# Functionality Assessment of Household Tap Connection under National Jal Jeevan Mission - 2022

Har Ghar Jal
Jal Jeevan Mission

**District Report: Balasore, Odisha**
**Survey Duration: January to March 2022**

## Contents

Abbreviations ..... 3
Glossary ..... 4
1. Factsheet ..... 6
2. Context ..... 8
2.1. District snapshot: Balasore ..... 8
2.2. FHTC Assessment Objectives ..... 9
2.3. Assessment Methodology ..... 9
2.4. Sample Size ..... 9
2.5. Sampling Methodology ..... 10
2.6. Methodology for Water Quantity Measurement at Households ..... 11
2.7. Methodology for Water Quality Measurement ..... 11
2.8. Project implementation ..... 12
2.9. Sample coverage ..... 13
2.10. Sampled village and household profile ..... 13
3. Findings ..... 14
3.1. Functionality status of FHTC at household level ..... 14
3.2. Quantity, Regularity, and Quality of Water ..... 15
3.3. Average water supply days in a week ..... 19
3.4. Household utilization of water for drinking and other activities ..... 19
3.5. Status at HH level (Nh=358) ..... 19
3.6. Source sustainability at the village level ..... 20
3.7. Water quality monitoring and surveillance in the villages ..... 21
3.8. Status of JJM ..... 21
3.9. Perception of HHs on Outcome Indicators ..... 22
3.10. User satisfaction ..... 23
4. Annexures ..... 24
4.1. Summary of villages ..... 24
4.2. Functionality – 55 LPCD vs regularity vs potability vs working tap connection ..... 24
4.3. Villages not meeting the quality parameters ..... 25

## Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| AWC | Aanganwadi Centre |
| FHTC | Functional Household Tap Connection |
| GoI | Government of India |
| GP | Gram Panchayat |
| HF | Health Facility |
| HH | Household |
| HGJ | Har Ghar Jal |
| JJM | Jal Jeevan Mission |
| LPCD | Litres per Capita per Day |
| MVS | Multi-village Scheme |
| NJJM | National Jal Jeevan Mission |
| RC | Residual Chlorine |
| O&M | Operation and Maintenance |
| OHT | Over Head Tank |
| PSU | Primary Sampling Unit |
| PWS | Piped Water Supply |
| SVS | Single Village Scheme |
| VAP | Village Action Plan |
| VWSC | Village Water and Sanitation Committee |
| WQMIS | Water Quality Monitoring and Information System |
| | |

## Glossary

1. **Community** – Group of people living in one particular area or village/habitation
2. **Cross-sectional research** – A cross-sectional study is a type of research design in which data is collected from a relatively large and diverse group of people at a single point in time
3. **Drinking water source** – Groundwater (open well, borewell, tube well, handpump, spring, etc.)/ surface water (river, lake, pond, reservoir, etc.)/rainwater, available for drinking and domestic use
4. **Improved sources** – The following sources as considered improved by the National Family Health Survey definitions: Piped water into dwelling, yard/plot with a tap, piped water connected to public stand-posts, tube well or borewell, Hand pump, dug well–protected, Spring–protected, Rainwater, Water ATM/ Community RO plant/ Community Water Purification Plant (CWPP)
5. **Unimproved sources** – The following sources as considered unimproved by the National Family Health Survey definitions: Unprotected spring, unprotected dug well, cart with small tank / drum, Tanker/ truck, Surface water (river/ dam/ lake/ pond/ canal), and bottled water
6. **Functional Household Tap Connection (FHTC)** – A tap connection to a rural household for providing drinking water in adequate quantity of prescribed quality on regular basis.
7. **Functionality of FHTC** – Functionality of a tap connection is defined as having infrastructure, i.e., household tap connection providing water in adequate quantity, as presented:

| Definitions | Fully-functional | Partially-functional | Non-functional |
|---|---|---|---|
| Quantity | >= 55 LPCD | > 40 lpcd - < 55 LPCD | < 40 LPCD |
| Regularity | 12 months or daily basis | 9-12 months or < daily basis | < 9 months or < daily basis |
| Quality | Potable | Potable | Non potable |

8. **Quantity (in litres)** of water received by households per person per day should meet the service level of 55 lpcd
9. **Functionality Assessment** – An assessment of the functionality of rural household tap connections based on a sample survey
10. **Fully Regular** – Regularity of water is considered when a rural household receives water for 12 months on daily basis or as per schedule.
11. **Potability –** Potable water is water that is safe to be used as drinking water. Parameters of potable water are mentioned below:

| Parameters for potable water tested in the survey | Unit | Acceptable Limit | **Permissible Limit** in the absence of alternative sources |
|---|---|---|---|
| i. pH (tested on site) | - | 6.5 to 8.5 | No relaxation |
| ii. Free residual chlorine (tested on site) | Mg/litre | 0.2 | 1 |
| iii. Turbidity | NTU | 1 | 5 |
| iv. Total hardness | Mg/litre | 200 | 600 |
| v. Total alkalinity | Mg/litre | 200 | 600 |
| vi. Chloride | Mg/litre | 250 | 1000 |
| vii. Ammonia | Mg/litre | 0.5 | No relaxation |
| viii. Phosphate | Mg/litre | 0.3 | 1 |
| ix. Iron (in hotspots only) | Mg/litre | 1 | No relaxation |
| x. Nitrate | Mg/litre | 45 | No relaxation |
| xi. Sulphate | Mg/litre | 200 | 400 |
| xii. Total dissolved solids | Mg/litre | 500 | 2000 |
| xiii. Fluoride | Mg/litre | 1 | 1.5 |
| xiv. Arsenic (in hotspots only) | Mg/litre | 0.01 | No relaxation |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| xv. | Bacteriological test for Total coliform bacteria and E. coli or thermotolerant coliform bacteria | Shall not be detectable in any 100 ml sample |

12. **Sampling** – Selection of a subset of individuals from within a statistical population to estimate water service delivery among the population. In the current study, households have been sampled to estimate the representation of the village and subsequently of the district as well as of the state.
13. **Types of schemes**: Following are the piped water supply schemes that were assessed
    a. Mini-solar based piped water supply scheme in isolated/tribal hamlets
    b. Single Village Scheme (SVS) in villages having adequate groundwater that needs treatment
    c. Single village scheme (having adequate groundwater/ spring water/ local or surface water source of prescribed Quality)
    d. Retrofitting of ongoing schemes taken up under erstwhile NRDWP for the last mile connectivity/ retrofitting of completed rural water supply schemes to make it JJM compliant
    e. Multi-village PWS scheme - with water grids/ regional water supply schemes
14. **Village Action Plan (VAP)** – Plan prepared by Gram Panchayat and/ or its sub-committee, i.e., VWSC/ Paani Samiti/ User Group, etc. based on baseline survey, resource mapping and felt needs of the village community to provide FHTC to every rural household, treat the generated greywater and plan its reuse, undertake surveillance activities, etc. VAP also indicates the fund requirement and timelines for completion of work under the Mission and will be approved by the Gram Sabha. Irrespective of the source of funding, all drinking water-related works in the village are taken up based on the VAP.
15. **Source Sustainability** – includes measures such as aquifer recharge, rainwater harvesting, increased storage capacity of water bodies, reservoirs, de-silting, etc. improve the lifespan of water supply systems
16. **Har Ghar Jal (HGJ)** – An administrative unit wherein all HHs are provided with water supply through FHTCs is called “Har Ghar Jal”.
17. **Public Institutions** – The public institutions in the survey include Aanganwadi Centre (AWC), Health Facilities, Schools, Gram Panchayat, and government buildings.
18. **Working tap connection –** A tap connection supplied water at least one day in the week, preceding of survey
19. **Functional Scheme –** A scheme is said to be functional if it was reported to be working for all 12 months in a year.

# 1. Factsheet

*Table 1: District level factsheet*

| Indicators | State | District |
|---|---|---|
| Functionality status of FHTC at households | | |
| Households (HHs) which received water through FHTC at least once in last 7 days (%) | 68 | 77 |
| Fully functional (%) | 54 | 64 |
| Partially functional (%) | 36 | 33 |
| Non-functional (%) | 10 | 3 |
| Quantity of water received by households | | |
| Adequate quantity (>55 LPCD) (%) | 54 | 96 |
| Partially adequate quantity (> 40 LPCD - < 55 LPCD) (%) | 7 | 2 |
| Inadequate quantity (<40 LPCD) (%) | 9 | 2 |
| Regularity of water received by households | | |
| Fully Regular Supply (as per schedule) (%) | 69 | 80 |
| Partially Regular Supply (not as per schedule) (%) | 23 | 9 |
| Irregular Supply (less than 9 months' supply) (%) | 8 | 11 |
| Potable (Quality) water received by households | | |
| Potable (%) | 88 | 80 |
| Non-potable (%) | 12 | 20 |
| Residual Chlorine (RCL) detected with in permissible limits (%) | 11 | 24 |
| Household level indicators | | |
| Households receiving water supply daily-7 days a week (%) | 85 | 84 |
| Daily HH requirement of water being met by FHTC (%) | 62 | 71 |
| Households reported FHTC as a primary source of drinking water (%) | 51 | 33 |
| Households purifying water before drinking (%) | 52 | 82 |
| Households paying water service delivery charges (%) | 13 | 22 |
| Households having coping mechanisms during scarcity (%) | 57 | 49 |
| Households aware of grievance redressal mechanism for reporting problems with FHTC (%) | 70 | 81 |
| Households reported incidence of water-borne diseases in the last year (%) | 0 | 0 |
| Households reported a reduction in time and effort in collecting water (%) | 58 | 77 |
| Overall user satisfaction at the household level | | |
| Regularity (%) | 75 | 72 |
| Overall quality (%) | 70 | 72 |

| Indicators | State | District |
|---|---|---|
| **Village level indicators (based on village questionnaire)** | | |
| Schemes reported to be functional (%) | 55 | 48 |
| Villages with groundwater resource (%) | 74 | 56 |
| Villages having groundwater recharge structure[1] (%) | 17 | 0 |
| **Water supply and storage status in villages** | | |
| Average no. of times water is supplied in a day | 1 | 2 |
| Villages having OHT/ Sump for storage of water (%) | 61 | 44 |
| **Water quality monitoring and surveillance in the villages** | | |
| Villages with Field Test Kits (%) | 16 | 17 |
| Villages in which bacteriological test was done in last 1 year by VWSC/ Pani Samiti (%) | 22 | 22 |
| Villages reported to have a mechanism for chlorination (%) | 2 | 0 |
| **VWSC/Pani Samiti and PWS signage in villages** | | |
| Village reported having presence of VWSC/ Pani Samiti (%) | 16 | 11 |
| Villages in which VWSC/ Pani Samiti is responsible for Operation & Maintenance of PWS schemes (%) | 4 | 0 |
| Villages in which persons are trained to use Field Test Kits (%) | 22 | 17 |
| Villages in which signages about JJM were observed (%) | 12 | 0 |
| **Operation and maintenance at village** | | |
| Villages levying water service delivery to households (%) | 12 | 17 |
| Convergence of JJM activities with other schemes in the villages (%) | 4 | 0 |
| Villages having skilled manpower for Operation & Maintenance of PWS schemes (%) | 24 | 22 |
| Community monitoring of water wastage in villages (%) | 14 | 22 |

[1] Out of villages who reported to have groundwater source ($N_v$=10)

## 2. Context

Jal Jeevan Mission (JJM) was launched on the 15th of August 2019 with the objective to provide functional household tap connections (FHTCs) to all rural households.

*Figure 1: Har Ghar Jal - Objective, Vision, & Outcome*




In accordance with the overall objectives as specified in the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the NJJM, GoI carried out a sample survey to assess the functionality of household tap connections. As part of this endeavour, NJJM, GoI engaged HTA Kantar Public to conduct the 'Functionality Assessment' of the household as well as public institution/ buildings such as schools, anganwadis, gram panchayat buildings, public health facilities, and wellness centers in all the rural districts for the fiscal year 2021-22.

### 2.1. District snapshot: Balasore

District Balasore of Odisha has a population of 2350659. The district has 11 blocks. Out of 2664 villages in the district, 439 are SC dominated and 253 are ST dominated villages. The district lies in East coast plains and hills and receives an annual rainfall of 1568.4mm.

Presented here are district level information collated from the DDWS-IMIS:

*Figure 1: District IMIS Status & Map*

**IMIS status:**

- 518 (19% of all) villages are Har Ghar Jal
- 2146 (81% of all) villages are Non-Har ghar Jal
- Non-SC/ST dominated district
- Non JE/AES
- Yes - History of water contamination
- 1235 (46% of all) villages with PWS more than 20 FHTC



## 2.2. FHTC Assessment Objectives

*Figure 3: Objectives of Functionality of Tap Connections*




## 2.3. Assessment Methodology

A cross-section research design has been used for this functionality assessment study. Quantitative data were collected from villages and households across all states/UTs using the CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing) mode. The survey includes two components, village, and household.

*Figure 4: Survey Components & Respondents*




## 2.4. Sample Size

The sample size was calculated to provide estimates with a 95% confidence interval (CI) and 5% margin of error (MoE) after incorporating the correction factor for a finite population considering the total number of geographic units having FHTCs.

- Village sample is estimated to be representative at the state level
- HH sample estimated to be representative at the district level

- Number of Har Ghar Jal (HGJ) villages were proportionately sampled at the district level
- All PWS schemes (up to 4) were covered per village. Per scheme approximately 9 (3 each from the head, middle, and tail HHs) or 18 households (6 each from head, middle, and tail HHs) were sampled to achieve the desired sample at the district level.

## 2.5. Sampling Methodology

As per the design, all villages having a PWS scheme with 20 or more functional household tap connections were included in the sample frame. The probability proportionate to size (PPS) method was used for village selection in each district. The steps for random selection of villages using PPS are as presented:

*Figure 5: Steps for Village Sampling*

The key considerations for the village and household sampling were:

*Figure 2: Sampling Considerations – Village & Households*




The record of all district-wise village replacements is maintained and reported as part of the annexure.

## 2.6. Methodology for Water Quantity Measurement at Households

Figure 7: Steps for Measuring Flowrate from Supply-tap at HHs




The flow rate of the water supply was measured using a container with gradual markings (either 5 litres or 1 litre, based on the flow of the tap) and a stopwatch/timer-watch. The process followed is as described in Figure 7.

In the case of households where the FHTC is connected directly with the storage tank, the following steps were adopted to measure the quantity:

- Assessor first asked and recorded length, breadth, and height.
- Assessor dipped a 5 feet long rod, marked the level of the water table, and calculated the volume – length x breadth x-height of water.
- Next the assessor opened the valve of the connection and allowed the water to flow inside the storage for 10 minutes.
- After 10 mins, the valve was closed, and the assessor again dipped the rod and recorded the new height of the water inside the tank. Based on this new 'height' and the CAPI calculated the changed volume.
- The difference in the volume of water in 10 minutes divided by 10 provided the flow rate of the water supply per minute.

The water flow rate was not measured for village-level public institutions.

## 2.7. Methodology for Water Quality Measurement

Water quality was tested for all public institutions available in the villages, including schools, anganwadis, gram panchayat buildings, public health facilities, and wellness centers, and at the selected households. Two types of quality tests were carried out – a) spot test for pH and free residual chlorine, and b) water sample was collected and transported to labs for testing against 13 quality parameters (total 15) as specified in Figure 8.

*Figure 8: On-site & Laboratory Based Quality Test*




JJM, with the support of the BMI Division of ICMR, enabled a new interface on the WQMIS portal for "Functionality Assessment (FA) User" to enable seamless harmonization of water sample registration, sample submission for testing, and sharing of results as per the applicable quality parameters.

## 2.8. Project implementation

An overview of the project implementation is as presented:

*Figure 9: Broad project implementation framework*



A total of 8 teams (comprising 8 supervisors, 48 assessors, and 8 water collection assistants) were recruited, trained, and deployed to complete the survey across the states of Odisha. One survey team covered approximately 2 – 3 districts. The state-wise team deployment and fieldwork dates were as presented:

**Table No. 1: State-wise team deployment and data collection start & end dates**

| State | Teams deployed | Start date | End date | Total data collection days |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Odisha | 8 Teams | 2/20/2022 | 4/10/2022 | 45 days |

A four-tier quality control (QC) system was put in place. At the ground level, the data collection exercise was done using a computer-aided Personal Interview (CAPI) application which contained all logic and skip-checks inbuilt. Also, 5% of the total samples were accompanied by the supervisors. Sub-targeted QC was done by the state field managers (5%) and the central project management team (5%). Apart from this, the central research team monitored the data trend and as per requirement debriefed data collection teams to improve quality.

## 2.9. Sample coverage

**Table No. 2: Sample covered**

| District | Targeted sample | | Achieved sample | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Village | HH | Village | HH | Public Institutions |
| **Balasore** | **18** | **396** | **18** | **358** | **16** |
| **Odisha** | **504** | **11,817** | **504** | **11,652** | **266** |

## 2.10. Sampled village and household profile

| SAMPLED VILLAGES | SAMPLED HOUSEHOLDS |
|---|---|
| • Total no. of villages covered in the district **–** 18<br>• Percentage of SC dominated villages covered in the district is 17% (which is higher than the state average, i.e., 9%)<br>• Percentage of ST dominated villages covered in the district is 11% (which is lower than the state average, i.e., 41%)<br>• Higher proportion of **pump operator** interviewed at the village level<br>• **Yes** the district reported to have any historical incidence of water contamination | • Total no. of households covered in the district **– 275**<br>• Proportion of General - 28%, SC 24%, ST% 16, OBC 33% households<br>• **22%** of the FHTC connections are under the name of a female member<br>• Average household size **–** 5<br>• **>75%** positive user experience in 0/5 measures |

# 3. Findings

## 3.1. Functionality status of FHTC at household level

**A. Overall Functionality* (in %)**

*Figure 3: Functionality of HH tap connection*




It has been found that 77 percent of the sampled HHs (N=275) had working tap connections (i.e., received water at least once in last 7 days). More than six out of ten (64 percent) HHs had fully functional tap connection (i.e., HHs receiving adequate quantity of prescribed quality of water on a regular basis).

## 3.2. Quantity, Regularity, and Quality of Water

Under JJM, functionality is defined as having infrastructure, i.e., household tap connection providing water in adequate quantity (55 LPCD or more) of prescribed quality on regular basis (every day or as decided by GP and/ or its sub-committee) with adequate pressure. It will also include long-term source and system sustainability. Presented here are the findings in this respect.

### A. Water quantity measured as LPCD (Litres per Capita per Day)

**96% HHs** reported receiving adequate quantity of water

*Figure 4: Quantity of water received by households*




**Quantity of water received across head, middle, and tail end HHs**

*Figure 5: Quantity of water received across head, middle and tail end households*




### B. Regularity of water supply to households

**80% HHs** receive a regular supply of water (as per agreed schedule)

*Figure: Regularity of water received by households*



**Regularity of water received across head, middle, and tail end**

*Figure 6: Regularity of water received across head, middle and tail end households*




## C. Water quality – Potability

*Figure 7: Potable water received by households*




**Potable water has been considered basis testing of water samples through laboratory tests for physical, chemical, and bacteriological as given in Table 4 parameters (within acceptable/ permissible range) and onsite testing of pH. The details of laboratory test are mentioned in the table given above in the glossary.*

**Table No. 3: Village quality parameters reported within permissible range (% sample within permissible range)**

| Quality Parameters (NV=32) | Water Samples Tested from Public Institutes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anganwadi Centre | Health Facility | Schools | Others |
| pH (on-site) | 100 | | 80 | 80 |
| Turbidity | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Total Hardness | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Total Alkalinity | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Chloride | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Ammonia | **Not Tested** | | | |
| Iron | 50 | 100 | 75 | 100 |
| Nitrate | **Not Tested** | | | |
| Sulphate | | | | |
| Total Dissolved Solids | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Bacteriological Test | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Fluoride | **No History** | | | |
| Arsenic (In Hotspots) | **No History** | | | |

**Table No. 4: Household water quality parameters reported within permissible range (in % sample within permissible range)**

| Quality Parameters | No of samples tested | % Households |
|---|---|---|
| pH (on-site) | 275 | 81 |
| Turbidity | 274 | 99 |
| Total Hardness | 271 | 100 |
| Total Alkalinity | 273 | 100 |
| Chloride | 273 | 100 |
| Ammonia | Not tested | |
| Iron | 272 | 97 |
| Nitrate | Not tested | |
| Sulphate | Not tested | |
| Total Dissolved Solids | 274 | 100 |
| Bacteriological | 271 | 100 |
| Fluoride | No History | |
| Arsenic (In Hotspots) | No History | |
| | | |

**Safeguarding piped water supply for unforeseen bacteriological contamination- Presence of Residual Chlorine (RC)**

The Residual Chlorine (RC) in the Balasore district was found in 14% samples. Out of which 5% samples were having RC outside range whereas 81% samples, had no RC. It may be mentioned that 100% of water samples passed the bacteriological contamination test but to assure the protection against bacteriological contamination, addition of RC is must in PWS system.

The Residual Chlorine in piped water supply is one of the most important preventive actions to assure quality of water against bacteriological contamination from source to consumption. The presence of residual chlorine within permissible limits is indicator of well-maintained and healthy piped water supply system.

It is advised that behavioural change communication campaigns on appropriate dosage of residual chlorine is held in all villages and monitoring system for chlorine dosing is established. The FTK must have residual chlorine testing facility for effective WQM&S.

**Comment on functioning of District Lab:**

The district lab tested water samples for 7 water quality parameters. 291 water samples were submitted, and 284 water samples were tested, and reports made available. The turnaround time for testing was more than 48 hours in most cases.

The labs did not have any issue with testing the number of water samples submitted nor had any issues with human resource, reagents etc

## 3.3. Average water supply days in a week

*Figure 8: Average number of days households receive water supply in a week (in %)*




## 3.4. Household utilization of water for drinking and other activities

**Fulfilment of requirement**

**71% HHs** reported that their daily requirement of water is being met by FHTCs

*Figure 17: Daily household's requirement of water being met by FHTC*




**Primary source of drinking water**

**33% HHs** reported HH tap connection as their primary source of drinking water




## 3.5. Status at HH level (Nh=358)

| % HHs purifying water before drinking | % HHs paying water service delivery charges | % HHs with booster pumps | % HHs having coping mechanism during scarcity |
|---|---|---|---|
| **82%** | **22%** | **2%** | **49%** |

| % HH aware of grievance redressal mechanism for reporting problems with FHTC | Channel for registering grievance ($N_h$=358*) | Key problems for reporting grievances (N=358) | % Reported complaints resolved |
|---|---|---|---|
| **81%** | **0** | **8** | 9% |

**HHs who reported complaints in last 1 year*

## 3.6. Source sustainability at the village level

### Schemes based on surface and ground water

9% of schemes are reported to be based on ground water.

*Figure 19: Schemes based on water source in village*




**'Surface Water Source' is Stream, Spring, Glacier, River, lake, pond etc. and Groundwater Source is open well, borewell, tube well, handpump, spring, etc*

### Villages reported having presence of a groundwater source

**56% of villages** reported the presence of groundwater sources like improved dug wells and borewells, and none were supported by recharging structures.

*Figure 20: Villages reported the presence of groundwater sources and among those how many reported to have a recharge structure*




### The top 3 other source sustainability measure taken by villages

*Figure 21: Villages reported having taken other source sustainability measure*



## 3.7. Water quality monitoring and surveillance in the villages

*Figure 22: Water quality monitoring and surveillance by villages*




## 3.8. Status of JJM

### A. VWSC/Pani Samiti and PWS signage in villages ($N_V$=18)

| Presence of VWSC/Pani Samiti | VWSC/Pani Samiti responsible for O&M | % Villages – VWSC/PO trained to use FTKs | % Villages with PWS signages |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11% | 0% | 17% | 0% |

### B. Water supply, storage and operation & maintenance at village level ($N_V$=18)

| Average no. of supply in a day | % Villages levying water service delivery to HH | % Villages with skilled manpower for O&M | % Villages where signage was observed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 17% | 22% | 0% |

| % Villages having OHT/ Sump | % Villages with O&M challenges | Primary points for reporting grievances | Key problems for reporting grievances |
|---|---|---|---|
| 44% | 6% | Block functionary | Pipeline leakage |

## 3.9. Perception of HHs on Outcome Indicators

**a. Health**

**Incidence of water borne diseases at HH level in last one year as reported**

*Figure 23: Household reported incidence of water borne diseases in last one year*




**b. Economic Income**

**Change in employment days since FHTC programmes/schemes**

*Figure 24: Household reported a change in employment days since FHTC programmes /schemes*




**c. Drudgery**

**Reduction in time and effort in collecting water**

*Figure 25: Households reported reduction in time and effort in collecting water*



## 3.10. User satisfaction

| Table No. 5: | User satisfaction - more than 75% happy with FHTC services | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **S. No.** | Parameter ($N_h$=358) | | In % |
| **1** | Regularity | | **72** |
| **2** | Overall quality | | **72** |
| **3** | Colour | | **71** |
| **4** | Taste | | **71** |
| **5** | Odour | | **70** |

Note:
Base ($N_v$)=18 means all villages sampled and covered in Balasore district
Base ($N_H$)=358 means all households sampled and covered across the 18 villages in Balasore district
Base ($N_H$)=358 means all households where female members used to fetch water before HH tap connection

# 4. Annexures

## 4.1. Summary of villages

**Table No. 6: Village summary**

| S.No. | Name of sample village | Sample HHs | Actual sample HHs (achieved) | No. of scheme | No of source of surface water | No of source of Ground water |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| # | Balasore | 396 | 376 | 22 | 23 | 38 |
| 1. | Kasafal | 54 | 56 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 2. | Nuapur | 18 | 19 | 1 | 1 | |
| 3. | Athantar | 36 | 19 | 1 | 2 | |
| 4. | Srijang | 18 | 19 | 2 | | 5 |
| 5. | Irda | 18 | 19 | 1 | | 4 |
| 6. | Madhupura | 18 | 19 | 1 | | 5 |
| 7. | Santeghari | 18 | 19 | 1 | | |
| 8. | Chouki | 18 | 19 | 1 | | |
| 9. | Malarbadia | 18 | 16 | 1 | | |
| 10. | Baradiha | 18 | 19 | 1 | 1 | |
| 11. | Sardarbandha | 18 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| 12. | Jhalajhalia | 36 | 19 | 2 | | |
| 13. | Kalyani | 18 | 19 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 14. | Kesharipur | 18 | 19 | 2 | 1 | |
| 15. | Gadapokhari | 18 | 19 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 16. | Garadihi | 18 | 19 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 17. | Badapokhari | 18 | 19 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| 18. | Paikapada | 18 | 19 | 1 | 2 | 4 |

## 4.2. Functionality – 55 LPCD vs regularity vs potability vs working tap connection

**Table No. 7: Functionality of HH tap connection**

| S. No. | Village | Fully Functional* (% HH) | Adequate Quantity (% HH) | Fully Regular Supply (% HH) | Potable (Quality) (% HH) | Working tap connections (%HH) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| # | **Balasore** | 63.6 | 96.0 | 80.4 | 80.4 | 100.0 |
| 1 | Kasafal | 63.6 | 98.2 | 63.6 | 94.5 | 100.0 |
| 2 | Nuapur | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 3 | Athantar | 0 | 85.7 | 0 | 28.6 | 100.0 |
| 4 | Srijang | 94.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 94.4 | 100.0 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Irda | 94.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 94.4 | 100.0 |
| 6 | Madhupura | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 7 | Santeghari | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 8 | Chouki | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 9 | Malarbadia | 60.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 60.0 | 100.0 |
| 10 | Sardarbandha | 38.9 | 94.4 | 100.0 | 38.9 | 100.0 |
| 11 | Jhalajhalia | 0 | 61.1 | 0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 12 | Kesharipur | 94.4 | 94.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 13 | Gadapokhari | 0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 14 | Garadihi | 5.6 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |

** Fully Functional has been computed as = Adequate Quantity ∩ Fully Regularity Supply ∩ Potable (Quality)*

## 4.3. Villages not meeting the quality parameters

**Table No. 8: Quality parameters dissatisfied at village level**

**1. pH (Acceptable Range- 6.5 to 8.5)**

| S.No. | Block Name | Panchayat Name | Villages | No. of HHs outside the acceptable range |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Balasore | Kasafal | Kasafal | 3 |
| 2 | Bhograi | Kakhada | Malarbadia | 6 |
| 3 | Jaleswar | Sardarbandha | Sardarbandha | 11 |
| 4 | Khaira | Gadapokhari | Gadapokhari | 17 |
| 5 | Nilgiri | Garadihi | Garadihi | 9 |
| 6 | Remuna | Remuna | Athantar | 5 |

**2. Free residual chlorine (Acceptable Range- 0.2 to 1 PPM)**

| S.No. | Block Name | Panchayat Name | Villages | HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range | HHs with no chlorine |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Bahanaga | Odasal | Jhalajhalia | 0 | 18 |
| 2 | Balasore | Kasafal | Kasafal | 0 | 46 |
| 3 | | Sasanga | Nuapur | 0 | 17 |
| 4 | Bhograi | Dehurda | Santeghari | 0 | 18 |
| 5 | | Kakhada | Malarbadia | 0 | 14 |
| 6 | Jaleswar | Sardarbandha | Sardarbandha | 0 | 18 |
| 7 | Khaira | Gadapokhari | Gadapokhari | 0 | 18 |
| 8 | Nilgiri | Garadihi | Garadihi | 0 | 18 |
| 9 | Remuna | Remuna | Athantar | 0 | 6 |
| 10 | | Srijang | Srijang | 0 | 18 |
| 11 | Soro | Kesharipur | Kesharipur | 0 | 18 |

**3. Turbidity (Acceptable Range- 1 to 5 NTU)**

| S.No. | Block Name | Panchayat Name | Villages | HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Nilgiri | Garadihi | Garadihi | 2 |

**4. Total hardness (Acceptable Range- 200 to 600 Milligram/litre)**

| S.No. | Block Name | Panchayat Name | Villages | HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

**5. Total alkalinity (Acceptable Range- 200 to 600 Milligram/litre)**

| S.No. | Block Name | Panchayat Name | Villages | HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

**6. Chloride (Acceptable Range- 250 to 1000 Milligram/litre)**

| S.No. | Block Name | Panchayat Name | Villages | HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

**7. Ammonia (Acceptable Range- 0.5 Milligram/litre)**

| S.No. | Block Name | Panchayat Name | Villages | HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

**8. Iron (Acceptable Range- 1 Milligram/litre)**

| Table No. 8: Quality parameters dissatisfied at village level | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **S.No.** | **Block Name** | **Panchayat Name** | **Villages** | **HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range** |
| 1 | Jaleswar | Sardarbandha | Sardarbandha | 2 |
| 2 | Khaira | Gadapokhari | Gadapokhari | 5 |
| 3 | Remuna | Srijang | Srijang | 1 |
| **9. Nitrate (Acceptable Range- 1 Milligram/litre)** | | | | |
| **S.No.** | **Block Name** | **Panchayat Name** | **Villages** | **HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range** |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **10. Sulphate (Acceptable Range- 200 to 400 Milligram/litre)** | | | | |
| **S.No.** | **Block Name** | **Panchayat Name** | **Villages** | **HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range** |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **11. Total dissolved solids (Acceptable Range- 500 to 2000 Milligram/litre)** | | | | |
| **S.No.** | **Block Name** | **Panchayat Name** | **Villages** | **HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range** |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **12. Bacteriological test (Presence)** | | | | |
| **S.No.** | **Block Name** | **Panchayat Name** | **Villages** | **HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range** |
| 1 | Basta | Irda | Irda | 1 |
| **13. Fluoride (Acceptable Range- 1 to 1.5 Milligram /litre)** | | | | |
| **S.No.** | **Block Name** | **Panchayat Name** | **Villages** | **HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range** |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **14. Arsenic (in hotspots) (Acceptable Range- 0.01 Milligram /litre)** | | | | |
| **S.No.** | **Block Name** | **Panchayat Name** | **Villages** | **HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range** |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |