
Executive Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

- 1.1 Sanitation is the basis of a healthy and civilized living. Alongwith feed and employment security, nutrition and health and access to safe drinking water, it has been accepted as one of the components of human development. Absence of sanitation facilities lead to water-borne diseases.
- 1.2 In India as many as 36 percent of the households do not have sanitary toilets. Of those having latrines, nearly 20 percent depend on "Service Latrines" or dry latrines which require the services of people to manually remove night soil. Those who use dry latrines and those who are engaged in the demeaning occupation of manually removing human excreta are exposed to innumerable health risks.
- 1.3 The scavengers, also referred to by the more dignified term "sanitary workers", come from the lower strata of even Scheduled Castes and belong to such castes as Bhangi, Valmiki, Thothi, etc.
- 1.4 For urban areas the integrated low cost sanitation programme, the flagship scheme implemented by the Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation (MOHUPA) in association with HUDCO and urban local bodies, is a major initiative that is expected to improve the physical quality of life in urban areas, particularly in small towns. The earlier subsidy oriented approach was replaced with the principle of "beneficiaries" meeting at least part of the project cost to make it demand driven.
- 1.5 The MOHUPA commissioned AFC to undertake an indepth evaluation of Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme (ILCS). This impact evaluation study is aimed to understand the magnitude of the problem, critically appraise the scheme, identify bottlenecks in implementation and assess constraints and difficulties of beneficiary participants.
- 1.6 The sampling methodology was designed through close interaction with MOUHPA and HUDCO and the final sample contained 19 towns, 51 town wards, 2292 households with converted/newly constructed latrines and 641 scavengers/ sanitation workers. Structured questionnaires, state level and town level checklists and FGDs were used by a team of trained researchers to collect primary and secondary data.

II. ASSESSMENT OF MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM

- 2.1 The employment of scavengers in the demeaning task of manually removing night soil and construction/continuation of dry latrines was banned by an Act of the Parliament in 1993. This legislation followed the recommendations of four committees and commissions appointed at different time periods between 1949 and 1968. 17 States have already adopted the Act, sanitation being a State subject.
- 2.2 The Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment (MSJE) has the overall responsibility for rehabilitation of scavengers, whereas the Ministry of Urban Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation has the responsibility for removal of dry latrines and provision of sanitation facilities at household and community levels in urban areas. In rural areas, the Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India is assigned this responsibility.
- 2.3 According to the data provided by MSJE (2006), there are 7.76 lakhs manual scavengers in the country. Of these 4.28 lakhs were rehabilitated under the National Scheme for liberation and rehabilitation of scavengers and their dependent. The latter was restructured into a comprehensive package as the "New Self Employment Scheme for Rehabilitation of Manual scavengers with the target of rehabilitating the entire population of scavengers by March 2009. The Prime Minister himself has taken a keen interest in the programme. While approving the programme the cabinet directed that "a viable framework for training and capacity building must be designed, with the approval of the Prime Minister, incorporating the required technical inputs and institutional linkages with business and industrial establishments and NGOs with vocational strength". Accordingly, AFC assisted in preparing a training framework under the scheme. The responsibility for managing the training has been assigned to NSFDC, NSKFDC and NBCFDC, national apex organizations under MSJE and their state level channelizing agencies.
- 2.4 Census of India, 1991 revealed that 76 percent of the households in India did not have toilet facilities. The proportion of toilet less houses decreased to 64 percent in 2001. The percentage of increase in houses having toilets was higher in rural areas than in urban area. Census figures also revealed that 20 percent of the households having toilets depended on "Service latrines" in which scavengers are needed to physically remove night soil.
- 2.5 ILCS has been implemented in 1534 towns with a population of 5 lakh or less. HUDCO has so far sanctioned 871 projects.

- 2.6 The total number of dry latrines that had to be dismantled and reconstructed in 1534 towns was 18.05 lakh, against which 10.77 lakh have been dismantled and reconstructed (indicating an achievement of about 60 percent). A total of 30.86 lakh new units were to be constructed for those households which did not have any latrines. Against this the achievement was 10.94 lakh (35%). Thus the total physical target was 48.91 lakh, against which the achievement was 45 percent only.
- 2.7 650 towns out of 1534 have been declared scavengers free. Data shows that ILCS is yet to make a dent in Assam, Bihar, J&K, Karnataka, Orissa, Manipur, Jharkhand, Meghalaya, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal and Goa.
- 2.8 As per information available from Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, the States of Haryana, Punjab and Chhattisgarh are scavenger free. As per data available with Kerala State Schedule Caste Development & Finance Corporation (KSSCDFC), there are 1198 scavengers yet to be rehabilitated in Kerala.

III. DELIVERY MECHANISM

- 3.1 In all 15 States, appropriate implementation arrangements are in place to facilitate project implementation. State Urban Development Agency (SUDA) is the nodal agency in three States, namely ; Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal. In Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand the work is executed and monitored by District Urban Development Agency (DUDA). In West Bengal, Municipal Engineering Directorate (MED) is the nodal agency and Municipal bodies are the executing arms. In Assam, Municipal Administration Department is the nodal agency and execution is done through Municipal Councils/Corporations. Jammu & Kashmir as well as Rajasthan have designated Directorate of Local Bodies as nodal agency. The nodal agency in Tamil Nadu is Municipal Administration Department (MAD) and execution is done through Municipal Councils/Corporations.
- 3.2 Haryana Slum Clearance Board (HSCB) is the nodal agency for Haryana whereas in Punjab Water Supply & Sewerage Board (PWSSB) is looking after the ILCS scheme in Punjab. In Orissa, Housing and Municipal Urban Development (HMUD) is the nodal agency. In Madhya Pradesh, Department of Urban Administration and Development is the nodal agency. Karnataka had designated Directorate of Municipal Administration (DMA) as the nodal agency. Maharashtra Jeevan Pradhikaran (MJP) is nodal agency in Maharashtra. Bihar Urban Development Agency (BUDA) as nodal agency in Bihar.

3.3 Special measures and initiatives adopted in different States are the following:

- In Uttar Pradesh, the initiatives included publicity through banners, hoardings, newspapers, radio, etc., community mobilization and awareness generation was done through community organizers of Community Development Society. Monitoring and supervision at construction stage was exercised by DUDA Project Officer.
- In West Bengal, State Government has printed and distributed posters for creating mass awareness. The Government contributed funds for superstructure from Phase-VI onwards and monitoring by Sanitation Engineer of SUDA and HUDCO is a regular feature.
- In Andhra Pradesh, awareness was created by NGOs in ward meetings. To educate the public about ILCS scheme, constant guidance of Municipal Commissioner and Executive Engineer, Municipality officials, financing of superstructure under Phase-III by the State Government are the major features.
- In Jammu & Kashmir also State Government financed the cost of superstructure. Comprehensive measures have been adopted under IHSDP and UDISSMT for conversion of pit latrines. As more funds are available under these schemes, ILCS scheme is not given much importance.

3.4 In Bihar, the scheme sanctioned for Bihar during the year 1995, could not be implemented at all. BUDA has neither refunded the unutilized subsidy amount nor has submitted new proposals. The State has no reliable survey figures on dry latrines and scavengers. The dry latrine figure quoted by the Government is as per 1989 survey. During the last seven months, BUDA has initiated necessary steps to conduct the survey through NGOs to know the status of dry latrines and scavengers. Due to various reasons, no suitable NGO could be involved and now survey work has been entrusted to District Literacy committees. Even at high levels of implementation mechanism, there was no knowledge about receipt of subsidy (Rs. 106.75 lakhs).

3.5 In State of Karnataka, the programme was severely affected due to poor execution at town level. Schemes had to be closed just after one year of its implementation due to legal problems with contractors.

- 3.6 In Punjab and Haryana, the execution of work was left totally to contractor. Only random checking of units was done by Executive Officers of Municipal Corporation and HUDCO. FGDs showed that beneficiaries were completely unaware about the details of the scheme.
- 3.7 Implementation was slow in Uttarakhand, inadequate staff at nodal agency (SUDA) level, frequent transfers of key personnel, deployment of NGOs on political recommendations and poor recovery of loans from beneficiaries. Non-submission of the reports in time by nodal agency to HUDCO is a major grey area.
- 3.8 In five of the sample States, the nodal agencies have confirmed existence of dry latrines. Uttar Pradesh reported 2,70,911 dry units, Jammu & Kashmir 63,927, Assam 60,361, Uttarakhand 16354 units and Bihar 2,00,230 (based on 1989 survey).
- 3.9 The number of dry units as on June, 2007 in Uttarakhand has come down to only 2611 dry units from the figures of 16354 in 2001. In Assam also the number of dry units has reduced to 21008 from 60,361 (2002-03. Not much progress has been seen in Jammu & Kashmir where number of units still required to be constructed is 61457.
- 3.10 In Assam, unwillingness of beneficiaries to repay loans had affected the progress of work. This had resulted in incomplete construction, poor fund utilization and non-submission of reports in time.
- 3.11 In Uttar Pradesh where 2,70,911 dry units were reported in 2005, the number has increased by 27389.
- 3.12 In the three sample towns of Uttar Pradesh namely ; Gorakhpur, Lucknow and Dasna, dry latrines are still in existence.
- 3.13 In Danapur and Phulwari Sharif of Patna (Bihar) the study team observed the existence of dry latrines. However, in the wards of Maner visited by the team, no dry latrines were seen.
- 3.14 In **14 towns conversion of dry latrines was to the extent of 73.0 percent** of the sanctioned number. No unit was sanctioned for conversion in Patna, Maner, Danapur, Udgir and Akhnoor. In eight towns (Moga, Yamunanagar, Rawatbhatta, Dehradun, Lucknow, Ramagundam, Tumkur and Tiruchirapally) the entire target has been completed. In all three towns of Uttar Pradesh, the work is under progress.

- 3.15 In nine towns, progress in construction of new units was to the extent of 46 percent of the target. The entire target was completed in Akhnoor and Dehradun. In Moga town of Punjab additional units were constructed by the Municipality from its own funds.
- 3.16 NGOs involvement in scheme implementation was seen in six towns. In Ramagundam, NGO was involved only in social mobilization. In Akhnoor and Gwalior they were involved in construction. During the field study, it was observed that NGOs did not play key role in educating the community about usage and maintenance of toilets.
- 3.17 The major constraints for effective delivery of programme benefits are the following :
- Lack of planning and monitoring (Parlekhamundi and Tumkur)
 - Failure to submit utilization certificates adversely affecting fund flow. (Tinsukhia, Parlekhamundi and Tumkur)
 - Use of sub standard material by contractors, leading to legal proceedings and stoppage of work (Karnataka).
 - Insufficient assistance by way of subsidy and loan, making it impossible for poor people to be easily convinced to participate in the programme.
 - The need for beneficiaries to mobilize as much as 55 percent of cost of construction due to absence of loan (Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Assam and Maharashtra).
 - Assistance is limited to the cost the toilet platform. Superstructure was to be constructed by beneficiary.

IV. NEW AND CONVERTED SANITARY TOILETS : FEED BACK FROM THE FIELD

- 4.1 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.
- 4.2 The fact that only about 40 percent of the households have pucca houses is an indication of the generally low physical quality of life. 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.
- 4.3 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.

- 4.4 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.
- 4.5 About 30 percent of heads of households are illiterate.
- 4.6 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.
- 4.7 More than 90 percent of the work of toilet construction took place before one year or more.
- 4.8 77 percent of the houses which did not have household toilet before implementation of ILCSS, constructed new sanitary toilets under the scheme.
- 4.9 About 12 percent of the households were not using the renovated/newly constructed toilets.
- 4.10 The main reason for non-usage was absence of super-structure, maintenance problems, water scarcity or social prejudices.
- 4.11 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.
- 4.12 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.
- 4.13 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.

- 4.14 More than two thirds of the beneficiaries were of the opinion that ILCS is a very good scheme and must continue till use of sanitary latrines at household level becomes universal.
- 4.15 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.
- 4.16 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 a major consideration.
- 4.17 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.

V. INTERACTION WITH MANUAL SCAVENGERS

- 5.1 Though 96.0 percent of the sample sanitation workers belonged to depressed segment among scheduled castes, there are a few scheduled tribes and persons from general castes who are engaged currently as sanitation workers. The latter of course are extremely poor or are migrant workers who could get no other jobs. However, non- SC sanitation workers do not remove night soil.
- 5.2 About 26 percent live in rented accommodation or encroached land.
- 5.3 About 65.0 percent sanitation workers are illiterate and only 30.0 percent are educated upto primary level. Due to low level of literacy they are not aware of any development programmes for their well being.
- 5.4 About 86 percent of the sanitation workers have quit the scavenging.
- 5.5 65 percent sanitation workers indicated increase in the family income as compared to the family income before the inception of the ILCSS.
- 5.6 The average income of 80.0 percent of sanitation workers is Rs 3300/- per month.
- 5.7 Sanitation workers are still continuing with removal of night soil in Tumkur, Udgir, Lucknow, Jalpaiguri and Gorakhpur.

- 5.8 30.0 percent of the sanitation workers know about the rehabilitation package. It is interesting to know that in Gorakhpur and Dasna where many dry latrines still exist, scavengers have knowledge about the scheme.
- 5.9 37 percent sanitation workers have received assistance from the Government for starting new profession.
- 5.10 42 percent of the sanitation workers have enhanced their skills. These workers are from Dasna, Lucknow, Gorakhpur, Moga and Tiruchirapally.
- 5.11 About 52.0 percent of the sanitation workers felt that their status in society has improved.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Need for Information, Education and Communication Campaign

- 6.1 To reduce open defecation and use of dry latrines, a mass awareness campaign needs to be taken up, particularly in those towns where these problems are acute.
- 6.2 Hygiene education needs to be included as an integral part of school education in urban areas.
- 6.3 A lot of training material is already available under other programmes like TSC and the projects supported by UNICEF, World Bank, Water Aid and Sulabh International. These are available in vernacular languages also. These can be suitably modified and used for ILCS.
- 6.4 The cost of such activities needs to be incorporated into the total project cost apart from the expenditure on construction.

Planning and Monitoring

- 6.5 In planning and implementing the scheme there is need for better coordination between the functions of "liberation" and "rehabilitation" of manual scavengers. All the relevant agencies should be involved at the planning stage and there needs to be efficient information sharing arrangements.
- 6.6 Monitoring needs to be strengthened by involving representatives of the actual beneficiaries in checking the quality of material used for construction.

- 6.7 Elected local representatives, political leaders, teachers, government functionaries etc must be closely involved in planning, implementation and monitoring of ILCS scheme in each urban ward.

Need for Superstructure

- 6.8 The present unit cost and level of subsidy are inadequate. At present the cost of construction up to plinth level only is taken into consideration for calculating subsidy. Super structure has to be constructed by the user, which, for most poor people, is a difficult proposition. Superstructure is absolutely necessary for privacy, convenience, dignity, optimum use, aesthetics and cleanliness. The aspect of privacy is very crucial in the thickly populated towns and slums which are more closely built around each other than the houses in the rural areas, hence the cost of constructing the superstructure must be included in the unit cost.
- 6.9 To ensure smooth flow of funds from Government and HUDCO there is a need to improve the quality and timeliness of information flow on scheme implementation. Responsibilities must be fixed in this regard.
- 6.10 To reduce the burden on poor beneficiaries the subsidy assistance should be suitably increased.

Revision of Unit Cost

- 6.11 The unit cost norm fixed way back is no longer feasible due to rise in the cost of cement, bricks, sand and porcelain seats, digging of hard soil, non availability of sand and its high cost. Hence the unit cost may be suitably revised through a realistic assessment of material and construction cost.
- 6.12 Unit cost must be fixed differentially for different geographic regions, keeping in view variation in the costs.

Area Specific Design

- 6.13 As land is scarce in towns, a space consuming disposal system of twin-leach pit type latrines is not feasible, particularly in slums and poor residential colonies (Yamunanagar, Moga, Lucknow, Akhnoor, Gwalior, Ramagundam).
- 6.14 Community Septic tank should be introduced in dense areas, subject to environmental considerations. Under a DFID funded project, community septic tanks are being constructed in Ramagundam town.

- 6.15 In water-logging prone areas of Assam, coastal Andhra Pradesh. Coastal Orissa, coastal Tamil Nadu etc., leach pit technology has proven to be ineffective and problematic. In these places, water table is at a depth of 5 ft. during monsoons. Here alternative technologies need to be explored.

Help to Poorer Municipal Bodies

- 6.16 As the municipal finances are in a poor shape in many places, HUDCO insists provision of guarantee before release of loans. Many municipalities are hesitant to provide such guarantees. To obviate this problem, Govt. of West Bengal stands guarantee. If ULB defaults in submitting utilization certificate, the Government deducts the unutilized amount from the next year's budget. Such a mechanism may be adopted in other States also.

Involvement of NGOs

- 6.17 The primary responsibility of identification of beneficiaries, generating awareness, execution of construction work and maintenance should be entrusted to technically qualified and reputed NGOs and community based organisations so that identified beneficiaries are able to obtain proper benefit of the scheme.

Adoption of Community Toilets

- 6.18 Even after achieving the full target, open defecation is likely to continue due to the problem of shelterless people, migrants, travelers, etc. To tackle this problem and improve urban living conditions, it is necessary to have sufficient number of community toilets at strategic locations. It is heartening to note that some such schemes are already under implementation (new scheme of HUDCO and JNNURM).
- 6.19 Municipal bodies should prepare a plan to construct more community toilets in market places, schools, colleges, bus terminus and railway stations. (Integration with HUDCO, new community toilet scheme).

Incentives for scavengers free towns

- 6.20 To accelerate the progress of the scheme, the concerned civic body should be given some incentives such as cash reward, if they achieve the goal.