

**5**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN DEVELOPMENT  
(2009-2010)**

**FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA**

**MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

**SOLID WASTE MANGEMENT**

(Action Taken by the Government on the Recommendations contained in the Thirty Eighth Report of the Committee on Urban Development (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) on Solid Waste Management )

**FIFTH REPORT**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

March, 2010 / Phalguna, 1931 (Saka)

**FIFTH REPORT**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN DEVELOPMENT  
(2009-2010)**

**(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

**MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

**SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT**

(Action Taken by the Government on the Recommendations contained in the Thirty Eighth Report of the Standing Committee on Urban Development (Fourteenth Lok Sabha)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 21.4.2010  
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 21.4.2010



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

March, 2010/Phalguna, 1931 (Saka)

C.U.D No. 55

Price: Rs. ....

(C) 2009 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Twelfth Edition) and printed by the Indian Press, Delhi-110033.

## CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE .....	PAGE .....(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(v)

## REPORT

<b>CHAPTER I</b>	Repot.....	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER II</b>	Recommendations/ Observations that have been accepted by the Government.....	<b>20</b>
<b>CHAPTER III</b>	Recommendations/ Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies.....	<b>40</b>
<b>CHAPTER IV</b>	Recommendations/ Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee.....	<b>45</b>
<b>CHAPTER V</b>	Recommendations / Observations in respect of which replies of the Government are still awaited.....	<b>56</b>

## APPENDICIS

- I. Minutes of the Seventh sitting of the Standing Committee on Urban Development (2008-09) held on 11<sup>th</sup> February, 2010. .... **59**
  
- II. Analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty Sixth Report of the Committee (14<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) .... **61**

**COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN DEVELOPMENT (2009-2010)**

*Shri Sharad Yadav* - *Chairman*

**MEMBERS**

**LOK SABHA**

2. Shri J.P. Agarwal
3. Shri Praveen Singh Aron
4. Shri Gajanan D. Babar
5. Shri Partap Singh Bajwa
6. Shri Ambica Banerjee
7. Smt. Priya Dutt
8. Shri Eknath M. Gaikwad
9. Sk. Saidul Haque
10. Shri Kailash Joshi
11. Shri Mohinder Singh Kaypee
12. Shri Ramesh Kumar
13. Shri Radhe Mohan Singh
14. Shri P.C. Mohan
15. Dr. Sanjeev Ganesh Naik
16. Shri Sonawane Pratap Narayanrao
17. Shri Baijayant Panda
18. Prof. Ramshankar
19. Shri Kadir Rana
20. Dr. Kirit Premjibhai Solanki
21. Shri Adagooru H. Vishwanath

**RAJYA SABHA**

22. Shri Parvez Hashmi
23. Shri Rajeev Shukla
24. Shri Surendra Motilal Patel
25. Shri Krishan Lal Balmiki
26. Shri Amir Alam Khan
27. Shri Manohar Joshi
28. Shri Varinder Singh Bajwa
29. Shri Shyam Benegal
30. Vacant
31. Vacant

## **SECRETARIAT**

- |                            |   |                     |
|----------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. Shri T.K. Mukherjee     | - | Joint Secretary     |
| 2. Smt. Anita B. Panda     | - | Additional Director |
| 3. Smt. Emma C. Barwa      | - | Committee Officer   |
| 4. Shri Sumit Kumar Grover | - | Committee Assistant |

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban Development (2009-10) having been authorized by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Fifth Report (15<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-Eighth Report (14<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Urban Development on the subject "Solid Waste Management" of the Ministry of Urban Development.

2. The Thirty- Eighth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2009. Replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received in March, 2009.

3. The Standing Committee on Urban Development considered and adopted this Report at their sitting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February, 2010.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty–Eighth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee is given at Annexure-II.

5. For the facility of reference and convenience, the Recommendations/ Observations of the Committee have been printed in bold letters in the body of the Report.

**NEW DELHI;**  
**11<sup>th</sup> February, 2010**  
**Magha, 1931 (*Saka*)**

**SHARAD YADAV**  
**Chairman,**  
**Standing Committee on Urban Development**

# REPORT

## CHAPTER I

This Report of the Standing Committee on Urban Development deals with the action taken by the Government on the Recommendations contained in their Thirty Eighth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) on "Solid Waste Management" relating to the Ministry of Urban Development, which was presented to the Lok Sabha and laid in Rajya Sabha on 18<sup>th</sup> December, 2008.

1.2 Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 23 recommendations contained in the Report. These have been categorized as follows:

(i) Recommendations/Observations, which have been accepted by the Government (Chapter-II):

Sl. Nos. 1, 4, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21 and 23

(Total 12)

(ii) Recommendations/Observations, which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the replies of the Government (Chapter-III):

Sl. Nos. 7, 10 and 19

(Total 3 )

(iii) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration (Chapter-IV):

Sl. Nos. 2, 3, 5, 9, 12 and 22

(Total 6)

(iv) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited (Chapter-V):

Sl. Nos. 11 and 17

(Total 2)

1.3 The Committee trust that utmost importance would be given by the Government to the implementation of their Recommendations. In cases, where it is not possible for the Government to implement the Recommendations(s) either fully or partially, for any reason, the matter may be reported to the Committee with reasons for non-implementation.

1.4 The Committee further desire that Action Taken Notes on the Recommendations/Observations contained in Chapter-I of this Report and final replies in respect of the Recommendations for which only interim replies have been furnished by the Government (included in Chapter-V) may be furnished to them at the earliest and in any case, not later than three months of the presentation of this Report.

1.5 The Committee will now deal with the action taken by the Government on some of their recommendations in the succeeding paragraph:

## **Recommendation (Para No. 2)**

### **Implementation of Municipal Solid Waste (Management & Handling) Rules, 2000**

1.6 In their report, the Committee had observed as below:-

The Committee note that the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India, have notified the 'Municipal Solid Waste (Management and Handling) Rules, 2000 through which specific directives have been issued to the urban local bodies, District Administrations and Departments of Urban Development of the State Governments to ensure proper and scientific management of municipal solid waste. The Ministry of Urban Development have not yet formulated any National Waste Policy for Solid Waste Management as according to them the MSW (M&H) Rules, 2000 act as the policy to handle MSW. However, the Ministry of Urban Development brought out a Manual on Municipal Solid Waste Management in May, 2000 to facilitate the ULBs to address issues relating to the Solid Waste Management. In this connection, the Committee are distressed to note that the deadline of December, 2003 for implementation of MSW (M & H) Rules, 2000 could not be achieved due to huge capital investment required to implement, operate and maintain solid waste management projects. Several other impediments like lack of planning, absence of segregation of waste at source, inadequate house-to-house collection, transportation, treatment and disposal of municipal solid waste, etc., have been identified by the Government in implementation of the MSW Rules, 2000. Consequently, the Committee note that the deadline for State Departments of Urban Development and Urban Local Bodies for implementation of these rules has been extended upto December 2008. The

Committee are sure that even this deadline would not be met since most of the ULBs and State Governments still lack requisite investment and infrastructure facilities for the same. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Ministry should impress upon the States that they should take all steps necessary to ensure that MSW (M&H) Rules, 2000 are strictly implemented by all concerned as early as possible. At the same time, the Committee also recommend that while sanctioning the Solid Waste Management Projects submitted by the States under the Centrally-Sponsored Schemes like Jawharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) and Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme in Small and Medium Towns (UIDSSMT), the Government should ensure the implementation of MSW (M&H) Rules, 2000 as a pre-condition.

#### 1.7 The Government have replied as below:

"The Ministry had conducted Regional Workshops between November 2007 and February 2008 at various places viz. Chennai, Nagpur, Chandigarh, Bhubaneswar, Guwahati and Dehradun to impart training to the personnel working in various ULBs, parastatals and State Nodal Agencies for preparation of Detailed Project Reports under UIG and UIDSSMT of JNNURM as per the guidelines of Municipal Solid Waste (Management and Handling) Rules, 2000 and Manual on Municipal Solid Waste Management published by this Ministry. Guidelines for preparation of DPRs had also been circulated to the participants in soft and hard copies for their reference and further action. These steps are expected to enhance the knowledge and expertise of the participants for preparation of qualitative detailed project reports for consideration under JNNURM.

Under JNNURM, while appraising the DPRs in respect of solid waste management schemes posed by the ULBs, the CPHEEO (the technical wing of the Ministry) examines the DPRs with reference to the guidelines of MSW (M&H) Rules, 2000 and Manual on Municipal Solid Waste Management published by this Ministry and also the

characteristics of waste being generated by the concerned ULBs, their quantity, population, soil condition, topography and other technical parameters. While approving the DPRs, the CPHEEO recommends source segregation including recovery of recyclables so as to minimize quantum of waste for treatment facilities. Technology options such as composting, vermi-composting, energy recovery through RDF etc. for treatment of waste also reviewed based on the field conditions and characteristics of the wastes and technical approval accorded accordingly. "

**1.8. The Committee find the reply of the Ministry inadequate to address the most significant point raised in their recommendation. The implementation of MSW (Management & Handling) Rules, 2000 is required to be carried out by State Departments and Urban Local Bodies throughout the entire country while the Ministry's reply is confined to JNNURM only, which at present is applicable for 65 cities only out of a total of 5161 cities / towns all over India. Though the Committee appreciate the efforts of the Ministry in assessing the DPRs submitted by the Mission cities for Solid Waste Management schemes in the light of MSW Rules as well as in conducting workshops to raise awareness on the issue, they feel that the requisite thrust by the concerned authorities to ensure responsible handling of municipal solid waste still remains to be seen. Moreover, even the number of Solid Waste projects under the Mission is only thirty-seven till date, which cannot be termed as impressive. Besides, the CPHEEO is understood to have rejected the DPR submitted for Solid Waste Management scheme in the city of Nashik. The Committee would like to be apprised of the latest status in this case, as well as the increase, if any, in the number of Solid Waste Management Schemes approved under JNNURM. The Committee are of the firm opinion that unless all the cities and towns gear up to reduce and manage their waste on a war footing as envisaged under MSW Rules, 2000,**

**urban people will continue to face pandemics and hardships and the country will have to suffer ridicule among the international community for the increasing garbage mountains all around its major cities. The Committee, therefore, urge the Ministry to continue providing expert guidance to ULBs of Mission cities as well as other cities to follow the rules stringently for scientific handling and professional management of their solid waste.**

### **Recommendation (Para No. 3)**

#### **National Urban Sanitation Policy**

1.9 In their report, the Committee had observed as below:

Open defecation, particularly, near urban slums and railway tracks is still prevalent in most of the cities and urban areas. It acts as a major hindrance in achieving 'clean city' status. The Committee are happy to note that the long awaited National Urban Sanitation Policy has been approved by the Cabinet on 3rd October, 2008 during the International Year of Sanitation, with a view to formulate policy guidelines, strategies for implementation of sewerage and sanitation facilities in the urban areas, so as to eliminate open defecation in the cities and towns. To achieve the goals of National Urban Sanitation Policy, the Government is reportedly contemplating steps like awareness generation and behavioural change, integrated citywide sanitation system, sanitary and safe disposal, proper maintenance and management of all sanitary installation, etc. in due course. The Committee feel that for effective implementation of the National Urban Sanitation Policy, a time-bound action plan with specified targets focussing on the prevailing conditions in a State needs to be framed by the Government, with adequate financial support so that ULBs could be strengthened to provide substantial sanitation services.

The Committee hope that the Central Government and the States will take necessary steps to achieve this goal.

1.10 The Government have replied as under:

"Sanitation is a State subject and hence it is the responsibility of the States to formulate and implement programmes for elimination of open defecation as well as safe disposal of human excreta. However, the Central Government supplements the efforts of behavioural changes among public through awareness creation and seeks to promote open defecation free cities. In addition, the policy enunciates development of state sanitation strategies which include setting up of State level standards, asset creation, capacity building & training, reaching the urban poor, monitoring & evaluation etc. The policy also requires the preparation of City Sanitation Plan by the respective ULBs to achieve the goal of 100% sanitation and open defecation free cities in a time bound manner. The implementation of the City Sanitation Plan shall be monitored by the City Sanitation Task Force. A Programme of awareness generation is under formulation. Requests have also been received from some states for financial assistance for the formulation of state sanitation strategies and city sanitation plans.

**1.11 While the Committee agree with the Ministry's view that the subject of sanitation falls under the purview of State Governments and thus, it is their responsibility to formulate and implement sanitation plans and programmes, they, in their original recommendation, had felt the need for a time-bound plan with specific target. Now the Committee note from the Annual Report (2008-2009) of the Ministry that there indeed is a target set under the National Urban Sanitation Policy, which is, hundred per cent sanitation during the 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan (2007-2012) with resources to the extent of Rs. 50 crore over the 5-year period. The Ministry have also not reflected another fact in their**

**Action Taken Reply that a National Advisory Group on Urban Sanitation already exists with representatives of various Ministries including that of Urban Development, external experts and State Government Representatives to assist them in implementing the Sanitation Policy. The Committee believe that counselling State Governments on achieving the desired goal of 100% sanitation and making appropriate suggestions for the same is a part of the mandate of this Advisory Group. They feel that in view of the history of dismal performance of earlier sanitation scheme like the ILCS (Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme), a sense of accountability as well as commitment is required on the part of the Central Ministry , the State Governments and various stakeholders to bring requisite change in the current sanitation and hygiene scenario in urban households. Therefore, the Committee reiterate their earlier stand and would like to be apprised about the cities, which have prepared their Sanitation Plans, as well as any financial assistance extended to them from the Central Government.**

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 5)**

##### **Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) for Municipal Solid Waste**

1.12 In their report, the Committee had observed as below:-

Lack of funds with Urban Local Bodies has been identified as a major hindrance in proper solid waste management. In this context, the Committee have been informed that Kerala State Government has created a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) for power generation by integrating its 60 municipalities with three intermediate depots to collect garbage and waste to dispose it off in large containers. Ahmedabad and Bangalore cities have also reportedly created SPV for management of municipal solid waste. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the

Government should closely monitor these initiatives and if found suitable, encourage other States, cities and ULBs to create such SPVs to address the shortage of funds. The Committee also recommend that the Government should examine the feasibility of developing, with adequate financial support, model clean cities in each State which demonstrate innovative MSW Management system.

1.13 The Government have replied as under:

“One of the optional reforms indicated in the JNNURM guidelines is to encourage Public Private Partnership. Under the approved JNNURM schemes, some cities have envisaged Public Private Partnership in lieu of contribution of ULBs. In certain schemes, the operation and maintenance of compost plants have been proposed for funding through private partnership. For instance, Coimbatore city has tied up with a private partner to set up compost plant/ Landfill site by the ULB share of the SWM project approved under JNNURM including O&M facilities created for a period of 20 years. Similarly, Surat city is contemplating entrusting construction and O&M of compost plant to a private operator. Secretary (UD) has issued an Advisory on SWM to all the States emphasizing the need for preparation of good quality DPR, timely implementation of the approved SWM project, its effective O&M and levy of reasonable user charge to generate adequate revenue to make the scheme self-sustainable in the long run.”

**1.14 The Committee are not convinced by the reply tendered by the Ministry on their recommendation to encourage other States, cities and ULBs to create SPVs to address the shortage of funds as well as to examine the feasibility of developing ‘model clean cities’. There is no response from the Ministry on the latter part of the recommendation and instead, the Committee have been merely informed that encouragement of Public Private Partnership is an optional reform indicated in the JNNURM under which few cities have tied up with private partners to set up compost plants / landfill sites. The Committee had**

**recommended that the Ministry should closely monitor these initiatives. They are aware that a fully-functional JNNURM Directorate exists in the Ministry, which can coordinate with IRMAs (Independent Review and Monitoring Agencies) set up / proposed to be set up in 36 cities / States to know best practices followed by some of the cities like Coimbatore and Surat in handling their solid waste. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation that developing ‘model clean cities’ or encouraging and awarding cities with exemplary performance in the sanitation field will encourage other cities to follow suit. Specific response of the Government on the same would be appreciated.**

### **Recommendation (Para No. 9)**

#### **Non-Completion of Pilot Projects in Solid Waste Management in Airfield Towns**

1.15 In their report, the Committee had observed as below:-

The Committee are distressed to note that though the scheme of Solid Waste Management in 10 airfield towns was scheduled to be completed by March, 2008, it has been delayed badly in Pune, Tezpur and Hindon. Only 45 per cent, 10 per cent and 45 per cent of work has been completed respectively in the three towns as on 30.6.2008. The progress of work in respect of project at Bareilly has also remained incomplete as per the information furnished to the Committee. They are perturbed to note that despite their recommendation in 31<sup>st</sup> Report on Demands for Grants (2008-2009) (14<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) of the Ministry of Urban Development urging the Ministry to take necessary action in the matter for urgently completing the schemes in the remaining 4 towns, substantial amount of work is still left, particularly in Tezpur. While urging for completion of these schemes without further delay, the Committee would like to be apprised of the present status of implementation of these projects, along with the steps taken by the

Ministry in 2008 to remove the impediments in the projects pending till date. They hope that the Ministry would take up the matter concerning Tezpur with appropriate authorities urgently lest the very objective of the scheme would stand defeated.

1.16 The Government have replied as under:

“The Tezpur project was mainly delayed due to non-availability of land for the project. Now, the land is in the possession of the State Government which will be handed over to NBCC for execution of the project. NBCC has called for tenders for implementation of Tezpur project. It is hoped that the Tezpur project may be completed by the end of this year.

As regards the Bareilly project, it is stated that the project was held up for want of funds. The funds have now been released and it is likely that the project will be completed within the year 2009.

As regards the Pune project, execution of work started at site in June, 2006 but was stopped due to local villagers disturbance and non-availability of land. The problem has been resolved by the ULB in September, 2008 and the work is in progress. It is likely to be completed by March, 2010.”

**1.17 The Committee, being extremely concerned about the delays in timely completion of the pilot project on Solid Waste Management in 10 airfield towns, have been urging the Ministry of Urban Development since their 31<sup>st</sup> Report (presented in April, 2008) to resolve the matter with the concerned authorities as well as State Governments and complete the project so that its intended objectives could be achieved. However, they are disappointed to note that although two decades have passed since the decision was taken to cover all 10 airfield towns by the 1<sup>st</sup> year of 11<sup>th</sup> Plan (i.e. 2007), yet the fate of the project in four towns**

namely Pune, Tezpur, Bareilly and Hindon is still unclear. What is further disquieting is the fact mentioned in the Ministry's latest Annual Report, which states that the project has been examined by the C&AG of India too and has received adverse comments from them for the lack of adequate and sustainable efforts on the part of the Ministry.

Further, from the reply tendered to the Committee in the instant case, they observe that the Pune project is likely to be completed by March 2010. The Committee recall that earlier, in reply to their recommendation on the matter as contained in their 31<sup>st</sup> report, the Government had stated that the Pune project was expected to be completed by December, 2008. From the foregoing the Committee are convinced that the likelihood of Tezpur and Bareilly projects planned to be completed by the end of this year (2009) is quite uncertain. Besides, no information has been shared with the Committee on the Hindon project, where the U.P. Government was stated to be considering an alternate site at village Dasna. The Committee expect the Ministry as well as the concerned State Governments to show more commitment towards the goals set under the pilot project, and thus, reiterate their recommendation that the pilot project must be completed in all the remaining four towns expeditiously.

## **Recommendation (Para No. 12)**

### **Monitoring of Solid Waste Management (SWM) Projects**

1.18 In their report, the Committee had observed as below:-

The Committee find that although monitoring of Solid Waste Management is primarily not the responsibility of the Ministry of Urban Development, the Ministry, however, monitor the implementation of approved Solid Waste Management projects under the Centrally- sponsored schemes through various mechanisms such as Quarterly Project Reports, field visits etc. The Committee have been further apprised that for monitoring and management of sanctioned projects of various sectors including SWM under JNNURM, the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) at ULB level and Project Monitoring Unit (PMU) at state level are being set up. The Committee are, however, constrained to note that in spite of the aforesaid efforts taken by the Central Government, only 30 PIUs, 12 PMUs and 4 Independent Review and Monitoring Agencies (IRMA) have been set up so far to monitor and manage the sanctioned projects. The Committee feel that it is grossly inadequate in view of the fact that the issue of managing Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) concerns 5161 cities and towns. The Committee, therefore, recommend that to give a major fillip to this programme, the Government should meet frequently and make constant dialogue with the State Governments so that more project implementation and monitoring units could be set up at the ULB/ State levels. Further, the performance of PIUs, PMUs and IRMAs also needs to be assessed in order to ensure that no loopholes are left in the execution of SWM projects.

1.19 The Government have replied as below:

“ As per the scheme, the PMU, PIU and IRMA are to be appointed under the UIG component of JNNURM. The JNNURM Directorate has brought out a tool kit for appointment of Independent Review and Monitoring Agencies (IRMA). IRMA are agencies to be appointed by the States for monitoring of progress of implementation of the projects sanctioned under JNNURM. The proposals of Kerala, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Maharashtra, West Bengal, Puducherry, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka for appointment of IRMA have been approved by the CSMC. IRMAs have been established in Andhra Pradesh , Gujarat, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Rajasthan. The States of Assam, Bihar, Delhi, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu are in the process of appointing IRMAs. For the States of Chandigarh, J&K, Punjab, Nagaland, Sikkim, Tripura, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Mizoram, Meghalaya, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Orissa and Goa, Ministry of Urban Development has initiated steps for appointment of IRMAs on behalf of the States. 8 no. of States are yet to submit proposals. 40 no. of PIUs have been approved and 23 no. have been set up. 25 no. of ULBs are yet to submit proposals.

**1.20 The Committee acknowledge the constant efforts of the Ministry through which 40 Project Monitoring Units and 36 IRMAs have either been set up or are in the processing stage in various cities / States. However, they note that JNNURM is due to complete its fifth year out of the seven-year mandate, yet all 65 cities still do not have a monitoring mechanism in place to ensure that the projects under the UIG component of the Mission are implemented appropriately. As various well-conceived policies and programmes of the Government become ineffective due to improper implementation, strict monitoring of the same is absolutely essential. Lack monitoring of Solid Waste projects straight-away translates into cities becoming an eyesore with their garbage mounds. The Committee, therefore, recommend that a fast-paced processing /approval of IRMAs at the Central**

**level and setting up of PIUs at ULB / State levels is the need of the hour. They also trust that the already set up monitoring units and agencies have initiated monitoring 37 solid waste projects approved under JNNURM so far. The Committee desire to be apprised about further progress on the matter.**

**Recommendation No.17 (Para No. 17)**

**PROJECTS FOR WASTE CHARACTERIZATION AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES**

1.21 In their report, the Committee had observed as follows:-

The Committee note that a scheme for financial assistance for waste characterization and feasibility studies was introduced in 1992 under which the Ministry had sanctioned 3 projects viz. (i) the municipal solid waste management project, Nagar Nigam Ghaziabad at a cost of Rs. 55 lakh, (ii) Pilot project for Solid Waste Management for Hyderabad city, Municipal corporation, Hyderabad at a cost of Rs. 53.3 lakh and (iii) Pilot project for Solid Waste Management in Shimla at a total cost of Rs. 25 lakh. However, none of these projects have been reported to be commissioned. The Committee would like to be apprised of the date of sanction of these projects, the reasons for their non-commissioning and the actual progress along with expenditure incurred, if any, on these projects. The committee strongly urge the Government to fix responsibility for the failure of commissioning these projects.

1.22 The Government have replied as under:

**Urban Solid Waste Management in Shimla:** The Ministry of Environment & Forests had released an amount of Rs. 25 lakhs to H.P Pollution Control Board, Shimla in March, 1996 for setting up of a demonstration project on urban solid waste management facility in Shimla. However, due to some technological and temperature constraints at Shimla,

the project was shifted to Nahan, wherein the temperature conditions was found to be adequate to facilitate composting. As per the information from the H.P. State Pollution Control Board, the project has been executed and completed at Nahan.

**Pilot project for Solid Waste Management for vermin-composting in Hyderabad**

**City:** The Municipal Commissioner of Hyderabad city had submitted a proposal to the Ministry of Environment & Forests (MoEF) in the year 1995 for a Pilot project for vermi-composting at Hyderabad city. The total project cost was Rs. 431 lakhs for a period of 5years. MoEF had approved the project for financial assistance of Rs. 53.30 lakhs as its share. The first installment of Rs. 25 lakhs was released on 28.03.1995. MoEF has taken up the matter with the State Government and has been pursuing the matter for the project completion activities.

**Municipal Solid Waste Management for Ghaziabad City:** The Mukhya Nagar Adhikari (MNA), Ghaziabad city had submitted a proposal to the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) in the year 1998 for a Municipal Solid Waste Management and Compost (Organic Fertilizer)project at Ghaziabad city. The estimated project cost was Rs. 375/- lakhs. MoEF approved the project for financial assistance of Rs. 55 lakhs as its share. The first instalment of Rs. 25 lakh was released on 31stMarch, 1998. MoEF has taken up the matter with the State Government and has been pursuing the matter for the project completion activities.

**1.23 Taking a strong view on the non-Commissioning of 3 Solid Waste Management Projects in Ghaziabad, Hyderabad and Shimla under the scheme for financial assistance for waste characterization and feasibility studies, the Committee had urged the**

Government to fix responsibility for the same in their recommendation. Now, the Committee are surprised to find from the reply of the Government that the demonstration project on urban Solid Waste Management facility has been shifted from Shimla to Nahan. They feel that the Ministry of Urban Development should have been aware of the fact that the same project has been shifted and has already been executed and completed at Nahan. It appears that the Government was also unaware of the actual progress and therefore could not keep the Committee informed of the same. As regards the Hyderabad project for vermin-composting, there seems to be no progress even after the release of first instalment of Rs.25 Lakh in 1995. The Committee are convinced that in past fifteen years, the original cost of Rs.431 Lakh of the project must have escalated manifold.

The ground situation in respect of Ghaziabad project seems no better as the Ministry have not followed further progress of the same after releasing the first instalment of Rs.25 Lakh in 1998, which is quite evident from the reply received from the Ministry. Though the Committee note that the major facilitator in all the three projects is the Ministry of Environment and Forests, nonetheless, the Ministry of Urban Development have reportedly extended limited financial assistance for these projects, besides sanctioning those. Thus, it should have followed their actual progress through proper dialogue with either the Ministry of Environment and Forests, or the concerned State Governments. The Committee therefore, deplore the casual manner with which these projects are being monitored and desire the Government to apprise them about the latest progress on the projects in Hyderabad and Gh aziabad within two months of presentation of this Report.

**Recommendation (Para No. 22)**

## **Monitoring of Public Private Participation (PPP) Projects**

1.24 In their report, the Committee had observed as below:-

The Committee note that under Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission guidelines, Urban Local Bodies shall have to implement obligatory reforms in which the Ministry of Urban Development has advocated for encouraging Public Private Participation (PPP). Further, the Ministry has approved PPP model for Indore, Coimbatore, Madurai, Surat and Mumbai. In six municipal zones in Delhi, the entire collection and transportation of waste has been given to private parties. The Committee have been also informed that the Ministry of Urban Development, in an advisory note sent to all State Governments in October, 2007, had advised them that the ULBs should explore possibility of including PPP and Non-Governmental Organizations / Resident Welfare Associations in door-to-door collection, transportation and treatment facility for municipal solid waste. The Committee, however, note that in some of the cities, Public Private Participation mode has been implemented successfully, while in others the performance has been dismal. They feel that an issue in PPP mode, which requires attention, is strengthening the ULB's capacity to enter into contracts and the private sector's ability to deliver professionally against a contract. They, therefore, recommend the Ministry to address the matter carefully keeping in view these crucial issues and initiate measures to tackle the same.

1.25 The Government have replied as under:

“This Ministry intends to develop Model Concession Agreement (MCA) for solid waste management. For this, a workshop will be held and representatives of both private sector

and ULBs will be invited. This MCA will be disseminated through MoUD. The above exercise may be followed by Training Programmes at the State Level.

However, pending preparation of MCA for PPP on Solid Waste Management, the Ministry has initiated proactive action for encouraging PPP in SWM projects approved under UIG of JNNURM. List of projects sanctioned under UIG of JNNURM involving PPP is enclosed at Annexure-V.”

**1.26 The Committee appreciate the fact that the Ministry intends to develop Model Concession Agreement (MCA) for solid waste management which will be followed by training programmes at the State level. They hope that the matter is progressing satisfactorily. As regards PPP in solid waste management projects approved under UIG of JNNURM, the Committee note that in the 37 projects approved so far, PPP is envisaged in 12 projects only. The Committee feel that more PPP is required to be explored for managing municipal waste. At the same time, as the performance of private partners in such projects is not always positive in all cases, the accountability clause needs to be ensured for every such agreement. The Committee, therefore, recommend that such a clause and suitable penalties in case of violation must be included in the Model Concession Agreement being developed by the Ministry.**

## **Chapter-II**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT**

#### **Recommendation (Para No.1)**

#### **SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT – NEED FOR ALL STAKEHOLDERS TO BE PROACTIVE**

2.1 Solid Waste Management (SWM) is a State subject. As it is essentially a municipal function, all the municipal authorities in India deal with collection, transportation and disposal of the city garbage so as to reduce its impact on public health, environment and aesthetics. Management of commercial/ industrial waste like bio-medical waste/ e-waste is usually the responsibility of the generator. The Committee note that though there had been phenomenal growth in Municipal Solid Waste generation in India since Independence, there was hardly any progress towards improving the overall Solid Waste Management system in cities so as to match this growth, as Municipal Solid Waste Management was typically assigned a lower priority than water supply and sanitation. It was only at the intervention of the Supreme Court in the late Nineties, that some attempts were made for ensuring proper and scientific management of Municipal Solid Waste through the MSW(Management & Handling) Rules and related Manual prepared by the Central Ministries of Environment & Forests and Urban Development respectively. A clean city is not an accident but a concerted effort of the citizens, the State, the city managers and the civil society. The Committee are of the view that in order to achieve the objectives of a well-designed and scientific SWM system, all the stakeholders need to be proactive. They feel that particularly the State Governments should not be found wanting in this

respect. The Committee's observations and recommendations arising out of the examination of these and other related issues are set out in the following paragraphs.

### **Reply of the Government**

2.2 No action is required to be taken since it is a preamble for the recommendations / observations of the Committee.

### **Recommendation (Para No.4)**

#### **MAGNITUDE OF THE MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE (MSW)**

2.3 From the information furnished by the Ministry, the Committee note that at present urban India produces about 42 million tonnes of municipal solid waste annually which would mean 1.15 lakh metric tonnes per day (TPD). Out of this, 83,378 TPD is generated in 423 class-I cities. They concur with the view of the Ministry that as soon as the problem in these class-I cities is addressed, 72.5% of the total urban waste generated could be managed. The Committee have also been informed that although Urban Local Bodies spend between Rs. 500/- to Rs. 1500 per tonne on Solid Waste Management, less than 5% of this amount is used for treatment and disposal of waste after spending 60% to 70% on collection and 20% to 30% on transportation. The Committee, therefore, are convinced that more financial resources are required for treatment and disposal of waste generated. At present there is no tax/tariff on waste management services. The Committee are of the view that the possibility of levying direct tax for waste management services need to be explored since it is a common public utility like water and electricity. They,

therefore recommend that the Ministry of Urban Development may initiate steps on the same at the earliest.

### **Reply of the Government**

2.4 Levy of user charges for urban services has been emphasized by the Ministry time and again in various fora.

JNNURM guidelines indicated one of the mandatory reforms for cost recovery as follows:

“Levy of reasonable user charges by ULBs / Parastatals with the objective that full cost of operation and maintenance of recurring cost is collected within next seven years. However, cities / towns in North East and other special category States may recover at least 50% of operation and maintenance charges initially. These cities / towns should graduate to full O&M cost recover in a phased manner.”

From the above, it is evident that the Ministry’s vision is to achieve sustainability by levying user charges for the services provided by the ULB including SWM.

Moreover, it is pertinent to mention that the SWM projects approved so far under JNNURM envisages provide for collection of requisite user fee from the households for SWM services rendered by the ULB to generate adequate revenue to meet the O&M expenditure and to make the SWM project sustainable throughout the design period.

### **Recommendation (Para No. 6)**

#### **TECHNOLOGICAL OPTIONS AVAILABLE FOR DISPOSAL OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE**

2.5 The Committee observe that various technological options like composting including vermi composting, anaerobic digestion / biomethanation, production of refuse derived fuel / pelletisation, etc. are available for treatment and disposal of municipal solid waste. The Committee further note that these technological options find mention in the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Report and in the Manual on Municipal Solid Waste Management. However, these options are yet to gain wide acceptance. While deploring the crude dumping of waste by the Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) in most of the cities, the Committee recommend that the Government should take the desired steps to encourage the State Governments/ULBs to adopt the available and proven technologies for safe disposal of Municipal Solid Waste. At the same time the Committee desire that the Government must also ensure that only environment-friendly technological options are adopted so as to prevent further worsening of an already polluted urban environment.

#### **Reply of the Government**

2.6 The technological options for treatment of municipal solid waste are always selected based on the quantity, type and characteristics of the waste generated by the concerned ULBs. Report of the Technology Advisory Group (TAG) lists out merits and demerits of various technologies. The ULBs have been directed to select a suitable technology based on the quantity and quality of the wastes and as per the field conditions. If the State Governments / ULBs implement the guidelines issued in the Manuals and MSW Rules, the issue of solid waste

management will be addressed effectively. (Copy of the relevant part of TAG Report is at Annexure-I.)

By and large, the ULBs prepare DPRs as per the guidelines of the Manual on Municipal Solid Waste Management 2000, Report of TAG, Report on Integrated Plan Nutrient Management for City Compost etc. Wherever deficiencies are found in the DPRs the CPHEEO suggests corrective measures including alternate equipment friendly technology options to the ULB at the DPR stage and gets it modified before approval under JNNURM

### **Recommendation (Para No. 8)**

#### **MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE PROJECTS UNDER JAWAHARLAL NEHRU NATIONAL URBAN RENEWAL MISSION, UIDSSMT, ETC.**

2.7 The Committee have been convinced that the Government is increasingly committed to improved MSW management through JNNURM, UIDSSMT, the pilot project of SWM in 10 Airfield towns and so on. The number of SWM projects sanctioned under JNNURM and UIDSSMT are 31 and 40 respectively. The Committee further note that the 12<sup>th</sup> Finance Commission had also made a provision of Rs. 2500 crore in June, 2005 exclusively for Urban Local Bodies for setting up Solid Waste Management systems in 423 class-I cities during the period, 2005-2010. The Committee are, however, concerned to note that only 26 schemes have been sanctioned so far at an approved cost of Rs.1458 crore and feel that the number of projects undertaken so far is very low in comparison to the magnitude of the problem. The Committee feel that though an overall momentum has been established, yet the need of the hour is to expand and improve the coverage of SWM schemes, which requires both upgraded institutional and financial structures with suitable investments as well as the willingness of the municipal bodies

to develop and implement clear-cut SWM projects for upgrading their facilities at a sustainable pace.

### **Reply of the Government**

2.8 The projects taken up under UIG and UIDSSMT are as per the priority of the State Governments and the ULBs consistent with their city development plans. Whenever the ULBs submit projects relating to SWM, the same are appraised and approved as per the guidelines of the Manual on Municipal Solid Waste Management, 2000 and Solid Waste Management (Management & Handling) Rules, 2000 and considering the technology options spelt out in the Report of Technology Advisory Group and the recommendations contained in the Report of the Integrated Plant Nutrient Management for city compost and also considering the physical and chemical characteristics of the wastes, site conditions, climate, water table, etc. As on 28.2.2009, 37 projects on solid waste management for 37 cities have been approved at a total estimated cost of Rs. 2006.40 crore under UIG and 64 number of projects under UIDSSMT.

### **Recommendation (Para No. 13)**

#### **STRENGTHENING OF CENTRAL PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING ORGANIZATION (CPHEEO)**

2.9 As regards the monitoring mechanism of Solid Waste Management system in 423 class-I cities available with the Ministry of Urban Development, the Committee observe that at present CPHEEO – the technical wing of the Ministry assists the Ministry in all technical matters relating to water supply and sanitation sector. It is stated to be a small organization having a sanctioned strength of only 9 officers. The Committee are further concerned to note that out of these 9 officers, 50% posts are reported to be lying vacant. The Committee have been further informed that a proposal for creation of 11 posts have been forwarded to Ministry of Finance for approval so that water supply, sewerage and solid waste management schemes implemented by the State Governments/ULBs could be monitored at Central level by CPHEEO. Taking note of the grossly inadequate manpower with CPHEEO for monitoring the water supply and sanitation services including solid waste management, the Committee, while recommending the Government to take appropriate action to fill up the existing vacancies at the earliest. The Committee would also like to know the present status of proposal of the Ministry to strengthen the organization by creation of 11 additional posts. The Committee would also like to be apprised as to how, with the increased strength of 20 officers, water supply and sanitation services including solid waste management in 5161 cities and towns in the country would be monitored by CPHEEO.

## **Reply of the Government**

2.10 The following measures are being taken up for the strengthening of CPHEEO:

1. Proposal for strengthening through creation of 15 number of additional posts including a feeder cadre has been sent to the Ministry of Finance in February, 2009.
2. Action is being taken for filling up existing vacancies.

### **Recommendation (Para No. 14)**

#### **TASK FORCE ON INTEGRATED PLANT NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT (IPNM)**

2.11 The Committee note that subsequent to a Writ Petition filed in the Hon'ble Supreme Court on solid waste management, an Inter-Ministerial Task Force on Integrated Plant Nutrient Management (IPNM) using city compost was created in August, 2003. In its Report submitted to the Supreme Court on 6.5.2005, the Task Force had recommended an integrated plant nutrient management using city compost so that it can be supplied within 50 km radius of all ULBs and their compost plants. The Committee find that as a follow up action, the Ministry of Urban Development had advised all the State Governments and concerned Ministries to implement the said recommendation including use of compost for development of plantation / afforestation and balanced integrated use of fertilizers. The Committee are concerned to note that although assistance of Rs. 20 lakh per unit were released from VII<sup>th</sup> to IX<sup>th</sup> Plan, no financial assistance for setting up / strengthening of soil testing laboratories and for setting up bio-fertilizer units were provided during 10<sup>th</sup> Plan period. The Committee are further dismayed to note that

although funds of Rs. 9.00 crore were provided for setting up of 30 mechanical compost plants in different States for conversion of biodegradable organic city waste into compost, most of these plants are either not working to their optimum capacity or are not functioning at all. While recommending the Government to take appropriate steps to ensure an optimum utilization of installed capacity of these compost plants, the Committee would like to be apprised of the reasons for their non-functioning as well as absence of financial assistance/ subsidy for setting up of more compost plants during the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> Plans.

The Committee are further disappointed to note that despite the efforts made by the Ministry of Urban Development to involve the Central Ministries of Chemicals & Fertilizers and Agriculture to know as to how best the city composts can be integrated with chemical fertilizers for the benefit of farmers, these Ministries have not shown any enthusiasm for the same. They feel that as SWM concerns several stakeholders including these Ministries, such an attitude is uncalled for. The Committee desire that the Ministry of Urban Development should again approach these Ministries to bring them on board.

### **Reply of the Government**

2.12 Steps have already been initiated to involve the views of other Ministries in the recommendations of the Task Force on Integrated Plant Nutrient Management. So far 3 meetings have been held under the chairmanship of Secretary (UD). The minutes of the meetings are at Annexure-II.

Moreover, it is pertinent to mention that the Ministry of Urban Development had accorded technical approval under JNNURM for providing solid waste management facilities in

37 towns (Annexure IIA) and all the projects envisage composting as one of the treatment facilities. The Ministry of Fertilizers has also initiated action for co-marketing compost along with chemical fertilizers.

It may be mentioned that the quality of city compost depends on the characteristics of the incoming waste to the plant. Normally, un-segregated mixed waste is brought to the compost plant, resulting in the product compost not being of good quality. Therefore, the Ministry, while approving DPRs for MSMW in Mission cities under JNNURM, has emphasized the need for segregation of waste at source and use of organic portion only in the compost plant.

### **Recommendation (Para No. 15)**

#### **COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION FUND**

2.13 The Committee are happy to note that the Ministry of Urban Development have created a Community Participation Fund (CPF) under which a community can conceive a project on municipal solid waste and submit it through the local Municipality to the Union Government. Funds to the tune of Rs. 9.5 lakh can be granted with community contributing 5% in case of slums and 10% in case of others. However, the Committee are dismayed to note that the response to the scheme has not been very encouraging as only three schemes from Madurai city have been received by the Government so far. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Government should analyse the reasons for CPF not being attractive enough and obviate the same. They should also create an awareness campaign among the public through Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) / Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) so that more and more community participation projects could be taken up for municipal solid waste management. The Committee

also feel that communities availing CPF should also undertake efforts to convince citizens to reduce waste and encourage exchange / gift of unwanted usable items instead of throwing them away.

### **Reply of the Government**

2.14 The Community Participation Fund (CPF) was initiated with a view to encouraging communities to take part in the development of their area and develop a sense of ownership with respect to the projects being undertaken. It was envisaged that once Community Participation Law is passed by the State And Area Sabhas are in place, they would submit the projects under CPF for their area.

However, in the meantime, Community Based Organisations (CBOs) can submit projects provided 51% of registered voters of given polling stations, for whom the project is meant, give their consent to it. These clauses are difficult to fulfill and this is one of the main reasons for lesser number of projects, but they are in fact the essence of this fund wherein following the process is crucial for the development of the spirit of participation. 21 projects have been sanctioned under CPF so far, out of which 2 are on Solid Waste Management for Madurai and Bangalore respectively.

Awareness is also being generated during city Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and City Volunteers Technical Corps (CVTC) formation workshop held in different cities. In the recent PEARL Workshop on 'Heritage Cities' held in Madurai, TAG Coordination Cell Team discussed about the funds, its guidelines and urged the city representatives (from ULBs and NGOs) to make the best use of CPF. Instructions is being issued to all CBOs which have been

sanctioned projects under CPF to create awareness regarding segregation and recycling of waste in their communities.

### **Recommendation No.16 (Para No.16)**

#### **PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT TO MUNICIPAL STAFF AND RAG PICKERS**

2.15 The Committee observe that as per guidelines given in the Manual on Municipal Solid Waste Management, 2000, the local body should provide adequate protective equipment including clothing and health check up from time to time to the staff to ensure that their health is not adversely affected on account of their handling of solid waste. Further, free medical services should be made available to those whose health is affected on account of handling of solid waste. The Committee are, however, convinced that very few ULBs have implemented these rules. They are also dismayed to note that the Ministry of Urban Development could not obtain any information from the State Governments/ULBs about the staff engaged in garbage disposal, who are not properly provided with the protective equipment as required under the Manual on Solid Waste Management, 2000. The Committee would like to urge the authorities to ensure that not only the waste handling municipal staff but the rag-pickers in unorganized sector, who are reported to be about 1.3 lakh in number and play a special role in segregation of waste, should also be provided with the adequate protective equipment and health checkup including other incentives like identity cards and use of public sanitation services. The Committee desire that the continuous monitoring of implementation of the guidelines in this regard should also be ensured at each level.

#### **Reply of the Government**

2.16 It is pertinent to mention that an advisory note has also been sent to all the State Governments to direct the ULBs to undertake various measures for litter-free /garbage-free cities across the country. One of the measures is reproduced below:

“The workers should be provided with uniforms, shoes, gloves and other implements etc. for their safety and easy working. They should be subjected to periodical health checks and health insurance.”

The Ministry will direct the ULBs through the PMUs, PIUs and Independent Review and Monitoring Agencies falling under JNNURM cities to ensure the provision of protective equipment to the municipal staff and rag pickers in their project area and render a report to this Ministry.

In the Manual on Municipal Solid Waste Management, 2000, requisite guidelines have been incorporated in regard to health and well being of the sanitary workers which the ULBs are expected to provide including periodical health check up of the workers.

### **Recommendation (Para No. 18)**

#### **RE-CYCLING OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE, PLASTIC, ETC.**

2.17 The Committee note that ULBs have been advised by the Ministry of Urban Development to segregate their construction and demolition waste and dispose them off in low lying areas. The Committee have also been apprised that Building and Material Technology Promotion Council (BMTPC) initiated a research and development project with Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action, Mumbai, for recycling of construction and demolition wastes as the use of recycled materials will help in reducing the use of natural resource materials for production of building materials. The Committee further observe that in Surat, Gujarat, the construction and demolition waste is reused for preparation of bricks for laying pavements. While appreciating the Research and Development project by BMTPC for recycling of construction and demolition waste, the Committee recommend that more such projects should be undertaken and implemented in other parts of the country. The Committee have also been informed that BMTPC has initiated and sponsored a project in the Central Building Research Institute (CBRI), Roorkee to develop plastics building products from recycled plastics with emphasis on wastes generated from the building industry. The Committee also learn that CBRI, Roorkee has developed building products using plastic waste, for special application in disaster resistant construction, though it has not been verified on the grounds of health and environment friendliness. While strongly recommending to promote the use of recycled plastic building products, the Committee feel that the impact of these products on health and environment needs to be tested and verified before putting it up for large-scale use. The Committee also feel that there is an urgent need to frame laws to encourage recycling by specifying mandatory deposit and return requirements to

shift the burden of waste disposal and recovery of materials back to the manufacturer of products by ensuring that retailers and wholesalers take back materials which is no longer required. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Ministry to gather expert opinion on this matter and approach the appropriate authority to initiate such a move.

### **Reply of the Government**

2.18 The Ministry of Environment & Forests has constituted a Committee to evaluate a Road Map on Management of Waste in India. The first meeting of the Committee was held on 21.10.2008 under the chairmanship of Additional Secretary, Ministry of E&F, Government of India wherein it was recommended to constitute a Working Group under the chairmanship of Secretary, Department of Environment, Government of Delhi to examine all the activities related to MSW. The meeting of the Working Group was held on 18.11.2008 under the chairmanship of Secretary, D/o Environment, Government of Delhi wherein it was decided to further constitute four Sub-Working Groups on various activities viz. (i) Municipal Solid Waste (ii) Plastic Waste (iii) Construction and Demolition Waste and (iv) Packaging Waste. The Sub-Working Groups were to finalize their work by 14.1.2009. Letters for constitution of various Sub-Working Groups are enclosed at Annexure-III.

The Sub-Working Group on Construction & Demolition Waste under the chairmanship of Deputy Adviser (PHE), CPHEEO has formulated and deliberated the guidelines and the final draft guidelines shall be placed before the Sub-Working Group in April, 2009. The final report will be submitted to the main Committee in the end of April 2009. On receipt of the report of the Sub-Working Groups, the Ministry will be able to take appropriate action in this regard.

## **Recommendation (Para No. 20)**

### **AWARENESS CAMPAIGN FOR SEGREGATION OF WASTE AT SOURCE**

2.19 The Committee note that 30 to 55 per cent of municipal solid waste comprises bio-degradable matter, 40 to 55 per cent is inert and 5 to 15 per cent is recyclable. The Committee are concerned to note that door-to-door collection of waste is not carried out in most parts of the country and it is still the responsibility of individual house owner to take the municipal waste to the dhalaos. The Committee cannot but deplore the way in which most of the Urban Local Bodies are ignoring the provision of using separate bins for non-organic and organic waste inspite of the Advisory Note sent in October, 2007 by the Ministry of Urban Development to all State Governments. In this context, the Committee observe that in Gujarat, cities like Surat and Vadodara have proposed private sector participation in handling this organic waste and converting it into compost. Even other combustible wastes like paper, plastic, etc., are being separated and treated with Refuse Derived Fuel. Similarly, Municipal Corporation of Delhi is reported to have implemented the door-to-door collection of waste in various parts of Delhi in a phased manner. Notwithstanding these few instances, the Committee still feel that the most important aspect in Solid Waste Management, i.e. reduction of waste and the segregation of waste at source, is the most neglected one. In view of the Committee, it is probably because of indifference of citizens towards inculcating the habit of segregating wastes as well as lack of community participation towards waste management. The Committee feel that the task of creating facilities to treat the wastes either for producing energy or for composting or recycling and bringing awareness about reduction and segregation of waste at source by involving citizens rests with the Ministry of Urban Development and the State Governments. The Committee,

therefore, recommend that the Government should boost up measures for Information, Education and Communication (IEC) of the public on the matter through print and electronic media, NGOs, student community, women, institutions, etc., at all available opportunities.

### **Reply of the Government**

2.20 In order to promote segregation of waste at source, necessary provision is made for household bins for storing of segregated waste into bio-degradable and non-biodegradable portions under Solid Waste Management projects approved under JNNURM. Further, under the guidelines of JNNURM – Urban Infrastructure and Governance (UIG), in order to prepare City Development Plans, Detailed Project Reports, community participation, information Education and Communication (IEC), a provision of 5% of the Central grant or the actual requirement, whichever is less, has been kept for the cities / towns covered under the Mission. The State Government /Urban Local Bodies can undertake IEC activities for promoting segregation of waste at source and funds for the purpose can be provided under the above-mentioned provision of the UIG guidelines.

## **Recommendation (Para No. 21)**

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF PLASTICS MANUFACTURING AND USAGE (A) RULES, 2003**

2.21 The Committee note that to avoid littering and segregation of plastic waste at source, 'Plastics Manufacturing and Usage (A) Rules, 2003 has come into force. Besides stipulating not to manufacture and sell thin plastic carry bags, the rules also prohibit the usage of recycled plastic carry bags for storing, carrying, dispensing or packaging of foodstuffs in India. Further, usage of plastics carry bags is banned in pilgrimage and tourists spots. In this regard, the Committee are of the opinion that although in some States use of plastic carry bags has been totally banned, these provisions are not strictly followed by all the States / Urban Local Bodies. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Government to pursue all the State Governments / Urban Local Bodies not only to incorporate a clause for penalty on the defaulters in their by-laws but their implementation should also be strictly adhered. The Committee would like to be informed of the action taken by the Government in this regard.

### **Reply of the Government**

2.22 The Ministry of Environment & Forests is the nodal agency for mentioning and control of use of plastic material and their impact on the environment. They have also brought out requisite guidelines in this regard.

Banning of plastic bags and imposition of penalty thereof comes within the purview of Municipal Rules and Regulations. Building By-Laws can only prescribe penalty in view of violations / deviations in the construction of buildings. Hence, the ULBs need to impose penalty against use of plastic bags as per the Municipal Rules and not under Building Bye-Laws per se.

Monitoring of the implementation of “Plastic Manufacturing & Usage (A) Rules, 2003” is under the purview of Ministry of Environment & Forests. The State Governments / ULBs are responsible for implementation of plastic waste management. The status of implementation of the aforesaid rules by different State Governments / ULBs as provided by the CPCB are at Annexure-IV.

The Ministry has been coordinating with the Ministry of Environment & Forests on environmental issues including banning of plastics by way of participating in the meeting convened by the Ministry of E&F regularly. Moreover, while sanctioning the MSWM projects under JNNURM, the ULBs are advised to ensure segregation of plastic waste separately for recycling and reuse.

### **Recommendation (Para No. 23)**

#### **ACUTE SCARCITY OF LANDFILLS**

2.23 Disposing of inert municipal solid waste in a landfill requires properly designed and well-managed landfills. Such landfills can be a hygienic and relatively inexpensive method of disposing of waste materials. However, the Committee are seriously concerned to note that lack of appropriate land for landfills has resulted in mounds of MSW which has become severe eyesores alongside roads in most of the class-I and medium cities in the country. The most recent instances noticed by the Committee in this connection are Gurgaon and Ghaziabad, where several public protests were witnessed on this account. In addition to it, old, poorly designed or poorly managed landfills in cities are creating several adverse environmental conditions, for instance, wind-blown litter, generation of liquid leachate, poisonous gases, bad odours, attraction of vermin and bacteria etc. In this connection, the Committee note that certain State

Governments are in the process of setting up landfill facilities, for instance, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Manipur, Rajasthan, West Bengal and Tamil Nadu. The Committee also note that 12 ULBs of AUDA (Ahmedabad Urban Development Authority), Gujarat have taken initiatives to construct a common landfill site. The Committee desire that the Ministry of Urban Development should assess the success of this common facility, once completed and counsel other State Governments to follow suit, wherever feasible, particularly in those States where severe land crunch is experienced. The Committee are also dismayed that in Delhi, Goa, Bihar, Uttarakhand, Punjab, Chhatisgarh, Mizoram and Lakshadweep, no initiatives were reported on the part of their ULBs towards setting up of landfill facilities for waste disposal. The Committee would urge expeditious steps to address this issue. They would like to be apprised of the latest progress on this account.

#### **Reply of the Government**

2.24 Letter has been sent to CPCB seeking requisite information on the aforesaid recommendation. On receipt of it, the same will be forwarded to the Lok Sabha Secretariat.

Moreover, as desired by the Committee, once the Ahmedabad Urban Development Authority complete the construction of a common landfill site, the officers will visit and assess the success of the common facilities and counsel other State Governments to follow suite wherever feasible, particularly in those State where server land crunch is experienced. In respect of Committee's concern for lack of initiatives in Delhi, Goa, Bihar, Uttarakhand, Punjab, Chhattisgarh, Mizoram and Lakshadweep towards setting up of landfill facilities for waste disposal, an Advisory Note has already been circulated to all the States including the aforesaid States for implementation of the Solid Waste Management.

## **Chapter- III**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS /OBSERVATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT'S REPLY**

#### **Recommendation No.-7 (Para No.7)**

##### **SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECTS IN HILLY REGION**

3.1 In Hilly regions, difficult terrain, lack of adequate land huge cost of basic site developments and weak financial positions of the municipal bodies make SWM a daunting task. The Committee note that 7 Solid Waste Management Projects viz. Doda, Bhandarwah, Akhnoor, Poonch, Samba, Kathua and Sunderbani in Jammu & Kashmir have been entrusted to the National Building Construction Corporations (NBCC), Ministry of Urban Development. The Committee appreciate that NBCC has entered into an agreement with the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) to develop solid waste management schemes in hilly regions, which shall be used to develop standard designs for future use. A scheme in Mandi, Himachal Pradesh has been taken up at present and is reported to be at design stage. The Committee are, however, concerned to observe several constraints being faced by NBCC in implementation of the projects in Jammu & Kashmir owing to the non-availability of suitable land for the processing plant, poor economics of Operation & Maintenance cost vis-à-vis revenue from sale of products, high landed cost of material and equipment due to high entry and toll taxes and high cost of registration for sales tax. They, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Urban Development should take up these issues with the concerned authorities so that the sanctioned Solid Waste Management projects in Jammu & Kashmir are well-supported financially and completed in time. At the same time, the Committee recommend that the Government should work out the cost of Solid Waste

Management projects in the hilly and difficult regions and accordingly raise the limit with respect to the project costs being sanctioned for such regions.

### **Reply of the Government**

3.2 The Ministry has not fixed any limit for the estimated cost of the project based on geographical area, population etc. The schemes are being formulated based on the characteristics of waste, field conditions, topography, temperature etc. For hilly regions, the Ministry provides power driven vehicles for primary and secondary collection rather than manual rickshaws etc.

The cost estimate for the SWM projects are prepared by the ULBs based upon the State Schedule of Rates (SOR) for civil works and prevailing market rates for other materials and equipment. For hilly regions including J&K, the funding under JNNURM is 90% of the project estimated cost and the balance funding is from the State/ULBs.

### **Recommendation No.10 (Para No.10)**

#### **SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT AND SANITATION SCHEME FOR GHAZIABAD TOWN (HINDON AIRFIELD), U.P.**

3.3 The Committee observe that the Ministry of Urban Development had approved a Solid Waste Management and Sanitation scheme for Ghaziabad town (Hindon Airfield) at an estimated cost of Rs. 13.52 crore. The project, which had commenced on 1.1.2006 is still incomplete. As against a total release of funds of Rs. 12.76 crore, the expenditure incurred on the project so far is reported to be Rs. 6.05 crore. As regards the progress of work on the project, the Committee note that in respect of sanitary landfill and compost plant, only 10% and 7% of the total work has

been completed so far. These components could not be completed due to dispute in acquisition of 43 acres of land which was originally identified by the Ghaziabad Nagar Nigam at Dooda Hera, Chippiyana Bujurg in Ghaziabad. The project has been further delayed due to a Writ Petition filed in 2006 for shifting of the site. The Committee have been further informed that on the direction of the Hon'ble High Court, a new site has been identified at Dasna in Ghaziabad which is about 9 Kms away from the present site. However, No Objection Certificates were required from Hindon Airfield and Uttar Pradesh Pollution Control Board by the Ghaziabad Development Authority before the start of land acquisition process at Dasna site, which is yet to be done. The Committee are dissatisfied to note that the funds allocated and released for the scheme could not be utilized fully due to several above-stated impediments and that the project is still languishing due to non-acquisition of land. The Committee hope that learning from the past experiences, the Government vigorously pursue the matter with the Uttar Pradesh State Government so that the scheme could be expedited. The Committee also recommend that the Ministry should impress upon the State Governments to take prudent measures for advance and realistic planning so that all clearances and acquisition of land for a Solid Waste Management project are taken care of, before the start of the project on ground. Further, the Committee desire that for such projects the Government should take recourse to the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act in public interest.

### **Reply of the Government**

3.4 A meeting was convened in the Ministry on 12.12.2008 to discuss various issues related to implementation of Hindon Project, in which the representatives of U.P. Government were also present. Representatives of Government of U.P. (GDA and UP Jal Nigam) stated that though the site is available, it can be utilized for construction of sanitary landfill only after change of land use. The Ministry explained the constraints in extending the scheme beyond the prescribed time

limit. However, a request dated 17.12.2008 was received from the Principal Secretary, Government of U.P. to allow them 10 more months to complete the project. The Ministry has accepted this requested.

The Secretary (UD) has issued an Advisory on SWM to all State Governments urging them inter-alia to initiate advance action in respect of acquisition of land for setting up of compost plant, landfill etc. since land is a very scarce resource in most of the bigger cities and towns.

The DPR received from the Mission cities for consideration under UIG component of JNNURM indicates that the land required for setting up of compost plant, SLF, etc. are available with the ULB. Based on this assurance only, the DPRs are approved by the Ministry.

#### **Recommendation No.19 (Para No.19)**

#### **IMPLEMENTATION OF BIO-MEDICAL WASTE (MANAGEMENT AND HANDLING) RULES, 1998**

3.5 The Committee note that based upon the Bio-medical Waste (Management and Handling) Rules, 1998, the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare had prepared National Guidelines on Hospital Waste Management and circulated it to States and Union Territories for information and compliance. The hospitals are required to implement these Rules by developing a comprehensive plan for hospital waste management in terms of segregation, collection, treatment, transportation and disposal of the wastes. Although the Committee have been informed that the Central Government hospitals are strictly adhering to the Bio-medical waste (Management and Handling) Rules, 1998 and implementation of these Rules by other Nursing homes and hospitals has also improved, the Committee would like to know the monitoring mechanism available with

the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare to check any violation of rules and guidelines issued in this regard. At the same time, the Committee would like to know the steps taken by the Ministry of Urban Development to ensure that these wastes are not dumped with the other Municipal wastes.

### **Reply of the Government**

3.6 The Municipal Solid Waste (Management & Handling) Rules has categorically mentioned that the hospital wastes shall not enter into the municipal stream. Since Ministry of Health & Family Welfare is having a separate scheme to provide necessary infrastructure to address the hospital waste including bio-medical waste, it is likely that hospital waste will not enter into the municipal stream. However, the ULBs will be directed to ensure that hospital wastes do not enter the Municipal wastes.

## **Chapter- IV**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS /OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE AND WHICH REQUIRED REITERATION**

#### **Recommendation No.2 (Para No.2)**

#### **IMPLEMENTATION OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE (MANAGEMENT AND HANDLING) RULES, 2000**

4.1 The Committee note that the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India, have notified the 'Municipal Solid Waste (Management and Handling) Rules, 2000 through which specific directives have been issued to the urban local bodies, District Administrations and Departments of Urban Development of the State Governments to ensure proper and scientific management of municipal solid waste. The Ministry of Urban Development have not yet formulated any National Waste Policy for Solid Waste Management as according to them the MSW (M&H) Rules, 2000 act as the policy to handle MSW. However, the Ministry of Urban Development brought out a Manual on Municipal Solid Waste Management in May, 2000 to facilitate the ULBs to address issues relating to the Solid Waste Management. In this connection, the Committee are distressed to note that the deadline of December, 2003 for implementation of MSW (M & H) Rules, 2000 could not be achieved due to huge capital investment required to implement, operate and maintain solid waste management projects. Several other impediments like lack of planning, absence of segregation of waste at source, inadequate house-to-house collection, transportation, treatment and disposal of municipal solid waste, etc., have been identified by the Government in implementation of the MSW Rules, 2000. Consequently, the Committee note that the deadline for State Departments of Urban Development and Urban Local

Bodies for implementation of these rules has been extended upto December 2008. The Committee are sure that even this deadline would not be met since most of the ULBs and State Governments still lack requisite investment and infrastructure facilities for the same. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Ministry should impress upon the States that they should take all steps necessary to ensure that MSW (M&H) Rules, 2000 are strictly implemented by all concerned as early as possible. At the same time, the Committee also recommend that while sanctioning the Solid Waste Management Projects submitted by the States under the Centrally-Sponsored Schemes like Jawharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) and Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme in Small and Medium Towns (UIDSSMT), the Government should ensure the implementation of MSW (M&H) Rules, 2000 as a pre-condition.

#### **Reply of the Government**

4.2 The Ministry had conducted Regional Workshops between November 2007 and February 2008 at various places viz. Chennai, Nagpur, Chandigarh, Bhubaneswar, Guwahati and Deharadun to impart training to the personnel working in various ULBs, parastatals and State Nodal Agencies for preparation of Detailed Project Reports Reports under UIG and UIDSSMT of JNNURM as per the guidelines of Municipal Solid Waste (Management & Handling) Rules, 2000 and Manual on Municipal Solid Waste Management published by this Ministry. Guidelines for preparation of DPRs had also been circulated to the participants in soft and hard copies for their reference and further action. These steps are expected to enhance the knowledge and expertise of the Participants for preparation of qualitative detailed project reports for consideration under JNNURM.

Under JNNURM, while appraising the DPRs in respect of solid waste Management schemes posed by the ULBs, the CPHEEO (the technical wing of the Ministry) examines the

DPRs with reference to the guidelines of MSW(M&H) Rules, 2000 and Manual on Municipal Solid Waste Management published by this Ministry and also the characteristics of wastes being generated by the concerned ULBs, their quantity, population, soil condition, topography and other technical parameters. While approving the DPRs, the CHEEO recommends source segregation including recovery of recyclables so as to minimize quantum of waste for treatment facilities. Technology options such as composting, vermin-composting, energy recovery through RDF etc. for treatment of waste also reviewed based on the field conditions and characteristics of the wastes and technical approval accorded accordingly.

#### **Comments of the Committee**

4.3 For comments of the Committee please see para no.1.8 of Chapter I of the Report.

#### **Recommendation No.3 (Para No.3)**

#### **NATIONAL URBAN SANITATION POLICY**

4.4 Open defecation, particularly, near urban slums and railway tracks is still prevalent in most of the cities and urban areas. It acts as a major hindrance in achieving 'clean city' status. The Committee are happy to note that the long awaited National Urban Sanitation Policy has been approved by the Cabinet on 3<sup>rd</sup> October, 2008 during the International Year of Sanitation, with a view to formulate policy guidelines, strategies for implementation of sewerage and sanitation facilities in the urban areas, so as to eliminate open defecation in the cities and towns. To achieve the goals of National Urban Sanitation Policy, the Government is reportedly contemplating steps like awareness generation and behavioural change, integrated city-wide sanitation system, sanitary and safe disposal, proper maintenance and management of all sanitary

installation, etc. in due course. The Committee feel that for effective implementation of the National Urban Sanitation Policy, a time-bound action plan with specified targets focussing on the prevailing conditions in a State needs to be framed by the Government, with adequate financial support so that ULBs could be strengthened to provide substantial sanitation services. The Committee hope that the Central Government and the States will take necessary steps to achieve this goal.

### **Reply of the Government**

4.5 Sanitation is a State subject and hence it is the responsibility of the States to formulate and implement programmes for eliminatin of open defecation as well as safe disposal of human excreta. However, the Central Government supplements the efforts of behavioural changes among public through awareness creation and seeks to promote open defecation free cities. In addition, the policy enunciates development of state sanitation strategies which include setting up os State leel standards, asset creation, capacity building & training, reaching the urban poor, monitoring & evaluation etc. The policy also requires the preparation of City Sanitation Plan by the respective ULBs to achieve the goal of 100% sanitation and open defecation free cities in a time bound manner. The implementation of the City Sanitation Plan shall be monitored by the City Sanitation Task Force. A programme of awareness generation is under formulation. Requests have also been from some states for financial assistance for the formulation of state sanitation strategies and city sanitation plans.

### **Comments of the Committee**

4.6 For comments of the Committee Please see Paragraph No. 1.11 of Chapter I of the Report.

### **Recommendation No.5 (Para No.5)**

#### **SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLE (SPV) FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE**

4.7 Lack of funds with Urban Local Bodies has been identified as a major hindrance in proper solid waste management. In this context, the Committee have been informed that Kerala State Government has created a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) for power generation by integrating its 60 municipalities with three intermediate depots to collect garbage and waste to dispose it off in large containers. Ahmedabad and Bangalore cities have also reportedly created SPV for management of municipal solid waste. The Committee, therefore, recommend that Government should closely monitor these initiatives and if found suitable, encourage other States, cities and ULBs to create such SPVs to address the shortage of funds. The Committee also recommend that the Government should examine the feasibility of developing, with adequate financial support, model 'clean' cities in each State which demonstrate innovative MSW Management system.

### **Reply of the Government**

4.8 One of the optional reforms indicated in the JNNURM guidelines is to encourage Public Private Partnership. Under the approved JNNURM schemes, some cities have envisaged Public Private Partnership in lieu of contribution of ULBs. In certain schemes, the operation and maintenance of compost plants have been proposed for funding through private partnership.

For instance, Coimbatore city has tied up with a private partner to set up compost plant/Landfill site by investing the ULB share of the SWM project approved under JNNURM including O&M facilities created for a period of 20 years. Similarly, Surat city is contemplating entrusting construction and O&M of compost plant to a private operator.

Secretary (UD) has issued an Advisory on SWM to all the States emphasizing the need for preparation of good quality DPR, timely implementation of the approved SWM project, its effective O&M and levy of reasonable user charge to generate adequate revenue to make the scheme self-sustainable in the long run.

### **Comments of the Committee**

4.9 For comments of the Committee Please see paragraph No. 1.14 of Chapter I of the Report

### **Recommendation No.9 (Para No.9)**

#### **PILOT PROJECT ON SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT IN 10 AIRFIELD TOWNS**

4.10 The Committee are distressed to note that though the Scheme of Solid Waste Management in 10 Airfield towns was scheduled to be completed by March, 2008, it has been delayed badly in Pune, Tejpur and Hindon. Only 45 per cent, 10 per cent and 45 per cent of work has been completed respectively in the three towns as on 30.6.2008. The progress of work in respect of project at Bareilly has also remained incomplete as per the information furnished to the Committee. They are perturbed to note that despite their recommendation in 31<sup>st</sup> Report on Demands for Grants (2008-09), (14<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) of the Ministry of Urban Development urging the Ministry to take necessary action in the matter for

urgently completing the schemes in the remaining 4 towns, substantial amount of work is still left, particularly in Tejpur. While urging for completion of these schemes without further delay, the Committee would like to be apprised of the present status of implementation of these projects, alongwith the steps taken by the Ministry in 2008 to remove the impediments in the projects pending till date. They hope that the Ministry would take up the matter concerning Tejpur with appropriate authorities urgently lest the very objective of the scheme would stand defeated.

### **Reply of the Government**

4.11 The Tezpur project was mainly delayed due to non-availability of land for the project. Now the land is in the possession of the State Government which will be handed over to NBCC for execution of the project. NBCC has called for tenders for implementation of Tezpur project. It is hoped that the Tezpur project may be completed by the end of this year.

As regards the Bareilly project, it is stated that this project was held for want of funds. The funds have now been released and it is likely that the project will be completed within the year 2009.

As regards the Pune project, execution of work stated at site in June 2006 but was stopped due to local villagers disturbance and non-availability of land. The problem has been resolved by the ULB in September 2008 and the work is in progress. It is likely to be completed by March 2010.

### **Comments of the Committee**

4.12 For comments of the Committee Please see Paragraph No. 1.17 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation No.12 (Para No.12)**

#### **MONITORING OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (SWM) PROJECTS**

4.13 The Committee find that although monitoring of Solid Waste Management is primarily not the responsibility of the Ministry of Urban Development, the Ministry, however, monitor the implementation of approved Solid Waste Management projects under the Centrally-sponsored schemes through various mechanisms such as Quarterly Project Reports, field visits, etc. The Committee have been further apprised that for monitoring and management of sanctioned projects of various sectors including SWM under JNNURM, the Project Implementation Units (PIU) at ULB level and Project Monitoring Unit (PMU) at State level are being set up. The Committee are, however, constrained to note that in spite of the aforesaid efforts taken by the Central Government, only 30 Project Implementation Units (PIU), 12 Project Monitoring Units (PMU) and 4 Independent Review and Monitoring Agencies (IRMA) have been set up so far to monitor and manage the sanctioned projects. The Committee feel that it is grossly inadequate in view of the fact that the issue of managing Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) concerns 5161 cities and towns. The Committee, therefore, recommend that to give a major fillip to this programme, the Government should meet frequently and make constant dialogue with the State Governments so that more project implementation and monitoring units could be set up at the ULB / State levels. Further the performance of PIUs, PMUs and IRMAs also needs to be assessed in order to ensure that no loopholes are left in the execution of SWM projects.

### **Reply of the Government**

4.14 As per the scheme, the PMU, PIU and IRMA are to be appointed under the UIG component of JNNURM. The JNNURM Directorate has brought out a tool kit for appointment of Independent Review and Monitoring Agencies. IRMA are agencies to be appointed by the States for monitoring of progress of implementation of the projects sanctioned under JNNURM. The proposals of Kerala, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Uttrakhand, Maharashtra, West Bengal, Puducherry, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat and Karnataka for appointment of IRMA have been approved by the CSMC. IRMAs have been established in Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Rajasthan. The States of Assam, Bihar, Delhi, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu are in the process of appointing IRMAs. For the States of Chandigarh, J&K, Punjab, Nagaland, Sikkim, Tripura, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Mizoram, Meghalaya, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Orissa and Goa, Ministry of Urban Development has initiated steps for appointment of IRMAs on behalf of the States. 16 no. of PMUs have been approved and 8 no. of PMUs have set up by the states 8 no. of States are yet to submit proposals. 40 no. of PIUs have been approved and 23 no. have been set up. 25 no. of ULBs are yet to submit proposals.

### **Comments of the Committee**

4.15 For comments of the Committee Please see Paragraph No. 1.20 of Chapter I of the Report)

## **Recommendations (Para No. 22)**

### **MONITORING OF PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTICIPATION (PPP) PROJECTS**

4.16 The Committee note that under Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission guidelines, Urban Local Bodies shall have to implement obligatory reforms in which the Ministry of Urban Development has advocated for encouraging Public Private Participation (PPP). Further, the Ministry has approved PPP model for Indore, Coimbatore, Madurai, Surat and Mumbai. In six municipal zones in Delhi, the entire collection and transportation of waste has been given to private parties. The Committee have been also informed that the Ministry of Urban Development, in an advisory note sent to all State Governments in October, 2007, had advised them that the ULBs should explore possibility of including PPP and Non-Governmental Organizations / Resident Welfare Associations in door-to-door collection, transportation and treatment facility for municipal solid waste. The Committee, however, note that in some of the cities, Public Private Participation mode has been implemented successfully, while in others the performance has been dismal. They feel that an issue in PPP mode, which requires attention, is strengthening the ULB's capacity to enter into contracts and the private sector's ability to deliver professionally against a contract. They, therefore, recommend the Ministry to address the matter carefully keeping in view these crucial issues and initiate measures to tackle the same.

### **Reply of the Government**

4.17 This Ministry intends to develop Model Concession Agreement (MCA) for solid waste management. For this, a workshop will be held and representatives of both private sector and ULBs will be invited. This MCA will be disseminated through MoUD. The above exercise may be followed by Training Programmes at the State Level.

However, pending preparation of MCA for PPP on Solid Waste Management, the Ministry has initiated proactive action for encouraging PPP in SWM projects approved under UIG of JNNURM. List of projects sanctioned under UIG of JNNURM involving PPP is enclosed at Annexure-V.

### **Comments of the Committee**

4.18 For comments of the Committee please see Paragraph No. 1.26 of Chapter I of the Report.

## **CHAPTER-V**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED**

#### **Recommendation No.11. (Para No.11)**

#### **LACK OF LANDFILL SITE IN GURGAON, HARYANA**

5.1 The Committee note with concern that in the National Capital Region, particularly, in Gurgaon, where the present population is more than 10 lakh against the 3.42 lakh as per 2001 Census, the problem of unmanaged municipal solid waste has created an uproar. They have been given to understand that now an integrated site to be developed on Build-Own-Operate-Transfer (BOOT) basis has been identified at Bandhwari village on Gurgaon - Faridabad Road on a Public-Private-Partnership model. The Committee note that although all necessary clearances for the project has been obtained, the project is likely to take one and a half years for completion after approval of the budget. The Committee hope that keeping in view the problem the project would be sanctioned and undertaken urgently and desire that it should be completed without any delay.

#### **Reply of the Government**

5.2 The Haryana PWD, Water Supply and Sanitation Department, Gurgaon has been requested to provide requisite information/ material. On receipt of it, the same will be forwarded to the Committee.

### **Recommendation No.17 (Para No. 17)**

#### **PROJECTS FOR WASTE CHARACTERIZATION AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES**

5.3 The Committee note that a scheme for financial assistance for waste characterization and feasibility studies was introduced in 1992 under which the Ministry had sanctioned 3 projects viz. (i) the municipal solid waste management project Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad at a cost of Rs.55 lakh, (ii) Pilot project for solid waste management for Hyderabad City, Municipal Corporation, Hyderabad at a cost of Rs. 53.3 lakh and (iii) Pilot project for solid waste management in Shimla at a total cost of Rs.25 lakh. However, none of these projects have been reported to be commissioned. The Committee would like to be apprised of the date of sanction of these projects, the reasons for their non-commissioning and the actual progress alongwith expenditure incurred, if any, on these projects. The Committee strongly urge the Government to fix responsibility for the failure of commissioning these projects.

#### **Reply of the Government**

**5.4 Urban Solid Waste Management in Shimla:** The Ministry of Environment & Forests had released an amount of Rs. 25 lakhs to H.P Pollution Control Board, Shimla in March, 1996 for setting up of a demonstration project on urban solid waste management facility in Shimla. However, due to some technological and temperature constraints at Shimla, the project was shifted to Nahan, wherein the temperature conditions was found to be adequate to facilitate composting. As per the information from the H.P. State Pollution Control Board, the project has been executed and completed at Nahan.

**Pilot project for Solid Waste Management for vermin-composting in Hyderabad City:** The Municipal Commissioner of Hyderabad city had submitted a proposal to the Ministry of Environment & Forests (MoEF) in the year 1995 for a Pilot project for vermi-composting at Hyderabad city. The total project cost was Rs. 431 lakhs for a period of 5years. MoEF had approved the project for financial assistance of Rs. 53.30 lakhs as its share. The first installment of Rs. 25 lakhs was released on 28.03.1995. MoEF has taken up the matter with the State Government and has been pursuing the matter for the project completion activities.

**Municipal Solid Waste Management for Ghaziabad City:** The Mukhya Nagar Adhikari (MNA), Ghaziabad city had submitted a proposal to the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) in the year 1998 for a Municipal Solid Waste Management and Compost (Organic Fertilizer)project at Ghaziabad city. The estimated project cost was Rs. 375/- lakhs. MoEF approved the project for financial assistance of Rs. 55 lakhs as its share. The first instalment of Rs. 25 lakh was released on 31stMarch, 1998. MoEF has taken up the matter with the State Government and has been pursuing the matter for the project completion activities.

#### **Comments of the Committee**

5.5 For comments of the Committee please see Paragraph No. 23 of Chapter I of the Report.

**NEW DELHI;  
11<sup>th</sup> February, 2010  
Magha,1931 (Saka)**

**SHARAD YADAV,  
Chairman,  
Standing Committee on Urban Development**

**COMMITTEE ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT (2009-2010)**

**MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON  
THURSDAY, 11<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY, 2010**

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1630 hrs. in Room No. 53, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

**Shri Sharad Yadav - Chairman**

***MEMBERS***

**LOK SABHA**

2. Shri J.P. Agarwal
3. Shri Gajanan D. Babar
4. Shri Ambica Banerjee
5. Shri Ramesh Kumar
6. Shri Mohinder Singh Kaypee
7. Dr. Kirit Premjibhai Solanki

**RAJYA SABHA**

8. Shri Rajeev Shukla
9. Shri Amir Alam Khan
10. Shri Manohar Joshi
11. Shri Gireesh Kumar Sanghi

**SECRETARIAT**

- |                        |   |                     |
|------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. Shri T.K. Mukherjee | - | Joint Secretary     |
| 2. Shri K.D. Muley     | - | Director            |
| 3. Smt. Anita B. Panda | - | Additional Director |

**REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

- |    |                      |   |                     |
|----|----------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. | Dr. M. Ramachandran  | - | Secretary (UD)      |
| 2. | Ms. Sudha Krishnan   | - | JS&FA               |
| 3. | Shri P.K. Srivastava | - | J S & MD            |
| 4. | Shri Nitin R. Gokarn | - | Director (NURM-III) |
| 5. | Shri Sanjay Kumar    | - | Director (NURM-I)   |

6.	Shri Upendra Malik	-	Director, (CSO), CPWD
7.	Shri M. Shankaranarayanan	-	Deputy Advisor (CPHEEO)
8.	Shri R. Sethuraman	-	Consultant (CPHEEO)
9.	Shri J.B. Kshirsagar	-	Chief Planner, TCPO
10.	Shri K.K. Joadder	-	Add. Chief Planner (TCPO)
11.	Shri S.K. Lohia	-	OSD (Urban Transport)

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members and representatives of the Ministry of Urban Development to the sitting of the Committee.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

6. Thereafter the Committee considered and adopted the Action Taken Report on 38<sup>th</sup> Report (14<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) on the subject 'Solid Waste Management' without any changes/modifications.

**4. *The Committee then adjourned.***

\* \* \* \* \*

## APPENDIX II

[Vide Para 4 of the Introduction]

### ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE THIRTY EIGHTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT (FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

I.	Total number of recommendations	23
II.	Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government.	
	Para Nos. Sl. Nos. Sl. Nos. 1, 4, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21 and 23	(Total 12)
	Percentage to total recommendations	(52.17%)
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies:	
	Para Sl. Nos.7,10 and 19	(Total 3)
	Percentage to total recommendations	(13.04%)
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee:	
	Para Sl. Nos.2,3,5,9,12, and 22	(Total 6)
	Percentage to total recommendations	(26.08%)
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited:	
	Para Sl. Nos.11 and 17	(Total 2)
	Percentage to total recommendations	(8.69%)