, another issue need to be addressed, *i.e.*, how to stop wastage of water. They find from the material furnished by the Department, that it has never thought of the necessity to maintain the data with regard to wastage of water due to mismanagement and leakage. The Committee feel that since scarcity of water is going to be the biggest problem in the country as is repeatedly being highlighted

in the respective chapters of the Report, more attention needs to be given in this regard. To tackle this problem, the Committee feel that, besides, sensitizing the community about the need to conserve every drop of water, some punitive measures should be taken to tackle the issue. While appreciating that water management is a State subject, the Committee would like that necessary guidelines should be issued to the State Governments to take desired steps for conservation of water. Besides, to have an exact idea about the magnitude of the problem, the Department should include the factor regarding wastage and leakage of water in the survey being conducted by several State Governments.”

53. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“The Guidelines and Information Booklets issued by the Department of Drinking Water Supply to the States’ Rural Water Supply Implementing Agencies from time to time do stress the necessity to conserve water by prevention of wastage due to mismanagement and leakage. Also the importance of conservation of every drop of water has been highlighted through TV spots developed by the Ministry of Rural Development. Further, to take up schemes for rain water harvesting and conservation, 5 per cent of ARWSP funds released to the States are earmarked under Sub-Mission on sustainability. The Sector Reforms initiated by the Government of India and accepted by the States, when implemented, will result in reducing the wastage of water as the PRIs/user groups will be owning most of the systems and will be fully responsible for their O&M. The concept of water being taken as a socio-economic good will be better realized by all. Prime Minister has recently announced to celebrate July and August months in the current year as Water Months. Major aim of such celebration is to generate people’s awareness on water conservation. This is also organized in the Ministry of Water Resources and this Department provides necessary inputs for the same.”

54. While noting the measures being taken by the Government to ensure conservation of water, the Committee would like to reiterate their recommendation that analysis of factors leading to leakage and wastage of precious drinking water should be carried out while conducting surveys pertaining to drinking water availability, quality, etc. by various State Governments.



**Q. Unsatisfactory implementation of HRD and IEC programmes.**

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.117)**

55. The Committee had recommended as below:

“The Committee find that although the Department has agreed to give maximum attention to human resource management, the year-wise allocation, as could be seen from the data, made since 2001-02 when earmarking separate allocation was started, tells another story. They are stunned to note that during 2002-03 against the allocation of Rs. 10 crore, the expenditure indicated under the programme is ‘Nil’. They are not satisfied with the replies furnished by the Department that due to the restructuring of the programme, the funds could not be utilized. While expressing their unhappiness over such an attitude of the Department, the Committee would like that human resource management should be given priority and the allocation made for the programme should be meaningfully utilized.”

56. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“A policy decision was taken by the Department of Drinking Water Supply that funds already available with the State Government under HRD Programme are to be utilized during the year 2002-03 and only committed liabilities are to be met by Government of India in the financial year 2002-03 upto 31.03.2003. Accordingly, no new projects were sanctioned during the financial year 2002-03 and a part of the committed liabilities upto 31.03.2003 amounting to Rs. 2.87 crore were released to the States.”

57. The Committee are unable to comprehend the reply furnished by the Department on the issue of under utilization of funds earmarked for HRD and IEC programmes. They had, in their earlier recommendation, expressed their concern over nil expenditure position against the allocation of Rs. 10 crore under HRD and IEC programmes. The Department in its action taken reply has since submitted that a policy decision was taken by the Department that funds already available with the State Government under HRD programme are to be utilized during the year 2002-03 and only committed liability is to be met by Government of India in the financial year 2002-03 upto 31 March 2003. The Committee fail to understand the rationale of the said policy decision to restrict the

allocation of funds under ARWSP for HRD and IEC programmes. The Committee during the course of examination of Demands for Grants were apprised that Rs. 200 crore had been estimated for HRD activities during the Tenth Plan period keeping in view the priority given to the said aspect [*refer* para no. 3.116 of the 46th Report (13th Lok Sabha)]. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee while expressing their unhappiness on a vague reply furnished by the Department, would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation that human resource management should be given due priority and the allocation made for the programme should be meaningfully utilized.

**R. Performance of the Area Officers' Scheme.**

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.128)**

58. The Committee had recommended as below:

“The Committee find that the Department of Drinking Water Supply has an effective monitoring mechanism. It has an exclusive monitoring cell and the officers of the Department undertake field visits to monitor the programmes being implemented in various States. They are surprised to note that with regard to the findings of the said visits, nothing is said in the Budget documents, *viz.*, Performance Budget or Annual Report. The Committee would like that the Performance Budget should indicate the performance of the Area Officers' Scheme in the last two or three financial years, in a specific chapter. They hope that the Department would take care of this aspect during the next financial year. Besides, the Committee would also like to be apprised about the details of the field visits made under the Area Officers' Scheme during the last three years, their findings and corrective action taken thereof.”

59. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“Area Officers' schemes are being maintained by the Monitoring Division of Ministry of Rural Development. In respect of Area Officers, this Department detail to State Governments/Implementing Agency of the Schemes for follow up action/corrected measures. These points are also looked into in the subsequent visits of the officers.”

60. The Committee note that the reply furnished by the Department is vague as the various issues addressed in their earlier recommendations have not been responded to in the right perspective. The Committee had desired that:

- (i) the performance of Area Officers' Scheme in the last two or three years should be maintained in the Performance Budget; and
- (ii) the details of the field visits made under the Area Officers' Scheme during the last three years should be furnished.

With regard to item at (i) above, the Committee hope that the Performance Budget (2004-05) would contain the desired details. With regard to (ii) above the Committee would like to have the detailed information expeditiously.

S. Evaluation studies of drinking water supply schemes.

Recommendation (Para No. 3.129)

61. The Committee had made the following recommendation:

"The Committee further find that the process of awarding the work of conducting evaluation studies on the impact of drinking water supply schemes was decided years back in 1997 and in thirteen States only, evaluation studies were carried out. Besides, they also note that no evaluation study could be conducted during the year 2001-2002, though the process of awarding the work of conducting such studies was initiated from September 2001. Thus the allocated amount remained Unutilized. The Committee would like that the evaluation studies in the remaining States should be completed expeditiously. Besides, they would also like to be apprised of the results of such studies in the States where these have already been completed."

62. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

"31 districts of 14 States were covered in the second phase of the evaluation studies on rural water supply and sanitation programmes. Final reports of 7 districts (Kanker district in Chhattisgarh, Kullu and Una districts of Himachal Pradesh, Wayanad, Idukki, Palakkad and Pathanamthitta districts of Kerala)

have been received. On receipt of the final reports for other districts, we would submit the same to the Committee.”

63. The Committee are pleased to note that evaluation studies regarding the second phase covered 31 districts of 14 States and final reports of seven districts have been received by the Department. The Committee would like to be apprised of the final reports for the other districts, when received by the Department. The Committee would like to be apprised of the detailed evaluation of the findings of such studies. Besides, they would also like to be enlightened whether these studies are also being proposed to be undertaken in the remaining States and the time interval after which such evaluation studies are conducted.

T. Poor condition of rural sanitation coverage.

Recommendation (Para Nos. 4.19 and 4.20)

64. The Committee had recommended as below:

“The Committee note with shame that even after the completion of Nine Five Year Plans, only about 20-22 per cent of the rural population have received sanitation coverage. Moreover, the Committee feel that adequate fund is not being allocated for this top-most priority programme of rural sanitation. During the Ninth Plan period, though it was proposed to cover 35 per cent of the rural population with sanitation facilities, the target was reduced to 25 per cent due to resource crunch. The Committee are astonished to find that though on the one hand, proposed target was reduced by nearly 10 per cent, on the other hand, the Department could not even utilize the funds available with them during the Ninth Plan period, as expenditure during this period has been shown as Rs. 20 crore less than that of the outlay, *i.e.* about 3.75 per cent of the outlay remained unspent. Analysing the year-wise financial performance of the Rural Sanitation Programme, the Committee find that under utilization of funds has become a recurrent feature. For 2000-01, there is an expenditure shortfall of Rs. 9.14 crore, in 2001-02, Rs., 77.67 crore was the unspent amount and in the year 2002-03, provisional expenditure figure show Rs. 33.47 crore underspending. The Committee are of the view that, besides asking for increase in allocation, the Department should try to concentrate on optimal utilization of funds available,

in a meaningful manner. Moreover, financial allocation and expenditure should get reflected in the physical coverage, which is hardly found in case of Rural Sanitation Programme.”

(Para No. 4.19)

65. “The Committee note that the Department has phased out the allocation based CRSP in favour of demand driven, community participative projects under Total Sanitation Campaign. The Committee further note that as per the information furnished by the Department, only in 241 districts such projects are being run. They are worried about the position of the remaining districts, where such projects under TSC have not yet taken off. The Committee would like to be apprised whether such districts are getting any funds allocated under CRSP or have been left in the lurch. The Committee are of the view that the programme of TSC should be extended to the remaining districts expeditiously.”

(Para No. 4.20)

66. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“Central Rural Sanitation Programme was started in the year 1986 in an “Allocation based” mode. The programme had a top-down approach and it was not based on the community participation principle. Toilet units at a unit cost of Rs. 2,500 were constructed with sub-structure and *pucca* superstructure. The programme did not achieve its main aim of curbing open defecation, as latrines were constructed but not put to proper use by the rural people. The rural people were not made aware of health and hygiene gains to be achieved by using the latrines so constructed. Following the deliberations made at the National Conference in 1998, the Central Rural Sanitation Programme has been restructured and the demand driven participatory mode “Total Sanitation Campaign” was launched in April 1999. The allocation based programme since then gradually phased out and from April 2002, no allocations had been made and only TSC had been under implementation. Under TSC, the individual household latrine cost was subsidized for below-poverty line families. The basic unit cost was Rs. 625 upto substructure level, out of which Rs. 500 was the incentive from Government and Rs. 125 was the beneficiary contribution. The approach of the sanitation programme has changed and the

Department agree that the demand generation had not taken place at a faster rate as sufficient Information, Education and Communication has not taken place and the mindset of the rural people has not changed to the desired level. This was the reason for the shortfall in picking up funds during the Ninth Plan period. In the financial year 2002-03 itself about 20 lakh individual household toilets have been put up which is significantly higher than the achievement made almost in the entire earlier years. This proves the fact that if TSC could be implemented with right earnest, the practice of open defecation can be eliminated. A review of the scheme has been made in consultation with the States; and the States have overcome the initial glitches and are on their way to implement the TSC in a meaningful way with definite time frames.

(Reply to Recommendation at Para No. 4.19)

67. "The Department has set a goal that by the end of 10th Five Year Plan, at least 35 per cent coverage in rural sanitation could be achieved in the country and all the districts of the country would be covered under TSC. The progress so far is as follows:

As on 31 May 2003, 288 districts in the country have been sanctioned TSC projects with a total financial outlay of Rs. 2,870 crore, of which the Government of India share is Rs. 1,710 crore. Share of the State Governments is Rs. 622 crore while the beneficiary share is of Rs. 538 crore. About Rs. 421 crore has been released by the Government of India and Rs. 76 crore by the State Governments. The community contribution accounts for Rs. 38. crore. Total expenditure incurred till date is Rs. 221 crore. Under the TSC programme, about 240 lakh IHHLs, 21,544 women sanitary complexes, 2.43 lakh school toilets, 28,091 toilets for balwadis, and 2,252 RSMs/PCs have been sanctioned. As on 31.05.2003, 25.1 lakh household toilets, 30,429 school toilets, 1,050 women sanitary complexes, 3,887 balwadi toilets and 469 RSMs & Production Centres have been set up. The implementation has gradually improved and good progress is reported from about 126 project districts."

(Reply to Recommendation at Para No. 4.20)

68. While noting the progress of the Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) in 288 districts of the country, the Committee are not satisfied with the overall rural sanitation scenario. Going through the

achievement figures under TSC as furnished by the Department, the Committee observe that these are too insignificant keeping in view that TSC was launched in 1998, *i.e.* nearly half a decade back. But in these last five years, only in 50 per cent of the districts, projects under TSC could be taken up. The Committee would like to know the status of implementation and performance of the projects taken under TSC in these districts of the country. Further, the Committee had wanted to know the status of those remaining districts out of the 593 districts in the country which at present have not been sanctioned any projects under TSC. The Committee would like to know whether such districts are getting any allocation under the CRSP (which has since been phased out) or have been left in the lurch. The Committee note that the overall sanitation scenario in the country is very dismal and, in such a situation, if the regular allocation is stopped without substituting an alternative programme in its place simultaneously, whatever little progress was taking place would stop.

U. Sanitation coverage of rural schools: dismal scenario.

Recommendation (Para No. 4.21)

69. The Committee had recommended as below:

“The Committee note with serious concern that provision of sanitation facilities in schools is abysmally low. As per the Sixth All India Education Survey which was conducted about 10 years back in 1993, out of 6.37 lakh primary and upper primary schools, only 0.58 lakh have lavatory facilities, *i.e.* about 9 per cent. The performance during the last two years is also not impressive, especially in the North-Eastern States, where only 147 schools were covered in 2001-02, and 281 schools in 2002-03. The Committee are of the view that proper attention should be given to the provision of sanitation facilities to the school children within a limited time frame, particularly focusing on provision of lavatory facilities for girls in co-educational schools. Fresh assessment regarding coverage of schools should be carried out and an Action Plan worked out in this regard. Further, the Committee would like to be apprised about how the projects under TSC would be implemented in schools. The Committee further feel that in the absence of allocation based CRSP, school coverage will suffer. They, therefore, recommend that alongwith projects under TSC, certain allocation should be

made exclusively for provision of sanitation facilities in schools and till the time it is done, some allocation should be made for them to continue the already existing rural sanitation programmes in these areas.”

70. The Government in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“In the 288 TSC projects approved in the country, 2.43 lakh school toilets have been sanctioned. The guidelines of TSC clearly indicate that separate toilets for boys and girls at a unit cost of Rs. 20,000 and the sharing pattern is 60:30:10 between Government of India, State Government and the Parent-Teachers Association/GP. During the recent review meetings taken by the Secretary, Department of Drinking Water Supply, targets have been fixed to complete the rural schools toilets before 31 March 2005 in all the approved projects. The coverage of schools with toilets is picking up in North Eastern States. During the year 2003-04, action plan decided by the respective State Government officials of North Eastern States and Sikkim for construction of schools toilets is as below:—

Sl. No.	State	Action Plan of completing school toilets during 2003-04
1.	Assam	1,889
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	353
3.	Manipur	190
4.	Nagaland	341
5.	Tripura	829
6.	Sikkim	622
Total		4,224

As the construction of school toilets require minimum efforts for demand generation and putting those to use by children will be the entry point for the household toilet promotion, the TSC implementation will achieve the desired objective. It is not proper to revive the allocation based sanitation programme for schools which has been identified as one of the dampeners of the school sanitation programme. The States are fully alert and alive to the situation and substantial progress under this is expected in the coming months.”



71. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply furnished by the Government. They find that the bright and assuring picture that the Government have tried to portray through their facts and figures do not match with the ground reality which shows that only 58 thousand schools out of 6.37 lakh schools have the lavatory facilities, *i.e.* about 9 per cent of schools have been covered. Moreover, the Committee find that while the Government, on the one hand, are against reviving allocation based sanitation programme for schools, on the other hand, under the demand driven TSC, only 288 districts, *i.e.* not even 50 per cent have been sanctioned projects. The Committee are concerned about the fate of those thousands of schools in the left-out districts for which no projects have been sanctioned so far. Moreover, regular allocation under Central Rural Sanitation Programme has also been phased out for them. Therefore, the Committee feel that till such time TSC is extended to all the Districts/ Villages of the country, some sort of allocation should be provided especially to schools, for providing sanitation facilities so that the future generations are not deprived of the basic amenities due to lack of funds. Further, the Committee feel that a fresh assessment of the sanitation coverage of rural schools in the country should be carried out urgently and action plans should be made on the basis of such findings. The Committee are of the view that such assessment studies should be undertaken both in those districts of the country in which TSC projects for school coverage are being implemented and also in those districts which have not been covered so far.

The Committee were informed that for 2003-04, respective State Government officials of North-Eastern States have chalked out an action plan for completing school targets. The Committee hope that the targets fixed would be scrupulously adhered to with an expeditious implementation. The Committee desire them to be kept informed about the progress made.

CHAPTER II  
RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED  
BY GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Para No. 2.12)

The Committee feel that in the years to come, ensuring, sustainability and quality of drinking water sources will be the biggest challenge before the country. While the concerns relating to adequate outlay to be provided during the Tenth Plan have been dealt with in the next chapter of the Report, the Committee seeing the overall position would like to recommend that substantial allocation should be made during the Tenth Plan period under Sub-Missions dealing with sustainability and water quality. Further, the Committee note with concern that while the Government have been stating time and again that groundwater sources are fast depleting causing serious environmental and health problems, various Centrally sponsored schemes focus on the utilisation of groundwater, for example, through installing handpumps or digging bore-wells, which often go dry after a short span of time or become contaminated. Though the Committee understand that handpumps or bore-wells are a cost-effective way to provide drinking water, in view of the consequent hazards, thought should be given towards developing some alternative and cost effective technology.

Reply of the Government

There are about 3.7 million handpumps and 1,45,00 of piped water supply schemes in the country. About 85% of rural drinking water supply is dependent on ground water and 15% have surface water source. In places where surface water is not available, the drinking water schemes will have to depend upon ground water. In fact, only 5% of the ground water is used for drinking water purposes. However, the State Governments and Panchayats adopt conjunctive use of ground and surface drinking water sources for drinking water purposes. Use of traditional sources like wells, ponds, bawdis etc. as drinking water sources have declined. The scheme as implemented provides for taking measures for ensuring sustainability of water sources through rain water harvesting arresting run-offs, artificial and natural water recharge etc., known technologies are also adopted for reducing chemical and

biological contamination in the drinking water R&D projects for developing water purification techniques and wherever water contamination cannot be reduced due to physical constraints, alternate supply of water is also suggested. The Government have decided to revive one lakh traditional drinking water sources in the country during the two years (2003-2005).

#### Comments of the Committee

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

#### Recommendation (Para No. 2.13)

The Committee find that the problems of sustainability and water pollution are being addressed by different Central Ministries, which *inter alia* include, Rural Development, Agriculture, Water Resources, Environment and Forests, and Health. The Committee would like to recommend that a proper mechanism should be evolved to coordinate the functions of these various Ministries, when dealing with the same issues, under a nodal Ministry or Department. This would ensure concerted and well-planned efforts with centralised allocation of funds.

#### Reply of the Government

The recommendation is accepted. It is felt that the Ministry of Water Resources will be the right agency to be nodal Ministry to coordinate water source sustainability, prevention of water pollution and other associate issues. The Cabinet Secretariat has been requested to identify one of the Ministries as the Nodal Ministry for coordinating the functions of all Ministries in the Government of India level dealing with problems of sustainability and water pollution issues.

#### Recommendation (Para No. 3.3)

The Committee show their strong displeasure regarding the fact that funds allocated for the topmost priority programmes of rural drinking water supply and sanitation, could not be fully utilized even in a resource starved economy. They are distressed to note that during the Ninth Plan period, there was an underspending of Rs. 129 crore out of the total outlay of Rs. 9,098 crore earmarked for the Department. Moreover, the expenditure trend for the last three years indicate that whatever allocation was provided for the Department was not fully utilized. For 2000-01, there was an underspending of Rs. 72.59 crore;

for 2001-02, the provisional expenditure figure show an underspending of Rs. 109.62 crore and for 2002-03, expenditure figure upto February show a huge shortfall of Rs. 629.8 crore. The Committee observe that despite this fact of underutilisation of available resources, the proposed allocation amount for the Tenth Plan period was Rs. 28463 crore, *i.e.*, an increase of about 212.85 per cent over that of the Ninth Plan allocation. However, the Planning Commission agreed to an outlay of Rs. 14200 crore, which is approximately 56 per cent more than the Ninth Plan outlay. Moreover, there is a huge gap between outlay proposed and BE for 2003-2004. The Committee feel that under-utilisation is the main reason for getting lesser allocation from Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Government should take all necessary steps and gear up the State Governments/implementing agencies for the various water supply and sanitation schemes to ensure cent-percent utilization of scarce resources. Moreover, Action Plans prepared by the Department should be strictly followed, so that there is minimum mismatch between allocation and expenditure. The Committee would also like that the Government should make an indepth analysis of the factors, which lead to underutilization of allocated funds. The States may not be well equipped to ponder over this aspect isolated; the Government hand is necessary to study the ground realities and come forward with a viable and effective solution.

#### Reply of the Government

The observations of the Committee are accepted. Some of the State Governments, however, are unable to utilize the entire amount released to them due to reasons like non-release of funds on time by their respective Departments of Finance to the implementing agencies, inability to match the ARWSP releases with State share. The Central Government is constantly in dialogue with the State Government to accord higher priority to rural drinking water supply sector so as to ensure that the fund flow is smooth and schemes get implemented fast. This point is stressed upon during the review meetings taken at various levels and also during the visits of the departmental officers to the States. Formally, the State Governments have been addressed to ensure utilization of funds. Each of the States have been requested to indicate specific reasons for underutilization of funds once again in July, 2003. States have also been asked to prepare action plans—detailing physical and financial targets in a definite time frame. The final reported expenditure is Rs. 1672.13 crore under ARWSP.

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.21)**

The Committee note with concern that the financial position of one of the top-most priority programmes of the Government, *i.e.*, to provide potable water to the rural masses is plagued by various shortcomings:

- (1) Underutilisation of available funds has become a regular feature. For the Eighth Plan period, underspending of about Rs. 957 crore has been reported, while for the Ninth Plan period, expenditure was 109 crore less than the outlay;
- (2) Going by the Tenth Plan Working Group proposal, inadequate allocation has been made for rural drinking water supply, whereby around 50% of what was proposed has been finally sanctioned by the Planning Commission.
- (3) There is huge underspending of the funds released by the Centre to State Governments under this Scheme.
- (4) There is decrease in allocation release and expenditure under the State sector Minimum Needs Programme. The Committee find that whenever the attention of the Department is drawn towards underutilisation or huge opening balances with the different State Governments, a routine reply stating poor financial position of the State Governments, non furnishing of utilisation certificates, late release of funds to the implementing authorities etc., has been furnished. The Committee have been receiving the same type of reply for the last four-five years. The Committee are unhappy over the way the Department is giving reply to their recommendation relating to such a priority programme *i.e.*, providing drinking water to rural masses. They feel that instead of analysing the State-wise position and finding the problems being faced by each of the State Governments, with regard to implementation of the programme, the Department is simply sidetracking the main issues by furnishing a routine reply. The Committee would like that the reasons for underutilisation should be analysed for each of the States and the Committee apprised about the details in this regard. Not only that, the Government should find different ways and means to ensure proper utilisation of scarce resources and efforts should be

made to contain unspent balances. As regards the later release of funds, the Committee find that this is the problem being faced in almost all schemes of the Department of Rural Development. They find that late release of money lead to huge underspending and wastage of money and feel that this trend has to be checked to ensure proper utilisation of funds. As regards the problems with regard to providing matching share by some of the State Governments, the Committee would like that the position with regard to each of the States should be critically analysed and the information furnished to the Committee. By the mixed tactics of persuasion and compulsion, the State Governments should be impressed upon to properly utilise the resources. Innovative mechanism for cent-percent utilization of the resources is not forthcoming from many States. Though they need money, but many of them do not know how to channelize them for a fruitful purpose. Under-utilization makes it more pronounced. Many States require a direction from the Centre which is not forthcoming. There is no zeal either to do so. However, something needs to be done. In this context, the Committee would like the Union Government to play a more proactive role, with regular visits of the Central Government officials to monitor and evaluate the various schemes and also to assist and guide the State Governments in selection of viable projects. The Committee strongly feel that the Government cannot abdicate their responsibility by simply indicating the oft quoted causes. Much is expected out of them. The Committee hope to see something in the near future.

#### Reply of the Government

It is stated that the reply furnished by the Government is not a routine one but is one based on facts. The fact that when the reasons for underutilisation remain the same, the same reply is given every year. The States are requested again and again to utilize the funds released to them on time so that rural water supply schemes are implemented fruitfully. These points are repeatedly brought home to the States during review meetings, visit of officers to the States and other fora including visits of various Ministers to the States and the discussion by State Ministers and sometimes even with the Chief Ministers of the States when they visit the Ministry. As far as

Government of India is concerned, funds are released on time wherever proposals are received from the State Government complete in all respects. When the utilization certificates and AG certificates and other details requiring sanction of funds are not being provided by the State Governments, this has to be insisted upon for ensuring financial discipline. Delay on the part of the State Governments in furnishing these details naturally result in delay in the release of funds. As recommended by the Committee, tactics of persuasion and compulsions is all the time used to impress upon the States the need for proper utilization of resources. Directions from the Central Government in the matter were always forthcoming. In fact, this point and also the observations by the Committee on this are always brought to the notice of the States, every time as mentioned. Central Government play a pro-active role with regular visits of the Central Government officers to evolve various schemes and, also to assist and guide the State Governments in the selection of viable projects. The responsibility of the Government in this regard is clearly understood and never ever abdicated by simply indicating the oft quoted causes, which are indicated, and they are the actual reasons for under spending by the States.

The States, which sent, complete proposals before December were released funds immediately. The delay was only in respect of some States, which submit proposals either late or in incomplete form.

#### Comments of the Committee

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

#### Recommendation (Para No. 3.33)

The Committee note with strong displeasure that the performance of many States with regard to the coverage of habitations with drinking water facility, as indicated in the preceding paras, is very dismal. However, as per the Government data, around nine per cent partially covered or not covered habitations remain to be covered and the Government target to cover these habitations by the year 2004. The Committee are concerned to find that during the year 2002-2003, the Government targeted to cover 64,474 habitations, but could cover only 17,234, *i.e.*, around 25.3 per cent. With this pace of achievement, the Committee seriously doubt the claim of the Department to cover the total habitations by the year 2004.

### Reply of the Government

The habitation coverage for the year 2002-03 as per information furnished till March, 2003 is 48,880 (76.5%) against the target of 63,869. The figures keep changing as more and more States report the habitation coverage status. It is the endeavour of the Central Government to impress upon the States to achieve coverage of all habitations during the year 2003-04. This point is being impressed upon during the review meetings and visit of the officers to the States in addition, by way of formal communications. NC and PC coverage target for 2003-04 has already been fixed and intimated to the State Governments.

### Recommendation (Para No. 3.35)

The Committee further find that the Department has proposed to revise the existing norms to provide 40 litres per capita per day (lpcd) with a source within 1.6 kilometers in the plains and 100 metres elevation in the hills to 55 lpcd with a source within 0.5 kilometers in the plains and 50 metres elevation in the hills after the coverage of all NC and PC rural habitations. They welcome the revised norms but express serious doubt about its feasibility, taking into account ground realities at present. In fact, during the course of oral evidence, the Secretary submitted that in certain parts of Rajasthan, water has to be carried from a distance of 20-30 kilometers. The Committee wish to emphasize that greatest priority must be accorded to ensure that every habitation and individual is covered in rural areas according to the revised norms.

### Reply of the Government

The Department has already revised the existing norms only for the States where all existing habitations are fully covered with 40 lpcd water service level from 40 lpcd with a source within 1.6 km. in the plains and 100 metres elevation in the hills to 55 lpcd with a source within 0.5 km. in the plains and 50 metres elevation in the hills. However, the States have been cautioned about the progressively depleting ground water sources and take a decision to relax the norm with extreme care and evaluating the ground realities. Even after the habitations are covered with a source within 1.6 km. during the summer season, many of the sources may dry resulting in the shortage of drinking water. The sources already provided become defunct in such



cases. In extreme summer months and drought conditions, drinking water is transported from far off sources by rail and road tankers to ensure minimum supply to the rural population. In the absence of perennial sources, this has to be resorted to. Increasing use of water conservation measures would, however, help to some extent improve the ground water levels when rainfall is normal. However, successive years of drought aggravate the problem in many parts of the country, including Rajasthan, resulting in the need for transportation of water.

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

(Please see Para No. 19 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.47)**

The Committee find from what has been stated in the preceding paras that the Government propose to replace the allocation based criteria of funds under ARWSP with a need based approach to achieve the objectives of coverage within a time frame set by the National Agenda for Governance. At another place, it has been mentioned that Swajaldhara Scheme is meant for taking up only simple and basic community oriented schemes and not for capital intensive complex projects costing to the tune of several lakh of rupees. These types of projects would be taken under ARWSP. The Committee fail to comprehend the contradictory statements. On the one hand, it has been stated that ARWSP will be phased out and on the other hand, it is mentioned the capital-intensive schemes would be taken up under ARWSP, and simple schemes costing less would be taken up under Swajaldhara scheme. They would like the Department to clarify in this regard.

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

There is no contradiction in the statements regarding replacement of allocation based criteria of funds under the ARWSP with a need based approach to achieve the objective of coverage within a given time frame. In the existing ARWSP, operational high cost schemes can be taken up where the funds from Central Government and the State Government can be utilized. In the case of Swajaldhara, it is proposed to take up small schemes so that it becomes manageable by the community to operate and maintain the same. It is also proposed to increase the allocation for Swajaldhara thereby giving a thrust to the

Sector Reforms in drinking water supply by reducing the existing ARWSP allocation, which will substantially reduce the Plan and non-Plan expenditure of the State Governments on their PHEDs/Nigams/Boards. The schemes which cannot be taken up under Swajaldhara because of its high cost can still be taken up for execution by the State Governments from its own funds it may be noted that by and large the habitations have been covered and the efforts now on should be to ensure sustainability of the assets created and the systems developed. The 73rd and the 74th Amendments of the Constitution provide increased role for the panchayati raj systems and through the Swajaldhara, Government of India would be pushing the reforms by involving the communities, panchayati raj bodies, all the facets of the rural water supply, and progressively increasing provision under the Swajaldhara with corresponding reduction in the traditional supply driven ARWSP. The PHEDs/Nigams/Boards of the State Governments will have to be suitably re-organised/re-engineered to discharge their new role, as service providers, and manning in the district, major projects, head works etc. leaving intra districts/intra panchayat activities, hitherto managed by them to the Gram Panchayats and communities and beneficiary groups. Any capital costs to be met by the Department/Nigams can, however, be met by States under their MNP. Water provided to the users will also generate adequate revenue to the States for maintaining the reorganized PHEDs/Nigams etc.

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.48)**

The Committee have further been informed that capital intensive schemes of less than Rs. 25 lakh can be taken under Swajaldhara scheme, where the community share is 10 per cent of the cost. The Committee feel that in villages having less density of population, the bigger projects even costing less than Rs. 25 lakhs cannot be taken up. They feel that the burden on the below poverty line person to bear the cost of the project should commensurate with his capacity and the Government has to think over this aspect. They would therefore like that the said ceiling should be reviewed. The Government should think over it and revise the said norms. The Committee further find that Swajaladhara is a project driven scheme. They fail to understand the fate of the districts, which do not send any projects to the Union Government. They also fail to understand how the Government would achieve the set target of covering the total not covered habitations by the year 2004 alongwith addressing the problems of sustainability and contamination during the remaining years of Tenth Plan.

### Reply of the Government

In the Guidelines on Swajaldhara (June, 2003). There is no limit towards the cost of the schemes which can be taken up by the community. It has also been provided that the community contribution can be in cash, kind or labour. It is expected that this will lessen the burden on the part of the below poverty line families. Through intensive IEC programme, it is expected that panchayat/beneficiary groups from all the districts will take part in the Swajaldhara project. However, since only 20% of the funds are set apart for community led programmes, 80% of the funds for the time being, are available for coverage of habitations in the existing mode of implementation. It is expected that by April, 2004 all habitations would be covered with safe drinking water. The last two years of the 10th Plan period will be focused on covering the habitations, which have slipped back to NC/PC and also for addressing quality problems and sustainability issues.

### Recommendation (Para No. 3.49)

The Committee further find from the progress of the Sector Reform Programme, that it could be implemented only in 67 districts. They also find that the programme was started in 1999 and during the four years of implementation, the progress is not very encouraging. They note the concern of the Department over the less satisfaction level in the community inspite of spending crores of rupees during different Five Year Plans, and feel that community participation is the main factor in making a programme successful. However, as admitted by the Department, changing the mindset of people who have been used to get water free of cost, is a bigger challenge. Keeping this in mind, the Committee feel that more has to be done for spreading awareness among the rural masses. They find that the Government propose to mobilise participation of community through Information, Education and Communication (IEC) and Human Resource Development (HRD), which have been addressed in detail in the later chapter of the Report. They would like that adequate separate allocation for IEC and HRD should be made.

### Reply of the Government

Sector Reform Projects are pilot ones. This has been scaled up under Swajaldhara. In the Guidelines on Swajaldhara (June, 2003), it has been provided to release funds to the State Water and Sanitation Mission and the District Panchayat/District Water and Sanitation

Mission for undertaking activities on communication and capacity development. This is to ensure spreading of awareness among the rural people and to equip them to take informed decision on the drinking water supply technologies adaptable, acceptable and affordable by them. The Panchayats and communities assume the role of sanctioning, designing, implementing, operating, maintaining and managing rural water supply schemes.

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.50)**

The Committee note that in the Swajaldhara Programme, community contribution is a non negotiable aspect. However, they are concerned about whether people at the grassroots will be able to contribute their share, especially for O&M charges. It has been generally observed that though initial investment is enthusiastically done, main problem arises when the system falls into disrepair and the onus is on the local people to get it repaired. Due to mindset or poor economic condition, there is reluctance on the community's part to take responsibility of the system. The Committee are of the view that to deal with such apathy and to ensure O&M at the Panchayat level, a proper mechanism, for *e.g.*, agreement, etc., should be evolved, by which the Panchayat members and community at large will be held responsible for the O&M of the installed system. In this manner, the sustainability of the system can be assured.

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

It is provided in the Guidelines on Swajaldhara (June, 2003) that there shall be a Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Drinking Water Supply, Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India and the State Governments. This would ensure commitment of the State Government in the Water and Sanitation sector and to promote throughout the State of Swajaldhara principles. Amongst other needs, the MOU will ensure that the reform principles are followed by all the stake-holders *viz.* State Government, Panchayat Raj Institutions, Non-Government Organisations and user groups. Action points for all stake-holders will be identified, strategy agreed upon and implementation time frame laid down in the MoU.

It is expected that this measure alongwith an appropriate information, education and communication (IEC) strategy for building awareness and capacity development of the PRIs and community in the operation and maintenance of the systems will ensure proper O&M. It has also been provided that the Gram Panchayat/user groups

contribute to the O&M funds. Size of the corpus should be sufficient to meet the O&M cost at least or six months. Upon the completion of the Swajaldhara schemes and their successful operation for 12 months from the date of completion, Government of India may provide upto 10% of the capital cost as one time incentive to the O&M funds created by the PRIs/user group. The State Government should also make an equal contribution to the O&M fund. It will be left to the PRIs/user groups to charge for the services, and that flexibility alone, it is expected, will enable the PRIs/user groups to generate sufficient funds for the O&M. Capabilities of PRIs/user groups to will also be improved through appropriate HRD activities, and their confidence level to maintain the assets will improve; and, their dependence on the Government for O&M of the assets will come to an end. Especially also where the assets have been created with their full involvement and they were in the complete know of the O&M responsibilities, it is expected that through these measures, O&M of the drinking water system is ensured by the community.

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.51)**

The Committee also feel that to ensure proper maintenance of the systems provided under drinking water scheme, a procedure can be evolved, whereby revolving funds having some percentage of the total allocation under ARWSP, say 5% beneficiary contribution and 5% Government contribution can be made. The said fund can be deposited in a bank account of a Gram Panchayat in a specific branch or invested as per the prescribed guidelines to be issued in this regard. It should also be prescribed that the said fund could be used only for the maintenance of the specified systems provided under the scheme to the specific Panchayats. The Committee would like that the Government should consider this proposal to ensure proper maintenance of the various systems like hand pumps, etc. provided to community.

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

As stated in reply to 3.50, it has been provided in the Guidelines on Swajaldhara that there should be an Operation and Maintenance Fund (OMF) at the Gram Panchayat/Community level. This will be a corpus, to which Government of India and State Government would contribute as a one time incentive. Surplus of community contribution towards capital cost may plough into the OMF. It has also been provided that the Gram Panchayat/user groups contribute to the O&M

funds. Size of the corpus should be sufficient to meet the O&M cost. While raising funds towards community contribution for meeting the part of the capital cost of the project, the PRIs/user groups can raise funds for the O&M cost that will have to be met after the completion of the project. Upon completion of the Swajaldhara schemes and their successful running for 12 months from the date of completion, Government of India may provide upto 10% of the capital cost as a one time incentive to the O&M funds created by the PRIs/user group and the State Government should also make an equal contribution to the O&M fund.

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.61)**

The Committee note that the Ministry of Human Resource Development is also dealing with providing drinking water to rural schools and it has also set some targets in this regard. The Committee would like that there should be some mechanism to coordinate with the Ministries involved in providing drinking water to schools, so that there is no duplication in this regard and there is proper channelization of funds to the areas where the same are urgently needed.

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

As already stated in reply to 3.59, the steps have been taken to coordinate the activities as being undertaken by the two Departments, namely, Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, under their District Primary Education Programme, Sarva Siksha Abhiyan etc. and the Department of Drinking Water Supply to avoid duplication and also to ensure faster coverage of schools, better utilization of funds and also by utilizing the resources of the States to cover all the left out Government schools right upto the higher secondary level with adequate drinking water facilities in the country.

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.72)**

The Committee note with concern that every year, out of the funds earmarked for North Eastern region, a huge amount has to be surrendered to the non-lapsable pool of resources for North-Eastern States, which also has a bearing on the overall releases under ARWSP. In 2001-02, an amount of Rs. 31.31 crore had to be placed in this pool while in 2000-2001, an amount of Rs. 61.82 crore had to be surrendered. As per the information furnished by the Department, for the current

year, the surrendered amount is going to be Rs. 18.57 crore. Though the Committee appreciate the fact that as per Government statistic, there is a steady decline in the underutilisation of funds, a long way has to be traversed to deal with the grim situation of the North East. The Committee feel that instead of analysing the reasons as to why these States are unable to utilise funds released to them, the Department in a routine manner has stated that non-receipt of adequate number of proposals from these States is the main reason for this financial anomaly. The Committee recommend that keeping in view the specific environmental and socio-cultural conditions of these States, the Central Government should play a greater role to ensure that people here are not deprived of the benefits of the various developmental schemes that are being planned for these States. Merely sanctioning funds and leaving everything to the State Governments will not solve the problem. If non-receipt of project proposals is the main concern, then a proper mechanism should be evolved, whereby expertise, guidance and other necessary assistance can be given by the Central Government in identifying viable projects. Moreover, the Committee feel that involving local NGOs, and other such voluntary organisations will yield fruitful results. Moreover, State Governments should be asked to prepare Annual Action Plans in advance, so that funds earmarked for them are meaningfully spent. Thus, a multi-pronged strategy has to be adopted by the Government to ensure cent per cent utilisation of funds earmarked for the North Eastern States.

#### Reply of the Government

The States are repeatedly requested to give priority to drinking water supply sector. Periodical reviews are held State-wise to bring home the need for greater attention to proper utilization of funds and implementation of rural water supply schemes. Officers from the Department regularly visit the States, to provide the States support in areas identified as deficient. As a result of the concerted efforts made, the funds which have gone to the non-lapsable pool out of the funds released to North Eastern States during 2002-03 has come down to Rs. 4.85 crore. This has been possible only due to constant interaction with the State Government so as to ensure their giving higher priority to drinking water supply issues. State Governments are also asked to prepare action plans which are reviewed during the review meetings. As stated during 2003, the NE States have also spent all the funds released to them leaving only a nominal amount of Rs. 4.85 crore to the non-lapsable pool.

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.74)**

The Committee are concerned to note that in the absence of adequate number of project proposals, which as per the Government is the main problem plaguing the implementation of drinking water supply scheme in the North Eastern States, how the Government visualise that the community led, demand driven scheme of Swajaldhara, where project proposals are to come from the village level Panchayats, will ever take off in these States. The Committee recommend that to generate demand from the grassroots and also to motivate the State Governments, extensive IEC programmes are needed, whereby the advantages of the various developmental schemes are impressed upon the potential beneficiaries.

**Reply of the Government**

Intensive IEC to be undertaken at the village level to generate demand from the community, is a very important part of the Swajaldhara Programme. The experience of the Department has been that some of the districts in the NE region are doing quite well in the implementation of the community based, demand responsive programmes. The IEC carried out in the districts of West Siang in Arunachal Pradesh, Serchhip in Mizoram and West Tripura in Tripura has promoted community level drinking water schemes. A total number of 10,227 schemes have been completed and taken over by the community for O&M in these districts.

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.100)**

The Committee find that as per the guidelines/directions issued by the Union Government, 20% of ARWSP funds are earmarked for new projects under the Sub Mission activities. Besides, even the States can utilise more funds to tackle quality problems after taking the concurrence of the Union Government in this regard. They further note that out of 20% of ARWSP funds, 15% explicitly has been earmarked for water quality. While going through the information furnished by the Department, they find that only eight States have sanctioned the projects under Sub Mission for water quality problems. Keeping in view the lack of interest taken by the various State Governments towards the quality problem in drinking water, the Committee feel that only earmarking funds under Sub-Mission will not be sufficient. The State Governments should be sensitised about



the need to sanction more projects to tackle the quality problem in drinking water as analysed in the preceding para, this being the biggest challenge the country will be facing in the coming years.

#### Reply of the Government

States have been impressed upon the need for making use of the 15% funds under ARWSP for quality protection and 5% for sustainability issues. In fact, in the sanction issued during 2003-04, break-up of funds to be utilized exclusively on normal programmes, quality issues and sustainability measures have been given with the direction that funds be utilized as per the break-up. During interaction with the States through review meetings and officers' visit, this factor is repeatedly being focused so that States are sensitized on the need to sanction more projects to tackle the quality problems in drinking water.

#### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 39 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### Recommendation (Para No. 3.102)

The Committee note with grave concern that most of the water treatment plants installed to deal with various quality problems are defunct. Out of 632 defloridation plants, which have been installed, only 233 are functioning. Similarly, out of 150 desalination plants installed, only 77 are functioning, while 5742 iron removal plants are functioning, out of 9524 installed plants. The Committee feel that the Government should conduct a thorough analysis to find out the reasons responsible for such large number of plants going defunct. Moreover, regarding the issue of water testing laboratories, which are to be established in each district of the country, the Committee find that a lot has to be done in this regard. Out of 555 water quality testing laboratories which have been sanctioned, only 346 have been established so far, *i.e.* about 62%. The Committee recommend that establishing these water quality testing laboratories should be given priority and a thorough accounting of the funds given to the State Governments for this purpose should be made by the Government. Moreover, the Committee feel that rather than depending solely on these water testing laboratories, all resources at the disposal of the State Governments should be utilised, such as school and College laboratories etc. The

employees from these organisations may be trained to take up the job of quality testing.

#### Reply of the Government

The Government will take following steps:

- (i) Conducting thorough analysis to find out reasons responsible for large number of water quality treatment plants going defunct;
- (ii) Giving a very high priority for establishment of water quality testing labs;
- (iii) Utilization of resources at the disposal of the State Governments i.e. school and College laboratories for testing water quality.

#### Recommendation (Para No. 3.104)

The Committee find that as admitted by the Secretary, sustainability is of two types, (i) sustainability of system and (ii) sustainability of source. The Committee note that the problem can be sorted out by having an inbuilt mechanism for maintenance of water systems *i.e.*, hand pumps, borewells, etc. provided under the scheme. The issue has been addressed in detail in preceding paras of the Report. On the issue of sustainability of sources, the Secretary admitted that the country would be facing a major problem in this regard in the coming years. The Committee also note that various Ministries, besides this Department, like Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Water Resources etc. are dealing with this issue. They would like the Department to act in coordination with the said Ministries while taking the desired steps to ensure sustainability of sources.

#### Reply of the Government

The view of the Committee that the problem of sustainability of the system can be sorted out by having an in-built mechanism for maintenance of water systems *i.e.* hand pumps, borewells, etc. provided under the scheme, is a very welcome suggestion. Efforts are afoot to make the PRIs/user groups to own sector units and maintain them under the reforms initiated under the SRPs and thereby the Swajaldhara. Though this system exists in principle but in practice, this is not leading to sustainability of the systems.

The suggestion of the Committee that this Department should act in coordination with the other Ministries/Departments like Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Water Resources etc. is well taken and efforts will be made to have an Inter-Ministerial Group/interaction to address the issue of source sustainability through appropriate mechanisms.

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.105)**

The Committee find that the Government have not so far maintained any data with regard to the underground water table in different areas in the country. They note that Department of Land Resources has recently brought out the publication "ATLAS" by mapping the different types of wastelands in the country by remote sensing technology. They feel that to know the ground water table in respective areas, the Department can have a similar type of Atlas. They also stress that such mapping would not only help in having an idea of the problem as a whole in the country, that would need to be tackled in the coming years, but would also save wastage of money on providing the systems that go dry after a short span of time.

**Reply of the Government**

Preparation of Ground water prospecting Maps utilizing satellite data, SOI toposheets, hydrogeomorphology and validation of ground water have been entrusted to the NRSA, Hyderabad for the States of Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Karnataka, M.P., Rajasthan, Jharkhand, Himachal Pradesh., Orissa and Gujarat. About 1454 maps have already been released to respective States and remaining 994 maps are under preparation. The Department has advised NRSA to take permission of Ministry of Defence to use digitized format of the maps of that these maps can be suitably compiled and further analysis undertaken.

The Department agrees to the recommendation of the Committee to have an a Atlas of ground water table for the entire country by remote sensing technology and the said work is in progress. Steps have also been initiated to train the State Government officials in using the maps generated by the NRSA for optimizing resource utilization and developing exploration in the most scientific way.

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.106)**

The Committee further note that only 5% of the outlay has been earmarked for tackling the problem of sustainability. They find that

although the Secretary has admitted that this has emerged as a major problem, adequate allocation has not been earmarked for the purpose. They also note that as per the 10th Plan projections, after tackling the problem of NC and PC habitations, stress would be given to water quality and sustainability. They further note that second year of 10th Plan is going on 2nd and admitted by the Department given in the preceding paras of the Report, the tackling of NC and PC habitations would need more allocation and time due to being in difficult terrain areas. Keeping in view this overall scenario that is emerging, the Committee find that this is high time the Department should give priority to the issue of sustainability of sources without waiting for NC and PC habitations to be covered fully in the country.

#### Reply of the Government

To tackle the problem of sustainability, the Mission has earmarked 5% of ARWSP outlay for undertaking Sub-Mission Projects on Sustainability. However, State Governments can use more funds on sustainability depending upon the requirement. As such, there is no stipulation that more than 5% funds cannot be spent on sustainability. The Committee's view that sustainability should be given priority without waiting for NC and PC coverage will be brought to the notice of State Governments.

#### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 39 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### Recommendation (Para No. 3.107)

The Committee further feel that to tackle the problem of water table going down, a multi-pronged strategy should be adopted. While on the one hand the Government should give stress to rain water harvesting, on the other hand they should also encourage traditional sources of water like ponds etc. They also note that in India, there is no dearth of rain water, but the need is to use the rain water for re-charging of water as well as for using the rain water after storage. They also note that in some States very good work has been done in this regard. They also find that the Ministry of Water Resources is mainly tackling this issue. They would like that in consultation with the concerned Ministries, the Department should chalk out some strategy to solve the issue of sustainability of sources.

### Reply of the Government

The recommendation of the Committee that Department of Drinking Water Supply should chalk out some strategy to solve the issue of sustainability of sources in consultation with the Ministry of Water Resources is accepted and efforts will be made to bring in better coordination. This Department is also contributing its might to put up water holding structures, to arrest the run offs, recharge of ground water under the ARWSP. A scheme to take up 1 lakh traditional sources especially in the drought affected areas in the country as announced by the Prime Minister in his Independence speech on 15.08.2002 will also be undertaken and implemented during this and the next year. A sum of Rs. 700 crore has been provided for the same and the allocation for the current year to the States has also been made.

### Comments of the Committee

(Please See Para No. 48 of Chapter I of the Report)

### Recommendation (Para No. 3.111)

The Committee find that besides addressing the issues like accessibility, availability, contamination of water and sustainability of source, etc., as dealt in preceding paras of the Report, another issue need to be addressed, i.e., how to stop wastage of water. They find from the material furnished by the Department, that it has never thought of the necessity to maintain the data with regard to wastage of water due to mismanagement and leakage. The Committee feel that since scarcity of water is going to be the biggest problem in the country as is repeatedly being highlighted in the respective chapters of the Report, more attention needs to be given in this regard. To tackle this problem, the Committee feel that, besides, sensitizing the community about the need to conserve every drop of water, some punitive measures should be taken to tackle the issue. While appreciating that water management is a State subject, the Committee would like that necessary guidelines should be issued to the State Governments to take desired steps for conservation of water. Besides, to have an exact idea about the magnitude of the problem, the Department should include the factor regarding wastage and leakage of water in the survey being conducted by several State Governments.

### Reply of the Government

The Guidelines and Information Booklets issued by the Department of Drinking Water Supply to the States' Rural Water Supply Implementing Agencies from time to time do stress the necessity to conserve water by prevention of wastage due to mismanagement and leakage. Also the importance of conservation of every drop of water has been highlighted through TV spots developed by the Ministry of Rural Development. Further, to take up schemes for rain water harvesting and conservation, 5% of ARWSP funds released to the States are earmarked under Sub-Mission on sustainability. The Sector Reforms initiated by the Government of India and accepted by the States, when implemented, will result in reducing the wastage of water as the PRIs/ user groups will be owning most of the systems and will be fully responsible for their O&M. The concept of water being taken as a socio-economic good will be better realized by all. Prime Minister has recently announced to celebrate July and August months in the current year as Water Months. Major aim of such celebration is to generate people's awareness on water conservation. This is also organized in the Ministry of Water Resources and this Department provides necessary inputs for the same.

### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 54 of Chapter I of the Report)

### Recommendation (Para No. 3.112)

The Committee note that children can play an important role in this regard. They feel that more has to be done to sensitize children about the need to conserve every drop of water. For this purpose, they feel that in the educational curriculum, conservation of water should also be included. The Department should consult the Human Resource Development Ministry in this regard.

### Reply of the Government

On 23.4.2003 Secretary, Department of Drinking Water Supply, Ministry of Rural Development had a detailed discussion with the Secretary, Department of Elementary Education and Literacy on major aspects of drinking water and sanitation in schools. Both Departments are coordinating to make the State Governments take coverage action. In this background, the need to conserve every drop of water by

educating children and to emphasise in the text on conservation of water to be included in the educational curriculum, Ministry of Human Resource Development will be taking necessary action.

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.122)**

The Committee find that as per the restructured programme, Swajaldhara, people and their Gram Panchayat must shoulder fully O&M responsibility. As regards the role of general public in maintenance, the issue has been addressed in detail in the preceding paras of the Report but with regard to Gram Panchayats handling O&M responsibility, the Committee find that while thrusting the responsibility in this regard upon Panchayats, the Department has not addressed the crucial issue of capacity building which includes financial capacity of Panchayats, the key issue in this regard. They would like that the Department should address the said issue also while giving the responsibility of O&M to Panchayats.

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

Provision for capacity building of all stakeholders including functionaries of GP under Swajaldhara project has been made in the guidelines on Swajaldhara issued by Ministry of Rural Development in June 2003. Para 15.8 of the guidelines indicates that "Funds would be provided to the State Water and Sanitation Mission (SWSM) and the District Panchayat/DWSM to meet the expenditure on activities like Start up, Communication & Capacity development, Quality check, monitoring etc. This would be limited to 10% of the value of project proposals cleared during the year in the State under Swajaldhara. Even in respect of the normal ARWSP funds released, to the State Governments, they have been requested to make a available 15% to the Panchayati Raj Institutions for taking up O&M activities.

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.22)**

The Committee are of the view that the success of any developmental programme/scheme depends on the mindset of attitude of the people for whom it is meant. The Committee feel that information, education and communication (IEC) activities assume significant role in the context of sanitation programme. Campaign to

spread awareness among the rural people should be undertaken with special emphasis on educating school children. The Committee recommend that hygienic sanitation habits should be imparted to the younger generation through their school curriculum. Necessary steps should be taken in this regard to include lessons about hygiene and sanitation in school textbooks. In this regard, the Department of Drinking Water Supply should consult the concerned Ministry, *i.e.* the Ministry of Human Resource Development.

#### Reply of the Government

The Department fully agrees with the recommendation of the Standing Committee that imparting education on hygienic sanitation habits to younger generation through their school curriculum is essential. This Department has already communicated the message to the Ministry of HRD and they have intimated that they are taking necessary action in this regard.

#### Recommendation (Para No. 4.25)

The Committee appreciate the fact that the Government have identified the crucial interlinkage between access to safe drinking water and adequate sanitation. However, analysing the performance of the Department with respect to various water supply and sanitation schemes under implementation, the Committee find that very little has been done till now to adopt a holistic approach to deal with the twin challenges of providing drinking water and sanitation. As per figures furnished by the Department, while on the one hand drinking water coverage is improving, sanitation coverage is much lower than the optimal. The Committee feel that even today, sanitation programme is given low priority as compared to drinking water supply projects. They are of the view that this sectoral approach has to be done away with and it should be replaced with a holistic, cost-effective and environment friendly approach, because if both the issues are not dealt simultaneously, the overall scenario will not improve. Positive effect of safe water on health is dissipated by inadequate sanitation. Contamination of drinking water by biological such as faecal matters and chemical wastes is a major problem being faced in many areas. Moreover, conventional waterborne sewage disposal systems add to the waste of precious drinking water by misusing it as a transport medium for solid and liquid wastes. In this context, the Committee would like to suggest that the 'dual water policy' should be adopted,



so that precious drinking water is not wasted for other purposes. The Committee further recommend that appropriate technologies should be developed, whereby industrial or agricultural waste products can be optimally utilised. Innovative projects such as utilising the huge amount of waste heat generated from petrochemical or thermal plants for desalination plants, using renewable resources, such as solar energy or minerals like alum for disinfecting water in water treatment plants, etc., should be encouraged by the Government. The Committee feel that such projects will turn out to be economical in the long run and will also help in controlling environmental pollution. The Committee further recommend that private sector participation should be encouraged in this regard. Moreover, other stakeholders, such as communities, NGOs along with Government authorities should play a concerted role in adopting this holistic approach.

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

The Department completely agrees with the recommendation of the Standing Committee that water supply and sanitation should have a holistic integrated approach.

In most places, the ground water being supplied for drinking purpose is potable and specific treatment is not necessary. In some water problem areas, where water is a scarcity or contaminated, the ground/surface water can be treated in lesser volumes for supply as drinking water, while the non-potable water can be used for other purposes like ablution, washing, bathing, etc. This dual water supply system has been advised under the ARWSP to the State Governments.

As per the Standing Committee recommendations, we will include a component for innovative proposals under TSC for liquid and solid waste management which may also include composting, vermiculture, proper garbage collection and disposal, etc. as per the present TSC guidelines, Private sector participation including NGOs can be availed of by the communities for setting up and running Rural Sanitary Marts/Production Centers, helping the district implementing agency in demand generation through appropriate IEC etc.

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.26)**

The Committee are of the view that effort should be made to develop a number of model villages with cost-effective and sustainable

water supply and sanitation systems. They feel that such villages will serve as inspirational models and the neighbouring villages and communities will be motivated to adopt the model practices.

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

The Department fully agrees with the concept of developing model village so that effective inspiration would be created amounts the other parts of the country. In this context, the Department has recently introduced "Nirmal Gram Puraskar" wherein the 100% open defecation free Gram Panchayats/Block/District/State will be rewarded suitably along with awards for individuals, NGOs and Institutions who play prominent role in achieving this goal. This would certainly motivate the implementing authorities at various levels and it is felt that the bad practices of open defecation could be curtailed gradually and effectively. Further, Swajaldhara aims to develop community led rural drinking water supply schemes by which Gram Panchayats will become self-sustained in drinking water facilities.

### CHAPTER III

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

-Nil-

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

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.11)**

The Committee express a deep sense of outrage that 55 years after Independence, the respective Governments have not been able to provide safe drinking water to all people. The Committee find the Government's claim that more than 90 per cent of all rural habitations have been fully covered with drinking water facilities as completely unacceptable. The Committee wish to reiterate that coverage should not mean only accessibility, rather it should be redefined to include availability and quality of water along with accessibility. While the Committee have examined the issues of accessibility versus availability, contamination of water, sustainability of sources and systems, etc., in detail in the succeeding chapters of the Report, they may like to highlight here that there is a hiatus between Government statistics regarding coverage and actual ground reality. In this context, the United Nation's survey report as per which India ranks 133rd out of 185 countries with regard to drinking water availability and 120th out of 122 countries in respect of drinking water quality, is very disturbing and poses a question on the authenticity of the Government's proclamation that 100 percent coverage would be achieved by 2004. The Committee are of the view that rather than trying to portray favourable picture by manipulating data, the Government should concentrate on quality work, whereby the provisions of safe and sustainable sources of drinking water is made to the rural masses. The Committee feel that focus should be on ensuring sustainability of sources and systems, so that once covered habitations do not revert back to not covered categories within a short span of time, thereby dissipating resources invested so far. Moreover, assessment of the actual ground position of NC, PC, and FC habitations should be made a regular and frequent feature with the help of latest information technology methods, whereby data is regularly updated and is easily made available.

### Reply of the Government

The position regarding coverage of rural habitations with the facility of drinking water has been indicated based on the reports received from the State Governments. As per the Constitutional provision (State list) water is a State subject and the States have the powers to plan, design and implement water supply schemes in the rural areas. The complete machinery for implementation of the water supply schemes in the country is with the State Government. Government of India, however, support the endeavours of the State Governments by providing additional funds and latest technologies in its water supply, conservations, etc. As such, the figures reported by the State Government are taken into account for arriving at the status regarding coverage of the habitations. Admittedly, the coverage has become a dynamic feature due to a variety of reasons like the sources going dry due to over-exploitation of ground water, poor maintenance of handpumps, increasing pollution, thereby water getting contaminated, caused by depleting ground water, increase in population, industrialisation, competing demands on groundwater, leaching agricultural wastes into waters into water bodies, etc.

A fresh survey is also underway to assess the actual position. There is no reason to doubt about the figures reported by the State Governments. The Government of India have already taken measures for ensuring sustainability of sources and systems to ensure that the habitations once 'covered' do not slip back to 'not covered'. This can only be tackled if there is a judicious distribution of available water based on priorities. The State Governments have already been requested to enact legislation on control and extraction of the ground water, on which the rural water supply systems entirely depend.

### Comments of the Committee

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

### Recommendation (Para No. 3.59)

The Committee find that even after five decades of planned development, provision of safe drinking water in schools in rural areas could not be ensured. Even taking the figures collected and compiled nearly ten years back regarding number of schools, it can be seen that 3.51 lakh rural primary and upper primary schools are yet to be

provided with potable water supply. Moreover, analysing the performance of the Government in this respect, the Committee feel that they are not serious enough in fulfilling the target of school coverage. Every year there is a huge shortfall in the achievement of target. Moreover, the Committee find that out of the 2.02 lakh schools to be covered under schemes of other Ministers, the Ministry of Human Resource Development has proposed to cover all these schools under Sarva Siksha Abhiyan within a period of ten years, which is a long time period. The Committee are unhappy at this slackened pace of coverage of schools, and observe that if it continues in the same pace, many more years will be taken to make safe drinking water available to all school children. Therefore, the Committee recommend that Government should take up school coverage with utmost sincerity and work out a plan of action to provide drinking water in schools within a limited time frame, as the school children cannot wait for a decade or so, to have drinking water in the schools, which is a basic necessity of life. Moreover, as done for other programmes under ARWSP, a certain percentage of ARWSP and MNP funds should be kept for this purpose.

#### Reply of the Government

The State Governments have been requested to take steps to ensure that all rural schools are provided with the facility of drinking water within a period of two years, *i.e.* 2003-04 and 2004-05. The Department of Drinking Water Supply in the Ministry of Rural Development and the Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development have agreed to work jointly to ensure proper coordination of efforts being taken in the rural drinking water supply sector. States have also been addressed to coordinate the action taken by the two Departments at the State and field levels. They have also been asked to furnish an action plan to cover all the schools within a period of two years. It is proposed to monitor this aspect intensively, independently and jointly by the two Departments at regular intervals. In addition to the on-going schemes, it has also been decided to cover 1 lakh schools during 2003-04 and 2004-05 as per the Independence Day (15.08.2002) announcement made by the Prime Minister on 15.08.2002. Funds for the purpose have been separately released to the State Governments.

#### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 22 of Chapter I of the Report)

### Recommendation (Para No. 3.60)

The Committee further observe that on the one hand, the Government propose to provide free primary education, but on the other hand, even for a basic amenity like drinking water in schools, students are being charged. The Committee, therefore, recommend that under the Sector Reform principle or Swajaldhara programme, guidelines should be made a little flexible regarding school coverage. Provision should be made so that the 10 percent beneficiary share of funds can be contributed from the MPLAD funds. They would like that the Department should interact with the concerned authorities to make suitable amendment in the guidelines of MPLAD Scheme. Besides, the Committee are of the view that Government-aided schools should also be brought under the purview of the Government's school coverage programme.

### Reply of the Government

Involvement of the community is an essential ingredient in the successful implementation, operation and maintenance of the rural water supply schemes. The community will have a sense of ownership only when they contribute towards capital cost and involve themselves in planning, designing, implementing, operating and maintaining the schemes of their choice. Swajaldhara Guidelines provide for 10 per cent contribution by way of cash, kind or labour so that the community need not burden itself with cash contribution alone. MPLAD programme is another form of Government of India funding. Therefore, contribution from MPLAD programme cannot be a substitute of community contribution. Such contribution can be over and above the prescribed per cent of community contribution.

Government aided schools are privately managed schools. Private management has the responsibility to provide drinking water in the schools. Therefore, Government funding has been basically confined to the Government schools only.

### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 25 of Chapter I of the Report)

### Recommendation (Para No. 3.103)

The Committee further note that though it was initially decided to provide mobile water testing laboratories to each district of the country,

so far only 23 such laboratories have been provided in various States. Though the Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated that due to mismanagement and misutilisation, they have stopped sanctioning funds for mobile laboratories, the Committee feel that mobile laboratories are the most effective means to check water quality, especially in difficult and inhospitable terrain. Moreover, to keep a watch on the functioning of these mobile laboratories, the Committee feel that a proper monitoring mechanism should be evolved at the Panchayat level to keep a tab on the number of water sample tested per day/year by these mobile laboratories.

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

It was decided to establish water quality testing labs in each district of the country. It is also planned to provide 22 mobile water testing labs in difficult and inhospitable terrains. The recommendation of the Committee that proper monitoring mechanism should be evolved at the Panchayat level to keep a tab on the number of water samples tested per day/year by these mobile labs, will be examined.

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

(Please see Para No. 45 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.108)**

The Committee for the last two years have been drawing the attention of the Department, for the need of the hour to accept sea water for drinking and other purposes. They in their earlier recommendation (refer para 2.78 of 32nd Report) had drawn the attention of the Department about the need to explore cost effective technologies in this regard. From the data, the Department has given, the Committee find huge difference between the approved plants, installed plants and those that are functioning. They are appalled to know that only around 50 per cent of the plants are functional. They would like to be apprised about the reasons for such a high percentage of plants going defunct. Besides, as recommended in their earlier Reports made during the last two years, the Committee would like to stress that Government should give more thrust on exploitation of sea water for drinking and other purposes.



### Reply of the Government

The Committee's recommendation for the last two years about acceptance of sea water for drinking purposes has been taken note of by the Department. The various techniques available have been collected and provided to the States and they have been advised to use such processes to desalinate sea water and provide it for drinking purposes, in areas where fresh water is not available.

### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 51 of Chapter I of the Report)

### Recommendation (Para No. 3.117)

The Committee find that although the Department has agreed to give maximum attention to human resource management, the year-wise allocation, as could be seen from the data, made since 2001-02 when earmarking separate allocation was started, tells another story. They are stunned to note that during 2002-03 against the allocation of Rs. 10 crore, the expenditure indicated under the programme is 'Nil'. They are not satisfied with the replies furnished by the Department that due to the restructuring of the programme, the funds could not be utilized. While expressing their unhappiness over such an attitude of the Department, the Committee would like that human resource management should be given priority and the allocation made for the programme should be meaningfully utilized.

### Reply of the Government

A policy decision was taken by the Department of Drinking Water Supply that funds already available with the State Government under HRD Programme are to be utilized during the year 2002-03 and only committed liabilities are to be met by Government of India in the financial year 2002-03 upto 31.03.2003. Accordingly, no new projects were sanctioned during the financial year 2002-03 and a part of the committed liabilities upto 31.03.2003 amounting to Rs. 2.87 crore were released to the States.

### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 57 of Chapter I of the Report)

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.128)**

The Committee find that the Department of Drinking Water Supply has an effective monitoring mechanism. It has an exclusive monitoring cell and the officers of the Department undertake field visits to monitor the programmes being implemented in various States. They are surprised to note that with regard to the findings of the said visits, nothing is said in the Budget documents, viz., Performance Budget or Annual Report. The Committee would like that the Performance Budget should indicate the performance of the Area Officers Scheme in the last two or three financial years, in a specific chapter. They hope that the Department would take care of this aspect during the next financial year. Besides, the Committee would also like to be apprised about the details of the field visits made under the Area officers Scheme during the last three years, their findings and corrective action taken thereof.

**Reply of the Government**

Area Officers schemes is being maintained by the Monitoring Division of Ministry of Rural Development. In respect of Area Officers, this Department detail to State Governments/Implementing Agency of the Schemes for follow up action/corrected measures. These points are also looked into in the subsequent visits of the officers.

**Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 60 of Chapter I of the Report)

**Recommendation (Para No. 4.19)**

The Committee note with shame that even after the completion of Nine Five Year Plans, only about 20-22 per cent of the rural population have received sanitation coverage. Moreover, the Committee feel that adequate fund is not being allocated for this top-most priority programme of rural sanitation. During the Ninth Plan period, though it was proposed to cover 35 per cent of the rural population with sanitation facilities, the target was reduced to 25 per cent due to resource crunch. The Committee are astonished to find that though on the one hand, proposed target was reduced by nearly 10 per cent, on the other hand, the Department could not even utilize the funds available with them during the Ninth Plan period, as expenditure during this period has been shown as Rs. 20 crore less than that of the outlay, i.e. about 3.75 per cent of the outlay remained unspent.

Analysing the year-wise financial performance of the Rural Sanitation Programme, the Committee find that under utilization of funds has become a recurrent feature. For 2000-01, there is an expenditure shortfall of Rs. 9.14 crore, in 2001-02, Rs., 77.67 crore was the unspent amount and in the year 2002-03, provisional expenditure figure show Rs. 33.47 crore underspending. The Committee are of the view that, besides asking for increase in allocation, the Department should try to concentrate on optional utilization of funds available, in a meaningful manner. Moreover, financial allocation and expenditure should get reflected in the physical coverage, which is hardly found in case of Rural Sanitation Programme.

#### Reply of the Government

Central Rural Sanitation Programme was started in the year 1986 in an "Allocation based" mode. The programme had a top-down approach and it was not based on the community participation principles. Toilet units at a unit cost of Rs. 2,500 were constructed with sub-structure and *pucca* superstructure. The programme did not achieve its main aim of curbing open defecation, as latrines were constructed but not put to proper use by the rural people. The rural people were not made aware of health and hygiene gains to be achieved by using the latrines so constructed. Following the deliberations made at the National Conference in 1998, the Central Rural Sanitation Programme has been restructured and the demand driven participatory mode "Total Sanitation Campaign" was launched in April 1999. The allocation based programme since then gradually phased out and from April 2002, no allocations had been made and only TSC had been under implementation. Under TSC, the individual household latrine cost was subsidized for below-poverty line families. The basic unit cost was Rs. 625 upto substructure level, out of which Rs. 500 was the incentive from Government and Rs. 125 was the beneficiary contribution. The approach of the sanitation programme has changed and the Department agreed that the demand generation had not taken place at a faster rate as sufficient Information, Education and Communication has not taken place and the mindset of the rural people has not changed to the desired level. This was the reason for the shortfall in picking up funds during the Ninth Plan period. In the financial year 2002-03 itself about 20 lakh individual household toilets have been put up which is significantly higher than the achievement made almost in the entire earlier years. This proves the fact that if TSC could be implemented with right earnest, the practice of open

defecation can be eliminated. A review of the scheme has been made in consultation with the States, and, States have overcome the initial glitches and are on their way to implement the TSC in a meaningful way with definite timeframes.

#### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 68 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### Recommendation (Para No. 4.20)

The Committee note that the Department has phased out the allocation based CRSP in favour of demand driven, community participative projects under Total Sanitation Campaign. The Committee further note that as per the information furnished by the Department, only in 241 districts such projects are being run. They are worried about the position of the remaining districts, where such projects under TSC have not yet taken off. The Committee would like to be apprised whether such districts are getting any funds allocated under CRSP or have been left in the lurch. The Committee are of the view that the programme of TSC should be extended to the remaining districts expeditiously.

#### Reply of the Government

The Department has set a goal that by the end of 10th Five Year Plan, at least 35 per cent coverage in rural sanitation could be achieved in the country and all the districts of the country would be covered under TSC. The progress so far is as follows:

As on 31 May 2003, 288 districts in the country have been sanctioned TSC projects with a total financial outlay of Rs. 2,870 crore, of which the Government of India share is Rs. 1,710 crore. Share of the State Governments is Rs. 622 crore while the beneficiary share of Rs. 538 crore. About Rs. 421 crore has been released by the Government of India and Rs. 76 crore by the State Governments. The community contribution accounts for Rs. 38 crore. Total expenditure incurred till date is Rs. 221 crore. Under the TSC programme, about 240 lakh IHHLs, 21,554 women sanitary complexes, 2.43 lakh school toilets, 28,091 toilets for balwadis, and 2,252 RSMs/PCs have been sanctioned. As on 31.05.2003, 25.1 lakh household toilets, 30,429 school toilets, 1,050

women sanitary complexes, 3,887 balwadi toilets and 469 RSMs & Production Centres have been set up. The implementation has gradually improved and good progress is reported from about 126 project districts.

#### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 68 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### Recommendation (Para No. 4.21)

The Committee note with serious concern that provision of sanitation facilities in schools is abysmally low. As per the Sixth All India Education Survey which was conducted about 10 years back in 1993, out of 6.37 lakh primary and upper primary schools, only 0.58 lakh have lavatory facilities, *i.e.* about 9 per cent. The performance during the last two years is also not impressive, especially in the North-Eastern States, where only 147 schools were covered in 2001-02, and 281 schools in 2002-03. The Committee are of the view that proper attention should be given to the provision of sanitation facilities to the school children within a limited time-frame, particularly focusing on provision of lavatory facilities for girls in co-educational schools. Fresh assessment regarding coverage of schools should be carried out and an Action Plan worked out in this regard. Further, the Committee would like to be apprised about how the projects under TSC would be implemented in schools. The Committee further feel that in the absence of allocation based CRSP, school coverage will suffer. They, therefore, recommend that alongwith projects under TSC, certain allocation should be made exclusively for provision of sanitation facilities in schools and till the time it is done, some allocation should be made for them to continue the already existing rural sanitation programmes in these areas.

#### Reply of the Government

In the 288 TSC projects approved in the country, 2.43 lakh school toilets have been sanctioned. The guidelines of TSC clearly indicate that separate toilets for boys and girls at a unit cost of Rs. 20,000 and the sharing pattern is 60:30:10 between Government of India, State Government and the Parent-Teachers Association/GP. During the recent review meetings taken by the Secretary, Department of Drinking Water Supply, targets have been fixed to complete the rural school toilets before 31 March, 2005 in all the approved projects. The coverage of

schools with toilets is picking up in North Eastern States. During the year 2003-04, action plan decided by the respective State Government officials of North Eastern States and Sikkim for construction of schools toilets is as below:

Sl. No.	State	Action Plan of completing school toilets during 2003-04
1.	Assam	1,889
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	353
3.	Manipur	190
4.	Nagaland	341
5.	Tripura	829
6.	Sikkim	622
Total		4,224

As the construction of school toilets require minimum efforts for demand generation and putting those to use by children will be the entry point for the household toilet promotion, the TSC implementation will achieve the desired objective. It is not proper to revive the allocation based sanitation programme for schools which has been identified as one of the dampeners of the school sanitation programme. The States are fully alert and alive to the situation and substantial progress under this is expected in the coming months.

#### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 71 of Chapter I of the Report)

## CHAPTER V

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

#### Recommendation (Para No. 3.34)

The Committee further note that besides the challenge of covering, not covered or partially covered habitations, the main problem the country would face in the coming years is sustainability of sources. While this issue has been addressed in detail in the subsequent chapter, the Committee find that the Department is conducting a survey to ascertain the position of slippage of fully covered habitations into partially covered and not covered habitations. They also note that the State Governments have been requested to complete the survey by 31 March, 2003. They hope that the survey has been completed by now and would like to be apprised about the results, so as to know the ground situation in this regard in the country.

#### Reply of the Government

The survey to identify fully covered, partially covered and not covered habitations is going on. Information from the States is yet to come in. Identifying lack of finances as one of the reasons for the unsatisfactory progress of the survey, a decision has subsequently been taken to financially support the States upto 50 per cent of the expenditure; and it has since improved the pace of the survey. They have been requested to complete the survey by 30.09.2003 the latest.

#### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 16 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### Recommendation (Para No. 3.62)

The Committee, further, note that the Sixth All India Educational Survey was done during the year 1993 and after that the Seventh All India Educational Survey is being conducted at present, the results of which are still awaited. They find that such an important survey is conducted after an interval of ten years. They also note that actual

estimation of ground situation is the basic factor on which implementation of a programme depends and for such a priority sector like schools, ten years is a long period, because the number of schools changes from year to year. To overcome this problem, the Committee would like that some periodic State-wise survey should be conducted to have latest information about the number of schools, so that no school is deprived of the benefit of drinking water supply scheme.

#### Reply of the Government

The recommendation of the Committee has been brought to the notice of Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development for taking necessary action.

#### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 28 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### Recommendation (Para No. 3.73)

The Committee note that though the Government have portrayed a favourable picture regarding the status of coverage with drinking water facility, by stating that only 322 Not Covered and 16,876 Partially Covered habitations are left, which would be covered by 2004, there is a great variation between availability and accessibility of drinking water sources, especially in these hilly and difficult terrain of the North East. Keeping this in view, the results of fresh surveys to ascertain the latest status of rural habitations with regard to availability of drinking water supply as on 1st January, 2003, should be compiled at the earliest and in the light of this, a fresh assessment of targets should be made. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the survey report, which all the States have been requested to complete by 31st March, 2003.

#### Reply of the Government

All States including NE States have been requested to carry out the survey regarding the status of availability of drinking water. Information from the States is expected to reach Government of India before 30th September 2003.

#### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 31 of Chapter I of the Report)



**Recommendation (Para No. 3.75)**

The Committee find that provision of drinking water in the schools of the North Eastern States show a dismal scenario. In the year 2001-2002, only 280 schools were provided drinking water facility, *i.e.* 17 per cent of the set target, while upto December 2002, 22 per cent coverage has been achieved with 467 schools. The Committee are not convinced by the arguments put forth by the Department in this regard, that inadequate resources and lack of technical capacity are mainly responsible for such low coverage, especially in view of the fact that every year, a substantial amount is surrendered to the non-lapseable pool of resources due to underspending of available funds. The Committee recommend that first of all a proper assessment should be made regarding the number of schools, especially the terrain where they are located. Thereafter, the facts regarding coverage should be ascertained to find out the number of not covered schools and also whether sources and systems once installed are still sustainable or not. Only after getting the picture of actual ground reality, a practicable action plan within a time frame can be worked out. In this context, the Committee urge the Government that results of the Seventh All India Educational Survey, which is being conducted at present, should be compiled at the earliest and utilised to assess the actual ground reality.

**Reply of the Government**

All States included those in the NE States have been requested to make proper assessment of the schools in the rural areas to be covered with drinking water supply during this year and next year. It has also been brought to their notice that action being taken under District Primary Education Programme, Sarva Shiksha Programme of the Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development should be coordinated with those of the Drinking Water Supply Department to avoid duplication of efforts. States have been asked to draw an action plan accordingly. Separately, the Ministry of Human Resource Development has already been requested to come out with the Seventh All India Education Survey based on which the actual ground reality can be assessed. Department

of Drinking Water Supply will, however, help the States to provide water right upto the higher secondary level schools.

**Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 34 of Chapter I of the Report)

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.101)**

The Committee find that as regards the assessment regarding quality affected habitations, a survey was done in April 1999. Further, they also note that the State Governments are carrying out 5-10 per cent stratified sampling survey taking block as a unit, the results of which are still awaited from most of the States. They also find that some of the States have completed the survey. The Committee would like to be apprised about the details/status of the findings of the said survey.

**Reply of the Government**

The Committee would be apprised of the details/status of findings of water quality survey once it is completed. The States have been requested to complete the survey by 30.09.2003.

**Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 42 of Chapter I of the Report)

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.129)**

The Committee further find that the process of awarding the work of conducting evaluation studies on the impact of drinking water supply schemes was decided years back in 1997 and in thirteen States only, evaluation studies were carried out. Besides, they also note that no evaluation study could be conducted during the year 2001-2002, though the process of awarding the work of conducting such studies was initiated from September 2001. Thus the allocated amount remained unutilized. The Committee would like that the evaluation studies in the remaining States should be completed expeditiously. Besides, they would also like to be apprised of the results of such studies in the States where these have already been completed.

### Reply of the Government

31 Districts of 14 States were covered in the second phase of the evaluation studies on rural water supply and sanitation programmes. Final reports of 7 districts (Kanker district in Chhattisgarh, Kullu and Una districts of Himachal Pradesh, Wayanad, Idukki, Palakkad and Pathanamthitta districts of Kerala) have been received. On receipt of the final reports for other districts, we would submit the same to the Committee.

### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 63 of Chapter I of the Report)

NEW DELHI;  
20 January, 2004  
30 Pausa, 1925 (Saka)

CHANDRAKANT KHAIRE,  
*Chairman,*  
*Standing Committee on*  
*Urban and Rural Development.*

## APPENDIX I

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2003)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE THIRTY-FIRST SITTING  
OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 30 DECEMBER, 2003

The Committee sat from 1145 hrs. to 1315 hrs. in Committee Room  
'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

### PRESENT

Shri Chandrakant Khaire — *Chairman*

### MEMBERS

#### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri S. Ajaya Kumar
3. Shri Shriram Chauhan
4. Shri Shamsher Singh Dullo
5. Shrimati Hema Gamang
6. Shri Hassan Khan
7. Shri Basavanagoud Kolar
8. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
9. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
10. Shri Maheshwar Singh
11. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma

#### *Rajya Sabha*

12. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
13. Shri Prasanta Chatterjee
14. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
15. Shri Rumandla Ramachandraiah
16. Shri Harish Rawat

### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N.K. Sapra — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri K. Chakraborty — *Director*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

2. As the Chairman was stranded on account of diversion of flight due to inclement weather, the Committee chose Shri Prasanta Chatterjee, M.P., to act as Chairman for the sitting under Rule 258 (3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. He was in the chair till 1245 hrs., when the Chairman came and presided over the sitting.

3. The Committee took up for consideration the following memoranda:

(i) Memorandum No. 9 regarding draft action taken report on action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 46th report (13th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development); and

(ii) \*\*\*\* \*\*

4. The Committee after deliberating on various observations/recommendations made in the aforesaid action taken report adopted the same with slight modifications/additions as given in *Annexure*.

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

*The Committee then adjourned.*

ANNEXURE

(See Para 4 of Minutes dated 30.12.2003)

Sl. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Line No.	Modifications
1	2	3	4	5
1.	6	7	7 from above	<i>Add before:</i> “.....Schemes.” “Centrally-Sponsored.”
2.	22	22	4 from below	<i>Add after:</i> “..... top priority to school coverage” “especially to primary schools”
3.	40	45	5 from below	<i>Add after:</i> “.....applicable to all the districts in rural areas” “In this context, the Committee would like to reiterate that the Government should strive to implement the Scheme of providing mobile water testing laboratories in each district of the country as they feel that such mobile labs are the most effective means to check water quality, especially in difficult and inhospitable terrains.”
4.	42	48		<i>Add at the end:</i> “Further, the Committee would like to be apprised about the present status of implementation of the aforesaid Scheme. In this regard,

1	2	3	4	5
				they would like to be informed about the number of traditional water sources identified so far, which are proposed to be revived.”
5.	58	68	5 from above	<p><i>For:</i></p> <p>“But in these last five years, only about 50 per cent of the districts have been covered with TSC projects.”</p> <p><i>Substitute:</i></p> <p>“But in these last five years, only in 50 per cent of the districts, projects under TSC could be taken up. The Committee would like to know the status of implementation and performance of the projects taken under TSC in these districts of the country.”</p>
6.	61	71	6 from below	<p><i>Add after:</i></p> <p>“made on the basis of such findings.”</p> <p>“The Committee are of the view that such assessment studies should be undertaken both in those districts of the country in which TSC projects for school coverage are being implemented and also in those districts which have not been covered so far.”</p>

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004)  
EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE FIRST SITTING OF THE  
COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 13 JANUARY 2004

The Committee sat from 1515 hours to 1615 hours in Room  
No. 139, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Chandrakant Khaire — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri S. Ajaya Kumar
3. Shri Ranen Barman
4. Shri Padmanava Behera
5. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
6. Shri Shriram Chauhan
7. Shri Jaiprakash
8. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
9. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
10. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
11. Shri maheshwar Singh
12. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
13. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
14. Shri ravi Prakash Verma

*Rajya Sabha*

15. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
16. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
17. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
18. Shri Harish Rawat

SECRETARIAT

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



2. At the outset, the Chairman, welcomed the members to the first sitting of the Committee and congratulated them on their nomination to the Committee. The Committee then formally adopted two draft action taken reports on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Departments of Drinking Water Supply and Land Resources which were considered and adopted by the previous Committee (2003) at their sitting held on 30 December 2003.

- |    |     |     |     |
|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 3. | *** | *** | *** |
| 4. | *** | *** | *** |
| 5. | *** | *** | *** |
| 6. | *** | *** | *** |
| 7. | *** | *** | *** |

*The Committee then adjourned.*

---

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

## APPENDIX II

[Vide Para 4 of the Introduction]

### ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE 46TH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

I.	Total number of recommendations	42
II.	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government Para Nos. 2.12, 2.13, 3.3, 3.21, 3.33, 3.35, 3.47, 3.48, 3.49, 3.50, 3.51, 3.61, 3.72, 3.74, 3.100, 3.102, 3.104, 3.105, 3.106, 3.107, 3.111, 3.112, 3.122, 4.22, 4.25 and 4.26.	26
	Percentage to total recommendations	(61.90%)
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies Percentage to total recommendations	Nil —
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government has not been accepted by the Committee Para Nos. 2.11, 3.59, 3.60, 3.103, 3.108, 3.117, 3.128, 4.19, 4.20 and 4.21	10
	Percentage to total recommendations	(23.80%)
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited Para Nos. 3.34, 3.62, 3.73, 3.75, 3.101 and 3.129.	6
	Percentage to total recommendations	(14.28%)