

## WHITE PAPER



# Report on Working of Ward Committees in the City of Mumbai and Civic Problems Registered by Citizens

## (January 2011 to December 2012)

April 2013

Supported by:

Narotam Sekhsaria Foundation

Friedrich Naumann FÜR DIE FREIHEIT

FORD FOUNDATION



## **Table of Contents**

Sr. No.	Title	Page No.
1	Foreword	4
2	Part A – Summary Data	6
	Section I. Comparison of most frequent citizen complaints and questions asked by municipal councillors in Ward Committees	6
	Section II. City Summary	7
	Section III. Functioning of the Ward Committees in 2012	10
3	Part B - Ward Wise Data	12
	Section I. Civic Complaint Data	12
	Section II. Citizen Survey Data	18
	Section III. Data of Questions Asked and Attendance in Ward Committees	19
	Annexure 1– Survey Methodology	23
	Annexure 2 – Political party wise data	24
	Annexure 3 – Ward wise councillor's data	25
	Graph	
1	Graph 1: Comparison between top three citizen complaints and top three questions asked by municipal councillors in the <i>Ward Committees in calendar year 2012</i>	6
	Tables	
1	Table 1: Top Four Civic Complaints in Mumbai during calendar years 2011 and 2012	7
2	Table 2: Sub-issue wise top four Civic Complaints during the calendar years 2011 and2012	8
3	Table 3: Citizen Satisfaction for civic services as per Praja's Citizen Survey 2012	9
4	Table 4: Total numbers of Meeting, Attendance and Questions during Mar'12 to Dec'12	10
5	Table 5: Number of questions askedby Councillors during Mar'12 to Dec'12	10



6	Table 6:Number of questions asked issue-wise during Mar'12 to Dec'12	10
7	Table 7:Ward wise top three civic complaints for the calendar years 2011 and 2012	12
8	Table 8:Top three Road related Ward wise civic complaints in the year 2012	13
9	Table 9: Top three Drainage related Ward wise civic complaints in the year 2012	14
10	Table 10: Top three Solid Waste Management related Ward wise civic complaints in         the year 2012	15
11	Table 11: Top three Water supply related Ward wise civic complaints in the year 2012	16
12	Table 12: Ward wise civic complaints on Potholes on the Roads in the Calendar Year2012	17
13	Table 13: Ward-wise Citizen Satisfaction for civic services as per Praja's Citizen Survey2012	18
14	Table 14: Ward Committee and Ward wise Number of Meetings, Attendance in (%)and No. of Questions Asked from Mar'12 to Dec'12	19
15	Table 15: Issues wise questions asked by Councillors in period of Mar'12 to Dec'12	21
16	Table 16: Party wise number of questions asked by Councillors during Mar'12 to Dec'12	24
17	Table 17: Party wise number of questions asked issue-wise during Mar'12 to Dec'12	24
18	Table 18: Ward wise councillors name, party and question asked during Mar'12 to         Dec'12	25



## I. <u>Foreword</u>

The more things change, the more they stay the same, is an age-old adage. Applied to the elected representatives of Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai (MCGM), the one question that rears its head is: "Why should they?" Some four years ago, when Praja Foundation had issued a White Paper on civic issues, we had found it shocking that of the plethora of problems facing the city of Mumbai, the maximum number of questions asked by the municipal councillors in the civic body was on renaming of roads.

That was two years ago. A fresh election in 2012 ushered in a new batch of 227 councillors, many of whom are old hands at the MCGM. The new councillors have completed one full year of their term. We decided to compare the quality and quantity of complaints from the citizens of Mumbai on civic issues. And tried to posit these complaints against the quality and quantity of questions asked by councillors in the MCGM Ward committee meetings!

The outcome is disheartening, to say the least. It is frustrating, exasperating and downright shocking! How else do you explain this?

Ward Committees were set up after the 74<sup>th</sup> Constitutional Amendment. The premise of Ward committees is decentralisation and devolution of powers to the local level.*Local issues and work to be done at the local level.* 

In the calendar year 2012, MCGM received 29,852 complaints related to roads, potholes etc. The 227 elected representatives together asked 100 questions on roads, repairs etc. in the ward committee meetings. The same year, 16,194 complaints were received on drainage problems by the citizens. Only 30 questions were asked by the elected representatives on drainage-related issues in the ward committee meetings. The 6562 complaints on Solid Waste Management (SWM) issues elicited 61 questions by the elected representatives while 6215 complaints on water supply problems prompted 47 questions.

# Now consider this: The maximum number of questions asked by elected representatives in ward committee meetings during the 12 month period last year were on renaming of roads and chowks, a hefty 127 questions!

The representatives are elected to communicate the grievances of their constituents to the MCGM administration and ensure that the complaints are addressed. That is the prime responsibility of all elected representatives. When one out of every five questions asked in the ward committee meetings are on renaming of roads, you begin to wonder if our elected representatives are mocking the entire democratic system, or are they just taking their constituents for granted and perhaps for a ride.

This White Paper reveals several additional interesting facts on the civic issues affecting our city. Between 2011 and 2012, complaints related to licenses, Water Supply have actually reduced. Those related to SWM and other issues have increased only marginally. MCGM deserves kudos for improving the SWM and Water Supply in the city, two extremely significant civic functions. But here's the shocker: Drainage-related complaints in 2012 have gone up by 59% over 2011 while complaints related to roads, potholes, repairs have gone up by over 477%, from 5177 complaints in 2011 to 29,852 complaints in 2012. However, this phenomenal increase is primarily due to the new Potholes complaint system developed by the corporation.

MCGM deserves to be congratulated for having introduced this effective new tool for citizens' complaints and one hopes that this type of mechanism's are introduced for other MCGM services also. This will not only help the MCGM get a true picture of the ground level condition and situation but will also help the MCGM improve its Services based on the complaints and feedback it gets.



Finally, I can't help repeating myself. The prime responsibility of any elected representative is to communicate the grievances of his/her constituents to the executive. Unless Municipal Councillors learn to interpret the data and raise valid, pertinent questions in the ward committee meetings, they are falling far short of the expectations the citizens have elected them for. Should our elected representatives be taking the Corporation to task over the citizen's complaints or should they be only asking the Municipal Commissioner to change names of roads/chowks?

Nitai Mehta Founder Trustee



## Part A – Summary Data

Section I: Comparison of most frequent citizen complaints and questions asked by municipal councillors in Ward Committees

Graph 1: Comparison between top three citizen complaints<sup>1</sup> and top three questions asked by municipal councillors in the *Ward Committees in calendar year 2012* 



#### Inference:

The above data presents the top three categories of complaints registered (*viz.Roads, Drainage and Solid Waste Management*) with Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai (henceforth, MCGM) across the wards for the calendar year 2012 and the top three issues raised (questions asked) by all the 227 elected Municipal Councillors in their respective ward committee meetings from March 2012 to December 2012.

While the issue affecting the most to citizens was Roads (29,852 complaints), our Municipal Councillors were more focussed on raising the issue of 'Renaming of roads/chowks' with the maximum of 127 questions asked.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The complaints registered data is obtained through RTI from the Central Complaint Registering System (CCRS) of the MCGM.



## Section II: City Summary

## Table 1: Top Four<sup>2</sup> Civic Complaints in Mumbai during calendar years 2011 and 2012

	Comp	Increase from 2011	
Issues	2011	2012	to 2012 (in %)
Roads	5177	29852	476.6%
Drainage	10203	16194	58.7%
Solid Waste Management (SWM)	6489	6562	1.1%
Water Supply	6231	6215	-0.3%
Other Complaints	32133	33891	5.5%
Mumbai	60,233	92,714	53.9%

#### Inference:

- Complaints on 'Roads' have increased by 476.6% in the year 2012 from the previous year. The increase is primarily due to the new Potholes complaint system developed by the corporation. This only emphasises the need for a technologically advanced, centralised, user friendly and effective complaints redressal mechanism.
- Drainage Complaints increased by 58.7%.
- Water supply related complaints decreased by -0.3%
- While the total complaints have seen an increase of 53.9%, which is primarily because of an advanced system to track potholes, which in turn led to registration of complaints that were not being captured before due to mostly lack of an updated complaint redressal system.

A definite positive step by the corporation in implementing an updated technology for capturing pothole complaints; however, a lot is still needed and can be done to make the entire complaint redressal system robust.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>As per complaints registered in the year 2012



## Table 2: Sub-issue wise top four Civic Complaints during the calendar years 2011 and 2012

Issues/Sub-issues	2011	2012	Increase from 2011 to 2012 (in %)
Roads			
Bad Patches / Potholes on the Roads	1538	26056	1594.1%
Municipal Land - Road/ Footpath/SWD	1914	1822	-4.8%
Resurfacing of Road	859	1056	22.9%
Total complaints	5177	29852	476.6%
Drainage			·
Drainage Chokes and Blockages	5531	10924	97.5%
Overflowing drains of manholes	3029	3290	8.6%
Replacement of Missing / Damaged Manhole	709	989	39.5%
Total complaints	10203	16194	58.7%
Solid Waste Management (SWM)			
Garbage not lifted from House/Gully/ Municipal Market/ Road/Authorised collection point	2822	2533	-10.2%
Removal of Debris	865	890	2.9%
Garbage lorry not reported for service/ Lorry not covered	699	826	18.2%
Total complaints	6489	6562	1.1%
Water Supply			
Shortage of Water Supply	2987	2402	-19.6%
Leaks in Water Lines	1179	1896	60.8%
Unauthorised Tapping of Water Connection	691	793	14.8%
Total complaints	6231	6215	-0.3%

#### Inference:

- Complaints on 'Drainage Chokes and Blockages' have increased by 97.5% in the year from 2011 to 2012. While the total complaints of Drainage have seen an increase of 58.7%.
- Complaints on 'Leaks in Water Lines' have increased by 60.8% in the year from 2011 to 2012.



## Table 3: Citizen Satisfaction<sup>3</sup> for civic services as per Praja's Citizen Survey 2012

Question/Issue	Satisfaction Level (out of 100)
Condition of roads in your area	62
Traffic Jams & congestion	57
Availability of public Gardens / open playgrounds	52
Water Supply	72
Water logging during rainy season	54
Pollution problems in your area	54
Cleanliness & Sanitation facilities like garbage disposal etc.	61

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Data based on a Citizen Satisfaction Survey that Praja Foundation had commissioned to Hansa Research which was conducted in March-April 2012 across the city of Mumbai with a total sample size of 15,191 households. Kindly find detailed methodology as Annexure 1



## Section III: Functioning of the Ward Committees in 2012 Table 4: Total numbers of Meeting, Attendance and Questions during Mar'12 to Dec'12

Committee	Total Meetings (Mar' 12 to Dec'12)	Attendance (%)	Total Questions Asked
16 Ward Committees	209	82%	672

## Table 5: Number of questions asked by Councillors during Mar'12 to Dec'12

Category	No. of Members
Zero Question	45
1 to 5 Question asked	150
6 to 10 Question asked	29
Above 10 Question asked	3

## Table 6: Number of questions asked issue-wise during Mar'12 to Dec'12

Issues	Question asked (Mar'12 to Dec'12)
Drainage	30
Solid Waste Management (SWM)	61
Water Supply	47
License	29
Roads	100
Storm Water Drainage	31
Toilet	17
Pest control	11
Garden/Open space	28
Community Development	13
Health	19
Education	19
Naming/Renaming of Roads/Chowks	127
Other issues related	140
Total	672



#### **Functioning of the Ward Committees:**

One of the most crucial mechanisms that the Municipal Councillors have for conducting deliberations for delivering effective governance are 'Ward Committees'. Issues of prime significance to citizens' daily life related to civic amenities such as road, water supply, drainage, etc. can be taken up and redressed effectively in this forum. Almost all civic issues are to be resolved and can be resolved through this mechanism. This was precisely the aim of the 74<sup>th</sup> Constitutional Amendment, which created the Ward Committees, to bring and strengthen grassroots democracy.

#### Inference:

Our municipal councillors rather than focussing on solving civic issues are using this mechanism of Ward Committees to change names of roads/chowks – one out of every 5 questions asked in the 16 ward committees' is on renaming/naming of roads/chowks.



## Part B - Ward Wise Data

#### Section I: Civic Complaint Data

#### Table 7: Ward wise top three civic complaints for the calendar years 2011 and 2012

	Road			Drainage		SWM			
Ward	2011	2012	Increase from 2011 to 2012 (in %)	2011	2012	Increase from 2011 to 2012 (in %)	2011	2012	Increase from 2011 to 2012 (in %)
А	137	1120	718%	395	428	8%	277	231	-17%
В	143	1151	705%	533	363	-32%	392	195	-50%
С	161	1079	570%	818	625	-24%	568	394	-31%
D	355	1807	409%	1470	1190	-19%	599	627	5%
E	131	1171	794%	244	640	162%	190	195	3%
F/N	226	1149	408%	204	418	105%	222	222	0%
F/S	167	1353	710%	182	349	92%	177	157	-11%
G/N	316	1706	440%	1062	1115	5%	599	752	26%
G/S	170	824	385%	250	627	151%	143	243	70%
H/E	143	760	431%	210	600	186%	86	116	35%
H/W	169	786	365%	250	762	205%	134	125	-7%
K/E	372	2089	462%	600	1133	89%	379	352	-7%
K/W	417	2215	431%	424	1500	254%	304	336	11%
L	223	1259	465%	701	1241	77%	242	269	11%
M/E	185	890	381%	383	496	30%	220	250	14%
M/W	136	738	443%	389	760	95%	150	200	33%
N	169	811	380%	286	687	140%	214	309	44%
P/N	258	1746	577%	437	621	42%	335	289	-14%
P/S	258	1238	380%	301	555	84%	419	283	-32%
R/C	314	1285	309%	428	763	78%	292	338	16%
R/N	87	931	970%	86	251	192%	93	85	-9%
R/S	359	1281	257%	279	495	77%	198	267	35%
S	166	1309	689%	187	314	68%	183	237	30%
Т	115	1007	776%	84	261	211%	73	90	23%
MCGM other agencies <sup>4</sup>		147							
Total	5177	29852	<b>477</b> %	10203	16194	<b>59</b> %	6489	6562	1%

• Complaints on roads highest increase is 970% for R/North ward.

• K/W ward shows highest increase of 254% for drainage complaints.

• H/E ward shows increased of complaints to 186% and 35% respectively for drainage and Solid Waste Management.

• G/S ward show highest increase of 70% for Solid Waste Management.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Pothole complaints related to central agencies of MCGM but not related to any specific ward.





#### Table 8: Top three Road related Ward wise civic complaints in the year 2012

		Road	
Ward	Bad Patches/Potholes on the Roads	Municipal Land - Road/ Footpath/SWD	Resurfacing of Road
A	1001	80	27
В	1079	51	12
С	972	61	38
D	1557	110	98
E	1042	71	38
F/N	1020	69	40
F/S	1251	56	28
G/N	1427	129	99
G/S	738	41	25
H/E	652	70	19
H/W	645	61	37
K/E	1841	112	87
K/W	1905	152	87
L	1019	96	58
M/E	774	45	33
M/W	623	65	24
Ν	642	85	50
P/N	1562	62	55
P/S	1087	59	42
R/C	1082	92	47
R/N	867	37	11
R/S	1040	82	57
S	1174	81	19
Т	909	55	25
MCGM other agencies	147		
Total	26056	1822	1056

• D, G/N, K/E and K/W among top five wards have highest number of complaints for Bad Patches/Potholes on the Roads, Municipal Land - Road/Footpath/SWD and Resurfacing of Road.

• During this year, the maximum number of complaint is related to Bad Patches/Potholes on the Roads (26,056).

#### WARD COMMITTEE WHITE PAPER



#### Table 9: Top three Drainage related Ward wise civic complaints in the year 2012

		Drainage	
Ward	Drainage Chokes and Blockages	Overflowing drains of manholes	Replacement of Missing / Damaged Manhole
A	300	103	21
В	199	137	17
С	360	197	33
D	594	519	46
E	391	194	35
F/N	231	122	49
F/S	189	116	25
G/N	768	214	72
G/S	423	159	24
H/E	503	60	16
H/W	632	77	41
K/E	764	155	76
K/W	1163	177	113
L	782	291	46
M/E	292	84	32
M/W	539	90	27
Ν	514	109	34
P/N	396	102	70
P/S	336	134	58
R/C	615	76	43
R/N	185	36	16
R/S	343	46	59
S	201	63	23
Т	204	29	13
Total	10924	3290	989

• K/W ward has highest number of complaints for Drainage Chokes and Blockages (1163) and Replacement of Missing/Damaged Manhole (113).

- D ward has highest number of complaints for overflowing drains of manholes (519).
- G/N ward is among top five wards for highest complaints of Drainage Chokes and Blockages, Overflowing drains of manholes and Replacement of Missing/Damaged Manhole.
- During this year, the maximum number of complaint is related to drainage chokes and blockages (10,924).



WARD COMMITTEE WHITE PAPER

Table 10: Top three Solid Waste	Management related Ward wise	civic complaints in the year 2012

	Solid Wa	aste Management (SWM	)
Ward	Garbage not lifted from House/ Gully/ Municipal Market/ Road/ Authorised collection point	Removal of Debris	Garbage lorry not reported for service/ Lorry not covered
А	90	28	62
В	133	19	15
С	255	51	17
D	342	106	28
E	98	35	7
F/N	79	34	23
F/S	64	26	24
G/N	191	74	80
G/S	99	25	53
H/E	39	26	8
H/W	25	26	14
K/E	123	45	35
K/W	97	75	35
L	125	38	23
M/E	99	26	32
M/W	63	36	20
N	100	29	72
P/N	85	40	38
P/S	78	37	42
R/C	120	19	82
R/N	25	23	3
R/S	86	39	39
S	91	21	55
Т	26	12	19
Total	2533	890	826

• D ward has highest number of complaints for Garbage not lifted from House/Gully/ Municipal Market/Road/Authorised collection point (342) and Removal of Debris (106).

• G/N ward is among top five wards for highest complaints of Garbage not lifted from House/Gully/ Municipal Market/Road/Authorised collection point, Removal of Debris and Garbage lorry not reported for service/Lorry not covered.

- R/C ward has highest number of complaints for Garbage lorry not reported for service/Lorry not covered (82).
- During this year, the maximum number of complaint is related to Garbage not lifted from House/Gully/ Municipal Market/Road/Authorised collection point (2,533).





#### Table 11:Top three Water supply related Ward wise civic complaints in the year 2012

		Wate	er Supply	
Ward	Shortage of Water Supply	Leaks in Water Lines	Unauthorised Tapping of Water Connection	Contaminated Water Supply
А	23	8	12	31
В	17	12	9	32
С	192	32	29	62
D	130	74	29	61
E	86	33	25	57
F/N	31	38	34	7
F/S	11	8	17	6
G/N	28	37	119	22
G/S	23	19	51	12
H/E	44	39	19	28
H/W	39	45	10	28
K/E	157	136	52	32
K/W	117	88	41	51
L	124	272	67	8
M/E	731	160	78	55
M/W	362	193	36	44
N	30	223	23	19
P/N	59	61	57	50
P/S	38	60	24	10
R/C	41	50	14	29
R/N	19	22	6	5
R/S	64	113	24	34
S	25	112	13	17
Т	11	61	4	4
Total	2402	1896	793	704

• M/E ward is among top five wards for highest complaints of Shortage of Water Supply, Leaks in Water Lines, Unauthorised Tapping of Water Connection and Contaminated Water Supply.

• During this year, the maximum number of complaint is related to Shortage of Water Supply (2,402).



WARD COMMITTEE WHITE PAPER

	Ро	tholes on the Roads	
Ward	Central Complaint Registration System (CCRs)	Voice of Citizens	Total
Α	29	972	1001
В	10	1069	1079
С	25	947	972
D	75	1482	1557
E	43	999	1042
F/N	69	951	1020
F/S	32	1219	1251
G/N	75	1352	1427
G/S	17	721	738
H/E	45	607	652
H/W	55	590	645
K/E	151	1690	1841
K/W	151	1754	1905
L	107	912	1019
M/E	65	709	774
M/W	51	572	623
Ν	78	564	642
P/N	178	1384	1562
P/S	109	978	1087
R/C	104	978	1082
R/N	30	837	867
R/S	153	887	1040
S	66	1108	1174
Т	39	870	909
MCGM other agencies	0	147	147
Total	1757	24299	26056

#### Table 12: Ward wise civic complaints on Potholes on the Roads in the Calendar Year 2012

#### Inference:

The above data presents the number of complaints registered onCentral Complaint Registration System (CCRS) and MCGM's Portal (<u>http://www.voiceofcitizen.com</u>)of Pothole tracking software across the wards for the years 2012.

The above data presents wards wise complaints related to potholes on roads. P/N (178) ward for CCRS and K/W (1754) wards for voice of citizen has highest number of complaint for Potholes on the Roads.



#### Section II. Citizen Survey Data

## Table 13: Ward-wise Citizen Satisfaction for civic services as per Praja's Citizen Survey<sup>5</sup> 2012

	(0000				-,		
Ward	Condition of roads in your area	Traffic Jams & congestion	Availability of public Gardens / open playgrounds	Water Supply	Water logging during rainy season	Pollution problems in your area	Cleanliness & Sanitation facilities like garbage disposal
А	63	57	54	76	64	63	65
В	61	58	53	77	53	53	57
С	64	62	63	75	55	60	65
D	69	62	68	78	57	59	69
E	65	58	63	78	57	60	66
F/N	65	55	51	75	55	54	59
F/S	67	63	68	82	70	66	67
G/N	63	56	52	83	57	55	62
G/S	74	61	65	78	55	57	74
H/E	58	50	47	64	48	48	52
H/W	67	60	55	71	53	50	68
K/E	63	56	53	75	54	57	64
K/W	59	56	54	56	50	50	54
L	61	53	43	69	51	52	60
M/E	58	54	40	66	48	48	55
M/W	67	59	54	82	54	57	66
Ν	64	63	59	79	60	59	68
P/N	55	49	47	66	50	51	59
P/S	65	64	57	61	61	58	62
R/C	64	61	57	70	53	55	60
R/N	67	60	56	71	51	50	53
R/S	54	52	42	72	49	51	62
S	58	51	43	73	50	48	55
Т	73	68	51	81	48	56	55

## (Satisfaction level scores below are out of 100)

## Shaded wards are the worst three wards as per citizen satisfaction for the respective issue.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Data based on Household survey of 15,191 respondents across the city of Mumbai.



## Section III: Data of Questions Asked and Attendance in Ward Committees

# Table 14: Ward Committee and Ward wise Number of Meetings, Attendance in (%) and No. of Questions Askedfrom Mar'12 to Dec'12

						No	-	ions asked cillors	l by
Sr. No.	Ward	No. of Councill ors	No. of Meetin gs	Atten dance (in %)	Total Question asked	Zero Que.	1 to 5 Que.	6 to 10 Que.	Above 10 Que.
1	Ward Committee A, B	and E	-						
	А	4			8	1	3		
	В	3			11	0	2	1	
	E	8	13	69%	14	4	4		
2	Ward Committee C and	D							
	С	4			23	0	3		1
	D	7	13	94%	26	1	4	2	
3	Ward Committee F/So	uth and F/N	North	-		-			
	F/N	10			27	1	9		
	F/S	7	12	84%	20	1	5	1	
4	Ward Committee G/North	11	11	82%	24	3	7	1	
5	Ward Committee G/South	9	11	87%	52	1	6	1	1
6	Ward Committee H/Ea			0770	52	Ŧ	0	Ŧ	Т
0	H/E	11			17	3	7	1	
	H/W	6	11	85%	15	2	2	2	
7	Ward Committee K/East	15	12	85%	35	4	8	3	
8	Ward Committee K/West	13	14	85%	49	0	12	1	
9	Ward Committee L	15	15	78%	54	4	8	3	
10	Ward Committee M/Ea	ast and M/	West						
	M/E	13			23	5	7	1	
	M/W	8	13	75%	20	2	5	1	
11	Ward Committee N	12	14	79%	57	0	8	3	1
12	Ward Committee P/North	16	12	83%	46	2	14		
13	Ward Committee P/South	8	12	84%	5	5	3		
14	Ward Committee R/Ce	ntral and R	/North	-					
	R/C	10			22	2	7	1	
	R/N	7	14	84%	21	0	7		



						No.	No. of questions asked by councillors			
Sr.		No. of Councill	No. of Meetin	Atten dance	Total Question	Zero	1 to 5	6 to 10	Above 10	
No.	Ward	ors	gs	(in %)	asked	Que.	Que.	Que.	Que.	
	Ward Committee	013	5	(1170)	usikeu	Que.	Que.	Que.	Que.	
15	R/South	11	13	84%	44	2	5	4		
16	Ward Committee S and	Т								
	S	13			40	2	9	2		
	Т	6	19	80%	19	0	5	1		
	Total	227	209	82%	672	45	150	29	3	

Inference:

- Councillors from A, B and E Ward Committee have lowest (69%) attendance.
- M/East and P/South ward has highest number of councillors(5) asking zero questions.
- 'A' and 'P/S' ward councillors has asked lowest number of questions.
- Only three Councillors out of 227, has asked questions above 10 and among them maximum number of councillors (150) have asked questions 1 to 5.
- Average three questions were asked per councillors.



## Table 15: Issues wise questions asked by Councillors in period of Mar'12 to Dec'12

Sr. No.	Ward	Drain age	SW M	Wat er Supp Iy	Licen	Roa ds	Gar den	Comm unity Devel opme nt	Heal th	Edu cati on	Nami ng/ Rena ming of Roads	Other	Tota I
1	Ward Committee A	A, B and E		1				1	r	r	1		
	A		2			2					2	2	8
	В	2				3					4	1	11
	E			2	1	1		1	1	2	1	4	14
2	Ward Committee C	and D		r	1	1	1	[	1		[	[]	
	С	2	1	2	1	4				1	4	6	23
	D		3	3	2	3	2	1		1	4	6	26
3	Ward Committee F	South a	nd F/N	orth									
	F/N		8	3		5	1		1		2	5	27
	F/S	2	6			3	3		2			3	20
	Ward Committee												
4	G/North		2	1	2	8	1		2	1	3	3	24
	Ward Committee												
5	G/South	3	2	6	3	5	4	1	2			17	52
6	Ward Committee H	l/East an		1					[				
	H/E		1	1		1		1	2	1	2	3	17
	H/W	1	3	1	1					1	2	5	15
	Ward Committee		-			_					40	10	
7	K/East Ward Committee		2	1	1	5	1				13	10	35
8	K/West	3	3	3	1	9	2	3	2		14	6	49
0	Ward Committee	5	5	5	-	5	2	5	2		14	0	45
9	L	2	3	1	3	14	3			1	11	14	54
10	Ward Committee N	M/East ar		Vest		1	1						
	M/E	2	2	5		2			1	2	1	5	23
	M/W	2	4		1			1		2	1	3	20
	Ward Committee		-										
11	N	4	7	5	3	7		2			17	8	57
	Ward Committee												
12	P/North	1	1	4	2	7	1		4	2	14	8	46
13	Ward Committee P/South					1					3		5
14	Ward Committee R	R/Central	and P	North	I	<u> </u>		1					
	R/C	1	1 1	1	2	3		1	1		3	6	22
	R/N	1	2	3	1	1			1	1	5	6	22
	Ward Committee		2	3	1	1			1	T	3	U	21
15	R/South	2	4	1	3	8		2		4	11	4	44



Sr. No.	Ward	Drain age	SW M	Wat er Supp ly	Licen se	Roa ds	Gar den	Comm unity Devel opme nt	Heal th	Edu cati on	Nami ng/ Rena ming of Roads	<b>Other</b> issues	Tota I
16	Ward Committee S	and T											
	S	2	2	3	1	5	9				7	11	40
	Т		2	1	1	3	1				3	4	19
	Total	30	61	47	29	100	28	13	19	19	127	140	672

#### Inference:

The above data presents Issues wise questions asked by Councillor in their respective wards in period of March2012 to December 2012

- Highest 57 questions were asked in N ward committee meetings and 17 were on Naming/Renaming of Roads.
- Highest numbers of questions were asked on Naming/Renaming of Roads (127).
- Top three complaints are Roads (29,705), Drainage (16,194) and SWM (6,562) respectively question asked on top three complaints are 100, 30 and 61.



#### **Annexure 1**– Survey Methodology

Praja Foundation had commissioned the **household survey** to Hansa Research and the survey methodology followed is as below:

- In order to meet the desired objectives of the study, we represented the city by covering a sample from each of its 227 councillor wards. Target Group for the study was :
  - ✓ Both Males & Females
  - ✓ 18 years and above
  - ✓ Belonging to that particular ward.
- Sample quotas were set for representing gender and age groups on the basis of their split available through Indian Readership Study (Large scale baseline study conducted nationally by Media Research Users Council (MRUC) & Hansa Research group) for Mumbai Municipal Corporation Region.
- The required information was collected through face to face interviews with the help of structured questionnaire.
- In order to meet the respondent within a ward, following sampling process was followed:
  - $\checkmark$  4 5 prominent areas in the ward were identified as the starting point
  - ✓ In each starting point about 12 15 individuals were selected randomly and the questionnaire was administered with them.
- Once the survey was completed, sample composition of age & gender was corrected to match the population
  profile using the baseline data from IRS. This helped us to make the survey findings more representatives in
  nature and ensured complete coverage.
- The total study sample was 15,191.



## Annexure2 – Political party wise data

## Table 16: Party wise number of questions asked by Councillors during Mar'12 to Dec'12

Political Party Name	Zero Question	1 to 5 Question asked	6 to 10 Question asked	Above 10 Question asked	Total Members
Akhil Bharatiya Sena	2	0	0	0	2
Bharatiya Janata Party	5	20	5	1	31
Bhartiya Republican Party Bahujan Mahasangha	0	1	0	0	1
Independent	3	11	1	0	15
Indian National Congress	10	33	9	0	52
Maharashtra Navnirman Sena	4	21	3	0	28
Nationalist Congress Party	0	11	2	0	13
Republican Party Of India (RPI)(A)	0	1	0	0	1
Samajwadi Party	4	3	1	1	9
Shiv Sena	17	49	8	1	75
Total Members	45	150	29	3	227

## Table 17: Party wise number of questions asked issue-wise during Mar'12 to Dec'12

Political Party Name	No. of Members	Road	Drainage	SWM	Water Supply	Naming/ Renaming of Roads / Chowk	<b>Other</b> issues	Total
Akhil Bharatiya Sena	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bharatiya Janata Party	31	14	2	7	10	20	39	92
Bhartiya Republican Party Bahujan Mahasangha	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4
Independent	15	10	1	3	2	9	18	43
Indian National Congress	52	19	10	21	11	29	54	144
Maharashtra Navnirman Sena	28	20	3	2	5	9	42	81
Nationalist Congress Party	13	6	1	4	2	13	24	50
Republican Party Of India (RPI)(A)	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Samajwadi Party	9	4	4	2	2	1	16	29
Shiv Sena	75	27	9	22	13	44	112	227
Total	227	100	30	61	47	127	307	672



#### Annexure 3- Ward wise councillor's data

## Table 18: Ward wise councillors name, party and question asked during Mar'12 to Dec'12

Ward	Councillors Name	Party	Question	Ward	Councillors Name	Party	Question
А	Anita Yadav	INC	0	L	Komal Jamsandekar	SS	0
А	Ganesh Sanap	SS	1	L	Lalita Annamalai	IND	0
А	Makarand Narvekar	IND	5	L	Leena Shukla	IND	5
А	Sushama Salunkhe	INC	2	L	Manali Tulaskar	SS	3
В	Dnyanraj Nikam	INC	1	L	Mohd. Ishak Shaikh	SP	0
В	Waqarunnisa Ansari	INC	3	L	Saeeda Khan	NCP	2
В	Javed Juneja	INC	7	L	Sanjana Mungekar	SS	4
С	Sampat Thakur	SS	3	L	Savita Pawar	NCP	5
С	Veena Jain	BJP	4	L	Vijay Tandel	IND	10
С	Yakub Memon	SP	12	M/E	Arun Kamble	Bharip	4
С	Yugandara Salekar	SS	4	M/E	Dinesh Panchal	SS	0
D	Anil Singh	SS	7	M/E	Hanifa Bi	IND	0
D	Arvind Dudhwadkar	SS	0	M/E	Manju Kumare	SS	0
D	Jyotshna Mehta	BJP	2	M/E	Mohd. Siraj Shaikh	IND	1
D	Noshir Mehta	INC	10	M/E	Noorjahan Shaikh	SP	1
D	Sarita Patil	BJP	1	M/E	Rahul Shevale	SS	0
D	Shantilal Doshi	INC	2	M/E	Rais Shaikh	SP	0
D	Surendra Bagalkar	SS	4	M/E	Reshma Nevrekar	SP	10
Е	Faiyaz Khan	INC	0	M/E	Shantaram Patil	SP	3
E	Geeta Gawli	ABS	0	M/E	Sunanda Lokare	INC	2
Е	Manoj Jamsutkar	INC	5	M/E	Usha Kamble	INC	1
E	Ramakant Rahate	SS	4	M/E	Vithal Kharatmol	BJP	1
E	Samita Naik	MNS	0	M/W	Anil Patankar	INC	2
E	Shahana Khan	INC	2	M/W	Deepa Parab	SS	1
E	Vandana Gawli	ABS	0	M/W	Mahadev Shivgan	BJP	4
E	Yamini Jadhav	SS	3	M/W	Rajshree Palande	BJP	0
F/N	Alka Doke	SS	0	M/W	Sangita Handore	INC	0
F/N	Lalita Yadav	INC	4	M/W	Seema Mahulkar	INC	3
F/N	Mahant Chaube	BJP	2	M/W	Suprada Phaterpekar	SS	2
F/N	Manojkumar Sansare	IND	3	M/W	Vandana Sable	INC	8
F/N	Nayna Sheth	INC	3	N	Ashwini Mate	SS	8
F/N	Pranita Waghdhare	SS	2	N	Bharti Bawadane	SS	6
F/N	Rajeshree Shirwadkar	BJP	2	N	Deepak Hande	IND	5
F/N	Selvan Tamil	BJP	3	N	Falguni Dave	BJP	7
F/N	Shradha Jadhav	SS	4	N	Harun Khan	NCP	1
F/N	Trushna Vishwasrao	SS	4	N	Mangal Kadam	MNS	1
F/S	Hemangi Chemburkar	SS	5	N	Pratiksha Ghuge	NCP	4

#### WARD COMMITTEE WHITE PAPER



Ward	Councillors Name	Party	Question	Ward	Councillors Name	Party	Question
F/S	Nandkishor Vichare	SS	8	N	Pravin Cheda	INC	5
F/S	Pallavi Mungekar	INC	1	N	Rakhi Jadhav	NCP	2
F/S	Sanjay Ambole	SS	1	Ν	Ritu Tawade	BJP	11
F/S	Shweta Rane	SS	0	N	Sanjay Bhalerao	MNS	2
F/S	Sunil More	INC	1	N	Suresh Awale	MNS	5
F/S	Vaibhavi Chavan	SS	4	P/N	Ajit Bhandari	SS	5
G/N	Anusha Kodam	SS	0	P/N	Anagha Mhatre	SS	4
G/N	Jyotsna Parmar	SP	0	P/N	Bhomsing Rathod	INC	4
G/N	Manish Chavan	MNS	3	P/N	Cyril D'souza	IND	5
G/N	Rajendra Suryavanshi	SS	3	P/N	Deepak Pawar	MNS	3
G/N	Sabreddy Bora	RPI-A	2	P/N	Gyanmurti Sharma	BJP	3
G/N	Sandeep Deshpande	MNS	3	P/N	Kamarjaha Siddiqi	INC	2
G/N	Shraddha Patil	MNS	1	P/N	Manisha Patil	SS	3
G/N	Sudhir Jadhav	MNS	6	P/N	Parminder Bhamra	INC	0
G/N	Vakil Shaikh	INC	1	P/N	Prashant Kadam	SS	2
G/N	Virendra Tandel	MNS	5	P/N	Ramnarayan Barot	BJP	2
G/N	Vishnu Gaikwad	IND	0	P/N	Rupali Raorane	NCP	4
G/S	Hemangi Worlikar	SS	27	P/N	Sayali Warise	SS	0
G/S	Hemlata Wange	MNS	0	P/N	Siraj Shaikh	INC	2
G/S	Kishori Pednekar	SS	3	P/N	Sunil Gujar	SS	2
G/S	Mansi Dalvi	SS	1	P/N	Vinod Shelar	BJP	5
G/S	Ratna Mahale	NCP	7	P/S	Jitendra Walvi	SS	0
G/S	Santosh Dhuri	MNS	4	P/S	Kiran Patel	INC	0
G/S	Seema Shivalkar	MNS	4	P/S	Lochana Chavan	SS	1
G/S	Snehal Ambekar	SS	1	P/S	Pramila Shinde	SS	0
G/S	Sunil Ahir	NCP	5	P/S	Rajan Padhye	SS	3
H/E	Anil Trimbakkar	SS	0	P/S	Sneha Zagde	INC	0
H/E	Brian Miranda	INC	2	P/S	Sunil Prabhu	SS	1
H/E	Deepak Bhutkar	SS	2	P/S	Varsha Tembvalkar	SS	0
H/E	Gulistan Shaikh	INC	0	R/C	Asawari Patil	BJP	1
H/E	Ilyas Shaikh	IND	1	R/C	Bina Doshi	BJP	3
H/E	Krishna Parkar	BJP	1	R/C	Chetan Kadam	MNS	3
H/E	Pooja Mahadeshwar	SS	3	R/C	Manisha Chaudhari	BJP	6
H/E	Priyatama Sawant	INC	6	R/C	Mohan Mithbaokar	BJP	0
H/E	Snehal Shinde	MNS	1	R/C	Pravin Shah	BJP	0
H/E	Sukhada Pawar	MNS	0	R/C	Riddhi Khursange	NCP	2
H/E	Sunaina Potnis	SS	1	R/C	Sandhya Doshi	NCP	4
H/W	Alka Kerkar	BJP	7	R/C	Shilpa Chogle	MNS	1
H/W	Asif Zakaria	INC	6	R/C	Shivanand Shetty	INC	2
H/W	Geeta Chavan	MNS	1	R/N	Abhishek Ghosalkar	SS	3

#### WARD COMMITTEE WHITE PAPER



Ward	Councillors Name	Party	Question	Ward	Councillors Name	Party	Question
H/W	Karen D'mello Allen	INC	0	R/N	Hansaben Desai	SS	2
H/W	Tanveer Mohd. Patel	INC	1	R/N	Prakash Darekar	MNS	3
H/W	Sunita Wavekar	INC	0	R/N	Sheetal A. Mhatre	INC	3
K/E	Anant Nar	SS	7	R/N	Sheetal M. Mhatre	SS	4
K/E	Bhalchandra Aambure	MNS	1	R/N	Shubha Raul	SS	1
K/E	Jyoti Alavani	IND	3	R/N	Udesh Patekar	SS	5
K/E	Kesarben Patel	INC	1	R/S	Ajanta Yadav	INC	6
K/E	Manisha Panchal	SS	3	R/S	Geeta Yadav	INC	8
K/E	Manjiri Parab	SS	1	R/S	Mukeshkumar Mistry	BJP	1
K/E	Pramod Sawant	SS	7	R/S	Neha Patil	INC	4
K/E	Sandhya Yadav	SS	0	R/S	Prajakta Sawant	SS	3
K/E	Shivani Parab	SS	0	R/S	Ramashish Gupta	INC	3
K/E	Shubhada Patkar	SS	2	R/S	Sagar Thakur	INC	0
K/E	Smita Sawant	SS	3	R/S	Shailaja Girkar	BJP	8
K/E	Sunita Elawadekar	SS	0	R/S	Shrikant Kavathankar	SS	5
K/E	Sushma Rai	INC	6	R/S	Sunita Yadav	BJP	0
K/E	Ujjwala Modak	BJP	0	R/S	Yogesh Bhoir	INC	6
K/E	Vinnifred D'souza	INC	1	S	Anisha Majgaonkar	MNS	0
к/W	Ameet Satam	BJP	4	S	Ashok Patil	SS	3
к/W	Bhavna Mangela	IND	2	S	Avinash Sawant	MNS	7
к/W	Binita Vora	INC	3	S	Chandan Sharma	NCP	6
к/W	Changej Multani	IND	2	S	Dhananjay Pisal	NCP	4
к/W	Devendra Amberkar	INC	1	S	Mangesh Pawar	IND	1
к/W	Dilip Patel	BJP	2	S	Priyanka Shrungare	MNS	4
к/W	Jyoti Sutar	SS	4	S	Ramesh Korgaonkar	SS	3
к/W	Jyotsna Dighe	INC	4	S	Rupesh Waingankar	MNS	5
к/W	Mohsin Haider	INC	4	S	Suresh Koparkar	INC	1
к/W	Raju Pednekar	SS	4	S	Tavaji Gorule	SS	3
к/W	Sanjay Pawar	SS	9	S	Vaishnavi Sarfare	MNS	3
K/W	Vanita Marucha	INC	5	S	Vishwas Shinde	SS	0
K/W	Yashodhar Phanse	SS	5	Т	Bhavna Jobanputra	BJP	2
L	Anuradha Pednekar	SS	8	Т	Manoj Kotak	BJP	2
L	Ashraf Ansari	SP	3	Т	Nandakumar Vaity	NCP	4
L	Darshana Shinde	SS	2	Т	Prakash Gangadhare	BJP	6
L	Dilip Lande	MNS	10	Т	Samita Kamble	BJP	2
L	Dilshad Azmi	SP	0	Т	Sujata Pathak	MNS	3
L	Ishwar Tayade	MNS	2				