

CHAPTER – III
IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHEMES

Public Health Engineering Department

3.1 Total Sanitation Campaign

Highlights

With a view to promoting sanitation facilities in Rural houses, Schools and Aganwadis etc., the Government of India (GOI) introduced a programme of “Total Sanitation Campaign” (TSC) in April 1999. The programme was initially not implemented in the year 1999-2000 and 2000-2001. The achievement of Individual House Hold Latrines (IHHLs) was eight (Above Poverty Line) and seventeen (Below Poverty Line) per cent of the fixed target. Similarly, two per cent of total projects cost (Rs. 422.55 crore) was spent on Information Education and Communication (IEC) against 15 per cent as approved. Funds for maintenance of Schools and Aganwadis latrines were not provided by the concerned departments. Only 190 Gram Panchayats out of 23051 could be awarded with Nirmal Gram Puraskar. Preliminary survey was found not conducted in test checked districts. Some other important findings of the review are given below:

The shortfall in release of funds was 38 per cent of the total provision.

(Paragraph 3.1.7.1)

The percentage of shortfall in expenditure ranged between 35 and 93 (with reference to total funds available) and 78 to 99 (with reference to sanctioned cost of project).

(Paragraph 3.1.7.2)

Against the sanctioned cost of project sanctioned (Rs. 411.10 crore) for 46 districts, only Rs. 167.72 crore (41 per cent) were received whereas completion period in these districts was scheduled to be over by the end of 2006-07. The shortfall in receipt of funds is likely to delay attainment of targets.

(Paragraph 3.1.7.4)

Unspent balance of IEC/HRD cell amounting to Rs. 0.22 crore was not transferred.

(Paragraph 3.1.9.6)

Only Rs. 12.23 lakh (six per cent) of Communication and Capacity Development Unit (CCDU) funds were utilised after lapse of 1-2 year against total receipt of Rs. 1.90 crore.

(Paragraph 3.1.9.7)

Separate units of toilets for girls and boys were not provided.

(Paragraph 3.1.11.3)

2302 works relating to hardware activities and alternate delivery mechanism (Estimated cost: Rs. 6.08 crore) were executed in excess of approval of the GOI.

(Paragraph 3.1.14)

Monitoring of progress through regular field inspections and review of project in each district and Periodical Evaluation Study were not conducted.

(Paragraph 3.1.19.1 and 3.1.20)

3.1.1 Introduction

The national programme “Total Sanitation Campaign” (TSC) was introduced by Government of India (GOI) in April 1999 and implemented in all districts of Madhya Pradesh from the same date as a Centrally sponsored scheme after revamping the Central Rural Sanitation Programme. The TSC intended to promote sanitation in a project mode through demand creation for sanitation facilities in rural-houses, schools and for cleaner environment and alternate delivery mechanisms for supply of services and products. The programme was being implemented with focus on community-led and people centered initiatives. The revised approach in the programme emphasises more on Information, Education and Communication (IEC), Human Resource Development (HRD) and Capacity Development (CD) activities to increase awareness among the rural people. The programme, also intended to tap the potential of the children as the most persuasive advocates of good sanitation practices in their own households and in schools.

3.1.2 Campaign objectives

The main objectives of the scheme were to:

- Bring about an improvement in the general quality of life in rural areas.
- Accelerate sanitation coverage in rural areas.
- Generate demand for sanitation facilities through awareness creation and health education.
- Cover Schools /Anganwadis in rural areas with sanitation facilities and promote hygiene education and sanitary habits among students.
- Encourage cost effective and appropriate technologies in sanitation.
- Eliminate open defecation to minimize risk of contamination of drinking water sources and food.
- Convert dry latrines to pour/flush latrines and eliminate manual scavenging practice wherever in existence in rural areas.

3.1.3 Organisational Setup

At the national level, the Department of Drinking Water Supply, Ministry of Rural Development GOI is authorised for implementation of the TSC. At State level, a State Water Sanitation Committee (SWSC) known as Shikhar Samiti headed by the Additional Chief Secretary, Government of Madhya Pradesh and the Project Director, Total Sanitation Campaign/Swajaldhara (PD-TSC) were responsible for implementation, co-ordination, monitoring and evaluation of the programme and facilitate implementation in the districts. An Executive Committee headed by Principal Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department (PHED) was responsible to implement the decisions taken by SWSC (i.e. Shikhar Samiti) at field level. PHED was also nominated

as nodal department to implement the campaign with the co-operation of other departments like School-Education Department, Rural Development Department and Industry Department.

At district and village levels, the programme was being implemented by the Panchayati Raj Institutions. The programme was implemented by District Water and Sanitation Committee (DWSC) at district level, Block Water & Sanitation Committee (BWSC) at Block level and Village Water & Sanitation Committee (VWSC) at Village level under the control of ZP, JP and GP respectively. The scheme was also implemented through Parents Teachers' Associations (PTA) Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO) Self Help Groups (SHGS).

3.1.4 Audit objectives

Performance audit was conducted to examine and assess whether:

- Adequate funds were timely provided and utilised efficiently and effectively.
- The efficacy of planning and economy in implementation of various components of the programme.
- Major programme intervention was according to the norms.
- Sufficient manpower was available for programme implementation.
- Demands for sanitation facilities through awareness creation and health education were generated.
- The monitoring system was proper and effective.

3.1.5 Audit Criteria

Audit criteria included the norms as per the scheme guidelines (TSC) for conducting preliminary survey, preparation of project implementation plan, IEC action plan, norms of infrastructure facilities provided to sanitary objectives in each component, availability of Staff, adequacy of training programme for key programme managers and hygiene education to the people as well as children in school. General Financial Rules/Treasury Rules and Circulars issued by Government of Madhya Pradesh and practices/recommendations published by Review- Mission of GOI were also taken into account.

3.1.6 Audit coverage and methodology

The performance audit was based on test check of records for the period 1999-2006 conducted during September 2006 to January 2007 in offices of Seven Zilla Panchayats (ZPs), 25 Janpad Panchayats (Janpads), 70 Gram Panchayats (GPs), 57 PTAs and three NGOs/Rural Sanitation Mats (RSMs) as shown in **Appendix-XXI** Informations and data were also collected from the PD (TSC) established in office of the Engineer in Chief (E-in-C), PHED Bhopal. The

districts were selected by sampling method of Probability Proportional to Size With Replacement (PPSWR) with total expenditure. Janpad Panchayats (Janpads), Gram Panchayats (GPs), PTAs. & NGOs were selected at random. The discussions were held with State Implementation Authorities (i.e. E-in-C, PHED and PD-TSC/ Swajaldhara Cell of PHED), Finance officer and other officers of project from time to time through courtesy visits. The points noticed during audit are discussed in succeeding paragraphs.

Audit findings

3.1.7 Financial management

The funding from the Ministry of Rural Development Department, Government of India and the State Government under TSC were on sharing basis **Appendix-XXII**. The State share was to be released to the concerned project districts at least in the same proportion as Central share within a fortnight of release of the Central share. For all the hardware activities executed, the corresponding household / community contribution was required to be taken and reflected appropriately in the progress report. According to the norms, seventy percent of the expenses were to be incurred on infrastructure (i.e. hardware activities like latrines and Sanitation Complexes etc.), fifteen percent on IEC, five percent on Start-up activities, five percent on Alternate Delivery Mechanisms i.e. Production Centre & Rural Sanitary Marts (PCs/RSMs) and five percent on administrative expenses. Annual accounts including utilisation certificate certified by Chartered Accountants were to be submitted to GOI. Certificate to the effect that inadmissible items had not been purchased was also to be submitted.

The year-wise details of receipts and expenditure incurred in the State during 1999-2006 were as under:

Year (Progressive)	No. of districts for which projects were sanctioned by GOI		Central share released	State share released	Beneficiaries Contribution received	Total funds available	Expendi- ture incurred	Percentage of Shortfall in expenditure	
	No. of districts/ Projects	Cost of project sanctioned						With reference to total available funds	With reference to cost of project Sanctioned
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
99-2000	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL
2000-2001	5	39.01	7.73	NIL	*NA	7.73	NA	--	--
upto 2001-2002	6	50.13	9.92	NIL	*NA	9.92	0.70	93	99
upto 2002-2003	15	127.07	16.37	3.84	*NA	20.21	9.09	55	93
upto 2003-2004	46	411.10	58.20	20.43	2.32	80.95	25.35	69	94
upto 2004-2005	48	422.55	83.05	28.62	5.13	116.80	69.26	41	84
upto 2005-2006	48	422.55	103.30	35.51	6.56	145.37	94.62	35	78

*NA – Not Available

Following shortcomings were noticed in financial management:

3.1.7.1 Short release of funds:- The total cost of Rs. 422.55 crore was to be met through Central share (Rs. 272.76 crore), State share (Rs. 94.03 crore) and beneficiaries contribution (Rs. 55.76 crore). As against the Central and State share amounting to Rs. 366.79 crore, only Rs. 138.81 crore (38 per-cent) was released as Government share which resulted to short release of funds.

3.1.7.2 Poor utilisation of available funds: - The percentage of shortfall in expenditure ranged between 35 and 93 (with reference to total funds available) and 78 to 99 (with reference to cost of projects sanctioned) which shows poor utilisation of available funds. The shortfall was attributed by the Department (November 2006) to low demand which was indicative of poor performance of IEC activities. The PD stated (June 2007) that the shortfall in the year 2003-04 to 2005-06 was justified as these years were primary for IEC activities only and new projects were sanctioned in the year from 2004-05 to 2005-06. The reply is not acceptable as the expenditure on IEC activities during these years was only Rs. 7.07 crore (five per cent) as compared to requirement of Rs. 21.81 crore (15 per cent) with reference to available funds (Rs. 145.37 crore) up to 2005-06. Further consuming three years (2003-04 to 2005-06) in a total project period of 3-4 years for implementation on one component (IEC) was unjustified. Even from 2004-05 to 2005-06 only two projects were sanctioned which was also negligible.

3.1.7.3 Non-release of State share: - The state share was to be released according to the funding pattern as prescribed in para 17-19 of guideline within a fortnight of release of the Central share. Test check of information made available by PD (TSC) revealed that no corresponding State share was released during the year 2000-01 to 2001-02 while GOI had released Rs. 9.92 crore as Central share. In reply, PD (TSC) stated (November 2006 and June 2007) that State share could not be released during the aforesaid years due to non-provision of budget for such type of new-programme. The reply was not acceptable as this was mandatory for the State Government.

Above shortcomings in Financial Management implied partial implementation, non-implementation and neglect of some critical areas that affected the overall implementation of the scheme.

3.1.7.4 Slow progress in receipt of funds:- According to terms and conditions for TSC, the project completion period was 3-4 years. Therefore the projects of 46 districts sanctioned between 2000-01 and 2003-04 were required to be completed from 2003-04 to 2006-07 as per details given below -
(Rs. in crore)

Year of Completion (Progressive)	No. of districts involved	Cost of projects Sanctioned	Total funds to be received	Total funds received	Percentage of receipt with reference to the project cost sanctioned
1	2	3	4	5	6
upto 2003-04	5	39.01	39.01	19.71	51
upto 2004-05	6	50.13	50.13	25.39	51
upto 2005-06	15	127.07	127.07	47.03	37
upto 2006-07	46	411.10	411.10	167.72	41 (September 2006)

The above table reveals that only 41 per cent funds (Rs. 167.72 crore) were received by the said districts upto 2006-07(September 2006) against the sanctioned cost of Rs. 411.10 crore while the period of 46 projects (3-4 years) was completed during 2006-07 and 15 projects had to be completed up to 2005-06. This resulted in slow execution of the projects. In reply, the PD (TSC) agreed to the fact of slow progress and stated (November 2006) that the proposals for releasing subsequent instalment were not finalised because (i)

proposals were objected by the GOI (4 Districts), (ii) proposals were kept pending with the GOI (4 Districts), (iii) proposals were to be obtained from the concerned districts (20 Districts) and (iv) utilisation of funds was not more than 60 per cent (14 Districts). These reasons clearly reveal poor demand generation, poor formulation of proposals and under utilisation of funds leading to slow/non-release of funds. It was however stated (June 2007) that the GOI has extended the completion of the project period by 2012. However terms and conditions, i.e. project period of 3-4 years for TSC project still remained unchanged. Therefore, the units sanctioned in the each district project were required to be completed within 3-4 years.

The slow progress implied that it would take longer to cover the entire State and the aim of TSC would take longer to achieve

Results of audit in test checked districts revealed violations of norms, non-maintenance of records etc. leading to weak control and heightened risks as detailed in the subsequent paragraphs: -

3.1.7.5 Delay in release of funds: - According to GOI guidelines (January 2004) the State share must be released within a fortnight of release of the Central share. In five test checked districts¹, it was noticed that State share amounting to Rs. 2.33 crore was released with delay of 2 to 29 months. In reply, PD stated (June 2007) that the funds were released as per availability of budget and demands made. The reply is not acceptable as the State share must be released within a fortnight of release of the Central share. There is no question of demands etc. made by the districts. Scrutiny of records in test checked districts revealed that in Gwalior and Sagar districts, the State share of Rs. 1.70 crore received by the Chief Executive officers (CEOs) Zilla Panchayats was also remitted with delay of 45 to 81 days into Bank accounts of TSC. The PD also stated (June 2007) that the CEOs were being instructed to deposit the funds in proper time.

3.1.7.6 Non-maintenance of ledgers: - The accounts of the TSC project (like: Receipts & payment accounts, Income and Expenditure accounts and Balance sheet) were to be audited annually by a Chartered Accountant. The accounts were required to be maintained on double entry system in which maintenance of ledger was necessary. Audit noticed that ledgers were not maintained in Zilla Panchayats of six test checked districts² for the accounts of the TSC project. In the absence of ledgers the classification of expenditure to concerned head of account could not be verified. In reply, test checked districts stated (November-December 2006 and April 2007) that the ledger would be maintained.

*Conference of State Ministers of Rural Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation, New Delhi (31 January- 1 February 2006)

¹ Bhopal (Rs. 11.74 lakh - 4 Months), Gwalior (Rs. 38.02 lakh - 24 - 29 Months), Jhabua (Rs. 61.63 lakh - 2 -7 Months), Narsinghpur (Rs. 55.87 lakh - 17 Months), Sagar (Rs.65.67 lakh-2-6 Months).

² Bhopal, Jabalpur, Jhabua, Narsinghpur, Sagar and Seoni district.

3.1.7.7 Improper maintenance of Cash Book: - According to Rule 53 of Madhya Pradesh Treasury Code (MPTC) volume- I, Drawing and Disbursing Officer (DDO) in charge of cash-book was required to record analysis of cash balance and to verify it personally at the end of each month under his dated signature. Daily totals of the cashbook were to be checked. Apart from this the cashbook was to be maintained in the format of double entry system. Test check of records revealed that the Zilla Panchayats of Gwalior, Jabalpur and Sagar districts were not following the prescribed formalities. In reply, it was stated (September-December 2006) that the cashbook would be maintained as required.

3.1.7.8 Non-adjustment of advances: - Rule 53 (IV) of MPTC (Volume-I) lays down that temporary advances were to be adjusted as early as possible and should not remain outstanding for more than three months. PD (TSC) also circulated (August 2005) that amount should be recovered immediately where the amount has been released but the work could not be started/completed for a long time. Audit observed that advances for Rs. 11.70 crore were lying unadjusted for periods ranging between 4 and 57 months in all the seven test checked Zilla Panchayats³ as detailed in **Appendix XXIII**. On this being pointed out in audit, it was stated (September - December 2006 and April 2007) that the action to adjust/recover these advances would be taken. The PD also informed (June 2007) that the concerned were being informed again.

3.1.7.9 Lapse of Rs. 5 lakh as State share: - CEO (ZP) Jhabua received (November 2006) Rs. 85.86 lakh as State share against the requirement of Rs. 90.86⁴ lakh whereas the receipt of Rs. 90.86 lakh was reported in the monthly progress report. On being pointed out in audit, the CEO. (ZP) Jhabua stated (November 2006) that the bill of Rs. 5 lakh was not passed by the District Treasury due to lack of budget allocation. The reply was not acceptable, as the budget allocation was available at that time (March 2004). This resulted in lapse of budget allocation to that extent and non utilisation of same for TSC activities.

3.1.7.10 Non-maintenance of VWSC wise payment register: - The audit report of the Chartered Accountant (CA) was to be submitted in the format annexed (Annexure -V to IX) to GOI guidelines (January 2004). Annexures - VIII to IX were prescribed for maintaining of VWSC wise payment registers. In six of seven test-checked districts², it was noticed that these registers/details were not being maintained and the audit report of CA was submitted without these formats. On being pointed out in audit, the CEOs (ZP) of six test checked districts⁵ stated (September-December 2006 and April 2007) that the registers/details would be maintained. In this connection, PD replied (June 2007) that the instructions were being issued to follow the rules.

³ Gwalior, Bhopal, Jabalpur, Jhabua, Narsinghpur, Sagar and Seoni district.

⁴ (i) Total cost of the project for Jhabua: Rs. 1330.01 lakh (C.S.:Rs. 848.34 lakh, S.S.:Rs. 302.88 lakh, and Beneficiaries share: Rs. 178.80 lakh) (ii) C.S. received: Rs.254.50 lakh (Nov.06) (iii) S.S. required: Rs. 90.86 lakh $\left(\frac{302.88}{848.34} \times 254.50\right)$

⁵ Gwalior, Jabalpur, Jhabua, Narsinghpur, Sagar and Seoni district.

3.1.7.11 Unauthorised procedure for releasing funds:- Govt. of M.P., PHED ordered (August 2003) that the District Water and Sanitation Committee (DWSC) would be responsible for further release of funds in instalments to the Village Water and Sanitation Committees (VWSCs)/Village Health Committees / Parents' Teachers' Associations (PTAs) and Beneficiaries groups. But the DWSCs of test checked districts released the funds aggregating to Rs. 9.36 crore **Appendix XXIII** to Janpad Panchayats and AEs, PHE-Sub-divisions which in turn released the fund to the executing agencies. This resulted in further delay in depositing funds to bank accounts which ranged between 30 and 222 days in four Janpads⁶ and was contrary to the intention of speedy release of funds to executing agencies as desired by the State Government/GOI. On enquiry it was stated by Sagar district that the matter would be reviewed. The CEO (ZP) Seoni replied (April 2007) that the funds of VWSCs and PTAs were released through Janpad Panchayat for monitoring purposes. The reply is not acceptable as this was contrary to the orders. On this issue, the PD replied (June 2007) that the necessary instructions were being issued to follow regular procedure.

3.1.7.12 Operation of more than single bank account:- According to the provision of GOI guidelines a single bank account was to be maintained for execution of the scheme. But five bank accounts were being maintained in the test checked district Sagar. This was against the provision of the guidelines as well as creating difficulty in reconciliation of bank accounts and weakens control on accounts. In reply, it was assured (December 2006) that the single account would be maintained.

3.1.8 Programme management / implementation

Implementation of TSC was proposed on a project mode. While GOI introduced TSC in April 1999, the implementation of the campaign could not be started in the same year due to non-receipt of Central share. As detailed in **Appendix XXIV**, 48 projects were sanctioned during 1999-2000 to 2004-05 at a total cost of Rs. 422.55 crore. Of these 46 projects were stipulated to be completed by the years 2003-04 to 2006-07. It was noticed that none of the projects were completed as of September 2006. Further short comings in the programme components and activities for TSC implementation were as follow:-

3.1.8.1 Start-up activities: -

TSC was required to be implemented with start up activities like preliminary survey, initial orientation and training of key programme managers and publicity etc. which were main activities for success of campaign. Short fall in start-up activities are discussed below:-

3.1.8.2 Preliminary survey not conducted: - In keeping with the aim of the TSC to generate/create demand for sanction and implementation with a focus on community led and people centered initiatives, a preliminary survey was to

⁶ Jhabua Janpad (Jhabua District), Shahgarh, Mallthon & Reheli Janpad (Sagar District).

be conducted to assess the status of sanitation and hygiene practices, people's attitude and demand for improved sanitation. This was expected to prepare the District TSC projects proposals for seeking Government of India assistance. However the preliminary survey was not conducted in any of the test checked districts and the projects for these districts were sanctioned without the preliminary survey. In reply, the PD stated (June 2007) that preliminary survey was conducted under some other programme at district level and there was no need of conducting separate preliminary survey. The reply is not acceptable as the approval for exemption conducting preliminary survey for objective of TSC was not obtained from the competent authority (i.e. GOI or Shikhar Samiti of TSC). Besides, no record relating to preliminary survey conducted was on record and no circular was issued for districts in this regards. In absence of preliminary survey, the demand and quantum of sanitary coverage were not identified and the stated aim and objectives of the TSC were therefore not fully complied with.

3.1.8.3 Initial orientation and training not conducted: - According to the guidelines of GOI (January 2004) initial orientation and training of key programme managers was a part of the start-up activities which was also not conducted in Bhopal, Gwalior and Jhabua districts. In reply, CEO (ZP) Bhopal stated (November 2006) that such training was not imparted due to lack of time. Reasons for not-conducting such training in Gwalior and Jhabua were not given. This also affected smooth of the running of campaign and the implementation of project.

3.1.8.4 Earmarked funds not utilised: - The shortfall in complying with requirements of start-up activities were borne out by the actual amounts utilised towards this purpose. According to the funding pattern, five per cent (Subject to a ceiling of Rs. 20 lakh per district) were earmarked for start-up activities. As against Rs. 21.13 crore⁷ which should have been spent for above activities, the funds actually utilised were only to the tune of Rs. 2.64 crore (0.62 per cent). This affected the aim of startup activities as envisaged. In reply, PD stated (June 2007) that the programme did not suffer due to non-utilisation of earmarked funds since the programme commenced in time with less utilisation of funds. The reply is not acceptable as the records of implementation shows that not a single project in any districts could be completed even after lapse of 6-7 years. For effective implementation it is essential that the correct requirement of personal is assessed and availability of trained manpower and publicity is ensured. This required that maximum expenditure as per norms should be incurred first.

⁷ Five percent of total cost of project for 48 districts: Rs. 422.55 crore, earmarked for start-up activities.

3.1.9 IEC Activities

Since the scheme was based on generation of demand and people/ community led initiatives, Information, Education and Communication (IEC) including Motivational Awareness, Educative Campaigns and Advocacy etc constituted important components of the programme. These were intended to create demand for sanitary facilities in rural areas for households, schools, Anganwadies, Balwadies and Community Sanitary Complexes and focus on health and hygiene practices and environmental sanitation aspects. Inadequate efforts for IEC activities, under utilisation of available funds in this regard and non adherence to available guideline can reduce the effectiveness of a scheme such as TSC, the success of which depends on changing attitudes, habits and mindsets of people at large. Shortfalls in IEC are discussed below: -

3.1.9.1 Less expenditure on IEC: - Funds were made available for preliminary IEC work. IEC funding would be in the ratio of 80:20 between GOI and the State Government and the total IEC cost should not be less than 15 per cent of the project. Audit observed that the expenditure on IEC in all 48 districts was Rs. 8.01 crore upto September 2006 against the sanctioned IEC-cost of Rs. 63.38 crore⁸ which was only 1.90 per cent of total project cost.

Further scrutiny of records of seven test checked districts revealed that against the total project cost for IEC component, sanctioned IEC cost was less than the norms. Further, the actual expenditure on IEC was only 9 to 35 per cent of the sanctioned IEC cost and 3 to 25 per cent of expenditure incurred on the project as shown below: -

(Rs. in crore)

S. No.	Name of districts test checked	Total project cost sanctioned for district	IEC cost to be sanctioned by the GOI (@ 15 per cent)	IEC cost actually sanctioned by the GOI	Expenditure incurred on		Percentage of IEC expenditure with reference to	
					IEC	Project	IEC cost actually sanctioned	Expenditure incurred on project
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	Bhopal	2.70	0.41	0.40	(Sep. 06) 0.14	0.57	35	25
2	Gwalior	5.60	0.84	0.76	(Aug. 06) 0.18	2.56	24	7
3	Jabalpur	12.20	1.83	1.36	(Oct. 06) 0.44	3.53	32	11
4	Jhabua	13.30	1.99	1.50	(Oct. 06) 0.36	3.40	24	11
5	N' pur	9.42	1.41	1.36	(Oct. 06) 0.42	5.46	31	8
6	Sagar	15.12	2.27	1.68	(Nov. 06) 0.15	4.53	9	3
7	Seoni	10.16	1.52	1.15	(Oct. 06) 0.34	6.00	30	6

⁸ Total IEC cost (15% of total PC): Rs. 63.38 crore (422.55×15%).

The CEOs (ZP) replied (September-December 2006 and April 2007) that the expenditure would be raised on IEC. The PD stated (June 2007) that due to shortage of trained manpower, electronic software, print media, hardware and certain machines the expenditure was less in IEC. The reply of the department is indicative of lapses on their part.

3.1.9.2 Very low expenditure on incentive to motivator: - The motivators were to be given suitable incentive (Rs. 20/- each as decided in May 2005) from the funds earmarked for IEC. The incentive would be performance based i.e. in terms of motivating the number of households and schools/anganwadis to construct latrines and soakage pits and also use the same subsequently. Audit scrutiny revealed that no incentive to motivators was given in Bhopal, Jabalpur, Jhabua, Narsinghpur and Seoni districts. Whereas the expenditure of Rs. 0.25 lakh (Gwalior: Rs. 0.02 lakh & Sagar Rs: 0.23 lakh) towards payment of incentive to motivators (Gwalior: 01 and Sagar: 16) was very nominal with reference to the works of hardware executed in seven test checked districts⁷. This has also resulted in poor performance of execution as commented in succeeding sub paragraph 3.1.10.2 and 3.1.11.1.

3.1.9.3 Non-imparting of hygiene education: - Funds available under IEC might be used for imparting hygiene education to people as well as children in schools. In this connection, GOI's guidelines required that at least one teacher in each school must be trained in hygiene education, who in turn should train the children through interesting activities and community projects that emphasize hygiene behavior. According to the information made available five⁹ of seven test checked districts did not impart such training. In Jabalpur district, only three teachers could be trained for 2086 schools of the district. In reply, PD stated (June 2007) that it was not possible to impart hygiene education at a time at all the places by the department. The reply is not acceptable as there was no such requirement to impart training at a time at all the places. Besides, the State Government had also ordered (July 2005) that each school should spend Rs. 100 to Rs.150 to purchase a big Mirror, Combs and Nail cutters etc. and provide to each student for developing hygiene practices among them. Scrutiny of information made available by Bhopal, Gwalior, Narsinghpur, Sagar and Seoni revealed that the funds for this purpose were not released. In reply, it was stated (October-December 2006 and April 2007) that the action would be taken.

3.1.9.4 IEC action plan not prepared:- Each project district should prepare a detailed IEC action plan with defined strategies to reach all sections of the community. The aim of such a communication plan is to motivate rural people to adopt hygiene behaviour as a way of life and thereby develop and maintain all facilities created under the programme. Scrutiny of records of TSC project revealed that in six¹⁰ of seven test checked districts, the IEC action plan was not prepared. In reply, the CEOs (ZP) confirmed the facts. The PD also stated (June 2007) that all the districts have been instructed to prepare the IEC action plans.

⁹ Five Districts: Bhopal, Jhabua, Narsinghpur, Sagar and Seoni.

¹⁰ Six Districts: Bhopal, Gwalior, J.pur, Jhabua, Narsinghpur and Seoni.

3.1.9.5 Prescribed activities not performed:- Under IEC, wall painting on a community building or hoarding should display the details of activities undertaken in that Panchayat. Further, audio/video clippings in AIR, Doordarshan and Cable TVs may be screened for demand generation. In four¹¹ of seven test checked districts neither expenditure was incurred on the above activities nor any amount was released to Panchayats under IEC component. In reply, It was stated (September-November 2006 and April 2007) that action would be taken in this regard. In this connection, the PD stated (June 2007) that all the prescribed activities under IEC can not be performed in each districts. Clipping in AIR and Doordarshan were being shown at state level. The reply is not acceptable as under IEC, wall painting and clipping in cable TVs were an important component indirectly reaching out to the people. Besides, state level IEC as conducted on audio and video clipping in AIR/ Doordarshan was met out from CCDU funds as discussed in the next sub para. In addition to that IEC was also to be conducted by districts through their funds.

3.1.9.6 Unspent balance of IEC and HRD programme not transferred so far:- According to GOI guidelines (January 2004), common IEC and HRD activities / programmes for the whole state were to be taken up at the state level under Water Supply and Sanitation sector. In this connection, GOI had restructured (June 2004) the IEC and HRD programme and set up a Communication and Capacity Development Unit (CCDU) in place of IEC and HRD cell supported by GOI earlier in the state for this purpose. Against approval of Rs. 2.12 crore for establishment of new CCDU to conduct IEC and HRD activities / programmes in Madhya Pradesh, Rs. 1.90 crore were released by the GOI (March 2005) after deduction of Rs. 0.22 crore towards unspent balance available with IEC and HRD programme cell. The unspent balance of the fund available with the State Government under IEC and HRD programmes supported earlier by the GOI was to be transferred to this unit (CCDU). Audit scrutiny revealed that the such unspent balance was not transferred (June 2007) for further utilisation. In reply, PD (TSC) stated (June 2007) that the TSC cell has requested the E-in-C (Head of Department) PHED office in this matter.

3.1.9.7 Under utilisation of CCDU funds:- According to GOI's guidelines, Specialist consultants from the fields of Communication, Human Resource Development (HRD), Social Mobilization and School sanitation & hygiene education can be engaged at the State level. Similarly common IEC and HRD activities for the whole State was to be taken up at the State level. Audit observed that only seven per cent of CCDU funds (Rs. 12.53 lakh)¹² were utilised (November 2006) against the total receipt of CCDU funds (Rs. 1.90 crore received in April 2005) even after lapse of 1-2 years under Rural Water and Sanitation Programme. In reply, the PD stated (June 2007) that due to support of UNICEF the expenditure was less. The reply is not acceptable as the UNICEF funds were not required to be linked with CCDU funds.

¹¹ Four Districts:- Bhopal, Gwalior, Jhabua and Seoni.

¹² Total expenditure Rs. 12.53 lakh (IEC: Rs.8.64 lakh, HRD: Rs. 1.16 lakh, Consultant fees: Rs. 0.81 lakh, Contingencies: Rs. 1.92 lakh),

3.1.10 Construction of Individual Household latrines (IHHLs)

With a view to cover all the rural families in eliminating open defecation to minimise risk of contamination of drinking water sources and food, the component of IHHLs was introduced. Incentive as provided under the scheme was to be extended only to Below Poverty line (BPL) families, if the same was considered necessary for full involvement of the community. The financing pattern including the incentive for BPL households for construction of individual household latrines was as follows: -

Basic low cost unit (sanctioned in Madhya Pradesh)	Contribution					
	GOI		State		Household	
	BPL	APL	BPL	APL	BPL	APL
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Upto Rs. 625/- (Single pit)	60%	NIL	20%	NIL	20%	100%

Scrutiny of records revealed as under: -

3.1.10.1 Low performance in the component of IHHLs: - Scrutiny of Monthly Progress Report (MPR) as on September 2006 made available by PD (TSC) revealed as under: -

No. of districts	Year of Completion of Projects (Progressive)	IHHLs Approved		IHHLs achieved		Shortfall with percentage	
		APL	BPL	APL	BPL	APL	BPL
1	2	3	4	5	6	7 (3-5)	8 (4-6)
46	2006-07	4306016	3228685	324784	548088	3981232 (92)	2680597 (83)
2	2007-08	138971	82628	500	19100	138471 (100)	63528 (87)

The above table revealed that in 46 districts where the projects were to be over by the end of 2006-07 the shortfall in this component was 92 (APL) and 83 (BPL) per cent respectively with reference to approved targets. This indicated very poor performance. In reply, the PD (TSC) stated (November 2006) that the slow progress was due to low-generation of demand which was indicative of inadequate attention on IEC as highlighted in the preceding paragraphs. The PD further stated (June 2007) that the low performance of IHHLs was not only due to inadequate IEC, but also due to large SCs/STs population, mental setup and low per capita income etc. The reply is not acceptable as the reasons cited by the PD only go to reinforce the audit observation that the expenditure on IEC should be stepped up and that performance in this regard was not satisfactory.

3.1.10.2 Approved targets not achieved: - According to the projects sanctioned by GOI for test checked districts, the projects were to be completed within 3-4 years. Scrutiny of MPRs revealed that the construction of IHHLs for BPL families was not completed according to the targets approved (No. of units approved) in the projects sanctioned as per details given below: -

Name of test checked districts	Year of sanction of the projects	Year of completion of the project	Total targets of IHHLs for BPL approved by GOI in the project	No. of IHHLs for BPL constructed (incentive was given)	Shortfall (with percentage)	No. of IHHLs constructed for SC and ST (with percentage)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bhopal	2002-03	2005-06	20010	1622 (Sep. 06)	18388 (92)	568 (35)
Gwalior	2000-01	2003-04	30166	10480 (Aug. 06)	19686 (65)	2937 (28)
Jabalpur	2003-04	2006-07	106290	28959 (Sep. 06)	77331 (73)	5704 (20)
Jhabua	2003-04	2006-07	109136	20770 (Oct. 06)	88366 (81)	19735 (95)
Narsingpur	2000-01	2003-04	67857	21270 (Oct. 06)	46587 (69)	10926 (51)
Sagar	2003-04	2006-07	145037	45148 (Nov. 06)	99889 (69)	19868 (44)
Seoni	2003-04	2006-07	84536	45102 (Oct. 06)	39434 (47)	18828 (42)

On being pointed out in audit, the CEOs (Z.P) stated that the construction could not be completed due to less-generation of demand. Further, PD reply (June 2007) that these targets were only indicative and now the GOI has extended the project upto 2012. The reply is not acceptable as number of units (Targets) to be completed were approved finally in the districts projects, and were not merely indicative. Besides, the period of project (3-4 year) was still not changed by the GOI in the terms and conditions as discussed earlier in the para 3.1.7.3. As per GOI guidelines a demand driven approach was to be adopted to achieve the target. The slow progress implied that it would take longer to cover the entire state and the aim of the TSC would take longer to achieve.

3.1.10.3 Information of availability/non-availability of IHHLs not collected:- According to PHED's orders (March 2003) the CEOs (Janpad) were required to ensure the collection of information regarding availability/non-availability of IHHLs for the families under BPL during BPL survey. A list thereof was to be made available to the Executive Engineer (PHED) of the concerned district. But the required information was not collected in any test checked district during BPL survey conducted from 2002-03 on wards. This resulted in non-confirmation of reality regarding availability/ non-availability of IHHLs for BPL family and releasing of advances thereto at the time of sanction. In inquiry, the facts were confirmed (September – December 2006 and April 2007) by the seven CEOs (ZP)⁷ during test check. But the PD replied (June 2007) that the information was available with the Block Officials. The reply was not acceptable as the required information was to be collected and incorporated in the list of BPL which was prepared after conducting survey.

3.1.10.4 Un-realistic progress-report of special group:- Out of the total incentive earmarked for the construction of household latrines, a minimum of 25 per cent was to be earmarked for the individual households of Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs). To monitor these aspects, the GOI prescribed a separate column in the format of monthly progress-report which was required to be compiled on the basis of block-wise information. However

the block wise information was not being obtained and the progress-reports were being prepared by the test checked districts showing fulfillment of special provision of construction of individual household latrines ranging between 20 per cent and 95 per cent for SCs/STs on an adhoc basis. Thus the progress reports were not realistic. On being pointed out in audit, the CEOs (ZP) of seven test checked districts⁷ confirmed the same (October-December 2006 and April 2007). With reference to un-realistic progress-report of special group, the PD also replied (June 2007) that every care was being taken to verify the report.

3.1.10.5 Construction of super structure not confirmed: - A duly completed household sanitary latrine comprised of a Basic Low Cost unit upto Rs. 625/- without the super structure. Additional amount could be spent by the beneficiaries or the State Government for the construction of super structure and/or of one extra pit. Scrutiny of records of test checked districts revealed that no additional fund for super structure was provided by the State Government for IHHLs constructed (567188) in 48 districts (September 2006). Besides, no records were available to show as to whether beneficiaries had constructed the super structure. Non-construction of super structure leads to the possibility of non-utilisation of IHHLs. On being pointed out, the CEOs (ZP) of seven test checked districts⁷ stated (September-December 2006 and April 2007) that the position regarding construction of super structure by beneficiary would be got verified. The PD informed (June 2007) that part cost of super structure had been added in the incentive since 1st April 2006 and that this would improve the system more effectively.

3.1.11 School Sanitation

School Sanitation formed an integral part of TSC project since the experience gained by children through use of toilets in school and Sanitation education imparted by teachers would reach home and would also influence parents to adopt good sanitary habits. Funding for school sanitation (Unit cost: Rs. 20,000 for each school) in a TSC project was provided by the Central Government, State Government and Parents Teachers Association in the ratio of 60: 30: 10. Gram Panchayat can also contribute the 10 per cent share of Parents Teachers' Association. Audit scrutiny revealed the following:-

3.1.11.1 Non achievement of targets: - The GOI sanctioned 56583 school latrines¹³ during 2000-2001 to 2004-2005 for 48 districts against which only 30859 latrines (55 per cent) were got constructed (September 2006) after lapse of 3-6 years. Scrutiny of MPRs of seven test checked districts⁷ also revealed that the shortfall in the physical progress of latrines completed ranged between 14 and 69 per cent as detailed in **Appendix XXV**. On being pointed out in audit the CEOs (ZP) of seven districts stated (September-December 2006 and April 2007) that efforts would be made to complete the works. Besides, the PD stated (June 2007) that Madhya Pradesh was a backward tribal state and any new programme was not easily acceptable. However, efforts were being made to expedite this work.

¹³ Total sanction 56583 (2000-01: 5063, 2001-2002: 1388, 2002-03: 6320, 2003-04: 41770 and 2004-2005: 2042).

3.1.11.2 Drawing / Design of school latrines suitable to the disabled students not obtained: - While constructing toilets in schools and other institutions, the construction should be made in such a way that the facilities could also be used by the disabled students and persons. Therefore, the State Government ordered (March 2005) that the school latrines constructed should be suitable for disabled students also and design should be same as available in the Rajya Shiksha Kendra Bhopal (RSK). Scrutiny of records revealed that such design was not obtained from the RSK. On being pointed in audit, the CEOs (ZP) of seven test checked districts⁷ admitted (September-December 2006 and April 2007) to the facts. Further, the PD informed (June 2007) that districts were directed to obtain the suitable design.

3.1.11.3 Separate units of toilets for girls and boys not provided: - Separate toilets for girls and boys should be provided and these should be treated as two separate units and each unit was entitled to central assistance upto Rs. 12000/- for a unit cost of Rs. 20,000/-. Scrutiny of records of seven test checked districts⁷ revealed that in 5829 schools, latrines were constructed but two separate units (Rs. 20,000/- for each unit cost) were not sanctioned in 4018 schools of co-education. On being inquired, the CEOs (ZP) of seven test checked districts stated (September-December 2006 and April 2007) that action would be taken in this regard. On this issue, the PD replied (June 2007) that such provision was not there in the initial projects. However, in the revised detailed project report proposal, such provision had been made. The reply is not acceptable as such provision was also mentioned in the each guidelines of the GOI since inception (April 1999).

3.1.11.4 Irregular expenditure on latrines constructed in Police Stations:- Latrines costing Rs. 20,000 each were to be constructed in all Government schools only (as approved in the project). But 17 latrines costing Rs. 3.40 lakh were irregularly constructed in the Rural Police Stations of Gwalior district by diverting funds meant for construction of latrines in Government Schools. In reply, the CEO (ZP) stated (September 2006) that the construction of such latrines was sanctioned after approval of DWSC. The reply was not acceptable as this was contrary to the items of the project sanctioned by the GOI. The PD also informed (June 2007) that the matter was being looked into and CEO Zilla Panchayat, Gwalior was asked to explain the irregular construction made in the Police Stations from this fund.

3.1.12 Anganwadi Toilets- Shortfall in coverage:-

In order to change the behaviour of the children from very early stage in life, it was essential that Anganwadis were used as platform of behaviour change of the children as well as the mothers attending the Anganwadis. For this purpose each Anganwadi was to be provided with a baby friendly toilet. One toilet of unit cost upto Rs. 5000 was to be constructed for each Anganwadi or Balwadi in the rural areas.

The GOI sanctioned the TSC project for all 48 districts of Madhya Pradesh. Scrutiny of information and data made available by the PD (TSC) revealed

that the component of Anganwadi toilets was not sanctioned in Eight¹⁴ out of 48 districts. Against 6923 Anganwadi toilets sanctioned in 40 districts, only 2252 (33 per cent) Anganwadi toilets were completed upto September 2006. This affected the objectives of the component. In this connection, the PD stated (June 2007) that the efforts were being made to provide sanitary latrines in all Anganwadis by March 2008.

3.1.13 Rural Sanitary Marts and Production Centres

The Rural Sanitary Mart (RSM) was an outlet dealing with materials required for the constructions of not only sanitary latrines but also other sanitary facilities required for individuals, families and the environment in the rural areas. The main aim of having a RSM was to provide materials, services and guidance needed for constructing different types of latrines and other sanitary facilities which are technologically and financially suitable to the area. Production Centres (PCs) were the means to improve production of cost effective affordable sanitary materials. Funding for this component was in the ratio of 80:20 between the GOI and the State Government. Further, under the TSC project, maximum amount of Rs. 3.5 lakh per RSM/PC was permissible for construction of shed, training of masons and also as a revolving fund for working capital. The revolving funds provided to the implementing agencies was refundable after RSM/PC attained a level of sustainability or after the expiry of period as mentioned in the agreements executed by the District. The results of test check were as under: -

3.1.13.1 Non-functioning of RSMs:- In test checked district Sagar, revolving funds to the tune of Rs. 12 lakh (Rs. 2 lakh for each) were sanctioned (2003-04 to 2005-06) for establishment of six RSMs. The sanctioned amount was to be released in eight equal monthly instalment of Rs. 0.25 lakh to the SHGs. It was noticed that only Rs. 1.75 lakh¹⁵ were released to six SHGs as first/second instalment. Scrutiny of sanctions and agreements revealed that neither further instalment was released nor inspections, as prescribed, were conducted to ensure that they were in functioning condition. On being pointed out in audit, the CEO (ZP) Sagar stated (December 2006) that the proposals for sanction of remaining amount would be put up in next meetings. Reasons for non-releasing the next instalments was not intimated. The reply was not acceptable as non-release of further instalments was indicative of non-functioning of RSMs.

3.1.13.2 Non-refund of revolving fund: - The CEOs (ZP) Bhopal and Gwalior released (2003-04 and 2004-05) revolving funds amounting to Rs. 4.50 lakh to five NGOs¹⁶ to establish RSMs. Scrutiny of records of agreements

¹⁴ Bhopal, Gwalior, Chhindwara, Indore, Mandasour, Rajgarh, Raisen and Rewa.

¹⁵ (I) Shakti SHG Jamuniya (Rs. 0.50 lakh), (ii) Sapna SHG Khairana (Rs. 0.25 lakh), (iii) Prajeev Educational Society Sagar (Rs. 0.25 lakh), (iv) Shri Mahendra Kumar Tiwari ((Rs. 0.25 lakh), (v) Milk Dairy SHG Hinotiya Kala (Rs. 0.25 lakh) and (vi) Shri Mahesh Kumar Soni, Sagar (Rs. 0.25 lakh).

¹⁶ (i) Gwalior -SHG Ramgarh, Dabra (Rs. 0.50 lakh), (ii) Shri Gangaram Sharma, Bhitrawar (Rs. 0.50 lakh) Bhopal – (i) Ahirwar SHG (Rs. 0.50 lakh), (ii) Yuva Shakti SHG Fanda Kala (Rs. 1.00 lakh) (iii) Basera Building centre, Bhopal (Rs. 2.00 lakh).

revealed that the refunds of revolving funds was to be started after 1-2 years, but only Rs. 0.24 lakh were refunded by M/s Ganga Ram Sharma, SHG, Bhitwar in Gwalior district and remaining amount of Rs. 4.26 lakh was not refunded by these NGOs so far. In reply, it was stated (September 2006 and November 2006) that the said amounts would be recovered. Besides, RSMs of Gwalior districts were also lying defunct as confirmed (September 2006). On this observation, the PD replied (June 2007) that efforts would be made to get the refund of the revolving fund.

3.1.14 Execution of works without GOI approval

Works relating to hardware activities and alternate delivery mechanism were to be executed in the numbers as approved by GOI. Scrutiny of MPR of 48 districts (September 2006) revealed that 26 out of 48 districts executed 2302 works (Estimated cost: Rs. 6.08 crore) in excess of approval of the GOI thereby neglecting other activities and with less expenditure thereon **Appendix XXVI**. On being inquired the PD agreed (June 2007) that the works were executed in excess of approval of the GOI as these were necessary and provision for these works have been made in the revised DPR of the districts.

3.1.15 Maintenance

3.1.15.1 Funds not provided for maintenance of school/anganwadi toilets:-

According to the GOI's guidelines, the funds for maintenance of school/anganwadi toilets were to be provided by the concerned departments. Scrutiny of monthly progress-report (September 2006) made available by the PD (TSC) revealed that 30859 schools latrines (Expenditure: Rs. 56.19 crore) and 2252 anganwadis latrines (Expenditure: Rs. 0.98 crore) were constructed in 48 districts of the state. Audit observed that funds for maintenance thereof were provided neither under TSC nor by the concerned departments to Janpads/Gram Panchayats. No information regarding provision of funds for maintenance of school/anganwadi latrines was made available though called for (January 2007). On being enquired from the concerned departments (i.e. School Education Department, Rajya Shiksha Kendra and Mahila Evam Bal Vikas Department, Bhopal), Mahila Evam Bal Vikas Department stated (June 2007) that the funds for maintenance of aganwadies were not provided due to lack of information. Besides, Rajya Shiksha Kendra (part of School Education Department) also informed that the funds for maintenance of school latrines were not provided.

3.1.15.2 Maintenance of complexes not proved:- The maintenance of CSCs was very essential and Gram Panchayats should own the ultimate responsibility or make alternative arrangements at the Village level. It was observed in five test checked districts in which 75 complexes (**Appendix XXV**) were constructed that ZPs were not monitoring the maintenance of these complexes as records/reports of maintenance of complexes were not being kept. On enquiry, it was informed that these facts would be confirmed. The PD also agreed with the reply of CEOs (June 2007).

3.1.16 Role of Non-Governmental organisations (NGOs)

NGOs had an important role in the implementation of TSC in the rural areas. They were required to involve actively in IEC (Software) activities as well as hardware activities. Shortcomings noticed in audit were as under:-

3.1.16.1 Blocking of funds:- District Water and Sanitation Committee (DWSC), Jhabua sanctioned (December 2003) Rs.1.50 crore in the favour of M/S M.P. Jeewan Vigyan Academy Indore (NGO) to conduct IEC work in all twelve blocks of Jhabua district. Out of sanctioned amount of Rs. 1.50 crore the DWSC released Rs. 50 lakh (December 2003) as 1st instalment in the shape of advance. Subsequently further payment to Academy was stopped by the PD (June 2004). The reasons were not given although called for (July 2007). Scrutiny of records revealed the followings:-

- Open tender/Offer was not invited by the DWSC for the execution of IEC work costing to Rs. 1.50 crore and copy of agreement was not sent to the Accountant General for perusal, as required under M.P. Store Purchase Rules.
- IEC and training materials used by the NGO was not got approved by the DWSC, as required.
- Inspection/ Evaluation of the activities performed by the said NGO was not conducted (November 2006).
- The records of progress-reports, utilisation certificates/ expenditure vouchers in support of expenditure if any against the advance were not produced to the audit.
- The agreement executed for three years expired in December 2006. But no action was taken to recover/adjust the advance after lapse of 2-3 years. Therefore, the possibility of misutilisation / blocking of funds can not be ruled out. On being pointed out in audit, DWSC Jhabua replied (December 2006) that the matter would be reviewed. The PD also informed (June 2007) that the matter regarding blocking of funds in Jhabua was under enquiry.

3.1.16.2 Selection of NGO not done by following a transparent criterion: -

GOI guidelines (January 2004) required that the selection of NGOs was to be done by following a transparent criterion. The PD (TSC) and PHED further issued (May 2004 and August 2005) the guidelines for selection of NGOs in which Offer was to be published for selection. During scrutiny of records in test checked district Sagar revealed that the work relating to the IEC and hardware activities costing Rs. 29.73 lakh were executed through NGOs/SHGs without inviting offer. On being enquired (December 2006), the CEO (ZP) stated that NIT was not issued as IHHLs were constructed through NGOs / SHGs with the consent of beneficiaries. The reply was not acceptable as the publication of Offer was essential. Further, the PD stated (June 2007) that the matter was being looked into.

3.1.16.3 Non-recovery of grants provided to NGOs: - The EE (PHED) Bhopal Division cancelled (October 2004 and May 2005) the agreements executed with nine NGOs¹⁷ of Bhopal district due to unsatisfactory work on the basis of decisions taken by the DWSC. Therefore, the grant provided to NGOs amounting to Rs. 1.56 lakh was to be recovered and blacklisted as envisaged in the agreements but no such action was taken. On being pointed out, it was replied (November 2006) that action would be taken for recovery and blacklisting of NGOs. In this connection, the PD also informed (June 2007) that the necessary action would be issued to DWSC.

3.1.17 Nirmal Gram Puraskar (NGP)

To add vigour to implementation of TSC, GOI separately launched (January 2004) an award scheme called the “Nirmal Gram Puraskar” for fully sanitised and open defecation free Gram Panchayats, Blocks and Districts. But only 190 GPs out of 23051 GPs could be awarded during five years since introducing TSC. On being pointed out, the PD stated (June 2007) that it was a difficult job as a whole GP was to achieve certain standards to qualify for NGP. The reply was not acceptable as it was mandatory to make GPs fully sanitised and open defecation free but it could not be achieved after a lapse of three and half year.

3.1.18 Research

Research Institutes, organisations and NGOs with proven track record in the areas of Sanitation and National/State level Institutions involved in the research related to the issue of Health, Hygiene, Water Supply and Sanitation should be involved to study the present technology of human excreta and Waste disposal systems in the rural areas. The GOI would be organizing such studies. However, the States might also take up such studies for improving the content of the programme. The cost thereto could be charged to the HRD component of the project. No records relating to organisation of such studies by the GOI as well as State Government could be made available (December 2006). The PD stated (June 2007) that the GOI was doing this work separately.

3.1.19 Monitoring

3.1.19.1 Inspections / Supervisions

Monitoring through regular field inspections by officers from the State level and the district level was essential for the effective implementation of the programme. On being enquired about such inspections conducted from State level, the PD (TSC) stated (November 2006) that action was taken on the receipt of complaints. The reply was not tenable, as regular inspections were

¹⁷ (i) Hope and Faith Education welfare society (Rs. 0.20 lakh) (ii) Gayatre - Chitranshi Vidhya Mandir (Rs. 0.10 lakh) (iii) Varun Manav Vikas Samati (Rs. 0.21 lakh) (iv) Society for Institute of Development (Rs. 0.15 lakh) (v) Paryavaran Avam Shodh Sansthan (Rs. 0.19.lakh) (vi) Impact (Rs. 0.13 lakh,) (vii) Sanpanden (Rs. 0.10 lakh) (viii) All India Uberous Rs. 0.16 lakh) (ix) NYK (Rs. 0.32 lakh).

required to be conducted from State level. The PD further replied (June 2007) that a senior IAS Officer and SE of PHED have been made in charge of each and every district to monitor the progress. The reply is not acceptable as the observation was about non-conduct of regular field inspections. In test checked districts Gwalior, Narsinghpur and Sagar the facts of non-conducting the required inspections were admitted. Separate records/reports for the inspections conducted were not being maintained in Bhopal, Jabalpur, Jhabua and Seoni districts.

As per scheme guidelines issued by GOI (January 2004), District Project authorities should constitute a team of experts in the district who should review the implementation in different block frequently. Such review should be held at least once a quarter. Similarly the State Government should conduct review of project in each district once a quarter. Scrutiny of information made available by the PD (TSC), revealed that no reviews of such nature were conducted so far. In reply it was stated (November 2006) that the reviews would be started in future. The PD further replied (June 2007) that the review of district projects was done at state level. The reply is not acceptable as the state Government should conduct review of projects in each district once a quarter as per guidelines of GOI (January 2004) and not at state level. Similarly seven test checked districts did not conduct review of the implementation in different blocks frequently. In reply CEOs (ZP) stated (September - December 2006 and April 2007) that a team of experts would be constituted.

The State Government directed (March 2003) that the regular supervision of implementation was to be conducted by the E-in-C, PHED. On being called for (November 2006) the details of regular supervisions conducted, the E-in-C replied (June 2007) that the review of progress and inspections were done but the details of inspections/supervisions and reports thereof for the period 1999-2006 were not made available although again called for (June 2007). The Chief Engineers (CEs) were also required to carry out random inspection of the works. The CE, Bhopal circle replied (June 2007) that the inspections were done but the information of random inspections and reports thereof were not made available as the same was not maintained.

The Commissioner (Revenue Divisions) would also monitor the progress through monthly meetings of divisional-level. Details of such monthly meetings were also not made available by the Commissioner, Gwalior division (September 2006).

Thus in the absence of reports relating to inspection/supervision, audit could not verify whether proper monitoring through regular inspections were carried out for proper implementation.

Joint monitoring not conducted: - According to scheme guidelines a system of joint monitoring was to be evolved to ensure that the RSMs and PCs were successful as an enterprise and function in accordance with the objectives of the programme. RSMs/PCs established in six of seven test checked districts were not monitored jointly as envisaged in the GOI guidelines. In reply, the

CEOs¹⁸ (ZP) admitted (September-December 2006 and April 2007) the facts. The PD replied (June 2007) that the districts were directed to monitor jointly.

3.1.19.2 Reports

A Block wise Monthly Progress Report (MPR) and Cumulative Annual Report (CAR) were required to be sent by the districts to the State. Scrutiny of records revealed that the Block wise MPR was not prepared by the test checked districts. Only MPR for whole district was being sent without compiling block wise figures, which indicated the preparation of the MPR on the basis of estimation. On being pointed out in audit, the CEOs (ZP) of six test checked districts confirmed the facts and stated (September-December 2006 and April 2007) that the block wise MPR could not be prepared due to non-receipt of such MPR from blocks and lack of time and the same would be maintained. The reasons for the same were not given by the CEO (ZP) Seoni (April 2007). The CARs were also not sent by Bhopal, Gwalior, Jhabua and Seoni districts. The PD informed (June 2007) that the district level officers have been directed to prepare block wise MPRs.

General Administration Department ordered (August 2003) that minimum four meetings of Shikhar Samiti in a year were to be organised. But only six meetings were organised during September 2003 to October 2006 against the requirement of twelve. Position regarding compliance with the following decisions adopted in the meetings of Shikhar Samiti was not furnished (June 2007) to audit:-

- To make available an amount of 10 per cent of total project cost sanctioned in M.P. for State Water and Sanitation Mission to perform their duties (Para 4 of minutes of meeting held on 5th August 2003).
- To conduct the evaluation of TSC from outside agencies and technical inspection (Para 10 of minutes of meeting held on 5th August 2003).
- To monitor the use of latrines constructed (Para 5 of minutes of meeting held on 9th February 2004).

The reply thereof and reasons for shortfall in organising the meetings were awaited (June 2007). Similarly the quarterly meetings were also to be arranged by the District Water and Sanitation Mission (DWSM) as ordered by PHED (August 2003). Scrutiny of records revealed that no meetings of DWSM were conducted in Bhopal and Narsinghpur, whereas eleven (31 per cent) meetings were arranged in Gwalior, Jhabua and Sagar district against the requirement of 36 during September 2003 to October 2006. In reply, the concerned CEOs (ZP) stated (September-December 2006) that the meetings would be conducted in future as required. The information of meetings of DWSM was not made available by Seoni district (April 2007). However, the PD stated (June 2007) that the efforts would be made to conduct the meetings of Shikhar Samiti regularly and district collectors and CEOs have been directed to arrange DWSM meetings regularly.

¹⁸ Bhopal, Gwalior, Jabalpur, Narsinghpur, Sagar and Seoni district.

3.1.20 Evaluation

The State Government was required to conduct Periodical Evaluation Study (PES) on the implementation of TSC. For a group of TSC project in the State, implementation progress review was to be organised by the GOI for two times in a year. The PD replied (June 2007) that there was no funds for PES. The department requested the GOI to provide funds for PES. The reply is not acceptable as the cost of such study could be charged to the HRD component (i.e. CCDU funds) as per GIO guidelines (January 2004). In the five test checked districts (Gwalior, Jabalpur, Jhabua, Narsinghpur and Seoni), it was noticed (September-November 2006 and April 2007) that neither PES nor implementation progress review was conducted. While the CEOs (ZP) Bhopal and Sagar district stated (November - December 2006) that a team nominated by the GOI evaluated the implementation but no Evaluation Report was received so far.

3.1.21 Conclusion

A preliminary survey was not conducted by the test checked districts. IEC expenditure ranged between 9 to 35 per cent with reference to IEC cost sanctioned in test checked districts. The performance was deficient in all types of hardware activities which was main goal of the campaign. Only 41 per cent (Rs. 167.72 crore) funds could be received (September 2006) in 46 districts against the required funds of Rs. 411.10 crore whereas the completion period of the projects in these districts was going to be over by the end of 2006-07. Utilisation of the funds available in 48 districts of the state ranged between 7 and 65 per cent during the year 2001-02 to 2005-06. Unspent balance of IEC/HRD cell amounting to Rs. 0.22 crore was not transferred so far. Funds for maintenance of Schools/Aganwadis toilets were not provided by the concerned Departments. The slow progress in receipt of funds implied that it would take longer to cover the entire State and the aim of TSC would take longer to achieve. Short release of funds and poor utilisation of funds implied partial implementation, non-implementation and neglect some critical areas that effected the over all implementation of the scheme. Monitoring and Evaluation as prescribed at various levels have not been conducted for effective implementation of the campaign.

3.1.22 Recommendations

- Separate formats in MPR should be prescribed to collect the full information regarding use/ maintenance of hardware works and three per cent reservation of incentive for disabled persons in the component of IHHLs.
- Codal provisions for maintenance of cashbook, ledger on the basis of double entry system, Advance register and Assets- register should be adhered to.
- A system of close monitoring should be evolved so as to ensure speedier execution and completion of works for effective implementation of the campaign.
- Sufficient funds should be released by the Government and the available funds should be utilised by the districts project authorities to achieve the aim of TSC.