
Chapter - IV : Impact of ILCS Programme at Beneficiary Household Level

CHAPTER-IV

IMPACT OF ILCS PROGRAMME AT BENEFICIARY HOUSEHOLD LEVEL

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, it is attempted to know the impact of the ILCS Scheme through analysis of data collected from the sample households who availed of subsidy and/or loan to convert their dry latrines or to construct new latrines or have participated in the programme through their own resources. The sample was drawn from 19 towns of 15 states. In most cases heads of households were interviewed with the help of a structured schedule. Where the heads of households were not available, his/her spouse or other senior member of the household was contacted. The urban local body was requested to categorize town wards in terms of completion of construction/conversion of latrines. The three categories were (maximum coverage) medium coverage and low coverage. One ward from each category was selected and the complete list of beneficiaries was obtained. This showed as the sample frame and sample was selected randomly from this sample frame.

The total number of beneficiaries covered numbered 2292. The town-wise distribution of sample is as follows :

Table-4.1 : Town-wise Distribution of Covered Beneficiaries

State and towns			No. of Beneficiaries
Sl. No.	State Name	Town Name	
1	Assam	Tinsukia	155
2	Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	132
3	Bihar	Patna	0*
		Maner	0*
		Danapur	0*
4	Haryana	Yamunanagar	150
5	Jammu	Akhnoor	149
6	Karnataka	Tumkur	128
7	MP	Gwalior	150
8	Maharashtra	Udgir	150
9	Orissa	Parlekhamundi	150
10	Punjab	Moga	150
11	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	151
12	Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	150
		Dasna	152
		Gorakhpur	74
13	Uttaranchal	Dehradun	150
14	Tamilnadu	Tiruchirapalli	151
15	West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	150
Total Sample Size			2292

* Programme not implemented

The designed sample size was 150 beneficiaries per town. However, the complete list could not be obtained in Gorakhpur, Ramagundam and Tumkur and consequently the actual sample size was less than the designed size.

4.2 SOCIAL PROFILE OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS

4.2.1 Nature of Dwellings

95.9 percent of the sample households reside in their own houses. All the sample beneficiaries in Moga, Yamunanagar, Dehradun, Dasna, Gorakhpur, Udgir, Parlekhamundi and Tinsukia own a house.

2.3 percent of the sample households live in rented accommodation. Such households are found in Jalpaiguri, Akhnoor and Gwalior. In Gwalior nearly one third of the households live in rented accommodation. Less than two percent of the sample households are squatting on public land. Such households are found in Akhnoor, Lucknow, Rawatbhata, Tumkur, Thiruchirapalli, Ramagundam & Jalpaiguri.

In Jalpaiguri nearly one fourth of the households are squatting. The squatters in Jalpaiguri live on the banks of River Teesta and owner of the land is State Irrigation Department. The squatters have been provided 'patta'.

Table 4.2: Percentage Distribution of Dwellings by Type of Ownership

Sl. No	Region	State	Town	Nature of dwelling		
				Own	Rented	Squatting
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	98.6	0.7	0.7
2		Punjab	Moga	100.0	0.0	0.0
3		Haryana	Yamunanagar	100.0	0.0	0.0
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	100.0	0.0	0.0
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	99.3	0.0	0.7
6			Dasna	100.0	0.0	0.0
7			Gorakhpur	100.0	0.0	0.0
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	99.3	0.0	0.7
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	100.0	0.0	0.0
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	68.0	32.0	0.0
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	99.3	0.0	0.7
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	98.0	0.0	2.0
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	99.3	0.0	0.7
14	East	Bihar	Patna	NA	NA	NA
15			Maner	NA	NA	NA
16			Danapur	NA	NA	NA
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	72.7	3.3	24.0
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	100.0	0.0	0.0
19	North east	Assam	Tinsukia	100.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL				95.9	2.3	1.8

4.2.2 Type of Dwellings

Type of construction of dwellings is an important indicator of economic conditions and standard of living of households. In the sample, 28.8 percent of the households had kuccha houses, 31.3 percent lived in semi pucca houses and 39.9 percent possessed pucca houses.

Table 4.3: Percentage distribution of dwellings by type of construction

Sl. No	Region	State	Town	Nature of House		
				Kuccha	Semi pucca	Pucca
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	2.0	4.7	93.3
2		Punjab	Moga	0.7	2.6	96.7
3		Haryana	Yamuna nagar	1.3	1.3	97.4
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	0.0	51.4	48.6
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	50.0	49.3	0.7
6			Dasna	20.4	73.6	6.0
7			Gorakhpur	98.6	1.4	0.3
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	39.1	37.1	23.8
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	84.0	14.6	1.4
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	0.0	26.0	74.0
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	50.8	40.6	8.6
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	7.9	37.2	54.9
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	1.5	6.1	92.4
14	East	Bihar	Patna	NA	NA	NA
15			Maner	NA	NA	NA
16			Danapur	NA	NA	NA
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	82.6	10.0	7.4
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	20.6	46.0	33.4
19	North east	Assam	Tinsukia	1.3	98.7	0.0
TOTAL				28.8	31.3	39.9

Town-wise interpretation of the data shows that about 93.3 percent of the sample beneficiaries in Akhnoor, 96.7 percent in Moga, 97.4 percent in Yamunanagar and 92.4 in Ramagundam have pucca houses. The towns where kuccha houses predominate are Gorakhpur (98.6%), Udgir (84%), Jalpaiguri (82.6%), Tumkur (51%), Lucknow (50%), Parlekhamundi (21%) and Dasna (20%).

In Akhnoor, Moga, Yamuna nagar and Ramagundam most of the sample households are daily wage earners and in Ramagundam they work in Singreni Coal mines, NTPC power generation units and Cement factories. They earn a handsome amount.

In Jalpaiguri town, the target beneficiaries are mostly daily wage earners in local shops, construction sites, etc. The wall of their houses made of wood and bamboo mats and for roofing they use clay tiles. In case of Gorakhpur, the sample households stay in the slums at the outskirts of the city. These houses are made of clay and roofed with clay tiles, asbestos sheet or corrugated tin sheets.

Apart from this 31.3 percent of the target beneficiaries are having semi pucca houses. Their houses are made of brick but the roofing is constructed with corrugated sheets or clay tiles.

The data shows that even very poor dwellings have not been left out of the ambit of ILCS and this fact deserves commendation.

4.2.3 Income Category

At the time of survey, 62.5 percent of the sample households with the latrine facilities are in the Economically Weaker Section (EWS) category, 32.2 percent are in the Low Income Group (LIG) and the rest are in higher income groups. There are different loan and subsidy amounts for different economic groups in the scheme and it is noticed that the state governments are eager to focus on the EWS group where the subsidy is 45 percent, loan amount is 50 percent and the beneficiary contribution is 5 percent. Some LIG beneficiaries are also targeted.

The towns where EWS households predominate are Gorakhpur (100%), Dasna (98.6%), Udgir (96%), Lucknow (94.6%), Jalpaiguri (94%), Tiruchirapalli (85.4%), Tumkur (79.6%), Ramagundam (79.5%), Parlekhamundi (60%) and Dehradun (60%).

Similarly LIG beneficiaries are found in large proportion in Akhnoor (65.1%), Moga (63%), Yamuna Nagar (62%), Gwalior (85%) and Tinsukia (82%). Discussions with civic body officials revealed that at the time of selection most households in almost all towns were in the EWS category. Owing to better earning and economic prosperity the EWS households have moved into LIG or APL categories presently.

Only 5.3 percent of the households were in MIG/HIG categories. It is not known what proportion of households in the MIG/HIG categories have converted their dry latrines.

21.5 percent of sample beneficiaries in Akhnoor, 13.3 percent beneficiaries in Moga, 14.7 percent in Yamuna nagar and 16.2 percent in Tinsukia have really done well financially during the last couple of years.

Table 4.4: Percentage Distribution of Sample Households by Income Category

Sl. No	Region	State	Town	Income category		
				EWS (Up to Rs.3300/- per month)	LIG (Rs. 3301 to Rs. 7300/- per month)	MIG/HIG (Rs. 7301/- to Rs. 14500/- per month)
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	13.4	65.1	21.5
2		Punjab	Moga	35.4	63.3	13.3
3		Haryana	Yamuna nagar	23.3	62.0	14.7
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	60.0	38.0	2.0
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	94.6	5.4	0.0
6			Dasna	98.6	1.4	0.0
7			Gorakhpur	100.0	0.0	0.0
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	72.1	25.1	2.8
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	96.0	3.3	0.7
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	6.0	85.3	8.7
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	79.6	20.4	0.0
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	85.4	13.2	1.4
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	79.5	20.5	0.0
14	East	Bihar	Patna	NA	NA	NA
15			Maner	NA	NA	NA
16			Danapur	NA	NA	NA
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	94.0	5.3	0.7
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	60.0	38.0	2.0
19	North east	Assam	Tinsukia	1.9	81.9	16.2
TOTAL				62.5	32.2	5.3

4.2.4 Occupation Status

Majority of the beneficiaries (46.8 %), are wage earners working on construction sites, shops, markets and storage houses, mining in the coal mines (as in Ramagundam), working in the nearby tea gardens (as in Jalpaiguri) working in industries (as in Tiruchirapalli and Udgir). 20.9 percent of the sample beneficiaries are in petty business like vending fruits and vegetables, vending household utilities, vending lime water and lemonades, shoe mending etc. whereas 19.2 percent of the beneficiaries, under the present study, are in private jobs.

Table 4.5: Percentage distribution of sample households by occupation

SI No	Region	State	Town	Occupation details of the beneficiaries				
				Private Service	Govt. Service	Petty Business	Daily Wage Earning	Other Employment
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	6.0	38.9	48.4	6.7	0.0
2		Punjab	Moga	24.7	1.3	33.3	32.0	8.7
3		Haryana	Yamuna nagar	32.0	6.0	28.7	12.0	21.3
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	5.3	2.7	42.7	48.7	0.6
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	32.0	0.7	2.0	57.3	8.0
6			Dasna	1.3	0.0	9.2	78.3	11.2
7			Gorakhpur	4.3	1.3	1.3	91.8	1.3
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	12.6	18.5	29.1	39.1	0.7
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	3.3	0.0	2.7	82.7	11.3
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	64.7	8.0	10.0	14.7	2.6
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	29.7	14.8	25.0	28.9	1.6
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	12.6	11.3	5.3	70.8	0.0
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	25.0	0.0	10.7	62.8	1.5
14	East	Bihar	Patna	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
15			Maner	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
16			Danapur	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	2.0	1.3	10.7	70.0	16.0
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	5.3	3.0	42.6	48.6	0.6
19	North east	Assam	Tinsukia	46.5	16.8	33.5	0.6	2.6
TOTAL				19.2	7.6	20.9	46.8	5.5

The data revealed that 48.7 percent of the beneficiaries in Dehradun, 57.3 percent in Lucknow, 78.3 percent in Dasna, 91.8 percent in Gorakhpur, 82.7 percent in Udgir, 62.8 percent in Ramagundam, 70 percent in Jalpaiguri and 48.6 percent of the beneficiaries in Parlekhamundi are daily wage earners.

48.4 percent of the beneficiaries in Akhnoor, 42.7 percent in Dehradun, 42.6 percent in Parlekhamundi, 33.5 percent in Tinsukia, 33.3 percent in Moga, 29.1 percent in Rawatbhata and 28.7 percent in Yamunanagar are involved in petty business.

Moreover, 38.9 percent in Akhnoor, 18.5 percent in Rawatbhata and 16.8 percent of in Tinsukia are in government jobs. 64.7 percent of the beneficiaries in Gwalior, 46.5 percent in Tinsukia 32 percent each in Lucknow and Yamunanagar and 29.7 percent in Tumkur are in private jobs.

In Gwalior, the beneficiaries are found involved in service industries like tourism and employed with travel agencies and hotels. Tinsukia is a border town and many companies

have their offices in Tinsukia. Many of the sample beneficiaries are found engaged in these offices as peons, drivers etc.

4.2.5 Education Level of the Target Beneficiary Households

29.8 percent of the respondents (mostly heads of households) are illiterate and 70.2 percent were literate. The literacy rate is higher than the national literacy rate of 65.4 percent by about 5 percent. 33.8 percent of the heads of the households are educated upto primary level, 26.9 percent up to secondary level and the 9.5 percent to higher secondary level or more.

Higher educational level was noticed in Akhnoor (38.3%), Yamunanagar (28.7%), and Tinsukia (43.2%) and this has a positive correlation with the income of the beneficiaries of the respective towns as well as nature of house too.

Table-4.6 : Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Level of Education

Sl. No.	Region	State	Town	Respondents' education level			
				Illiterate	Primary	Secondary	Higher secondary and above
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	8.0	20.1	33.6	38.3
2		Punjab	Moga	2.0	24.6	64.7	8.7
3		Haryana	Yamunanagar	0.6	20.0	50.6	28.7
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	3.3	60.7	32.7	3.3
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	76.7	14.0	7.3	2.0
6			Dasna	57.9	40.1	2.0	0.0
7			Gorakhpur	79.8	18.9	0.0	1.3
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	12.6	58.9	21.2	7.3
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	44.7	38.7	14.0	2.6
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	7.3	8.0	78.7	6.0
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	35.9	46.9	16.4	0.8
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	3.3	66.9	24.5	5.3
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	78.7	19.7	0.8	0.8
14	East	Bihar	Patna	NA	NA	NA	NA
15			Maner	NA	NA	NA	NA
16			Danapur	NA	NA	NA	NA
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	61.3	33.3	4.0	1.4
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	3.33	60.66	32.68	3.33
19	North east	Assam	Tinsukia	0.6	7.8	48.4	43.2
Total				29.8	33.8	26.9	9.5

4.2.6 Awareness about ILCS Scheme

There is no Information, Education and Communication component in the ILCS scheme. Still, it is interesting to know how scheme details were known to the target households.

The data show that the two most important information dissemination sources were personnel contact by civic body officials (56.3%) and local community leaders (38.5%). Local leaders played the most prominent role in Yamunanagar (93%), Parlekhamundi (97%), Gwalior (81%), Lucknow (63%), Dehradun (97%) and Moga (83%).

Table-4.7: Percentage Distribution of Households by Knowledge of Scheme

SI No	Region	State	Town	Knowledge About The ILCS Scheme							
				Through Radio	Through newspaper	Through Television	Through Hoardings & Bill-boards	Through civic body officials	Through local leaders	Legal notice under Prohibition Act1993	Others
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.9	21.4	0.0	0.0
2		Punjab	Moga	1.3	10.7	0.0	2.0	18.0	83.3	0.0	0.0
3		Haryana	Yamunanagar	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	14.0	92.7	0.0	0.0
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	96.7	0.0	0.0
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	25.3	9.3	2.0	0.7	78.0	62.6	65.3	2.6
6			Dasna	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	43.4	11.8	32.9	27.0
7			Gorakhpur	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	100.0	14.9	82.4	0.0
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	0.0	0.7	0.0	2.6	97.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	0.7	4.7	0.0	0.0	53.3	30.0	0.0	0.7
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	24.7	26.0	12.7	24.0	44.7	81.3	2.7	0.0
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	10.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	0.0	0.7	0.0	2.0	97.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.5	96.2	0.8	0.0	8.4
14	East	Bihar	Patna	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
15			Maner	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
16			Danapur	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	96.7	0.0	0.0
19	North east	Assam	Tinsukia	0.6	5.2	0.6	6.5	83.9	3.9	0.0	0.0
TOTAL				3.2	3.7	0.9	2.7	56.3	38.5	11.4	2.4

Legal notices formed an important source (11.6%) but this was mostly in the three towns of Uttar Pradesh.

Generation of awareness about the ILCS scheme through radio was noticed in Lucknow (25.3% of households) and Gwalior (25%). Newspapers formed an important source in

Gwalior (26%). Television played a role in generating awareness only in Gwalior (12.7%) and Lucknow (2.0%).

4.3 POSSESSION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE UNITS BY THE BENEFICIARIES

4.3.1 Possession of the Units

About 77 percent of the households did not have household toilet before and constructed new sanitary toilets under ILCS. 23 percent of the sample households owned dry-latrines before and converted them into sanitation latrines.

Table-4.8: Coverage of Beneficiary's Household by Possession of Type of Unit

SI No	Region	State	Town	New Construction	Conversion
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	93.3	6.7
2		Punjab	Moga	8.6	91.4
3		Haryana	Yamuna nagar	62.7	37.3
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	54.1	45.9
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	63.3	36.7
6			Dasna	89.3	10.7
7			Gorakhpur	71.3	28.7
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	94.7	5.3
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	62.7	37.3
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	99.2	0.8
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	100.0	0.0
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	99.4	0.6
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	97.4	2.6
14	East	Bihar	Patna	NA	NA
15			Maner	NA	NA
16			Danapur	NA	NA
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	62.5	37.5
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	83.3	16.7
19	North east	Assam	Tinsukia	76.0	24.0
	Total			76.8	23.2

The proportion of households which converted dry latrines into sanitary latrines was highest in Moga (91%). The proportion of such households was 45.9 percent in Dehradun, 37.3 percent each in Yamunanagar and Udgir, 36.6 percent in Lucknow and 37.5 percent in Jalpaiguri.

All respondents in Tumkur possess newly constructed units. More than 90 percent households in Akhnoor, Rawatbhata, Gwalior and Ramagundam also fall in this category.

Case Study-13 : Diversion of Fund without HUDCO approval in Jammu

Under the study, scheme No 17967, which started in the year 2003, was selected. The scheme was for Jammu Division in ten towns namely for Reasai, Katra, Basohli, Sunderbani, Ramnagar, Billwar, Vijaypur, Arnia, Akhnoor, Kishtwar of J&K State. Akhnoor town was selected for the study. As per data received from HUDCO, New Delhi Office, it was mentioned that number of units converted was 2518 and, 813 new units have been converted by Jammu Municipality under this scheme for these ten towns.



Pit Latrine in Akhnoor, Jammu

During meeting with Assistant appraisal Officer of HUDCO, Regional Office, Jammu, it was mentioned by the official, that Akhnoor was selected for implementation of ILCS scheme during 1996, but no work was undertaken by the Nodal Agency, DLB Jammu. Further HUDCO has also sanctioned one more scheme to DLB Jammu with a Government of India subsidy of Rs. 127.74 lakh under the scheme No. 17967 for the construction of 7155 units in 10 towns of Jammu Province vide sanction letter No. HUDCO/ JMRO/ 17967/2003/921-24 dated 07.04.2003. Under this scheme, also Akhnoor was selected under ILCS scheme.

As per HUDCO sanction letter, a period of four to eight months was given for completion of legal documentation including execution of agreement and complying with all the other requirements of the mentioned sanction letter and the subsidy agreement/ drawl of first installment of subsidy. The letter had mentioned that the validity of sanction has already lapsed but until 2004, January, DLB have not submitted neither any document nor requested for extension of validity period.

During the meeting with Director of Directorate of Local Bodies, Jammu, it was learnt that way back in 1996, scheme for six towns were sanctioned. At that time, low cost units were constructed in Akhnoor, though Akhnoor was not selected under the scheme. When Study team enquired how the units have been constructed, the director told, DLB, Jammu either have diverted funds from other sanctioned scheme of HUDCO or taken funds from the State Government. During the meeting, HUDCO official asked for clarification as to how funds could

be diverted without HUDCOs approval. The Directorate officials could not reply the answer. The DLB Jammu officials told that they only knew from the previous records that in Akhnoor town the latrines were constructed in 1996 by an NGO, Sulabh International.

Team met representative of Sulabh International also to be apprised of the implementation mechanism and background of the selected scheme. Sulabh International was assigned the task of construction of 175 Latrines in Akhnoor in the year 1996. The sanction cost per unit was Rs. 4500/- . Sulabh was paid Rs 3000/-per unit for construction of new latrine and Rs 1500/- per unit was contributed by the beneficiaries as cost of super structure. The proposed budget for the scheme was Rs.9.00 lakh and out of this Rs 7.875, lakh was released for the Akhnoor town. The representative of Sulabh International was not aware of the source of fund or about the subsidy and loan component. The list of all 175 beneficiaries was provided to the team by Sulabh International.

During field verification in three wards namely Ward No 3, Pucca Dunga, Ward No 8, Adarsh Colony and Ward No 4, Kashmiri Mohalla, the beneficiaries told that they were not having dry latrines before inception of the scheme. They used to go out in the open. It was observed during Focus Group Discussion that more than 40% beneficiaries were aware of Manual Scavenging Prohibition Act and hardly 12% were found to be aware about provision of penal action against the users of dry latrine holders. People either used to defecate in open fields or used to make a big pit along the riverbank of Chenab that was covered by sand and soil after use. On asking, how they come to know about the scheme, the beneficiaries told that they came to know about the scheme through Officials of Akhnoor municipality and NGO Sulabh International. With regard to opinion about the scheme, Deshraj of ward No. 8 said the purpose of the scheme was good, however quality of latrine seat provided under the scheme was not very good. When beneficiaries were asked whether in their wards still scavengers are working, the reply was "No".

Field verification, shows that out of 175 constructed units, only 40 are in use and functioning properly (22.8 percent units). 95 households have stopped using the latrine. Two units are being renovated and 38 households are not having any type of latrine since the old units were dismantled due to lack of space. It was told by the beneficiaries that in Akhnoor around 300 families are still going for open defecation along the bank of river Chenab.

4.3.2 Time of Construction of the Units

More than 90 percent of the ILCS units were constructed more than one year back in Dasna (83.6%), Gorakhpur (63.5%), Ramagundam (81.1%) and Udgir (54.7%).

Table-4.9: Percentage Distribution of Household by Duration of construction

SI No	Region	State	Town	Duration of Construction					
				Recently	Six months back	One year back	Two years back	Can't remember	
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	0.0	0.0	4.0	96.0	0.0	
2		Punjab	Moga	1.3	0.0	0.1	69.3	29.3	
3		Haryana	Yamunanagar	0.7	0.0	0.0	61.3	38.0	
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	0.0	0.7	0.0	99.3	0.0	
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow		11.3	14.6	26.6	45.3	3.3
6			Dasna		0.7	12.5	83.6	0.7	2.6
7			Gorakhpur		4.1	32.4	63.5	0.0	0.0
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	0.0	18.2	81.1	0.8	0.0	
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	6.7	1.3	54.7	30.7	6.7	
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	8.0	13.3	16.0	18.0	44.7	
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	2.3	2.3	0.0	3.1	92.2	
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	0.7	0.7	2.6	7.9	88.1	
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	0.0	0.0	0.0	98.7	0.7	
14	East	Bihar	Patna	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
15			Maner	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
16			Danapur	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	20.0	12.7	6.7	41.3	19.3	
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	0.0	0.7	0.0	99.3	0.0	
19	North east	Assam	Tinsukia	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	95.5	
TOTAL				3.5	7.1	21.2	41.9	28.2	

Other constructions were pre-dominant in Akhnoor, Dehradun, Ramagundam, Moga and Yamunanagar

In Jalpaiguri 20 percent of the beneficiaries surveyed responded that some units are constructed very recently in less than two months time. In Dasna, Gorakhpur and Lucknow the construction of new units is still going on. The new constructions are maintained relatively better than the older ones.

4.3.3 Usage of ILCS latrines

It is not just enough that people construct toilets but also use them actually. At the aggregate level more than 12 percent of the households do not use their latrines. The proportion of households not using the toilets is as high as 52.0 percent in Rawatbhata, 41.0 percent in Tumkur, 27.0 percent in Gwalior and 22.0 percent in Udgir and 32.0 percent in Akhnoor.

Table-4.10: Percentage Distribution of Households by Using or not Using Toilets

Sl No	Region	State	Town	Yes	No
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	68.8	32.2
2		Punjab	Moga	98.7	1.3
3		Haryana	Yamuna nagar	94.0	6.0
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	100.0	0.0
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	100.0	0.0
6			Dasna	98.7	1.3
7			Gorakhpur	97.3	2.7
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	47.7	52.3
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	78.0	22.0
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	73.3	26.7
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	58.6	41.4
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	96.0	4.0
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	100.0	0.0
14	East	Bihar	Patna	NA	NA
15			Maner	NA	NA
16			Danapur	NA	NA
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	95.4	4.6
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	100.0	0.0
19	North east	Assam	Tinsukia	100.0	0.0
	Total			87.9	12.1

Case Study-14 : Despite Cent Percent subsidy and Provision of Superstructure - Scheme closed

Focus Group Discussions with beneficiaries were conducted in three wards of Tumkur town namely, Ambedkar Nagar, Shri Ram Nagar and Nazirabad. Most of the participants told that they knew about the scheme from the Municipality officials who visited the wards prior to the inception of the programme. Only a few could recollect that the scheme was launched more than 15 years back in the year 1992. They also said that because of legal proceedings against the contractor who had been constructing the low cost units with poor quality material, the scheme was closed in 1994 by the order of Municipal Commissioner.



Abandoned ILCS unit at Tumkur, Karnataka

It was noticed during field visits that in more than eighty percent cases, the latrines were dismantled. However, in place of the old ones they have now constructed new units by themselves. The beneficiaries told that they have received 100 percent subsidy and have not paid for the construction of latrines under the ILCS scheme. There was no loan component as per the information gathered during the FGD. There was 100 percent subsidy. The super structure was also included under the programme in Tumkur.

About 90 percent of the targeted member of low cost units had been constructed in Nazirabad, a minority-dominated area. The scheme was well recalled by the beneficiaries. The community still needs to be sensitized about the role of sanitation & personal hygiene in maintaining health standards for work & enjoyment.

According to a survey conducted by an Institute, 6 dry latrines still existed in Tumkur. However, the response of the Municipal Corporation to query made by the Study Team was that there were no such units in the corporation area.

According to the Municipal Commissioner, 42 Safai Karamcharies are available in the list but no one is involved with the removal of night soil. Nine Safai Karamcharies are dead now. It is told to us that some are migrated to other places in search of suitable jobs.

When beneficiaries asked to provide their suggestion about the scheme, they told that the scheme was good but the implementation mechanism was faulty as the implementation was given to the local contractor and they used the low quality materials for constructing the low cost units. As a result, the units were not durable at all and after some time they dismantled the old ones and constructed new latrines. This matter was discussed with the Commissioner who said it was due to the low cost per unit sanctioned limited to Rs. 3800/- per unit.

4.3.4 Reasons for the Usage of ILCS latrines by the Beneficiaries

It was attempted to know why people actually use latrines. The most important factor (about 50% of households using toilets) appears to be convenient for women and children, followed by hygiene (37%) improved social status (31%) and convenience for the aged (29%)

Table 4.11: Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Usage of Latrines

(Multiple choice answers)

SI No	Region	State	Town	Reason of using the unit				
				Hygienic	Convenience for women & Children	Convenience for the aged	Improved social status	Other Reason
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	0.7	57.0	49.0	36.2	3.4
2		Punjab	Moga	48.7	49.3	24.4	29.3	0.0
3		Haryana	Yamunanagar	50.0	37.3	2.7	37.3	0.0
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	98.7	15.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	1.3	86.7	36.7	28.0	0.7
6			Dasna	5.9	75.7	23.0	36.8	0.7
7			Gorakhpur	35.7	34.7	7.7	21.4	0.5
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	31.3	45.7	30.5	4.6	1.3
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	20.0	68.7	22.7	21.3	0.0
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	18.0	60.6	40.7	22.7	0.0
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	31.8	59.4	57.8	48.6	0.0
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	1.3	54.3	87.4	90.7	1.3
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	25.1	25.8	24.8	24.3	0.0
14	East	Bihar	Patna	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
15			Maner	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
16			Danapur	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	83.7	81.3	49.3	78.0	2.7
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	59.6	25.0	0.0	15.4	0.0
19	North east	Assam	Tinsukia	73.5	21.9	7.7	0.6	0.0
	Total			36.6	49.9	28.8	30.9	0.6

Case Study-15 : ILCS Unit in Jalpaiguri : An Honour for the Women

Minoti Das of Jalpaiguri a daily wage earner says previously there was open land at several places in the town area which was used by the women for defecation, even from those households having dry latrines. Before sunrise and after sunset the women went for open defecation to those places. But day by day the open space is shrinking and the women have to go far, which is not possible during day time. It is also inconvenient for the aged too. Therefore ILCS units are very helpful in mitigating the basic problems. Also these units save time for the work. She also added that it is very important to build the low cost unit, which provides privacy to women. She told that now she is not worried about her daughters who always used to go out of house for open defecation.

Beneficiaries in Dehradun (98.7%), Jalpaiguri (83.7%), Tinsukia (73.5%), Parlekhamundi (59.6%) and Yamunanagar (50.0%) have responded that they are using the units for maintaining good hygiene. Beneficiaries in Lucknow, Jalpaiguri, Dasna, Tumkur, Udgir and Gwalior think that it is convenient for the women and children. 87.4 percent of the beneficiaries in Tiruchirapalli have told it is convenient for the aged too.

Moreover, 90.7 percent of the beneficiaries in Tiruchirapalli and 78 percent in Jalpaiguri responded that having a latrine in homestead improves social status.

4.3.5 Reason for Not Using Latrines

A total of 12.9 percent of the sample was not using the sanitary toilets even after having them in their houses. The major reasons for not using the toilets (58% of the respondents reporting non usage) were categorized into the “other” category. These included fear of getting filled up soon (Jalpaiguri), using substandard materials in Yamunanagar, Tumkur & Udgir and migration due to war with Pakistan in Akhnoor.

Case Study-16 : Still Searching for Sanitation Solutions - Yamuna Nagar

It is true that the degrading practice of carrying human excreta as head load does not exist at all in Yamuna Nagar town. However the side drains in narrow congested lane of East Bhatia Nagar was the example of the unhygienic condition prevailing in the colony where low cost latrines were constructed in way back in the year 1995.

To understand the implementation mechanism and beneficiaries' feedback about the ILCS scheme when study team visited Ward No Six, East Bhatia Nagar, selected under the study, a huge crowd gathered with their grievances. Focus group discussion was held with the residents in the presence of Mr. Gurcharanjeet Singh, Municipal Councilor of the area. During the discussions, around twenty men and twenty-five women were present.

The latrines constructed more than 12 years back under the scheme are in use but effluent is now directly flowing in the lanes instead of the cess pits. The reason was that the road where leach pits were dug was badly damaged due to new construction of houses and access roads.



Discussion with the beneficiaries in East Bhatia Nagar, Yamunanagar

The pressure on the sewage system also increased. Many times, there were disputes among people and police had to intervene. Several families (Mrs. Suman Gandhi, Mrs. Kiran Soni and Mrs. Pinki Dhiman) residing in the colony have dismantled their leach pits and water seals. At present, the excreta directly flows in to open drain and spread over road side. An over loaded and a defective sewage system can lead to infiltration of sewage in to drinking water supply lines.



Excreta Coming out in open drain from ILCS Unit

During the group discussion it became apparent that awareness about penal sections of 1993 Act for non-maintenance of dry latrines was low.

As per Mrs. Suman, the ILCS scheme was appropriate at that time when they were using pit latrines, however after linking of sewer connection in some parts of their colony, they are facing the problem. While Mrs. Dhiman concern is that, they are receiving bill from Municipality for latrine since they have not paid their beneficiary contribution to the contractor at the time of construction.

The team visited the Municipal Corporation office and discussed the matter with the present Chairman Mrs. Kavita Arora and former Chairman Mr. Naresh Sharma. Highlighting the unhygienic conditions in the area by the team, other councilors indicated that in colonies namely outer area of Gulab Nagar, Jogender Nagar, Veena Nagar, Adarsh Nagar, Shiv Nagar, Patel Nagar, Bishan Das Colony, Laxmi Nagar and Tarapuri also night soil or latrine on the street is flowing from water seal latrines directly. All the councilors admitted that no dry latrines are in use now in Yamuna Nagar and Haryana is a scavenger free State but the prevailing unhygienic conditions are so adverse that community is searching the option for cleaning this filth flowing on the streets.

About 30 percent could not use the toilets due to clogging and blockage of sewer pipe.

Nearly 14 percent reported scarcity of water as the main factor for non-usage. Clogging and bad odour indicate the need for better maintenance. The cultural resistance against earning oneself within the house itself, which is prevalent in rural areas, was noticed only in a negligible number of cases (3 each in Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu and one in West Bengal).

Table 4.12: Percentage distribution of households for reasons not using the latrines

Sl. No.	Region	State	Town	Reason of using the unit*					
				No. of not using	Not enough water	Problem of bad odour	Blocked/Clogged sewer pipe	Cultural biasness in using latrines with house	Others
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	48	0 (0.0)	3 (6.3%)	19 (39.5)	0 (0.0)	29 (60.4)
2		Punjab	Moga	2	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
3		Haryana	Yamunanagar	9	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (22.27)	0 (0.0)	7 (77.3)
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	0	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	9	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	9 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
6			Dasna	2	0 (0.0)	2 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
7			Gorakhpur	2	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (100.0)
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	79	8 (10.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (12.0)	0 (0.0)	87 (84.8)
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	33	1 (3.0)	3 (9.0)	20 (60.6)	0 (0.0)	5 (15.5)
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	40	30 (75.0)	18 (45.0)	40 (100.0)	3 (7.5)	0 (0.0)
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	53	0 (0.0)	1 (1.8)	4 (7.5)	0 (0.0)	51 (96.21)
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	7	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (14.2)	3 (74.8)	1 (14.2)
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	0	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
14	East	Bihar	Patna	-	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
15			Maner	-	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
16			Danapur	-	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	6	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (16.6)	5 (83.3)
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	0	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
19	North east	Assam	Tinsukia	0	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Total			290	40 (13.7)	27 (9.3)	85 (29.3)	6 (2.1)	167 (57.6)

*Multiple answers possible

4.3.6 Maintenance of ILCS Latrines by Beneficiaries

The data shows that the women in 52.0 percent of the households clean and maintain the latrines. Interestingly in 37.0 percent of the households, the head of the households also assist in maintenance of latrines. Only in 7.2 percent of the cases outside sanitary workers are engaged for cleaning. The instances were noticed mainly in Punjab and Yamunanagar where beneficiaries have to employ the scavengers due to chocking of toilets.

Table 4.13: Percentage Distribution of respondents by who Cleans and Maintains*

SI No	Region	State	Town	Cleaning and maintenance of the ILCS units				
				Self	Women of the HH	Domestic help	Scavengers	Others
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	76.5	13.4	0.7	4.7	0.0
2		Punjab	Moga	3.3	79.3	0.7	28.7	0.7
3		Haryana	Yamuna nagar	1.3	56.7	0.0	44.0	0.0
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	4.0	88.7	0.0	6.7	0.0
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	26.7	63.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
6			Dasna	48.7	36.2	2.0	10.5	0.7
7			Gorakhpur	85.1	52.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	43.0	14.6	0.0	42.4	0.0
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	25.3	46.7	0.7	1.3	0.7
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	2.7	97.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	55.5	50.0	47.7	3.9	0.7
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	90.1	7.9	0.0	0.7	0.0
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	57.6	40.2	0.0	2.2	0.0
14	East	Bihar	Patna	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
15			Maner	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
16			Danapur	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	36.7	52.0	1.3	2.7	0.0
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	4.0	88.7	0.0	6.7	0.0
19	North - East	Assam	Tinsukia	60.6	39.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL				37.0	51.6	3.0	7.2	0.2

In Gwalior (98%), Parlekhamundi and Dehradun (88.7% each), Moga (79.3%), It is responsibility of the women to clean toilets.

In Tiruchirapalli (90%), Gorakhpur (85%) and Akhnoor (77%), the head of households themselves clean the latrines. In Jalpaiguri, Ramagundam, Tinsukia, Tumkur, Udgir and Yamuna nagar both the respondents and their spouses clean the latrines. 44 percent of the households in Yamunanagar, 28.7 percent in Moga and 10.5 percent in Dasna deploy sanitation workers for cleaning the latrines.

It is encouraging to note that people use and maintain their toilets, indicating that once they have access to good sanitation facilities people are proud about them and maintain them well. In some towns like Udgir, Rawatbhata, Tinsukia, Gwalior, Tumkur and Ramagundam many of the households have even renovated and improved their low cost units through their own resources.

* Multiple choice questions

4.3.7 Changes in Living Standard

Access to improved sanitation facilities are bound to improve the quality of life of people. The data reveals that this has actually happened in the case of ILCS. 57.3 percent of the total sample under the study told that the scheme improved their social status. 36.2 percent of the beneficiaries responded that the problem of worms in children has decreased. 31.5 percent have told that the scheme increased privacy for women, whereas, 27.2 percent told that the units have saved precious time for them. Decrease in water borne diseases was reported by 20 percent of the sample. Convenience was reported by 18 percent

Table 4.14: Percentage distribution of respondents by ownership of received benefits of on sanitary toilets *

(Multiple answers)

Sl No	Region	State	Town	Change noticed						
				Decrease in water borne diseases	Decrease in worms in the children	Increased privacy	Improved social standard	Saving of time	Convenience for children, aged and women	Any others
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	0.0	3.4	79.2	59.1	94.0	0.0	0.0
2		Punjab	Moga	2.7	33.3	6.7	96.0	53.3	1.3	0.0
3		Haryana	Yamuna nagar	0.0	21.3	3.3	94.0	2.0	5.3	0.0
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	2.0	0.0	0.0	99.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	26.7	67.3	2.0	8.0	1.3	40.7	0.0
6			Dasna	5.3	33.6	16.4	49.5	38.8	25.7	0.7
7			Gorakhpur	36.2	33.7	19.4	3.5	7.2	0.5	0.0
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	23.2	25.8	56.3	29.8	63.6	2.0	0.0
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	36.0	28.7	15.3	20.0	18.0	34.7	0.7
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	40.0	65.3	14.7	18.0	13.3	87.3	0.0
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	22.7	54.7	57.8	53.1	28.9	12.5	0.0
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	0.0	6.6	27.8	90.7	89.4	42.4	0.0
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	1.5	31.0	31.9	31.4	2.1	2.1	0.0
14	East	Bihar	Patna	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
15			Maner	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
16			Danapur	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	92.7	72.7	41.3	72.3	51.3	66.0	0.7
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	1.2	6.1	23.5	43.8	0.0	25.4	0.0
19	North east	Assam	Tinsukia	7.1	23.2	58.1	15.5	1.9	1.3	0.0
TOTAL				20.2	36.2	31.5	57.3	27.2	18.1	0.1

* Multiple choice responses

Town-wise perception shows that 40 percent of the sample in Gwalior, 36.2 percent in Gorakhpur and 30 percent in Udgir are of the opinion that there is decrease in the water borne disease and their children are free of it.

Shri Surendra Kumar Singh, a resident of Ward No. 7 of Gwalior town said, “ILCS scheme is a very good scheme and in my house I have three children. The health of my children has improved after we constructed the unit in our house. This Scheme must continue” and benefit to others also.

67.3 percent of sample in Lucknow, 65.3 percent in Gwalior and 54.7 percent in Tumkur reported that there is a decrease of worms in children.

99.3 percent beneficiaries in Dehradun, 96 percent in Moga, 94 percent in Yamuna nagar and 90.7 percent of the beneficiaries in Tiruchirapalli reported the scheme is good as it improved the social status of the people.

Shri Parminder Singh, a petty businessman from ward no 20, 394/20 Prem nagar of Moga: *“This scheme is very good and after constructing the unit in my house, I gained social status among relatives and friends”.*

79.2 percent of sample in Akhnoor, 57.8 percent in Tumkur and 56.3 percent in Rawatbhata told that the privacy of the beneficiaries specially of women has increased manifold.

“Today the city is congested and there is no space for defecation. It is very difficult for the women to go out. This low cost unit made by Sulabh has increased privacy of my wife”. – **Yogi Ram and his wife of Rawatbhata town**

94 percent beneficiaries in Akhnoor and 89.4 percent of the beneficiaries in Tiruchirapalli also reported that the toilet saves of a lot of time. Previously people had to walk a long way to find open space for defecation specially in the towns where the influx of population is increasing day by day.

4.3.8 Opinions about the Scheme

The study tried to elicit opinion of people about the usefulness and efficacy of ILCS. 66.6 percent of the sample was of the opinion that the scheme is very good and must continue. All sampled beneficiaries in Gorakhpur, 98.7 percent in Dehradun, 90.2 percent in Ramagundam, 94 percent in Jalpaiguri and 84 percent in Moga had very positive opinion about the scheme.

Shri Shayma Das Saha of Paresh Mitra Colony, Ward no. 25 in Jalpaiguri said, “The latrine has given us freedom from diseases and recognition among relatives. Though I am a daily wage earner and support a family of six including three children and seventy year old mother, when the civic body officials told me for construction of one unit I agreed readily and gave my contribution for construction of the unit in my house immediately. I have been re-paying the loan also. I know it is good”.

Table-4.15: Percentage distribution of households by opinion about ILCS

(Multiple answers)

SI No	Region	State	Town	Opinion of the beneficiary about the scheme						
				Very good and need to continue	Good but needs improvement	Subsidy is too less	Beneficiary list is faulty	Civic body officials hardly care for the scheme	No awareness generation by the civic body officials	Any others
1	North	Jammu & Kashmir	Akhnoor	45.6	38.9	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2		Punjab	Moga	84.0	78.0	2.0	19.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
3		Haryana	Yamuna nagar	66.0	69.3	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.7
4		Uttaranchal	Dehradun	98.7	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5		Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow	32.7	62.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
6			Dasna	47.4	88.2	71.7	3.9	1.3	0.0	0.0
7				Gorakhpur	100.0	12.2	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
8	West	Rajasthan	Rawatbhata	45.0	67.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
9		Maharashtra	Udgir	54.7	24.7	4.7	16.7	21.3	2.7	2.7
10		Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	52.0	37.3	1.3	18.0	19.3	18.0	0.0
11	South	Karnataka	Tumkur	59.4	82.0	3.1	2.3	7.8	0.0	3.1
12		Tamil Nadu	Tiruchirapalli	55.0	45.0	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
13		Andhra Pradesh	Ramagundam	90.2	3.8	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14	East	Bihar	Patna	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15			Maner	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16			Danapur	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17		West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	94.0	60.0	0.7	2.0	2.0	1.3	0.7
18		Orissa	Parlekhamundi	58.7	36.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.3	0.0
19	North East	Assam	Tinsukia	61.9	19.4	13.5	5.2	0.6	0.6	0.0
TOTAL				66.6	47.9	6.8	4.5	4.5	1.5	0.5

It is also important to note that 48 percent of the sample at aggregate level felt that though the scheme is good, it needs improvement by way of increasing unit cost and subsidy, enabling construction of super structure. The major constraint absence of adequate space was stated in Dasna, Lucknow, Yamunanagar, Rawatbhata, Punjab, Jalpaiguri, Tumkur, Tiruchirapalli & Parlekhamundi.

When inquired about what kind of improvement in the scheme is needed, **Md. Rahisuddin of Yaseen Ghari**, Ward no 1, Dasna said, “*Construction of the toilets has been undertaken by the local contractors using low quality material. The civic body officials must monitor the activities of the contractors*”. A DUDA official in Dasna stated that the unit cost is so low that it is not feasible to use good quality material.

71.7 percent of the beneficiaries in Dasna and 13.5 percent in Tinsukia are of the opinion that subsidy amount from the government is too less and this should be increased atleast to 65 percent. In Jalpaiguri, Tumkur, Tiruchirapalli, Akhnoor, Ramagundam beneficiaries suggested raising subsidy to 80 percent. Even the civic body officials in all towns and the state government officials attached to the scheme expressed the same view. SUDA officials at West Bengal are also of the view that subsidy must be increased. In other schemes of the Ministry of Urban Housing and Poverty Alleviation, Govt. of India provision of 65 to 80 percent subsidies is provided for the EWS people. Therefore under ILCS scheme the subsidy amount should be increased appropriately.

Shri Lal Singh of 115 Narsingh Nagar, ward no – 7 of Gwalior said, “Details regarding the schemes should be provided beforehand to the beneficiaries. We should be made aware of details regarding loan, subsidy, and quality of materials to be used for construction.

In Moga (19.3%), Udgir (16.7%) and Gwalior (18.0%) the beneficiaries told that the beneficiaries’ lists are full of errors. Even the study team checked the lists and found duplication of names. The names of some non-existent households also appeared in the list. Some beneficiaries mentioned that civic body officials do not care for the scheme and do not take initiative. But the team found that in most of the cases the civic body officials took utmost initiative to generate adequate awareness about the scheme and its outcomes.

Overall the scheme is implemented well in almost all towns and as per the beneficiaries’ responses the scheme is found to be very good for the beneficiaries and needs to continue. The unit cost should be increased as well as the subsidy amount. The other suggestions given by beneficiaries in Rawatbhata, Udgir, Tumkur and Jalpaiguri stated that awareness component and regular monitoring are two main aspects that should be taken care of on periodic basis.

4.4 SUMMING UP

- (i) Though majority of the “beneficiary” households in most towns have their own houses, some households live in rented accommodation or have built their dwellings on public land.
- (ii) The fact that only about 40 percent of the households have pucca houses is an indication of the generally low standard of living among the sample. It is encouraging to note that ILCS has targeted all households irrespective of their economic conditions though subsidy has been given only to EWS households.
- (iii) Nearly two third of the sample households belong to EWS category currently and about one third are in the LIG category. But even the latter were reported to be in EWS at the time of selection.
- (iv) Nearly half the number of beneficiaries are employed in the informal sector of construction, petty business etc. Some work as miners, tea garden workers, or unskilled or semi skilled factory workers. About one fourth are salaried employees in private or government jobs.
- (v) About 30 percent of heads of households are illiterate.
- (vi) The two most important information dissemination sources about ILCS for the respondents were civic body officials or local/community leaders. About 12 percent of the beneficiaries got information only when legal notices were served on them for conversion of their dry latrines. An effective communication campaign would have enhanced the acceptability of the scheme by the community.
- (vii) More than 90 percent of the construction took place more than a year ago.
- (viii) In the sample, about 12 percent of the households were not using the renovated/newly constructed toilets.
- (ix) The main reason for non-usage was absence of super-structure, maintenance problems, water scarcity or social prejudices.
- (x) The most important consideration in making optimum use of the toilets was “convenience for women” children and the elderly, hygiene and improvement in standard of living and consequent social prestige.

- (xi) In more than half the number of households the responsibility for cleaning and upkeep is vested in women. In more than a third of cases even male members chipped in to do the cleaning work. Only in seven percent cases sanitation workers were engaged.
- (xii) One of the major impact of the ILCS was the improved social prestige endowed on the owners of the sanitary latrines. Another important outcome was decrease in worm infestation in children and reduction in water borne diseases. Improved privacy for women was another positive outcome perceived by the sample beneficiaries.
- (xiii) More than two thirds of the beneficiaries was of the opinion that ILCS is a very good scheme and must continue till use of sanitary latrines at household level becomes universal.
- (xiv) On the whole, the respondents and even officials of the civic bodies were of the opinion that unit cost for construction/conversion approved under the scheme is inadequate. Poor people cannot mobilize the resources for a fully constructed toilet without increasing the unit cost.
- (xv) There was also an opinion that unit cost must provide for the cost of construction of super-structure as dwellings are close together in urban areas and privacy is major consideration.
- (xvi) In some states like Uttar Pradesh Orissa, Assam, Rajasthan & Maharashtra, HUDCO loan is not accessible. Due to this, beneficiaries have to shell out 55% of the cost of construction, which is a herculean task for most poor people.