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

Har Ghar Jal
Jal Jeevan Mission

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

Contents

Abbreviations 3
Glossary 4
1. Factsheet 6
2. Context 8
2.1. District snapshot: Prakasam 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=650) 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 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	Andhra Pradesh	Prakasam
Functionality status of FHTC at households		
Households (HHs) which received water through FHTC at least once in last 7 days (%)	98	100
Fully functional (%)	68	75
Partially functional (%)	26	24
Non-functional (%)	6	1
Quantity of water received by households		
Adequate quantity (>55 LPCD) (%)	92	96
Partially adequate quantity (> 40 LPCD - < 55 LPCD) (%)	3	3
Inadequate quantity (<40 LPCD) (%)	5	1
Regularity of water received by households		
Fully Regular Supply (as per schedule) (%)	79	82
Partially Regular Supply (not as per schedule) (%)	17	18
Irregular Supply (less than 9 months' supply) (%)	4	0
Potable (Quality) water received by households		
Potable (%)	90	94
Non-potable (%)	10	6
Residual Chlorine (RCL) detected with in permissible limits (%)	48	22
Household level indicators		
Households receiving water supply daily-7 days a week (%)	74	53
Daily HH requirement of water being met by FHTC (%)	94	92
Households reported FHTC as a primary source of drinking water (%)	75	81
Households purifying water before drinking (%)	79	68
Households paying water service delivery charges (%)	10	0
Households having coping mechanisms during scarcity (%)	30	5
Households aware of grievance redressal mechanism for reporting problems with FHTC (%)	86	100
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	94
Overall user satisfaction at the household level		
Regularity (%)	88	84
Overall quality (%)	84	84

Indicators	Andhra Pradesh	Prakasam
Village level indicators (based on village questionnaire)		
Schemes reported to be functional (%)	30	14
Villages with groundwater resource (%)	35	3
Villages having groundwater recharge structure[1] (%)	7	0
Water supply and storage status in villages		
Average no. of times water is supplied in a day	1	1
Villages having OHT/ Sump for storage of water (%)	72	97
Water quality monitoring and surveillance in the villages		
Villages with Field Test Kits (%)	39	34
Villages in which bacteriological test was done in last 1 year by VWSC/ Pani Samiti (%)	20	10
Villages reported to have a mechanism for chlorination (%)	21	21
VWSC/Pani Samiti and PWS signage in villages		
Village reported having presence of VWSC/ Pani Samiti (%)	30	3
Villages in which VWSC/ Pani Samiti is responsible for Operation & Maintenance of PWS schemes (%)	10	3
Villages in which persons are trained to use Field Test Kits (%)	33	28
Villages in which signages about JJM were observed (%)	6	3
Operation and maintenance at village		
Villages levying water service delivery to households (%)	16	14
Convergence of JJM activities with other schemes in the villages (%)	6	0
Villages having skilled manpower for Operation & Maintenance of PWS schemes (%)	32	21
Community monitoring of water wastage in villages (%)	22	17

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

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: Prakasam

District Prakasam of Andhra Pradesh has a population of 30,42,897. The district has 28 blocks. Out of 1,229 villages in the district, 202 are SC dominated and 36 are ST dominated villages. The district lies in East Coast Plain and Hill Region and receives an annual rainfall of 807mm.

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

Figure 1: District IMIS Status & Map

IMIS status:

- 159 (13% of all) villages are Har Ghar Jal
- 1070 (87% of all) villages are Non-Har ghar Jal
- Non-SC/ST dominated district
- Non JE/AES
- Yes- History of water contamination
- 838 (68% of all) villages with PWS greater 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 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
Prakasam	**29**	**639**	**29**	**650**	**64**
Andhra Pradesh	**374**	**8,739**	**374**	**8,827**	**849**

2.10. Sampled village and household profile

SAMPLED VILLAGES	SAMPLED HOUSEHOLDS
• Total no. of villages covered in the district **–** 29 • Percentage of SC dominated villages covered in the district is 14% (which is higher than the state average, i.e., 10%) • Percentage of ST dominated villages covered in the district is 0% (which is lower than the state average, i.e., 22%) • Higher proportion of **panchayat member\ panchayat secretary** interviewed at the village level • **Yes** the district reported to have any historical incidence of water contamination	• Total no. of households covered in the district **– 649** • Proportion of General - 37%, SC 20%, ST% 6, OBC 38% households • **26%** of the FHTC connections are under the name of a female member • Average household size **–** 4 • **>75%** positive user experience in 4/5 measures

3. Findings

3.1. Functionality status of FHTC at household level

A. Overall Functionality* (in %)

Figure 3: Functionality of HH tap connection



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

It has been found that 100 percent of the sampled HHs (N=649) had working tap connections (i.e., received water at least once in last 7 days). More than seven out of ten (75 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

82% 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 (in % sample within permissible range)

Quality Parameters (NV=32)	Water Samples Tested from Public Institutes			
	Anganwadi Centre	Health Facility	Schools	Others
pH (on-site)	100	100	100	100
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	100	100	100	100
Nitrate	100	100	100	100
Sulphate	100	100	100	100
Total Dissolved Solids	100	100	100	100
Bacteriological Test	100	100	88	100
Fluoride	100	100	100	100
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 water samples tested	% Samples within permissible range
pH (on-site)	649	96
Turbidity	308	100
Total Hardness	308	100
Total Alkalinity	308	96
Chloride	308	100
Ammonia	Not tested	
Iron	307	100
Nitrate	308	100
Sulphate	308	100
Total Dissolved Solids	308	100
Bacteriological Test (Absence)	304	99
Fluoride	308	100
Arsenic	No history	

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

The Residual Chlorine (RC) in the Prakasam district was found in 22% samples. It has been found that 78% of samples, had no RC. It may be mentioned that 99% of water samples passed the bacteriological contamination test. In the remaining 1% sample bacteriological contamination was present, 100% had no RC

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. 713 water samples were submitted, and 332 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, regents 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

92% 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

81% 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 (Nh=650)

% HHs purifying water before drinking	% HHs paying water service delivery charges	% HHs with booster pumps	% HHs having coping mechanism during scarcity
68%	**0%**	**7%**	**5%**

% HH aware of grievance redressal mechanism for reporting problems with FHTC	Channel for registering grievance (Nh=650*)	Key problems for reporting grievances (N=650)	% Reported complaints resolved (Nh=5)
100%	**Pump operator**	**Pipeline leakage**	100%

**HHs who reported complaints in last 1 year*

3.6. Source sustainability at the village level

Schemes based on surface and ground water

7% of schemes are reported to be based on surface water and 0% 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

3% of villages reported the presence of groundwater sources like improved dug wells and borewells, and none of them 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=29)

Presence of VWSC/Pani Samiti	VWSC/Pani Samiti responsible for O&M of PWS Schemes	% Villages – VWSC/PO trained to use FTKs	% Villages in which signages about JJM was observed
3%	3%	28%	3%

B. Water supply, storage and operation & maintenance at village level (N_V=29)

Average no. of supply in a day	% Villages levying water service delivery to HH	% Villages with skilled manpower for O&M for PWS	Community monitoring of water wastage in villages
1	14%	21%	17%

% Villages having OHT/ Sump	% Villages having faced O&M challenges	Primary points for reporting grievances	Key problems for reporting grievances
97%	3%	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=650)		In %
1	Regularity		84
2	Overall quality		84
3	Colour		78
4	Taste		70
5	Odour		80

Note:
Base (N_v)=29 means all villages sampled and covered in Prakasam district
Base (N_H)=650 means all households sampled and covered across the 29 villages in Prakasam district
Base (N_H)=650 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 available in the village	No of source of ground water available in the village
#	**Total**	**639**	**679**	**24**	**4**	**1**
1	Ardhaveedu	27	28	1		
2	Venkatachalampalli	18	19	1		
3	Veta Palem	27	28	1		
4	Lingamgunta	18	20	1	1	
5	Gonugunta	18	19	1		
6	Vemulapadu	9	10	1		
7	Papayapalli	9	10	1		
8	Somavarapeta	9	10	2		
9	Cumbum	27	28	1		
10	Kongalaveedu	27	29	1		
11	Kotha Kota	27	29	1		
12	Nallaguntla	9	10	1		
13	Komarole	27	28	1	2	
14	Uppaladinne	9	10	1		
15	Mittapalem	27	28	1		
16	Bhatla Machavaram	27	28	0	1	1
17	Potha Varam	27	28	1		
18	Ammana Brolu	27	28	1		
19	Marlapadu	9	10	1		
20	K.Bitragunta	27	28	0		
21	Pandalapadu	27	28	0		
22	Tiragaladinne	27	28	0		
23	Lingasamudram	27	28	1		
24	Chevuru	27	29	0		
25	Bheemavaram	27	35	1		
26	Old Singaraya Konda	27	28	1		
27	Ayyavaripalli	18	19	0		
28	J.Pangulur	27	28	1		
29	Devarampadu	27	28	1		

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)**
#	**Total**	**75**	**96**	**82**	**94**	**100**
1	Ardhaveedu	100	100	100	100	100
2	Venkatachalampalli	78	78	100	100	100
3	Veta Palem	100	100	100	100	100
4	Lingamgunta	100	100	100	100	100
5	Gonugunta	100	100	100	100	100
6	Vemulapadu	0	100	0	100	100
7	Papayapalli	0	100	44	0	100
8	Somavarapeta	44	100	44	100	100
9	Cumbum	89	89	100	100	100
10	Kongalaveedu	57	100	61	96	100
11	Kotha Kota	0	100	52	0	100
12	Nallaguntla	33	100	33	100	100
13	Komarole	15	89	22	100	100
14	Uppaladinne	100	100	100	100	100
15	Mittapalem	93	100	100	93	100
16	Bhatla Machavaram	48	78	70	100	100
17	Potha Varam	22	96	22	100	100
18	Ammana Brolu	96	100	100	96	100
19	Marlapadu	100	100	100	100	100
20	K.Bitragunta	96	100	100	96	100
21	Pandalapadu	100	100	100	100	100
22	Tiragaladinne	100	100	100	100	100
23	Lingasamudram	100	100	100	100	100
24	Chevuru	64	96	68	100	100
25	Bheemavaram	79	100	79	100	100
26	Old Singaraya Konda	82	82	96	100	100
27	Ayyavaripalli	94	94	100	100	100
28	J.Pangulur	100	100	100	100	100
29	Devarampadu	96	96	100	100	100

** 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	Giddalur	Kotha Kota	Kotha Kota	27

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	Ardhaveedu	Ardhaveedu	Ardhaveedu	0	27
2	Chimakurthy	Muvva Vari Palem	Gonugunta	0	18
3	Cumbum	Cumbum	Cumbum	0	27
4	Darsi	Venkatachalampalli	Venkatachalampalli	0	18
5	Giddalur	Kongalaveedu	Kongalaveedu	0	1
6	Gudluru	Chevuru	Chevuru	0	27
7	Hanumanthunipadu	Vemulapadu	Vemulapadu	0	9
8	J.Pangulur	J.Pangulur	J.Pangulur	0	27
9	Kandukuru	Pandalapadu	Pandalapadu	0	1
10	Kondepi	Muppavaram	Mittapalem	0	27
11	Lingasamudram	Lingasamudram	Lingasamudram	0	27
12	Maddi Padu	Lingamgunta	Lingamgunta	0	19
13	Naguluppalapadu	Ammana Brolu	Ammana Brolu	0	27
14		Potha Varam	Potha Varam	0	27
15	Ongole	Devarampadu H/W	Devarampadu	0	26
16	Pamur	Nutchupoda	Tiragaladinne	0	27
17	Ponnaluru	Uppladinne	Uppaladinne	0	9
18	Santhanuthalapadu	Madduluru	Bhatla Machavaram	0	26
19	Singarayakonda	Singaraya Konda	Old Singaraya Konda	0	27
20	Tangutur	Marlapadu	Marlapadu	0	9
21	Ulavapadu	Bheemavaram	Bheemavaram	0	30
22	V.V.Palem	Ayyavaripalli	Ayyavaripalli	0	18
23	Vetapalem	Ramanna Peta	Veta Palem	0	27
24	Zarugumalli	K.Bitragunta	K.Bitragunta	0	27

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

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

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

S.No.	Block Name	Panchayat Name	Villages	HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range
1	Zarugumalli	K.Bitragunta	K.Bitragunta	1

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

S.No.	Block Name	Panchayat Name	Villages	HHs outside the acceptable/permissible range
1	Bestavaripeta	Bestavaripeta	Papayapalli	9
2	Giddalur	Kongalaveedu	Kongalaveedu	1
3	Zarugumalli	K.Bitragunta	K.Bitragunta	1

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**
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
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	Kondepi	Muppavaram	Mittapalem	2
2	Naguluppalapadu	Ammana Brolu	Ammana Brolu	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