



India WASH Forum

Update 12;

May 2010

1. **India WASH Forum News**
2. **Readers Page**
Business models in rural drinking water supply
3. **Right to Water and Sanitation**
Darryl D Monte
David Saatherwaite
Editorial EPW – Food Security
4. **Denial of Rights**
Operation Green Hunt
Rights Group Upset
5. **Hygiene Practitioners Workshop 2008(report highlights)**
6. **Reports and News**
7. **India WASH Forum on the WSSCC website**
8. **About India WASH Forum**

India WASH Forum News

We are pleased to share the 12th Issue of IWF Update. As we had mentioned in the last Update, we see this newsletter as a platform for independent credible voice in the water and sanitation sector. For which our emphasis is on bringing together critical news and information with analysis.

The programme of India WASH Forum for 2010 includes a commitment to supporting Right to Water and Sanitation. We had organized a (national workshop in Aug 2009). It was followed by the FORUM Workshop in Pune in Feb 2010 organised by SOPPECOM. Where WaterAid and India WASH Forum had committed to working on Sanitation and Water, respectively, for developing position papers on what needs to be done. We intend to carry this work forward as a core component of all our research and advocacy work this year.

A study on sector financing for sanitation, will look at district level administrative mechanisms to identify opportunities for enhancing sanitation financing. The second study will look into critical aspects of menstrual hygiene and is being anchored by WaterAid India.

A national workshop is planned in the later half of this year on urban pro poor sanitation.

IWF is supporting the launch of the Global Sanitation Fund in India this year. This is a \$5 million five year fund to be administered from WSSCC with an Executing Agency appointed by a bidding process in India.

A joined up Civil Society Collaboration for engagement with and influencing the SACOSAN 4 in Sri Lanka in Feb 2011 is also underway. A meeting was organized by WSSCC, WaterAid and FAN in Nov 2009 in Sri Lanka to take stock of progress since SACOSAN 3. Since then efforts are on to define the Content of the CSO engagement in SACOSAN 4 and widen the representation of all CSOs in this initiative.

This Issue has the following highlights.

We retain our core focus on **right to water and sanitation**. We have, with the permission of the authors, culled out some excellent comments on drinking water provisioning, that appeared in response to a query on Solution Exchange on the role of private sector. One response gives the example of Swajal project in UP and the enabling factors for its success - "The *Swajaldhara* experience clearly shows the kind of incentives that are required if the private participation in water supply needs to be promoted. It also delineates the risks that are involved with this model. **The incentives** are clear – minimum or no investment, guarantee of charges to generate profits, control of water resources, etc. **The risks involved** are also clear – no water resource risks, no investment risks – capital or O&M and no risks related to revenue generation. If these are taken care by the government the private operators would be more than willing to get into water supply operations in the rural areas". There are others who have rightly asked as to **what will be the role of the government** in such a scenario(when rural water supply is managed by private suppliers).

The developments in India on the National Food security Act(draft), has valuable lessons for the Right to Water and Sanitation work. The major issue in the Right to Food Bill was defining who will benefit from



this Act. The Economic and Political Weekly editorial in April rightly remarks. "If one were to go by EGM's frame of the draft National Food Security (NFS) Act, 2010, frankly, it might best be seen as a design of how *not* to end malnutrition and hunger. The principal concern seems not to ensure food security to all and therefore to ensure a nutritional minimum, but to contain the government's expenditure under the proposed NFS Act". The EPW Editorial on the drama of Right to Food has some important lessons for Right to Water and Sanitation. That **Rights cannot be Targeted only in the name of administrative and economic justification by the government.**

In IWF Update 10, we had shown how drinking water and sanitation schemes of central and state governments try to target subsidies and to reduce commitments to universal access to basic drinking water and sanitation needs for all. Delhi government has done away with basic lifeline free drinking water and several state governments have abolished public water points in the name of improving efficiency and controlling leakages.

We retain our **commitment and understanding that human rights are not exclusive to one sub sector.** Violation of rights in any sphere demand a response from all of us. We share excerpts of the **Independent Peoples Tribunal on Land Acquisition** news report based on testimonies of tribal peoples, activists, academics and experts from Chattisgarh, Jharkhand, West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh. The tribunal consisted of Justice P.B. Sawant, Justice H. Suresh, Yash Pal, V. Mohini Giri, P.M. Bhargava, and K.S. Subramanian. In their observations, they noted that "state violence has been accentuated by Operation Green Hunt in which a huge number of paramilitary forces are being used mostly on the tribals. The militarisation of the state has reached a level where schools are occupied by security forces."

In the IWF Update 11 issue we had shared a brief note on the Hygiene Practitioners workshop held in Dhaka in Feb 2010. We share excerpts of the main recommendations of the 2008 workshop (also organized by IRC, BRAC, WaterAid). To highlight that one of the commitments made then towards developing "**golden indicators to measure impact and outcomes of hygiene programmes**", needs to be reviewed based on the outcome of the 2010 workshop. In the Dhaka Hygiene Practitioners Workshop in Feb 2010, the example of the UNICEF

project (SHEWAH-B) evaluation had **questioned if it was sensible to measure health outcomes (diarrhea reduction) at all in, at the level of one WASH project?**

We also bring to our readers some important developments in the **urban sector related to water and sanitation.** Slums upgradation is becoming a new matra. In the attempt to make cities world class or to host international events like the Commonwealth Games, what is happening to the civic amenities and slums, is not highlighted. **David Saatherwaite**, a noted name in urban development, writes about the "**Dharavi Redevelopment Project (DRP) in Mumbai goes against what we have learnt on good practice in upgrading.** The project seeks to fund Dharavi's redevelopment by allowing commercial developers to take part of the land. But the **purpose of upgrading is to improve conditions for the inhabitants, not to free up land for commercial development.** As a group of Concerned Citizens for Dharavi have pointed out, the project does not engage the population in how the upgrading is planned, financed and managed; indeed the needs and priorities of Dharavi's population are secondary to the desire to free up land for commercial uses. But this very land is needed to improve housing conditions, to re-block Dharavi so roads and infrastructure can be installed and to increase provision for schools and public space."

An interesting **USAID report on "Septage in south Asia"** has a chapter on India, with comments on the Urban Sanitation Policy: "the **2008 National Urban Sanitation Policy (NUSP)** changed the country's approach to urban sanitation, and mandates local governments to address behavioural change, total sanitation, 100 percent safe waste disposal, and manual scavenging, in addition to sewerage development." We see a **plethora of guidelines and policy work everywhere.** New Policies and Guidelines are formulated at shortening intervals of time, many committees working simultaneously on different issues. The concern remains, **how transparent and inclusive this process of Policy Formulation** can be. It is true that inputs are invited in the Policy Formulation, including the NSUP. However, once the inputs are given, we do not know what all has come to the Policy Formulation Committee. **All the inputs should be shared on the website.** Secondly, **the process of developing the first and final draft of the policy, based on the inputs, should be made public** and people should be able to see this being developed on the website of the government agency.



Usually a consultant is hired to draft the Policy and no effort is made to explain why certain inputs were incorporated into the final policy document.

Finally, every year we note the worsening **crisis of drinking water** with the onset of summer. This year, due to a deficit rainfall in 2009, we have a very bad situation of drinking water stress in many parts of the country. Few national newspapers are devoting attention to this serious crisis. **The demand for 24x7 drinking water supply**, looks hollow when faced with the situation of an acute water stress of the magnitude that we face in India for the summer months. Where can water for sanitation and flushing toilets in urban areas of Rajasthan and the water stress areas of Deccan plateau come from? We bring out one news report from Rajasthan where the situation of drinking water is grim in most of its 33 districts. Water is being guarded from being stolen and in Bhilwara. Drinking water is being supplied by trains carrying water from Kota since February this year and there is a demand to raise the number of daily trains to three, in place of one. While a lot of focus has recently been on sanitation (and rightly so), the crisis in drinking water is emerging as a major threat to health and hygiene in India. **It is likely that legislation and restrictions on withdrawal of ground water, that have been resisted for long, will first take place from urban centres** in cities like Jaipur and Jodhpur in Rajasthan where acute water stress is being witnessed. Will we witness rioting and public anger or will the state act in a preemptive move to secure a right to drinking water through regulation of ground water use in urban areas, is to be seen.

IWF is committed to an independent credible voice in the water and sanitation sector. We bring together this newsletter on all major initiatives by organizations and networks in India in the spirit of transparency, sharing and learning. We invite readers of our monthly update to send in their comments and any original material for the Updates. We will give priority to good quality people centered analytical commentaries, a max of 500 words please. We are now on Google's group. Please subscribe so that it is easier for us to send Updates as well for you to download all the important reports and files that we have uploaded on the group site.

Group name: India WASH Forum
Group home page: <http://groups.google.co.in/group/india-wash-forum>

Readers Page: Business Models in Rural Drinking Water Supply

We re-print here with the permission of the authors, the submissions they made to a query on solution Exchange recently on Business Models in Rural Drinking Water Supply”.

Gaurav Dwivedi, Manthan Adhyayan Kendra, Badwani (MP)

“It would also be interesting to note the general contexts that one should look upon before heading in straight away on setting parameters for successful business models in rural water supply. As some of the members have already noted - why do we need to commercialise water, why is there a need to bring private operators in rural water supply, the state responsibility and human rights aspects. It is important to note that after going full throttle for privatising water supply distribution in urban areas, the results of which are really not inspiring, the next target is rural water supply.

The experiences and observations that are drawn upon here are from short studies done in some of the districts of Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan on the World Bank supported “Swajaldhara” rural water supply scheme, which promotes private/ community participation.

1. **Triggers that led to selection of Private Operators.** The triggers that have led to the selection of private operators in villages for water supply as have been observed during field visits have shown that among the other common factors like water scarcity, lack of positive interventions from public agencies, etc. The major factor that has led to the involvement of private operators (read petty local contractors) in rural water supply schemes in the villages of the above mentioned states is the funding aspect. The *Swajaldhara* experience shows that involvement of private operators in rural water supply is mostly driven because of the availability of funds from the Central and the state governments through this World Bank funded scheme. Since the funds were there to be utilised, the proposals were prepared and sent out for approval to the respective agencies. It is an easy way out for village and district level bodies to access funds through this scheme. Even if they do not have the 10% of the funds required to contribute for the



project, these bodies simply get a private contractor on board, who pays the money required and consequently owns the system, collects charges from the households, runs the system, decides with the village power holders on who gets water - as long as there are profits to be made, the equipment is working or the resource is yielding water. (It is a good opportunity to own a system with minimum of investment.) As soon as these factors come into play he just abandons the project in whatever shape it is. The village households are then again back to square one, fending for themselves.

2. Specific responses to the basic issues of water supply management. The specific responses and subsequent experiences to the basic issues of water supply management by the private operators have been poor as observed in the villages during field visits. The water availability still depends on the resource, although more funds have allowed deeper borewells to be dug, powerful motors to be installed. But with the depleting ground water tables across the country and especially in the water-scarce areas of Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh these become dysfunctional soon. Private operators do not want to get their hands into promoting recharging of ground water aquifers or more surface water storage.

The claims in the improvement in quality water supplied also remain ambiguous since there are no treatment facilities constructed, and if done would be very costly in terms of capital and maintenance costs for sparsely located populations. On the other hand most of the villages still have access to water which is very much potable. So in fact the need for high cost purification system negates itself in such conditions.

The affordability issue is a serious concern, since most of the private operators supply water to only those households which are able to pay the monthly charges that are applicable. Those who are not able to pay are simply left out of the distribution system and left to fend for themselves. This means that the poorest of the rural poor are not able to get the advantages of the new/ improved water systems because of lack of paying capacity which means quite a big number is left out. These households then have to revert to those water resources which are very poor in terms of quality, water availability and distance. Since the better ones are already been captured by the better off, aggravating the water situation for such people, like the Dalits, Harijans and other lower castes. There are other issues like caste, class and village politics which

hamper the access of such communities to improved water supplies. And these are such factors which no private operator has the ability to resolve.

3. Contextual factors that explain or influence the success or failure of rural private operators. The observations show that there are no contextual factors for success or failure of private operators, and even if there are any they should be the secondary concern, unless and until the fundamental issues are dealt with. The questions that need to be asked here should be

a. Would the private operators be interested in investing in improving the water resources, recharging ground water or improving surface water storage? The answer is no, this would mean costs and if these are done there would not be any need to the private operator since then with abundant water resources and a community would not need a private operator to run the show.

b. Would the private operator be interested in providing water to all cutting across the boundary of affordability? The answer again would be no, since the private operator is there for a business, for earning profits. It would not be his concern to supply water to poor households. Hence, again in such a case a government agency/ department would have to step in to provide water to these households or worse they are left to find their own resource

c. Would the private operator keep running the system even if it is not financially sustainable? The answer sadly is again a no, since it would not be a social welfare responsibility of the private operator. It is the responsibility of the state to do so

d. Would the private operator be interested in repairing the costly equipments without any state or community support? Unless there are huge profits to be made the answer is no again. Since profit margins would be low in rural areas. The private operators are not interested in such investments which also mean a lot of other problems in far off rural areas where spare parts, technical



manpower and instruments are not available easily. Hence as soon as such a situation arises the water supply is stopped. If the funds are raised the repairs are done otherwise nobody really bothers.

4. **Incentives that attract them and the risks that deter Private operators** – The *Swajaldhara* experience clearly shows the kind of incentives that are required if the private participation in water supply needs to be promoted. It also delineates the risks that are involved with this model. The incentives are clear – minimum or no investment, guarantee of charges to generate profits, control of water resources, etc. The risks involved are also clear – no water resource risks, no investment risks – capital or O&M and no risks related to revenue generation. If these are taken care by the government the private operators would be more than willing to get into water supply operations in the rural areas.

Alternatives. However, if we are ready to look beyond this model we would find many others who are working on specifically community-based approaches and with a lot of success. We would find these successful models in places as far and different like Tarun Bharat Sangh in Rajasthan, People's Science Institute in Uttarakhand, TWAD Board in Tamil Nadu, in Kutch, Gujarat among others. These approaches show the way through community consultation and participation, low cost technologies, local raw material and local manpower used, community ownership, ease of operation and repairs, etc. To conclude the time is to seriously rethink the private model in whatever terms it may be – financially, socially, and environmentally.

Shashikant Kumar, Green Eminent Research Centre, Vadodara

The basic question of supply by the private agencies is twofold:

(a) How feasible (preference) is the supply by private agencies in rural areas?

(b) How rural water supply is managed in rural areas?

The answer lies in the segment where the private parties can play role in supplying water which is

presently taken care by the public agencies like water supply boards, as in case of most of Indian states. **Scale of operations and management, ownership of water resources and agreement between the parties are essential components.** This may not be same in all the situations.

Community based water management has succeeded in the semi-arid state of Gujarat wherein the state makes the capital investment and the system is managed by the local panchayats. The intent is only to supply the water (hygienic) to the people in a desired quantity. People themselves try to manage, by checking the quality (in fluoride-prone areas), maintain the infrastructure (in case of hand pumps) and maintain the supply level (addressing the issue with district level departments). This structure of function of water supply is still in place.

How then does the question of incorporating private players into the water supply system arise? This happens specially in case of (a) cost management and (b) failure of public bodies. There have been protests against experiments with the privatization of water supply on many accounts for urban areas. Even in case of urban areas (large or small towns), we are yet to see sufficient examples of operating systems in country.

The World Bank would be creating a road block to functional development of the rural infrastructure services if the privatization of water supply is pursued beyond its present designated framework. In case of preference, most people may like private players to come in for ensuring the quality and quantity of supply, but the cost recovery mode of operations may not be feasible unless we have sufficient models for successful implementation in a rural area.

This is shown by some of responses wherein difficulties in managing the water supply at the community level also has problems. Where is the scope for private companies to make money in the sector of rural water supply?

Annie George, BEDROC, Nagapattinam (Tamil Nadu)

Forgive me if I sound like a doomsday prophet, but, the entire study and the reason for the study is worrying. Does not water come under basic rights? If so, isn't this the responsibility of the government? We did dilute this principle by forming rural water supply



schemes and transferring this fundamental responsibility to the communities. Now we seem to be carrying this a step further.

Studies have shown that efficiency and cost-effectiveness improves with subsidiarity and devolution of responsibility/ authority upto to the lowest units-village or hamlet level. This was the central theme when micro/ rural water supply systems, owned and operated by the community, were introduced and popularised. However, instead of trying to understand where and what are the barriers to the successful functioning of this model, we are already thinking of moving on to another "model" creation. What happens to the systems that have already been started off by the communities who trusted what we told them 6- 7 years ago when we were trying to roll out the community based model?

Even in the community based models, there were problems of exclusions, worsening of conditions of those so excluded, privatising common property resources like common ponds and wells for the so called community based schemes, drying of sources etc. Do we really know what are the problems of the old model that we are addressing in the new model and if so how will the new model take into account the above mentioned concerns?

It would be good to hear from the agencies, who have been rolling out the community based model, on this. Also, I, for one, would like to know what is the Government's envisaged role in **ensuring drinking water** in this scenario.

Right To Water and Sanitation

Right to water: Long Road Ahead

Excerpts from the India Together e-newsletter report on the Right to Water and Sanitation Workshop by Darryl D Monte, Aug 2009.

<http://www.indiatogether.org/2009/aug/env-h2oright.htm> 12 August 2009 - Barely a couple of days after the Lok Sabha passed the Right to Education bill on August 3, a number of officials, experts and activists met in Delhi to discuss another basic human right - to water and sanitation. The meeting was called by the Freshwater Action Network

(FANSA) in South Asia, Forum for Policy Dialogue on Water Conflicts in India , Bread for the World, WaterAid India and the India WASH Forum.

Shantanu Consul, who was appointed Secretary of the Department of Drinking Water Supply in the Rural Development Ministry a few months ago, was present. His attendance, and that of his senior colleagues, was duly noted by activists who had fought for the right to education and health, who remarked that it was a welcome departure from the indifference they had faced from the bureaucracy during the course of their prolonged struggles.

Three countries - South Africa, Uruguay and Morocco - have introduced laws guaranteeing rights to water and sanitation. In South Africa, the basic minimum which households are entitled to is 6000 litres per month, or 200 litres a day, or about 50 litres per head, free of charge. However, as with many well-intentioned laws, this has been a mixed blessing. As a condition for getting 6000 litres a month, households had to have meters installed. After some poor families couldn't pay their bills when they exceeded this amount, their supply was cut off. Activists cite epidemics of cholera in that country being triggered off by such action.

At a consultation of the India WASH Forum two days earlier, FANSA cited how there were 55 lakh toilets installed between 2001 and 2008, of which over half were unusable today. There was a subsidy of Rs.2750 on the cost of Rs.5000, which was paid in three installments. As Joe Madiath, who runs Gram Vikas in Orissa which has won considerable acclaim for its achievements in galvanising communities to build their own toilets remarked, sanitation "is not only about the disposal of human waste, but a question of dignity". He questioned why poor people were offered poor solutions. Did three cement rings with a hole in the centre constitute a household latrine? Was the cheapest the most economical? Instead, the rural poor had to be presented a dignified solution, which was comparable to that enjoyed by their urban counterparts. The word 'subsidy' had bad connotations, so he preferred the use of the term 'incentives', which could ensure that a village could be fully covered. Every landless labourer could be taught basic masonry to construct a toilet on a scientific basis, which included bathing facilities. The only external inputs would be cement, steel, a toilet pan and door. As speaker after speaker pointed out at the consultation, sanitation was inextricably linked to the



provision of water, which is why the right refers to both of these most basic human needs. Where water flowed, there wasn't a single instance of a toilet not being used.

There are customary rights to water, as in the Philippines. However, there have been some departures. For instance, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) specifically refers to how water in its natural state is a tradeable commodity. When the California-based Sun Belt Corporation sought to transport water from British Columbia in Canada to Saudi Arabia, citizens in the exporting country protested and stopped it. As education and health activists, who spoke at the right to water meeting mentioned, it was the duty of the state to keep the market at bay and prevent it from being commoditised.

K J Joy from Pune observed that the right to water should be distinct from water rights, a concept propagated by the World Bank and other neo-liberal forces. Typically, the latter refers to the policy whereby farmers can sell their water rights in preference to cultivating their fields, which is questionable. The scope of the right encompassed quantity, quality, access and affordability. As far as duties and responsibilities were concerned, this right would be justiciable and it was the state's responsibility to provide every family with a minimum amount. Some activists have in fact called for a much broader right to water security, which is far more all-encompassing and will be that much more difficult for the state to grant. It would call into question, for example, the current practice of supplying water to towns and cities at the expense of rural areas. Speakers referred to how there are lined canals taking water to Bangalore, while villages along the way are denied their supply.

World Class Cities for Whom?

David Saatherwaite

<http://epw.in/epw/uploads/articles/14508.pdf>

As city governments ignored these settlements or actually increased the problems by bulldozing them, so it became common for 30-60% of the population to live there. Many cities in India house more than a third of their population in such settlements. Others, including Mumbai, Aligarh and Moradabad, house more than

half (Burra 2005; Agarwal et al 2006). In Pune, 39% of the population lived in slums in 2001 and this proportion is growing, despite Pune's economic success (Bapat 2009). Official statistics may understate the proportion of a city's inhabitants that live in such settlements – for instance, by only counting the population in settlements officially recognised as slums (Agarwal et al 2006). For Delhi, estimates for 2000 suggest that 47% of the population in the national capital territory live in *jhuggi-jhopdi* (JJ) clusters, slum-designated areas and JJ resettlement colonies. This still may be an undercount as it misses some kinds of informal settlements and those who sleep on the streets (Government of Delhi 2004; Bhan 2009). Yet, even if they do not bulldoze the settlements, governments view them as illegal and thus with no claim on infrastructure and services.

City politicians and civil servants in Asia, and elsewhere, usually pushed by prominent local business interests, are concerned about how to make their city "world class". In an ever-more interconnected global economy, all major cities depend in part on the success of their enterprises within international markets. Mayors and senior civil servants often look to successful cities that they have read about or seen – for instance, Singapore, Shanghai or despite its current financial difficulties, Dubai. Mayors often want to support large projects that will be their legacy and, they hope, get them re-elected or shifted to other prominent political positions. Perhaps more worryingly, the examples of Singapore, Shanghai and Dubai are used to justify projects and private sector partnerships that do nothing to address very poor housing conditions. Instead, they may involve large-scale evictions. So one important influence on any city's future is how politicians and civil servants view low-income populations and the slums in which they reside. It is difficult to envisage any successful city in a democracy that does not see them as citizens with legitimate rights to public services. Democratic cities should be accountable to the urban poor, and this implies that upgrading must become a central part of housing policies.

The Dharavi Redevelopment Project (DRP) in Mumbai goes against what we have learnt on good practice in upgrading. The project seeks to fund Dharavi's redevelopment by allowing commercial developers to take part of the land. But the purpose of upgrading is to improve conditions for the inhabitants, not to free up land for commercial development. As a group of Concerned Citizens for Dharavi have pointed out, the



project does not engage the population in how the upgrading is planned, financed and managed; indeed the needs and priorities of Dharavi's population are secondary to the desire to free up land for commercial uses (Patel, Arputham, Burra and Savchuk 2009). But this very land is needed to improve housing conditions, to re-block Dharavi so roads and infrastructure can be installed and to increase provision for schools and public space. There are precedents to show that housing can be improved incrementally, infrastructure much strengthened and densities reduced by building more storeys with more space per person, without displacing the population and disrupting the economy. Much housing could be upgraded in situ. Where this is not possible, it can be rebuilt to higher densities – for instance ground plus four – but with no change in location for the inhabitants and businesses. This kind of on-site upgrading can be inconvenient for people and businesses while it is being implemented but it is far less disruptive than site clearance and rebuilding. Experiences from other cities on this kind of incremental upgrading in high density settlements can also be drawn on. By doing this, the government demonstrates its commitment to improving the lives of several hundred thousand Mumbai residents and sets a precedent from which all cities can learn. With upgrading, Dharavi can continue to be a hub of innovation and enterprise, but without the appalling conditions that have long been one of its defining characteristics.

Trivialising Food Security – What at the Minimum Should National Food Security Act Encompass?

Excerpt of the EPW editorial 17 April 2010
<http://epw.in/epw/uploads/articles/14650.pdf>

“It was an election promise of the Congress Party. Then, when the Congress-led United Progressive Alliance came back to power, it was part of its 100-day agenda. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh even declared, “Not a single Indian will be allowed to go hungry”. Yet, the Empowered Group of Ministers (EGM) entrusted with the task of getting the government’s act together on “food security” more than merely treated the subject as unimportant, of utter in consequence, prompting Congress Party President Sonia Gandhi, who has a more down-to-earth understanding of the political process, to intervene in order to restore its significance. If one were to go by

EGM's frame of the draft National Food Security (NFS) Act, 2010, frankly, it might best be seen as a design of how *not* to end malnutrition and hunger. The principal concern seems not to ensure food security to all and therefore to ensure a nutritional minimum, but to contain the government's expenditure under the proposed NFS Act. After all, meeting the demands of the fiscal deficit is more important than putting in place universal rights to as basic a requirement as food. The draft bill as drawn up by the EGM denies the notion of universal rights, keeps entitlement to as little as 25 kg a month and even seeks to vary the issue price! **The continuing debate within government and outside about how many poor there are in India has come in handy for the “cost-cutters”. But food security means a right to food and rights cannot be “targeted”, they have to be universal. Therefore, the only meaningful legislation on food security is one that covers the entire population.** Independent estimates of a universal scheme under which every household would be entitled to 35 kg of cereals every month are that it will cost an additional Rs 25,000 crore over the current annual expenditure of Rs 55,000 crore on the public distribution system (PDS), or less than 0.5% of India's gross domestic product as incremental expenditure. Should the government then even think of denying the right to food on “cost considerations”?”

Denial of Rights

“Stop Operation Green Hunt”

<http://www.hindu.com/2010/04/13/stories/2010041359331000.htm>

NEW DELHI: Operation Green Hunt was in the dock at a people's tribunal in the capital over the weekend and the verdict of the jury was loud and clear: Guilty.

Organised by civil society groups, the “Independent People's Tribunal on Land Acquisition, Resource Grab and Operation Green Hunt” heard the testimonies of tribal people, activists, academics and experts from Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh and Orissa. The final recommendations of the jury advised the government to “Stop Operation Green Hunt and start a dialogue with the local people.”



Among the jury members were Justice P.B. Sawant, Justice H. Suresh, Yash Pal, V. Mohini Giri, P.M. Bhargava, and K.S. Subramanian. In their observations, they noted that “state violence has been accentuated by Operation Green Hunt in which a huge number of paramilitary forces are being used mostly on the tribals. The militarisation of the state has reached a level where schools are occupied by security forces.”

They also warned that if peaceful resistance was violently crushed, the government “could very well be sowing the seeds of a violent revolution demanding justice and rule of law that would engulf the entire country.”

The jury recommended that all compulsory acquisition of agricultural or forest land be stopped. The forced displacement of tribal people needs to end, and rehabilitation started immediately. It called on the government to declare the details of all MoUs and industrial and infrastructural projects proposed in these areas and stop all environmentally destructive industries.

The paramilitary and police forces need to be withdrawn, and dissenters must not be victimised, said the jury.

Rights group upset over arrest of activist

<http://www.hindu.com/2010/04/13/stories/2010041359311000.htm>

KOLKATA: The recent arrest of a human rights activist here by the city police on the charge of organising a “people's tribunal” in June 2008, has drawn the ire of the Human Rights Watch which has accused the police of harassing social activists.

The organisation has demanded that the charges be dropped. The person in question is Kirity Roy, secretary of the Banglar Manabadhikar Suraksha Mancha (MASUM) and National Convener, Program Against Custodial Torture and Impunity (PACTI).

While Mr. Roy alleges that his arrest and subsequent release on bail was “an attempt to curb the dissenting voice against the authoritarian approach of the police administration and the government,” Kolkata Commissioner of Police, Gautam Mohan Chakrabarti

asserted that the charges pressed against Mr. Roy are justified since none can run a “parallel jury” in the country.

According to Mr. Roy, the public tribunal was a part of the European Union-funded project NPTTI (National Project on Preventing Torture in India), and 13 jury members, who are also noted social activists, former judges and journalists, were present at the programme.

He claimed that the city police was notified about the programme. “Eighty-two victims of torture deposed before the panel and several officials of the State police and the Border Security Force were present. It was a natural process so that the victims' voices are heard by society as well as to pressurise the concerned authorities into taking action,” Mr. Roy told The Hindu on Monday.

Hygiene Practitioners Workshop(2008) Highlights:

<http://www.irc.nl/page/39432>

Participants at the South Asia Sanitation and Hygiene practitioners' workshop in Bangladesh from 29 to 31 January 2008 identified five priority messages they will push in 2008:

- Sanitation and hygiene programmes must reach the poor and this is what should guide partnerships.
- More policy focus and funds are needed for urban sanitation for the poor.
- Local government and communities are in highest need for capacity building to sustain sanitation services.
- Needs of differently-abled people must be incorporated to achieve sanitation for all.
- The issue of manual scavenging must be recognised and addressed.

The group will raise these issues and push for change during the International Year of Sanitation (IYS) and the third South Asia Conference on Sanitation (SACOSAN) in 2008, scheduled from 16 to 21 November 2008 in New Delhi, India.



The workshop jointly organised by IRC, WaterAid and BRAC brought together 53 practitioners working in South Asia, including those with specific experience in Nepal, Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, Bhutan and Vietnam. They work for a wide range of organisations, including partner NGOs of IRC, WaterAid and BRAC as well as WaterAid country staff.

At the end of the workshop the participants agreed to be working together to inject learning from the workshop to sector debates and publications during IYS 2008, and at events such as during World Health Day on April 7, 2008 and through creating a platform for community and civil society perspectives to be heard at SACOSAN 2008.

Areas for joint action research

A quick voting exercise and buzz group discussion led to the prioritisation of possible areas for joint action research:

Developing golden indicators to measure outcomes and impacts - Which indicators would provide sound evidence for attribution of development impacts of sanitation and hygiene programmes on health, education, livelihoods, empowerment etc.?

Cost-effectiveness of hygiene promotion – What is the duration of an effective hygiene promotion programmes and what are the costs? How cost-effective are different approaches in different contexts?

Citizens voices and accountability – This would address the important issues of realising and meeting demands with transparency and accountability. Topics would include the differential access of citizens to information, the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders to provide information on choices and their implications and their response to the emerged citizen demands, as well as the degree and effects of transparency of funds in promoting sanitation and hygiene.

Reports and News

GLASS Report(excerpts)

WASHINGTON, D.C. 21 April 2010 – Between 1997 and 2008, aid commitments for sanitation and water fell from 8% of total development aid to 5%, lower than commitments for health, education, transport, energy and agriculture, according to the latest UN-Water Global Annual Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water (GLAAS) report, launched today by UN-Water and the World Health Organization (WHO).

This drop occurred despite compelling evidence that achieving the water and sanitation target of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) would lower health-care costs, increase school attendance and boost productivity.

Improved access to sanitation and water produces economic benefits that range from US\$ 3 to US\$ 34 per US\$ 1 invested, increasing a country's gross domestic product (GDP) by an estimated 2% to 7%.

http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/glaas
http://www.unwater.org/activities_san4all.html

So, what happened at the High Level Meeting on Sanitation and Water?

<http://freshwateractionnetwork.wordpress.com/2010/04/26/so-what-happened-at-the-high-level-meeting-on-sanitation-and-water/>

FAN Network

Well, is it just another Monday, or can we look back at last week's High Level Meeting on Sanitation and Water in Washington DC and see something different happening in the sector? What actually happened?

Well, for a start, commitments from Ministers and policy-makers from 30 countries includes promises to:

- Work through the new Sanitation and Water for All partnership to increase political prioritisation, resource mobilisation and aid effectiveness.
- Work together to improve targeting of resources to ensure more gets to low-income countries and the poorest communities.



- Set up a new funding mechanism to better support the poorest countries with the weakest capacities to develop national plans.

Read the entire [Water Ministers Statement](#) (pdf)

Bangladesh for example, committed to spending an extra \$200m over the next 5 years, Senegal an extra \$24m per year and many others (Ghana, Liberia, Ethiopia), committed to raising domestic budgets to meet regional commitments, such as those in Africa to spend 0.5% of GNI on sanitation.

However, in spite of this, and in spite of a strong appeal from African and Asian Water ministers there were few specific targets from wealthier donor countries to increase resources to the poorest countries.

Parched Rajasthan stares at a crisis

<http://www.zeenews.com/news619241.html>

Jaipur: In some villages, water is being supplied once or twice in a month. In others, people are hoping a train will arrive with water wagons. The desert state of Rajasthan is staring at a parched summer, as the heat picks up and groundwater sources run dry.

With 26 of the state's 33 districts reeling under drought, the Rajasthan government's efforts to ease the crisis seem too late and too little. Reports coming from various parts suggest growing unrest among residents for water.

Sunder Devi, a resident of Naulakhi, told reporters that her village is getting water only two or three times in a month and that too with very low pressure. "It takes over half an hour to fill a bucket," she said, adding that if the situation persists, villagers would be forced to migrate. Incidents of manhandling of employees of the water resource department have been reported from a few places, including Bundi town.

Acute water shortage in the state has forced residents of a village near Bikaner to maintain a tight vigil on water bodies to prevent water theft. "We do not want to take any chances; so we have appointed four security guards to keep a vigil on our water bodies," said Lala Ram, a resident of Pugal village in Bikaner district.

The crisis in Akhlara in Jhalawar district has become so acute that the local administration is now planning to engage 150 tankers to supply water. The Amalvada Deh dam - the only source of water in the town with a population of over 12,000 - has water only for two weeks. "We have asked the state relief department to help us. We want water to be supplied by tankers from May," a senior district administration official said.

A similar situation has emerged on Sojat Road in Pali district where the administration has demanded a special 65 wagon water train from next month. The crisis has become so acute in Atru in Baran district that the water resource department, in spite of spending Rs.20,000 daily on the supply of water through tankers, is finding it difficult to quench the thirst of local residents. "This water supply is not sufficient; the government should do something to solve it. Water is a necessity after all," said Babulal Meena, a resident of Gaytri Nagar.

Women in Bhilwara town Tuesday blocked the road in front of the municipality office, demanding more water. "We want more tubewells to be dug so that we can get more supply of water," Kamla, a housewife, said. Water is being supplied once in every three days in the town which is famous for its textile industry.

In 2009, the Rajasthan government had declared a drought in 26 districts following over 50 percent damage to the crops due to the poor monsoon last year. And the drought continues. In all, 32,833 villages spread over 26 districts have been affected by scanty rainfall.

PPP for Handwashing – Soapbox toolkit

The Public-Private Partnership for Handwashing (PPPHW) is happy to share with you the latest edition of **Soapbox**, packed full of the latest handwashing and hygiene news from around the world. In this issue you will read about the results of the 2009 Global Handwashing Day celebrations and the latest updates on handwashing programs and research.

Link to Soapbox:
http://www.globalhandwashing.org/newletter-pdf/PPPHW_SoapBox_newsletter_March2010.pdf



"Septage" Report; USAID

Country Assessment Report - India

<http://www.waterlinks.org/sites/default/files/India%20Country%20Assessment.pdf>

With 1.15 billion people, India faces an immense challenge in providing all residents with adequate sanitation facilities and wastewater treatment. As an estimated 50 percent of the country lacks access to improved sanitation, much of the current focus in India is on providing basic sanitation. Access to improved sanitation is higher in urban areas, where, by one estimate, about 40 percent of households are connected to sewerage systems, 29 percent are connected to a septic tank, and 17 percent use other onsite systems like pit or vault latrines. However, very few cities in India have the physical capacity to safely collect, transport, and treat urban domestic septage and sewage. Most onsite sanitation systems (OSS) are emptied manually; only some of the larger cities have private desludging companies that use vacuum trucks. Medium and large cities treat on average only nine percent of collected wastewater, and although there are over 160 million OSS in Indian cities, there are no septage management programs or treatment facilities in the country. As a result, while the majority of urban residents in India have access to improved sanitation, the ongoing contamination of water sources with human excreta is taking an immense toll on public health.

India's growing population has overwhelmed the country's water and sanitation infrastructure. From 2007 to 2017, the country's urban population is projected to grow from 350 million to 500 million. Through continuous household and public investments, urban access to improved sanitation has risen to somewhere between 59 and 86 percent, depending on the estimate. The development of wastewater treatment infrastructure has proven to be a greater challenge. By one estimate, only 13 percent of all wastewater is treated in India. Although there are an estimated 102 million septic tanks and 60 million latrines in cities in India, there are no known septage treatment facilities in the country.

As a result, domestic waste contributes to 80 percent of the pollution in India's surface waters. With so many people depending on surface water for washing and drinking, waterborne diseases account for one-fifth of communicable diseases in India. Diarrheal

diseases cause an estimated 20 percent of deaths among children under the age of five, or somewhere between 365,000 to 500,000 child deaths per year. At last count, the World Bank estimated that water pollution causes \$5.7 billion in health costs alone in India.

India WASH Forum on the WSSCC website

<http://www.wsscc.org/en/what-we-do/networking-knowledge-management/national-level-activities/india/index.htm>

India WASH Forum monthly updates

In each newsletter you will find news from the Indian WASH Forum, book reviews, experiences and sharing, media alerts, upcoming events and more.

- [March 2010](#): understanding recent poverty estimates in India, highlights from the Hygiene Practitioners Workshop, making water-excreta accounts, and more.
- [January 2010](#): Rights-based approach and right to water and sanitation: learning from the past, looking to the future, understanding rights, excerpt: new policy framework for rural water supply, and more.
- [November 2009](#): proceedings from the Global Sanitation Fund launch workshop
- [October 2009](#): right to water and sanitation workshop, pre-SACOSAN IV workshop
- [September 2009](#): right to water and sanitation: shared statement of intent, information updates on the sector and beyond
- [August 2009](#): recommendations towards improving the total sanitation guidelines, 2009 Stockholm water prize laureate Dr. Bindeshwar Pathak, and more.
- [July 2009](#): summer of 2009 series, upcoming events, and more.

Links and Resources

- [Global Sanitation Fund: Proceedings of the India Launch Workshop](#) (August 2009)
- [Global Sanitation Fund launch in India: Suggested Directions for Programme and](#)



[Management](#) - Launch workshop August 2009 in Delhi (powerpoint presentation of 213 KB)

- [Right to water and sanitation: WaterAid and FANSA India meet in January 2010](#) (powerpoint presentation of 825 KB)
- [Delhi declaration process of civil society engagement and review of Key Commitments of the official declaration](#) (Colombo 2009 of WSSCC-FANSA-EWP-WaterAid) - powerpoint presentation of 365 KB
- [India WASH Forum Report on the Right to Water and Sanitation \(November 2009\)](#)
- [WASH India Presentation \(April 2007\)](#)
- [What is ailing poor sanitation coverage in India?](#) By Depinder Kapur, at the occasion of World Toilet Day 2007 (19th of November)
- [Sanitation in India, how to take the bull by the horns?](#) Briefing paper at the occasion of World Toilet Day 2007 (19th of November)
- [Delhi Declaration in Hindi](#)
- [Delhi Declaration in Oriya](#)
- [Delhi Declaration in Tamil](#)
- [Delhi Declaration in Telugu](#)

India WASH Forum Trustees

Ms. Nafisa Barot

Mr. Ramisetty Murali

Mr. Subhash Chand Jain

Mr. Ashok Jaitly (Chair)

Mr. Bunker Roy

Dr. Pawan Kumar Jha

Mr. Darryl D'Monte

Ms. J. Geetha

Mr. Ashoke Kumar Chatterjee

Mr. Ravi Narayanan (Vice Chair)

Mr. SS Meenakshisundaram

Dr. Joe Madiath

Mr. Depinder S Kapur (National Coordinator)

About India WASH Forum

India WASH Forum is a registered India WASH Forum is a Registered Indian Trust, since July 2008. It is affiliated to the WSSCC Geneva and is a membership based coalition of Indian organizations and individuals working on water, sanitation and hygiene.

A unique feature of IWF is its non-hierarchical set up. The organisation is a coalition and its Trustees are on the IWF as individuals and not representing the organisations they are associated with. The agenda and activities that India WASH Forum are determined at the initiative of the Trustees and Members and support from organisations and individuals. We receive a very small operations grant from WSSCC.

Our Charter includes the following commitments;

- ❑ **Promoting knowledge generation** through research and documentation which is linked to and supported grassroots action in the water-sanitation-hygiene sectors. Special emphasis is given to **sector-specific and cross-cutting thematic learnings**.
- ❑ **Supporting field-based NGOs and networks in their technical and programmatic work.** The IWF would also consistently highlight gender and pro-poor considerations, and provide a national platform for interest groups working in the sector to come together.
- ❑ **Undertaking policy advocacy and influence work** through
 - Monitoring and evaluations
 - Media advocacy and campaigns, and
 - Fact finding missions
- ❑ **Undertaking lobbying and networking to promote common objectives** in the sector.

Registered office of India WASH Forum: K-U, 6 Pitampura, Delhi-110034.

Please contact the following for any queries;

Depinder Kapur: kapur.depinder@gmail.com; 9711178181

Romit Sen : romitsen@wateraid.org 9871961575