REVISED GUIDELINES ON SUB-MISSION ON WATER QUALITY



Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission Department of Drinking Water Supply Ministry of Rural Development Government of India

1.1 SUB-MISSION PROJECTS

Sub-Mission projects are undertaken by the States for providing safe drinking water to the rural habitations facing water quality problems like excess fluoride, Arsenic, Brackishness, Iron, nitrate or a combination of these. Sub Mission projects are also taken up for ensuring source sustainability through rain water harvesting, artificial recharge etc.

1.2 DELEGATION OF POWERS FOR SANCTIONING SUB-MISSION PROJECTS

Powers have already been delegated to the States for sanctioning Sub-Mission Projects w.e.f. 1-4-1998. The State Governments/UTs may approve the Sub-Mission projects by following the procedure being adopted for sanctioning normal ARWSP schemes without detriment to coverage, sustainability and quality aspects. The funding pattern of Sub Mission projects taken up after 1-4-1999 will be in the ratio of 75:25 between the Central and State Governments. However, the funding pattern for the Sub-Mission projects sanctioned between 1-4-1998 and 31-3-1999 would remain in the ratio of 50:50 between the Central and State Governments.

1.3 SUB-MISSION PROJECTS ON WATER QUALITY

Government of India in February 2006 has approved major policy changes for Sub-Mission programme on water quality, wherein, it has now been decided to retain upto 20% of ARWSP funds at the Centre to provide focused funding to those States which have reported drinking water quality problems. This ceiling could be exceeded in exceptional cases for providing focused funding to tackle severe contaminations of water. The funding pattern of all projects taken up after February 2006 shall remain as 75:25 between Centre and State.

(ii) Sub Mission projects taken up for ensuring source sustainability through rain water harvesting, artificial recharge etc will continue to be taken up by the State Governments out of 5 % of ARWSP funds allocated to them for sustainability under the delegated powers.

- (iii) Funds to be allocated to States would be governed by the following weightage criteria- Arsenic = 35%, Fluoride = 35%, Salinity = 15%, Nitrate = 5%, Iron = 5% and Multiple problems = 5%.
- (iv) Since coverage is dynamic and subsequent surveys may reveal new cases of contamination, the above weightage criteria may require change at regular intervals. The Department of Drinking Water Supply in consultation with Planning Commission and the Department's Integrated Finance Division will do the same whenever required. Hence forth, upto 20% of ARWSP funds would be retained by the Centre for focused funding to tackle water quality problems that will be assessed periodically.
- (v) Involvement of Gram Panchayats/VWSC in selection, implementation and maintenance of the assets created will be the guiding principle for the new projects sanctioned under the Sub-Mission for water quality. To facilitate sustainability, community contribution towards capital cost for assets created for distribution network within the village (habitation in hilly/tribal/difficult area) shall be at least 10%. It may be only 2.5% for SC/ST habitations. This was decided in consultation with States in the State Minister's Conference held on 31st Jan-1st Feb 2006. The community contribution could be paid in cash, labour, land or material or a combination of these. The Gram Panchayats/Village Water and Sanitation Committees VWSC) shall have the responsibility of mobilizing community participation. Completed single-village schemes and intra-village distribution network of multi-village schemes are to be transferred in a phased manner alongwith funds transfer to Gram Panchayats/VWSCs for subsequent Operation & Maintenance. The GPs/VWSCs would recover O&M cost through collection of user charges and by mobilizing resources. The user charges so collected would be used exclusively for the O&M of the assets for drinking water. For multi-village schemes, the State Government Department/ Board would maintain main water supply system to the village. For difficult single village schemes, particularly, in hilly/tribal/difficult areas the State Government Department/Board would maintain the water supply system to the habitation. However, the State Governments may devolve this responsibility to an appropriate level of the Panchayati Raj Institutions(PRI), depending upon the technical requirements of the scheme. The

Department/Board/PRI would maintain the main water supply system upto the village and could also charge the GPs/VWSCs for bulk supply of water for drinking purposes.

1.4 PROCEDURE FOR RELEASE OF FUNDS

The Project-wise funds will be released to States in three instalments of 45, 45 and 10% against the Central Share. This pattern can be changed depending upon the technology used for tackling the problem. The State Governments are required to contribute their share in similar installments.

- (ii) The second or subsequent installment will be released based on submission of separate Utilization certificates duly signed by Chief Engineer and countersigned by Secretary in-charge of PHED in the form enclosed (Annexure I) for more than 60% expenditure under Central and State shares in addition Audit certificates whenever due.
- (iii) The States/UTs are also required to comply with the following:
- (a) Funds will be released for implementation of Sub-Mission projects for the projects approved by the State level Scheme Sanctioning Committee. The existing Committee in the PHED with Secretary, in-charge of Rural water supply as the Chairman and with representatives from the CGWB, NGRI, NEERI, State Referral Institute identified for Water Quality Monitoring & Surveillance, etc., constituted for the purpose of clearing the ARWSP(normal) projects may also consider and clear the Sub Mission projects, after the project proposals are duly cleared by the State level Source finding Committee, for ensuring source sustainability. It would be mandatory to obtain clearance of the State level Scientific Source Finding Committee. The agenda for the meetings should be sent to Central Government 20 days in is also mandatory for the State Governments for associating the representative of the Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission in the State level Sanctioning Committee set up to sanction Sub Mission projects by the States/UTs. For seeking release of funds, the proposal should be sent immediately along with minutes of the

State level Scheme Sanctioning Committee. Cases requiring clarifications on examination can be referred back to States.

- (b) Names of habitations affected with quality problem in each district should be sent to the Central Government indicating the extent of excess arsenic, fluoride, salinity and iron with the undertaking that the schemes are taken up in the order of priority, first covering the habitations with the highest extent of chemical contamination.
- (c) The State Governments are required to formulate an Action Plan for tackling all the water quality problems during the period of 4 years ie., 2005-06 to 2008-09, as per the template annexed (Annex-II) with the guidelines and send the same to Central Government for facilitating release of funds and monitoring. The Action Plan will comprise of list of the water quality habitations with concentration of the contaminants found in excess in drinking water, apart from other details like type of scheme vis-à-vis technology adopted, tentative cost of coverage, time frame for implementation, modalities of Operation & Maintenance by PRIs/State The Action Plan should indicate the left over and total implementing agency. number of habitations affected with specific quality problems at the commencement of the year and the target for the year (with the names) of the habitations to be covered.
- (d) The State Governments shall devise an integrated approach for technology options covering single village schemes, comprehensive piped water supply schemes, low cost treatment plants, domestic filters, roof-top rain water harvesting, in-situ water conservation, etc., For treatment of water contamination, the ratio of affected habitations to be provided with alternate safe source based drinking water supply scheme and in-situ treatment technology based drinking water supply scheme should be, as far as possible, as follows-

| S.No. | Type of Problem | Alternate Safe Source Vs In-situ Treatment |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|
| (i) | Arsenic, fluoride and salinity | 90:10 |
| (ii) | Iron affected habitations | 30:70 |
| (iii) | Nitrate affected habitatios | 100:00 |

- (e) Common habitations which are NC/PC and also quality affected should be first covered fully with safe drinking water facilities. The habitations already covered fully but affected by chemical and/or bacteriological contamination may be covered subsequently under separate schemes/projects.
- (f) The per capita cost should not ordinarily exceed the cost norms followed by the State Governments under the ARWSP and the State MNP.
- (g) The State Governments are required to communicate availability of matching State share at the time of request for releases for the sanctioned Sub-Mission projects.
- (h) The procedure for capital cost sharing by the community and O&M costs shall be as mentioned 1.3 (v)
- (i) Coverage funds from normal-ARWSP could be utilized in Sub-Mission projects, to cover enroute PC & NC habitations. Costs of coverage of such habitations from the main or trunk water supply line, shall remain on 50:50 basis between Centre and State as per ARWSP norms. However, capital cost contribution of community for intra-village distribution network and subsequent O&M costs, as described in the above para shall remain valid for these NC/PC habitations also.
- (j) Coverage of Urban and Cantonment areas could also be done under the Sub-Mission projects, provided they bear the proportionate cost of bulk water/treated water to be supplied to them at the entry point of their territory.
- (k) Every Sub-Mission project should be studied for probable infiltration routes or ground water movements and the possibility of entry into the aquifer, due to disposal of waste-water/sludge. Hydro-geo-morphological maps prepared for ground water prospecting shall be utilized for selection of drinking water source and locating suitable locations for water harvesting structures.

1.5 DUAL WATER POLICY

Dual Water Supply Policy may be adopted for rural habitations facing acute water quality problems. In these habitations even if safe water is provided upto 10 LPCD, which would be sufficient for drinking and cooking purposes, it may be

considered as habitation(s) with a safe source of drinking water. For other activities like washing, etc. water available from unsafe sources could be utilized without problem.

1.6 MONITORING & EVALUATION

Monthly and Quarterly Progress Reports as per enclosed format, shall be submitted to the Ministry by all the State Governments/UTs regularly within 10 days of succeeding month.

- (ii) The existing Committee in the PHED with Secretary, in-charge of Rural water supply will constitute Review Missions for conducting on-the-spot inspection of the Sub-Mission projects during the course of implementation. The State Governments may devise a standard schedule of inspection for this purpose.
- (iii) The Central Government will also field Review Teams/Independent Monitors once in six months or as per requirement, for inspection of Sub-Mission projects.
- (iv) The Review Mission/Independent Monitors may suggest mid-course correction related to pace of implementation, quality of works, technology options and financial implications, if the situation demands so. Any deviations from the original scope of works will be subjected to approval of the Ministry.
- (v) The District level Vigilance & Monitoring Committee set up by Ministry of Rural Development will also monitor the progress and exercise vigilance in respect of Sub-Mission Projects. Both State level PHED and District level officers must provide information to District level Vigilance & Monitoring Committees and PRIs.
- (vi) Both State PHED and District level officers must provide information to District Level Vigilance and Monitoring Committees & PRIs.

1.7 IEC & CAPACITY BUILDING

Treatment plants require active community participation. The awareness generation may include the following components:-

- Effects on health of human beings due to ingestion of contaminated drinking water
- Willingness for partial capital cost contribution for constructing water supply assets for distribution within the habitation/village/panchayat.
- Awareness of school children with regard to school water supply.
- Capacity building of community for understanding the system from technical angle including back-washing procedures
- Understanding that the performance of treatment plants
- Understanding the financial implications for taking up proper O&M
- Quality audit by the community using field test kits and technical monitoring by concerned PHED/Board
- (ii) Funds granted under the Communication & Capacity Development Units (CCDU) could be utilized for undertaking awareness campaigns on various water related diseases, training and capacity building of Panchayati Raj Institutions/Village Water and Sanitation Committees.

Note:- All references to Sub-Mission on Water Quality in the Guidelines for Implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme issued in 2000 by Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission, Department of Drinking Water Supply shall stand modified according to these revised guidelines.

Certified that a sum of Rs.

Form of Utilization Certificate

Letter NO. and Date Amount

| | | only was received by SWSM/DP/DWSM/DWSC/VWSC (as the case may be) as Grants-in-aid during from Government of India as per details given in the margin and a sum of Rs was received from the State Government during Further a sum of Rs only being unspent balance of the previous year Was allowed to be brought forward for utilisation during the year |
|--|---|--|
| Total | | The other miscellaneous receipts as given in the attached annexure during the year was Rs |
| swsm/DP/DWsm/DWs/swhich it was sanctioned only was referred that I have satisfied that I | m of Rs SC/VWSC w.e.f. d. It is further maining at the en year. attisfied myself the duly fulfilled/a see that the mone ed. ent of accounts we thave been received at physical and the second sec | bove mentioned total funds of Rs |
| Signature | | Signature |
| Designation – Chairman | | Designation – Member Secretary |
| Date: | | |

ANNEXURE FOR UTILISATION CERTIFICATE

| Opening Balance as on 1st April | Receipt of Central Share | State Share | Refund of Unutilised Grant | Interest received during the year | Other Receipts e.g. Community contribution etc. | Total Receipt of the year – Total funds available |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| A | В | С | D | Е | F | A+B+C+D+E+F |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | _ |
| | | | | | | |

Annexure - II

ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE FOR TACKLING RURAL DRINKING WATER QUALITY PROBLEMS UNDER SUB-MISSION PROGRAMME

| 1. | Name of State | : |
|------------|--|-------------------------------|
| 2. | No. of habitations affected with drinking water quality problem | |
| | (a) (as per 1999 survey) | ; |
| | Total Fluoride (> 1.5 ppm) Arsenic (> 0.05 ppm) Brackishness (> 1500 ppm) Nitrate (> 45 ppm) Iron(> 1.0 ppm) | : |
| | Multiple problem (combination of above) (b) (as per 2000 survey) | ;; |
| | Total Fluoride (> 1.5 ppm) Arsenic (> 0.05 ppm) Brackishness (> 1500ppm) Nitrate (> 45 ppm) Iron(> 1.0 ppm) Multiple problem (combination of above) | |
| 3. | No. of water quality problem habitations where safe drinking water supply facility has been provided so far under Sub – Mission Programme (as on 1.4.2005) | : |
| 4. | (a) No. of water quality problem habitations which are yet to be provided with safe drinking water supply facilities (as on 31.03.2005) | : |
| | (b) Time frame required for covering all remaining water quality habitations | : |
| 5. | No. of WQ habitations proposed to be provided with safe drinking water supply by Treatment Technologies | : |
| 6. | Average cost of Treatment Plants : (capacity-wise) | : Capacity Cost |
| 7. | No. of treatment plants required to be provided (capacity –wise) | :Capacity Nos. Habs Served |
| 8. | Total cost of providing safe water through treatment plant | :: |
| 9. | No. of water quality habitations proposed to be covered by alternate safe sources | : |
| 10. | Average cost of providing drinking water to the water quality habitations from alternate safe sources {PWSS/Multi-village schemes/others (specify)} | : |
| 11. 12. | No. of PWSS proposed to be implemented Funds required for alternative safe source based PWSS Schemes | : |

| 13. | Total funds required for tackling water quality pro | blem | ; | | | | |
|-----|--|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| 14. | Sharing of State Government and Central Government | nent : | | | | | |
| | (a) Central share (75% of Estd cost) (13) | | : | | | | |
| | (b) State share (25% of Estd. Cost (13) | | [| | | | |
| 15. | Availability of funds during $10^{\rm th}$ and $11^{\rm th}$ Plan. | | 10 th Plan 11 th Plan | | | | |
| | (a) Central | | : | | | | |
| | (b) State | | : | | | | |
| 16. | Funds proposed from other schemes like NABAR | D, HUDCO, A | ADB, World Bank, etc. | | | | |
| | YearName of the scheme Funding source | | ading expected 2006-7 2007-8 2008-9 | | | | |

17. Financial breakup (year-wise)

(Rs. In crore)

| Particulars | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 |
|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Total No. of water quality | | | | |
| habitations targeted to be | | | | |
| covered. | | | | |
| Fluoride | | | | |
| 2. Arsenic | | | | |
| Brackishness | | | | |
| 4. Nitrate | | | | |
| 5. Iron | | | | |
| 6. Multiple | | | | |
| Total | | | | |
| Total (year-wise funds required | | | | |
| identified as gap) | | | | |
| Fluoride | | | | |
| 2. Arsenic | | | | |
| Brackishness | | | | |
| 4. Nitrate | | | | |
| 5. Iron | | | | |
| 6. Multiple | | | | |
| Total | | | | |
| Central Government Share | | | | |
| State Government share | | | | |

17. Remarks:-

- 18. Documents to be furnished:
 - (i) Implementation schedule (Plan of Implementation)
 - (ii) Prioritization of Water quality affected habitations under arsenic, fluoride, brackishness, nitrate, iron and multiple problems, year-wise.
- 19. Priority list of habitations To be enclosed by State Govt as per the enclosed proforma.

| | Signature of CE/Engineer-in-Chief/MD of PHEDs/Boards |
|------------------|--|
| | Date |
| | |
| Countersigned by | |

(State Secretary dealing with RWS) Date :

| Name of | GP | Block | Reason for prioritization | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|-------|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| the habitation | name | name | Water quality habitation not covered under CAP 1999 | Water quality affected habitation as per March'2000 survey (mention problem) | Water quality affected habitation found after March'2000 survey and reported on 31/3/2004 | Enroute safe habitation but NC/PC as per CAP'99 | Enroute safe habitation but slipped back | | | | |
| 2005-2006 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2006-2007 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2007-2008 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | _ | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2008-2009 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

${\bf PROFORMA~FOR~MONTHLY/QUARTELY~PROGRESS~REPORTS~UNDER~SUB-MISSION~PROGRAMME}$

Name of the State ------ Reporting period ------

| of the | of the district | of release of funds from | quality affected habitations proposed | quality affected | project cost | Central Share of the project | Share of the | Share released | against | Expenditure against State Share | completion of project | Reasons for delay in project, if any |
|--------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | _ | · | |
| | | | | | | | | | | _ | · | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |