

A study of Financial Performance Indicators and Critical Evaluation of RRWSS analysis based on Secondary data

Dr. Sapna .S. Patel

Department of Accounting and Financial Management, Faculty of Commerce
The M.S University of Baroda, Gujarat, India
Email - sapna_saupatel@yahoo.com

Abstract: *Historically, drinking water supply in the rural areas in India has been outside the government's sphere of influence. Community- managed open wells, private wells; ponds have often been the main traditional sources of rural drinking water. Government of India's effective role in rural drinking water supply sector started in 1972-73 with the launch of Accelerated Rural Water Supply Program (ARWSP). With the passage of time, the program was modified in 2009-10 and re-named as National Rural Drinking Water Programme with the national goal to provide every rural person with adequate safe water for drinking, cooking and other domestic basic needs on sustainable basis. The program has now been modified with major emphasis on ensuring sustainability of water availability in terms of potability, adequacy, convenience, affordability and equity while also adopting decentralized approach involving Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) and community organization.*

NRDWP releases details of total rural water supply schemes of States of India. The data were gathered from the point of commencement of NRDWP. The financial data related to the allocation of funds to various states, release of funds to various states and expenditure incurred by various states. The details related to central fund. The analysis is carried out for the data as well as the share of the state over the entire period of six years. The second set of data related to combination of operational and financial data. These data related to ongoing scheme, new scheme, achieved scheme, total habitations, total cost. From the data collected cost per scheme and per habitation are derived for all states and for the entire period of the study.

Key Words: *NRDWP, ARWSP, Ongoing PRIs, achieved, new, total cost, total habitation, financial data and operational data*

1. INTRODUCTION:

Water availability is a problem in some of the areas of India and to improve accessibility of water and to improve quality of available water has continuously remained one of the focus areas for the Government of India. To meet with this, numerous efforts have been taken under five year plans in India. NRDWP is a body instituted for this purpose at all India level. A vast variety of data are available for different states of the entire country as well as different districts of these states. In order to get comprehensive idea about number of water supply schemes on going / new, along with their coverage of habitation / allotted fund and expenditure incurred, state wise data for all the states have been analyzed. Special attention is given to the study of Gujarat state.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

The NRDWP was established in 2009. This is a 100% centrally sponsored programme¹. The role of Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation is to provide funds to the State Governments on the basis of allocation criteria which will include the rural population, the extent of Desert Development Program /Drought Prone Area Program /Hill Area Development Program areas. However, flexibility is available with the Department to allocate more funds to the States which show better performance during the course of the implementation of the programme. The fund allocation for different national rural drinking water schemes and the individual schemes utilize funds in different manners. The ongoing schemes, new schemes and achieved schemes are for various states and districts. In 2009, for e.g. there are 55,216 schemes ongoing, 1,35,281 are new schemes, 1,48,633 are achieved schemes and 2,29,544 are covered habitations.

The amount of allocation for each state is decided based² on (i) rural population (ii) rural SC and ST population (iii) area under desert, drought prone, hilly areas (iv) extent of devolution of management of schemes to *Panchayats* which are to be utilized for Operation and Maintenance. Year wise data is available from <http://www.ddws.nic.in> about allocation, release and expenditure incurred out of central fund. The states are also contributing to the same³.

An attempt is made to analyze the data published by NRDWP about various schemes working in different states of India important financial indicators to understand the financial viability of the water supply scheme of India.

As NRDWP came into existence in 2009, the data are available from 2009-10 on wards only. Complete annual data are available up to 2014-15. Therefore, the analysis based on available data is carried out for 6 years. The available data can be bifurcated in to 2 parts (1) financial progress data and (2) operational data.

(1) Amongst the financial data collected are: allocation of funds by centre to various states, release of funds by centre to various states and the expenditure incurred out of released funds. For some of the years, 'other deposits' are also there. This is part of source of funds and therefore the years when other deposits are there, expenditure are derived as percentage of (Release + other deposits).

(2) The operational data relates to schemes in various categories e.g. new, ongoing and achieved, the habitations covered and the total cost.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

Research methodology used for analysis of secondary data to evaluate the overall performance of RRWSS in different states of India. The RRWSS supplies adequate and potable drinking water to villages, where local drinking water sources yield insufficient water or water that is not potable or where water is fetched from remote water sources. The RRWSS are based on reliable underground sources such as tube wells or surface water sources.

4. SOURCE OF DATA:

NRDWP publishes the financial and operational data from 2009-10 onwards. Government of India allocates the fund and the proportion of Centre and States share. The financial data are available for allocation of funds as well as release of funds during the year. It also provides the amount of expenditure incurred during the year. The information is available state wise for the whole nation. Operationally, it also provides the data about ongoing schemes, new schemes, achieved schemes, total habitations covered etc. All these data are available for each state separately. The data are available for a period of six years from 2009 to 2015. Prior to 2009 Government data were not available for the water supply schemes.

For the smooth supply of potable water the Central Government is putting sincere efforts and at all India level, scenario has improved substantially. 1028 million habitats were covered in 2001. This has improved to 1210 million habitats by 2011³. To supply the water, various programmes like NRDWP, ARWSP, Swajaldhara, MNP, DDP, and Sujalam Suphalam are undertaken. For programme like NRDWP, funding is by Central Government. For programme like MNP, funding is by State Government. Huge amount of the funds are allocated.

Based on the data collected, an analysis is carried out using percentage analysis. This is applied state wise for release as a percentage of allocation and expenditure as percentage of release. Moreover, to have an idea about the status of state in relative terms, the percentage allocation of funds, release and expenditure in comparison to total figures for India are also derived for each state for the six years. Further, taking all six years together, the average percentage of release to average funds allocation and average expenditure to average release are derived for each state. To have an idea about relative status of state, percentage of allocation, release and expenditure, in comparison to total for India are also derived for each state on an average for six years.

As part of analysis of the operational aspect, for a time span of six years, the percentage of ongoing schemes, new schemes, achieved schemes, habitations covered, cost per schemes and cost per habitation are derived for all states and union territories.

Based on the data available for fund allocation by Centre etc. the following computations are carried out.

- (i) Percentage of funds released (centre) to percentage of funds allocated (centre), state wise.
- (ii) Percentage of expenditure incurred (centre) to percentage of funds released centre state wise.
- (iii) To know the relative status of various states, the percentage share of state for each of the above, for all six years is derived.

Average for 2009-15

Release and expenditure sometimes have a little time lag. Therefore, in one year release may be higher percentage of allocation or expenditure may be higher percentage of (Release + Deposit). To average out these fluctuations, average is derived from the year 2009-10 to 2014-15, of release as percentage of allocation and expenditure as percentage of Release and this is presented in Table 1.

From the Table 1 it is observed that during last six years in certain states, percentage of expenditure was more as compared to fund release. Bihar, Jammu & Kashmir, Manipur, Nagaland, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, West Bengal etc. had made more expenditure as compared to funds centrally released by the Government. However, major difference was found in case of Bihar where percentage of expenditure is 140% as compared to fund released. It is noticed that for certain states, percentage of release was more compared to allocation fund. Meghalaya, Tripura, Punjab, Sikkim, Haryana, Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Assam etc. had more release of funds as compared to allocation of funds centrally announced by the Government. However, major difference was found in case of Arunachal Pradesh where percentage of release is 142.84% as compared to allocation.

Table 1. Average Percentage of Release and Expenditure (2009 - 2015)

Sr. No	State	Percentage of Release Against the Allocation	Percentage of Expenditure Against the Release
1	Andaman & Nicobar	28.44	127.37
2	Andhra Pradesh	101.76	100.39
3	Arunachal Pradesh	142.84	102.88
4	Assam	113.25	97.66
5	Bihar	64.99	140.73
6	Chhattisgarh	97.19	101.57
7	Goa	25.95	6.37
8	Gujarat	105.28	104.80
9	Haryana	114.45	97.20
10	Himachal Pradesh	109.86	97.47
11	Jammu & Kashmir	96.79	107.30
12	Jharkhand	102.47	101.18
13	Karnataka	101.07	98.12
14	Kerala	110.18	101.06
15	Madhya Pradesh	104.68	96.42
16	Maharashtra	95.60	95.58
17	Manipur	89.19	97.04
18	Meghalaya	133.65	98.34
19	Mizoram	106.45	82.10
20	Nagaland	98.85	104.46
21	Odisha	114.29	103.36
22	Puducherry	9.01	0.00
23	Punjab	129.43	101.58
24	Rajasthan	103.38	95.08
25	Sikkim	129.98	124.74
26	Tamil Nadu	123.92	103.25
27	Telangana	17.63	14.86
28	Tripura	134.66	102.93
29	Uttar Pradesh	95.90	97.50
30	Uttarakhand	73.58	112.59
31	West Bengal	103.12	103.63
	Average	96.06	94.11

(Source: Compiled from Report NRDWP)

Note: Chandigarh, Dadar & Nagar haveli, Daman & Diu, Delhi and Lakshadweep are not considered because they have not received allocation.

The Table 2 presents the data to examine the share of each state in fund allocation, release and expenditure. The computations are carried out and are presented in Table 2 (2009 to 2015). It is observed that highest allocation was made to Rajasthan at 13.23% of fund allocated by Centre, followed by Uttar Pradesh (10.62%) and Maharashtra (8.58%). When release of the funds is examined for the state of Rajasthan again, it is at the highest at 13.39% followed by Uttar Pradesh (10%), Maharashtra (8.03%). When actual expenditure incurred is examined, Rajasthan with 12.73% is at top of expenditure incurred from central funds, followed by Uttar Pradesh (9.96%) and Maharashtra (7.77%). Thus, for all three aspects of allocation, release and expenditure, these three states are at the top.

Table 2 States Share Allocation, Release and Expenditure: Average of 2009- 2015

Sr. No	State	Allocation Central (₹ Crores)	Release Central (₹ Crores)	Expenditure Central (₹ Crores)
1	Andaman & Nicobar	0.01	0.00	0.00
2	Andhra Pradesh	5.69	5.64	5.54
3	Arunachal Pradesh	1.57	2.08	2.16
4	Assam	5.01	5.56	5.44
5	Bihar	4.58	2.93	3.86
6	Chhattisgarh	1.60	1.52	1.54
7	Goa	0.06	0.02	0.01
8	Gujarat	5.87	6.05	6.34
9	Haryana	2.53	2.82	2.69
10	Himachal Pradesh	1.56	1.69	1.65
11	Jammu & Kashmir	5.16	4.89	5.29
12	Jharkhand	1.90	1.90	1.92
13	Karnataka	8.01	7.91	7.75
14	Kerala	1.70	1.83	1.84
15	Madhya Pradesh	4.48	4.58	4.38
16	Maharashtra	8.58	8.03	7.77
17	Manipur	0.73	0.64	0.62
18	Meghalaya	0.76	0.98	0.96
19	Mizoram	0.50	0.52	0.40
20	Nagaland	0.90	0.87	0.90
21	Odisha	2.39	2.67	2.66
22	Puducherry	0.01	0.00	0.00
23	Punjab	1.02	1.29	1.32
24	Rajasthan	13.23	13.39	12.73
25	Sikkim	0.30	0.38	0.38
26	Tamil Nadu	3.76	4.52	4.65
27	Telangana	0.38	0.39	0.33
28	Tripura	0.69	0.91	0.95
29	Uttar Pradesh	10.62	10.00	9.96
30	Uttarakhand	1.58	1.14	1.12
31	West Bengal	4.82	4.86	4.86
		100.00	100.00	100.00

(Source: Compiled from Report NRDWP)

Note: Chandigarh, Dadar & Nagar haveli, Daman & Diu, Delhi and Lakshadweep are not considered because they have not received allocation

Table 3. Total Allocation, Release and Expenditure of Central Funds for State wise 2009 – 2015

Year	Allocation Central (₹ Crores)	Release Central (₹ Crores)	Expenditure Central (₹ Crores)
2009 – 10	7,986.97	7,989.86	6,957.55
2010 – 11	8,543.35	8,941.85	8,011.00
2011 – 12	8,330.00	8,474.02	8,982.79
2012 – 13	10,290.02	10,473.20	9,978.21
2013 – 14	9,348.40	9,600.32	10,817.44
2014 – 15	8,869.64	9,056.22	9,661.56

(Source: Compiled from Report NRDWP)

Table 3 describes the total allocation, release and expenditure of central funds to the states from the year 2009-10 to 2014-15. From the table 3 it can be observed that allocation and release have increased substantially in the year 2012-

13. However, it has declined during the 2013-14 and 2014-15. It is noticed that the expenditure has kept on increasing each year up to 2013-14 and it has declined during 2014-15.

5. ANALYSIS OF OPERATIONAL DATA:

Out of total 36 Indian states the RRWSS is implemented in 27 states. Out of these 27 states, for 10 states “Review of Effectiveness of Rural Water Supply Schemes in India” is carried out under the World Bank⁴. These 10 states are: Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Maharashtra, Odisha, Punjab, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, and West Bengal for the period 2008.

The present data relates to water supply schemes by NRDWP for the years 2009 to 2015. The data relates to the ongoing schemes, new schemes, achieved schemes, habitations and total cost.

Water supply schemes in different States of India by NRDWP

Like previous analysis here also data are collected for a period of 6 years from 2009-10 to 2014-15. The data relates to, new schemes, ongoing schemes, achieved schemes, habitations covered and the total cost. For each of the item, the share of each state in total is derived by percentage analysis. In addition to this, for each state cost per habitation and cost per scheme are also derived.

Table 4 describes the total number of schemes taken up at the national level. This is inclusive of ongoing, new and achieved schemes. It also includes total number of habitations, total cost and cost per scheme and cost per habitation.

Table 4 Total Number of Schemes Taken up for the Year 2009 - 2015

Sr. No	Year	Total States	No. of Ongoing Schemes	No. of New Schemes	No. of Scheme Achieve	Total No. of Habitation	Total Cost (₹Crores)	Cost per Scheme (₹ Crores)	Cost per Habitation (₹Crores)
1	2009-10	28	55,216	1,35,281	1,48,633	2,22,794	31,104.78	0.52	0.26
2	2010-11	30	40,618	1,84,612	1,70,277	2,74,680	34,736.90	1.27	0.36
3	2011-12	27	38,282	1,87,350	2,09,552	2,86,636	37,795.32	0.99	1.70
4	2012-13	29	46,795	2,32,532	2,22,233	3,40,722	52,311.64	3.27	0.42
5	2013-14	28	60,411	1,91,314	2,22,058	3,17,916	59,549.36	0.81	0.30
6	2014-15	29	85,400	1,81,458	1,04,040	3,32,465	96,397.87	0.81	0.30
Average								1.28	0.56

(Source: Compiled from Report NRDWP)

From the Table 4 it can be observed that the number of new schemes have kept on increasing each year up to 2012-13. However, it has declined during 2013-14 and 2014-15. For ongoing schemes fluctuating trend is observed. For the year 2010-11 and 2011-12 it has declined. However, for the year 2013-14 and 2014-15 it has increased. For the increase in number it can be interpreted that the schemes that are newly commenced in preceding years are transferred to ongoing status and therefore it has gone up. Achieved schemes have gone down drastically for 2014-15. Number of habitations covered has also gone up each year except a fall in 2013-14. As it is usual practice to take up various schemes every year based on demand and requests from the rural community, it is possible that the number of new scheme has declined during the year 2014-15.⁸

Table 5 presents the state wise details about percentage of ongoing schemes, new schemes, achieved schemes, total cost and habitations. From the Table it can be observed that percentage of ongoing schemes for Karnataka is highest (26.50%). For Maharashtra it is found to be about 14%. Thus, only two states have around 40% of the ongoing schemes. The remaining 60% are divided between remaining 29 states.

Table 5 Average Percentage of Ongoing, New, Achieved Schemes, Total Habitations, Total Cost and Cost per Scheme and Cost per Habitation

Sr. No	State	% of Ongoing Schemes	% of New Schemes	% of Achieved Schemes	% of Habitation	% Total Cost	Average Cost per Scheme (₹ Crores)	Average Cost per Habitation (₹ Crores)
1	Andaman & Nicobar	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.52	0.44
2	Andhra Pradesh	5.02	1.16	2.02	2.88	5.19	0.37	0.32

Sr. No	State	% of Ongoing Schemes	% of New Schem	% of Achieved Schemes	% of Habitation	% Total Cost	Average Cost per Scheme (₹)	Average Cost per Habitation
3	Arunachal Pradesh	0.35	0.34	0.32	0.28	0.47	0.17	0.26
4	Assam	4.85	4.74	4.50	5.84	2.44	0.07	0.08
5	Bihar	7.47	6.38	6.90	9.27	2.30	0.05	0.04
6	Chhattisgarh	5.79	15.46	12.92	9.52	1.77	0.02	0.03
7	Goa	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.13	17.72	1.09
8	Gujarat	1.61	0.81	1.01	1.35	3.16	0.41	0.50
9	Haryana	1.86	0.33	0.67	0.89	4.33	0.68	0.87
10	Himachal Pradesh	1.53	0.25	0.37	3.43	2.94	0.81	0.23
11	Jammu & Kashmir	2.76	0.43	0.53	2.09	5.13	0.91	0.75
12	Jharkhand	4.11	14.45	12.26	6.95	1.74	0.02	0.04
13	Karnataka	26.50	17.32	18.83	10.44	12.49	0.08	0.20
14	Kerala	0.26	0.01	0.04	0.69	2.39	7.43	3.35
15	Madhya Pradesh	1.89	12.53	12.07	6.37	1.57	0.02	0.10
16	Maharashtra	13.96	3.38	4.74	5.61	12.36	0.29	0.37
17	Manipur	0.82	0.05	0.18	0.19	0.20	0.13	0.19
18	Meghalaya	3.93	0.31	0.56	1.07	1.83	0.26	0.34
19	Mizoram	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.16	0.53	0.92
20	Nagaland	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.06	0.12	0.22	0.41
21	Odisha	5.89	10.76	9.72	9.01	3.26	0.04	0.07
22	Puducherry	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.13	0.17
23	Punjab	1.23	0.44	0.55	0.68	1.36	0.26	0.36
24	Rajasthan	3.29	4.56	4.72	6.43	22.20	1.67	0.70
25	Sikkim	0.46	0.09	0.17	0.12	0.14	0.10	0.21
26	Tamil Nadu	1.87	4.73	5.19	6.05	4.23	0.13	0.13
27	Telangana	0.13	0.04	0.07	0.12	0.16	0.10	0.07
28	Tripura	1.23	0.79	0.52	0.98	0.50	0.09	0.10
29	Uttar Pradesh	0.25	0.05	0.06	4.88	1.04	1.71	0.58
30	Uttarakhand	1.56	0.18	0.43	0.99	0.98	0.37	0.21
31	West Bengal	1.26	0.32	0.49	3.80	5.43	1.88	0.67
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	1.20	0.44

(Source: Compiled from Report NRDWP)

(Note: Chandigarh, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu, Delhi, and Lakshadweep are not considered because they have no ongoing, new and achieved schemes)

Habitation: It is a term used to define a group of families living in proximity to each other, within a village. It could have either heterogeneous or homogenous demographic pattern. There can be more than one habitation in a village but not vice versa.)

It is further observed that eleven states have less than 1% (of total) ongoing schemes. They are Andaman & Nicobar, Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Kerala, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Puducherry, Sikkim, Telangana and Uttar Pradesh. For the new schemes also, Karnataka is at the top having about 17.32% of the states followed by Chhattisgarh (15.46%), Jharkhand (14.45%), Madhya Pradesh (12.53%) and Odisha (10.76%). For the achieved scheme also, Karnataka is at the top having about 19% of state followed by Chhattisgarh (12.92%), Jharkhand (12.26%) and Madhya Pradesh (12.07%). It is noticed that percentage of habitations of Karnataka is 10.44% followed by Chhattisgarh (9.52%). It is observed that percentage of total cost in Rajasthan is highest (22.20%). It is noticed that cost per schemes of Goa is highest (₹17.72 crores). Similarly, cost per habitations of Kerala is highest (₹3.35 crores).

The main issues in successful scheme implementation are institutional development, financial viability and protection of water sources apart from the leakages in distribution system.

6. MAJOR FINDINGS:

This is operational and financial details regarding the schemes with the help of data published by NRDWP. As NRDWP was established in the year 2009, data are available from 2009-10 onwards only. The chapter took the review of various states for a span of six years 2009-10 to 2014 -15 regarding new, achieved and ongoing schemes. The data were also gathered about the financial aspects of schemes *viz*, from the total cost of all schemes, cost per scheme was derived and from the total number of habitations covered, cost per habitation was derived. Based on the analysis following major findings are made.

Allocation and expenditure from 2009 to 2015 related findings

1. In the year 2009-10, 12 out of 28 states have release fund greater than the allocation. 8 out of 28 states have expenditure greater than release. It is noticed that Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, have allocation, release and expenditure higher than the average.

2. In the year 2010-11, 16 out of 30 states have release fund greater than the allocation. 6 out of 30 states have expenditure greater than release fund. It is found that Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have allocation, release and expenditure higher than the average.

3. In the year 2011-12, 11 out of 28 states have release fund greater than allocation and 15 out of 28 states have expenditure greater than release. It is noticed that Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal have allocation fund, release and expenditure higher than the average.

4. In the year 2012-13, 12 out of 30 states have release fund greater than allocation. It can be seen that 12 states have expenditure greater than release fund. It is observed that Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal have allocation, release fund and expenditure higher than the average.

5. In the year 2013-14, 16 out of 30 states have release fund greater than allocation. It can be seen that 20 states have expenditure greater than release fund. It is observed that Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal have allocation, release of fund and expenditure higher than the average.

6. In the year 2014-15, 17 out of 31 states have release fund greater than allocation and 18 out of 31 states have expenditure greater than release funds. It is observed that Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have allocation, release of fund and expenditure higher than the average.

7. When year wise trend is examined for allocation, release and expenditure related to central funds, it is observed that over a period of time allocation and release have kept on increasing up to 2012-13 and it has declined during the year 2013-14 and 2014-15. It is noticed that the expenditure has kept on increasing each year up to 2013-14 and it has declined during 2014-15.

8. Examining over a period of six years, on an average it is found that release is about 96% of allocation and expenditure is about 94% of release of central funds.

State's share in Allocation, Release and Expenditure:

1. For the year 2009-10, percentage of fund allocated and released are highest for Rajasthan at 12.98% and at 12.67%. When actual expenditure incurred is examined, Rajasthan does not remain at top. Instead, Uttar Pradesh is at the top at 13.90%. Only 5 out of 28 states have 46% allocation of funds, 47% of release of funds and 47% of total expenditure out of central funds.

2. For the year 2010-11, percentage of fund allocated and released are highest for Rajasthan at 13.64% and at 12.30%. When actual expenditure incurred is examined, Rajasthan does not remain at the top. Instead, Uttar Pradesh is at the top at 11.65% expenditure out of central funds. Only top 5 states have 46% of allocation and about 45% of release and expenditure of the central funds.

3. For the year 2011-12, percentage of fund allocation, release and expenditure are highest for Rajasthan at 13.01%, 13.62% and 15.91%. Thus, for all three aspects, Rajasthan is at the top. It is noticed that for Rajasthan release of funds was higher for 2011-12 as compared to 2010-11, both in absolute terms as well as percentage share. 5 out of 28 states have 46% of allocation and release of funds and 45% of total expenditure.

4. For the year 2012-13, percentages of central funds allocation, release and expenditure is highest for Rajasthan at 13.14%, 13.48% and 13.17%. For all three aspects, Rajasthan is consistently at the top. 5 out of 30 states have 46% of allocation and release of funds and 43% of expenditure of the central fund.

5. For the year 2013-14, percentage of fund allocation, release and expenditure are highest for Rajasthan at 13.71%, 13.88% and 13.51%. 5 out of 30 states have 47% allocation of funds, 42% of release of funds, 43% of total expenditure.

6. For the year 2014-15, percentage of central fund allocation, release and expenditure are highest for Rajasthan at 13.47%, 14.41% and 13.49%. The top 5 out of 31 states have 46% allocation and release of funds and 47% of total expenditure.

7. For the time period 2009- 10 to 2014-15, when the state wise status is examined, on an average, it is found that for all three aspects of allocation, release and expenditure, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra are at the top.

Analysis of operational and financial details of schemes with reference to states:

For 4 operational aspects and one financial aspect data were collected, viz. ongoing schemes, new schemes, achieved schemes, habitations and total cost. From this, cost per scheme and cost per habitation are derived. Moreover, the percentage share of each state for ongoing schemes, new schemes, achieved schemes, habitations and total cost are also derived. Table 6 presents the findings in summarized form regarding highest share in ongoing schemes, highest share in new schemes, highest share in achieved scheme, highest share in habitations covered and highest share in total cost for all 6 years. Moreover, it also presents the state with highest cost per scheme and highest cost per habitation.

Table 6 Analysis of Operational and Financial Details of Schemes with Reference to States

Year	Ongoing	New	Achieved	Habitations	Total Cost	Cost per Scheme (₹ Crores)	Cost per Habitation (₹ Crores)
2009-10	Karnataka 24.21%	Chhattisgarh 20.56%	Chhattisgarh 18.67%	Bihar 18.34%	Maharashtra 20.21%	Kerala ₹4.55	Haryana ₹0.89
2010-11	Karnataka 20.01%	Chhattisgarh 18.84%	Jharkhand 17.05%	Bihar 11.23%	Rajasthan 14.70%	Goa ₹26.59	Goa ₹3.13
2011-12	Karnataka 21.91%	Jharkhand 19.32%	Jharkhand 18.46%	Jharkhand 9.87%	Rajasthan 23.72%	Kerala ₹7.52	Kerala ₹17.14
2012-13	Karnataka 21.99%	Karnataka 23.42%	Karnataka 21.07%	Karnataka 11.53%	Karnataka 15.53%	Goa ₹79.75	Goa ₹3.39
2013-14	Karnataka 32.38%	Karnataka 30.87%	Karnataka 32.42%	Karnataka 13.23%	Rajasthan 24.67%	Kerala ₹8.90	Andaman & Nicobar ₹1.05
2014-15	Karnataka 38.51%	Karnataka 22.44%	Karnataka 30.20%	Odisha 12.31%	Rajasthan 42.02%	Kerala ₹13.49	Rajasthan ₹1.60

(Source: Compiled from Table 5.16 to 5.21)

From the table 6 it is observed that taking 2009-10 to 2014-15 on the whole, for all 6 years Karnataka has highest share in ongoing scheme. For new schemes and achieved schemes, for 3 years Karnataka has highest share and for 2 years Jharkhand has highest share. For highest share in habitations covered, it is Bihar (2), Karnataka (2), Jharkhand (1) and Odisha (1). For total cost Rajasthan has highest share in 4 out of 6 years. Cost per scheme is found to be highest for Kerala for 4 years out of 6 years. Cost per habitation was found to be highest for different states for different years except that Goa had highest cost per habitation twice out of 6 years.

7. RECOMMENDATION:

This study is mainly focus on secondary data based on NRDWP report. However, the details of the achieved schemes are not available for the year end. Hence, one of the suggestion is that is achieved scheme details are given for the year ended. It will be really useful for carrying out detailed analysis. The details about the schemes commenced but dropped at later date will also be useful to carry out detailed analysis. The meaning of habitation does not help to understand the number of household covered under the habitation. Under the circumstances, even though cost per habitation has been derived, it constraints the comparison between the states, hence if the number of household covered for the schemes are also published it will lead to meaningful comparison between the states.

REFERENCES:

1. NRDWP Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation Government of India.
www.wasmo.org/downloads/nrdwp_sujoy_majumdar.pdf_Accessed on 14/06/2013.
2. NRDWP Programme .http://www.rural.nic.in/sites/downloads/our-schemes-glance/salientfeatu_resnrdwp.pdf,
Accessed on 18/01/2013.
3. NRDWP Report (2009-14), <http://indiawater.nic.in>, Accessed on 12/01/2015.
4. The World Bank Report (2008), Review of Effectiveness of Rural Water Supply Schemes, Sustainable Development Unit, South Asia Region, *Press Services Pvt. Ltd.*, New, (pp.1-180).
5. Union Compliance Civil Territories Report 32 (2015),
http://www.cag.gov.in/sites/default/files/audit_report_files/Union_Compliance_Civil_Territories_Report_32_2015_chap_2.pdf, Accessed on 21-1-2015.
6. Government of Goa, Eleventh Five Year Plan 2007-2012 and Annual Plan 2007-08, (p. 353).
7. Shriram A.N (2010), Transmission Dynamics of Diurnally Sub Periodic Wuchereria Bancroft Transmitted by 1952 (dipteran: culicid) in Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Ph.D. Thesis, India, Vector control Research Centre, Pondicherry University.
8. GWSSB Report (2011-12), Annual Administrative Report, (pp.1-60).
9. GWSSB Report (2012-13), Annual Administrative Report, (pp.1-66).
10. GWSSB Report (2013-14), Annual Administrative Report, (pp.1-64).