Using government data, this brief reports on trends for SBM-Gramin along the following parameters:

- Allocations and expenditures
- Physical progress of toilets built
- Expenditures incurred under Information, Education and Communication (IEC) activities

In addition, this brief reports findings from a fund tracking survey (PAISA) conducted in December 2015. The survey covered close to 7,500 Households, spread across 10 districts in 5 states in India.

Cost share: Funds for total sanitation are provided primarily through GOI. For Individual Household Latrines (IHHL), states and beneficiaries are expected to contribute a share as well.

### HIGHLIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>₹9,000cr</th>
<th>49%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOI allocation for SBM in FY 2016-17</td>
<td>of GOI funds released in FY 2015-16 till February</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY & ANALYSIS

- Allocations for SBM-Gramin increased over three-fold from ₹2,850 crore in FY 2014-15 to ₹9,000 crore in FY 2016-17. Part of this jump is due to the introduction of the SBM cess in November 2015.

- Release of SBM funds to states has been slow. Till February 2016, only 49 per cent of the total allocation had been sanctioned by Government of India (GOI).

- Construction of Individual Household Latrines (IHHL) accounted for 97 per cent of the total expenditure between April 2015 and February 2016.

- Information, Education and Communication (IEC) activities accounted for only 1 per cent of total expenditure. This is a 3 percentage point drop from FY 2014-15.

- According to Accountability Initiative's district survey, in the last two years, less than 50 per cent of eligible households who had applied to SBM for a toilet construction grant actually received it.

- Most households were unaware of the Swachhata Doots and Panchayat Samiti in their village.
In 2014, GOI launched the Swachh Bharat Mission-Gramin (SBM-G) – a community-led rural sanitation programme aimed at providing access to sanitation facilities and eradicating the practice of open defecation by 2019.

**Allocations**: There is a 38 per cent increase in GOI allocations for FY 2016-17 from FY 2015-16. When compared to FY 2014-15, this is more than a three-fold increase.

At the start of FY 2015-16, GOI allocated ₹2,625 crore for rural sanitation. The revised allocation was increased to ₹6,525 crore in the same year by passing supplementary budgets in July and December. This increase is, in part, due to the introduction of a 0.5 per cent Swachh Bharat cess introduced in November 2015.

**Budgets for SBM are determined through a process of negotiation between GOI and state governments. The negotiation is based on project proposals called Annual Implementation Plans (AIP) developed at the Gram Panchayat (GP) level and consolidated at the state level. Final approvals rest with the Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation (MDWS). Funds are released based on approved budgets.**

**Releases**: Release of funds to state governments in FY 2015-16 has been low compared to previous years. Till February 2016, only 49 per cent of the total allocation had been sanctioned by GOI (release numbers calculated from date of sanction). In contrast, GOI had released more than 71 per cent of its revised allocations in FY 2014-15 by February 2015.

There have been improvements in the pace of fund release. In FY 2014-15, only 4 per cent of funds had been released in the first quarter. In FY 2015-16, this improved to 28 per cent.

However, given that only 46 per cent of allocations have been released so far, it is likely that there will be bunching of expenditure in the last month. In FY 2014-15 for instance, nearly half the releases (48 per cent) were in the last quarter of the financial year.

---

**TRENDS IN GOI ALLOCATIONS AND RELEASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GOI allocations for rural sanitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-15</td>
<td>2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015-16</td>
<td>6,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016-17</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note**: All figures are in ₹ crore. All figures are revised estimates, except for FY 2016-17, which are budgeted estimates. In FY 2015-16, GOI had passed Supplementary budgets resulting in an increase in total allocations to ₹8,920 crore. However, the revised estimates were substantially less at ₹6,525 crore.
Expenditure performance: Low releases in FY 2015-16 have resulted in an improvement in expenditure figures, as states have less money to spend. In FY 2014-15, only 58 per cent of total funds available (opening balances and releases by state and GOI) had been spent. In FY 2015-16, till February 2016, on average more than 100 per cent of funds available had been used.

There have been variations in expenditure performance across states.

In FY 2014-15 for instance, Madhya Pradesh had spent 55 per cent of its funds available, while in FY 2015-16, by February, it had already spent nearly double its available funds. Similarly, expenditure was greater than funds available in states such as Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal, Odisha, Jharkhand and Karnataka.

In contrast, expenditures were low in Kerala. In FY 2015-16, till February, Kerala had spent only 32 per cent of its available funds, 3 percentage points less than FY 2014-15.

The pace of expenditure has also been faster. In FY 2015-16, till the third quarter of the financial year, 89 per cent of funds available had been spent, compared to 20 per cent in FY 2014-15.
Construction of IHHL accounted for 97% of total expenditure between April 2015 and February 2016.

COMPONENT-WISE TRENDS IN EXPENDITURES

- Implementation of SBM involves a number of activities. These include:
  - Start-up activities, such as a needs assessment and subsequent preparation of plans
  - IEC activities
  - Construction of IHHL
  - Construction of community sanitary complexes
  - Construction of school toilets and hygiene education
  - Construction of Anganwadi toilets
  - Setting up of Rural Sanitary Marts (RSM) or production centres and retail outlets responsible for manufacturing and marketing low-cost hardware.

- Construction of IHHL accounted for 97 per cent of total expenditure between April 2015 and February 2016. IEC expenditure, on the other hand, accounted for only 1 per cent of total expenditure. This is a 3 percentage point drop from FY 2014-15.

- **IHHL**: IHHL are basic low-cost toilets provided to Below Poverty Line (BPL) households and certain categories of Above Poverty Line (APL) households, such as Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, small and marginal farmers, landless labourers, physically handicapped, and women-headed households, at subsidised rates. The cost is shared between GOI, state governments and beneficiaries.

IEC EXPENDITURE DROPPED FROM 4% IN FY 2014-15 TO 1% OF THE TOTAL EXPENDITURE TILL FEBRUARY IN FY 2015-16

With the launch of SBM in 2014, the unit cost of IHHL increased from ₹10,000 per unit to ₹12,000.

In FY 2015-16, the share of IHHL in total expenditure increased, compared to FY 2014-15. For instance, while Sikkim had spent only 36 per cent of its total expenditure on IHHL in FY 2014-15, this increased to 68 per cent in FY 2015-16 (till February). Similarly, share of IHHL in Mizoram’s total expenditure jumped from 7 per cent to 63 per cent during the same period.
In December 2015, Accountability Initiative conducted a facility level expenditure tracking survey (PAISA survey). The survey aimed to capture the flow of monies at the facility/household level across key social sector schemes. These are the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA), Integrated Child Development Scheme (ICDS) and the Swachh Bharat Mission (SBM). In this section we report on some of our key findings from the SBM survey. The survey covered 7,500 households, across 10 districts in 5 states in India. These include Bihar - Nalanda and Purnea, Himachal Pradesh - Kangra and Solan, Madhya Pradesh - Sagar, Maharashtra - Satara, Rajasthan - Jaipur, Udaipur, Jhalawar and Jhunjhunu.

Only 48 per cent of households surveyed had a complete toilet across all districts

- Only 17 per cent households in Purnea (Bihar) and 18 per cent in Udaipur (Rajasthan) reported having a toilet.
- Coverage is high in Solan and Kangra districts (Himachal Pradesh) and Satara (Maharashtra).

Less than 30% of households in Purnea (Bihar) and Udaipur (Rajasthan) have a complete toilet

Source: Accountability Initiative Fund Tracking Survey (PAISA), December 2015.

The focus of SBM expenditure in FY 2015-16 was on IHHL construction

22% of households in Udaipur constructed a toilet in the last 2 financial years

23 per cent of surveyed households constructed toilets in the last 2 financial years
• SBM is designed to ensure toilet access. To study the effectiveness of SBM, the survey asked eligible households whether they had constructed toilets through government grants in the last two years. Since the launch of SBM in 2014, toilet construction has been low.

61 per cent of surveyed households that did not apply for a SBM grant reported that the primary reason was lack of knowledge
• 85 per cent of households in Nalanda (Bihar) and 79 per cent in Jaipur (Rajasthan) said the primary reason for not applying for grants was lack of awareness.

In the last 2 years, 43 per cent of surveyed households that were eligible and applied for an SBM grant received it
• Around 30 per cent of households in Purrea (Bihar), Sagar (Madhya Pradesh), Jhalawar and Jhunjhunu (Rajasthan) who applied for an SBM grant received funds.
Most households were unaware of the Swachhata Doots and Panchayat Samiti in their village

- The SBM mandates that Swachhata Doots (cleanliness messengers) are employed in each village to promote awareness and encourage toilet usage. As the graph below shows, households in most districts were unaware that their village had Swachhata Doots, which suggests that the reach of awareness efforts is low.

Source: Accountability Initiative Fund Tracking Survey (PAISA), December 2015.

At least one member defecates in the open across 48% of the total households surveyed

Source: Accountability Initiative Fund Tracking Survey (PAISA), December 2015.