Annex-II
(Referred to in paragraph 8)
Year-wise and Scheme-wise Budget Allocation and Actual Expenditure during 1999-2000 to 2003-2004

(Rupees in crore)

Sl. No.	Name of the Scheme	1999-2	2000	2000	-01	2001	-02	2002	2-03	2003	3-04	To	tal	Savings (-)/ Excess (+)
		Budget Allocation	Actual Expe- nditure by DJB	Budget Allocation	Actual Expend- iture by DJB									
1.	Trunk Sewers	17.50	12.02	29.80	14.74	21.23	14.24	41.35	10.52	48.00	38.32	157.88	89.84	(-) 68.04
2.	STP	30.00	35.58	31.60	31.88	41.60	34.97	55.13	33.14	37.00	33.70	195.33	169.27	(-) 26.06
3.	Branch Sewers	5.50	2.52	33.50	14.19	48.15	39.97	22.02	32.12	49.60	19.52	158.77	108.32	(-) 50.45
4.	Renovation of Existing Plants	1.75	2.08	4.50	3.40	7.68	6.86	6.43	4.93	5.00	1.54	25.36	18.81	(-) 6.55
5.	Sewerage & Drainage in Trans Yamuna	9.70	9.40	10.00	9.53	9.94	9.74	6.43	5.72	8.00	6.07	44.07	40.47	(-) 3.60
6.	Prevention of Pollution of River Yamuna	0.35	0.02	0.72	0.23	0.45	0.52	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.00	1.52	0.91	(-) 0.61
7.	Anti Flood works	4.00	2.67	5.00	4.30	1.55	1.73	1.36	0.48	4.00	2.81	15.91	11.99	(-) 3.92
Total		68.80	64.29	115.12	78.27	130.60	108.03	132.72	87.05	151.60	101.96	598.84	439.60	(-) 159.24

Annex-III

(Referred to in paragraph 13.2) Quality of Treated Effluent as per DJB lab reports

S. No.	Name of the Plants	BOD TSS		T.C.	Remarks
1.	Okhla STPs –	202	122	2700	100100
	(I) 30 MGD	35 to 48 mg/l	54 to 81 mg/l	17 per cent to 87.75 per cent	
	(ii) 16 MGD	Meeting prescri	bed standard		As per CPCB Report of November-December 2003 not meeting the BOD and TSS standards .
2.	Keshopur STP -				
	(i) 20 MGD	38 to 92 mg/l	57 to 138 mg/l	Not analysed	
	(ii) 40 MGD	33 to 40 mg/l	50 to 65 mg/l	-do-	
3.	Kondli STP - (i) 10 MGD (Ph.I)	Meeting the pre-	scribed standard	-do-	As per CPCB Report of November- December 2003 not meeting the standards of TSS.
	(ii) 25 MGD (Ph. II)	-do-		-do-	As per DPCC Report July to Dec. 2003 not meeting the standards in respect of BOD and TSS.
	(iii) 10 MGD (Ph. III)	-do-		-do-	As per DPCC Report October-December 2003 not meeting the standards of BOD and TSS.

Annex–IV (Referred to in paragraph 14) Status of CETPs in Delhi as of December 2003 (Rupees in crore)

Sl.	Name of CETP	Capacity	Cost of	Actual	Status of the	Remarks
No.	Name of CE11	of plant (in MLD)	Plant	Expenditure incurred	CETPs CETPs	Kemarks
1.	Wazirpur	24	19.85	20.85	Commissioned in October 2001	CETP is not functional since 9th July 2003 as it was closed due to flooding. Further, due to non-existence of conveyance system, flow is taken from open drain.
2.	Mangolpuri	2.4	6.29	6.80	Commissioned in November 2001	CETP is not functional since August 2003 due to paucity of funds. Rising main yet to be laid.
3.	Mayapuri	12	12.18	13.88	Commissioned in July 2002	Only primary treatment due to non availability of Chemicals because of paucity of funds.
4.	Jhilmil	16.8	13.15	8.59	Commissioned in June 2003	Railway permission pending to lay line. Conveyance system not completed.
5.	Lawrence Road	12	10.92	7.21	Completed in March 2003	Plant not working due to action pending with DJB, MCD etc. Disposal line of treated effluent is yet to be laid under Ring Road.
6.	Badli	12	9.24	9.79	Completed in March 2003	Commissioning held up because DJB had not given connection to individual units.
7.	Okhla Industrial Area	24	23.69	21.56	Completed in April 2003	Plant completed but rising main of REPs yet to be laid, permission from

Report on Government of NCT of Delhi of 2005

Sl. No.	Name of CETP	Capacity of plant (in MLD)	Cost of Plant	Actual Expenditure incurred	Status of the CETPs	Remarks
						Railways delayed the work.
8.	G.T.K. Road	6	8.29	8.12	Completed in December 2002	Commissioning delayed due to non availability of power as there was paucity of funds.
9.	S.M.A. Industrial Area	12	13.54	12.92	Completed in May 2003	Commissioning held up as DJB had not laid the internal conveyance system and paucity of funds
10.	Nangloi	12	14.56	13.38	Completed in May 2003	Commissioning held up because of power and MCD permission for road cutting for laying of rising main.
11.	Najafgarh Road	9.6	10.98	1.81	Work in progress	Delay in allotment of land and thereafter hindrance by local residents.
12.	Naraina	21.6	16.70	1.21	-do-	Progress of work slow due to repeated litigation for site besides paucity of funds.
13.	Mohan Co-op	1.8	4.64	0.46	Work not taken up so far	Work had not been taken up due to uncertainty of funds.
14.	Okhla Industrial Estate	1.2	4.36	0.07	-do-	Award of work not approved by Plant Level Committee (PLC)
15.	Anand Parbat	24	16.87	0.38	-do-	Due to demolition of existing structures at site.