Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

Mandatory Indicators Queries

A. Why ULB failed or awarded lower level (L1/L2/L3) in *M1 (Door to Door Garbage collection service)*, even though the Garbage collection vehicle/s were found active during field observation in all/few of the areas of the concerned ward?

   Response: *The subjected indicator is a combination of Independent Observation (20%) and Citizen Validation (80%). Citizen's feedback was recorded less than the minimum qualifying criteria. To qualify level 1 in M1 the minimum per cent requirement was 54% (post relaxation), which was not in compliance based on the citizen responses recorded. Similarly, lower level is attained on not meeting the requisite per cent range of higher levels.*

B. Why ULB failed or awarded lower level (L1/L2/L3) in M2 (Segregated Door to Door Garbage Collection service), even though the Compartmentalized Garbage collection vehicle/s were found active during field observation in all/few of the areas of the concerned ward?

   Response: *The subjected indicator is a combination of Independent Observation (20%) and Citizen Validation (80%). Citizen's feedback recorded was less than the minimum qualifying criteria. To qualify level 1 in M2 the minimum per cent requirement was 27% (post relaxation), which was not in compliance based on the citizen responses recorded. Similarly, lower level is attained on not meeting the requisite per cent range of higher levels.*

C. Why ULB failed or awarded lower level (L1/L2/L3) in M3 (Daily/Twice Daily Sweeping in in Residential/Commercial-Public Areas), despite photographic evidence showing clean areas?

   Response: *The subjected indicator is a combination of Independent Observation (80%) and Citizen Validation (20%). Citizen's feedback recorded was less than the minimum qualifying criteria. To qualify level 1 in M3, the minimum per cent requirement was 90% (post relaxation), which was not in compliance based on the citizen responses recorded. Also, in case of any ULB where one/more Garbage Vulnerable Point (GVPs) were found, the ULB failed in respective area and ward as a whole.*
   Similarly, lower level is attained on not meeting the requisite per cent of higher levels.

D. In M4 (Twin Litter Bins installed at road length), photographic evidence captured during field observation depicts presence of Twin Litter Bin in the Public Area (Tourist/ Park-Gardens/Transport hubs) but ULB failed. Please Clarify.

   Response: *As per the GFC protocol, it is mandatory for all ULBs to install fixed twin litter bins at every 50-100 meters in all public areas of the respective wards. The photographic evidence did not depict the fixed twin litter bins installation. Hence the ULB failed in the respective wards.*

E. In M4 (Twin Litter Bins installed at road length), photographic evidence captured during field observation depicts presence of Fixed Twin Litter Bin in the Public /Commercial Areas but ULB failed. Please Clarify?

   Response: *The photographic evidence depicted the fixed twin litter bins but were not found at every 50-100 meters with reference to the road length under observation. Hence the ULB failed in the respective wards.*

F. In M4 (Twin Litter Bins installed at road length), photographic evidence captured during field observation depicts presence of Fixed Twin Litter Bin in the Public /Commercial Areas at every 50-100 meter (Tourist/ Park-Gardens/Transport hubs) but ULB failed. Please Clarify?

Response: *If the ULB was found with fixed litter Twin-bins installation at every 50-100 meter and still failing, then it is certain that one/more Twin-bin was observed to have spillage of garbage.*

G. In M5 (Secondary Storage Bins), secondary waste storage bins/dhalao found during field observation but ULB failed. Why?

Response: *The photographic evidence depicted the secondary storage bins but the ULB failed in the respective wards due to one/both of the following reasons:1. Spillover of waste was found besides waste storage bins2. Requisite number of Waste Storage Bins were not found within the wards with reference to active GVPs found within the area/s of the ward.*

H. In M5 (Secondary Storage Bins), secondary waste storage bins/dhalaos not found anywhere in the wards but ULB failed under the concept of 'bin-less'. Why?

Response: *The ULB failed in the respective wards due to Garbage Vulnerable Point (GVP) found in one/more area/s of the wards*

I. Why ULB failed or awarded lower level (L1/L2/L3) in M6-M7 (Wet-waste processing and installed functional capacity to process the wet waste), even though the Wet waste processing center was observed (with reference to the photographic evidence captured)?

Response: *The ULB failed due to one/both of the following reasons:*

*1. the wet waste processing plant was **NOT** found on the claimed location/ was **NOT** claimed in the City Profile by the city*
2.the wet waste processing plant was found on the claimed location, but the plant was observed to be non-operational/ non-functional
3. the requisite per cent range of wet waste processing to qualify Level -1 was not met.

The ULB attained lower levels due to the requisite per cent range of wet waste processing was not met to qualify higher levels (Level 2,3,4)

J. Why ULB failed or awarded lower level (L1/L2/L3) in M8-M9 (Dry-waste processing and installed functional capacity to process/recycle the dry waste), even though the Dry waste processing center was observed (with reference to the photographic evidence captured)?

Response: *The ULB failed due to one/more of the following reasons:*

*1. the dry waste processing plant was **NOT** found on the claimed location/ was **NOT** claimed in the City Profile by the city*
2.the dry waste processing plant was found on the claimed location, but the plant was observed to be non-operational/non-functional
3. the requisite per cent range of dry waste processing to qualify Level -1 was not met.
4. the requisite per cent range of dry waste processing was found but the minimum quantum of recyclables was not observed to qualify Level 1

The ULB attained lower levels due to the requisite per cent range of dry waste processing/recyclables was not met to qualify higher levels (Level 2,3,4)

K. Why ULB failed in M10 (Grievance Redressal via. Swachhata App within SLA)?

Response: *There was no independent citizen validation by the TPA for M10. The Swachhta App data was dependent on the data received from Janaagraha -in approval to MoHUA.*

Essential Indicators Queries

L. Why ULB failed in E1 (Bulk Waste Generator to process wet waste, based on population class), despite photographic evidence depicting BWG entity along with facility to process wet waste?

   Response: *The ULB failed due to one/ more of the assessed BWGs **NOT being** aware about the mandates of BWG to process wet waste*

   The ULB attained a lower level due to one of the following reasons:
   1.the ULBs with population >1,00,000 were found to be aware about the mandates of BWG but did not have any mechanism for onsite wet waste processing facility as observed during independent observation
   *2. the ULBs with population >1,00,000 were found to be aware about the mandates of BWG, also the BWG had a facility for onsite wet waste processing but **it was found to be non-functional***

M. Why ULB failed (L1/L2/L3) in following Indicators:
   - E2 (Penalty/ Spot Fines)
   - E4 (User Charge)
   - E5 (Plastic Ban)

   Response: *The ULB failed or awarded lower level due to citizen's feedback recorded being less than the minimum qualifying criteria. To qualify level 1 in the above indicators the minimum per cent requirement was 90% (post relaxation), which was not in compliance based on the citizen responses recorded.*

N. Why ULB failed/awarded lower level in E6 (C&D Waste Collection facility for all wards of the ULB), despite photographic evidence depicting C&D Waste Collection?

   Response: *The subjected indicator is a combination of Independent Observation (20%) and Citizen Validation (80%). The C&D collection center was observed but citizen's feedback recorded was less than the minimum qualifying criteria. To qualify level 1 in E6 the minimum per cent requirement was 90% (post relaxation), which was not in compliance. Similarly, lower level is attained on not meeting the requisite per cent range of higher levels.*

O. Why ULB failed in E7-E8 (Landfill/ Sanitary Landfill), even though the ULB has a simple landfill which is operational and found active as per the photographic evidence?

   Response: *ULBs failing with active simple landfill shall have one/more of the following reasons:*
   1. The ULBs having a population of more than 1 Lakh were required to have a sanitary landfill, which was not found
   2. The ULBs population was less than 1 Lakh but the quantum of waste being dumped (unprocessed waste) in the simple landfill exceed the minimum acceptable range (45%)

P. Why ULB failed or lower level awarded in E7-E8 (Zero Landfill Concept) when claimed by ULB?

   Response: *ULBs failed/attained lower levels due to less than 100% wet and dry waste processing found during the assessment*

Q. Why ULB passed in E7 at L1/L2 but failed in E8 when cleared processing (M6 & M8) with L1/L2?

   Response: *ULBs failed in E8 due to one of the following reasons:*

1. ULBs with population greater than 100000 passed with Level 1, must have identified land (under construction) for Sanitary Landfill but currently garbage is being dumped in a simple landfill/ legacy dumpsite location. Hence, the ULB failed in E8 as the requirement to qualify here is to have operational Sanitary Landfill, wherein the garbage dumping quantum exceeded the limit of 45% including process rejects, if any.

Another, case where ULB was awarded with Level 2 in E7 but failed in E8; due to the presence of operational Sanitary Landfill but the garbage dumping quantum exceeded the limit of 45% including process rejects, if any.

R. Why ULB failed in E9A (Water bodies) failed?
Response: *ULBs failing in E9A have not met the minimum requirement of Level 1, where all the Water bodies were required to be clean (with zero waste dumping/ No floating solid waste).*

S. Why ULB was awarded with Level 1 in E9A (Water bodies)?

Response: *ULBs not attaining Level 2 (but attained Level 1) is due the following reasons:*
- *All the Water bodies were not found with the Anti-Littering & Cleanliness (along the walkway of water body). Requirement to qualify*

T. Why ULB was awarded Level 1/ Level 2 (Why not Level 4) when the area of the water body was found with less than 1 Acre (less than 30-meter width)?

Response: *ULBs attaining Level 1/ Level 2 (but not level 4), is due to the following:*
- *open dumpsites present within the radius of 1 km from edge of the water body*
- *Garbage Vulnerable Points (GVPs) are found within the radius of 1km from edge of one or all the water bodies*

U. Why ULB failed or awarded lower level in E9B (Storm Water Drain/ Nallah)?

Response: *ULBs failed/ attained lower level due to one/more the following reasons:*
- *Less than 50% of the Nallahs/SWD found without screen/filters. Hence failed*
- *The nallahs/drains found with screen/filters but the secondary nallahs (if any) was not found with intermediate screen/filter at every 1km. Hence attained lower level*

Desirable Indicators Queries

V. Why ULB failed or awarded lower level in D1 (Sustainability)?

Response: *ULBs failed or attained lower level due to*
- *Less than 2 parameters observed in one/every ward's public area/s. Hence the ULB failed*
- *Less than minimum number of parameters observed in one or more wards public areas. Thus, the ULB attained lower level*

W. Why ULB failed/awarded lower levels in D2 (onsite wet waste processing by waste generator)?

Response: *ULBs failed in onsite wet waste processing by waste generator due to Citizen's feedback less than the minimum qualifying criteria. To qualify level 1 in D2 the minimum per cent requirement was 1.8% (post relaxation), which was not in compliance based on the citizen responses recorded. Similarly, lower level is attained on not meeting the requisite per centage range of higher levels*

***Note**: Due to the 2nd wave of Covid Pandemic the independent observation was not captured for the above indicator. It was challenging to capture the onsite processing facility inside houses, non-bulk generators. Hence it was captured through citizen validations.*

X. Why ULB failed in D3 (C&D Waste Storage, Segregation, Processing & Recycling), even though the C&D Collection Center is evident in photographic evidence?

Response: *To qualify D-3, C&D processing plant is required. This implies that the C&D waste should be collected, stored, segregated, processed, and recycled within municipal limits. No basic segregation into five types was observed during field assessment. The basic non-mechanized equipment was not found at the claimed C&D Waste Processing Plants location, along with record tonnage processing and percentage of commodity recovery (logbook not found wrt to bulk and non-bulk waste processing). It was only a **C&D waste collection Center.** Moreover, in ULBs> 50000 population segregation machineries were not found. Hence ULB failed.*

Y. Why ULB failed in D4 (C&D Waste use of materials)?

Response: *To qualify D-4, use of C&D waste is required. The raw C&D waste in municipal/ government/ municipality approved construction activities in nonstructural applications: lower layers of road pavements, inner colony roads, filling of plinth and basement. To use the C&D waste, the processing and recycling of C&D waste is **mandatory**. Thus, if no processing the ULB has failed in D4.*

Z. Why ULB failed in D5 (Dumpsite Remediation in process-completed)?

Response: *To qualify D-5, minimum 25% remediation activity should be completed. The ULB has failed due to one/more of the following reasons:*
   - *No remediation activity was observed during the assessment*
   - *In case of less than 25% remediation activity*
   - *In case the dumpsite was found to be active, and waste was dumped*