



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



**District Report: Guntur, Andhra Pradesh  
Survey Duration: February to April 2022**

## ContSents

Abbreviations .....	3
Glossary .....	4
1. Factsheet.....	6
2. Context .....	8
2.1. District snapshot: Guntur.....	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.....	18
3.4. Household utilization of water for drinking and other activities .....	18
3.5. Status at HH level (Nh=660) .....	18
3.6. Source sustainability at the village level .....	19
3.7. Water quality monitoring and surveillance in the villages .....	20
3.8. Status of JJM.....	20
3.9. Perception of HHs on Outcome Indicators.....	21
3.10. User satisfaction.....	22
4. Annexures .....	23
4.1. Summary of villages.....	23
4.2. Functionality – 55 LPCD vs regularity vs potability vs working tap connection .....	23
4.3. Villages not meeting the quality parameters .....	24

## Abbreviations

AWC	Aanganwadi Centre
FHTC	Functional Household Tap Connection
Gol	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	$\geq 55$ 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	1,000
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	2,000
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	Andhra Pradesh	Guntur
<b>Functionality status of FHTC at households</b>		
Households (HHs) which received water through FHTC at least once in last 7 days (%)	98	100
Fully functional (%)	68	39
Partially functional (%)	26	54
Non-functional (%)	6	7
<b>Quantity of water received by households</b>		
Adequate quantity (>55 LPCD) (%)	92	95
Partially adequate quantity (> 40 LPCD - < 55 LPCD) (%)	3	2
Inadequate quantity (<40 LPCD) (%)	5	3
<b>Regularity of water received by households</b>		
Fully Regular Supply (as per schedule) (%)	79	60
Partially Regular Supply (not as per schedule) (%)	16	35
Irregular Supply (less than 9 months' supply) (%)	4	5
<b>Potable (Quality) water received by households</b>		
Potable (%)	90	71
Non-potable (%)	10	29
Residual Chlorine (RCL) detected with in permissible limits (%)	48	93
<b>Household level indicators</b>		
Households receiving water supply daily-7 days a week (%)	74	70
Daily HH requirement of water being met by FHTC (%)	94	95
Households reported FHTC as a primary source of drinking water (%)	75	69
Households purifying water before drinking (%)	79	87
Households paying water service delivery charges (%)	10	2
Households having coping mechanisms during scarcity (%)	30	51
Households aware of grievance redressal mechanism for reporting problems with FHTC (%)	86	88
Households reported incidence of water-borne diseases in the last year (%)	0	0
Households reported a reduction in time and effort in collecting water (%)	85	97
<b>Overall user satisfaction at the household level</b>		
Regularity (%)	88	88
Overall quality (%)	84	84

Indicators	Andhra Pradesh	Guntur
<b>Village level indicators (based on village questionnaire)</b>		
Schemes reported to be functional (%)	30	47
Villages with groundwater resource (%)	35	52
Villages having groundwater recharge structure <sup>1</sup> (%)	7	28
<b>Water supply and storage status in villages</b>		
Average no. of times water is supplied in a day	1	1
Villages having OHT/ Sump for storage of water (%)	72	38
<b>Water quality monitoring and surveillance in the villages</b>		
Villages with Field Test Kits (%)	39	10
Villages in which bacteriological test was done in last 1 year by VWSC/ Pani Samiti (%)	20	7
Villages reported to have a mechanism for chlorination (%)	21	7
<b>VWSC/Pani Samiti and PWS signage in villages</b>		
Village reported having presence of VWSC/ Pani Samiti (%)	30	38
Villages in which VWSC/ Pani Samiti is responsible for Operation & Maintenance of PWS schemes (%)	10	14
Villages in which persons are trained to use Field Test Kits (%)	33	14
Villages in which signages about JJM were observed (%)	6	0
<b>Operation and maintenance at village</b>		
Villages levying water service delivery to households (%)	16	0
Convergence of JJM activities with other schemes in the villages (%)	6	0
Villages having skilled manpower for Operation & Maintenance of PWS schemes (%)	32	10
Community monitoring of water wastage in villages (%)	22	7

<sup>1</sup> Out of villages who reported to have groundwater source (N<sub>v</sub>=15)



## 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: Guntur


District Guntur of Andhra Pradesh has a population of 31,82,784. The district has 25 blocks. Out of 1011 villages in the district, 177 are SC dominated and 32 are ST dominated villages. The district lies in East Coast Plain and Hill Region and receives an annual rainfall of 781mm.

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

Figure 2: District IMIS Status & Map

#### IMIS status:

- 69 (7% of all) villages are Har Ghar Jal
- 942 (93% of all) villages are non-Har ghar Jal
- Non-SC/ST dominated district
- Non-JE/AES
- Yes- History of water contamination
- 601 (59% of all) villages with PWS more than 20 FHT





## 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 6: 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 10 teams (comprising 10 supervisors, 60 assessors, and 10 water collection assistants) were recruited, trained, and deployed to complete the survey across the states of Andhra Pradesh. 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
Andhra Pradesh	10 Teams	2/22/2022	4/25/2022	58 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
<b>Guntur</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>648</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>660</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>8,739</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>8,827</b>	<b>849</b>

## 2.10. Sampled village and household profile


SAMPLED VILLAGES	SAMPLED HOUSEHOLDS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total no. of villages covered in the district – 29</li> <li>Percentage of SC dominated villages covered in the district is 17% (which is slightly higher than the state average, i.e., 10%)</li> <li>Percentage of ST dominated villages covered in the district is 0% (which is lower than the state average, i.e., 22%)</li> <li>Higher proportion of <b>pump operator</b> interviewed at the village level</li> <li><b>Yes</b>, the district reported to have any historical incidence of water contamination</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total no. of households covered in the district – <b>660</b></li> <li>Proportion of General - 56%, SC 16%, ST% 2, OBC 26% households</li> <li><b>21%</b> of the FHTC connections are under the name of a female member</li> <li>Average household size – 4</li> <li><b>&gt;75%</b> positive user experience in 5/5 measures</li> </ul>

### 3. Findings

#### 3.1. Functionality status of FHTC at household level

##### A. Functionality – Working tap connection vs 55 LPCD vs regularity vs potability

Figure 10: Functionality of HH tap connection



It has been found that 100 percent of the sampled HHs (N=660) had working tap connections (i.e., received water at least once in last 7 days). Less than half (39 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)


**95% HHs** reported receiving adequate quantity of water

Figure 11: Quantity of water received by households



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


Figure 12: Quantity of water received across head, middle and tail end households



#### B. Regularity of water supply to households

**60% 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 13: Regularity of water received across head, middle and tail end households



### C. Water quality – Potability

Figure 14: 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 (in % sample within permissible range)**

Quality Parameters (N <sub>v</sub> =29)	Water Samples Tested from Public Institutes			
	Anganwadi Centre	Health Facility	Schools	Others
pH (on-site)	100	100	100	100
Turbidity	Not tested			
Total Hardness	Not tested			
Total Alkalinity	Not tested			
Chloride	Not tested			
Ammonia	Not tested			
Iron	Not tested			
Nitrate	Not tested			
Sulphate	Not tested			
Total Dissolved Solids	Not tested			
Bacteriological Test	Not tested			
Fluoride	Not tested			
Arsenic	Not tested			

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

Quality Parameters	No of water samples tested	% Samples within permissible range
pH (on-site)	660	94
Turbidity	627	100
Total Hardness	620	86
Total Alkalinity	621	91
Chloride	1	100
Ammonia	Not tested	
Iron	611	100
Nitrate	618	86
Sulphate	617	100
Total Dissolved Solids	620	89
Bacteriological Test (Presence/Absence)	4	100
Fluoride	618	99
Arsenic	Not tested	

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

The Residual Chlorine (RC) in the Guntur district was found in 93% samples. Out of which 1% samples were having RC outside range whereas 6% 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 10 water quality parameters. 752 water samples were submitted, and 627 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 capacity to test more than 40 number of samples and had issues of human resource, reagents etc

### 3.3. Average water supply days in a week

Figure 15: 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

**96% 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

**69% HHs** reported HH tap connection as their primary source of drinking water

Figure 18: Households reported FHTC as primary source of drinking water



### 3.5. Status at HH level (N<sub>h</sub>=660)

% HHs purifying water before drinking	% HHs paying water service delivery charges	% HHs with booster pumps	% HHs having coping mechanism during
87%	2%	57%	51%
% HH aware of grievance redressal mechanism for reporting problems with FHTC	Channel for registering grievance (N <sub>h</sub> =660*)	Key problems for reporting grievances (N=660)	% Reported complaints resolved (N <sub>h</sub> =38)
88%	Pump-operator	Pipeline leakage	76%


\*HHs who reported complaints in last 1 year

### 3.6. Source sustainability at the village level

#### Schemes based on surface and ground water

38% of schemes are reported to be based on surface water and 47% 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


**52% of villages** reported the presence of groundwater sources like improved dug wells and borewells, and 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<sub>v</sub>=29)

Presence of VWSC/Pani Samiti	VWSC/Pani Samiti responsible for O&M	% Villages – VWSC/PO trained to use FTKs	% Villages with PWS signages
38%	14%	14%	0%

#### B. Water supply, storage and operation & maintenance at village level (N<sub>v</sub>=29)


Average no. of supply in a day	% Villages levying water service delivery to HH	% Villages with skilled manpower for O&M	Community monitoring of water wastage in villages
1	0%	10%	6.9%
% Villages having OHT/ Sump	% Villages with O&M challenges	Primary points for reporting grievances	Key problems for reporting grievances
38%	3%	PHED	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 <sub>h</sub> =660)		In %
1	Regularity		88
2	Overall quality		84
3	Colour		82
4	Taste		82
5	Odour		82

**Note:**

Base (N<sub>v</sub>)=29 means all villages sampled and covered in Guntur district

Base (N<sub>H</sub>)=660 means all households sampled and covered across the 29 villages in Guntur district

Base (N<sub>H</sub>)=660 means all households where female members used to fetch water before HH tap connection



## 4. Annexures

### 4.1. Summary of villages

S.No.	Name of sample village	Sample HHs	Actual sample HHs (achieved)	No. of scheme	No of source of surface water available in the village	No of source of ground water available in the village
1	Total	648	689	33	45	23
2	Endroy	27	28	1	8	4
3	Pedaparimi	18	19	3	4	2
4	Tadikonda	27	28	1	4	1
5	Karalapadu	27	37	1		
6	Gottipalla	27	28	2	2	1
7	Nallapadu	9	10	0	2	1
8	Ankireddypalem	27	28	1		
9	Koppuravuru	27	28	1	1	1
10	Venigandla	27	28	1	1	1
11	Takkellapadu	18	19	1	1	
12	Pidaparru	18	19	0		
13	Sudda Palli	18	19	1		
14	Kovelamudi	27	28	1		
15	Prathipadu	27	29	1	2	1
16	Edlapadu	27	28	3	2	1
17	Chandavaram	18	19	1	2	1
18	Velpur	27	28	1	1	
19	Garikapadu	27	29	2	2	1
20	Moparru	27	28	1		1
21	Pallikona	18	19	1		
22	Kankatapalem	27	28	1		
23	Mulukuduru	18	18	1	1	
24	Medikonduru	27	28	1	2	5
25	Modukuru	27	28	1	1	
26	Mulakalur	9	11	1	3	1
27	Murikipudi	27	28	1		
28	Kopparru	18	20	1	4	1
29	Kamarajugadda	9	10	1	1	
30	Manukondavaripalem	18	19	1	1	

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

S. No.	Village	Fully Functional* (% HH)	Adequate Quantity (% HH)	Fully Regular Supply (% HH)	Potable (Quality) (% HH)	Working tap connections (%HH)
1	Total	39	95	60	71	100
2	Endroy	11	100	100	11	100
3	Pedaparimi	94	100	94	100	100
4	Tadikonda	82	100	85	96	100
5	Karalapadu	33	97	36	86	100
6	Gottipalla	48	100	100	48	100
7	Nallapadu	100	100	100	100	100
8	Ankireddypalem	4	96	52	11	100
9	Koppuravuru	59	78	96	78	100
10	Venigandla	33	89	41	100	100
11	Takkellapadu	6	100	6	94	100

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)
12	Pidaparru	6	100	6	100	100
13	Sudda Palli	0	94	50	0	100
14	Kovelamudi	11	100	11	93	100
15	Prathipadu	43	93	54	54	100
16	Edlapadu	100	100	100	100	100
17	Chandavaram	94	100	94	100	100
18	Velpur	96	100	96	96	100
19	Garikapadu	86	100	86	93	100
20	Moparru	0	100	0	100	100
21	Pallikona	6	100	6	100	100
22	Kankatapalem	7	100	7	100	100
23	Mulukuduru	0	6	82	0	100
24	Medikonduru	22	100	37	26	100
25	Modukuru	4	100	4	82	100
26	Mulakalur	80	90	90	90	100
27	Murikipudi	11	96	96	11	100
28	Kopparu	74	100	74	100	100
29	Kamarajugadda	78	89	89	89	100
30	Manukondavaripalem	28	83	100	33	100

\* Fully Functional has been computed as = Adequate Quantity  $\cap$  Fully Regularity Supply  $\cap$  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.N o.	Block Name	Panchayat Name	Villages	No. of HHs outside the acceptable range	
1	Guntur Rural	Lalpuram	Ankiredypalem	4	
2	Kakumanu	Telagayapalem	Garikapadu	1	
3	Medikonduru	Bhiminenivaripalem,Medikonduru	Medikonduru	14	
4	Narasaraopet	M.Reddipalem	Mulakalur	1	
5	Pedakakani	Takkellapadu	Takkellapadu	1	
6	Piduguralla	Ayyappa Nagar,Karalapadu,Kotha Vellampalli	Karalapadu	5	
7	Ponnuru	Machavaram	Mulukuduru	1	
8	Prathipadu	Prathipadu	Prathipadu	12	
9	Repalle	Kamarajugadda-S	Kamarajugadda	1	
10	Savalyapuram	Velpur	Velpur	1	
11	Vatticheruku	Kovelamudi	Kovelamudi	1	
2. Free residual chlorine (Acceptable Range- 0.2 to 1 PPM)					
S.N o.	Block Name	Panchayat Name	Villages	HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range	HHs with no chlorine
1	Bapatla	Kankatapalem	Kankatapalem	0	27
2	Chebrolu	Sudda Palli	Sudda Palli	0	14
3	Guntur Rural	Lalpuram	Ankiredypalem	1	0
4	Ponnuru	Machavaram	Mulukuduru	4	0
5	Vatticheruku	Kovelamudi	Kovelamudi	0	2

<b>Table No. 8: Quality parameters dissatisfied at village level</b>				
<b>3. Turbidity (Acceptable Range- 1 to 5 NTU)</b>				
<b>S.N o.</b>	<b>Block Name</b>	<b>Panchayat Name</b>	<b>Villages</b>	<b>HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range</b>
1	Prathipadu	Prathipadu	Prathipadu	1
<b>4. Total hardness (Acceptable Range- 200 to 600 Milligram/litre)</b>				
<b>S.N o.</b>	<b>Block Name</b>	<b>Panchayat Name</b>	<b>Villages</b>	<b>HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range</b>
1	Amaravathi	Endroy	Endroy	23
2	Chilakalurip et	Dandamudi	Manukondavaripalem	1
3		Murikipudi	Murikipudi	21
4	Guntur Rural	Lalpuram	Ankireddypalem	20
5	Pedakakani	Koppuravuru	Koppuravuru	1
6	Ponnuru	Machavaram	Mulukuduru	16
7	Tsundur	Modukuru	Modukuru	3
8	Vatticheruku ru	Kovelamudi	Kovelamudi	1
<b>5. Total alkalinity (Acceptable Range- 200 to 600 Milligram/litre)</b>				
<b>S.N o.</b>	<b>Block Name</b>	<b>Panchayat Name</b>	<b>Villages</b>	<b>HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range</b>
1	Amaravathi	Endroy	Endroy	1
2	Chilakalurip et	Dandamudi	Manukondavaripalem	10
3	Guntur Rural	Lalpuram	Ankireddypalem	20
4	Medikonduru	Bhiminenivaripalem, Medikonduru	Medikonduru	15
5	Ponnuru	Machavaram	Mulukuduru	9
<b>6. Chloride (Acceptable Range- 250 to 1000 Milligram/litre)</b>				
<b>S.N o.</b>	<b>Block Name</b>	<b>Panchayat Name</b>	<b>Villages</b>	<b>HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range</b>
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>7. Ammonia (Acceptable Range- 0.5 Milligram/litre)</b>				
<b>S.N o.</b>	<b>Block Name</b>	<b>Panchayat Name</b>	<b>Villages</b>	<b>HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range</b>
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>8. Iron (Acceptable Range- 1 Milligram/litre)</b>				
<b>S.N o.</b>	<b>Block Name</b>	<b>Panchayat Name</b>	<b>Villages</b>	<b>HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range</b>
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>9. Nitrate (Acceptable Range- 1 Milligram/litre)</b>				
<b>S.N o.</b>	<b>Block Name</b>	<b>Panchayat Name</b>	<b>Villages</b>	<b>HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range</b>
1	Chebrolu	Sudda Palli	Sudda Palli	18
2	Chilakalurip et	Murikipudi	Murikipudi	22
3	Guntur Rural	Lalpuram	Ankireddypalem	22
4	Pedakakani	Koppuravuru	Koppuravuru	5
5	Ponnuru	Machavaram	Mulukuduru	2
6	Tsundur	Modukuru	Modukuru	4
7	Veldurthi	Gangalakunta, Hanumapuram Thanda, Ramachandrapuram Thanda	Gottipalla	14
<b>10. Sulphate (Acceptable Range- 200 to 400 Milligram/litre)</b>				
<b>S.N o.</b>	<b>Block Name</b>	<b>Panchayat Name</b>	<b>Villages</b>	<b>HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range</b>
1	Ponnuru	Machavaram	Mulukuduru	1
<b>11. Total dissolved solids (Acceptable Range- 500 to 2000 Milligram/litre)</b>				
<b>S.N o.</b>	<b>Block Name</b>	<b>Panchayat Name</b>	<b>Villages</b>	<b>HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range</b>
1	Amaravathi	Endroy	Endroy	23
2	Chilakalurip et	Dandamudi	Manukondavaripalem	8
3	Guntur Rural	Lalpuram	Ankireddypalem	20
4	Ponnuru	Machavaram	Mulukuduru	16

<b>Table No. 8: Quality parameters dissatisfied at village level</b>				
5	Vatticheruku ru	Kovelamudi	Kovelamudi	1
<b>12. Bacteriological test (Presence)</b>				
<b>S.N o.</b>	<b>Block Name</b>	<b>Panchayat Name</b>	<b>Villages</b>	<b>HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range</b>
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>13. Fluoride (Acceptable Range- 1 to 1.5 Milligram /litre)</b>				
<b>S.N o.</b>	<b>Block Name</b>	<b>Panchayat Name</b>	<b>Villages</b>	<b>HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range</b>
1	Chilakalurip et	Dandamudi	Manukondavaripal em	5
2	Kakumanu	Telagayapalem	Garikapadu	1
3	Tadikonda	Tadikonda	Tadikonda	1
<b>14. Arsenic (in hotspots) (Acceptable Range- 0.01 Milligram /litre)</b>				
<b>S.N o.</b>	<b>Block Name</b>	<b>Panchayat Name</b>	<b>Villages</b>	<b>HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range</b>
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA