

# Local Governance and WaSH Priorities: A Comparative Analysis of Tamil Nadu, Kerala, and Karnataka & Reflections from Praxis

Ms. N. Shanthi Maduresan,  
Programme Leader, DHAN Foundation  
Chief Executive,  
DHAN Panchayat Development Foundation  
(Subsidiary of DHAN Collective)

Global South Academic Conclave on WASH and Climate 2026

6th – 7th February 2026, Ahmedabad

**CWAS** CENTER  
FOR WATER  
AND SANITATION  
**CRDF** CEPT  
UNIVERSITY

**CEPT**  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY  
OF PLANNING

Gates Foundation

**viega** foundation

# Governance, Policy Convergence, and Community Action in WaSH

## A Comparative Analysis of Kerala, Tamil Nadu, and Karnataka

**Focus** : Aligning Ground Realities with Central Mandates (JJM, SBM-G).

**Key Theme** : Addressing the Governance-Technology Mismatch.

**Goal** : A Roadmap to 100% Coverage & Functionality.

**Sample Villages:** Karnataka, Kerala and Tamilnadu (One Panchayat from each states  
– from Aspirational District / Block)

- Karnataka: Devergonal Village Panchayat, Sorapura Block, Yadgir District
- Kerala: Chinnakanal Village Panchayat, Devikulam Block, Idukki District
- Tamilnadu: Keelkudi Village Panchayat, Thiruchuzi Block, Virudhunagar District

**Methodology** : Secondary data on financial reports of the Panchayats,  
Field visits to capture community aspirations

# Executive Summary – The "Scheme-Governance" Mismatch

## The Problem:

Achieving 100% WaSH saturation is stalled by a **"Governance-Technology Mismatch,"** not a lack of funds.

## The Reality:

States struggle to transition from **"Asset Creation"** (Capex - funded by schemes) to **"Service Delivery"** (Opex - requires local autonomy).

## The Gap:

JJM mandates 10% community contribution, but states often bypass this using subsidies, leading to a lack of ownership.

## The Verdict:

Policy convergence is required to bridge the gap between Central mandates and state-specific governance cultures.

# The Three State Paradigms

## Kerala: "The Efficiency Paradox"

High fiscal devolution and cash reserves.

Struggles with technical execution and aging infrastructure (Plan Slippage).

## Tamil Nadu: "The Dependency Trap"

High reliance on State-driven schemes (TWAD Board).

Panchayats lack decision-making power; burdened by high electricity bills.

## Karnataka: "The Fragmentation Trap"

Disconnect between District (Zilla Panchayat) planning and Village needs.

**Result: Defunct assets and heavy spending on repairs**

# Governance Architecture – Central Mandates vs. State Reality

## Jal Jeevan Mission (JJM) Implementation:

### Kerala (Integration):

JJM funds integrated into "People's Plan Campaign." Panchayats use "Plan Funds" for the state share, ensuring local control.

### Tamil Nadu (Centralization):

Executed by TWAD Board. Panchayats are "recipients," often unaware of technical specs until handover.

### Karnataka (Fragmentation):

Zilla Panchayat creates the roadmap. Targets often mismatch village realities (e.g., taps vs. dried borewells)

# The "Operation & Maintenance" Crisis – The Reactive Maintenance Cycle

## The Core Issue:

Funds are drained by "fixing broken things" rather than investing in sustainability.

## The "Repair Trap" (Karnataka):

**65% of budget** spent on tube-well repairs.

Indicates failure of source sustainability schemes (Jaladhare).

## The "Energy Trap" (Tamil Nadu):

- High-horsepower pumps lead to massive electricity bills.
- Development funds are diverted to pay power bills (High-Cost Debt)

# The Policy Gap in Maintenance

## 15th Finance Commission Misinterpretation:

Tied grants are available for "Water & Sanitation".

## Gap:

Panchayats interpret this as permission to build *new* assets rather than maintain *old* ones.

## Sanitation as the "Poor Cousin":

- Receives only ~7% of the budget compared to water supply.
- Focus remains on "liquid" (drainage) rather than "solid" waste management

# Community Institutions – Best Practices

## Kerala: Formalized Service Providers:

- **Institution:** Haritha Karma Sena (HKS) & Beneficiary Committees.
- **Mechanism:** "Green Army" collects waste door-to-door.
- **Impact:** Normalized **User Fee (₹50/month)**. This is a "contract" enforcing accountability, not just a donation.
- **Result:** Sustainable "Own Source Revenue" for WaSH

## Tamil Nadu: The Informal Workforce

- **Institution:** Self-Help Groups (SHGs) / Kalanjams.
- **Role:** Informal "Gap-Fillers." They pool money to fix motors when Panchayat funds are stuck.
- **Success:** In Madurai, SHGs formally contract to maintain toilets better than government staff.

## Karnataka: At reflected at the field

- **Institution:** Village Water & Sanitation Committees (VWSCs).
- **Status:** Mandatory under JJM but often inactive.
- **Redeeming Feature:** Social Audit Units successfully expose "ghost toilets"

# Comparative PAI (Panchayat Advancement Index) Scorecard Analysis (2022-23) on the WaSH Theme

## Inferences:

- **Keelkudi (TN)** and **Chinnakanal (Kerala)** are in the **"Performer" (Grade B)** category with scores of **62.51** and **64.15** respectively.
- **Devar Gonal (Karnataka)** lags as an **"Aspirant" (Grade C)** with a score of **50.41**,

## Strategic focus to be given as follows:

- **Keelkudi** needs to focus on **Sanitation (53.73)** to move to 'A' grade.
- **Chinnakanal** needs to solve the **Water Sufficiency (49.62)** bottleneck (likely terrain/maintenance issues).
- **Devar Gonal** requires a complete overhaul in **Clean & Green (38.27)** via the proposed "Sanitation Sub-Quota."

# Comparative Ranking of Southern States on WaSH Governance

Key Parameter	Kerala	Tamil Nadu	Karnataka
<b>1. Fiscal Decentralization</b> <i>(Autonomy to plan &amp; spend)</i>	<b>Rank: 1 (High)</b> Panchayats act as "planners" using untied <b>Plan Funds</b> to pay for state shares, ensuring high local control.	<b>Rank: 3 (Low)</b> Panchayats are often " <b>check-signers</b> " for centralized boards (TWAD). Schemes are driven by State mandates rather than local resolution.	<b>Rank: 2 (Medium)</b> Suffers from <b>fragmentation</b> . District (Zilla Panchayat) plans often override village-level (GPDP) needs, creating a top-heavy structure.
<b>2. O&amp;M Efficiency</b> <i>(Maintenance of assets)</i>	<b>Rank: 1 (Medium)</b> Better maintenance systems exist, though funds sometimes lapse ("Plan Slippage") due to technical delays.	<b>Rank: 2 (Low)</b> Paralyzed by the " <b>Energy Trap.</b> " High-horsepower pumps lead to massive electricity bills, draining development funds.	<b>Rank: 3 (Low)</b> Stuck in a severe " <b>Repair Trap.</b> " Spends <b>65% of budget</b> on tube-well repairs, indicating a failure of source sustainability.

# Comparative Ranking of Southern States on WaSH Governance

Key Parameter	Kerala	Tamil Nadu	Karnataka
<b>3. Sanitation Focus</b> (Solid Waste & Hygiene)	<b>Rank: 1 (High)</b> Holistic focus on "Ecological Sanitation" via Haritha Karma Sena. Moves beyond toilets to waste management.	<b>Rank: 2 (Medium)</b> Focus remains largely on "liquid" (drainage). However, SHGs are emerging as effective managers of community toilets in some districts.	<b>Rank: 3 (Low)</b> Sanitation is a "poor cousin," receiving only ~7% of the budget. Heavy focus on construction targets rather than usage.
<b>4. Community Role</b> (Participation & Ownership)	<b>Rank: 1 (High)</b> Formalized role of Beneficiary Committees and the Green Army (HKS) ensures active "skin in the game".	<b>Rank: 2 (Medium)</b> Informal but effective. SHGs/Kalanjams often fill gaps, pooling money to fix motors when the Panchayat fails.	<b>Rank: 3 (Low)</b> Bureaucratic. VWSCs (Village Water & Sanitation Committees) often exist only on paper.
<b>5. Financial Sustainability</b> (Revenue Generation)	<b>Rank: 1 (High)</b> Sustainable "Own Source Revenue" generated through normalized user fees (₹50/month) for waste collection.	<b>Rank: 3 (Low)</b> Deep "freebie culture" prevents water taxation. Panchayats are permanently dependent on State grants for electricity bills	<b>Rank: 2 (Low)</b> Heavily grant-dependent and volatile, though recent shifts to granular accounting (2024-25) offer hope for better tracking.

# Financial Convergence Strategy – "Green Energy"

- **Goal** : Solving the "Energy Trap" in Tamil Nadu & Karnataka.
- **Strategy** : Converge **PM-KUSUM Component C** (Solarization) with **15th FC Tied Grants**.
- **Mechanism** : Use 15th FC funds for capital cost of solar panels.
- **Impact:**
  - Converts monthly liability (bills) into a one-time asset.
  - Frees up to **50% of O&M budget** for sanitation
- **CSR for Innovation (Solving the Tech Gap):**
  - **Problem:** No state funds for "Smart" tech (leak detection).
  - **Solution:** Direct CSR funds to "**Smart Water Management Pilots**" (IoT Flow Meters).
  - **Benefit:** Provides granular data to detect leaks early.
- **Wage-Material Convergence (Solving the Maintenance Trap):**
  - Strategy:** Combine **MGNREGS** (Labor) with **SBM-G** (Material).
  - Action:** Use labour for desilting (source sustainability) and SBM-G for technical upgrades.

# Strategic Recommendation 1 – Sanitation Sub-Quotas

**Rationale:** Preventing funds from being monopolized by water supply.

**Policy Action:** Issue Government Order (GO) for "**Sanitation Sub-Quota**".

**The Rule:**

- **30% of 15th FC Tied Grants** must be ring-fenced for Solid Waste Management (SWM).
- Focus on Segregation Sheds and Composting Units, not just drains

# Strategic Recommendation 2 – Monetization via User Fees

**Shift:** Move from "Free Water" to "Service Fee".

**Mechanism:** Introduce a nominal "**Service & Repair Fee**" (e.g., ₹30-50/month).

**Marketing Strategy:**

- Market as a "**24/7 Service Assurance Premium**".
- Guarantee: Payment ensures repair within 24 hours.

**Evidence:** Kerala's HKS proves communities *will* pay for reliable service

## Strategic Recommendation 3 – Institutionalizing Maintenance

**Shift:** From "Break-Fix" to **Annual Maintenance Contracts (AMCs)**.

**Action:** Empower Panchayats to sign AMCs with local **SHG federations**.

**Benefits:**

- Ensures preventive maintenance (monthly check-ups).
- Provides formal livelihoods for women.
- Ensures local accountability

## Summary of Key Interventions

Gap Identified	Proposed Solution	Target State
Energy Trap	Solar Convergence (PM-KUSUM + 15th FC)	TN, KA
Repair Trap	Smart Water Pilots (CSR + IoT)	KA
Maintenance Gap	Formal SHG Contracts (AMCs)	TN, KA
Sanitation Neglect	30% Ring-Fenced Sub-Quota	All
Funding Gap	Service Assurance Premium (User Fee)	All

# Conclusion – The Path to 100% Coverage

**Vision:** Move from "Coverage" (Construction) to "Functionality" (Sustained Usage).

**Requirement:** A shift in governance culture—empowering Panchayats with fiscal autonomy and technical support.

## Call to Action:

- **For Government:** Enforce policy convergence (Green Energy & Sub-Quotas).
- **For Communities:** Institutionalize user fees for service assurance.
- **For Corporates:** Direct CSR to bridge the technology gap.

# Thank You

**Global South Academic Conclave on WASH and Climate 2026**

**CWAS** CENTER  
FOR WATER  
AND SANITATION  
**CRDF** CEPT  
UNIVERSITY

**CEPT**  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY  
OF PLANNING

Gates Foundation

**viega** foundation