

IMPACT OF INTEGRATED LOW COST SANITATION SCHEME: A STUDY IN UTTAR PRADESH AND BIHAR

Niloo Faruqui* and R. V. M. Reddy**

***Abstract:** Sanitation is the state subject and thus, improving urban sanitation is main task of state governments and urban local bodies. There have been several national and state level flagship schemes and programmes for improving urban sanitation and rehabilitation of manual scavengers. However, a large segment of urban population is depending on insanitary latrines and defecates in open spaces due to lack of sanitary toilets. The sewerage network is found to be very low due to non-existence of sewer line in most of the cities and towns. A large segment of urban population is depending on conventional septic tanks. In view of the improving urban sanitation, Government of India under the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation has introduced National Urban Sanitation Policies and advised to the state governments for formulation of policy at the state level and sanitation plans at the city level. The implementation of Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme and National Scheme of Rehabilitation of Manual Scavengers are also focusing on conversion of dry toilets and construction of sanitary latrines besides banning on the practice of manual scavenging. However, the condition of urban sanitation is reported to be poor. Present paper purports to assess the impact of Integrated Low Cost Sanitation in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar.*

INTRODUCTION

Sanitation is the basis of a healthy and civilized living. It has been one of the components of human development. Absence of sanitation facilities lead to water-borne diseases. Sanitation is closely associated with environment as in absence of proper sanitation, a large segment of children die annually due to water borne diseases. Though,

* UpakshitMahila Avam Jan Kalyan Vikas Samiti, Lucknow

** Faculty of Management Studies, Alliance University, Bangalore

sanitation coverage has been improved over the period, however, a large segment of households do not have sanitary latrines and in absence of safe toilets, they are forced to defecate in open public places. In view of the improving urban sanitation, Integrated Low Cost Sanitation programme, the flagship scheme has been implemented by the Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation 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. The present paper is based on a major study conducted by Upakshit Mahila Avam Jan Kalyan Vikas Samiti, Lucknow under the auspices of Indian Council for Social Sciences Research, New Delhi. It is empirical in nature and based on mainly primary data collected through field survey. The field survey has been conducted in the state of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. Kanpur, Varanasi and Lucknow have been selected from Uttar Pradesh and Patna, Begusarai and Gaya districts have been selected from Bihar.. Overall 900 households who have been benefited under Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme, were covered in the sample of the study. The filled in questionnaires have been thoroughly checked, processed in computer and tabulated. The inferences, trends, patterns and conclusions have been drawn out to analyze and interpret the research findings.

IMPLEMENTATION OF ILCS

The Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme basically aims at conversion of individual dry latrine into pour flush latrine thereby liberating manual scavengers from the age old, obnoxious practice of manually carrying night soil. The Scheme was initially started in 1980-81 through the Ministry of Home Affairs and later through Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment. The scheme was transferred in 1989-90 to Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation and from 2003-04 onwards to Ministry of Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation. The scheme has helped in constructing and converting of over 28 lakh latrines

to liberate over 60952 scavengers so far. While implementing the ILCS Scheme, it was observed that the Scheme did not perform well due to various reasons. In order to make the Scheme more attractive and implementable the Guidelines have been revised in 2008.

The Salient features of the revised guidelines of the Scheme are as follows:

- (i) The objective of the Scheme is to convert/ construct low cost sanitation units through sanitary two pit pour flush latrines with superstructures and appropriate variations to suit local conditions (area specific latrines) and construct new latrines where EWS Household have no latrines.
- (ii) The scheme is on 'All Town' coverage basis irrespective of the population criteria. The Scheme is limited to EWS households only.
- (iii) Targets are fixed initially in the ratio of 75 percent for conversion of dry latrines with reference to 6 lacs dry latrines reported by the States so far and 25 percent for provision of pour flush latrines to beneficiaries having no latrines.
- (iv) The scheme is funded in the manner of Central Subsidy to 75 percent, State Subsidy in the tune of 15 percent and beneficiary share of 10 percent.
- (v) The upper ceiling cost of Rs. 10,000/- is provided for the complete unit of a two pit pour flush individual latrine with superstructure. For the States falling in the category of difficult and hilly areas, 25 percent extra cost is provided for each two pit pour flush latrine. The Scheme is limited to EWS households only and does not entail a loan component. The scheme will be implemented by Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation directly.
- (vi) The States should select NGOs having adequate experience in this field that will be funded to a maximum extent of 15 percent over and above the total project cost to be borne by the Centre and States based on the ratio of 5:1 at different stages of implementation.

- (vii) One percent of total central allocation is retained by the Ministry every year, to be utilized for MIS, Monitoring System, Capacity Building and IEC components.

Till 31st March 2010 the total number of schemes sanctioned under the previous ILCS programme through HUDCO is 873 covering 2093 towns in 23 States/UTs. The cumulative project cost of the scheme is Rs.236834.16 lakhs for conversion & construction of 5020074 units. The cumulative subsidy released as on 31.12.2009 is Rs. 35951.30 lakhs. As per the progress reported by the State nodal agencies, 2881862 units have been completed. The total number of 60952 scavengers has been liberated through implementation of ILCS schemes and 911 towns have been declared as scavenger free. Physical and financial performance under Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme is shown in Table 1. Under the scheme, about 4 lakh units were sanctioned and out of the sanctioned units, 2.52 lakh units were sanctioned for convergence of dry toilets and 1.56 lakh units were construction units. The total central share sanctioned was recorded Rs. 340 crores however, only 318 crores were released to the states. Out of total sanctioned units, a large number of units were reported in the state of Uttar Pradesh followed by Maharashtra, Chhattisgarh, Tripura and West Bengal.

At the time of revision of revision of guidelines of the scheme the State of Assam, Bihar, Jammu & Kashmir, Nagaland and Uttar Pradesh together indicated 6 lakh dry latrines. Later the State of Assam, Nagaland and Jammu Kashmir have stated that they have no dry latrines in their States. These figures changed during implementation after the house to house survey of all municipal areas for identification. Presently, State of Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand have reported existence of dry latrine and funds have eventually been sought to eliminate existence of dry latrines are as follows:

Presently, only states of Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and Bihar have to declare as dry latrine free. The revised ILCS Scheme envisages conversion of all existing dry latrines within a period of three years (2007-2010). In the video conference held on 28.09.2010, with the representative of States of Bihar, Uttarakhand and Uttar

Table 1
Performance of Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme in India

Sl. No.	Name of the State	No. of Units Sanctioned	Units Sanctioned for		Total Central share (Rs. in crores)	
			Conversion	Construction	Sanctioned	Released
1	Uttar Pradesh	2,38,253	2,38,253	0	202.58	202.58
2	Bihar	12,131	3,545	8,586	9.25	9.25
3	MP	14,281	0	14,281	10.81	10.81
4	West Bengal	14,549	0	14,549	11.09	11.09
5	Uttarakhand	1,613	1,613	0	1.23	1.23
6	Nagaland	5,480	499	4,981	5.18	5.18
7	Kerala	8,239	0	8,239	6.28	2.53
8	Maharashtra	39,663	0	39,663	30.5	28.86
9	J&K	5,897	5,624	273	5.54	5.54
10	Manipur	7,117	0	7,117	6.78	6.78
11	Tripura	25,039	2,429	22,610	23.85	23.85
12	Rajasthan	1,039	0	1,039	0.79	0.79
13	Odisha	4,690	0	4,690	3.58	3.58
14	Jharkhand	3,891	0	3,891	2.96	0.74
15	Chhattisgarh	26,018	0	26,018	19.83	4.96
	Total	4,07,900	2,51,963	1,55,937	340.25	317.77

Source: Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India, New Delhi, 2013.

Pradesh, these states have assured that the conversion task will be completed by 31st December 2010 and they would be able to declare themselves dry latrine free. There was a budget provision of Rs 71.00 crores for the financial year 2010-11 under the Scheme. An amount of Rs.68.09 crore has been released so far to the States of Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh and Kerala. Under the revised guidelines of ILCS scheme 1 percent of the total Budget Estimates is earmarked for MIS, Monitoring System, Capacity Building and IEC Component. In the financial year 2010-11 Rs1.00 crore was

earmarked for IEC component and an amount of Rs.8.77 lakh has been released to the Institute of Social Sciences, Kolkata for conducting third party inspection of the projects sanctioned under the ILCS scheme. With the present pace of implementation of revised ILCS scheme, it is expected that the inhuman practice of manual scavenging will be eradicated from the country.

At the same time, though dry latrines have been converted, in many cities poorer households have circumvented the law and dry latrines have been converted into 'Bahao' latrines i.e. into pour flush pan connected not to septic tanks or underground pits but to open drains flowing through congested colonies. These Bahao latrines other unsanitary latrines generally exists in economically depressed areas which are not slums they are either the older parts of towns or very congested old localities or villages within towns. These unsanitary latrines require continuous cleaning, which is done by municipal staff and almost always manually, with the most rudimentary of appliances, generally only a broom & folded sheet of metal. Since cleaning is often irregular, these unsanitary latrines clog the drains, causing the sludge and excreta in open drainage to spill out, especially in rainy weather and cause environmental and health hazards. Through the ongoing Jawaharlal Nehru Urban Renewal Mission and Interest Subsidy Scheme for Housing the Urban Poor, a toilet facility which is integral to the new houses being constructed, is during provided in all slum household being covered, the inner city areas and poor households nor covered under the category of 'slums', this menace continues unchecked. The Ministry has mooted a proposal that the revised guidelines of ILCS Scheme be continued with the balance provision; with the objective of assisting Economically Weaker Section households to convert 'bahao' and other unsanitary latrines into twin pit pour flush latrines or latrines connected to bio digesters, septic tanks etc., with an approach that aims to make urban areas fully sanitation compliant. The identified scavengers are being provided training, loan, and subsidy. Credit will be provided by the banks, which will charge interest from the beneficiaries at the rates prescribed under the scheme.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Most of the households reported that they knew about Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme through legal notice. This was found more pronouncing in Gaya, Patna and Beghusarai. About 2/5th respondents reported that they get the information about centrally sponsored scheme of sanitation through other source of information including the officials from SUDA/DUDA and urban local bodies (Table 2).

Table 2
Source of Information Regarding Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Print Media</i>	<i>Civic Officials</i>	<i>Ward Counsellors</i>	<i>Legal Notice</i>	<i>Others</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	8 5.3%	0 0.0%	16 10.7%	0 0.0%	126 84.0%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	8 5.3%	0 0.0%	4 2.7%	2 1.3%	136 90.7%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	6 4.0%	2 1.3%	1 0.7%	0 0.0%	141 94.0%	150 100.0%
Patna	3 2.0%	0 0.0%	9 6.0%	138 92.0%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	37 24.7%	113 75.3%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Gaya	2 1.3%	0 0.0%	5 3.3%	143 95.3%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Total	27 3.0%	2 0.2%	72 8.0%	396 44.0%	403 44.8%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

The respondents were asked about the nature of benefits received under the scheme. Most of the respondents received benefits under the scheme through conversion of dry toilets. However, a significant proportion of respondents in Lucknow reported that new toilets were constructed under the scheme (Table 3).

Table 3
Nature of Beneficiaries

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>New Construction</i>	<i>Conversion</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	10 6.7%	140 93.3%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	5 3.3%	145 96.7%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	1 0.7%	149 99.3%	150 100.0%
Patna	0 0.0%	150 100.0%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	0 0.0%	150 100.0%	150 100.0%
Gaya	0 0.0%	150 100.0%	150 100.0%
Total	16 1.8%	884 98.2%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

Most of the respondents were not aware about the period of construction/conversion of toilets under the scheme. It is to be noted that the scheme was implemented long back with modifications time to time. Only 5 per cent respondents reported that they received the benefits under the scheme during last 5 years. This was found more pronouncing in Kanpur (18 per cent) (Table 4).

Table 4
Duration of Conversion/Construction of Toilets

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Before 3 Years</i>	<i>Before 5 Years</i>	<i>Cannot Remember</i>	<i>Others</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	7 4.7%	7 4.7%	136 90.7%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	1 0.7%	26 17.3%	121 80.7%	2 1.3%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	2 1.3%	6 4.0%	135 90.0%	7 4.7%	150 100.0%
Patna	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%

contd. table 4

Impact of Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme...

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Before 3 Years</i>	<i>Before 5 Years</i>	<i>Cannot Remember</i>	<i>Others</i>	<i>Total</i>
Beghusarai	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	139 92.7%	11 7.3%	150 100.0%
Gaya	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Total	10 1.1%	39 4.3%	831 92.3%	20 2.2%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

Most of the respondents reported that the cost of construction/ conversion of toilets was less than Rs. 10,000. However, a large segment of respondents in Lucknow, Beghusarai and Kanpur reported that the cost of construction/ conversion of toilets was more than Rs. 10,000 (Table 5).

Table 5
Cost of Toilet Construction/Conversion

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Less Than 10000</i>	<i>10000-15000</i>	<i>15000-20000</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	104 69.3%	33 22.0%	13 8.7%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	117 78.0%	27 18.0%	6 4.0%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	148 98.7%	2 1.3%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Patna	150 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	119 79.3%	31 20.7%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Gaya	149 99.3%	1 0.7%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Total	787 87.4%	94 10.4%	19 2.1%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

The respondents were asked that whether they received subsidy under the scheme. Only a negligible proportion of respondents revealed that they received subsidy under the scheme. About 6 per cent respondents were not aware that whether their families received any kind of subsidy under the scheme for construction/conversion of toilets. This was found more pronouncing in Beghusarai (18.7 per cent) followed by Lucknow (10 per cent) (Table 6).

Table 6
Whether You Get Subsidy under the Scheme

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Cannot Say</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	3 2.0%	132 88.0%	15 10.0%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	0 0.0%	149 99.3%	1 0.7%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	0 0.0%	141 94.0%	9 6.0%	150 100.0%
Patna	5 3.3%	145 96.7%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	4 2.7%	118 78.7%	28 18.7%	150 100.0%
Gaya	0 0.0%	150 100.0%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Total	12 1.3%	835 92.8%	53 5.9%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

The respondents were further asked that whether they received loan for construction of toilets. Only a negligible proportion of respondents in Lucknow and Kanpur reported that they received loan for construction of toilets. A significant proportion of respondents in Varanasi (6 per cent) were not aware that whether their families received loans under the scheme for construction of toilets (Table 7).

Table 7
Whether You Received Loan for the Construction of Toilet

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Cannot Say</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	3 2.0%	144 96.0%	3 2.0%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	1 0.7%	149 99.3%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	0 0.0%	141 94.0%	9 6.0%	150 100.0%
Patna	0 0.0%	150 100.0%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	0 0.0%	147 98.0%	3 2.0%	150 100.0%
Gaya	0 0.0%	150 100.0%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Total	4 0.4%	881 97.9%	15 1.7%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

Most of the respondents revealed that they are using the toilets. However, a significant proportion of respondents in Varanasi (26.7 per cent) and Lucknow (23.3 per cent) reported that they are not using the toilets (Table 8).

Table 8
Whether You Are Using the Toilets

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	115 76.7%	35 23.3%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	130 86.7%	20 13.3%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	110 73.3%	40 26.7%	150 100.0%
Patna	142 94.7%	8 5.3%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	144 96.0%	6 4.0%	150 100.0%
Gaya	148 98.7%	2 1.3%	150 100.0%
Total	789 87.7%	111 12.3%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

The respondents were asked that whether toilets are hygienic. Most of the respondents reported that toilets are hygienic. Moreover, more than 10 per cent respondents in Gaya reported that toilets are convenient for children (Table 9)

Table 9
Whether Toilets Are Hygienic

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Hygienic</i>	<i>Convenient for Child</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	150 100.0%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	150 100.0%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	150 100.0%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Patna	149 99.3%	1 0.7%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	148 98.7%	2 1.3%	150 100.0%
Gaya	134 89.3%	16 10.7%	150 100.0%
Total	881 97.9%	19 2.1%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

There are multiple reasons for not using the toilets. Bad odors, blocking/clogging of toilets, non-availability of adequate water and cultural biasness are some of the important reasons for non usage of toilets. Cultural biasness was found more pronouncing in Beghusarai while non-availability of adequate water was found more pronouncing in Kanpur. Clogging and blockage of toilets was reported significantly high in Gaya followed by Patna, Beghusarai and Kanpur (Table 10).

The respondents were asked that who is cleaning the toilets. Majority of the respondents reported that they themselves clean the toilets. This was found more pronouncing in Beghusarai (75.3 per cent) followed by Lucknow (73.3 per cent), Varanasi (73.3 per cent), Patna (70.7 per cent) and Kanpur (66 per cent). Women of house are

Table 10
Reasons for Not Using the Toilets

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Non-Availability of Adequate Water</i>	<i>Bad Odors</i>	<i>Blocked / Clogged</i>	<i>Cultural Biasness</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	22 14.7%	63 42.0%	63 42.0%	2 1.3%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	24 16.0%	79 52.7%	47 31.3%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	6 4.0%	83 55.3%	58 38.7%	3 2.0%	150 100.0%
Patna	1 0.7%	114 76.0%	35 23.3%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	12 8.0%	107 71.3%	4 2.7%	27 18.0%	150 100.0%
Gaya	0 0.0%	148 98.7%	2 1.3%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Total	65 7.2%	594 66.0%	209 23.2%	32 3.6%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

cleaning toilets mainly in Gaya (44 per cent) followed by Kanpur (28 per cent) and Beghusarai (24 per cent). A significant proportion of respondents in Varanasi, Patna, Lucknow and Kanpur reported that servants and maids are engaged in cleaning of toilets (Table 11).

The respondents were asked about the changes in living standards and social status after construction or conversion of toilets. Increase in privacy, improved social standards, convenient for children, aged and women, saving of time and safety to women are some of the important changes after construction or conversion of toilets. It to be noted that open defecation is a shameful practice and it is against the dignity of women besides the issues of safety and inconvenience to members of family. Thus, toilet construction not only improves the living standards but also improves social status and leads to increased productivity and sound health (Table 12).

Table 11
Who is Cleaning the Toilets

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Self</i>	<i>Women of House</i>	<i>Domestic Service/Maid</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	110 73.3%	29 19.3%	11 7.3%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	99 66.0%	42 28.0%	9 6.0%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	110 73.3%	26 17.3%	14 9.3%	150 100.0%
Patna	106 70.7%	32 21.3%	12 8.0%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	113 75.3%	37 24.7%	0 0.0%	150 100.0%
Gaya	83 55.3%	66 44.0%	1 0.7%	150 100.0%
Total	621 69.0%	232 25.8%	47 5.2%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

Table 12
Changes in Living Standards and Social Status After Construction of Toilets

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Decrease in Water Born Diseases</i>	<i>Decrease of Worms Among Children</i>	<i>Increase in Privacy</i>	<i>Improved Social Standards</i>	<i>Saving of Time</i>	<i>Safety of Women</i>	<i>Convenient for Children, Aged and Women</i>
Lucknow			150 100%	137 91.3%	26 17.3%	41 27.3%	150 100%
Kanpur		5 3.3%	147 98%	107 71.3%	33 22%	37 24.7%	139 92.7%
Varanasi		7 4.7%	148 98.7%	86 57.3%	27 18.0%	22 14.7%	140 93.3%
Patna	1 0.7%	6 4.0%	116 77.3%	138 92.0%	78 52.0%	66 44.0%	24 16.0%
Beghusarai	2 1.3%	26 17.3%	136 90.7%	77 51.3%	82 54.7%	105 70.0%	23 15.3%
Gaya		3 2.0%	104 69.3%	121 80.7%	113 75.3%	75 50.0%	39 26.0%
Total	3 0.3%	47 5.2%	801 89.0%	666 74.0%	359 39.9%	346 38.4%	515 57.2%

Source: Field Survey.

More than 1/3rd respondents were found satisfied with the amount of subsidy under the centrally sponsored scheme. However, about 2/3rd respondents were found dissatisfied with the amount of subsidy under the scheme. This was found more pronouncing in Kanpur followed by Varanasi, Lucknow and Beghusarai (Table 13).

Table 13
Satisfaction Regarding Amount of Subsidy
Under ILCS Scheme

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	36 24.0%	114 76.0%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	19 12.7%	131 87.3%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	26 17.3%	124 82.7%	150 100.0%
Patna	119 79.3%	31 20.7%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	53 35.3%	97 64.7%	150 100.0%
Gaya	64 42.7%	86 57.3%	150 100.0%
Total	317 35.2%	583 64.8%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

The respondents were further asked that whether they are satisfied with the level of awareness creation under the ILSC Scheme regarding urban sanitation. About 35 per cent respondents were found satisfied with the level of awareness however, most of the respondents in Kanpur and Varanasi were found dissatisfied with the level of awareness creation (Table 14).

Table 14
Satisfaction Regarding Level of Awareness Creation Under ILCS Scheme

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	33 22.0%	117 78.0%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	18 12.0%	132 88.0%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	23 15.3%	127 84.7%	150 100.0%
Patna	115 76.7%	35 23.3%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	60 40.0%	90 60.0%	150 100.0%
Gaya	65 43.3%	85 56.7%	150 100.0%
Total	314 34.9%	586 65.1%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

About 1/3rd respondents were found satisfied with the provision of loan under scheme. However, about 2/3rd respondents were found dissatisfied with the provision of loan under the scheme for construction of toilets. This was found more pronouncing in Kanpur followed by Varanasi, Lucknow and Beghusarai (Table 15).

Table 15
Satisfaction Regarding provision for Loan Under ILCS Scheme

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	36 24.0%	114 76.0%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	15 10.0%	135 90.0%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	24 16.0%	126 84.0%	150 100.0%
Patna	114 76.0%	36 24.0%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	52 34.7%	98 65.3%	150 100.0%
Gaya	64 42.7%	86 57.3%	150 100.0%
Total	305 33.9%	595 66.1%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

The respondents were asked regarding their satisfaction of the procedure for selection of beneficiaries under the scheme. Only 1/3rd respondents were found satisfied regarding the procedure for selection of beneficiaries under the scheme. About 2/3rd respondents were found dissatisfied with the procedure for selection of beneficiaries under the scheme (Table 16).

Table 16
Satisfaction Regarding Procedure for Selection of the Beneficiary under ILCS Scheme

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	36 24.0%	114 76.0%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	19 12.7%	131 87.3%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	24 16.0%	126 84.0%	150 100.0%
Patna	110 73.3%	40 26.7%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	52 34.7%	98 65.3%	150 100.0%
Gaya	67 44.7%	83 55.3%	150 100.0%
Total	308 34.2%	592 65.8%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

About 2/3rd respondents were found dissatisfied with the attitude of concerned officials. This was found more pronouncing in Kanpur followed by Varanasi, Lucknow and Beghusarai. Only 1/3rd respondents were found satisfied with the attitude of concerned officials (Table 17).

The respondents were asked that whether they pay user charges for better sanitation services. About 56 per cent respondents reported that they pay user charges for better sanitation services. However,

Table 17
Satisfaction Regarding Attitude of Concerned Officials Under the
ILCS Scheme

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	36 24.0%	114 76.0%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	19 12.7%	131 87.3%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	24 16.0%	126 84.0%	150 100.0%
Patna	107 71.3%	43 28.7%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	53 35.3%	97 64.7%	150 100.0%
Gaya	66 44.0%	84 56.0%	150 100.0%
Total	305 33.9%	595 66.1%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

most of the respondents in Patna and Gaya do not pay user charges for better sanitation services (Table 18).

Table 18
Do You Pay User Charges for Better Sanitation Services

<i>Name of District</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Total</i>
Lucknow	147 98.0%	3 2.0%	150 100.0%
Kanpur	147 98.0%	3 2.0%	150 100.0%
Varanasi	147 98.0%	3 2.0%	150 100.0%
Patna	0 0.0%	150 100.0%	150 100.0%
Beghusarai	61 40.7%	89 59.3%	150 100.0%
Gaya	1 0.7%	149 99.3%	150 100.0%
Total	503 55.9%	397 44.1%	900 100.0%

Source: Field Survey.

There has been positive impact of Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme and urban sanitation however, the provision of loan and subsidy has been found inadequate. Most of the households reported that they converted their dry toilets after issuing of legal notice to them. However, only a small proportion of respondents received benefits of subsidy and loan under the scheme.

CONCLUSION

Though, Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme has been implemented for the conversion and construction of new toilets at the household levels besides, construction of community toilets however, a large number of dry toilets still exists in the states of Uttar Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Bihar, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh and Manipur. A large number of household toilets are still treated as insanitary latrines while a significant proportion of households dispose human excreta directly into open drains and water bodies. The coverage of urban population by sewer line is very low as sewer line is inexistence mainly in larger cities. Thus, major part of urban India is dependent on conventional individual septic tanks. The coverage of urban population by sewage treatment plant is found significantly high in larger cities while majority of the urban population in medium and smaller towns is not covered by sewage treatment facility. Besides, ineffective functioning of sewage treatment plants due to various factors.

Government of India has also introduced National Urban Sanitation Policy. Sanitation being state subject, Government of India has advised to state government for formulation of State Urban Sanitation Policy and City Sanitation Plans for providing guidelines and strategies for improving urban sanitation and empowering manual scavengers. However, progress in this regard is not found satisfactory. Sanitation is the main responsibility of urban local bodies. Most of the local bodies do not have adequate resources to tackle the daunting task of urban sanitation. This is also proved by the service level benchmarking conducted by Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India regarding the state of urban sanitation during 2009. There are large gaps in sanitation services as compared to the benchmarks. Solid waste disposal is the major

task of urban local bodies however, more than 1/4th urban solid waste is not being attended which is cause of concern. The littering of waste and particularly plastic waste leads to blockage of drains as well. A large number of urban households do not have sanitary toilets while the existing community toilets are not properly and regularly cleaned. Thus, the effective use of individual and community toilets could not be ensured due to lack of proper cleaning, availability of water and privacy.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS:

- There should be effective enforcement of flagship schemes of urban sanitation besides effective implementation of National Urban Sanitation Policy. Each state should formulate State Urban Sanitation Policy while each city should have City Sanitation Plan as per the guidelines of National Urban Sanitation Policy. The City Sanitation Plans should review the current status of urban sanitation and the issues of rehabilitation of manual scavengers.
- The capacity of existing sewerage treatment plant should be fully utilized through addressing the prevailing problems, constraints and challenges in effective functioning of the sewerage treatment plants. There should be effective ban on disposal of human excreta into open drains and water bodies.
- The scheme of Integrated Low Cost Sanitation needs 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. Besides, monitoring needs to be strengthened by involving representatives of the actual beneficiaries in checking the quality of material used for construction. Elected people’s representatives, political leaders, teachers, government functionaries etc must be closely involved in planning, implementation and monitoring of ILCS scheme in each urban ward.
- The present unit cost and level of subsidy are inadequate. Superstructure is necessary for privacy, convenience, dignity,

optimum use, aesthetics and cleanliness. To reduce the burden on poor beneficiaries the subsidy assistance should be suitably increased.

- 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. Unit cost must be fixed differentially for different geographic regions, keeping in view variation in the costs
- Community Septic tank should be introduced in dense areas, subject to environmental considerations. In water-logging prone areas leach pit technology has proven to be ineffective and problematic.
- 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 organizations so that identified beneficiaries are able to obtain proper benefit of the scheme.