T.M. Vijay Bhaskar, LAS. Joint Secretary टीर्प. विजय भास्कर,आई.ए.एस संयुक्त सचिव



भारत सरकार

पेयजल एवं स्वच्छता मन्त्रालय । राजीव गांधी राष्ट्रीय पेयजल मिशन Government of India Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission D.O. No. W-11011/07/2012-WQ

Dated: July 17, 2012

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Please refer to letter No. G-11015/2/2012-Water-II dated July 3, 2012 wherein you were informed about the recent modifications in the National Rural Drinking Water Programme (NRDWP) from 2012-13. A copy is enclosed for ready reference. It was mentioned therein that detailed guidelines would be issued for utilisation of the earmarked 5% Water Quality fund under NRDWP.

- 2. Please find attached the detailed guidelines for utilisation of the 5% Water Quality fund under NRDWP for habitations having chemical contamination of drinking water sources and for Japanese Encephalitis (JE)/ Acute Encephalitis Syndrome (AES) affected priority districts.
- 2. Out of the earmarked 5% Water Quality Fund, 75% will be allocated to States with habitations with chemical contamination (arsenic, fluoride, nitrate, salinity and iron in that order of priority) and the remaining 25% funds will be allocated to the 5 States with the 60 high priority districts affected with JE/ AES viz. Assam, Bihar, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. These guidelines have also been hosted on the Ministry's website: www.ddws.gov.in. States are requested to follow these guidelines while utilising this fund.
- 3. For the purpose of release of the funds for Water Quality affected habitations in the current year 2012-13, States are requested to send proposals in the formats at Annexure-III, IV, V and VI of the attached Guidelines by 20th August, 2012 to enable the Ministry to release the funds.
- 4. As regards release of funds to the 5 States with JE/ AES affected high priority districts, habitation-wise proposals have been received only from UP and West Bengal and funds will shortly be released to them. Assam, Bihar and Tamil Nadu are requested to send their habitation-wise proposals immediately.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,

(T.M. Vijay Bhaskar)

To

Principal Secretaries / Secretaries incharge of RWS in all States Copy to: TD (NIC), MoDWS, alongwith enclosures for hosting the letter on the Ministry's website.

T.M. Vijay Bhaskar, I.A.S. Joint Secretary टी.रप. विजय भारकर,आई.ए.एस संयुक्त सचिव



भारत सरकार पेयजल एवं स्वच्छता मंत्रालय राजीव गांधी राष्ट्रीय पेयजल मिशन Government of India Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation

Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission D.O. No. G-11015/2/2012-Water II

Dated: July 3, 2012

Sir/ Madam,

The Cabinet in its meeting held on 14.6.2012 in New Delhi has approved the following modifications to the National Rural Drinking Water Programme (NRDWP) guidelines, which are detailed as under:

- a) Earmarking of 5% of NRDWP funds for allocation to States, with habitations having chemical contamination of drinking water sources and with Japanese Encephalitis/Acute Encephalitis Syndrome (JE/AES) affected priority districts. Detailed Guidelines in this regard will be issued shortly.
- b) Increase in allocation for the Operation and Management component of NRDWP from the existing 10% to 15%.
- c) Decrease in allocation for the Sustainability component of NRDWP from 20% to 10%.
- d) As a consequence of the above, the previous and new NRDWP allocation for the earmarked areas is given below:

| Earmarked areas | Previous allocation | New allocation (w.e.f. 1/04/2012) | Change, if any |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| North East States | 10% | 10% | No change |
| DDP blocks | 10% | 10% | No change |
| Natural | 2% | 2% | No change |
| Calamities | | | |
| Water Quality | Nil | 5% | New earmarking |
| Non North-East | 78% | 73% | Reduction due to |
| States | | | earmarking for WO |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 0 ~ |

The previous and new allocation for various components of the NRDWP at the State level is :

| Component | Previous | New |
|----------------|----------|---------------|
| Coverage | 42% | 47% |
| Quality | 20% | 20% |
| Sustainability | 20% | 10% (Maximum) |
| O&M | 10% | 15% (Maximum) |
| Support | 5% | 5% |
| WQMS | 3% | 3% |

2. You are requested to note the above changes in the NRDWP and disseminate the same for implementation of the programme in your State.

Yours sincerely,

Myaylohadar (T.M. Vijay Bhaskar)

To

States Secretaries / Principal Secretaries in charge of RWS/ PHED in all the

Guidelines for utilization of the earmarked 5 % Water Quality Fund under NRDWP for habitations having chemical contamination of drinking water sources and high priority districts affected with Japanese Encephalitis/Acute Encephalitis Syndrome (JE/AES)

1.0 Background:

Chemical contamination of drinking water, especially of Arsenic and Fluoride, is a major concern in drinking water supply. The number of habitations and population in States with at least one drinking water source affected with chemical contamination, as on 1.4.2011, is at Annexure I. Bacteriological contamination in drinking water is a major cause of gastrointestinal disease having a significant impact on Infant Mortality Rates and diarrhoeal deaths. Cases of Acute Encephalitis Syndrome (AES) are also attributed to some extent, to bacteriological contamination of drinking water. The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare has identified 60 districts which are the most affected with JE/AES, the list of which is at Annexure II.

Under the existing NRDWP Guidelines, 20 % of the Statewise allocation is to be utilized for Water Quality component for providing safe drinking water to water quality affected habitations. States have also been given flexibility to utilize the Coverage component funds also for Water Quality and vice versa. However, available reports on IMIS show that only about 14 % of total expenditure is on Water Quality component. The goal of covering nearly 1 lakh habitations (as on 1/4/2012), remaining to be covered with safe drinking water, as envisaged under Bharat Nirman is yet to be achieved. It is therefore considered necessary to give greater thrust to this task of covering all water quality affected habitations especially the arsenic and fluoride affected habitations.

Considering the need to tackle chemical contamination in rural habitations and JE/AES in select districts, Government of India in June 2012 has approved a modification in the NRDWP Guidelines, earmarking 5% of NRDWP funds for allocation to States, with habitations having chemical contamination of drinking water sources and with Japanese Encephalitis/Acute Encephalitis Syndrome (JE/AES) affected priority districts.

Thus the previous and new NRDWP allocation for the earmarked areas is given below:

| Earmarked areas | Previous allocation | New allocation (w.e.f. 1/4/2012) | Change, if any |
|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| North East States | 10% | 10% | No change |
| DDP blocks | 10% | 10% | No change |
| Natural Calamities | 2% | 2% | No change |
| Water Quality | Nil | 5% | New earmarking |
| Non North-East States | 78% | 73% | Reduction due to earmarking for WQ |
| Total | 100% | 100% | |

With respect to allocation of funds to States, after the earmarking of 5% NRDWP funds for allocation to States affected by water quality issues, the remaining 73% funds will be allocated among the non-NE States on the same criteria as described in the NRDWP Guidelines.

The previous and new allocation for various components of the NRDWP at the national level is:

| Component | Previous Distribution of annual budgetary allocation | Center- State Sharing pattern | New Distribution of annual budgetary allocation wef 1/4/2012 | Center- State Sharing pattern |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Coverage | 40% | 50:50 * | 45% | No change |
| O&M | 10% | 90:10 ** | 15% Maximum | |
| Quality | 20% | | 20% | |
| Sustainability | 20% | 100:0 | 10% Maximum | No change |
| Support | 5% | 100:0 | 5% | No change |
| Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance | 3% | 100:0 | 3% | No change |
| Fund for Natural Calamities | 2% | 100:0 | 2% | No change |
| Total | 100% | | 100% | No change |

2.0 Earmarked 5% Fund - An Additionality to 20 % Water Quality component

This 5% fund will be set aside from the total allocation under NRDWP. These Earmarked funds are an additionality to be used to cover water quality habitations over and above the habitations to be covered using 20 % Water Quality component funds allocated to the States.

3.0 Allocation of Funds to the States

Of the Earmarked 5 % Water Quality funds, 75% would be provided for chemical contamination based on the population in the water quality affected habitations to be covered as on 1/4/2011 as entered by the States on the online IMIS of the Ministry. The remaining 25% would be provided for the 60 priority districts affected with JE/AES and distributed on the basis of the number of drinking water sources in rural areas in these

districts, as entered on Integrated Management Information System (IMIS) of the Ministry as on 1/4/2011, and extent of contamination as per Multi-District Assessment of Water Safety survey conducted by UNICEF in these States.

The earmarked 5% fund would be allocated among States as per the following criteria:

| Earmarked Allocation for Water Quality Affected States | Type of Contamination /disease | Weightage % | Contamination | Weightage to population in rural habitations reporting contamination as on 1/4/2011 in % |
|--|--------------------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 5% of NRDWP Allocation | Chemical Contamination | 75 | Arsenic Fluoride Iron Nitrate Salinity | 40 45 5 5 5 |
| | JE/AES affected priority districts | 25 | Drinking Water sources estimated as affected | 100 |

4.0 Guidelines for Expenditure under 5 % NRDWP Funds: The 5 % WQ earmarked funds should be utilized as under:

4.1 In Water Quality affected habitations

- The State Governments are required to formulate an Action Plan for tackling the water quality problems, as per the template annexed (Annexure III with details of schemes under 20% Water Quality component & Annexure IV with details of schemes under earmarked 5% Water Quality fund) with the guidelines and send the same to MDWS for discussions, and modify if necessary, to facilitate release of funds and monitoring. The States are required to provide details of schemes habitation-wise in Annexure V and Annexure VI.
- The Action Plan will comprise of names of the water quality habitations targeted , over and above the QA habitations already targeted with 20% WQ Component, with details of the contaminants found, type of scheme, technology adopted, estimated cost, time frame for implementation, modalities of 0 & M by PRIs/State implementing agency. The action plan should indicate the left over and the targeted number of habitations affected with specific quality problems.
- The schemes should be taken up to cover the quality affected habitations in the order of priority, first covering the habitations with the highest extent of arsenic, then the habitations with highest extent of fluoride, and then other contaminants.
- The State Governments shall devise an integrated approach for technology options covering single village schemes, comprehensive piped water supply schemes, low cost treatment plants, domestic filters, in-situ water conservation, supply of safe

drinking water from safe sources, additionality/improvement in existing drinking water supply schemes etc.

4.2 JE/AES Districts

- States should prepare an Action Plan in the template at Annexure VI at the beginning of the year incorporating the following activities, timelines, estimated costs and names of habitations to be covered with new water supply schemes with these funds.
- Initially baseline survey of existing drinking water sources should be carried out with NRDWP (Support) funds.
- JE/AES cases which are shown district wise should be broken down to habitationwise in the descending order of cases for each district.
- Test all public water sources for bacteriological contamination (Faecal coliform) including virological testing with NRDWP (WQMS) fund.
- Test all private handpumps for bacteriological contamination using FTKs and if found unfit for consumption, the households may be strongly advised not to use it for drinking purpose or to treat it with halogen tablets/chlorination before use or seal it if the household agrees.
- Repair existing hand pumps to prevent further contamination of water, such as, repair of platform, soak pit, raising of hand pumps in flood prone areas, chlorination of hand pumps.
- Replace public shallow hand pumps in respective habitations by India Mark-II hand pumps.
- Mini water supply schemes in feasible habitations where JE/AES cases have been reported with energized deep borewell and standposts with adequate number of taps and provision for chlorination.
- Routine regular chlorination of drinking water sources and supplied water.
- Safe drinking water facility in schools/anganwadis with NRDWP (Coverage) funds.
- Widely publicize Dos and Don'ts for sanitary check near hand pumps, standposts and safe sanitation with NRDWP (Support) funds.

5.0 Dual Water Policy

As mentioned in the NRDWP Guidelines, dual water policy may be adopted where there is constraint of water resources or costs.

6.0 Other Provisions

All other provisions of NRDWP for Planning, Sanctioning, Fund Release procedure, Involvement of GPs and VWSCs, Approval of schemes by SLSSC, Monitoring, Reporting and Community involvement of the schemes shall remain as per existing NRDWP guideline. (Kindly refer Page number 30 to 35 of the existing NDWP Guidelines for more information)

7.0 Monitoring & Evaluation

The targeted habitations should be marked on IMIS of the website of the Ministry and the achievements shall have to be entered on the IMIS periodically. All other provisions for Monitoring on the IMIS shall continue as in the NRDWP Guidelines and IMIS instructions. [Kindly refer to Annex III (Page 50) of the existing NDWP Guidelines for more information on Monitoring of the Programme & Reporting mechanism].

8.0 WQM&S, IEC & Capacity building:

(Kindly refer to Annex IV-A (Page 54) of the existing NDWP Guidelines for more information on IEC Guidelines for Rural Drinking Water Supply).

The 5% NRDWP Support Fund and the 3% Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance funds should be used in these habitations to take up intensive IEC and capacity building activities.

Quality Affected Habitations and Population at Risk (as on 1.4.2011)

Annexure I

| | | | | 5K (as on 1.4.20) | (1) |
|-----|----------------------|----------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | Total Rural | Total Rural Population in | No. of Quality (Chemical) | Total Rural |
| S.N | 0 | Habitations in | the State (in | Affected Rural | Population at |
| | State Name | the State | lakh) | Habitations | Risk (in lakh) |
| 1 | MAHARASHTRA | 98842 | 648.72 | 2698 | 53.39 |
| 2 | DAMAN & DIU | 21 | 0.78 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | CHATTISGARH | 72329 | 183.79 | 7845 | 17.45 |
| 4 | UTTARAKHAND | 39142 | 70.6 | 14 | 0.29 |
| 5 | DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI | 70 | 1.68 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | HARYANA | 7385 | 175.03 | 30 | 0.82 |
| 7 | PUNJAB | 15338 | 181.73 | 55 | ⁷ 0.51 |
| 8 | WEST BENGAL | 95395 | 750.88 | 5546 | 58.65 |
| 9 | HIMACHAL PRADESH | 53201 | 62.28 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | KARNATAKA | 59532 | 383.06 | 7599 | 72.26 |
| 11 | MANIPUR | 2870 | 24.78 | 4 | 0.01 |
| 12 | NAGALAND | 1432 | 17.45 | 166 | 1.56 |
| 13 | PUDUCHERRY | 248 | 3.58 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | KERALA | 11883 | 254.71 | 969 | 20.46 |
| 15 | MADHYA PRADESH | 127197 | 526.96 | 2917 | 14.15 |
| 16 | LAKSHADWEEP | 9 | 0.5 | 0 | 14.15 |
| 17 | MEGHALAYA | 9326 | 23.18 | 102 | 0.44 |
| 18 | MIZORAM | 777 | 5.22 | 0 | 0.44 |
| 19 | ARUNACHAL PRADESH | 5612 | 9.75 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | CHANDIGARH | 18 | 0.81 | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | GOA | 347 | 7.54 | 0 | 0 |
| 22 | GUJARAT | 34415 | 360.71 | 323 | 5.42 |
| 23 | RAJASTHAN | 121133 | 519.95 | 32150 | |
| 24 | SIKKIM | 2498 | 5.4 | 0 | 103.69 |
| 25 | UTTAR PRADESH | 260110 | 1570.42 | 1038 | 8.75 |
| 26 | ANDHRA PRADESH | 72407 | 614.39 | 585 | |
| 27 | JAMMU AND KASHMIR | 12826 | 95.92 | 26 | 4.69 |
| 28 | ORISSA | 141928 | 347.43 | 14811 | 0.4 |
| 29 | JHARKHAND | 120154 | 247.21 | 808 | 47.8 |
| 30 | ANDMAN and NICOBAR | 491 | 2.41 | 0 | 2.3 |
| 31 | ASSAM | 86976 | 263.96 | 18683 | (2.40 |
| 32 | BIHAR | 107642 | 904.15 | | 63.49 |
| 33 | TAMIL NADU | 94500 | 353.81 | 18427 509 | 104.24 |
| 34 | TRIPURA | 8132 | 28.13 | 6196 | 2.36 |
| | Total | 1664186 | 8647.09 | 121501 | 19.3 |
| | | | 3017.07 | 141301 | 602.55 |

Annexure II

List of 60 Most Seriously affected Districts with Japanese Encephalitis (IE) and Advanced Encephalitis Syndrome (AFS)

| S.N. | | ed Encephalitis Syndrome (AES) |
|------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| | State | District |
| 1 | ASSAM | BARPETA |
| 2 | ASSAM | DHEMAJI |
| 3 | ASSAM | DIBRUGARH |
| 4 | ASSAM | GOLAGHAT |
| 5 | ASSAM | JORHAT |
| 6 . | ASSAM | LAKHIMPUR |
| 7 | ASSAM | SIBSAGAR |
| 8 | ASSAM | SONITPUR |
| 9 | ASSAM | TINSUKIA |
| 10 | ASSAM | UDALGURI |
| | Total = 10 | |
| 11 | BIHAR | ARARIA |
| 12 | BIHAR | DARBHANGA |
| 13 | BIHAR | GAYA |
| 14 | BIHAR | GOPALGANJ |
| 15 | BIHAR | JEHANAB AD |
| 16 | BIHAR | MUZAFFARPUR |
| 17 | BIHAR | NALANDA |
| 18 | BIHAR | NAWADA |
| 19 | BIHAR | PASHCHIM CHAMPARAN |
| 20 | BIHAR | PATNA |
| 21 | BIHAR | PURBA CHAMPARAN |
| 22 | BIHAR | SAMASTIPUR |
| 23 | BIHAR | SARAN |
| 24 | BIHAR | SIWAN |
| 25 | BIHAR | VAISHALI |
| | Total = 15 | |
| 26 | UTTAR PRADESH | AZAMGARH |
| 27 | UTTAR PRADESH | BAHRAICH |
| 28 | UTTAR PRADESH | BALLIA |
| 29 | UTTAR PRADESH | BALRAMPUR |
| 30 | UTTAR PRADESH | BASTI |
| 31 | UTTAR PRADESH | DEORIA |
| 32 | UTTAR PRADESH | GONDA |

| 1 | 1 | |
|----|---------------|------------------|
| 33 | UTTAR PRADESH | GORAKHPUR |
| 34 | UTTAR PRADESH | HARDOI |
| 35 | UTTAR PRADESH | KANPUR DEHAT |
| 36 | UTTAR PRADESH | KUSHINAGAR |
| 37 | UTTAR PRADESH | LAKHIMPUR KHERI |
| 38 | UTTAR PRADESH | MAHARAJGANJ |
| 39 | UTTAR PRADESH | MAU |
| 40 | UTTAR PRADESH | RAE BARELI |
| 41 | UTTAR PRADESH | SAHARANPUR |
| 42 | UTTAR PRADESH | SANT KABIR NAGAR |
| 43 | UTTAR PRADESH | SHRAVASTI |
| 44 | UTTAR PRADESH | SIDDHARTHNAGAR |
| 45 | UTTAR PRADESH | SITAPUR |
| | Total = 20 | |
| 46 | TAMIL NADU | KARUR |
| 47 | TAMIL NADU | MADURAI |
| 48 | TAMIL NADU | THANJAVUR |
| 49 | TAMIL NADU | TIRUVARUR |
| 50 | TAMIL NADU | VILLUPURAM |
| | Total = 5 | |
| 51 | WEST BENGAL | BANKURA |
| 52 | WEST BENGAL | BARDHAMAN |
| 53 | WEST BENGAL | BIRBHUM |
| 54 | WEST BENGAL | DAKSHIN DINAJPUR |
| 55 | WEST BENGAL | DARJEELING |
| 56 | WEST BENGAL | HOOGHLY |
| 57 | WEST BENGAL | HOWRAH |
| 58 | WEST BENGAL | JALPAIGURI |
| 59 | WEST BENGAL | MALDA |
| 60 | WEST BENGAL | MIDNAPUR WEST |
| | Total = 10 | - MOINT OR WEST |

NRDWP - Details of schemes under 20 % Water Quality Component covering Water Quality Affected Habitations (Please attach district wise number of schemes and habitations targeted) Annexure III.

(Amount in Rs Crore)

| | Details of the schemes | Physics schemes Under N WQ Co | Physical Target of schemes in 2012-13 Under NRDWP 20% WQ Component | Habitations targeted coverage under 20% WQ Component in 2012-13 | Habitations targeted for coverage under 20% WQ Component in 2012-13 | | Estimated Cost of Schemes/Activities under 20% WQ Component | Expected during? Schemes/A 20% WQ | Expected expenditure during 2012-13 on Schemes/Activities under 20% WQ Component |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|-----------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. Number of | | Treatment | Treatment Alternative safe units sources | Treatment units | Alternative safe sources | Treatment | Alternative safe sources | Treatment units | Alternative safe sources |
| Schemes covering Arsenic affected habitations | : | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1. Spillover schemes PWS (| Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | | | | | | | | |
| - V) U | Multi Village Supply Schemes (MVSS) | | | | | | | | |
| Others | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2 New Schemes PWS (| Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | | | | | | | | |
| ≥ Ø ∪ | Multi Village Supply Schemes (MVSS) | | | | | | | | |
| Others | | | | | | | | | |

| 2 Number of Schemes covering | ıf vering | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Fluoride aff habitations | ected | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Spillover schemes | PWS | Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | | | | | |
| | | Multi Village Supply Schemes(MVSS) | | | · | | |
| | Others | | | | | | |
| 2.2 New Schemes | PWS | Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | | | | | |
| | | Multi Village Supply Schemes(MVSS) | | | | | |
| | Others | | | | | | |
| 3 Number of Schemes covering Nitrate affected habitations | ering | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Spillover schemes | PWS | Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | | | | | |
| | | Multi Village Supply Schemes(MVSS) | | | | | |
| | Others | | | | | | |
| 3.2 New Schemes | PWS | Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | - |

| | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|--------|---|--|---|--------|--|---|--------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | VSS | | | e mes | (SS) | | nes | (SS) | | | 165 | (SS) |
| Multi Village | Schemes (MVSS) | | | Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | Multi Village Supply Schemes(MVSS) | | Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | Multi Village Supply Schemes(MVSS) | | | Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | Multi Village Supply Schemes(MVSS) |
| | | Others | 4 Number of Schemes covering Salinity affected habitations | 4.1 Spillover schemes PWS | | Others | 4.2 New Schemes PWS | | Others | 5. Number of Schemes covering Iron affected habitations | 5.1 Spillover schemes PWS | _ V/ V/ |

| Oth | 5.2 New Schemes PW | | Oth | Total Outlay on Schemes for Quality PW5 | | Others |
|--------|--|---|--------|---|---|--------|
| Others | PWS S | <u> </u> | Others | \$ \$ \$ \$ | N.S. X | ers |
| | Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | Multi Village Supply Schemes(MVSS) | | uday Single Village nes Supply Schemes (SVSS) | Multi Village Supply Schemes (MVSS) | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

In case of schemes covering multiple contamination financial figures should be provided only for the most serious contaminant in the following order of priority: arsenic, fluoride, nitrate, salinity and iron.

Annexure 1v
NRDWP - Details of schemes under earmarked 5 % Water Quality fund covering Water Quality Affected Habitations
(Please attach list of schemes and names of habitations targeted as per Annexure V)
(In Rs Crore)

| Filtocide affected Filtocide Filtoci | 2 Number of | f vering | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------|--|--|--|--|--------|
| PWS Others Covering ffected ons ver PWS Others Others Others | Fluoride affe habitations | ected | | | | | |
| Others Others Others over PWS ver PWS Others Others | 2.1 Spillover schemes | | Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | | | | |
| Pws Pws Others Covering ffected ons ver Pws Pws Pws | | | Multi Village Supply Schemes(MVSS) | | | | |
| PWS others covering ffected ons ver PWS others Others | | Others | | | | | |
| Others covering covering ffected ons ver PWS Others | 2.2 New Schemes | | Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | | | | |
| others covering ffected ons ver PWS Others | | | Multi Village Supply Schemes(MVSS) | | | | |
| frected ons ver PWS Others | | Others | | | | | i C |
| PWS Others PWS | 3 Number of Schemes cov Nitrate affect habitations | ering | | | | | |
| Others | 3.1 Spillover schemes | 1 | Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | | | | |
| Others | | | Multi Village Supply Schemes(MVSS) | | | | |
| PWS | | Others | | | | | |
| | 3.2 New Schemes | | Single Village Supply Schemes (SVSS) | | | | |

Annexure VI

NRDWP - Details of schemes under 5 % Water Quality Earmarking For JE/AES affected districts

(In Rs Crore)

Name of the State:

| Nam Number of Number of Number of PWS proposed e of sources likely public public public public drinking to be sources likely public public contaminated tubewells proposed to sources sources likely public public public public public public public public contaminated tubewells proposed to lakh sources sources shallow provided) around Rs sources sources shallow provided) around Rs sourced tubewells provided) around Rs sourced tubewells provided) around Rs sourced shallow provided) around Rs sourced tubewells sourced tubewell sourced tubewell sourced tubewells sourced tubewells sourced tubewells sourced |
|--|
| Number of Number of New IM-II No. of mini Cost of Other urgent Sub – Add 10 Add for sources likely public public public public public public sources likely public public public public shallow handpumps @ around Rs 3 hand approx. 8000 crore SLWM (5.96) pumps per contaminated tubewells proposed to lakh pumps per contaminated shallow provided) around Rs 3 around Rs source 31,000** |
| Number of Number of New IM-II No. of mini Cost of Other urgent Sub – Add 10 sources likely public public PWS proposed new public measures @ Rs total Rs % for to be shallow handpumps @ around Rs 3 hand approx. 8000 crore SLWM contaminated tubewells proposed to lakh pumps per replace (* list to be shallow provided) around Rs source shallow provided) around Rs source tubewells provided) 31,000** |
| Number of Number of New IM-II No. of mini Cost of Other urgent Sub- sources likely public public PWS proposed new public measures @ Rs total Rs to be shallow handpumps @ around Rs 3 hand approx. 8000 crore contaminated tubewells proposed to lakh pumps per replace (* list to be shallow provided) around Rs source shallow provided) 31,000** |
| Number of Number of New IM-II No. of mini Cost of Other urgent sources likely public public PWS proposed new public measures @ Rs to be shallow handpumps @ around Rs 3 hand approx. 8000 contaminated tubewells proposed to lakh pumps per replace ("list to be shallow provided) around Rs sourced tubewells provided) 31,000** |
| Number of Number of New IM-II No. of mini Cost of sources likely public public PWS proposed new public to be shallow handpumps @ around Rs 3 hand contaminated tubewells proposed to lakh pumps replace (* list to be shallow provided) around Rs tubewells tubewells 31,000** |
| Number of Number of New IM-II No. of mini Cost of sources likely public public PWS proposed new public to be shallow handpumps @ around Rs 3 hand proposed to lakh proposed to lakh replace (* list to be shallow provided) around Rs tubewells tubewells around Rs around Rs shallow |
| Number of Number of New IM-II sources likely public public to be shallow handpumps contaminated tubewells proposed to replace shallow tubewells |
| Number of Number of sources likely public to be contaminated tubewells |
| Number of sources likely to be contaminated |
| 2 % 2 0 |
| Nam Number e of of Distri drinking ct water sources |
| Nam e of Distri ct |
| |

Documents to be enclosed:

- *Names of habitations proposed to be covered with mini PWS with number of JE/AES cases reported in each habitation in the period 2010-12. Unit cost may differ from State to State according to design and local rates.
- **Blockwise number of new public hand pumps to be installed to replace existing public shallow tubewells. Unit cost may differ from State to State according to design and local rates.
 - ***Activity wise estimates of IEC activities.
- 4. Plan for water quality testing in affected districts.
 5. Plan for SLWM works & habitations to be covered.
 6. Plan for water safety measures around contaminate.
- ^a Plan for water safety measures around contaminated sources. Costs may differ from State to State.

Signature of CE Date:

(State Secretary dealing with RWS) Countersigned by Date: