

The CTARA-Habitat Center water project

Jal-Swarajya Review



Jal-Swarajya-Overview

- Maharashtra-a water profile.
- Jal-Swarajya, the background and broad objectives
- Main features-options, choices and documentation
- Monitoring framework
- A critique-plusses and minuses
- A research proposal
 - ▶ A pointed district-wise approach
 - ▶ Larger technical issues

Data Sources:

- *Jal-Swarajya*-Project Implementation Plan, WSSD, September 2003.
- Various new clippings from IE, Sakal etc.

Maharashtra-Demographics

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Districts | 33 |
| Panchayat Samities | 378 |
| Gram Pachayats | 27626 |
| Habitations | 86000 |
| Rural Families | 1.1 crores |
| Growth rate (decadal) | 22 % |
| Area | 307 lakh ha. |
| Population density | 314 /sq.km. 3.1 /ha. |
| Grain requirement ¹ | 1130 kg./ha. |
| Percentage BPL | 23.7 |

¹at 1kg/person-day

Land and Irrigation

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Area | 307 lakh ha. |
| Cultivable | 225 lakh ha. (73 %) |
| Irrigated | 39 lakh ha. (18 %) |
| Ground-water based irrigated | > 50 % |
| Country-wide average | 43 % |
| Max. Irrigable | 85 lakh ha. |
| Drought-prone | 32 % |

| | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Watershed sub-units | 2415 |
| Average size | 120 sq. km. |
| Critical and worse | 460 |
| Safe | 1874 |

“Even in the safe category ... a large number ... become dry in the summer...”

Rural Drinking Water

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Total habitats | 86,000 |
| > 40 LPD | 62,000 (68 %) |
| Dependence on ground-water | > 80% |
| summer tankers | 5,500 |
| dug-wells | 90,000 |
| bore-well hand-pumps | 2,20,000 |
| non-functional | 12,000 |
| pipied water supply schemes | 18,500 |

“Even those which are treated as fully covered, the service levels are reduced during summer months”

Governance conclusions

Analysis of the past

- Hydro-geological and agro-ecological challenges to sustainability of water sources.
- Supply led approach-costly and not amenable to management by PRI. About 3.5 projects per village already done!
- lack of community ownership-poor O&M, poor recovery of water charges.
- Huge gap in the availability of financial resources for new investments and in the O&M of existing facilities.

The future, July 2000, GoM policy:

- Demand-driven approach which is participatory.
- cost-sharing in both rural and urban setting.

The July 2000 GoM policy-in detail

- composite, water and sanitation.
- 10% towards capital costs and 100% of O&M.
- Govt. to shift from supply of service to policy and support.
- Information, Education and Communication campaign to prepare beneficiaries.
- Inclusive and participatory-women and weaker sections.
- 3-pronged strategy : conservation, preservation and utilization through demand-management and regulating extraction of ground-water.
- Ensure independent monitoring by reputed institution/agencies

Jal-Swarajya Objectives

- Community Development
 - ▶ Community capacity building
 - ▶ Women empowerment and tribal development
 - ▶ Village Panchayat strengthening
- Infrastructure building
 - ▶ Ground-water recharge and source strengthening
 - ▶ Water Supply schemes
 - ▶ School and sanitation link-up
- Institutional strengthening
 - ▶ District level HRD and project management
 - ▶ IEC-sanitation and hygiene
 - ▶ Monitoring and learning-transparency, non-confrontation and information flow and usage.

Jal-Swarajya Objectives (contd.)

- Sector Development and strengthening
 - ▶ knowledge management for policy support
 - ▶ Water quality measurement
 - Pilot Component
 - ▶ Local government incentive fund
 - ▶ Ground-water aquifer management pilot
 - ▶ O&M Pilot
- No mention of independent institutions/agencies
 - Presumably, O&M implementation after pilot, though there in the water-supply fine-print.
 - great stress on knowledge generation, documentation and access

Institutional and Implementation arrangements

- At the village level-**village water and sanitation committee** (VWSC).
- Support Organization (SO) as hand-holding agency which will taper off.
- SO will help VWSC prepare Village Action Plan (VAP).
- VWSC final implementer and also does subsequent O& M.
- **VWSC is the expression of demand**
 - ▶ demands support, IEC from panchayat and district
 - ▶ demands money for infrastructure
 - ▶ demands payments from villagers.

The service

- 40 LPD at village standpost
- Majority of schemes to be ground-water based
- Average investment per household-**Rs 8968/-**
- 10% capital and 100 % O&M

No provision for:

- Cattle, incidental uses such as house repair, livelihood use

| Liter-wise needs | |
|-------------------|----|
| Drinking | 3 |
| Cooking | 5 |
| Bathing | 15 |
| Wash. uten./house | 7 |
| Ablutions | 10 |

| Investment/household | |
|----------------------|------|
| Supply | 3678 |
| Source Str. | 440 |
| Env. Sanitation | 1320 |
| Software | 3330 |

The Infrastructure building

Options for sources are: (Attachment 2.5)

- combinations of *dug-well, bore-well, pumps and pipeline.*
- *surface lift* if available.

Options for source strengthening (Attachment 2.6)

- Earthen weirs, to impound water.
- Contour trenching
- Gabion, Vanrai and underground bandharas
- Ponds and percolation tanks

Two important documents (Pre-implementation)

- Selection of village panchayats (Attachment 2.4)
 - ▶ Existing water availability (25%)
 - ▶ Contamination (25%)
 - ▶ Implementation of Ground-Water act (10%)

- Village Action Plan (Attachment 5.5)
 - ▶ Demographic data
 - ▶ Choice of water-management option (largely about water supply and O&M)
 - ▶ Choice of source strengthening and development procedure.
 - ▶ Details of environmental mitigation measures

Three important documents (During and Post-implementation)

- **Joint Field Appraisal (Attachment 5.8)**
 - ▶ A vetting of the Village Action Plan by ZP.
 - ▶ covers all fields in VAP
- **Risk and Mitigation Report (Attachment 5.9)**
 - ▶ A Report prepared during project implementation by **Para-Professionals**
- **Project Component Indicators**
 - ▶ prepared by DAMT and OMT.
 - ▶ Project summary indicators

Good Features

- A sound holistic framework with clear objectives
- Clear documentation, work-sheets and formats suitable for implementation
- Welcome stress on community development and education
- Laudable design in terms of transparency-accountability-participation
- Identifies the connection with ground-water stress
- Pilot project with sound objectives

Of course, ...

The proof of the pudding is in its eating.

Criticisms (Engg.)

- Project depends crucially on ground-water, a resource which is already under stress.
 - ▶ Should have a separate phase for source stabilization. This would have clarified above point.
- Even when successful, project relies on better extraction of ground-water and does not ensure that sufficient recharge has taken place.
 - ▶ Mitigation and sustainability procedures should be result-oriented.
- 40 LPD norm too low to create meaningful assets.
 - ▶ Must match 200 LPD urban norm, at the very least.
- Even at 40 LPD, inadequate investment to source and supply systems.
 - ▶ Urban norm: Rs. 70-100/cu.m., while here it is **Rs. 40!**

Questions

- Is Year-long 40 LPD norm is really met for 62% households?
 - ▶ Outside irrigation command and head areas, summer stress probably widespread.
- Net consumption per house-hold: 70 cu.m. per year.
- Expected net payments (O&M): 20% of investment (Rs. 5000): Rs. 1000
- Thats Rs 15/cu.m. which exceeds urban rates by 50%.
- That exceeds irrigation water rates by 1500 %.

More serious

Scheme fails to address livelihood issues of rural people on non-irrigated lands (82%)

More Questions

What exactly is the “supply-side” paradigm?

- departmental planning, execution and service provision
- Minimal role for beneficiary

These two features of pre-reform systems are *independent*.

New paradigm plans to change both.

- Isn't Supply-side paradigm attributed with too much blame?
 - ▶ Try supply-side with as much IEC and t-a-p.
- Can PRI really be made duty-bound to provide service?
 - ▶ Can one try district-level service provision as a pre-cursor?

Advantages of departments:

- duty to deliver service
- right to collect charges
- technical expertise to maintain systems

Are PRI institutions ready to assume these roles?

Research Plan A

Our own pilot study- *Thane district*- 60 in O&M phase and 40 in implementation.

- Analyse outcome of project in above 60
 - ▶ source stability, ground-water recharge
 - ▶ supply system and metering infrastructure
 - ▶ O&M institutional system and execution
- Acquire village-level Documentation
 - ▶ various forms listed earlier
- Obtain district-wise documentation, output of pilot project.

Research Plan B

Investigate a composite livelihood-security and food-security approach to rural water supply.

- The 200 LPD norm
 - ▶ What is the economic basis for different rural and urban norms?
 - ▶ What would a 200 LPD norm mean to rural households?
 - ▶ What are economic and engineering solutions to enable the 200 LPD norm?
- Engineering
 - ▶ Study of micro-hydro-geological systems
 - ▶ interactions of ground and surface waters
 - ▶ What are possible structures for impounding water at Rs. 100 /cu.m. price-point.
- Cases and Studies
 - ▶ A survey of other states and their rural supply systems
 - ▶ Wider still, what is the economic interaction between irrigated and non-irrigated systems?

Reports to be acquired

- GoM Ground-water survey
- *Jal-Swarajya Technical Manual*
- *Jal-Swarajya Pilot project report*
- *Sukhtankar Committee Report, January 2000.*

