



**5**  
**Chapter**



# 5

## Chapter

# Rural Sanitation

### 5.1 Introduction

Under the *Namami Gange* programme, improved sanitation access was to be provided in identified villages and panchayats located along the main stem of the River Ganga. This component was to be undertaken by NMCG through Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation (MoDW&S), as MoDW&S was already working on this area under Swachh Bharat Mission (Gramin) [SBM(G)] scheme, with objectives to bring about an improvement in the general quality of life in the rural areas, by promoting cleanliness, hygiene and eliminating open defecation; and to accelerate sanitation coverage in rural areas.

The components of rural sanitation were to be implemented as per existing guidelines of SBM(G). Implementation of SBM(G) requires large scale social mobilisation and monitoring. A five-tier implementation mechanism was set up at National, State, District, Block and Village level for execution of the programme as illustrated in Chart 5.1.

**Chart 5.1: Five tier implementation mechanism of SBM(G)**



### 5.2 Planning and appraisal- adequacy of selection criteria, objectives and targets

MoWR, RD&GR had requested (September 2014) MoDW&S for preparation of detailed action plan for Gram Panchayats located on the banks of the Ganga to make them

Open Defecation Free (ODF). Accordingly, MoDW&S in February 2015 submitted Action plan for three activities namely – (i) Individual Household Latrines (IHHLs), (ii) Solid Liquid Waste Management (SLWM), (iii) Information, Education and Communication (IEC), with a total financial requirement of ₹ 2,354.46 crore, including Administrative charges. Out of that, Central share was of ₹ 1,753.23 core (funding pattern of share of 75:25 between Centre and State) for five riparian States<sup>39</sup> of the Ganga covering 1,657 Gram Panchayats in 253 blocks of 53 districts adjoining the River Ganga, as detailed in Table 5.1.

**Table 5.1: Component wise total financial requirement of funds**

(₹ in lakh)					
State	IHHLs	SLWM	IEC	Administrative Charges	Total
<b>Bihar</b>	70,133.88	6,180.00	6,783.46	1,695.86	84,793.20
<b>Jharkhand</b>	2,679.24	660.00	296.82	74.21	3,710.27
<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	52,222.08	16,793.04	6,134.68	1,533.67	76,683.47
<b>Uttarakhand</b>	1,198.44	1,376.00	228.84	57.21	2,860.49
<b>West Bengal</b>	56,179.08	4,480.00	5,391.92	1,347.98	67,398.98
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,82,412.72</b>	<b>29,489.04</b>	<b>18,835.72</b>	<b>4,708.93</b>	<b>2,35,446.41</b>

The proposal of MoDW&S was approved (June 2015) by the MoWR, RD&GR. However, as a result of revision (January 2016) in the funding pattern in the ratio of 60:40, the Central share was reduced to ₹ 1,412.68 crore.

Initially, MoDW&S (May 2015) had set a target date for achievement of 100 *per cent* households covered with facility of toilet by March 2016 (Bihar, Jharkhand and West Bengal), June 2016 (Uttar Pradesh) and November 2015 (Uttarakhand). The target date was extended (December 2016) upto March 2017. However, due to slow progress of work in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, the target date was again extended in March 2017 upto April 2017.

NMCG stated (August 2017) that it had released the Central share to MoDW&S, which released the same to States Executing Agencies. It further stated that the targets and objectives were set by MoDW&S, as NMCG had no direct role and all marked villages identified on the bank of the River Ganga had now been declared ODF.

The reply of NMCG on the issue of declaration of all marked villages as ODF, is to be viewed in the light of the fact that it did not provide any documentary evidence regarding verification of ODF status made by the State Governments through its own teams or through third party. Our audit findings on incorrect declaration and verification of ODF are discussed at paragraphs 5.4.2 and 5.4.3.

<sup>39</sup> Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand and West Bengal

### 5.3 Fund release and utilisation

In terms of SBM(G) guidelines, the fund is to be released by the MoDW&S to the State Governments. The State Governments in turn releases the funds to the SBM(G), within 15 days of transfer of funds from Government of India.

NMCG/ MoWR, RD&GR in June 2015 and September 2016, released a lump sum amount of ₹ 263 crore and ₹ 315 crore, respectively to MoDW&S for the activities relating to construction of IHHLs, IEC and SLWM.

We found that although MoDW&S had released the funds amounting to ₹ 578 crore to the five State Governments, but amount of State share was not available with MoDW&S. The details of Central and States share as obtained during the years 2015-16 and 2016-17 are given in Table 5.2.

**Table 5.2: State wise/year wise details of funds received and utilized by during 2015-17**

(₹ in crore)

Sl. No.	State		Total				
			Opening Balance	Releases	Misc. Receipts	Utilization	Closing Balance
1	Bihar	Central share	0	79.02	0	45.96	61.22
		State share		28.16			
Total			0	107.18	0	45.96	61.22
2	Jharkhand	Central share	-3.63	27.83	0.44	30.36	3.56
		State share		9.28			
Total			-3.63	37.11	0.44	30.36	3.56
3	Uttarakhand	Central share	0	22.56	0.71	6.96	16.31
		State share		0			
Total			0	22.56	0.71	6.96	16.31
4	Uttar Pradesh	Central share	0	370.76	0.60	257.09	335.52
		State share		221.25			
Total			0	592.01	0.60	257.09	335.52
5	West Bengal	Central share	0	77.83	60.78	146.15	44.35
		State share		51.89			
Total			0	129.72	60.78	146.15	44.35
	Total	Central share	-3.63 <sup>40</sup>	578.00	62.53	486.52	460.96
		State share		310.58			
Grand Total			-3.63 <sup>40</sup>	888.58	62.53	486.52	460.96

Source : Data provided by MoDW&S and State Governments

<sup>40</sup> Expenditure incurred prior to March 2015 on the IHHLs

It is evident from the Table 5.2 that as against the total available fund of ₹ 951.11 crore<sup>41</sup>, these five States could utilise a sum of ₹ 490.15 crore<sup>42</sup> i.e. 52 *per cent* of the total available fund.

NMCG stated (August 2017) that it had issued the Letter of Authorisation to MoDW&S and was not concerned with State's share. Further, NMCG made a mention of unspent balances shown against the MoDW&S, which do not match with the actual physical progress of the scheme, as most of the villages have been declared ODF. NMCG further stated (August 2017) that funds released to MoDW&S have been fully utilised but UCs have yet to be received by it.

The reply of NMCG is also to be viewed in light of the fact that ODF status of more than 33<sup>43</sup> *per cent* ODF declared villages were yet to be verified, as of March 2017. Further, there were discrepancies in declaration of ODF villages and constructions of IHHLs, as discussed at paragraphs 5.4.2 and 5.4.4.

We further noticed that

- State Government of Uttarakhand did not release its own share of ₹ 2.78 crore to District Implementing Agency, as of 31 March 2017. Further, two<sup>44</sup> States made a short release of ₹ 50.44 crore against their committed shares, to their District Implementing Agencies.
- Uttarakhand could utilise only 30 *per cent* of the Central Share available with it, as of March 2017. Further, two<sup>45</sup> States could not utilise even the 50 *per cent* of the funds available with them, as of March 2017.
- Scrutiny of records of four<sup>46</sup> out of 11 test checked districts<sup>47</sup> of Uttar Pradesh revealed that in April 2017, 37 GPs<sup>48</sup> of these four districts, which were earlier identified as Ganga Basin GPs had been unmarked/ deleted from list of Ganga Basin by the State Government. However, prior to their deletion from the list of Ganga Basin GPs, an amount of ₹ 17.76 crore had already been spent on construction of 19,246 IHHLs in these 37 GPs, from the grant received under *Namami Gange*. As the

<sup>41</sup> ₹ 888.58 crore plus ₹ 62.53 crore

<sup>42</sup> ₹ 3.63 crore plus ₹ 486.52 crore

<sup>43</sup>  $\{(3656-45)-2406\}/(3656-47) \times 100 = 33 \text{ per cent}$

<sup>44</sup> Uttar Pradesh and Bihar

<sup>45</sup> Uttar Pradesh and Bihar

<sup>46</sup> Allahabad, Meerut, Kasganj and Ghazipur

<sup>47</sup> Farrukhabad, Kanpur, Bijnor, Mirzapur, Varanasi, Allahabad, Bhadohi, Kasganj, Ghazipur, Unnao and Meerut

<sup>48</sup> Ustapur Mahoodabad, Chhibaiya uparhar, Palikaranpur, Murarpatti, Katwaroopur, Kaithwal, Kotawa, Mainaya uparhar, Babura, Khajuraul, Mungairi, Kunahiaida, Khanpur Garhi, Makdoompur Bajpur, Nardauli pukhta, Asadgarh, Ismailpur, Pachilana, Hetumpur, Taajpur Manjha, Radhopur, Chitawanpatti, Manjhariya, Rampur Patti, Deva Bairan, Khijirpur, Sabbbarpurkalan, Chakmedani No.2, Leelapur, Badsara, Sitapatti, Sonhariya, Mainpur, Parmeth, Mahepur, Manikpur and Karanada

expenditure of ₹ 17.76 crore was incurred on non-Ganga Basin GPs, therefore, the expenditure was to be recouped from the MoDW&S.

NMCG in its reply (August 2017) noted the audit observation. However, it stated that it was not concerned with State share and its utilisation by State EAs. On non-recoupment of expenditure, the reply of NMCG is not acceptable as the funds of *Namami Gange* was utilised for non-Ganga Basin GPs.

#### 5.4 Physical Targets and achievements

MoDW&S (December 2016) revised the target to achieve all Ganga villages ODF by 31 March 2017. The target date, in the review meeting (24 March 2017) with the Cabinet Secretary was further extended to April 2017 due to slow progress in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar.

We noticed that the target date of April 2017 had lapsed, yet Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand and West Bengal could not achieve the target of 100 *per cent* constructions of IHHLs and completion of IEC activity, Solid Liquid Waste Management work in every selected district as detailed in Table 5.3.

**Table 5.3: Target and achievements in terms of numbers of IHHLs constructed**

State	IHHLs targeted to be provided as on 31.03.17	IHHLs provided against the targeted IHHLs as on 31.03.17	IHHLs yet to be provided as on 31.03.17	IHHLs targeted to be provided as on 19.05.2017	HHLs provided against the targeted IHHLs as on 19.05.2017	IHHLs yet to be provided as on 19.05.2017
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
Bihar	2,71,150	1,62,356	1,08,794	4,49,207	2,06,254 (45.92 per cent)	2,42,953
Jharkhand	33,132	27,801	5,331	36,911	27,801 (75.32 per cent)	9,110
Uttarakhand	9,975	9,943	32	9,641	9,641 (100 per cent)	0
Uttar Pradesh	4,42,874	3,23,168	1,19,706	4,42,672	4,10,869 (92.82 per cent)	31,803
West Bengal	5,06,996	5,03,964	3,032	5,06,996	5,05,528 (99.71 per cent)	1,468
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,64,127</b>	<b>10,27,232</b> (81.26 per cent)	<b>2,36,895</b>	<b>14,45,427</b>	<b>11,60,093</b> (80.26 per cent)	<b>2,85,334</b>

Source : Data at Col. No. 2 to 4 was provided by the States. Data at Col. No.5 to 6 was obtained from MIS database of MoDW&S

It can be observed from the Tables 5.3 that there were variation in data of targets set for IHHLs in March 2017 and May 2017. Within a span of two months, in Bihar and Jharkhand the targets of IHHLs were increased from 2,71,150 to 4,49,207 and 33,132 to 36,911, respectively. While, in Utarakhand the targets for construction of IHHLs was

reduced from 9,975 in March 2017 to 9,641 in May 2017. However, the fact is that 9,943 IHHLs had already been constructed in Uttarkhand, as of March 2017.

The State wise target and achievements for ODF villages is given in Table 5.4.

**Table 5.4: Target and achievements in terms of numbers of ODF villages**

State	Villages targeted to be ODF 31.03.17	Villages attain status of ODF against the target as on 31.03.17	Villages yet to attain the status of ODF as on 31.03.17	Villages targeted to be ODF (as on 19.05.2017)	Villages attain status of ODF against the target (as on 19.05.2017)	Villages yet to attain the status of ODF (as on 19.05.2017)
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
Bihar	485	228	257	487	342 (70.23 per cent)	145
Jharkhand	78	47	31	73	64 (87.67 per cent)	9
Uttarakhand	265	265	0	222	222 (100 per cent)	0
Uttar Pradesh	1,560	1,022	538	1,627	1,373 (84.39 per cent)	254
West Bengal	2,106	2,094	12	2,106	2,095 (99.48 per cent)	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,494</b>	<b>3,656</b> (81.35 per cent)	<b>838</b>	<b>4,515</b>	<b>4,096</b> (90.72 per cent)	<b>419</b>

Source : Data at Col. No. 2 to 4 was provided by the States. Data at Col. No.5 to 6 was obtained from MIS database of MoDW&S

Tables 5.3 and 5.4 indicate the following:

#### 5.4.1 Non-achievement of target of construction of IHHLs and ODF

None of the States could achieve the target of construction of 100 per cent IHHLs, as of 31 March 2017 except Uttarakhand, while other four States could complete 45.92 to 99.71 per cent of constructions of IHHLs, by May 2017. As a result of non-achievement of target of 100 per cent construction of IHHLs, none of the States, except Uttarakhand, could get the status of ODF.

NMCG in its reply (August 2017) stated that the target set (11,95,678 IHHLs) by MoDW&S as on August 2017 has been fully achieved. The reply of NMCG is to be viewed in the light of the fact that the target set in May 2017 had been reduced by 2,49,749 IHHLs, for which no evidence has been provided.



#### 5.4.2 Incorrect declaration of ODF

In Uttar Pradesh, 19 GPs<sup>49</sup> of 10 districts<sup>50</sup> declared ODF as on 31 March 2017, were selected for verification of their ODF status. Examination of records revealed that a total of 6,824 IHHLs were required for making them ODF. However, only 5,437 IHHLs were constructed by 31 March 2017 in these GPs, leaving shortfall of 1,387 IHHLs. Hence, 19 GPs failed to construct required number of IHHLs by March 2017 but were declared ODF.

NMCG in its reply (August 2017) noted the audit observation and assured that the matter will be taken up with MoDW&S.

#### 5.4.3 Verification of ODF Gram villages

As per guidelines from MoDW&S, the GP after attaining the status of ODF was to declare the same in its Gram Sabha meeting. The resolution passed by Gram Sabha may be for entire GP or even a village/ habitation. State Government was to verify the ODF status through its own teams or through third party. Since ODF is not a one-time process, at least two verifications were to be carried out. The first verification was to be carried out within three months of the declaration to verify the ODF status and the second verification was to be conducted after six months from the first verification. A Gram Panchayat was to be declared ODF only on completion of the above verification procedure. The status of ODF declared and verified GP collected during audit is given in the Table 5.5.

**Table 5.5 : Status of declared and verified Villages as on 31 March 2017**

State	Number of villages declared ODF	ODF status of villages verified
Bihar	228	Not done
Jharkhand	47	Not furnished by State Government
Uttarakhand	265	204
Uttar Pradesh	1,022	108
West Bengal	2,094	2,094
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,656</b>	<b>2,406</b>

In Uttarakhand and Uttar Pradesh, out of 1,287 villages declared ODF, the status of only 312 villages could be verified by the two States as of March 2017. Further, ODF status of none of the ODF declared village in Bihar could be verified, as of March 2017. This shows very slow progress in verification of ODF villages and authenticity of ODF declared villages could not be ascertained.

<sup>49</sup> Derwa, Chakniranjan, Badripur, Kakra, Domari, Sarai Domari, Shree Goverdhan, Amauli, Nijamuddinpur, Shivpur, Moiddinpur, Moh Pochha, Kirachan, Nimbai Gair Ehatmali, Sadhopur, Khalispur, Tiwaripur, Chandrapur Gaupura and Ukarrifarauli

<sup>50</sup> Bhadoi, Allahabad, Varanasi, Mirzapur, Bijnor, Kanpur, Farrukhabad, Unnao, Ghazipur and Kasganj

In its reply (August 2017), NMCG noted the audit observation and assured that the matter will be taken up with MoDW&S.

#### 5.4.4 Irregularities in constructions/ allotment of IHHLs in Jharkhand

In Jharkhand, Village Water and Sanitation Committees (VWSCs) were carrying out the construction activities in the identified villages in phases, for which funds at the rate of ₹ 12,000 per IHHL were being released by District Water and Sanitation Mission (DWSM), Sahibganj to all the VWSCs in advance, with the instructions that in case of joint family, only one IHHL should be constructed, that too in the name of head of the family. We noticed that

- Against one Below Poverty Level (BPL) number, more than one allotment was made, as 147 IHHLs were allotted against the 69 BPL numbers. The expenditure of ₹ 9.36 lakh incurred on construction of 78 IHHLs was in violation of instructions of DWSM, which ultimately led to irregular sanction of IHHLs to ineligible beneficiaries.
- In 10 test-checked villages<sup>51</sup>, against the name of 34 beneficiaries, 71 IHHLs were shown as constructed by VWSCs. Thus, misappropriation of fund of ₹ 4.44 lakh in constructions of 37 IHHLs at the rate of ₹ 12,000 per IHHL, cannot be ruled out.
- In two<sup>52</sup> test-checked villages, against 2,076 households identified by VWSCs for construction of IHHLs, 2,575 were constructed. Thus, construction of excess 499 IHHLs is doubtful for which ₹ 59.88 lakh was paid to VWSCs. Further, in these villages, 851 out of 7,657 beneficiaries were selected by VWSCs without verifiable identification like - Voter Identity card, Aadhar card number, BPL number, etc. In the absence of valid identity, the genuineness of payment of ₹ 1.02 crore made to VWSCs, on account of constructions of IHHLs to these 851 beneficiaries<sup>53</sup> could not be verified in audit.
- 1,755 BPL families were identified as beneficiaries by *Mukhiya* and *Jal Sahiya*. Examination of BPL list provided by the District Authority revealed that names of 95 beneficiaries recorded in the list of constructed IHHLs of VWSCs did not match with the name for same BPL number in the BPL list of District Authority. Further, 585 BPL numbers reported in the list of constructed IHHLs of VWSCs, did not exist in the BPL list.

NMCG in its reply (August 2017) noted the facts and stated that issue had been conveyed to MoDW&S. However, on the issue of misappropriation of fund, NMCG stated that it was not concerned with the allotment of IHHLs.

<sup>51</sup> West Pranpur, Amanat Diyara, North Palasgachi, Mokimpur, Kaswa, Bada Madansahi, Fatehpur, Chotti Koderjanna, Badi Koderjanna and Makmalpur Part

<sup>52</sup> West Pranpur, Amanat Diyara

<sup>53</sup> at the rate of ₹ 12,000 per IHHL

The reply of NMCG is not acceptable as there was variation in the numbers of available beneficiaries and the IHHLs constructed by VWSCs in actual.

### 5.5 Irregularities in construction and functioning of IHHLs in Joint site visits

We carried out joint site visits of IHHLs in GPs with representatives of GPs. These visits in Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar revealed that 100 *per cent* target of creation of IHHL in ODF declared villages not achieved, no proper sanitation of waste water was available, IHHLs not utilised by families of beneficiaries, no training/ promotion was provided etc. Details of audit findings are as follows:

**5.5.1 Uttarakhand:** The joint site visits (April-June 2017) revealed that out of 1,188 beneficiaries of 16 villages<sup>54</sup> in seven districts<sup>55</sup> declared ODF free, names of 44 beneficiaries were repeated<sup>56</sup> in the beneficiaries list of five districts<sup>57</sup>. Further, out of these 44 beneficiaries, double payments amounting to ₹ 1.40 lakh were made to 12 beneficiaries of two districts<sup>58</sup>. 41 beneficiaries had still not initiated construction of IHHLs, whereas construction of 34 IHHL was yet to be completed. Hence, actual number of beneficiaries with completed IHHLs was 1,068<sup>59</sup> only.

**5.5.2 Uttar Pradesh:** In test checked 11 districts<sup>60</sup> of Uttar Pradesh, joint site visits (May-June 2017) of IHHLs in 22 GPs<sup>61</sup> revealed that –

- a. Out of total 11,993 households in these GPs, 9,288 individual household latrines were to be constructed. However, only 8,152 (88 *per cent*) IHHLs were constructed. Thus 12 *per cent* households were still not having IHHLs.
- b. Out of total 8,152 IHHLs constructed under *Namami Gange*, only 7,041 IHHLs (86 *per cent*) were actually functional.

**5.5.3 Bihar:** The findings of the joint site visits (May-June 2017) of IHHLs in 10 villages<sup>62</sup> of five<sup>63</sup> districts of Bihar disclosed that –

<sup>54</sup> Baleshwar, Srikote, Chaka, Kevar Malla, KevarTalla, Ratni, Mala, Palegaon, Bagi, Kinsur, Pokhta, Taidi, Jhala, Bagodi, Badshahpur and Birpurkhurd

<sup>55</sup> Tehri, Rudrapryag, Chamoli, Pauri, Uttarkashi, Haridwar and Dehradun

<sup>56</sup> Name of 43 beneficiaries twice and one thrice

<sup>57</sup> Puari Garwal, New Tehri, Haridwar, Chamoli and Uttarkashi

<sup>58</sup> Uttarkashi and Chamoli

<sup>59</sup> 1,188 – [45 + 41 + 34]

<sup>60</sup> Farrukhabad, Kanpur, Bijnor, Mirzapur, Varanasi, Allahabad, Bhadohi, Kasganj, Ghazipur, Unnao and Meerut

<sup>61</sup> Datayana, Khalliullahpur, Kathinai, Shilpi, Ramchandipur, Chadravati, Tewaripur, Mainpur, Nagla Gusi, Makdumpur, Indajashanpur, Shahwazur Pukhta, Jamsedpur urf Lalapur, Dubawal uparhar, Badripur, Chakniranjan, Durgapur, Behta, Kirachan, Pattidarapur, Katri alhuapur sarosa and Dudhora

<sup>62</sup> Nakata Diyara, Sabalpur, Mirzapur Warda, Shankarpur, Malakpur, Hetanpur, Panapur, Banwari Chak, Khawaspur Khurd and Arjunpur

<sup>63</sup> Patna, Munger, Bhagalpur, Saran and Buxar

- a. Out of 381 IHHLs surveyed, which were reported constructed for the beneficiaries, only 208 (55 per cent) IHHLs were actually found constructed. Of these, 64 IHHLs (31 per cent) were not being utilised by all family members.
- b. The payment of incentive was to be made to beneficiaries, only after completion of construction of IHHL and after declaration of ODF village by 'Ward Sabha'. We observed during joint site visits that 35 IHHLs were under construction in three villages<sup>64</sup> but incentive was found paid to all the 35 beneficiaries at the rate of ₹ 12,000 each.
- c. During joint site visit, no IHHL were found constructed in ODF declared village Banwari Chak; whereas, in two declared ODF villages Khawaspur Khurd and Malakpur 20 and 33 per cent construction of IHHLs were found respectively.
- d. Out of 381 test-checked beneficiaries, training/ promotion for use of toilets were not imparted to 241 beneficiaries (63 per cent) in six villages<sup>65</sup>.



**Plate 5.1: Non-functional toilet**  
GP-Datayana, KP- Jalilpur, Bijnor, Uttar Pradesh



**Plate 5.2: Non-functional toilet**  
GP-Kirachan, Block Rajepur, Farrukhabad, Uttar Pradesh

NMCG in its reply (August 2017) noted the audit observation and stated that issue had been conveyed to MoDW&S.

## 5.6 Solid Liquid Waste Management

The objective of SBM(G) is to bring about improvement in the cleanliness, hygiene and the general quality of life in rural areas. Solid and Liquid Waste Management (SLWM) is one of the key components of the programme.

We noticed that SLWM activities were not taken up in any of the identified districts of the States of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand and West Bengal. However,

<sup>64</sup> Shankarpur-nine IHHLs, Malakpur-18 IHHLs and Nakata Diyara-eight IHHLs

<sup>65</sup> Sabalpur, Shankarpur, Hetanpur, Panapur, Banwari Chak and Khawaspur Khurd

Uttarakhand could complete the work relating to SLWM in two out of 132 GPs and SLWM work in 11 GPs were under progress, as of March 2017.

NMCG in its reply (August 2017) noted the audit observation and stated that issue had been conveyed to MoDW&S.

## 5.7 Reporting and monitoring discrepancies

In terms of SBM(G) guidelines, the monitoring of outcomes will be the prime focus to be measured in terms of toilet usage as reflected in creation of ODF communities. Monitoring of outputs will also be done for administrative purposes in terms of monitoring of expenditure and assets created.

MoDW&S has developed an online monitoring system for SBM(G). Household level data with respect to sanitation facilities of all GPs in the country are to be made available on the MIS by States. States shall be permitted to update the Baseline Survey status once a year in the month of March-April. All SBM(G) Project districts are to submit their physical and financial progress reports of the implementation of the Programme every month through this online MIS. GP wise physical and financial progress for every month is to be entered in the SBM(G) MIS.

Discrepancies noticed in the reporting and monitoring mechanism are discussed below :

### 5.7.1 Inadequate Baseline Survey

As per para 5.1 of SBM guidelines, all States were to ensure entry of baseline data on the MIS latest by 30 January 2015. Any household not entered by the States on the Management Information System (MIS) would not be entitled for funds under SBM(G). The Baseline Survey (BLS) data has to be updated by the States in April of every year to take into account changes in the GP during the preceding year. This does not envisage resurvey of GPs, but only entry of incremental changes that may have happened in the GP in the preceding year.

In Uttar Pradesh, a BLS was conducted in 2012-13 to ascertain the number of households without toilets to whom the facility was to be provided with the objective to make GPs Open ODF. Our scrutiny revealed that number of household without toilets in GPs of Uttar Pradesh was being revised frequently at short intervals<sup>66</sup> in MIS in BLS, which was in contravention to the provision of the guidelines.

Further scrutiny revealed that in 10<sup>67</sup> out of 11 test checked districts<sup>68</sup> of Uttar Pradesh, 6,983 toilets were required in 23 GPs<sup>69</sup> as per BLS report (May 2017),

<sup>66</sup> Three difference figures were reflected from March 2017 to May 2017. March 2017: 4,79,449; April 2017: 4,57,202; 19 May 2017: 4,42,672.

<sup>67</sup> Farrukhabad, Kanpur, Bijnor, Mirzapur, Varanasi, Allahabad, Bhadohi, Kasganj, Ghazipur and Meerut

however, in these 23 GPs total 9,285 toilets were constructed/ being constructed under *Namami Gange* scheme. Thus, 2,302 toilets were constructed/ under construction in excess of requirement as per the BLS report. This indicates that the assessment of household without toilets in BLS report was not realistic.

NMCG while accepting the fact stated (August 2017) that it did not have direct concern with baseline survey. NMCG further stated that it had approved the budgetary estimates, on the basis of proposal submitted by MoDW&S for different activities i.e. constructions of IHHLs, SLWM, IEC and Administrative expenses.

### 5.7.2 Discrepancies between MIS data and basic records of Gram Panchayats

Scrutiny of records of 12 test-checked districts<sup>70</sup> of Uttar Pradesh and Jharkhand disclosed the discrepancies in the data reported under MIS data of MoDW&S and basic records maintained by GPs, as discussed in Table 5.6.

**Table 5.6 : Details of discrepancies in MIS data of MoDW&S and basic records of GPs**

State	Discrepancies
<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In six<sup>71</sup> GPs of three<sup>72</sup> districts of Uttar Pradesh, the difference in numbers of the beneficiaries was noticed in the online MIS list and the list provided by GPs.</li> <li>In 63 GPs of test checked districts of Uttar Pradesh, 211 beneficiaries were appearing twice in the MIS list. This shows that the online MIS data was not reliable.</li> </ul>
<b>Jharkhand</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the MIS data of six sampled villages<sup>73</sup> of Jharkhand, 540 IHHLs were allotted to 258 beneficiaries suggesting multiple allotments of 282 IHHLs to same beneficiaries. However, in beneficiaries list, only one IHHL to each beneficiary was provided.</li> <li>The names of 49 out of 70 beneficiaries of seven<sup>74</sup> test checked villages of Jharkhand were included in the beneficiary list of constructed IHHLs. However, their names were not found available in the MIS data.</li> </ul>

<sup>68</sup> Farrukhabad, Kanpur, Bijnor, Mirzapur, Varanasi, Allahabad, Bhadohi, Kasganj, Ghazipur, Unnao and Meerut

<sup>69</sup> Sunderpur, Mahigawa, Hansauli Kajiganj, Durgapur, Sunhauhra, Behta, Bipausi, Khalliullahpur, Daranagar, Sahpur mau bhalwa/ Nizamuddinpur, Sujabad, Jamsedpur urf Lalapur, Jera, Kalik Mawaiya, Ojhapur, Purawa, Kedarpur, Beraspur, Chakniranjan, Sahwajpurpukhta, Devchandrapur, Manpur and Jalalpurjeera

<sup>70</sup> Uttar Pradesh (Farrukhabad, Kanpur, Bijnor, Mirzapur, Varanasi, Allahabad, Bhadohi, Kasganj, Ghazipur, Unnao and Meerut) and Jharkhand (Sahibganj)

<sup>71</sup> Tewaripur, Khalispur, Deoria, Sadhopur, Manpur, Mehmoodpur Pukhta

<sup>72</sup> Ghazipur, Meerut and Kasganj

<sup>73</sup> Bada Madanashi, North Palasgachi, West Pranpur, Kaswa, Fatehpur and Makhmalpur part

<sup>74</sup> Bada Madanashi, North Palasgachi, West Pranpur, Kaswa, Fatehpur, Chotti Koderjanna and Makhmalpur part



State	Discrepancies
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5,340 IHHLs were constructed, yet 3,153 IHHLs were reported as constructed in MIS.</li> <li>• The names of 49 out of 70 beneficiaries were included in the beneficiary list of constructed IHHLs. But their names were not found available in the MIS data.</li> </ul>

The above observations indicated that targets as well as achievements reported by MoDW&S through its online MIS is not reliable.

NMCG in its reply (August 2017) noted the audit observation and stated that issue had been conveyed to MoDW&S.

### 5.8 Conclusion

The main objective of Rural Sanitation programme to make all Ganga river basin villages ODF could not be achieved despite repeated extension of time. There were deficiencies in planning and laxity in spending of available funds by the State Governments, as target set for constructions of IHHLs and ODF villages could not be achieved. Cases of excess constructions of IHHLs and multiple allotments of IHHLs to same beneficiaries were also found. The work relating to Solid Liquid Waste Management was not initiated in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand and West Bengal. There were discrepancies in data of targets/ achievement reported under MIS and in the records of Gram Panchayats.

### 5.9 Recommendations

We recommend that

- i. NMCG, in consultation with MoDW&S, may ensure the optimum utilisation of available funds with the State Governments.
- ii. NMCG, in consultation with MoDW&S, may ensure more realistic planning, data integrity and strict monitoring for achievement targets.
- iii. NMCG and MoDW&S may ensure the reliability of the data reported under MIS by cross checking with monthly physical/ financial reports submitted by all Swachh Bharat Mission (Gramin) Project Districts.

