

Annexes

Annexe-1.1 (A)
Process and Mechanism for Sampling
(Refer to para 1.5.4)

Ist Stage (Districts¹)	25 <i>per cent</i> of the districts excluding DDP districts from each region (subject to a minimum of two) were selected by Probability Proportional to Size Without Replacement (PPSWOR) method with size measure as total NRDWP expenditure during 2012-17.
	Out of 40 DDP districts in seven states ² , 25 <i>per cent</i> of districts (subject to a minimum of two) were selected by PPSWOR method with size measure as entire expenditure in these DDP districts during 2012-17.
	In each selected district, two divisions selected for detailed examination by PPSWOR method with size measure as total NRDWP expenditure during 2012-17.
IInd Stage (Blocks)	Within each selected district in the 1 st stage, 20 <i>per cent</i> rural blocks (subject to minimum two and maximum four) were selected by PPSWOR method with size measure as number of drinking water supply schemes completed during 2012-17.
IIIrd Stage (Gram Panchayats)	After having selected the sample blocks in the 2 nd stage, two <i>Gram Panchayats</i> from each block were selected on Simple Random Sampling Without Replacement (SRSWOR).
IVth Stage (Beneficiary survey)	From each selected <i>Gram Panchayat</i> , based on SRSWOR, four habitations were selected. For the purpose of impact assessment, 10 households were selected from each of the four selected habitations using SRSWOR.

¹ Maximum of 10 districts was to be selected.

² Andhra Pradesh (1), Gujarat (6), Haryana (7), Himachal Pradesh (2), Jammu & Kashmir (2), Karnataka (6) and Rajasthan (16).

Annexe-1.1 (B)
Details of habitations surveyed
(Refer to para 1.5.4)

Habitations coverage status	Fully covered	Partially covered	Quality Affected	Not covered by any water supply scheme
	1,279	976	39	28
Habitations covered through	Piped water supply	Hand-pump/ Tube-Well	Others	Not covered by any water supply scheme
	1,312	894	88	28
Source of supply	Ground water	Surface water	Others	Not covered by any water supply scheme
	1,738	535	21	28

Annexe-1.1 (C)
Profile of beneficiaries surveyed
(Refer to para 1.5.4)

Household/ Beneficiaries	General	Schedule Caste	Schedule Tribes	Others	Total
Male	4,506	2,815	3,032	4,742	15,095
Female	3,871	2,786	3,365	3,469	13,491
Total	8,377	5,601	6,397	8,211	28,586

Annexe-1.2
Details of Sample Selected
(Refer to para 1.5.4)

Name of State	District		Division		Block		Gram Panchayat		Habitation		Beneficiary
	Total	Selected	Total	Selected	Total	Selected	Total	Selected	Total	Selected	Surveyed
Andhra Pradesh	13	5	13	9	284	10	182	20	61	44	800
Arunachal Pradesh	16	4	7	6	25	8	299	16	149	64	640
Assam	27	9	17	13	107	23	296	46	1,394	184	1,840
Bihar	38	10	12	12	160	20	213	40	187	111	1,600
Chhattisgarh	27	8	13	11	51	16	1,347	32	251	113	1,280
Goa ³	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gujarat	33	10	19	17	81	20	1,197	40	87	73	1,600
Himachal Pradesh	12	6	12	12	38	13	446	26	387	104	1,021
Jammu & Kashmir	22	7	17	10	55	14	326	29	63	66	698
Jharkhand	24	6	8	8	90	19	340	38	848	152	1,520
Karnataka	30	10	10	10	60	20	748	40	293	160	1,600
Kerala	14	4	15	8	46	8	58	16	295	64	640
Madhya Pradesh	51	10	10	10	72	22	1,650	44	294	176	1,623
Maharashtra	34	10	0	0	126	27	976	54	109	85	2,160
Manipur	9	4	5	5	20	8	387	19	44	38	640
Meghalaya	11	4	7	7	16	8	1,653	16	39	35	640
Mizoram	8	2	6	4	8	4	94	8	9	9	90
Nagaland	11	3	6	6	22	6	142	22	142	22	220
Odisha	30	8	13	13	109	24	540	48	1,113	192	1,920
Punjab	22	7	17	11	48	14	318	28	30	28	1,080
Rajasthan	33	10	36	18	71	20	654	39	93	87	866
Sikkim	4	2	0	0	5	4	85	8	156	32	319
Tamil Nadu	31	8	0	0	102	21	583	42	552	168	1,680
Telangana	9	3	7	6	50	10	187	20	59	37	814
Tripura	8	2	3	3	18	4	102	8	68	31	321
Uttar Pradesh	75	10	47	20	118	27	1,834	54	397	178	2,160
Uttarakhand	13	4	16	8	43	10	913	20	133	69	814
Total	607	168	316	227	1,825	380	15,570	773	7,253	2,322	28,586

³ Goa was exempted from Beneficiary survey so no further selection after District was made.

Annexe-1.3
Name of Selected Districts
(Refer to para 1.5.4)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Selected Districts	Name of Selected Districts
1.	Andhra Pradesh	5	Anantpuram, Chittoor, Kadapa, Guntur, West Godavari
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	4	Papum Pare, lower Subansiri, West Siang, West Kameng
3.	Assam	9	Golaghat, Dhubri, Nagaon, Cachar, Kamrup Rural, Karbi Anglong, Udalgiri, Hailakandi, Jorhat
4.	Bihar	10	Nawada, Samastipur, Banka, Kaimur (Bhabhua), Muzaffarpur, Nalanda, Patna, Saharsa, Saran, Sitamarhi
5.	Chhattisgarh	8	Raipur, Kawardha, Bastar, Kanker, Rajnada, Surajpur, Jashpur, Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara
6.	Goa	2	North Goa, South Goa
7.	Gujarat	10	Banaskantha, Bhavnagar, Junagadh, Mehsana, Narmada, Navsari, Panchmahal, Surat, Surendranagar, Vadodara
8.	Himachal Pradesh	6	Kangra, Solan, Bilaspur, Shimla, Kinnaur, Lahaul & Spiti
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	7	Jammu, Reasi, Rajouri, Kupwara, Pulwama, Kargil, Leh
10.	Jharkhand	6	Dhanbad, Garhwa, Hazaribag, Palamu, Sahibganj, West Singhbhum
11.	Karnataka	10	Belagavi, Bidar, Chamarajanagar, Chitradurga, Gadag, Mandya, Tumakuru, Yadgir, Bagalkot, Koppal
12.	Kerala	4	Thiruvananthapuram, Kottaym, Kannur, Malappuram
13.	Madhya Pradesh	10	Gwalior, Singrouli, Narsinghpur, Chhindwara, Dhar, Khargone, Vidisha, Tikamgarh, Raisen, Ujjain
14.	Maharashtra	10	Pune, Sangli, Ahmednagar, Nashik, Nagpur, Aurangabad, Beed, Raigad, Thane, Buldana
15.	Manipur	4	Bishnupur, Churachandpur, Senapati, Thoubal
16.	Meghalaya	4	Jaintia Hills ⁴ , Ri Bhoi, West Garo Hills, South West Garo Hills
17.	Mizoram	2	Aizawl, Champhai
18.	Nagaland	3	Kohima, Dimapur, Tuensang
19.	Odisha	8	Ganjam, Nabarangpur, Nuapada, Jajpur, Mayurbhanj, Cuttak, Keonjhar, Sambalpur
20.	Punjab	7	Amritsar, SAS Nagar, Bathinda, Hoshiarpur, Fatehgarh Sahib, Moga, Patiala
21.	Rajasthan	10	Barmer, Bhilwara, Jaipur, Jaisalmer, Jhalawad, Kota, Jodhapur, Sriganganagar, Dungarpur, Tonk
22.	Sikkim	2	East Sikkim, South Sikkim
23.	Tamil Nadu	8	Coimbatore, Cuddalore, Dindigul, Karur, Nagapattinam, Pudukkottai, Vellore, Virudhunagar
24.	Telangana	3	Khammam, Mahbubnagar, Nalgonda
25.	Tripura	2	Dhalai, West Tripura
26.	Uttar Pradesh	10	Agra, Jhansi, Aligarh, Chitrakoot, Etawa, G B Nagar, Gorakhpur, Jaunpur, Rae Bareilly, Sonbhadra
27.	Uttarakhand	4	Almora, Nainital, Pauri, Tehri
Total		168	

⁴ District Jaintia Hills was bifurcated in two districts (East Jaintia Hills and West Jaintia Hills) on July 2012. Both these two district were taken as one district for the purpose of sampling due to non-availability of separate data of fund of these two districts with the department.

Annexe-1.4

Details of deficiencies, corresponding recommendation of PAC and status as per current audit
(Refer to para 1.5.5)

Sl. No.	Main Recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee	Response of the Ministry	Status as per current audit report
1.	The Ministry should issue instructions to the States to prepare and submit the Annual Action Plan (AAP) habitation-wise and such instructions should not be merely on paper but bring tangible results. (Recommendation No. 7)	AAPs are prepared at the district level and district level AAPs are combined at the State level to give State level AAP. AAPs prepared by the States every year are discussed with the Ministry. Habitations targeted under the AAPs are marked on the IMIS.	In 10 states, AAPs were prepared at state level without district level AAPs being prepared. (Para 2.2.3.2)
2.	The Committee, expressing concern over the delay in receiving proposals from the States, recommended that the Ministry should devise a strong Monitoring Mechanism in consultation with the Chief Secretaries of the States so that proposals are invariably received in time. (Recommendation No. 8)	Letters have been addressed to states to send proposals in time.	Instances of delayed submission of proposals were observed. (Para 2.2.3.2 and Para 3.2.2)
3.	The Ministry should evolve a mechanism within a time-frame whereby precise data with regard to the 'slip-back' habitations could be obtained. States should be impressed upon to ensure that habitation does not slip-back further and a quarterly report of the progress in this regard should be sent to the Ministry. Further, expressing serious concern towards a number of schemes lying as non-functional, the Committee desired the Ministry to look into this vital area and take necessary corrective steps for completion of all the schemes in time in every State. The Ministry may also consider withholding of financial assistance to the defaulter States. (Recommendation No. 9)	The Ministry had referred various reasons (<i>viz.</i> over extraction of ground water, irregular/deficient rainfall, contamination of water due to unchecked disposal of industrial/municipal effluents and extensive use of pesticides) due to which slip-back could not be eliminated. It can be certainly minimized/reduced by taking the corrective and preventive measures (such as sustainability of sources, construction of sustainability structures) for which states have been advised in various meetings/through letters. In respect of non-functional schemes, states had been asked to take all corrective/preventive actions to avoid the schemes to become non-functional.	Instances of slip-back habitations and non-functional schemes noticed. (Para 4.5.4 and Para 4.6)
4.	All States should assess the technical staff requirements and the Ministry should impress upon the States to fulfil the vacancies so that the Scheme could be implemented in an effective manner and quality water is available to the users. The Ministry should also periodically monitor the augmentation	During various meetings, the State Government officials have been requested to recruit/hire trained manpower urgently in the laboratories so that water quality testing is done regularly.	Shortage of labs, infrastructure and equipment for water quality testing were observed in several States. (Para 4.8.1)

Sl. No.	Main Recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee	Response of the Ministry	Status as per current audit report
	<p>of water testing in States through field visits or otherwise and ensure that these laboratories are functional at all times.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Recommendation No. 10)</p>		
5.	<p>The Ministry should pay more emphasis on water testing aspect and should increase the frequency of monitoring the quality of water. The Ministry should instruct the States to test all drinking water sources at least twice a year and for chemical contamination at least four times in a year <i>i.e.</i> every quarterly. The information so obtained should be put on the public domain.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Recommendation No. 11)</p>	<p>The Ministry will continue to focus on drinking water quality monitoring and coverage of water quality affected habitations during XII Five Year Plan and thereafter.</p>	<p>In all selected States, shortfall in carrying out prescribed tests were noticed. In addition, shortfall with respect to performance of envisaged tests against parameters were also noticed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Para 4.8.2)</p>
6.	<p>A future targets for procurement and distribution of Field Test Kits (FTKs) should also be fixed. Further, workers at the grass root level at GPs should be adequately trained to achieve the sole objective of providing safe potable water in each rural habitat.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Recommendation No. 12)</p>	<p>In the Annual Action Plans (AAP), targets are fixed for supply of field test kits and number of persons to be imparted training and refresher training on use of these kits.</p>	<p>Instances of non-procurement of required FTKs, non-utilisation of FTKs and expiry of shelf-life of FTKs were noticed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Para 4.8.2)</p>
7.	<p>Being a funding agency it was incumbent upon the Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation to monitor completion of projects without any time overrun.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Recommendation No. 15)</p>	<p>Ministry is using the IMIS to closely monitor the schemes being implemented by the States. During the AAP discussions, completion of incomplete schemes is given priority. States are urged to ensure completion of incomplete schemes before taking up new schemes.</p>	<p>Several cases of incomplete schemes, schemes that remained non-operational after completion and abandoned works were noticed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Para 4.2.6, 4.2.7 and 4.2.9)</p>

Annexe-2.1
Shortcomings in preparation of Annual Action Plan
(Refer to para 2.2.3.2)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Shortcomings
1.	Andhra Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Action Plans (AAP) were prepared without local participation. Further, the plan was not discussed in the SLSSC meetings for approval. • Preference to minority concentrated habitations and other backward communities, sustainability structures, coverage of schools and <i>anganwadis</i> with water supply were not included in the AAPs.
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AAP was prepared with base as 40 lpcd upto 2012-13. The department has not planned for any augmentation/improvement for coverage of water deficient habitations (habitations with 40 lpcd water supply) despite the existing water supply schemes were being below the prescribed norms of 55 lpcd. • Priority was not given to habitations with lower availability of drinking water.
3.	Assam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AAPs were prepared without having any input from the village/GP. • AAPs were submitted to the Ministry with a delay of four months during 2012-17.
4.	Bihar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AAPs were submitted to the Ministry with a delay ranging between 24 days and 78 days during 2014-17. • Water Quality Affected Habitations and low coverage habitations were not given priority.
5.	Chhattisgarh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 217 Piped Water Supply Schemes (PWSS) sanctioned with cost of ₹ 93.01 crore in 2014-17 were designed for 40 lpcd service levels. • AAPs were submitted to the Ministry with a delay ranging between three and eight months during 2012-17.
6.	Goa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AAPs were not approved by the SLSSC due to non-conduct of SLSSC meetings. • No planning for provision of drinking water in the schools and <i>anganwadis</i> was noticed in the AAPs even though 52 <i>anganwadis</i> and five out of 1568 schools did not have access to adequate drinking water.
7.	Himachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AAP was submitted to the Ministry with a delay ranging between two and five months. • Proposals of elected public representatives were not obtained for inclusion in AAP.
8.	Jharkhand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AAPs were prepared with minimum service level of 40 lpcd during 2012-17. • AAP did not prioritise habitations with partially covered population (0-25 per cent population) and quality affected habitations over habitations with fully covered population (100 per cent population).
9.	Karnataka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AAPs were approved with a delay ranging between five and ten months during 2012-17. • Basic information on which AAPs were prepared was not documented. • Plans for coverage of schools and <i>anganwadis</i> with water supply schemes were not included in AAP.
10.	Kerala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state AAP was prepared on the basis of details received from the divisions without having grass root level planning.

Sl. No.	Name of State	Shortcomings
11.	Madhya Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan did not contain the required aspect i.e., target, coverage of habitation, schemes, water quality monitoring, etc.
12.	Maharashtra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AAPs were submitted to the Ministry with a delay ranging between three and six months during 2012-17. None of the schemes taken up during 2012-17 were designed for water supply at 55 lpcd.
13.	Manipur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AAP was prepared based on 40 lpcd during 2012-16. Priority was not given to 0-25 <i>per cent</i> and 25-50 <i>per cent</i> population coverage habitations.
14.	Meghalaya	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AAPs were prepared without having any inputs from the districts and villages as well as any suggestions/proposals from the elected public representatives. All the schemes were designed to provide 40 lpcd till 2016-17
15.	Mizoram	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AAPs were prepared on the basis of data available at the department regarding the coverage of water supply in the habitations without receiving any inputs from the village/district levels. AAP was prepared with base as 40 lpcd till 2015-16.
16.	Nagaland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AAPs were prepared with base as 40 lpcd of drinking water supply during 2012-17 instead of 55 lpcd. Provision for water supply to the <i>anganwadis</i> was not included in the AAP.
17.	Rajasthan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AAPs were prepared without having community participation as well as suggestions/proposals of elected public representatives. Schemes/projects were prepared on the basis of 40 lpcd instead of 55 lpcd.
18.	Sikkim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target was not fixed for coverage in AAP regarding priority to be given for coverage of 0 <i>per cent</i>, 0-25 <i>per cent</i> and 25-50 <i>per cent</i> population covered in planning. The department targeted 40 lpcd in AAPs. AAPs were submitted to the Ministry with delay up to two months.
19.	Tamil Nadu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AAPs were prepared by taking service level of 40 lpcd and less.
20.	Telangana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no indication of prioritising habitations with 0 - 25 <i>per cent</i> of population covered, quality affected habitations, SC, ST and minority community dominated habitation.
21.	Tripura	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence of bottom-up approach i.e., involvement of PRIs in the preparation of AAP.
22.	Uttar Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In selected districts, AAPs were not prepared in bottom up approach. AAPs were not submitted for approval of SLSSC during 2015-17.
23.	Uttarakhand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AAP was prepared with base as 40 lpcd.

Annexe-2.2
SLSSC Meetings held during 2012-17
(Refer to para 2.4.2)

Sl. No.	Name of State	No. of Meetings required to be held during 2012-17	No. of meeting held during					Total	Percentage shortfall during 2012-17
			2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17		
1.	Andhra Pradesh	10	2	2	1	1	1	07	30
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	10	2	1	1	1	0	05	50
3.	Assam	10	2	2	2	1	0	07	30
4.	Chhattisgarh	10	1	1	2	1	1	06	40
5.	Gujarat	10	2	1	1	0	1	05	50
6.	Jammu & Kashmir	10	0	2	1	1	2	06	40
7.	Kerala	10	2	1	1	1	0	05	50
8.	Madhya Pradesh	10	1	2	1	1	2	07	30
9.	Maharashtra	10	1	1	1	1	1	05	50
10.	Manipur	10	1	1	1	1	1	05	50
11.	Meghalaya	10	1	0	1	0	2	04	60
12.	Mizoram	10	1	1	1	1	1	05	50
13.	Nagaland	10	1	1	1	1	0	04	60
14.	Odisha	10	1	2	2	1	1	07	30
15.	Punjab	10	0	1	1	0	0	02	80
16.	Sikkim	10	0	2	0	0	0	02	80
17.	Tamil Nadu	10	2	2	1	1	1	07	30
18.	Telangana	06	-	-	1	1	1	05	50
19.	Tripura	10	1	1	1	1	1	05	50
20.	Uttarakhand	10	1	2	2	1	1	07	30
	Total	196	22	26	23	16	17	106	46

Annexe-2.3
Shortcomings in functioning of WSSO
(Refer to para 2.4.5)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Shortcomings
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultants for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and Hydro-geologist had not been appointed since its inception. • WSSO did not carry out evaluation and impact assessment study and Research and Development (R&D) activities during 2012-17.
2.	Assam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSSO did not prepare plan for capacity building. State specific information, education and communication strategy for reform initiatives in water was not developed. • Evaluation and impact assessment study was not carried out.
3.	Bihar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staffs viz. Director, Consultants (Hydro geologist), Accountant and Data Entry Operator were not appointed in WSSO. • WSSO did not carry out Research and Development (R&D) activities.
4.	Chhattisgarh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Function of Evaluation and Impact assessment studies, software aspects of RWS sector, assistance to GPs in preparation of Water Security Plan was not done.
5.	Goa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSSO did not undertake any evaluation studies and impact assessment studies as well as activity relating to R&D.
6.	Himachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation faced shortage of staff during the period of performance audit.
7.	Karnataka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation did not involve in the preparation of water security plans and did not take up evaluation studies, impact assessment, development of IEC and HRD modules, research and development, Geographical Information System (GIS) mapping, etc.
8.	Manipur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Organisation did not take up evaluation studies and impact assessment of the programme.
9.	Meghalaya	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant (HRD), Consultant (IEC), Consultant (M&E), Consultant (Hydrogeologist), Consultant (WQM&S) and Consultant (Sanitation and Hygiene) were not appointed.
10.	Nagaland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation neither carried out the responsibility of preparation of water security plan in the state nor conducted evaluation studies, impact assessment and R&D activities.

Sl. No.	Name of State	Shortcomings
11.	Rajasthan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation couldn't achieve the autonomy as the organisation was functioning under the CE (Rural). Members from reputed CSOs¹, academic institutions, representative of GPWSC/VWSC were not nominated in WSSO. • Meeting of General Body of WSSO was not held during 2012-17 against the norms of at least two meetings in a year. • Director for WSSO was not appointed since October 2016 but additional charge was given to the Superintending Engineers (SE) working in the PHED.
12.	Telangana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSSO's involvement in preparation of water security plan including state specific information on education and communication strategy for reform initiatives in water and sanitation and new technologies and research on various aspects of sanitation, IEC strategies, etc., was not forthcoming from the records.
13.	Uttar Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members from Civil Society Organisation, academic Institutions, and technical institutes working in the sector, representatives of GPWSC/VWSCs etc., were not included in the organization.

¹Civil Society Organisations

Annexe-2.4
Shortcomings in functioning of DWSM
(Refer to para 2.4.6)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Shortcomings
1.	Andhra Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In all test checked districts, meetings were not conducted during 2012-17.
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instead of DWSM, DWSC headed by Deputy Commissioners of respective districts was constituted which didn't have PRIs and community representation in formulation, implementation and monitoring of water supply schemes.
3.	Assam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DWSM remained non-functional during 2012-17. All the functions of DWSM were performed division-wise by the respective Executive Engineers.
4.	Chhattisgarh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In all selected districts, Collector chaired the DWSM. The MPs, MLAs, Chairperson of Standing Committees of ZP, District Officers of Social Welfare, WRD and Agriculture were not members of the Mission/Committee in two districts². Remaining five districts did not produce records relating to DWSM.
5.	Goa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings were not held during 2012-17. DWSMs were chaired by District Collector. The Mission did not have representation of the MPs / MLAs as well as NGOs.
6.	Gujarat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instead of DWSM, District Water and Sanitation Committees (DWSCs) headed by District Collators of respective districts were constituted. However, elected public representatives were not associated in the committee.
7.	Himachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Mission did not have sufficient staff during 2012-17 as against the requirement of six consultants for each DWSM, one consultant was appointed. Follow up action on the decision taken in the meetings was not taken up in the subsequent meetings.
8.	Jammu & Kashmir	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DWSMs were defunct due to non-existence of PRI structure.
9.	Jharkhand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Against the required 40 meetings, four meetings were held in two districts during 2012-17. Meetings were not held in rest of four selected districts³. NGO was not co-opted as member by DWSM.
10.	Karnataka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings were not held in four⁴ selected districts during 2012-17. In other four districts the number of meetings held ranged from one to four. None of the selected districts except Chitradurga and Tumakuru, co-opted the NGOs as members of DWSM. DWSMs wherever constituted were also

² Raipur and Surajpur

³ Garhwa, Hazaribag, Palamu, and Sahibganj.

⁴ Bagalkot, Chitradurga, Koppal and Mandya

Sl. No.	Name of State	Shortcomings
		<p>not involved in formulation and approval of the activities under the programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Chitradurga, the CEO of ZP was made the President of DWSM instead of the Chairman of ZP.
11.	Maharashtra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In five⁵ districts, DWSM was not headed by Chairman of Zilla Parishad. In none of the selected districts Members of Parliament, Members of Legislative Assembly/Council were included in the DWSM. In none of the districts, members of NGOs were co-opted as members of DWSM.
12.	Manipur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no record of meetings of the Mission during the period of performance audit. It has no technical and professional persons(Consultant HRD, IEC, M&E and Hydrogeologist).
13.	Meghalaya	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Role of DWSM was limited to Swachh Bharat Mission (SBM).
14.	Mizoram	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instead of DWSM, DWSCs were formed in selected districts and their role was confined to Swachh Bharat Mission (SBM).
15.	Odisha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In seven out of eight selected districts, meetings were not held during 2012-17. Against requirement of eight staff members, DWSMs were functioning with two to seven staff members in six out of eight selected districts. In five⁶ out of eight selected districts, technical and professional personnel were not engaged.
16.	Punjab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings were not held during 2012-17.
17.	Telangana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Records were not available regarding meetings held by DWSMs in any of the selected districts.
18.	Tripura	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district West, only one meeting was held during 2012-17.
19.	Uttar Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DWSMs had three consultants against the prescribed six consultants of different specialised areas. The General body of the Mission met only six times during 2012-17.

⁵Ahmednagar, Nagpur, Sangli, Thane and Nashik

⁶Cuttack, Ganjam, Jajpur, Mayurbhanj, Nabarangpur

Annexe-2.5
Shortcomings in functioning of VWSC
(Refer to para 2.4.8)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Shortcomings
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though the VWSCs were formed in all selected GPs, the schemes/projects were being formulated at District Water and Sanitation Committee (DWSC) level without involving VWSC. This indicated that participation of GPs/village communities in planning and management of rural water supply was not ensured.
2.	Assam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VWSCs were only involved in sanitation activities.
3.	Chhattisgarh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12⁷ out of 32 selected GPs, did not have records pertaining to constitution of VWSC.
4.	Jammu & Kashmir	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though VWSCs were constituted in December 2013 they were not functional due to dissolution of PRIs.
5.	Jharkhand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VWSCs were not involved in planning, designing, approval and implementation of schemes in selected districts.
6.	Karnataka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VWSCs were not involved in the process of formulation of activities under the programme.
7.	Madhya Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 36 out of 44 GPs, VWSCs did not ensure community participation and decision making in all phases of village activities.
8.	Maharashtra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In three GPs (Beed: one GP; Nashik: 2 GPs), the VWSCs were not formed on the ground that they were not aware about the formation of VWSC.
9.	Mizoram	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VWSCs were mainly engaged with the operation and maintenance of the schemes but were not involved in the planning, designing and implementation process of the schemes.
10.	Telangana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In districts Khammam and Mahbubnagar, representation of persons from SCs, STs and poorer sections of the village was not ensured in any of selected GPs.
11.	Tripura	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though the Committee was constituted by the state government, joint physical verification in eight GPs showed their non-existence.
12.	Uttar Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VWSCs members were not involved in planning of water supply schemes.

⁷ Datrenga, Boriakala, Paragaon, Khiloura, Manikchouri, Piplawand, Bhanpuri, Borigaon, Koliyapuri, Luikona, Charaidand and Malda.

Annexe-3.1
Non-release of State share of funds (2015-17)
(Refer to para 3.2.3)

Component	Central-State fund share	2015-16	2016-17
		States which had not released their share	States which had not released their share
Desert Development Programme	60:40 (90:10)	Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka and Rajasthan	Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir
Natural Calamity	60:40 (90:10)	Assam, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh and Tamil Nadu	Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur and West Bengal
Earmarked Water Quality	50:50 (90:10)	Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand, Punjab and Rajasthan	Karnataka, Maharashtra
Support Activities	60:40 (90:10)	Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Kerala, Maharashtra, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu and Telangana	Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar, Goa, Jammu & Kashmir, Kerala, Maharashtra, Manipur, Odisha, Punjab and Sikkim
Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance	60:40 (90:10)	Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Goa, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Maharashtra, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand	Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Goa, Jammu & Kashmir, Kerala, Maharashtra, Manipur, Odisha, Punjab, Sikkim and Uttarakhand

Source: IMIS data of the Ministry

Note: Figures in brackets indicate Central-State fund sharing pattern in respect of North-Eastern and Himalayan States.

Annexe-3.2

State-wise position of releases, utilisation and outstanding balance of Central and State Share (2012-17)

(Refer to para 3.2.4)

₹ in crore)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Central Share						State Share			Total (Central + State)			
		Opening balance	Central Release	Misc. receipt (Intt. etc.)	Total	Expenditure	Closing balance	Release	Expenditure	Remaining balance (Grants – Expenditure)	Available Fund	Expenditure	Closing Balance	Percentage of unutilised fund
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11 (5+8)	12 (6+9)	13 (7+10)	14
1.	Andhra Pradesh	301.30	1,868.49	0.00	2,169.79	2,110.28	59.51	2,763.29	2,671.07	92.22	4,933.08	4,781.35	151.73	3
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	9.46	746.61	7.38	763.45	751.06	12.40	67.51	67.46	0.05	830.96	818.52	12.45	1
3.	Assam	127.51	2,401.67	19.29	2,548.47	2,238.89	309.59	773.51	703.56	69.95	3,321.98	2,942.45	379.54	11
4.	Bihar	285.65	1,548.89	1.52	1,836.06	1,751.09	84.97	1,631.78	1,314.83	316.95	3,467.84	3,065.92	401.92	12
5.	Chhattisgarh	80.82	579.69	4.96	665.47	638.61	26.86	642.34	607.49	34.85	1,307.81	1,246.10	61.71	5
6.	Goa	5.91	2.88	0.00	8.79	5.57	3.23	12.27	12.27	0.00	21.06	17.84	3.23	15
7.	Gujarat	327.59	2,155.53	0.00	2,483.12	2,457.26	25.84	3,406.55	2,652.94	753.61	5,889.67	5,110.20	779.45	13
8.	Haryana	43.98	1,055.09	3.91	1,102.98	1,072.67	30.30	2,229.80	1,919.06	310.74	3,332.78	2,991.73	341.04	10
9.	Himachal Pradesh	61.94	529.29	-27.66	563.57	533.49	30.09	581.76	264.83	316.93	1,145.33	798.32	347.02	30
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	147.04	1,780.99	17.86	1,945.89	1,888.01	57.87	266.88	259.92	6.96	2,212.77	2,147.93	64.83	3
11.	Jharkhand	74.31	935.72	51.90	1,061.93	981.30	80.62	1,458.90	1,185.41	273.49	2,520.83	2,166.71	354.11	14
12.	Karnataka	213.14	2,952.24	61.69	3,227.07	3,133.97	93.10	7,265.07	6,335.52	929.55	10,492.14	9,469.49	1,022.65	10
13.	Kerala	16.08	708.45	22.43	746.96	729.24	17.72	1,411.13	1,300.19	110.94	2,158.09	2,029.43	128.66	6
14.	Madhya Pradesh	32.54	1,880.68	30.59	1,943.81	1,907.82	35.92	1,984.46	1,779.93	204.53	3,928.27	3,687.75	240.45	6
15.	Maharashtra	320.10	3,020.31	0.76	3,341.17	3,168.35	172.82	3,102.15	2,711.80	390.35	6,443.32	5,880.15	563.17	9
16.	Manipur	17.72	278.58	0.00	296.30	267.27	29.61	147.52	132.45	15.07	443.82	399.72	44.68	10

Performance Audit of National Rural Drinking Water Programme

Sl. No.	Name of State	Central Share						State Share			Total (Central + State)			
		Opening balance	Central Release	Misc. receipt (Intt. etc.)	Total	Expenditure	Closing balance	Release	Expenditure	Remaining balance (Grants – Expenditure)	Available Fund	Expenditure	Closing Balance	Percentage of un-utilised fund
17.	Meghalaya	36.83	342.17	1.88	380.88	377.48	3.39	513.57	445.87	67.70	894.45	823.35	71.09	8
18.	Mizoram	6.80	169.12	0.55	176.47	177.19	0.14	42.59	34.78	7.81	219.06	211.97	7.95	4
19.	Nagaland	1.10	348.08	1.21	350.39	349.49	0.89	28.42	28.54	-0.12	378.81	378.03	0.77	0
20.	Odisha	84.34	996.47	48.76	1,129.57	1,076.14	53.47	1,079.93	992.93	87.00	2,209.50	2,069.07	140.47	6
21.	Punjab	30	484.28	0.00	487.28	460.63	26.64	974.57	743.32	231.25	1,461.85	1,203.95	257.89	18
22.	Rajasthan	397.00	5,648.16	96.79	6,141.95	5,527.04	555.31	3,700.81	2,553.76	1,147.05	9,842.76	8,080.80	1,702.36	17
23.	Sikkim	49.88	122.09	4.82	176.79	169.53	4.75	9.11	9.10	0.01	185.90	178.63	4.76	3
24.	Tamil Nadu	240.27	1,696.77	16.11	1,953.15	1,938.79	14.35	2,590.35	2,345.94	244.41	4,543.50	4,284.73	258.76	6
25.	Telangana	0.00	443.04	0.24	443.28	407.56	35.71	1,213.52	1,185.92	27.60	1,656.80	1,593.48	63.31	4
26.	Tripura	4.03	334.24	5.32	343.59	337.06	6.54	95.66	96.42	-0.76	439.25	433.48	5.78	1
27.	Uttar Pradesh	159.90	3,970.46	62.91	4,193.27	3,935.45	257.82	4,222.09	3,508.22	713.87	8,415.36	7,443.67	971.69	12
28.	Uttarakhand	239.27	421.62	16.16	677.05	624.37	52.66	386.45	452.07	-65.62	1,063.50	1,076.44	-12.96	-1
29.	West Bengal	417.10	2,076.28	35.28	2,528.66	2,507.87	20.78	3,659.76	3,326.20	333.56	6,188.42	5,834.07	354.34	6
30.	Andaman & Nicobar Island	0.00	2.06	0.05	2.11	1.07	1.05	3.40	2.30	1.10	5.51	3.37	2.15	39
31.	Puducherry	0.00	1.23	0.08	1.31	0.00	1.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.31	0	1.27	97
	Total	3,704.61	39,501.18	484.79	43,690.58	41,524.55	2,105.22	46,265.15	39,644.10	6,621.05	89,955.73	81,168.65	8,726.27	10

Annexe-3.3
(State-wise financial position under Coverage/WQ/Sustainability/O&M)
(Refer to para 3.2.6)

(₹ in crore)

Sl. No.	Name of state	Available Fund (2012 – 2017)			Expenditure (2012-2017)							Percentage Utilization of available funds
		Central (Opening + Release + Intt.)	State Release	Total	Central					State	Total	
					Coverage	Water quality	Sustainability	Operation & maintenance	Total			
1	2	3	4	5 (3+4)	6	7	8	9	10 (6 to 9)	11	12 (10+11)	13
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1,858.88	2,762.38	4,621.26	1,485.30	151.90	16.56	186.18	1,839.94	2,662.73	4,502.67	97.43
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	642.48	67.51	709.99	497.82	13.41	24.22	95.04	630.49	67.46	697.95	98.30
3.	Assam	2,127.49	773.51	2901	804.42	651.03	188.6	277.79	1,921.84	696.97	2,618.81	90.27
4.	Bihar	1,493.66	1,574.87	3,068.53	903.51	392.10	49.76	68.73	1,414.10	1,215.99	2,630.09	85.71
5.	Chhattisgarh	638.27	642.34	1,280.61	436.55	34.79	71.86	69.02	612.22	604.59	1,216.81	95.02
6.	Goa	7.03	12.27	19.30	5.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.57	12.27	17.84	92.44
7.	Gujarat	1,682.50	3,406.55	5,089.05	1,254.72	100.56	88.98	225.66	1,669.92	2,642.02	4,311.94	84.73
8.	Haryana	572.06	2,229.80	2,801.86	471.99	1.84	44.82	45.14	563.79	1,917.20	2,480.99	88.55
9.	Himachal Pradesh	509.05	581.76	1,090.81	297.38	44.05	49.55	65.74	456.72	264.52	721.24	66.12
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	1,761.61	266.88	2,028.49	1,371.64	36.18	103.99	225.74	1,737.55	259.92	1,997.47	98.47
11.	Jharkhand	911.37	1,458.90	2,370.27	589.93	86.28	78.51	91.84	846.56	1,157.90	2,004.46	84.57
12.	Karnataka	2,199.29	7,265.07	9,464.36	1,320.03	330.45	215.06	288.31	2,153.85	6,328.15	8,482.00	89.62
13.	Kerala	685.85	1,408.74	2,094.59	539.56	32.63	23.54	102.52	698.25	1,297.78	1,996.03	95.29
14.	Madhya Pradesh	1,815.34	1,956.22	3,771.56	1,269.68	80.87	150.20	292.98	1,793.73	1,742.86	3,536.59	93.77
15.	Maharashtra	3,018.01	3,102.15	6,120.16	2,054.41	342.13	218.28	277.70	2,892.52	2,711.80	5,604.32	91.57

Performance Audit of National Rural Drinking Water Programme

Sl. No.	Name of state	Available Fund (2012 – 2017)			Expenditure (2012-2017)							Percentage Utilization of available funds
		Central (Opening + Release + Intt.)	State Release	Total	Central					State	Total	
					Coverage	Water quality	Sustaina-bility	Operation & maintenance	Total			
16.	Manipur	284.24	147.52	431.76	186.58	2.89	22.44	44.78	256.69	132.45	389.14	90.13
17.	Meghalaya	351.86	513.57	865.43	257.50	5.12	38.13	49.35	350.10	445.67	795.77	91.95
18.	Mizoram	165.23	42.59	207.82	123.93	0.00	19.10	22.81	165.84	34.62	200.46	96.46
19.	Nagaland	320.25	28.42	348.67	197.49	49.21	23.99	48.69	319.38	28.42	347.80	99.75
20.	Odisha	1,040.66	1,079.93	2,120.59	694.90	84.24	122.00	105.67	1,006.81	992.93	1,999.74	94.30
21.	Punjab	456.18	974.57	1,430.75	305.73	21.49	42.67	61.17	431.06	743.32	1,174.38	82.08
22.	Rajasthan	3,222.90	3,463.34	6,686.24	2,115.07	405.85	285.19	402.45	3,208.56	2,367.10	5,575.66	83.39
23.	Sikkim	128.00	9.11	137.11	107.33	1.49	9.99	5.04	123.85	9.10	132.95	96.97
24.	Tamil Nadu	1,750.89	2,581.42	4,332.31	1,289.21	40.19	161.29	259.65	1,750.34	2,332.98	4,083.32	94.25
25.	Telangana	393.96	1,208.26	1,602.22	320.50	28.12	5.28	15.59	369.49	1,173.73	1,543.22	96.32
26.	Tripura	321.64	95.58	417.22	221.81	43.64	3.46	46.90	315.81	96.14	411.95	98.74
27.	Uttar Pradesh	3,393.01	3,694.66	7,087.67	2,084.87	328.01	249.59	534.07	3,196.54	3,144.98	6,341.52	89.47
28.	Uttarakhand	576.82	386.45	963.27	409.31	10.99	37.57	88.31	546.18	451.97	998.15	103.62
29.	West Bengal	1,771.27	3,352.18	5,123.45	1,224.68	212.48	55.06	274.06	1,766.28	3,018.54	4,784.82	93.39
30.	Andaman & Nicobar Island	1.84	3.40	5.24	0.24	0.53	0.11	0.00	0.88	2.16	3.04	58.02
31.	Puducherry	1.16	0.00	1.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	34,102.80	45,089.95	79,192.75	22,841.66	3,532.47	2,399.8	4,270.93	33,044.86	38,556.27	71,601.13	90.41

Annexe-3.4
(State-wise Financial Position under Support Fund)
(Refer to para 3.2.6)

(₹ in crore)

Sl. No.	Name of state	Available Fund (2012 – 2017)			Expenditure (2012-2017)			Percentage Utilization of available funds
		Central (Opening + Release + Intt.)	State Release	Total	Central	State	Total	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	60.11	5.08	65.19	58.92	2.34	61.26	93.97
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	33.12	0.00	33.12	32.69	0.00	32.69	98.70
3.	Assam	96.65	0.00	96.65	95.12	0.00	95.12	98.42
4.	Bihar	49.08	0.00	49.08	46.56	0.00	46.56	94.87
5.	Chhattisgarh	17.37	3.30	20.67	17.14	1.71	18.85	91.19
6.	Goa	1.55	0.00	1.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7.	Gujarat	95.52	8.21	103.73	90.21	6.71	96.92	93.43
8.	Haryana	17.77	2.39	20.16	16.66	1.32	17.98	89.19
9.	Himachal Pradesh	22.91	0.23	23.14	22.71	0.19	22.90	98.96
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	48.04	0.00	48.04	21.47	0.00	21.47	44.69
11.	Jharkhand	32.45	7.11	39.56	31.66	4.65	36.31	91.78
12.	Karnataka	76.00	14.80	90.80	70.24	7.37	77.61	85.47
13.	Kerala	19.45	0.00	19.45	19.33	0.00	19.33	99.38
14.	Madhya Pradesh	65.01	14.67	79.68	57.22	6.83	64.05	80.38
15.	Maharashtra	165.07	0.00	165.07	149.20	0.00	149.20	90.39
16.	Manipur	8.65	0.00	8.65	8.64	0.00	8.64	99.88
17.	Meghalaya	9.38	0.11	9.49	9.32	0.11	9.43	99.37

Sl. No.	Name of state	Available Fund (2012 – 2017)			Expenditure (2012-2017)			Percentage Utilization of available funds
		Central (Opening + Release + Intt.)	State Release	Total	Central	State	Total	
18.	Mizoram	7.17	0.10	7.27	7.32	0.10	7.42	102.06
19.	Nagaland	11.12	0.07	11.19	11.37	0.07	11.44	102.23
20.	Odisha	37.31	0.00	37.31	33.04	0.00	33.04	88.56
21.	Punjab	15.26	0.00	15.26	14.92	0.00	14.92	97.77
22.	Rajasthan	118.39	5.00	123.39	84.38	0.00	84.38	68.38
23.	Sikkim	2.67	0.00	2.67	2.64	0.00	2.64	98.88
24.	Tamil Nadu	75.73	5.82	81.55	73.52	5.57	79.09	96.98
25.	Telangana	22.22	3.25	25.47	17.11	3.23	20.34	79.86
26.	Tripura	14.94	0.36	15.30	14.70	0.14	14.84	96.99
27.	Uttar Pradesh	148.56	58.16	206.72	148.15	22.57	170.72	82.59
28.	Uttarakhand	17.52	0.10	17.62	16.34	0.10	16.44	93.30
29.	West Bengal	88.11	13.12	101.23	88.10	12.62	100.72	99.50
30.	Andaman & Nicobar Island	0.21	0.77	0.98	0.15	0.14	0.29	29.59
31.	Puducherry	0.09	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	1,377.43	142.65	1,520.08	1,258.83	75.77	1,334.6	87.80

Annexe-3.5
(State-wise financial position under Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance)
(Refer to para 3.2.6)

(₹ in crore)

Sl. No.	Name of state	Available Fund (2012 – 2017)			Expenditure (2012-2017)			Percentage Utilization of available funds
		Central (Opening + Release + Intt.)	State Release	Total	Central	State	Total	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	52.30	5.25	57.55	51.92	5.21	57.13	99.27
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	17.23	0.00	17.23	17.21	0.00	17.21	99.88
3.	Assam	62.73	0.00	62.73	60.99	0.00	60.99	97.23
4.	Bihar	25.94	0.00	25.94	25.01	0.00	25.01	96.41
5.	Chhattisgarh	9.79	1.55	11.34	9.26	1.19	10.45	92.15
6.	Goa	0.22	0.00	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7.	Gujarat	31.17	4.65	35.82	29.86	4.22	34.08	95.14
8.	Haryana	9.96	1.67	11.63	9.38	0.54	9.92	85.30
9.	Himachal Pradesh	11.18	0.14	11.32	10.55	0.12	10.67	94.26
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	35.30	0.00	35.3	31.63	0.00	31.63	89.60
11.	Jharkhand	18.96	1.33	20.29	17.85	0.90	18.75	92.41
12.	Karnataka	45.47	5.34	50.81	37.20	0.00	37.20	73.21
13.	Kerala	9.26	0.00	9.26	9.26	0.00	9.26	100.00
14.	Madhya Pradesh	37.76	10.84	48.60	34.32	5.25	39.57	81.42
15.	Maharashtra	86.76	0.00	86.76	85.02	0.00	85.02	97.99
16.	Manipur	2.18	0.00	2.18	1.93	0.00	1.93	88.53
17.	Meghalaya	4.62	0.09	4.71	3.06	0.09	3.15	66.88
18.	Mizoram	4.04	0.06	4.10	4.03	0.06	4.09	99.76

Sl. No.	Name of state	Available Fund (2012 – 2017)			Expenditure (2012-2017)			Percentage Utilization of available funds
		Central (Opening + Release + Intt.)	State Release	Total	Central	State	Total	
19.	Nagaland	5.06	0.04	5.10	5.06	0.04	5.10	100.00
20.	Odisha	18.55	0.00	18.55	16.97	0.00	16.97	91.48
21.	Punjab	15.51	0.00	15.51	14.38	0.00	14.38	92.71
22.	Rajasthan	32.08	0.95	33.03	25.65	0.34	25.99	78.69
23.	Sikkim	1.73	0.00	1.73	1.63	0.00	1.63	94.22
24.	Tamil Nadu	42.33	2.40	44.73	39.30	2.09	41.39	92.53
25.	Telangana	14.47	3.71	18.18	14.47	3.71	18.18	100.00
26.	Tripura	5.46	0.07	5.53	5.16	0.07	5.23	94.58
27.	Uttar Pradesh	78.29	19.04	97.33	72.05	16.20	88.25	90.67
28.	Uttarakhand	11.25	0.00	11.25	9.16	0.00	9.16	81.42
29.	West Bengal	49.44	7.87	57.31	49.44	7.87	57.31	100.00
30.	Andaman & Nicobar Island	0.09	0.00	0.09	0.05	0.00	0.05	55.56
31.	Puducherry	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
32.	Total	739.19	65.00	804.19	691.80	47.90	739.70	91.98

Annexe-3.6
State-wise Release and Expenditure under earmarked water quality (2012-2017)
(Refer to para 3.4)

(₹ in crore)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Central				State				Total (Central and State)		
		Earmarked Funding (Chemical)		Earmarked Funding (Bacterial)		Earmarked Funding (Chemical)		Earmarked Funding (Bacterial)		Earmarked Funding (Chemical + Bacterial)		
		Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	% of Expr. of Release
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2.13	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.91	0.78	0.00	0.00	3.04	1.56	51.32
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3.	Assam	46.08	40.50	2.56	2.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	48.64	42.99	88.38
4.	Bihar	80.95	78.46	13.82	13.37	33.00	31.92	4.32	4.18	132.09	127.93	96.85
5.	Chhattisgarh	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6.	Goa	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7.	Gujarat	1.52	1.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.52	1.14	75.00
8.	Haryana	0.42	0.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.42	0.42	100.00
9.	Himachal Pradesh	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
11.	Jharkhand	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.00
12.	Karnataka	135.93	117.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	135.93	117.31	86.30
13.	Kerala	2.39	2.40	0.00	0.00	2.41	2.41	0.00	0.00	4.80	4.81	100.21
14.	Madhya Pradesh	22.53	22.53	0.00	0.00	28.23	24.99	0.00	0.00	50.76	47.52	93.62
15.	Maharashtra	38.42	23.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	38.42	23.55	61.30
16.	Manipur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
17.	Meghalaya	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
18.	Mizoram	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
19.	Nagaland	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.05	100.00
20.	Odisha	2.78	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.78	0.57	20.50
21.	Punjab	0.30	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.25	83.33
22.	Rajasthan	104.78	78.07	0.00	0.00	20.58	6.62	0.00	0.00	125.36	84.69	67.56
23.	Sikkim	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Performance Audit of National Rural Drinking Water Programme

Sl. No.	Name of State	Central				State				Total (Central and State)		
		Earmarked Funding (Chemical)		Earmarked Funding (Bacterial)		Earmarked Funding (Chemical)		Earmarked Funding (Bacterial)		Earmarked Funding (Chemical + Bacterial)		
		Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	% of Expr. of Release
24.	Tamil Nadu	0.24	0.23	6.69	6.06	0.36	0.22	8.57	5.08	15.86	11.59	73.08
25.	Telangana	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
26.	Tripura	1.38	1.38	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.08	0.00	0.00	1.46	1.46	100.00
27.	Uttar Pradesh	14.57	14.56	282.41	291.58	0.00	0.00	503.88	279.16	800.86	585.30	73.08
28.	Uttarakhand	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
29.	West Bengal	386.30	386.28	5.24	4.97	133.82	122.14	3.76	2.57	529.12	515.96	97.51
30.	Andaman & Nicobar Island	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
31.	Puducherry	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	840.94	768.48	310.72	318.47	219.39	189.16	520.53	290.99	1,891.58	1,567.10	82.85

Annexe-3.7

Delay in release of fund by state government during 2012-17

(Refer to para 3.6.1)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Delay released	
		Amount (₹ in crore)	Period
1.	Andhra Pradesh	655.27	12 to 249 days
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	73.52	30 to 150 days
3.	Assam	545.87	2 to 59 days
4.	Bihar	6.28	81 days
5.	Jharkhand	1,194.25	1 to 180 days
6.	Karnataka	695.44	1 to 127 days
7.	Kerala	247.37	6 to 98 days
8.	Maharashtra	1,151.01	up to 365 days
9.	Meghalaya	84.86	7 to 92 days
10.	Mizoram	59.56	More than 15 day up to 365 days
11.	Nagaland	176.81	More than 15 day up to 365 days
12.	Odisha	173.67	6 to 35 days
13.	Rajasthan	1,560.17	More than 15 days up to 365 days
14.	Sikkim	61.38	15 and up to 180 days
15.	Tamil Nadu	497.71	7 to 66 days
16.	Telangana	227.21	26 to 104 days
17.	Tripura	62.10	4 to 262 days
18.	Uttar Pradesh	1,766.26	5 to 478 days
19.	Uttarakhand	150.15	8 to 267 days
	Total	9,388.89	

Annexe-3.8
Cases of inadmissible expenditure and diversion of funds
(Refer to para 3.6.3)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Fund diverted to	Amount (₹ in crore)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Purchase of land for augmentation of pipe water scheme to Akumarru and 19 other habitations in district Krishna	2.20
2.	Assam	Renovation/repair of residential buildings, purchase of squatting plates to be used as sanitary latrine during calamities, construction of guest house and other state schemes, incorrect payment of excise duty.	30.13
3.	Bihar	Social awareness through organisation of ' <i>Jalchaupal</i> ' under <i>Mukhyamantri Gram Swakcha Pey Jal Nischaya Abhiyan</i> , World Water day celebration, purchase of trolley bag for presentation of budget speech in the legislative assembly, tender premium and diversion of funds due to execution of agreement higher than administrative approval.	28.05
4.	Chhattisgarh	In 792 cases accepted, during 2012-17, rates were higher than the estimated cost and payment towards tender premium.	14.77
5.	Goa	Centage charges paid to Public Works Departments	0.71
6.	Himachal Pradesh	₹ 19.39 crore were diverted to other habitations (six divisions), ₹ 0.26 crore paid as price escalation (one division), ₹ 0.41 crore for land acquisition (two divisions) and excess expenditure over approved cost of ₹ 15.82 crore (seven divisions).	35.88
7.	Jammu and Kashmir	In three division, NRDWP funds were diverted to other state schemes	1.47
8.	Jharkhand	Price escalation	3.55
9.	Karnataka	Payment of rent, hiring of vehicles, outsourcing of employees, telephone charges, etc.	5.64
10.	Kerala	For construction of compound wall, approach road, repair, electricity charges , etc.	4.50
11.	Madhya Pradesh	In five selected districts ¹ , expenditure was incurred on fuel, typing and photocopy works of the divisions, tender premium	4.67

¹ Chhindwara, Gwalior, Narsinghpur, Raisen and Vidisha

Sl. No.	Name of State	Fund diverted to	Amount (₹ in crore)
12.	Maharashtra	In selected divisions and Zila Paridshad, funds were diverted towards tender premium, centage charges and cost escalation	172.53
13.	Manipur	Centage charges, extension of office building, construction of conference hall, construction of laboratory	7.22
14.	Meghalaya	Purchase of vehicles	0.31
15.	Mizoram	Other scheme (Maintenance of Urban Water Supply Scheme), purchase of stationery , furniture, vehicles, etc.	2.32
16.	Nagaland	Purchase of vehicles	0.15
17.	Odisha	Payment to watch and ward, photocopy expenses, purchase of fuel, etc.	0.44
18.	Punjab	Inadmissible works and items of expenditure (maintenance of office building, purchase of genset, etc.)	2.36
19.	Rajasthan	Payment towards Tender premium, Construction of Staff Quarters	6.13
20	Uttar Pradesh	Payment of salary to permanent staff of <i>Jal Sansthan</i> of districts Jhansi, Lalitpur and Orai	34.62
21.	Uttarakhand	Construction of <i>Swajal Pathshala</i> and Toilet Museum in Dehradun	0.94
Total			358.59

Annexe-4.1
Incomplete Works
(Refer to para 4.2.6)

(₹ in crore)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Brief of work	No. of works	Estimated Cost	Expr. incurred
1.	Andhra Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive Protected Water Supply (CPWS) scheme to cover 51 habitations in district Anantapur was taken up in November 2012 with scheduled completion date of November 2013. This was completed and handed over to Zila Parishad in March 2017 without constructing the intake well due to denial of permission by Irrigation Department. Department replied that water supply was provided to 39 habitations by November 2016 on temporary basis by drawing water from another project. 	1	56.00	46.77
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three CPWS (167 habitations in district Chittoor; augmentation of water supply to some mandals in district Guntur for 12 villages and 130 habitations in Achanta constituency) taken up between September 2010 and November 2015 with scheduled dates of completion between September 2011 and June 2017, remained incomplete due to land dispute and non-release of water from source. 	3	51.00	34.60
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two CPWS schemes (one for 12 habitations in Tanuku and the other for 14 habitations in Attili (M) of district West Godavari), taken up between April 2011 and May 2014 with scheduled date of completion between April 2012 and June 2015, remained incomplete for want of permission from Railways Authorities. 	2	29.00	19.10
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CPWS scheme to Kamavarapukota (M) of district West Godavari to serve 11 habitations, taken up in March 2014 with schedule date of completion as February 2015, was not commissioned for want of power connection. 	1	6.30	5.22
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> J C Nagi Reddy Drinking Water Supply Project planned with Gandikota reservoir remained incomplete as detailed in Paragraph 4.2.6. 	1	508.00	365.88
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Yuipa division, a water supply scheme based on deep bore well was reported to have been completed in March 2016. However, during physical verification it was found that only 50 per cent of the work had been completed at a cost of ₹ 0.35 crore. 	1	0.51	0.35
3.	Assam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three works for sustainability and quality affected habitations in Silchar-I and Hojai Divisions, taken up for execution between January 2013 and October 2014 with scheduled date of completion between December 2015 and December 2016, remained incomplete for want of road cutting permission 	3	36.28	19.06

Sl. No.	Name of State	Brief of work	No. of works	Estimated Cost	Expr. incurred
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nine works for sustainability and quality affected habitations in Silchar-I, Silchar-II and Hojai Divisions, taken up for execution between May 2013 and May 2015 with schedule date of completion between December 2015 and February 2017, remained incomplete for want of material (DI pipes). 	9	73.00	38.10
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19 works for sustainability and quality affected habitations in Silchar-I, Silchar-II, Bokakhat, Golaghat, Hojai and Nagaon divisions, taken up for execution between February 2011 and March 2015 scheduled to be completed between April 2014 and February 2017, remained incomplete due to paucity of funds. 	19	187.92	107.04
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Howraghat division, work of Jar-op Langso water supply scheme for quality affected habitation, taken up in 2013 at a cost of ₹ 6.00 crore and scheduled to be completed by February 2014, remained incomplete due to remoteness of area. 	1	6.00	1.63
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Bakakhat division, work of the Greater Dergaon Rural Water Supply Scheme was administratively approved in February 2014 at a cost of ₹ 10.92 crore. Department stated that work had not been started due to non-availability of land. However, verification of records disclosed that possession of the required land had already been taken in October 2015 by the concerned Sub-Division. 	1	10.92	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 works in Hailkandi and Jorhat divisions, taken up for execution between March 2013 and June 2014 remained incomplete as discussed in paragraph 4.2.6. 	10	136.24	70.34
4.	Bihar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work for re-organising rural piped water supply scheme was taken up in May 2013 for completion within a year. However, the work was rescinded in July 2017 due to slow progress after incurring expenditure of ₹ 0.41 crore. 	1	0.75	0.41
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Patna District, work for construction of 8.95 Million Litre per day (MLD) capacity surface water supply scheme for 45 arsenic affected habitations at Maner was taken up in June 2009 but remained incomplete as discussed in paragraph 4.2.6. 	1	62.00	45.35
5.	Gujarat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In district Narmada, work of Narmada No-Source Regional Water Supply Scheme Part-II, to provide potable water (surface water) to habitants of 12 fluoride affected villages, was awarded (Mach 2012) at a cost of ₹ 4.70 crore and was to be completed by February 2013. Work of supply and laying of pipelines was completed in August 2014 after incurring expenditure of ₹ 3.73 crore. However, the pipe line failed (November 2013 to August 2014) in hydro testing due to leakages at various locations. The contract was terminated in June 2016 due to slow progress of work and non-replacement of defective pipes. As the contractor has gone for arbitration the work remained incomplete after incurring expenditure of ₹ 3.73 crore. 	1	4.70	3.73

Sl. No.	Name of State	Brief of work	No. of works	Estimated Cost	Expr. incurred
6.	Himachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Ghumarwin, Kaza and Pooh divisions, execution of six schemes, sanctioned during June 2009 and July 2016 to cover 97 habitations, remained incomplete since March 2012 and March 2017 on account of land dispute and non-execution of work by the contractors. 	6	7.92	5.46
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheme to provide potable water to habitations in Tehsil Arki of Solan division, was administratively approved in June 2011 for ₹ 21.69 crore. The scheme was however technically sanctioned for ₹ 21.59 crore in February 2015 i.e., after four years of obtaining administrative approval, due to change in water source. The scheme has remained unexecuted as only 81 <i>per cent</i> of the expenditure (June 2017) was incurred as advance to the contractor. 	1	21.59	3.60
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 41 schemes in Sadar, Gumarwin and Jhanduta Blocks in district Bilaspur awarded in June 2010 remained incomplete as discussed in paragraph 4.2.6. 	41	47.08	38.99
7.	Jammu & Kashmir	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In division Awantipur, four schemes were lying incomplete since March 2013 to March 2016 due to paucity of funds. 	4	12.01	6.33
8.	Jharkhand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Palamau, Baratola Water Supply Scheme for fluoride affected habitations, was taken up in October 2009 at a cost to ₹ 16.38 crore to be completed by January 2011. The scheme remained incomplete due to non-acquisition of land and lack of clearances from authorities. The contractor, after executing work for ₹ 12.29 crore (up to March 2013), refused to complete the work on account of increased rates and contract was rescinded in April 2013. Tender for balance work was invited in February 2014 and the work was awarded to a contractor at a cost of ₹ 10.26 crore. The contractor was paid ₹ 8.85 crore (May 2016) and the work still remained incomplete (July 2017). 	1	24.75	21.14
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Palamau, Purabdiha Rural Water Supply Scheme for fluoride affected habitations, was taken up in March 2008 at a cost of ₹ 1.33 crore for completion by March 2009. The scheme remained incomplete for want of Ductile iron pipes (to be supplied departmentally) and non-availability of required land. The contract was rescinded (October 2010). The estimate was revised to ₹ 2.53 crore and remaining work was awarded (July 2017) at a cost of ₹ 1.58 crore. 	1	2.53	1.44
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hulhulla Khurd Rural Water Supply Scheme to provide potable water to fluoride affected habitations in <i>Gram Panchayat</i> Julhulla under Block Nagaruntari, sanctioned in December 2007 at a cost of ₹ 0.86 crore, was taken up for execution in September 2008 to be completed by March 2010. However, the work was not completed and terminated for want of pipes (to be supplied departmentally). The work was again taken up at a cost of ₹ 0.74 crore in July 2010 which included supply and laying of pipelines. The work remained 	1	0.86	0.85

Sl. No.	Name of State	Brief of work	No. of works	Estimated Cost	Expr. incurred
		incomplete for want of laying of 290 metres of pipelines passing under railway track for which permission from railways authorities still awaited (July 2017).			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district West Singhbhum, 253 PWS schemes (Chaibasa-181 and Chakradharpur-72) were taken for execution during 2012-14 remained incomplete as discussed in paragraph 4.2.6 	253	32.83	27.40
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Sahibganj, a Mega Water Supply Scheme for 58 villages in 4 blocks under quality affected component, taken up in July 2012 remained incomplete as discussed in paragraph 4.2.6 	1	147.93	117.67
9.	Karnataka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two works for supply of potable water to 297 villages of Chamrajanagar and Gundhupet taluks, taken up for execution in March 2014 at cost of ₹ 497.80 crore for completion by September 2015, remained incomplete (March 2017). Besides this, Project Monitoring Consultant appointed for supervision of work after eight months of entrustment of work for a lump sum remunerations of ₹ 7.78 crore, was also granted extended till completion of work at a cost of ₹ 0.38 crore per month which led to extra payment of ₹ 2.29 crore. 	2	497.80	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In four districts (Baglkot, Gadag, Yadgir and Chitradurga), six works taken up for execution between 2007-08 and 2012-13, remained incomplete as discussed in paragraph 4.2.6. 	6	53.20	42.59
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In three districts (Bagalkot, Gadag and Tumakuru), five water supply schemes taken up during 2007-08, 2011-12 and 2012-13 remained incomplete as discussed in paragraph 4.2.6. 	5	42.95	39.56
10.	Kerala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Six works (WSS to Kottiyur, Kelakam and Kanichar; improvement of rural water supply scheme to Manjaloor Panchayat; CARWSS to Thiruvalli and adjoining villages; WSS Munniyoor Gram Panchayat ARWSS Karoor Panchayat and WSS to Meenachil, Thalappalam and Barananganam Panchayat), taken up between January 2002 and May 2015 with estimated cost of ₹ 61.94 crore, remained incomplete due to non-acquisition of required land. 	6	61.94	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Six works (WSS to Madayl Panchayat; CWSS to Irikkur and adjoining villages; WSS to Valavannur-Kalpakanchan Panchayats; CARWSS to Thirunavaya and adjoining villages; WSS to Cheekode and adjoining villages and Source sustainability –RWSS to Kakkakuzi in Vettoor Panchayat), awarded at cost of ₹ 32.78 crore between March 2014 to October 2016 for completion between September 2014 and April 2017, remained incomplete for want of road cutting permissions. 	6	32.78	
11.	Manipur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two schemes (PHE Bishanupur division-construction of settling tank, slow sand filter, service reservoir filter media and pump house and PHE Thoubal division-water supply scheme of Bitra), taken up for execution in June 2013 and September 2010 to be completed by June 2015 and September 2013, were incomplete. 	2	0.53	0.46

Sl. No.	Name of State	Brief of work	No. of works	Estimated Cost	Expr. incurred
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The work of RWS at Nongmaikhong at estimated cost of ₹ 0.20 crore was taken up for execution during 2012-13. As of March 2015, expenditure of ₹ 0.11 crore was incurred on settling tank and procurement of pipes. On spot verification it was found that scheme was not yet completed (July 2017) even after more than five years. 	1	0.20	0.11
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Thoubal division, execution of an ARWS scheme was stated to have been completed in November 2013 at a cost of ₹ 0.66 crore. During physical verification (August 2017), Audit found that the scheme had not been commissioned and the created assets were in a dilapidated state. Further, several assets such as pipelines, filter media, power installations were not found at the work site. 	1	0.45	0.66
12.	Punjab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work of construction of providing potable water for village Jagga Ram Tirth and Jumber Basti was sanctioned in October 2014 at a cost of ₹ 2.77 crore. The work of Package-I was awarded (October 2014) at a cost of ₹ 1.72 crore to be completed by July 2015. However, the work was lying incomplete due to absence of forest clearance for laying of pipe line. Expenditure of ₹ 1.57 crore incurred on the scheme rendered unfruitful. 	1	2.77	1.57
13.	Sikkim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14 rural water supply works, taken up between December 2012 and January 2015 for completion between November 2013 and January 2016, remained incomplete due to non-availability of material (pipes), change of water source, land dispute, shortage of funds etc. 	14	5.14	1.33
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three¹ works, sanctioned during February 2014 and February 2015 (sanctioned/awarded cost of ₹ 0.63 crore), though completed (March 2016) or achieved physical progress of 90 per cent (March 2017), did not serve its intended purpose as sustainability of water source throughout the year was not ensured. 	3	0.63	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district South Sikkim, two² works with sanctioned cost of ₹ 0.56 crore, were awarded to Co-operative Society for completion by February 2014 and May 2015. During physical verification (May/June 2017), it was found that both the works were held up due to missing material (G I Pipes) and damage of tank during construction of road. 	2	0.56	
14.	Rajasthan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide water to villages where water was being transported through tanks, work of Borabas-Mandana Water Supply project with technical sanction at ₹ 98.10 crore was taken up for execution in September 2012 to be completed by December 2014. The work remained incomplete as forest and wildlife clearances were not obtained. 	1	98.10	49.57

¹ RWSS from Hitti dhara to Namphok, Sarki Jhora to Chawangaon and Bhalukhop source to Sangtong

² RWSS at Kochey from Tirikhola source and augmentation of RWSS from Tur Khola source to Shyamdas Upper Dwarey Ward

Sl. No.	Name of State	Brief of work	No. of works	Estimated Cost	Expr. incurred
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Bhilwara, the work to provide safe drinking water to 1,698 villages under Chambal- Bhilwara Project to be completed by October 2016 , remained incomplete as discussed in Paragraph 4.2.6. 	1	1495.68	204.30
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Phulera, water supply scheme for 173 villages, taken up for execution in July 2013 remained incomplete as discussed in paragraph 4.2.6. 	1	226.95	115.68
15.	Telangana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nine works, taken up between April 2012 and April 2016 remained incomplete as discussed in paragraph 4.2.6 	9	248.18	149.81
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Nalgonda district, a CPWS scheme awarded in May 2014 remained incomplete as discussed in paragraph 4.2.6 	1	71.00	60.17
16.	Tripura	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work of setting up 11 Surface Water Treatment Plants taken up between 2007-08 to 2013-14, remained incomplete. 	11	44.51	21.19
		Total	437	4,293.49	1,667.46

Annexe-4.2
Abandoned Works
(Refer to para 4.2.9)

(₹ in crore)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Brief of work	No. of works	Expr. incurred
1.	Andhra Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractors abandoned five³ works (estimated cost of ₹ 10.94 crore) midway between April 2012 and December 2016. Expenditure of ₹ 6.17 crore was incurred on these works as discussed in paragraph 4.2.9. 	5	6.17
2.	Assam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Diphu (R) Water Supply Division, a ground water based scheme (Baliyan No.1) was completed with an expenditure of ₹ 1.13 crore. However, the work related to installation of deep tube well was unsuccessful after two attempts and the scheme became non-functional. This rendered entire expenditure of ₹ 1.13 crore on the scheme infructuous. 	1	1.13
3.	Jammu & Kashmir	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In division Kargil, five works (estimated cost of ₹ 1.59 crore) were abandoned after incurring ₹ 0.40 crore due to land dispute. 	5	0.40
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two⁴ works, completed at a cost of ₹ 0.53 crore in February 2009 and March 2012, remained non-functional. 	2	0.53
4.	Jharkhand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Medininagar, expenditure of ₹ 0.52 crore on 4.50 km of ductile iron pipes laid in 2012-13 under Baralota Rural Water Supply Scheme was rendered wasteful as the work was rescinded in March 2013. Further, the newly laid pipeline was covered by a road while widening and strengthening of an existing road. Besides, work done at a cost of ₹ 0.20 crore on Water Treatment Plant and GLSR, was also damaged. 	1	0.72
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Hazaribag, eight mini rural piped water supply schemes, taken up at a cost of ₹ 1.34 crore for completion by December 2014, remained incomplete after incurring an expenditure of ₹ 0.36 crore due to various factors including non-availability of land. Efforts were not made to complete these schemes even after a lapse of two and half years. 	8	0.36
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Palamu, two works (Singra and Bishrampur), taken up at a cost of ₹ 12.19 crore in March 2008 and January 2010, were abandoned as discussed in paragraph 4.2.9. 	2	5.52
5.	Karnataka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In taluk Yelandur, work of construction of overhead tank for piped water supply to B R Hills was awarded at a cost of ₹ 0.22 crore in April 2016 for completion in six months. After incurring expenditure of ₹ 0.04 crore, the work was abandoned due to land disputes. 	1	0.04

³ CPWS to Chintalapudi and strengthening of band and protection works in Prathikollalanka in district West Godavai; Single Village Water Scheme to Krishnayapalem (V) of Mangalagiri (M) and Kuragallu (v) of Mangalagiri (M); scheme of Neerukonda (v) of Mangalagiri (M) of district Guntur

⁴ WSS Gatoo Goshan and Choka Tacha

Sl. No.	Name of State	Brief of work	No. of works	Expr. incurred
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In taluk Chamarajanagar, a piped water supply work was awarded for execution in June 2013 at a cost of ₹ 0.12 crore. The work was, however, not progressed after July 2013 after the contractor had completed a portion of the pipeline and construction of pump house at a cost of ₹ 0.05 crore incurred . 	1	0.05
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Yadgir, work for water supply to 11 villages was abandoned due to contamination of source after incurring expenditure of ₹ 2.96 crore as discussed in paragraph 4.2.9. 	1	2.96
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Chitradurga, water supply work for 27 villages was abandoned due to heavy leakage in pipelines and drying up of source rendering expenditure of ₹ 9.45 crore as wasteful as discussed in paragraph 4.2.9. 	1	9.45
6.	Maharashtra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Pune, department did not draw water in village Hinjavadi from identified source (Kasarsai Medium Irrigation project) due to protest by the villagers against drawing of water from the source. This led to expenditure of ₹ 0.37 crore incurred (October 2015) on excavation work of Jack well and approach bridge to the jack well, infructuous. 	1	0.37
7.	Nagaland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A scheme for providing water supply sanctioned during 2014-15 at a cost of ₹ 0.17 crore which was stated to be complete was found (July 2017) to be non-functional due to non-construction of one IRP unit and a public fountain. 	1	0.17
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Kohima, project for providing water supply to Sanoru-Peraciezie was taken up in 2014-15 at a cost of ₹ 0.14 crore and stated to have been completed in November 2014. During physical verification (July 2017), the work was found to be incomplete due to land dispute. 	1	0.14
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheme to augment water supply to Menguzuma by pumping ground water was taken up in 2014-15 at a cost of ₹ 0.22 crore and was stated to have been completed in November 2014. During physical verification (July 2017), the scheme was found to be non-operational due to non-availability of water at the source. 	1	0.22
8.	Odisha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In division Keonjhar, two works for supply of safe drinking water to 11 habitations were sanctioned during 2012-13 for ₹ 1.16 crore with provision of source, head works, distribution system, rising line, treatment unit, elevated storage reservoir, delivery point, etc. However, the works were abandoned after incurring expenditure of ₹ 0.17 crore as five solar dual pumps were installed in existing tube wells at a cost of ₹ 0.25 crore in these habitations in 2015-16. 	2	0.17
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In division Nuapada, three works sanctioned during 2009-12 for ₹ 1.68 crore were abandoned after incurring expenditure of ₹ 0.25 crore on procurement of pipes. 	3	0.25
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In division Khariar, as per IMIS, physical progress of two works⁵ sanctioned during 2010-11 for supply of potable water to a population size of 11,225 was 100 <i>per cent</i>. However, physical verification showed that work was abandoned after achieving physical progress of 20 <i>per cent</i> and incurring expenditure of ₹ 0.93 crore on source creation and procurement of pipes. 	2	0.93

⁵ PWS to Thelkodungari and Kuligaon

Sl. No.	Name of State	Brief of work	No. of works	Expr. incurred
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1,310 tube-wells executed at a cost of ₹ 3.76 crore become unsuccessful as discussed in paragraph 4.2.9. 	1,310	3.76
9.	Punjab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In divisions Patiala and Rajpura, two water supply schemes⁶, constructed at a cost of ₹ 0.62 crore, became non-functional due to leakages in distribution system and non-payment of electricity bills. 	2	0.62
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Fatehgarh Sahib, one water supply scheme and 10 hand pumps, installed at a cost of ₹ 0.61 crore, became non-functional due to disputes and water quality problems. 	11	0.61
10.	Rajasthan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Tehsil Uniyara, work of water supply scheme Bentha Roopwara, taken up at a cost of ₹ 1.73 crore for completion by May 2013 was abandoned by the contractor (March 2013) after incurring expenditure of ₹ 1.02 crore. 	1	1.02
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district Jaisalmer, water supply scheme (Sagarmal Gopa branch Ramgarh-Sonu-Mokan-Khuniyala) abandoned due to hard strata as discussed in paragraph 4.2.9. 	1	1.87
11.	Sikkim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district South Sikkim, a water supply scheme was completed in March 2014 at a cost of ₹ 0.47 crore. During physical verification audit found that the entire work had been damaged due to widening of road. 	1	0.47
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Maniram Bhanjyang, a water supply scheme taken up at a cost of ₹ 1.08 crore was to be completed by November 2014. Physical verification (June 2017) showed that 50 per cent of the work was completed at a cost of ₹ 0.30 crore and the pipeline along a six kilometre road was damaged during road widening work. 	1	0.30
12.	Uttar Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Raebarely, the Bardar Water Supply Scheme was abandoned due to excess discharge of sand and soil as discussed below paragraph 4.2.9. 	1	1.84
Total			1,367	40.07

⁶ Dharamgarh (Rajpura-November 2014) and Rakhra (Patiala-April 2015)

Annexe-4.3

Non-preparation/implementation of Support Activity plan (IEC, HRD MIS, R&D)
(Refer to para 4.7.1)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Audit Observation
1.	Andhra Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual plan for IEC, HRD, MIS, R& D was not included in AAP. Capacity building plan was not prepared at District and State level. Training module based on Training Needs Assessment Workshop for different stakeholders was not prepared annually. In Guntur district, ₹ 97.77 lakh was not utilized for support activities as the District did not prepare plan for IEC activities (March 2017).
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department did not prepare a comprehensive plan for implementing IEC/HRD activities. 13,091 out of 24,463 IEC and 11,858 out of 15,966 HRD activities were reported to be conducted during the five-year period. There were no records of the exact nature of activities conducted to assess their impact and adequacy.
3.	Assam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yearly achievements under various activities were not commensurate with the yearly targets during the entire period of 2012-17. Achievement against the targets for IEC Activities was three <i>per cent</i> during 2012-14 and 19 <i>per cent</i> during 2014-17.
4.	Bihar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targets were not fulfilled in respect of MIS, IEC and Training during 2013-17. As per IMIS data, no target was fixed for Support Activities in 2012-13 During 2012-17, expenditure was not incurred on R&D activities.
5.	Goa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No expenditure was incurred on IEC activities before 2015-16.
6.	Himachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shortfall in achievement of targets during 2012-17 under IEC, HRD and computer program was ranged 18, 5 and 35 <i>per cent</i> respectively. Department did not set up R&D Cell of the Program.
7.	Jammu & Kashmir	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Against targets for IEC activities, there was a shortfall ranging between 34 and 94 <i>per cent</i>. For trainees under HRD, there was a shortfall against targets ranging between 9 and 58 <i>per cent</i> during 2012-15 and of 100 <i>per cent</i> during 2015-17. Out of targeted 2.51 lakh persons for training of GPs only 220 were imparted training during 2013-17.
8.	Kerala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite availability of funds, CCDU did not take up programmes under support activities. This was attributed to shortage of manpower. No activities under R & D were undertaken. Achievement against target for IEC activities was 45 <i>per cent</i> during 2012-17 and it was 12 <i>per cent</i> under HRD activities. Against target of 1.35 lakh trainees, only 16,915 trainees were trained.
9.	Madhya Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three activities were undertaken under R&D. 8,066 training programs out of 10,078 were conducted under HRD. Out of selected 44 GPs, IEC, HRD and other awareness activities was not carried out in 42 GPs.

Sl. No.	Name of State	Audit Observation
10.	Maharashtra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WSSO did not prepare AAP for R&D activities for the approval of SLSSC. Out of 86,441 activities under IEC, 21,332 (25 per cent) were conducted.
11.	Manipur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Against target of 76,338 IEC activities and 218 training programmes the shortfall was 27 per cent and 50 per cent respectively. No R&D activity and computer training was taken.
12.	Meghalaya	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20 to 30 per cent of the targeted IEC activities were undertaken during 2012-16. In 2016-17 achievement was 88 per cent as targets were drastically reduced.
13.	Mizoram	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No training need assessment was made to develop training module on different subjects. During 2012-17, out of 6,525 persons targeted for training, only 3,887 were trained during 2012-13 to 2014-15 and no training was done during 2015-17. No R & D activities were undertaken.
14.	Nagaland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Against target of 303 training programmes, 209 were conducted during 2012-14. In 2014-15, no training programme was conducted against the target of 900 and no training programme was planned during 2015-17. No R&D activities were undertaken.
15.	Punjab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shortfall in IEC activities was ranged between 14 and 74 per cent during 2012-13 and 2014-17.
16.	Rajasthan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major part of expenditure for IEC was incurred on State level activities and a very small portion ranging from 0 to 39 per cent was incurred on village level activities. During 2015-17, no district and village level IEC activities were taken up. No R&D, software development and computer trainings activities undertaken by WSSO.
17.	Sikkim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Support Activity Plan was prepared for support activities during the period 2012-17. Against target of training 880 personnel annually during 2012-17 only 378 and 33 trainees were trained during 2015-16 and 2016-17 respectively. No R & D activity was carried out.
18.	Telangana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support activity plan was not incorporated in AAP fixing targets for training, IEC and HRD activities, etc. No expenditure was incurred towards R & D activities.
19.	Tripura	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AAP for the support activities was prepared except for R&D activities. Against the 483 targeted training programmes to be conducted during 2012-17, 389 (80 per cent) were conducted.

Annexe-4.4

Shortage of labs, infrastructure and equipment for water quality testing

(Refer to para 4.8.1)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Audit observation
1.	Andhra Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Out of 107 laboratories only one lab i.e., the Guntur district laboratory was, accredited.
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLL had only eight staff against the required number of 14. DLLs of four selected districts had capacity to examine only 10 out of the 34 prescribed parameters. DLLs had only six staff against requirement of 32.
3.	Assam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLL was capable of examining 19 parameters against requirement of 78 parameters. DLLs were capable of examining 13 to 25 parameters against requirement of 34 parameters. DLLs had shortage of manpower.
4.	Bihar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLL was capable of examining only 17 parameters out of requirement of 78 parameters. DLLs (selected districts) examined only 14 to 15 parameters out of 34 parameters. Patna district was arsenic affected, but DLL did not test arsenic contamination due to non-functioning of Spectrophotometer during 2012-17. Labs at Block/Sub-Division levels were not in existence.
5.	Chhattisgarh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DLLs (eight selected districts) were capable of examining only 8 to 18 parameters out of 34 parameters. DLLs except in district Raipur, did not have required infrastructure facilities. Five DLLs were inadequately staffed while three (Kawardha, Surajpur and Jashpur) had no staff. SDLLs were functional in only 24 out of 76 PHE Sub-divisions.
6.	Goa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No labs had NABL accreditation.
7.	Gujarat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Out of 32 DLLs, only four had NABL accreditation that too only for testing 13 out of 34 parameters. In SLL only 16 out of 78 prescribed parameters and in DLLs only 14 out of 34 parameters were tested due to non-availability of required instruments.
8.	Himachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 25 labs were set up during 2012-17 against target of establishment of 42 laboratories at State/district/block level. Only 56 labs were strengthened during 2012-17 against target of 106. In the absence of the required man power such as chemists/bacteriologists, required tests were not conducted in selected districts. Equipment procured for bacteriological tests were not put to use in absence of trained staff.

Sl. No.	Name of State	Audit observation
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None of the 22 DLLs and 78 SDLLs in existence were accredited with NABL. Staff such as chemist/water analyst were not appointed on regular basis in test checked divisions. In DLLs only 11 to 13 out of 34 parameters were examined.
10.	Jharkhand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLL had NABL accreditation for testing only 10 out of the 78 required parameters. No DLLs (in selected districts) were accredited with NABL. DLLs were examining only 5 to 15 out of prescribed 34 parameters. DLLs had shortage of instruments and manpower and Microbiologist/ bacteriologist were not appointed in any of the selected DLLs. No block level laboratories were established in selected blocks.
11.	Karnataka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DLLs were not equipped for conducting all prescribed 34 tests. DLLs were not adequately staffed. DLLs (in selected districts) did not have essential equipment in working condition and did not maintain required inventory of chemicals.
12.	Kerala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At block level, labs were functioning in only 33 out of 148 Rural Blocks.
13.	Madhya Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLL was accredited to test only 26 out of 78 parameters. In selected districts, DLLs had a shortage of 31 staff against a total requirement of 72 persons. 15 selected blocks had no lab facilities.
14.	Maharashtra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DLLs in 28 districts did not have NABL Accreditation. DLLs and 138 SDLLs had no facility for testing arsenic. Out of a total of 818 post required for the labs at various levels 224 posts remained vacant.
15.	Manipur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLL had capability of examining only 14 out of 78 parameters DLLs had capability of examining only 12 out of 34 parameters. No Microbiologist/ Bacteriologist was posted in the labs.
16.	Meghalaya	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DLLs were in existence in only 7 out of 11 districts. Out of 41 sub-divisions, laboratories were set up only in 20 sub-divisions.
17.	Mizoram	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Laboratory and DLLs were not accredited to NABL. 50 per cent manpower shortages were noticed in SLL, DLLs and SDLLs.
18.	Nagaland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLL and three selected DLLs did not conduct tests against prescribed parameters due to non-availability of required equipment and chemicals. DLL in Dimapur was non-functional since its inception. SDLLs were not set up.
19.	Odisha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DLLs were not accredited with NABL. Against a requirement of eight staff per lab there was only one staff in 13 labs, two staff in ten labs and three staff in three labs. Shortfall in equipment, glassware and chemicals in the labs ranged between 28 and 95 per cent.

Sl. No.	Name of State	Audit observation
20.	Punjab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labs were inadequately equipped with manpower.
21.	Rajasthan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLL did not have facility and equipment for testing heavy metals, pesticides/toxic elements and radioactive elements in drinking water. DLLs were not strengthened to examine all required parameters.
22.	Sikkim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Against requirement of four DLLs and nine SDLLs only two DLLs were established. DLLs at North and West Districts were not established though approval of ₹ 69.92 lakh had been given. Essential staff such as microbiologist/bacteriologist and sampling assistants were not available in the DLLs.
23.	Tamil Nadu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In SLL, eight out of 34 parameters were tested. SLL faced shortage of personnel such as Senior Chemist, Water Analyst, lab Assistant and Sampling Assistant. Post of Microbiologist/Bacteriologist were not sanctioned and operated in SLL as well as in sampled DLLs.
24.	Telangana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only two out of 76 laboratories established during 2010-12 were accredited to NABL.
25.	Tripura	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No action was taken to establish SDLLs though approval was given (August 2009) for 23 new SDLLs at a cost of ₹ 2.82 crore. None of the labs had the adequate sanctioned strength of manpower. Equipment supplied to labs were lying unused/in defunct condition.
26.	Uttar Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shortage of 38 staff was noticed in eight⁷ out of 10 test checked districts.
27.	Uttarakhand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In DLLs only 19 out of 34 parameters were examined. None of the Labs were accredited with NABL.

⁷Agra, Aligarh, Gautam Budha Nagar, Etawah, Jaunpur, Jhansi, Chitrakoot and Sonebhadra.

Annexe-4.5
Shortfall in Water Quality Testing
(Refer to para 4.8.2)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Audit observation
1.	Andhra Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievement of targets in respect of Bacteriological and Chemical parameters was 39 <i>per cent</i> and 52 <i>per cent</i> respectively. • In selected districts, out of 4.15 lakh water sources, 50 <i>per cent</i> bacteriological and 52 <i>per cent</i> chemical tests were conducted. • Required tests were not conducted due to non-availability of sufficient funds and non-procurement of required quantities of refills of chemical reagents and H2S vials.
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In selected districts, against the required 92,613 bacteriological/ chemical tests, 40 <i>per cent</i> bacteriological/ chemical tests were conducted. • 56 <i>per cent</i> both pre and post monsoon testing were conducted as against the required 61,742 tests to be conducted during 2012-17 for 6,839 water sources.
3.	Assam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In selected eight districts, against the required 28,952 samples tests, SRL conducted 2,564 tests. • DLLs carried out 0.68 lakh tests against 1.03 lakh targeted sources/delivery points.
4.	Bihar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In selected districts, divisions carried out two to 20 <i>per cent</i> test of total sources. • Pre and post-monsoon check of water quality from sources was not done in selected districts.
5.	Chhattisgarh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In selected eight districts, shortfall in conducting of tests ranged between two to 95 <i>per cent</i>. • Testing of all the water samples twice for bacteriological contamination and once for chemical contamination in a year was not done.
6.	Goa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State laboratory did not conduct the test of fluoride and arsenic contamination.
7.	Gujarat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the districts laboratories re-examined water samples tested in the Taluka laboratories as per guidelines. • Out of 4.40 lakh sources, 33.39 <i>per cent</i> were tested in the laboratories during 2016-17.
8.	Himachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortfall to the tests required to be carried out was 88 <i>per cent</i>.
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IMIS data showed that year-wise tests were carried out during the pre-monsoon and post monsoon. • However, no records/details of the pre-monsoon or post-monsoon tests were available either with the Department or in selected executing divisions
10.	Jharkhand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In selected districts, shortfall in testing was ranged between 16 and 70 <i>per cent</i> for chemical contamination.
11.	Karnataka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortfall in testing was ranged between 90 and 99 <i>per cent</i>.

Sl. No.	Name of State	Audit observation
12.	Kerala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Out of 22.09 lakh 5.80 lakh samples were tested. Testing of all sources was not carried out due to the shortage of sufficient labs, staffs and other infrastructure.
13.	Madhya Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In nine selected districts, against targeted 1.55 lakh samples, 1.38 lakh tests were conducted. Against the target of conducting biological testing of Pre and post-monsoon samples of 13.20 lakh, 0.58 lakh tests were conducted.
14.	Maharashtra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shortfall in testing ranged between seven to 42 per cent.
15.	Manipur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Out of targeted 1,800 water sample, 61 per cent were tested by State Lab. Testing of heavy metals was started by State Lab in September 2016 and tested 60 per cent against the target of 20 samples. The State Lab did not take up testing for presence of pesticides/toxic elements and radioactive elements in drinking water. In four selected districts, against the target of 8,015 tests for DLLs, 73 per cent tests were carried out.
16.	Meghalaya	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In selected districts, tests conducted ranged between nil to nine per cent. As per IMIS, tests conducted by RiBhoi DLL were shown as 117, 40 and 87 during 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 respectively, but laboratory was not functional during these years. Department stated (September 2017) that tests reported in the IMIS were tests which were conducted through FTKs at the village level.
17.	Mizoram	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In selected Aizawl and Champhai districts, water quality test for 28 to 46 per cent and 12 to 17 per cent of sources were not conducted in pre and post monsoon respectively.
18.	Nagaland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No pre and post monsoon tests were carried out for 2,195 sources in Dimapur district.
19.	Odisha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratories were not testing the mandatory parameters such as nitrate, arsenic, alkalinity (January 2017).
20.	Punjab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shortfall in Chemical testing was ranged between 34 and 84 per cent during 2013-14 to 2016-17. No information was available on bacteriological testing as FTKs were distributed in fields to Health and Education department.
21.	Rajasthan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Out of 20.43 lakh sources to be tested, 8,094 sources were tested both pre and post monsoon.
22.	Sikkim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In district labs, against the required 36,798 tests each year, actual testing ranged between one and five per cent due to acute shortage of manpower. Treatment of water and fencing of 80 water sources to prevent biological contamination was not done.

Sl. No.	Name of State	Audit observation
23.	Tamil Nadu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of 2.46 lakh samples to be tested each year, 35 <i>per cent</i> and one <i>per cent</i> tests were carried out during 2015-16 and 2016-17 respectively. • No laboratory tests were conducted by DLLs and SDLLs due to inadequate-receipt of funds from Ministry in 2016-17.
24.	Telangana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortfall in water quality testing ranged between 61 and 65 <i>per cent</i> during 2014-15 to 2016-17.
25.	Tripura	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of tests performed against 63,000 targeted tests was ranged from 20 to 35 <i>per cent</i> during 2012-17.
26.	Uttar Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In nine selected districts, out of targeted 1.50 lakh sources, tests were carried out for 0.78 lakh sources.
27.	Uttarakhand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In selected districts, 91 to 95 <i>per cent</i> of sources were not tested and number of sources tested twice a year was less than two <i>per cent</i>. • Shortfalls attributed to shortage of staff.

Annexe-5.1
Inconsistency in IMIS data
(Refer to para 5.3.1)

Sl. No.	Format	Information given	Remarks
1.	B6	73,87,069 number of water supply scheme sources shown	Different information on the number of sources furnished
	B28	74,42,389 number of water supply sources (72,68,567 ground water and 1,73,822 surface water)	
2.	B28	Incorrect information on latitude/longitude (mentioned as 0,0 in Gujarat), aquifer names (mentioned as fgegefg, abc in Gujarat and Rajasthan)	Information were futile for monitoring purpose
3.	C31	Against expenditure for supply of tankers physical status was shown nil in all the years.	
4.	B15	Piped water and Hand pump schemes for the years 1899-1900, 1900-1901 and 1907-1908 have been shown in respect of States of Haryana and Tamil Nadu.	
5.	D1	During 2016-17, earmarked expenditure (Central) in respect of chemical affected habitations was ₹ 114.52 crore, while in respect of bacteriological affected habitations it was ₹ 35.46 crore. During 2015-16, earmarked expenditure (Central), in respect of chemical affected habitations was ₹ 223.52 crore.	
	D8A	During 2016-17, earmarked expenditure (Central) in respect of chemical affected habitations was ₹ 104.47 crore, while in respect of bacteriological affected habitations it was ₹ 27.89 crore. During 2015-16, earmarked expenditure (Central), in respect of chemical affected habitations was ₹ 220.79 crore.	
6.	C29	For 2016-17, in respect of support fund total available fund was ₹ 409.61 crore.	Variation was due to data of Meghalaya, Nagaland, Tamil Nadu, Tripura and Uttar Pradesh.
	D1	For 2016-17, in respect of support fund total available fund was ₹ 395.97 crore.	

Annexe-5.2(a)
Number of surface water bodies
(Refer to para 5.3.2)

Sl. No.	Name of State	No. of Districts	Data as per IMIS (B-8)	Data as per records of the Department
1.	Andhra Pradesh	4	0	371
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	4	2,602	6,839
3.	Bihar	10	0	37
4.	Chhattisgarh	2	2	0
5.	Gujarat	10	284	317
6.	Jammu & Kashmir	3	190	62
7.	Kerala	4	2	1,288
8.	Madhya Pradesh	10	2	0
9.	Maharashtra	10	10	971
10.	Manipur	4	1,182	1,174
11.	Meghalaya	2	67	300
12.	Mizoram	1	1	7
13.	Odisha	8	2	33
14.	Rajasthan	10	1,039	8
15.	Tripura	2	0	5
16.	Uttarakhand	4	3,565	8,558

Annexe-5.2(b)
Status of Drinking Water Facility at School in selected districts
(Refer to para 5.3.2)

Sl. No.	Name of State	No. of GPs	Number of Schools		No. of School with drinking water facility	
			As per IMIS (B-10)	As per site or records	As per IMIS (B-10)	As per site or records
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	16	62	33	47	22
2.	Assam	46	635	747	533	634
3.	Bihar	40	187	334	185	258
4.	Chhattisgarh	32	122	141	115	122
5.	Jammu & Kashmir	29	114	98	109	70
6.	Jharkhand	38	166	284	150	227
7.	Karnataka	40	358	315	287	303
8.	Kerala	16	0	179	0	179
9.	Madhya Pradesh	44	205	226	174	197
10.	Maharashtra	54	160	139	154	122
11.	MANIPUR	19	58	58	53	25
12.	Meghalaya	16	44	44	24	28
13.	Mizoram	08	31	20	31	20
14.	Nagaland	22	36	34	28	20
15.	Odisha	48	316	434	266	422
16.	Rajasthan	39	143	309	118	209
17.	Sikkim	8	44	38	28	23
18.	Tripura	8	20	28	15	19
19.	Uttar Pradesh	54	89	185	71	171
20.	Uttarakhand	20	35	40	22	36

Annexe-5.2(c)
Status of Drinking Water Facility at Anganwadis in selected districts
(Refer to para 5.3.2)

Sl. No.	Name of State	No. of GPs	Number of Anganwadis		No. of Anganwadis with drinking water facility	
			As per IMIS (B-10)	As per site or records	As per IMIS (B-10)	As per site or records
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	16	71	57	16	15
2.	Assam	46	319	745	140	264
3.	Bihar	40	55	323	47	98
4.	Jharkhand	38	70	304	46	168
5.	Karnataka	40	311	362	215	302
6.	Kerala	16	0	502	0	271
7.	Madhya Pradesh	44	56	125	40	98
8.	Maharashtra	54	133	183	125	151
9.	Manipur	19	15	113	14	10
10.	Meghalaya	16	7	14	5	9
11.	Mizoram	08	15	20	14	16
12.	Odisha	48	203	469	137	392
13.	Rajasthan	39	23	210	15	123
14.	Sikkim	8	6	56	3	27
15.	Tripura	8	39	55	27	42
16.	Uttar Pradesh	54	0	220	0	140

Annexe-5.2(d)

Status of Drinking Water Facility at Schools in whole state as compared to data of education department (As on 31.3.2017)

(Refer to para 5.3.2)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Number of Schools			No. of Rural Schools with drinking water facility		
		As per IMIS	As per Data of Education Department (HRD)	Difference	As per IMIS	As per Data of Education Department (HRD)	Difference
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	3,480	3,513	33	2,898	2,877	21
2.	Assam	29,841	45,827	15,986	23,390	42,357	18,967
3.	Goa	224	1,551	1,327	163	1,200	1,037
4.	Karnataka	47,397	43,895	3,502	38,384	43,785	5,401
5.	Kerala	1,504	11,904	10,400	1,484	11,904	10,420
6.	Madhya Pradesh	91,550	1,07,391	15,841	77,653	1,02,444	24,791
7.	Manipur	2,074	2,973	899	1,700	2,863	1,163
8.	Mizoram	1,940	2,047	107	1,608	1,883	275
9.	Nagaland	2,362	1,874	488	1,786	1,476	310
10.	Punjab	15,176	19,458	4,282	15,175	19,374	4,199
11.	Uttarakhand	6,545	16,994	10,449	5,306	686	4,620

Annexe-5.2(e)

Status of Drinking Water Facility at Schools in selected districts as compared to data of education department (As on 31.3.2017)

(Refer to para 5.3.2)

Sl. No.	Name of State	No. of District	Number of Schools			No. of Rural Schools with drinking water facility			
			As per IMIS	As per Data of Education Department (HRD)	Difference	No. of District	As per IMIS	As per Data of Education Department (HRD)	Difference
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	3	874	779	95	3	783	644	139
		1	245	292	47	1	169	182	13
2.	Assam	9	12,242	19,922	7,680	9	9,850	17,960	8,110
3.	Karnataka	9	17,663	14,728	2,935	8	12,364	13,563	1,199
		1	775	931	156	2	2,244	2,051	193
4.	Kerala	4	479	4,367	3,888	4	469	4,367	3,898
5.	Manipur	4	1,058	1,438	380	4	843	1,431	588
6.	Mizoram	2	706	557	149	2	638	550	88
7.	Nagaland	3	770	587	183	3	611	442	169
8.	Goa	2	224	1,551	1,327	2	163	1,200	1,037
9.	Madhya Pradesh	10	22,349	25,205	2,856	10	18,898	24,016	5,118
10	Maharashtra	4	9,085	8,608	477	4	9,085	8,608	477
		6	14,772	16,414	1,642	6	14,771	16,365	1,594
11	Punjab	7	5,924	7,007	1,083	7	5,924	6,918	994

Annexe-5.2(f)
Water Testing Labs
(Refer to para 5.3.2)

Sl. No.	Name of State	No. of District	Selected Districts		Selected Blocks (Sub-Divisional Level)		Total Mobile Labs	
			As per IMIS	As per Physical records	As per IMIS	As per Physical records	As per IMIS	As per Physical records
1.	Andhra Pradesh	5	14	20	23	18	0	0
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	4	4	4	5	4	0	0
3.	Assam	9	19	27	4	8	7	7
4.	Chhattisgarh	8	8	8	1	1	7	18
5.	Jammu & Kashmir	7	7	7	27	24	4	0
6.	Jharkhand	6	6	6	0	1	1	0
7.	Karnataka	10	14	10	24	18	1	0
8.	Kerala	4	14	14	0	1	0	0
9.	Madhya Pradesh	10	10	9	2	7	0	1
10.	Maharashtra	10	12	13	36	46	0	0
11.	Meghalaya ¹	4	4	3	3	1	0	0
12.	Nagaland	3	3	3	0	0	1	0
13.	Rajasthan	10	10	10	17	2	0	1
14.	Telangana	3	7	7	17	20	0	0
15.	Tripura	2	2	2	5	4	0	0
16.	Uttarakhand	4	0	4	0	4	0	0

¹In respect of difference in number of labs in **Meghalaya**, the Department agreed that there were errors in IMIS due to the fact that the figures in IMIS could not be corrected.

Annexe-5.2(g)
Non-functional Schemes (as on 31.3.2017)
(Refer to para 5.3.2)

Sl. No.	Name of State	No. of Districts	Total No. of Schemes		Total No. of Non-functional schemes	
			As per IMIS (B-17)	As per Physical records	As per IMIS (B-17)	As per Physical records
1.	Assam	9	44,407	3,108	4,651	357
2.	Bihar	10	36,552	2,76,414	787	50,200
3.	Chhattisgarh	8	44,508	1,00,392	7,564	2,855
4.	Himachal Pradesh	6	18,218	14,217	22	470
5.	Jammu & Kashmir	7	4,675	3,210	7	4
6.	Jharkhand	6	1,10,126	1,18,926	8,031	23,467
7.	Madhya Pradesh	10	1,46,291	51,120	14,416	4,736
8.	Maharashtra	10	58,856	61,260	1,218	7,143
9.	Meghalaya	4	6,368	1,896	277	65
10.	Mizoram	2	255	309	0	0
11.	Nagaland	3	1,280	1,280	3	24
12.	Odisha	8	1,49,224	1,30,741	6,699	1,476
13.	Punjab	7	5,227	5,227	166	38
14.	Rajasthan	10	33,543	17,853	2,111	133
15.	Sikkim	2	2,879	935	0	1
16.	Tripura	2	7,054	8,795	2,267	632
17.	Uttar Pradesh	10	3,09,256	4,11,627	2,413	21,094
18.	Uttarakhand	4	11,435	11,381	9	0

Annexe-5.2(h)
Category of schemes in selected Gram Panchayats
(Refer to para 5.3.2)

Sl. No.	Name of State	No. of GPs	Total			PWS				Hand pumps				Others			
			As per IMIS	As per Records	Difference	No. of Selected GPs	As per IMIS	As per Records	Difference	No. of Selected GPs	As per IMIS	As per Records	Difference	No. of Selected GPs	As per IMIS	As per Records	Difference
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2	50	58	8	10	51	21	30	1	22	23	1	2	0	14	14
		10	135	99	36	2	26	30	4	11	86	69	17	-	-	-	-
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	16	137	107	30	16	133	103	30	16	4	4	0	16	0	0	0
3.	Assam	22	624	1,063	439	6	20	29	9	19	422	635	213	19	14	10	4
		24	1,416	541	875	40	222	159	63	27	1,313	406	907	27	49	365	316
4.	Bihar	40	897	884	13	40	59	50	9	40	839	839	0	40	0	0	0
5.	Himachal Pradesh	6	80	123	43	3	5	9	4	9	41	103	62	1	1	0	1
		20	351	268	83	23	231	173	58	17	154	106	48	-	-	-	-
6.	Jammu & Kashmir	29	354	287	67	27	110	93	17	2	4	9	5	1	1	0	1
		-	-	-	-	2	1	3	2	27	238	201	37	-	-	-	-
7.	Kerala	16	0	542	542	16	0	210	210	16	0	179	179	16	0	153	153
8.	Madhya Pradesh	6	169	226	57	44	40	24	16	6	165	216	51	4	0	11	11
		38	1,241	816	425	-	-	-	-	38	1,205	791	414	-	-	-	-
9.	Maharashtra	11	86	44	42	5	9	15	6	42	98	399	301	35	1	0	1
		43	234	535	301	49	164	74	90	12	48	18	30	19	0	73	73
10.	Mizoram	8	9	46	37	8	9	17	8	8	0	24	24	2	0	5	5

Sl. No.	Name of State	No. of GPs	Total			PWS				Hand pumps				Others			
			As per IMIS	As per Records	Difference	No. of Selected GPs	As per IMIS	As per Records	Difference	No. of Selected GPs	As per IMIS	As per Records	Difference	No. of Selected GPs	As per IMIS	As per Records	Difference
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	0	1
11.	Nagaland	23	60	52	8	23	60	52	8	23	0	0	0	23	0	0	0
12.	Odisha	4	183	225	42	1	2	3	1	4	170	213	43	-	-	-	-
		44	3,146	3,099	47	47	109	103	6	44	3,026	2,983	43	4	22	22	0
13.	Rajasthan	17	62	226	164	4	4	18	14	10	29	162	133	5	0	17	17
		22	801	265	536	35	75	47	28	29	738	237	501	32	16	10	6
14.	Sikkim	1	34	37	3	2	41	51	10	-	-	-	-	8	37	0	37
		7	212	119	93	6	168	105	63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15.	Tamil Nadu	42	2,011	1,961	50	42	976	976	0	42	857	807	50	42	178	178	0
16.	Uttar Pradesh	32	2,879	4,138	1,259	4	0	4	4	31	2,765	3,944	1179	-	-	-	-
		22	1,216	1,204	12	50	42	42	0	23	1,364	1,352	12	-	-	-	-
17.	Uttarakhand	13	70	43	27	14	72	39	33	-	-	-	-	2	2	0	2
		7	15	26	11	6	11	22	11	-	-	-	-	5	0	8	8

Annexe-5.2(i)
Number of Habitations with CWPP
(Refer to para 5.3.2)

Sl. No.	Name of State	No. of Districts	Number of Habitations with CWPP	
			As per IMIS (C-17A)	As per site or records
1.	Assam	9	1	0
2.	Jharkhand	6	20	0
3.	Karnataka	10	37	82
4.	Kerala	4	2	0
5.	Maharashtra	10	0	2
6.	Rajasthan	10	50	53
7.	Uttar Pradesh	10	0	4

Annexe-5.2(j)
Status of Water quality of habitation
(Refer to para 5.3.2)

Sl. No.	Name of State	No. of Habitations	Status of water quality of the selected Habitation (Chemically affected, Bacteriological affected or Potable)			
			Potable		Non Potable (Chemically affected, Bacteriological affected)	
			As per IMIS	As per site or records	As per IMIS	As per site or records
1.	Andhra Pradesh	32	32	19	0	13
2.	Assam	184	164	68	20	108 ²
3.	Chhattisgarh	113	106	106	7	4
4.	Karnataka	160	90	90	70	0
5.	Kerala	16	14	14	2	0
6.	Madhya Pradesh	176	176	166	0	10
7.	Maharashtra	54	53	45	1	0
8.	Rajasthan	87	68	62	19	25
9.	Telangana	14	6	6	8	0
10.	Uttar Pradesh	178	175	165	0	9

² Information not available in 3 habitations and water quality not tested in 5 habitations

Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

Term	Details
AAP	Annual Action Plan
ARWSP	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme
BRC	Block Resource Centre
CCDU	Communication and Capacity Development Unit
CPWS	Comprehensive Protected Water Supply
CWPP	Community Water Purification Plant
CWSAP	Comprehensive Water Security Action Plan
DDP	Desert Development Programme
DLL	District Level Laboratory
DPR	Detailed Project Report
DWSM	District Water and Sanitation Mission
DWSP	District Water Security Plan
FTK	Field Test Kit
GIS	Geographical Information System
GPUs	Gram Panchayat Units
GPWSC	Gram Panchayat Water and Sanitation Committee
HRD	Human Resource Development
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
IMIS	Integrated Management Information System
IRPs	Iron Removal Plants
IT	Information Technology
LPCD	Litres per capita per day
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MDI	Management Devolution Index
MIS	Management Information System
MVPWSS	Multi Village Piped Water Supply Scheme
MVS	Multi Village Scheme
NABL	National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration Laboratories
NDWM	National Drinking Water Mission
NIC	National Informatics Centre
NLM	National Level Monitor
NRDWP	National Rural Drinking Water Programme

NWQSM	National Water Quality Monitoring & Surveillance
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
PAC	Public Accounts Committee
PHE	Public Health Engineering
PHED	Public Health Engineering Department
PPSWOR	Probability Proportional to Size Without Replacement
PWSS	Piped Water Supply Scheme
RCC	Reinforced Cement Concrete
RWSS	Rural Water Supply Scheme
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SDLL	Sub-Divisional Level Laboratory
SLL	State Level Laboratory
SLSSC	State Level Scheme Sanctioning Committee
SRSWOR	Simple Random Sampling Without Replacement
STA	State Technical Agency
SVS	Single Village Scheme
SWSM	State Water and Sanitation Mission
UDWQMP	Uniform Drinking Water Quality Monitoring Protocol
UNICEF	United Nation International Children's Emergency Fund
VMC	Vigilance and Monitoring Committee
VWSC	Village Water and Sanitation Committee
VWSP	Village Water Security Plans
WASMO	Water and Sanitation Management Organization
WHO	World Health Organization
WQM&S	Water Quality Monitoring & Surveillance
WSSO	Water and Sanitation Support Organization