

WHITE PAPER



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

(March 2012 to December 2015)

April 2016



Table of Contents

Sr. No.	Title	Page No.
1	I. Foreword	4
2	II. Acknowledgement	5
3	III. Part A – Summary Data	6
4	Section I: Comparison of most frequent complaints by citizens and questions asked by Municipal Councillors in Ward Committees	6
5	Section II: City Summary	13
6	Section III: Functioning of Ward Committees	16
7	IV. Part B – Ward-Wise Data	27
8	Section I: Civic Complaints Data	27
9	Section II: Data of Attendance and Questions Asked in Ward Committees	40
10	Annexure1 - Analysis of complaints attended (closed) in comparison with days mentioned in MCGM's Citizen Charter	44
11	Annexture2 - Analysis of Air Quality Index (AQI) averages at Bandra, Mumbai with its corresponding measuring scale	46
12	Annexure3 -Political party-wise data	47
13	Annexure4 - Ward-wise Councillors' data	49
14	Supported by	54
	Мар	
15	Map 1: Wards in Crisis	11
16	Map 2: Wards in Crisis (a comparison)	12
	Graph	
17	Graph 1: Comparison between top five citizen complaints from 2013 to 2015	6
18	Graph 2: Comparison between Pothole Complaints received through Centralized	7
10	Complaints Registration System (CCRS) and Voice of Citizen Online Portal	,
19	Graph 3: Top five questions asked by Municipal Councillors in ward committee	8
20	Graph 4: Representation and Analysis of 'Pollution' Complaints in 2015	14
21	Graph 5: Types of devices used by Councillors in the year 2012 to 2015	20
22	Graph 6: Answers given by Administration to Point of Order questions raised in Ward committee meetings in the Year 2015	21
23	Graph 7: Comparison of the average days taken to answer Point of Order questions in the Ward Committees from 2012 to 2015	22
	Table	
24	Table 1: Analysis of complaints attended (closed) in comparison with days mentioned in MCGM's Citizen Charter	9
25	Table 2: Comparison between the actual days taken and Citizen Charter specified days for the services given by the MCGM in 2015	10



26	Table 3: Civic Complaints by Citizens in Mumbai during calendar years 2013 to 2015	13
27	Table 4: Sub-issue wise top four Civic Complaints by Citizens during the calendar years2013 to 2015	15
28	Table 5: Total number of Meetings, Attendance and Questions from March 2012 to December 2015	17
29	Table 6: Number of questions asked by Councillors from March 2012 to December2015	18
30	Table 7: Issue-wise number of questions asked during March 2012 to December 2015	19
31	Table 8: List of nominated members in Ward Committee	23
32	Table 9: Top three wards in complaints and questions in proportion to the ward population in year 2015	25
33	Table 10: Top three wards in complaints and questions in year 2015	25
34	Table 11: Top three wards in questions asked in proportion to the Councillors elected from the ward in the Year 2015	26
35	Table 12: Ward-wise total complaints in year 2013 to 2015	27
36	Table 13: Ward-wise top civic complaints for the calendar years 2013 to 2015	28
37	Table 14: Ward-wise top civic complaints for the calendar years 2013 to 2015	29
38	Table 15: Ward-wise top three Road related civic complaints in the years 2013 to 2015	30
39	Table 16: Ward-wise top three Drainage related civic complaints in the years 2013 to 2015	31
40	Table 17: Ward-wise top three Solid Waste Management related civic complaints in the years 2013 to 2015	32
41	Table 18: Top Four Water supply related Ward-wise civic complaints in the years 2013 to 2015	33
42	Table 19: Ward-wise civic complaints on Potholes on the Roads from the year 2013 to 2015	34
43	Table 20: Status report of complaints in year 2014	35
44	Table 21: Status report of complaints in year 2015	36
45	Table 22: Ward-wise average number of days for closing complaints in the year 2015	37
46	Table 23: Ward-wise average number of days for closing complaints in the year 2015	38
47	Table 24: Ward Committee and Ward-wise Number of Meetings, Attendance in (%)and No. of Questions Asked from January 2015 to December 2015	40
48	Table 25: Issue-wise questions asked by Councillors during the period January 2015 to December 2015	42
49	Table 26: Party-wise number of questions asked on civic issues during March 2012 to December 2015	47
50	Table 27: Party-wise number of questions asked on civic issues during March 2012 to December 2015	48
51	Table 28: Ward-wise Councillors' names, party and questions asked during Mar'12 to Dec'15	49



I. <u>Foreword</u>

Deonar's massive fire in late January was caught on NASA's satellite radar and live streamed around the world. While the satellites' usually capture the picturesque beauty of the iconic wonders of the world – like the Great Wall of China or the Pyramids from Egypt; the Deonar destruction images were the images from India. This incident directly leads to questions on the sorry state of civic services in the city. Praja has been continuously highlighting this state of affairs over the last few years. And in turn underlying core issues of the governance of the city. But then why do incidents like Deonar happen in the first place? Don't we have enough resources? Of course we have with a budget of thirty seven thousand crores. Then do we lack manpower? Or is it the lack of technology? The resonant fact remains that we have them all but what we lack is a responsible political leadership and proactive administration.

MCGM (Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai) in November last year stopped the 'Voice of Citizen' online portal, which had previously allowed citizens to conveniently report complaints regarding potholes on roads directly. While the officials reasoned that they intended to replace the portal with an 'in-house' software, the only news that has been released so far in 2016 is about the creation of a ward-wise Facebook page that would allow citizens to report issues and register complaints on road related issues. Now while becoming social media savvy is definitely a positive approach, the focus of the administration should have been on centring the already established Central Complaint Registration System (CCRS) through all three: hotline (1916), walk-ins, and online portal alongside social media.

Along with these policy issues of the administration, there is also a glaring issue with the way our legislators work. The reality is: every elected representative in the city represents approximately eighty thousand people on an average. The responsibility of this elected representative is then to represent her or his ward problems and citizen grievances in the ward committee meeting. However, the sad truth is, grievances and core issues are often (much more often than should be acceptable!) side-lined because representatives are not doing their jobs! Take for example, the fact that on an average, ninety-one percent of the Councillors in the last four years have asked less than 10 questions in Ward Committee meetings. Councillors like Jyotsna Parmar (G/N ward) and Ujjwala Modak (K/E Ward) have not asked a single question in Ward Committee meetings across the last four years. If this is not enough, there has also been a four percent increase from last year for questions relating to 'renaming of roads'. That means one out of every seven question that councillors ask are on the issue of renaming roads! Another significant example is the fact that some of the citizens' complaints on issues regarding waste management, illegal constructions amongst some others in 2015 took an odd thousand days to be addressed.

The broad conclusion here is that although Mumbai has a functioning legislative framework and resources its elected representatives and the administration lack the will to provide efficient, responsible and accountable governance. The emphasis of the city's custodians on replacing and reacting rather than improving and evolving governance is the crux of the problem. Hence, the core ideal behind this paper has been about creating a factsheet about the custodians of our city, in an effort to make democracy work.

NITAI MEHTA Founder Trustee, Praja Foundation



II. <u>Acknowledgement</u>

Praja has obtained the data used in compiling this white paper through Right to Information Act, 2005. Hence it is very important to acknowledge the RTI Act and everyone involved, especially the officials who have provided us this information diligently.

We would like to appreciate our stakeholders; particularly, our Elected Representatives & government officials, the Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and the journalists who utilize and publicize our data and, by doing so, ensure that awareness regarding various issues that we discuss is distributed to a wide-ranging population. We would like to take this opportunity to specifically extend our gratitude to all government officials for their continuous cooperation and support.

Praja Foundation appreciates the support given by our supporters and donors, namely European Union Fund, Friedrich Naumann Foundation, Dasra, TATA Trusts, Narotam Sekhsaria Foundation and Madhu Mehta Foundation and numerous other individual supporters. Their support has made it possible for us to conduct our study & publish this white paper.

We would also like to thank our group of Advisors & Trustees and lastly but not the least, we would like to acknowledge the contributions of all members of Praja's team, who worked to make this white paper a reality.



SIR DORABJI TATA TRUST+SIR RATAN TATA TRUST

Tata Trusts have supported Praja Foundation in this project. The Trusts believe in a society of well-informed citizens and it is to this effect that Tata Trusts supports Praja's efforts to communicate with and enable citizens to interact with their administration through innovative and effective methods.



III. Part A – Summary Data

Section I: Comparison of most frequent complaints by citizens and questions asked by Municipal Councillors in Ward Committees



Graph 1: Comparison between top five citizen complaints¹ from 2013 to 2015



Note: The percentage given in the bracket is out of total issues raised/questions asked

- Complaints on 'Roads' issues have been the highest citizens' concern for the last three years (41%, 27%, and 20%).
- 'Drainage' (15%) and 'Water Supply' (11%) complaints have both increased in the year 2015 as compared to 2013 and 2014.

¹ The complaints registered data is obtained through RTI from the Central Complaint Registration System (CCRS) of the MCGM







Inference:

- There is clear and sharp hike (81%) in the registered complaints in 2012 (through Voice of Control the application was itself launched in 2011), which proves that there is a clear audience responding to tech savvy governance.
- Voice of Citizens (third party software) provided an accessible and convenient platform for citizens to initiate grievances.

Note: CCRS is a unified central system where complaints are registered through phone (1916), website (<u>www.mcqm.in</u>), and walk-ins at Citizens Facilitations Centre (CFC) – through a Complaint Officer; which is then registered as complaints.



Graph 3: Top five questions asked by Municipal Councillors in ward committee



Note: The percentage given in the bracket is out of total questions asked

- Like 2014, the maximum questions asked by our Municipal Councillors have been for the same category i.e. Roads (194 questions).
- However, even now (again like 2014), the second highest concern for the Councillors has been on issues pertaining to 'Naming/Renaming of Roads'.
- That is on an average of about every 7 questions 1 question is asked on the issue of renaming of roads by our elected representatives.



Table 1: Analysis of complaints² attended (closed) in comparison with days mentioned in MCGM's Citizen Charter³

Complaint to be attended as per Citizens' Charter	To be resolved as per Citizens' Charter	Actual time taken to resolve in 2014	Actual time taken to resolve in 2015
Drainage Chokes and Blockages	1	17	8
Overflowing drains or manholes	1	18	13
Odour (Foul Smell) from Drains	1	16	14
Replacement of Missing / Damaged Manhole	1	21	18
Raising of Manhole (except in Monsoon)	7	14	11
Cleaning of septic tank	7	19	16
Repairs to pipe sewers/main sewers	7	20	18
Contaminated Water Supply	1	16	12
Leaks in Water Lines	7	17	14
Shortage of Water Supply	2	18	15
Burst Water Main	1	17	15
Garbage not lifted - Co-authorized Point	1	16	15
Collection point not attended properly	1	15	9
Garbage lorry not reported for service/ Lorry not covered	1	14	9
Providing/removing/replacing dustbins	8	17	9
Sweeping of road	1	18	10
Removal of Dead Animals	1	19	7
No attendance at public toilets	2	18	11
Average Days	3	17	13

- The average days taken by the MCGM to resolve complaints were 13 in the year 2015, while the Citizens' Charter stipulates that all complaints should be resolved within an average of 3 days.
- MCGM took an average of 18 days to resolve complaints involving 'Replacement of Missing / Damaged Manhole' issues which should have taken just 1 day according to the Citizens' Charter.

² Detailed analysis of this table is available in Annexure 1

³ Citizen Charter http://goo.gl/M8EL9h



Table 2: Comparison between the actual days taken and Citizen Charter specified days for the services given by the MCGM in 2015

Sr. No.	Complaints	Citizens' Charter (In days)	RTS (In days)	Actual resolution time in 2014 (In days)	Actual resolution time in 2015 (In days)
1	Issue of Birth Certificate	3	3	22	12
2	Issue of Death certificate	3	3	22	12

Inference:

• It actually took the MCGM on an average 12 days in 2015 to deal with complaints regarding the delay in processing and issuing Birth Certificates and Death Certificates, which should have actually been issued in 3 days according to the Citizens' Charter.



Map 1: Wards in Crisis



Note: The complaints data for Roads, Drainage, Water Supply and Solid Waste Management has been plotted for the years 2016 to 2018 using time series analysis on data from 2008 to 2015. As per this data, we have computed wards that will be worst affected in the next three years.

Comparing similar analysis from last year, it is seen that wards P/N, L, and D remain to be the worst affected wards, while the wards R/S, S, H/W, M/E, and C have been added to the list.



Map 2: Wards in Crisis (a comparison)



Note: The wards which would be the worst three wards Contaminated Water and Pest Control by 2018 have been correlated using time series analysis with Diarrhoea and Malaria/Dengue deaths (Source: Cause of death from 2011 to 2015)

The time series projections shows that K/W, G/S and D ward will be worst affected by Water Contamination complaints and the Diarrhoea deaths; while, S, N and B wards will be worst affected by Pest Control complaints and Malaria/Dengue deaths



Section II: City Summary

Issues		Complaints		Increase from 2013 to 2014	Increase from 2014 to 2015
issues	2013	2014	2015	(in %)	(in %)
Roads	42287	21847	13601	-48.3	-37.7
Buildings	21125	17339	14999	-17.9	-13.5
Drainage	12708	9394	9904	-26.1	5.4
Water Supply	6075	7645	7728	25.8	1.1
Solid Waste Management (SWM)	5519	7331	5213	32.8	-28.9
License	5741	6123	7145	6.7	16.7
Pest control	3495	5048	4364	44.4	-13.5
Garden	1468	1595	1307	8.7	-18.1
Colony Officer	1292	1023	881	-20.8	-13.9
Storm Water Drainage	895	1160	830	29.6	-28.4
Shop and Establishment (S & E)	347	423	401	21.9	-5.2
Medical Officer Health (MOH)	440	425	553	-3.4	30.1
MCGM related	431	504	447	16.9	-11.3
Estate	249	216	112	-13.3	-48.1
Toilet	177	257	159	45.2	-38.1
Pollution	117	135	135	15.4	0
School	22	25	56	13.6	124
Mumbai	102,388	80,490	67,835	-21.4	-15.7

Table 3: Civic Complaints by Citizens in Mumbai during calendar years 2013 to 2015

- Medical Officer Health (MOH) complaints have increased to 30.1% in 2015.
- Drainage complaints have increased by 5% in the year 2015.
- Complaints on 'Roads' have decreased by 37.7% in the year 2015 as compared to the previous year.
- Total complaints have seen a decrease of 15.7% in the year 2015.





Graph 4: Representation and Analysis of 'Pollution' Complaints in 2015

- 70% of the complaints registered under 'Pollutions' complaints in 2015 were Air Pollution complaints.
- No questions were asked on the issue of air pollution in the Ward Committees.
- Diwali, which was on November 11, 2015 recorded the highest ever level of AQI (287), which has serious negative impact for public health. Refer to Annexure2 for a more detailed analysis on Air Quality Index (AQI).



Table 4: Sub-issue wise top four Civic Complaints by Citizens during the calendar years 2013 to 2015

				Increase from 2013 to 2014	Increase from 2014 to 2015			
Issues/Sub-issues	2013	2014	2015	(in %)	(in %)			
Roads	Roads							
Bad Patches / Potholes on the Roads	38279	16103	7491	-57.9	-53.5			
Municipal Land - Road/ Footpath/SWD	2028	2288	2855	12.8	24.8			
Resurfacing of Road	988	1770	1308	79.1	-26.1			
Total complaints	42287	21847	13601	-48.3	-37.7			
Drainage								
Drainage Chokes and Blockages	8264	4612	5591	-44.2	21.2			
Overflowing drains of manholes	2679	2787	2807	4.0	0.7			
Replacement of Missing / Damaged								
Manhole	932	989	675	6.1	-31.7			
Total complaints	12708	9394	9904	-26.1	5.4			
Solid Waste Management (SWM)								
Garbage not lifted from								
House/Gully/Municipal								
Market/Road/Authorised collection								
point	2085	2819	1593	35.2	-43.5			
Removal of Debris	889	1001	953	12.6	-4.8			
Lifting of Tree Cutting	503	568	573	12.9	0.9			
Providing/removing/replacing dustbins	223	658	334	195.1	-49.2			
Total complaints	5519	7331	5213	32.8	-28.9			
Water Supply								
Shortage of Water Supply	2000	2829	2739	41.5	-3.2			
Leaks in Water Lines	1968	1849	2077	-6.0	12.3			
Unauthorised Tapping of Water								
Connection	817	760	961	-7.0	26.4			
Total complaints	6075	7645	7728	25.8	1.1			

- There has been a sharp increase in complaints (by 26.4%) on the issue of 'Unauthorized Tapping of Water Connection'.
- There has also been a 24.8% increase in complaints pertaining to issues of 'Municipal Land Road/Footpath/SWD'
- Complaints on 'Bad Patches/Potholes on the Roads' decreased by 53.5% from the year 2014 to 2015.
- Significantly, complaints on 'Resurfacing of Road', which saw an increase of 79.1% in 2014, have decreased by 26.1% in 2015 from the previous year.
- Complaints on 'Garbage not lifted from House/Gully/Municipal Market/ Road/Authorized collection point' have decreased by 43.5%. This can of course be attributed to the focus on the Swachh Bharat Abhiyan.



Section III: Functioning of Ward Committees

Functioning of the Ward Committees:

'Ward Committees' are one of the most crucial mechanisms available to Municipal Councillors for conducting deliberations for delivering effective governance. Issues of prime significance to citizens' daily lives 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 through this mechanism. This was precisely the aim of the 74th Constitutional Amendment, which mandated the creation of the Ward Committees, to bring in grassroots democracy and strengthen it.

Devices for raising questions/grievances in ward committee meetings:

Councillors use various devices to enable them to know about the functioning of various committees, monitor performance of Administration and resolve citizen's problems.

1. **Short Notice Questions**: Councillors can raise civic issues and follow up on them with the Administration through Short Notice Questions. These questions should be of urgent civic importance, for instance, those causing harm to lives of citizens, such as building collapse or fire etc. Such urgent matters are admitted and the Commissioner is accountable to answer them. In cases of not to so urgent matters, the written questions are sent by the Councillors to the Assistant Commissioner, who sends answers to respective Councillors. The Short Notice Question should be specific and related to only one matter at a time and should be framed in not more than 2-3 sentences. For example, 1) Is it true that Mumbai city is severely caught up with Swine Flu?, 2) How many patients are being treated in Mumbai in Kasturba and other hospitals?, 3) Why has the indigenous vaccine for Swine Flu not yet been procured in Mumbai? Please give detailed information. The Short Notice Questions are not discussed in the House.

2. **Notice of Motions**: Councillors may ask for a statement to be made by the Commissioner on an urgent matter relating to the Administration by giving at least one hour notice before the meeting. The Commissioner answers the notice in writing and no discussion can be done on the answers. The Councillors may present a Notice of Motion on matters of importance and in the interest of Mumbai city. The Motion should be presented in a general form and should be in the interest of the public at large.

3. Adjournment Motion: The Councillors may bring to the notice of the House any incidences where citizens are facing severe problems due to specific reasons, and the concerned officers and ward in-charge have not taken due action despite bringing the matter to their attention. In such cases, Councillors can propose an Adjournment Motion, as a protest against the inaction of the Administration. The notice for the Adjournment Motion should be given at least half an hour before the meeting of the House. The proposal is accepted by majority vote. In case the Councillors directly present an Adjournment Motion in the House without prior notice, then it is treated as a Simplicitor, which is not discussed in the House and passed only with unanimous voting.

4. **Amendments proposed**: When a Councillor has any objection about a topic on the meeting agenda, if s/he thinks it is inadequate, s/he can present a notice to the Administrative office for Amendment in order to reconsider the topic. If a Councillor wants to present an Amendment, it is customary that s/he is allowed to speak first.



5. **Proposal raised/agenda raised/ letter to raise issues**: When a Councillor wants to raise any agenda or question, s/he writes a letter for the same, following which it appears in the agenda for discussion in the meeting.

6. **Point of Orders**: The Councillor, in order to bring any serious incident in his/her constituency to the notice of the House, can raise a Point of Order. There are specific rules on when and how the Point of Order can be raised apart from precedents. The Point of Order can be raised while a subject is being discussed in the house, provided it is related to that subject. The Committee Chairperson has a right to decide whether or not to allow a discussion on the Point of Order and announces the decision on the Point of Order. In case the information provided is inadequate to reach a decision, it is presented in the subsequent meeting. The decision by the Ward Committee Chairperson is deemed final and in cases of disagreements, it can only be challenged in the Court.

Source: Corporation Procedure Rules and Regulation Mumbai: Municipal Printing Press, 2001.

Ward Committee							
Year Total Meeting Attend in (%) Total Question							
Mar'12 to Dec'12	209	82%	679				
Jan'13 to Dec'13	265	79%	989				
Jan'14 to Dec'14	298	71%	972				
Jan'15 to Dec'15	279	73%	1098				

Table 5: Total number of Meetings, Attendance and Questions from March 2012 to December 2015

Inference:

• There has been a increase (2%) in the Councillor's attendance in Ward Committee meetings from 2014 to 2015.



			No. of Members			
Category	Mar'12 to Dec'12	Jan'13 to Dec'13	Jan'14 to Dec'14	Jan'15 to Dec'15	Average (Mar'2012 to Dec'2015)	
Zero Question	44	19	26	27	29	
1 to 5 Question asked	149	142	134	124	139	
6 to 10 Question asked	31	54	47	55	46	
Above 10 Question asked	3	12	20	21	13	
Total Members	227	227	227	227	227	

- Number of Councillors who did not ask any questions has increased from 26 during the January' 14-December' 14 to 27 in January' 15-December' 15.
- In contrast, number of councillors who asked more than 10 questions have increased from 20 during the January' 14-December' 14 to 27 in January' 15-December' 15.
- On an average only 13 Councillors have asked more than 10 questions in the last four years.



Table 7: Issue-wise number of questions asked during March 2012 to December 2015

		Question asked	(Mar 12 to Dec 15)	
Issues	Mar'12 to Dec'12	Jan'13 to Dec'13	Jan'14 to Dec'14	Jan'15 to Dec'15
Drainage	30	35	44	39
Solid Waste Management (SWM)	62	85	111	86
Water Supply	47	44	71	65
License	29	50	61	89
Roads	102	141	138	194
Storm Water Drainage	31	51	52	59
Toilet	19	22	31	21
Pest control	11	13	25	9
Garden/Open space	28	38	43	42
Community Development	13	29	26	23
Health	19	18	13	19
Education	19	29	16	21
Naming/Renaming of Roads/ Chowks	127	147	109	161
Other issues related	142	287	232	270
Total	679	989	972	1098

- Highest number of questions (194) was asked on Roads in the year January 2015 to December 2015.
- Like the previous year, a majority of the questions (161) were focused on the issues regarding 'Naming/Renaming of Roads/Chowks'.







- The average of Point of Order questions for the last four years is 74%.
- In 2015 (as in 2014), not even a single Councillor used Amendment Proposed device.
- Agenda Raised (Letter) device used by Councillors increased from 227 in 2014 to 244 in 2015.



Graph 6: Answers given by Administration to Point of Order questions raised in Ward committee meetings in the Year 2015



Inference:

• The total number of pending questions has risen by approximately 5 times (from 327 to 1530) in the last 4 years.

The key takeaway here is the understanding that for the smooth functioning of the administration, the Ward Committee needs to answer Point of Order questions raised in the ward committee meetings – which in return is only possible when the administration participates proactively in the Ward Committee Meetings. This is a very serious impediment within the MCGM bureaucracy and needs to be dealt with urgently by the political leadership and government executives – particularly the Urban Development department and the CM personally. Else we will essentially be faced with a situation of a non-functioning decentralisation of powers leading towards a poorly functioning and poorly governed city.



Graph 7: Comparison of the average days taken to answer Point of Order questions in the Ward Committees from 2012 to 2015



- The average days taken to answer Point of Order questions are 128 days in the last 4 years: from 2012 to 2015 and hence, from our earlier graph, the emphasis again is for the administration to start answering the Point of Order questions.
- The maximum numbers of days taken to answer some Point of Order questions were actually 1000 days. The broad issues that were raised in these questions fall into the general categories of: illegal construction, facilities and use of public space, potholes, and garbage related.



Nominated Councillors in Ward Committees

The 16 Ward Committees have been formed in the month of January 2000 vide Section 50TT after amending Mumbai Municipal Corporation Act 1888 as per 74th Amendment of the Constitution of India. The duration of the each Ward Committee formed co-terminus with the duration of the corporation. (Since 2013, there are 17 ward committees).

Nominated Councillors in Ward Committees:

Such number of the members, not exceeding three, nominated by the Councillors referred to in clause (1), from amongst the members of recognized nongovernment organizations and community based organizations engaged in social welfare activities working within the area of the Ward Committees. Provided that such persons are registered as electors in the Wards within the jurisdiction of the Ward Committee. Provided further that, the norms for recognition of the non-government organizations, the requisite qualification for nomination as members and the manner in which they are to be nominated shall be such as the State Government prescribes.

Source: The Mumbai Municipal Corporation Act, 1888

Committee 2007 to Feb 2012 From Mar 2012 to 2014 2015 Name Khalil I Chouadhari Ward Committee The nominated members have The nominated members Noorlamin Yusuf Parak A, B and E not been appointed have not been appointed (Amain Parekh) Nitin Ramchandra Redkar Ward Committee The nominated members have The nominated members The nominated members C and D not been appointed have not been appointed have not been appointed Sabir Ali Khan Ward Committee The nominated members The nominated members F/South and Shishir Tatkar have not been appointed have not been appointed F/North Sunil A. Waghmare Shankar Hanumanta Santi Bhaskar Ramanna Shetty Bhaskar Ramanna Shetty Ward Committee Ansari Afzal Tahaneez Husain Jayant Gajanan Patil Jayant Gajanan Patil G/North Shaikh Ziyauddin Jahur Ali Prakash Krushna Kadam Sandip Kashinath Kambli Sandip Kashinath Kambli Ward Committee The nominated members have G/South not been appointed Sohani S. Bhutani Sohani S. Bhutani Shyama Charuchandra Shyama Charuchandra **Dayanand Govind Mohite** Ward Committee Kulkarni Kulkarni H/East and Shabnam Rangwala Lemos Ayvin Lemos Ayvin H/West Yatin N. Shah Shubhangi Avinash Sherekar Shubhangi Avinash Sherekar Ward Committee The nominated members have The nominated members The nominated members K/East not been appointed have not been appointed have not been appointed

Table 8: List of nominated members in Ward Committee



Committee Name	2007 to Feb 2012	From Mar 2012 to 2014	2015
Ward Committee	Vijay Jadhav	The nominated members	The nominated members
K/West	Beg Irfan Karim	have not been appointed	have not been appointed
	Haider Abdul Raheman		·····
	Jayvant Kisan Karande	The mension stand as such and	The mension should be such a set
Ward Committee	Valajibhai Veerji Bhanushali	The nominated members have not been appointed	The nominated members have not been appointed
L	Ajay Laxman Yadav		
Ward Committee	M/E ward come into existance	Sambodhi Ramchandra Kamble	Sambodhi Ramchandra Kamble
M/East	since 22nd Apr 2013	Shabbir Siddique Khan	Shabbir Siddique Khan
Ward Committee M/West	Vijay Ashok Dalavi	Y. Chandrashekhar	Y. Chandrashekhar
Mand Committee	Ashok Kharatmol	The new instead members	The new instead menshere
Ward Committee N	Ajit Dattaram Gujar	The nominated members have not been appointed	The nominated members have not been appointed
IN IN	Vasantlal Ratilal Cheda	nave not been appointed	have not been appointed
Ward Committee	Jayendra P. Mehta	The nominated members	The nominated members
P/North	Noela V. Warela	have not been appointed	have not been appointed
	Vipul P. Shah		nave not been appointed
Ward Committee	Shriniwas Shirsekar	The nominated members	The nominated members
P/South	Dilip Ghotage	have not been appointed	have not been appointed
	Vishwanath Poddar		
Ward Committee	Sanjiv Sharad Bavadekar	The nominated members	The nominated members
R/Central and	Abhishek Vinod Ghosalkar	have not been appointed	have not been appointed
R/North	Ashok kumar Jayantilal Shah		
Ward Committee	The nominated members have	The nominated members	The nominated members
R/South	not been appointed	have not been appointed	have not been appointed
Ward Committee	Sandip Madhukar Joshi	The nominated members	The nominated members
S and T	Shivaji Sahadev Shinde	have not been appointed	have not been appointed
	Madhukar Deu Sawant		

- Since 2007 to 2015, not even a single member is nominated in ward committees of (C and D), (K/East), and (R/South).
- Even in 2015 (following 2014's lead), 11 ward committees have again not nominated members.



Table 9: Top three wards in complaints and questions in proportion to the ward population in year 2015

Top three Wards in con	nplaints	F/S	R/N	S
Population 2011		360972	431368	743783
No. of councillor		7	7	13
Total Complaints		1305	1339	2936
	Complaints	276	307	624
Road	Question asked	2	2	8
	Complaints	264	228	321
Drainage	Question asked	2	2	2
	Complaints	113	72	290
SWM	Question asked	2	1	5
Total Question		20	28	41
Naming/Renaming of R	oads	4	1	3

Inference:

- F/S (1305), R/N (1339) and S (2936) are the top three wards with the highest number of complaints in proportion to their population.
- During 2015, the maximum number of complaints that were raised in the three wards were related to 'Roads'.
- However, disproportionately, councillors representing their wards have only asked 2 (F/S), 2 (R/N), and 8 (S) questions on the issue of Roads

Table 10: Top three wards in complaints and questions in year 2015

Top three wards i	n complaints	K/W	L	P/N
No. of Councillors		13	15	16
Total Complaints		4328	7799	4702
	Complaints	1053	844	1134
Road	Questions asked	19	13	15
	Complaints	829	866	496
Drainage	Questions asked	2	1	3
	Complaints	249	385	257
SWM Questions asked		5	5	8
Total Questions		90	66	56
Naming/Renamin	g of Roads	24	6	10

- K/W (4328), L (7799), and P/N (4702) are the top three wards with the highest number of complaints.
- Comparatively, the councillors from K/W (13), L (15), and P/N (16) wards have asked less questions pertaining to citizens' complaints.



Table 11: Top three wards in questions asked in proportion to the Councillors elected from the ward in theYear 2015

Top three wards in total questions	G/S	K/W	R/S
No. of Councillor	9	13	11
Total Question	77	90	86
Question asked on following	issues		
Roads	15	19	21
Drainage	6	2	5
SWM	8	5	8
Naming/Renaming of Roads	5	24	5
Total Complaints	1495	4328	3290

- G/S (77), K/W (90), and R/S (86) are the top three wards for questions asked in the year 2015.
- Among the top three wards, Councillors of K/W wards (13 councillors) have asked only 2 questions on 'Drainage' while they asked 24 questions on the issue of 'Naming and Renaming of Roads'.



IV. Part B – Ward-Wise Data

Section I: Civic Complaints Data

			al Complaint	S	Increase	Increase from
Ward	Population 2011	2013	2014	2015	from 2013 to 2014 (in %)	2014 to 2015 (in %)
А	185014	2646	1960	1418	-26	-28
В	127290	2571	1761	1326	-32	-25
С	166161	2483	1908	1525	-23	-20
D	346866	4983	3395	3282	-32	-3
E	393286	3299	2688	2414	-19	-10
F/N	529034	3088	2558	2318	-17	-9
F/S	360972	1980	1561	1305	-21	-16
G/N	599039	4441	3007	3094	-32	3
G/S	377749	2612	1674	1495	-36	-11
H/E	557239	3383	2323	2245	-31	-3
H/W	307581	4014	3172	2715	-21	-14
K/E	823885	6844	5060	4323	-26	-15
K/W	748688	8412	4957	4328	-41	-13
L	902225	9136	8085	7799	-12	-4
M/E	807720	5615	4869	3338	-13	-31
M/W	411893	3618	2886	1966	-20	-32
N	622853	4013	3701	2966	-8	-20
P/N	941366	6120	5061	4702	-17	-7
P/S	463507	3995	3511	3095	-12	-12
R/C	562162	4534	3674	3088	-19	-16
R/N	431368	2791	1770	1339	-37	-24
R/S	691229	4261	4841	3290	14	-32
S	743783	4014	3340	2936	-17	-12
Т	341463	2717	2658	1466	-2	-45
MCGM-other agency ⁴		818	70	62	-91	-11
Total	12442373	102388	80490	67835	-21	-16

Table 12: Ward-wise total complaints in year 2013 to 2015

• G/N ward reported the highest (3%) increase in the total number of complaints from year 2014 to 2015.

• There has been a decrease in total number of complaints in the rest of the wards; lowest being in the R/S and M/W wards (both 32%).

⁴ MCGM-other agencies include: (SWD) Western Suburbs ,(SWD) ONM,(SWD) Eastern Suburbs, Hydraulic Engineers(HE), Sewage Project(SP), Water SUPPLY Projects(WSP),Storm Water Drainage(SWD), Sewerage Projects(Micro Tunneling), construction (CITY), construction (EASTERN).



Table 13: Ward-wise top civic complaints for the calendar years 2013 to 2015

	•			Road			D		
Ward	Population 2011	2013	2014	2015	Increase from 2014 to 2015 (in %)	2013	2014	2015	Increase from 2014 to 2015 (in %)
A	185014	1602	569	453	-21	323	371	241	-35
В	127290	1229	498	270	-47	280	225	294	31
C	166161	1002	539	201	-63	357	284	198	-30
D	346866	2487	1013	544	-47	499	411	663	61
E	393286	1619	775	449	-42	496	345	512	48
F/N	529034	1675	694	438	-37	425	372	395	6
F/S	360972	1043	525	276	-48	253	159	264	66
G/N	599039	2003	674	335	-51	455	392	335	-15
G/S	377749	1061	330	259	-23	555	230	341	48
H/E	557239	1479	661	420	-37	599	323	459	42
H/W	307581	1733	1056	621	-42	655	434	512	18
K/E	823885	2649	1090	933	-15	850	759	604	-20
K/W	748688	2309	1305	1053	-20	1317	659	829	26
L	902225	2360	950	844	-11	1147	992	866	-13
M/E	807720	1815	679	505	-26	392	410	261	-36
M/W	411893	1148	608	279	-55	593	491	358	-27
N	622853	1505	1320	627	-53	624	368	386	5
P/N	941366	2475	1354	1134	-16	591	417	496	19
P/S	463507	1631	1223	851	-30	501	344	380	10
R/C	562162	2115	1378	828	-40	633	377	398	6
R/N	431368	1498	621	307	-52	228	125	228	82
R/S	691229	1258	1564	792	-50	394	431	427	-1
S	743783	2005	1203	624	-51	291	317	321	1
Т	341463	1768	1148	496	-57	250	158	136	-14
MCGM-other agency⁵		818	70	62	-11				
Total	12442373	42287	21847	13601	-38	12708	9394	9904	5

• C Ward recorded the highest decrease (63%) in complaints related to 'Roads'.

- There has also been a considerable decrease (on an average 38%) in complaints on 'Roads' in the rest of the wards of the city.
- 11% decrease in complaints of other MCGM agencies on Voice of Citizen Portal.
- R/N (82%), F/S (66%), D (61%), E (48%), and G/S (48%) recorded the highest increase in complaints related to 'Drainage'.

⁵MCGM-other agencies include: (SWD) Western Suburbs ,(SWD) ONM,(SWD) Eastern Suburbs, Hydraulic Engineers(HE), Sewage Project (SP), Water SUPPLY Projects(WSP),Storm Water Drainage(SWD), Sewerage Projects(Micro Tunneling), construction (CITY), construction (EASTERN).



Table 14: Ward-wise top civic complaints for the calendar years 2013 to 2015

				SWM			Water Supply			
Ward	Population 2011	2013	2014	2015	Increase from 2014 to 2015 (in %)	2013	2014	2015	Increase from 2014 to 2015 (in %)	
А	185014	189	302	124	-59	65	74	67	-9	
В	127290	156	202	124	-39	74	89	87	-2	
С	166161	235	306	219	-28	159	109	117	7	
D	346866	628	643	450	-30	155	194	249	28	
E	393286	164	298	202	-32	169	234	204	-13	
F/N	529034	148	402	225	-44	98	196	170	-13	
F/S	360972	111	188	113	-40	66	91	102	12	
G/N	599039	271	314	281	-11	198	185	282	52	
G/S	377749	159	219	117	-47	55	103	107	4	
H/E	557239	111	255	197	-23	101	121	169	40	
H/W	307581	166	298	289	-3	159	283	173	-39	
K/E	823885	431	411	247	-40	353	373	546	46	
K/W	748688	517	420	249	-41	289	439	527	20	
L	902225	274	420	385	-8	473	605	771	27	
M/E	807720	178	237	125	-47	1322	1780	1381	-22	
M/W	411893	149	247	97	-61	582	448	399	-11	
Ν	622853	249	306	288	-6	379	406	385	-5	
P/N	941366	269	369	257	-30	265	439	447	2	
P/S	463507	243	295	212	-28	161	186	224	20	
R/C	562162	265	348	250	-28	256	261	326	25	
R/N	431368	63	106	72	-32	74	135	127	-6	
R/S	691229	281	377	323	-14	245	369	290	-21	
S	743783	183	259	290	12	275	359	435	21	
Т	341463	79	109	77	-29	102	166	143	-14	
Total	12442373	5519	7331	5213	-29	6075	7645	7728	1	

- M/W (61%) and A (59%) wards show the sharpest decrease in the number of 'Solid Waste Management (SWM)' complaints from the year 2014 to 2015.
- While, G/N (52%), K/E (46%), and H/E (40%) wards report the sharpest increase in the number of complaints on 'Water Supply' from the year 2014 to 2015.
- Overall, there was a decrease in 'SWM' complaints (29%) and an increase in 'Water Supply' complaints by 1%.



Table 15: Ward-wise top three Road related civic complaints in the years 2013 to 2015

Roads												
Ward	Population 2011	Bad Patch tł	ies / Poth ne Roads	oles on		ipal Land otpath/S		Resurf	acing of	Road		
	2011	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015		
А	185014	1501	415	200	48	52	167	42	55	49		
В	127290	1151	326	101	48	92	87	20	64	37		
С	166161	918	333	72	51	98	72	25	75	29		
D	346866	2254	701	222	93	92	119	89	158	110		
E	393286	1467	564	227	95	85	118	48	85	42		
F/N	529034	1502	433	170	83	84	152	56	78	47		
F/S	360972	980	419	108	43	46	96	13	35	31		
G/N	599039	1746	442	124	142	123	83	66	69	81		
G/S	377749	922	203	90	63	51	85	46	49	42		
H/E	557239	1336	523	215	85	68	132	20	38	20		
H/W	307581	1622	874	427	59	75	98	33	59	38		
K/E	823885	2371	706	531	159	170	186	54	100	83		
K/W	748688	2025	955	631	144	165	222	76	93	70		
L	902225	2138	660	436	91	105	154	26	63	68		
M/E	807720	1654	453	358	91	75	62	17	50	22		
M/W	411893	1018	443	117	67	69	72	20	48	40		
N	622853	1280	1045	306	124	155	146	57	62	69		
P/N	941366	2261	1032	813	104	118	128	50	103	71		
P/S	463507	1464	949	525	61	93	137	49	96	95		
R/C	562162	1911	1092	535	68	73	146	61	96	49		
R/N	431368	1430	493	188	40	64	54	13	25	19		
R/S	691229	1033	1084	409	90	97	112	53	165	95		
S	743783	1856	985	352	89	100	91	29	68	66		
Т	341463	1621	903	272	90	138	136	25	36	35		
MCGM-other												
agency ⁶		818	70	62								
Total	12442373	38279	16103	7491	2028	2288	2855	988	1770	1308		

• 53% decrease in complaints related to 'Bad Patches/Potholes on the Roads' from 2014 to 2015

• P/N (21%), M/E (21%), K/W (34%), and L (34%) have shown the highest decrease in complaints of 'Bad Patches/Potholes on the Roads'.

- A (221%), F/S (109%), R/C (100%) wards show the highest increase in complaints of 'Municipal Land Road/Footpath/SWD'.
- G/N ward (17%) recorded the highest increase in complaints related to resurfacing of roads.

⁶MCGM-other agencies include: (SWD) Western Suburbs ,(SWD) ONM,(SWD) Eastern Suburbs, Hydraulic Engineers(HE), Sewage Project (SP), Water SUPPLY Projects(WSP),Storm Water Drainage(SWD), Sewerage Projects(Micro Tunneling), construction (CITY), construction (EASTERN).



Table 16: Ward-wise top three Drainage related civic complaints in the years 2013 to 2015

	Drainage													
	Population 2011		age Choke Blockages			lowing dra manholes		Replacement of Missing / Damaged Manhole						
Ward		2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015				
А	185014	235	243	136	71	80	75	10	20	9				
В	127290	184	104	163	72	84	111	16	18	7				
С	166161	187	145	102	133	100	76	13	17	12				
D	346866	317	204	388	135	154	223	29	30	30				
E	393286	333	198	337	123	98	122	27	28	23				
F/N	529034	246	188	209	81	116	120	74	44	45				
F/S	360972	170	87	146	52	47	98	19	9	9				
G/N	599039	289	193	198	93	132	110	52	37	16				
G/S	377749	437	122	229	87	71	90	19	23	12				
H/E	557239	445	191	345	108	77	75	28	22	13				
H/W	307581	468	206	351	124	144	100	37	60	36				
K/E	823885	485	360	335	192	226	138	91	79	46				
K/W	748688	936	334	562	219	167	139	116	104	90				
L	902225	680	431	359	293	350	362	57	70	39				
M/E	807720	224	209	126	88	111	82	25	38	17				
M/W	411893	395	221	155	86	136	91	28	38	28				
N	622853	448	170	179	114	130	139	35	33	34				
P/N	941366	331	183	224	141	124	159	59	37	45				
P/S	463507	250	137	183	163	110	127	63	67	39				
R/C	562162	463	203	265	65	89	74	50	52	41				
R/N	431368	150	51	156	53	29	38	11	19	11				
R/S	691229	242	205	240	76	86	109	31	73	32				
S	743783	158	162	136	74	79	105	28	49	27				
Т	341463	191	65	67	36	47	44	14	22	14				
Total	12442373	8264	4612	5591	2679	2787	2807	932	989	675				

- R/N (206%) recorded the highest increase in complaints on 'Drainage Chokes and Blockages' from the year 2014 to 2015.
- F/S (109%) recorded the highest increase in complaints for 'Overflowing drains of manholes' and P/N (22%) ward for 'Replacement of Missing/Damaged Manholes'.



Table 17: Ward-wise top three Solid Waste Management related civic complaints in the years 2013 to 2015

	Solid Waste Management (SWM)													
	Population 2011	from N Ma A	age not House/(/unicipa rket/Ro uthorise ection p	lifted Gully/ al ad/ ed	Garbage lorry not reported for service/ Removal of Debris Lorry not covered				Providin g/remo ving/re placing dustbins	Lifting of Tree Cutting				
Ward		2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	2014	2015		
Α	185014	91	118	43	20	30	15	34	25	2	48	10		
В	127290	84	103	64	21	25	28	11	13	1	7	3		
С	166161	145	178	106	30	33	33	8	2	6	17	7		
D	346866	349	310	183	94	103	95	22	11	6	42	46		
E	393286	65	172	109	35	34	32	6	7	6	21	6		
F/N	529034	46	173	52	30	37	43	13	14	4	30	26		
F/S	360972	36	68	17	19	26	30	17	13	2	15	11		
G/N	599039	87	108	35	35	51	59	16	11	7	19	72		
G/S	377749	57	71	38	38	44	22	10	7	4	32	8		
H/E	557239	37	88	53	17	22	29	8	11	10	42	12		
H/W	307581	53	94	69	28	33	50	7	19	12	17	69		
K/E	823885	128	126	59	71	75	63	39	15	11	37	23		
K/W	748688	181	120	63	77	96	76	61	19	5	13	18		
L	902225	124	179	147	43	57	81	9	19	11	51	15		
M/E	807720	37	76	39	46	39	19	7	17	5	31	11		
M/W	411893	39	82	27	24	26	18	6	9	5	27	7		
N	622853	86	112	77	41	47	44	17	19	6	26	47		
P/N	941366	85	141	69	35	50	35	29	25	6	25	43		
P/S	463507	72	86	45	33	31	32	18	17	10	27	32		
R/C	562162	75	124	66	33	30	33	27	36	9	36	44		
R/N	431368	17	29	14	13	12	11	2	5	0	4	6		
R/S	691229	113	142	115	47	53	46	27	15	14	32	24		
S	743783	53	83	86	38	31	48	11	11	10	43	22		
Т	341463	25	36	17	21	16	11	6	1	1	16	11		
Total	12442373	2085	2819	1593	889	1001	953	411	341	153	658	573		

- S ward (4%) recorded the highest increase in complaints of 'Garbage not lifted from House/Gully/Municipal Market/Road/Authorized collection point'.
- S (55%) and H/W (52%) recorded the highest increase in complaints for 'Removal of Debris'
- G/N ward (72) recorded the highest increase in complaints on 'Lifting of Tree Cutting'.



Table 18: Top Four Water supply related Ward-wise civic complaints in the years 2013 to 2015

	Water Supply												
	Population 2011	Short	age of V Supply	Vater	Leaks	in Wate	r Lines	Тарр	authoris ing of V onnectio	Vater		ntamina ater Sup	
Ward		2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015
А	185014	33	40	38	3	12	3	7	5	9	12	11	9
В	127290	15	34	40	2	5	11	19	11	8	31	30	24
С	166161	67	39	31	17	9	16	8	5	24	58	42	37
D	346866	43	64	60	65	52	78	12	5	11	21	41	54
Е	393286	56	85	66	20	47	45	23	34	27	52	41	44
F/N	529034	12	84	51	13	29	30	29	28	26	29	26	24
F/S	360972	14	41	23	16	12	27	4	7	19	22	11	19
G/N	599039	32	51	58	24	17	47	101	77	107	19	18	32
G/S	377749	14	24	27	12	19	32	15	31	29	5	15	7
H/E	557239	8	34	33	39	15	36	16	15	18	28	30	35
H/W	307581	57	98	75	43	43	29	18	29	15	25	51	34
K/E	823885	83	132	192	146	85	173	70	44	70	21	43	36
K/W	748688	71	176	209	67	47	80	69	85	75	49	92	108
L	902225	57	137	146	268	274	363	97	88	148	13	31	32
M/E	807720	908	974	898	227	248	154	73	73	45	51	55	40
M/W	411893	229	141	137	179	165	144	45	30	36	60	42	31
N	622853	23	70	61	270	227	207	32	27	38	36	11	17
P/N	941366	58	141	103	65	74	92	67	59	110	45	100	70
P/S	463507	37	59	90	70	44	45	19	25	36	8	34	24
R/C	562162	62	109	152	108	54	53	13	14	25	55	46	54
R/N	431368	19	45	49	28	32	34	11	9	12	8	28	9
R/S	691229	57	148	91	80	82	91	36	28	26	44	62	32
S	743783	37	63	62	146	185	244	22	23	40	50	14	14
Т	341463	8	40	47	60	72	43	11	8	7	4	13	16
Total	12442373	2000	2829	2739	1968	1849	2077	817	760	961	746	887	802

- P/S (53%), K/E (45%), R/C (39%), K/W (19%), and B (18%) wards recorded the highest increase in complaints of 'Shortage of Water Supply' and G/N ward reported the highest increase (176%) in complaints for 'Leaks in Water Lines'.
- C ward (380%) reported the sharp increase on complaints for 'Unauthorized Tapping of Water Connection.'
- G/N (78%) and F/S (73%) wards reported the highest increase in complaints for 'Contaminated Water



Table 19: Ward-wise civic complaints⁷ on Potholes on the Roads from the year 2013 to 2015

Potholes on the Roads												
Ward		ral Comp ration S (CCRs)		Increase from 2014 to 2015		e of Citize	ens	Increase from 2014 to 2015		Total		
waru	2013	2014	2015	(in %)	2013	2014	2015	(in %)	2013	2014	2015	
А	39	97	40	-59	1462	318	160	-50	1501	415	200	
В	16	33	14	-58	1135	293	87	-70	1151	326	101	
С	44	50	24	-52	874	283	48	-83	918	333	72	
D	67	99	65	-34	2187	602	157	-74	2254	701	222	
E	49	37	33	-11	1418	527	194	-63	1467	564	227	
F/N	85	108	35	-68	1417	325	135	-58	1502	433	170	
F/S	21	34	19	-44	959	385	89	-77	980	419	108	
G/N	52	45	38	-16	1694	397	86	-78	1746	442	124	
G/S	37	49	41	-16	885	154	49	-68	922	203	90	
H/E	43	40	43	8	1293	483	172	-64	1336	523	215	
H/W	44	61	55	-10	1578	813	372	-54	1622	874	427	
K/E	133	175	144	-18	2238	531	387	-27	2371	706	531	
K/W	152	143	134	-6	1873	812	497	-39	2025	955	631	
L	97	75	61	-19	2041	585	375	-36	2138	660	436	
M/E	44	95	33	-65	1610	358	325	-9	1654	453	358	
M/W	53	69	35	-49	965	374	82	-78	1018	443	117	
Ν	86	95	80	-16	1194	950	226	-76	1280	1045	306	
P/N	127	209	139	-33	2134	823	674	-18	2261	1032	813	
P/S	188	210	92	-56	1276	739	433	-41	1464	949	525	
R/C	129	139	83	-40	1782	953	452	-53	1911	1092	535	
R/N	34	46	30	-35	1396	447	158	-65	1430	493	188	
R/S	116	320	141	-56	917	764	268	-65	1033	1084	409	
S	107	92	128	39	1749	893	224	-75	1856	985	352	
Т	41	39	59	51	1580	864	213	-75	1621	903	272	
MCGM other												
agencies ⁸					818	70	62	-11	818	70	62	
Total	1804	2360	1566	-34	36475	13743	5925	-57	38279	16103	7491	

• T (51 S (39%), and H/E (8%) recorded the highest increase in complaints on the Central Complaint Registration System (CCRS) and C ward recorded the highest (83%) decrease in complaints on Voice of Citizens portal for Potholes on the Roads.

⁷The above data presents the number of complaints registered on Central Complaint Registration System (CCRS) and MCGM's Portal (<u>http://www.voiceofcitizen.com</u>) of Pothole tracking software across the wards.

⁸MCGM-other agencies include: (SWD) Western Suburbs, (SWD) ONM,(SWD) Eastern Suburbs, Hydraulic Engineers(HE), Sewage Project(SP), Water SUPPLY Projects(WSP),Storm Water Drainage(SWD), Sewerage Projects(Micro Tunneling), construction (CITY),construction (EASTERN).



Table 20: Status report of complaints in year 2014

Ward	Total Complaints	Closed (Action taken)	Comp Registere Pend	d (Action	In Process (Not assigned/Re Assigned/Being	Not related to	Councilo giv	
		takeny	No.	In (%)	Attended)	MCGM	No.	In (%)
А	1642	1075	535	33	30	2	207	13
В	1468	558	908	62	2	0	314	21
С	1625	294	1329	82	2	0	379	23
D	2793	1057	1669	60	67	0	360	13
E	2161	607	1550	72	4	0	578	27
F/N	2233	394	1818	81	21	0	475	21
F/S	1176	578	564	48	33	1	330	28
G/N	2610	1714	573	22	323	0	704	27
G/S	1520	470	1046	69	4	0	337	22
H/E	1840	634	1122	61	84	0	437	24
H/W	2359	1068	1264	54	27	0	537	23
K/E	4529	1386	3064	68	78	1	1318	29
K/W	4145	448	3515	85	182	0	958	23
L	7500	2141	5352	71	7	0	877	12
M/E	4511	1303	3185	71	23	0	789	17
M/W	2512	1129	1382	55	1	0	557	22
Ν	2751	704	2042	74	5	0	694	25
P/N	4238	2562	1552	37	124	0	1199	28
P/S	2772	1571	1194	43	7	0	485	17
R/C	2721	753	1897	70	71	0	662	24
R/N	1323	386	919	69	18	0	436	33
R/S	4077	1366	2684	66	27	0	796	20
S	2447	833	1568	64	43	3	589	24
Т	1794	527	1266	71	1	0	756	42
Total	66747	23558	41998		1184	7	14774	
In (%)	00/4/	35	63		2	0.01	22	

• MCGM departments (Administration) have closed 35% of the total 66,747 civic complaints in 2014.

• No action has been taken by the Administration in case of 63% registered complaints in 2014.

• The Councillor code⁹ was filled in only 22% citizen's complaints.

⁹While solving complaints the engineer concerned has to mention the councillor name (code) for each complaint, based on the constituency that the complaint belongs to. This is compulsory and should be filled out rigorously. This will assist councillors to get the list of constituency-wise complaints.



Table 21: Status report of complaints in year 2015

	Total	Closed (Action	Complaints Registered (Action Pending)		In Process (Not assigned/Re Assigned/Being	Not related to	Coun code	
Ward	Complaints	taken)	No.	ln (%)	Attended)	MCGM	No.	In (%)
A	1258	994	254	20	6	4	127	10
В	1239	1017	196	16	26	0	154	12
С	1477	1080	397	27	0	0	234	16
D	3125	2648	475	15	2	0	235	8
E	2220	1833	380	17	7	0	386	17
F/N	2183	1754	373	17	52	4	363	17
F/S	1216	1056	157	13	3	0	202	17
G/N	3008	2783	190	6	35	0	366	12
G/S	1446	1220	200	14	26	0	219	15
H/E	2073	1477	573	28	22	1	289	14
H/W	2343	1709	628	27	6	0	316	13
K/E	3936	3120	734	19	82	0	457	12
K/W	3831	2236	1592	42	3	0	463	12
L	7424	5668	1626	22	125	5	636	9
M/E	3013	952	2056	68	5	0	250	8
M/W	1884	1594	289	15	1	0	256	14
N	2740	2275	459	17	6	0	522	19
P/N	4028	2982	1000	25	46	0	565	14
P/S	2662	2208	430	16	24	0	393	15
R/C	2636	1834	755	29	47	0	521	20
R/N	1181	922	249	21	10	0	232	20
R/S	3022	1876	1130	37	16	0	479	16
S	2712	2197	496	18	19	0	447	16
Т	1253	902	346	28	5	0	244	19
Total		46337	14985		574	14	8356	
In (%)	61910	75	24		1	0.02	13	

Note: This total complaints excludes the 'Voice of Citizens' complaints from 2015.

Inference:

• MCGM departments (Administration) have closed about 75% of the total 61910 civic complaints in 2015.

• The Councillor code¹⁰ was filled in only 13% of the citizen complaints.

¹⁰While solving complaints the engineer concerned has to mention the councillor name (code) for each complaint, based on the constituency that the complaint belongs to. This is compulsory and should be filled out rigorously. This will assist councillors to get the list of constituency-wise complaints.


Table 22: Ward-wise average number of days for closing complaints in the year 2015

Complain t to be attened as per Citizens' Charter	Drainage Chokes and Blockages	Overflowi ng drains or manholes	Odour (Foul Smell) from Drains	Replacem ent of Missing / Damaged Manhole	Raising of Manhole (except in Monsoon)	Cleani ng of septic tank	Repairs to pipe sewers/ main sewers	Contami nated Water Supply	Leaks in Water Lines
То									
resolved									
as per Citizens'									
Charter	1	1	1	1	7	7	7	1	7
Actual					,	,	,	-	,
time									
taken to									
resolve in									
2015	8	13	14	18	11	16	18	12	14
Α	5	5	4	8	0	2	13	5	4
В	9	12	14	40	24	10	17	5	8
С	9	16	51	15	0	10	0	5	6
D	7	8	12	11	0	10	16	9	7
E	8	9	12	16	2	15	14	7	13
F/N	8	12	8	20	0	14	87	7	10
F/S	6	10	28	21	0	0	14	10	11
G/N	3	5	6	7	0	2	13	7	7
G/S	11	11	3	9	0	22	2	17	21
H/E	7	30	5	43	8	26	11	17	17
H/W	4	9	4	9	0	5	9	31	24
, K/E	9	18	21	22	0	19	14	14	16
K/W	9	28	32	22	0	22	31	30	33
Ĺ	11	12	13	14	8	15	17	11	18
M/E	12	12	10	11	0	13	24	31	62
M/W	8	10	13	7	6	9	10	5	5
N	9	9	2	21	19	6	13	5	8
P/N	14	21	14	38	5	22	50	18	17
P/S	10	24	17	27	0	29	53	23	20
R/C	10	17	59	27	0	23	26	14	19
R/N	4	17	6	8	0	26	59	13	10
R/S	8	13	10	14	0	4	9	13	10
S S	13	15	10	31	25	15	21	17	13
Т	20	18	27	8	0	8	74	8	7



Table 23: Ward-wise average number of days for closing complaints in the year 2015

Complaint to be attended as per Citizens' Charter To	Shorta ge of Water Supply	Burst Water Main	Garbage not lifted - Co- authorise d Point	Collection point not attended properly	Garbage lorry not reported for service/ Lorry not covered	Providing /removin g/replaci ng dustbins	Sweepi ng of road	Remo val of Dead Anima Is	No attenda nce at public toilets
resolved as per Citizens'									
Charter	2	1	1	1	1	8	1	1	2
Actual time taken to resolve in 2015	15	15	15	9	9	9	10	7	11
A	5	6	8	4	4	7	3	0	2
В	5	15	10	13	5	0	11	0	0
C	4	11	14	2	8	9	15	29	0
D	6	6	0	5	8	7	7	6	7
E	9	9	0	7	6	15	9	0	0
F/N	11	14	0	8	11	9	13	0	19
F/S	12	15	4	5	5	4	6	4	4
G/N	8	5	14	8	3	6	1	0	12
G/S	32	85	3	2	2	2	2	3	5
H/E	16	17	12	6	10	7	4	9	10
H/W	31	23	12	17	13	22	18	0	31
K/E	12	12	17	11	18	11	9	14	18
K/W	24	30	0	8	9	11	8	0	7
L	13	21	15	10	12	11	8	4	7
M/E	46	76	14	12	10	16	15	1	14
M/W	5	8	25	8	13	9	13	7	13
N	6	11	23	8	2	4	10	8	3
P/N	16	25	32	17	21	12	21	14	19
P/S	23	31	10	4	5	7	6	5	4
R/C	17	18	0	6	4	4	5	3	18
R/N	6	1	2	0	0	4	7	0	14
R/S	12	19	0	18	12	16	22	0	14
S	15	13	0	5	7	8	18	0	8
Т	8	4	19	16	6	5	11	0	5



Inference:

- H/W & M/E (31) Ward Committees took the longest days to attend to complaints regarding 'Contaminated Water Supply', which should actually have taken only a day according to the Citizens' Charter.
- F/N (87) Ward Committee took the longest days to attend to complaints regarding 'repairs to pipe sewers and main sewers', which according to the Citizens' Charter should have been dealt within 7 days.
- P/S (29) Ward took 66 days to address complaints regarding the 'Cleaning of Septic Tank' which according to the Citizens' Charter should have been addressed within 7 days. On the other hand, T Ward took the least days to address this particular issue (8 days).
- G/S Ward Committee took on an average 85 days for closing complaints relating to 'Burst Water Main' in 2015, which should actually have been closed within 1 day according to the Citizens' Charter.
- M/E Ward Committee took on an average 76 days to close complaints relating to 'Burst Water Main', 53 days to close complaints regarding 'Shortage of Water Supply', and 62 days close complaints Leaks in Water Lines



Section II: Data of Attendance and Questions Asked in Ward Committees

Table 24: Ward Committee and Ward-wise Number of Meetings, Attendance in (%) and No. of Questions Askedfrom January 2015 to December 2015

					Total	No.	of quest cour	tions asl ncillors	ked by
			No. of	Attenda	Questi		1 to	6 to	Above
Sr.		No. of	Meeti	nce	on	Zero	5	10	10
No.	Ward	Councillors	ngs	(in %)	asked	Que.	Que.	Que.	Que.
1	Ward Committee A, B and E								
	А	4			12	1	2	1	0
	В	3			14	1	0	2	0
	E	8	18	63	20	1	7	0	0
2	Ward Committee C and D		1	1	r		1		
	С	4			24	0	1	3	0
	D	7	18	84	29	0	5	2	0
3	Ward Committee F/South a	nd F/North	T		r		1	1	
	F/N	10			41	2	5	2	1
	F/S	7	15	68	20	2	4	1	0
4	Ward Committee G/North	11	14	81	55	2	5	2	2
5	Ward Committee G/South	9	16	69	77	2	3	2	2
6	Ward Committee H/East and	d H/West							
	H/E	11			59	0	7	3	1
	H/W	6	16	83	34	1	3	0	2
7	Ward Committee K/East	15	19	77	92	2	7	5	1
8	Ward Committee K/West	13	17	65	90	2	1	7	3
9	Ward Committee L	15	17	76	66	1	10	3	1
10	Ward Committee M/East	13	15	65	59	2	6	5	0
11	Ward Committee M/West	8	15	74	45	0	5	1	2
12	Ward Committee N	12	16	64	60	2	5	4	1
13	Ward Committee P/North	16	13	73	56	2	11	3	0
14	Ward Committee P/South	8	21	77	25	0	7	1	0
15	Ward Committee R/Central	and R/North					1		
	R/C	10			45	1	6	2	1
	R/N	7	17	71	28	1	5	0	1
16	Ward Committee R/South	11	17	88	86	0	5	3	3
17	Ward Committee S and T								
	S	13			41	0	12	1	0
	Т	6	15	62	20	2	2	2	0
	Total	227	279	73	1098	27	124	55	21



Inference:

- Councillors from Ward Committee S and T have the lowest (62%) attendance during the year January 2015 to December 2015.
- 27 councillors have not asked a single question in the year 2015.
- R/S and M/W ward has the highest numbers of councillors (11 and 8 respectively) who have not asked a single question in the year 2015.
- Only 21 Councillors out of a total 227 have asked more than 10 questions. A majority of councillors (124) have asked only '1 to 5 questions'.



Table 25: Issue-wise questions asked by Councillors during the period January 2015 to December 2015

Sr. No.	Ward	Drai nage	S W M	Wa ter Sup ply	Lice	Ro ads	Gar den	Commu nity Develo pment	He alt h	Educ	Nami ng/ Rena ming of Road s	Oth er issu es rela ted	To tal
1	Ward Committee A, B a			PIY	nse	aus	ucii	pinent		ation	3	icu	tai
	A	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	5	12
	В	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	14
	E	0	1	0	3	1	1	2	0	1	2	9	20
2	Ward Committee C and	D											
	С	1	1	1	0	7	1	1	0	0	2	10	24
	D	1	2	2	1	6	1	0	1	0	8	7	29
3	Ward Committee F/Sou	th and	F/Nor	rth				1					
	F/N	1	4	2	4	3	1	1	0	1	7	17	41
	F/S	2	2	1	1	2	2	0	1	0	4	5	20
	Ward Committee												
4	G/North	1	6	1	8	9	2	1	0	3	3	21	55
	Ward Committee												
5	G/South	6	8	4	4	15	1	1	1	1	5	31	77
6	Ward Committee H/Eas							1		1	[
	H/E	3	0	4	8	4	1	3	1	1	7	27	59
	H/W	0	3	4	4	3	2	0	1	0	9	8	34
	Ward Committee		_		_		-		•		10		
7	K/East	2	4	2	7	17	6	3	0	1	19	31	92
8	Ward Committee K/West	2	5	6	6	19	4	3	0	1	24	20	90
9	Ward Committee L	1	5	6	6	13	1	2	2	1	6	20	66
9	Ward Committee	T	5	0	0	13	1	<u> </u>	۷		0	23	00
10	M/E	2	5	9	1	13	1	0	1	3	8	16	59
	Ward Committee												
11	M/W	1	9	0	1	6	2	1	0	2	6	17	45
12	Ward Committee N	0	5	2	2	11	4	2	2	1	10	21	60
	Ward Committee												
13	P/North	3	8	3	7	15	0	0	1	2	10	7	56
	Ward Committee	6		-	~	~			6	<u> </u>	6		
14	P/South	0	1	5	3	3	1	0	0	0	6	6	25
15	Ward Committee R/Cer				-		-		-		-		
	R/C	1	3	3	6	11	0	1	2	0	4	14	45
	R/N	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	2	2	1	11	28
16	Ward Committee R/South	5	8	3	7	21	6	0	2	1	5	28	86



Sr. No.	Ward	Drai nage	S W M	Wa ter Sup ply	Lice nse	Ro ads	Gar den	Commu nity Develo pment	He alt h	Educ ation	Nami ng/ Rena ming of Road s	Oth er issu es rela ted	To tal
17	Ward Committee S and	T											
	S	2	5	2	3	8	2	0	2	0	3	14	41
	Т	1	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	4	8	20
						19							10

Inference:

- K/E (92) and K/W (90) ward committees have asked the highest number of questions in 2015.
- Lowest (12) number of questions were asked in the A ward.



Annexure1 –Analysis of complaints attended (closed) in comparison with days mentioned in MCGM's Citizen Charter

		Actu	al time taken	to resolve
Issues/Sub-issues	To resolved as per Citizens' Charter	2014	2015	Increase from 2014 to 2015 (In %)
Drainage				
Drainage Chokes and Blockages	1	17	8	-53
Overflowing drains or manholes	1	18	13	-27
Odour (Foul Smell) from Drains	1	16	14	-10
Replacement of Missing / Damaged Manhole	1	21	18	-13
Raising of Manhole (except in Monsoon)	7	14	11	-23
Cleaning of septic tank	7	19	16	-18
Repairs to pipe sewers/main sewers	7	20	18	-10
Water Supply			1	
Contaminated Water Supply	1	16	12	-25
Leaks in Water Lines	7	17	14	-18
Shortage of Water Supply	2	18	15	-17
Burst Water Main	1	17	15	-10
Solid Waste Management (SWM)	1			
Garbage not lifted - Co-authorised Point	1	16	15	-3
Collection point not attended properly	1	15	9	-38
Garbage lorry not reported for service/ Lorry not covered	1	14	9	-33
Providing/removing/replacing dustbins	8	17	9	-48
Sweeping of road	1	18	10	-47
Removal of Dead Animals	1	19	7	-64
No attendance at public toilets	2	18	11	-37



201-300

301-400

>401

Poor

Very Poor

Severe

Annexture2 - Analysis of Air Quality Index (AQI) averages at Bandra, Mumbai with its corresponding measuring scale

					scale			
				AQ	I (Air Quality Index)			
DAY	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
1	98	78	69	65	58	175	112	125
2	99	138	69	66	59	99	111	167
3	96	87	69	64	65	72	156	122
4	93	102	67	64	68	80	175	127
5	105	106	69	65	65	92	149	162
6	94	106	78	66	65	159	162	148
7	180	114	68	85	61	189	167	132
8	82	107	72	74	70	183	155	137
9	100	106	66	87	64	75	184	192
10	88	102	67	71	88	74	180	160
11	89	103	72	58	81	76	287	156
12	77	101	65	57	68	84	153	144
13	84	106	65	50	66	124	186	139
14	93	109	69	64	59	159	138	135
15	87	107	71	81	57	167	147	138
16	95	71	77	81	59	169	146	152
17	77	60	65	92	60	183	144	132
18	76	65	64	70	62	170		133
19	72	67	64	61	63	170		164
20	76	67	63	84	64	173	154	176
21	75	67	61	68	62	183	161	126
22	84	66	68	61	69	183	151	121
23	79	60	68	61	75	161	150	129
24	73	66	67	62	81	117	138	116
25	90	69	66	74	83	110	154	103
26	91	68	64	61	83	105	198	129
27	80	69	66	68	78	105	133	158
28	87	69	67	125	92	127	113	137
29	73	73	67	81	136	157	148	152
30	76	69	66	74	132	116	134	181
31	101		65	67		130		162
AVERAGE	89	86	68	71	73	134	157	144
Color code	Scale	Value		Impact				
	0-50	Good		Minimal Imp	pact			
	51-100	Satisfac	torv		hing discomfort to s	sensitive people		
	101-200	Modera			iscomfort to the peo		t disease, children	and older adults
	101 200	mouch		Di catiling u	been not to the per		e alscuse, children	

Respiratory effects even on healthy people

Breathing discomfort to people on prolonged exposure

Respiratory illness to the people on prolonged exposure



Summarizing the origin and concept of Air Quality Index (AQI)

To address the growing concerns regarding public health as well as environment sustainability, as well as make air quality data that was either too confusing or too technical to be accessible by both decision-makers as well as common man, Air Quality Index (AQI) has been developed and used effectively in many developed countries for over last three decades.

AQI Definition:

Simply put, An AQI is defined as an overall scheme that transforms weighted values of individual air pollution related parameters (SO2, CO, visibility, etc.) into a single number or set of numbers. The result is a set of rules (i.e. set of equations) that translate parameter values into a more simple form by means of numerical manipulation:



Note: This image has been taken from the 'National Air Quality Index' Report released by the Central Pollution Control Board (2014)



Annexure3 – Political party-wise data

Table 26: Party-wise number of questions asked by Councillors during March 2012 to December 2015

	Zero Q	Zero Question		1 to 5 Question asked		o 10 stion ced	Abov Ques aske	tion	Total
Political Party Name	Y1 ¹¹	Y2	Y1	Y2	Y1	Y2	Y1	Y2	Members
Akhil Bharatiya Sena	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Bharatiya Janata Party	2	6	18	12	7	10	4	3	31
Bhartiya Republican Party Bahujan Mahasangha	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
Bhartiya Shetkari Kamgar Party	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Independent	2	2	10	8	1	4	1	0	14
Indian National Congress	5	4	30	24	12	16	5	8	52
Maharashtra Navnirman Sena	3	2	20	20	5	3	0	3	28
Nationalist Congress Party	2	0	3	9	7	4	1	0	13
Republican Party Of India (RPI)(A)	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Samajwadi Party	1	1	4	4	2	4	2	0	9
Shiv Sena	8	11	48	43	12	14	7	7	75
Total Members	26	27	134	124	47	55	20	21	227

¹¹ Y1 is refers to is January 2014 to December 2014 and Y2 is January 2015 to December 2015



Political Party Name	No. of Members		Roa	d			Drai	nage			sv	/M		v	Vater	Supply	y
		Y1 ¹²	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4
ABS ¹³	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BJP	31	15	24	37	25	2	4	7	2	7	12	15	19	10	12	17	6
BRPB	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
BSKP	1			0	0			0	0			0	0			0	0
Ind.	14	10	9	2	13	1	2	3	2	3	7	7	8	2	6	6	6
INC	52	19	22	21	45	10	8	11	14	21	24	25	19	11	9	15	22
MNS	28	20	22	16	25	3	7	2	3	2	11	11	9	5	4	4	1
NCP	13	6	5	15	16	1	1	1	1	4	3	8	4	2	1	4	3
RPI (A)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SP	9	4	12	9	9	4	0	2	0	2	5	6	6	2	2	8	2
SS	75	28	47	37	61	9	13	18	17	23	23	39	21	13	10	17	25
Total	227	102	141	138	194	30	35	44	39	62	85	111	86	47	44	71	65

Table 27: Party-wise number of questions asked on civic issues during March 2012 to December 2015

Political Party Name	No. of Members			enamin Chowk	-	Ot	her rela	ited issu	ies		То	tal	
•		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y1	Y2	Y3	¥4
ABS	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	3
BJP	31	20	26	12	34	40	69	64	75	94	147	152	161
BRPB	1	0	1	1	2	2	3	4	2	4	4	6	4
BSKP	1			0	1			0	0	0	0	0	1
Ind.	14	9	5	3	4	18	34	24	28	43	63	45	61
INC	52	29	37	34	47	54	103	122	139	144	203	228	286
MNS	28	9	20	11	10	42	70	41	79	81	134	85	127
NCP	13	13	15	16	8	24	38	33	28	50	63	77	60
RPI(A)	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0
SP	9	1	0	3	3	16	29	27	22	29	48	55	42
SS	75	44	43	28	51	114	189	184	178	231	325	323	353
Total	227	127	147	109	161	310	537	499	553	678	989	972	1098

¹² Y1 refers to January 2012 to December 2012, Y2 is January 2013 to December 2013, Y3 is January 2014 to December 2014 and Y4 is January 2015 to December 2015

¹³ ABS refers to Akhil Bharatiya Sena, BJP to Bharatiya Janata Party, BRPB to Bhartiya Republican Party Bahujan Mahasangha, BSKP to Bhartiya Shetkari Kamgar Party, IND to Independent, INC to Indian National Congress, MNS to Maharashtra Navnirman Sena, NCP to Nationalist Congress Party, RPI(A) to Republican Party Of India (RPI)(A), SP to Samajwadi Party and SS refers to Shiv Sena.



Annexure4– Ward-wise Councillors' data

	Councillor				uestio					1	otal Qu	estio	n
W ¹⁴	Name	Party	Y1 ¹⁵	Y2	Y3	Y4	w	Councillor Name	Party	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4
								Komal					
Α	Anita Yadav	INC	0	0	0	3	L	Jamsandekar	SS	0	1	3	2
Α	Ganesh Sanap	SS	1	5	1	0	L	Lalita Annamalai	IND	0	0	1	0
	Makarand							16					
A	Narvekar	IND	5	2	3	2	L	Leena Shukla# ¹⁶	IND	5	9	7	5
•	Sushama		2	1	2	7		Manali Tulaskar		2	2		2
A	Salunkhe	INC	2	1	2	7	L	Manali Tulaskar Mohd. Ishak	SS	3	3	4	2
В	Dnyanraj Nikam	INC	1	0	3	0	L	Shaikh	SP	0	7	9	4
	Waqarunnisa		-	•	<u> </u>	Ū				0	,		
В	Ansari	INC	3	0	5	8	L	Saeeda Khan	NCP	2	0	11	5
								Sanjana					
В	Javed Juneja#	INC	7	9	7	6	L	Mungekar	SS	4	9	6	5
С	Sampat Thakur	SS	3	4	5	7	L	Savita Pawar	NCP	5	9	4	5
С	Veena Jain	BJP	4	5	3	6	L	Vijay Tandel	IND	10	10	11	8
С	Yaqoob Memon	SP	12	8	7	7	M/E	Arun Kamble#	BRP	4	4	6	4
	Yugandara												
С	Salekar	SS	4	5	3	4	M/E	Dinesh Panchal	SS	0	4	2	4
D	Anil Singh	SS	7	12	14	2	M/E	Khairunnisa Hussain ¹⁷	BSK	N/A			0
	Arvind												
D	Dudhwadkar	SS	0	2	1	3	M/E	Manju Kumare	SS	0	2	0	0
D	Jyotshna Mehta	BJP	2	2	3	5	M/E	Mohd. Siraj Shaikh	IND	1	1	0	2
								1				-	
D	Noshir Mehta	INC	10	10	12	6	M/E	Noorjahan Shaikh	SP	1	3	1	5
D	Sarita Patil#	BJP	1	5	9	6	M/E	Rahul Shevale	SS	0	1	1	0
D	Shantilal Doshi	INC	2	3	3	5	M/E	Rais Shaikh* ¹⁸	SP	0	9	5	3
_	Surendra			-	_	_					-		
D	Bagalkar	SS	4	2	2	2	M/E	Reshma Nevrekar	SP	10	8	12	9
E	Faiyaz Khan Geeta Gawli	INC ABS	0	0	1	0	M/E M/E	Shantaram Patil	SP INC	3	3 2	5 5	7 6
<u>с</u>	Manoj	ABS	0	1	0			Sunanda Lokare		2	2	5	0
Е	Jamsutkar	INC	5	9	7	1	M/E	Usha Kamble	INC	1	3	3	8
	Ramakant				,	-							
Е	Rahate	SS	4	8	9	5	M/E	Vithal Kharatmol	BJP	1	6	12	10

Table 28: Ward-wise Councillors' names, party and questions asked during Mar'12 to Dec'15

 $^{^{\}rm 14}$ W is refers to Ward

¹⁵ Y1 is refers to March 2012 to December 2012, Y2 is January 2013 to December 2013 and Y3 is January 2014 to December 2014, Y4 is January 2015 to December 2015

 ¹⁶ (#) Councillors are Ward Committee Chairperson for 2015-16
 ¹⁷ Councillor Hanifa Bi passed away in December 2013 and was succeeded by Khairunnisa Hussain

¹⁸(*) Councillors are also Party Heads



	Councillor			Total Q	uestion	ľ				т	otal Q	uestio	n
	Name	Party					w	Councillor Name	Party				
W			Y1 ¹⁹	Y2	Y3	Y4				Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4
E	Samita Naik	MNS	0	1	4	4	M/E	Anil Patankar	INC	2	4	3	1
E	Shahana Khan	INC	2	1	1	3	M/W	Deepa Parab	SS	1	2	2	2
								Mahadev					
E	Vandana Gawli	ABS	0	1	0	2	M/W	Shivgan#	BJP	4	5	7	4
E	Yamini Jadhav	SS	3	7	3	4	M/W	Rajshree Palande	BJP	0	7	9	19
F/N	Alka Doke	SS	0	1	0	2	M/W	Sangita Handore	INC	1	1	1	1
F/N	Lalita Yadav	INC	4	6	9	10	M/W	Seema Mahulkar	INC	3	1	1	1
								Suprada					
F/N	Mahant Chaube	BJP	2	0	0	2	M/W	Phaterpekar	SS	2	5	1	11
- (Manojkumar		-				/			-	_	-	
F/N	Sansare	IND	3	1	1	4	M/W	Vandana Sable	INC	8	5	6	6
F/N	Nayna Sheth	INC	3	4	13	11	M/W	Ashwini Mate	SS	8	3	4	6
E /N	Pranita	SS	2	2	4	2	N	Bharti Bawadane	SS	6	3	1	0
F/N	Waghdhare Rajeshree		2	2	4	2	IN	Bridru Bawauane		0	3	T	0
F/N	Shirwadkar	BJP	2	4	6	9	N	Deepak Hande	IND	5	20	4	8
F/N	Selvan Tamil	BJP	3	4	2	0	N		BJP	7	8	17	15
			-	-		-		Falguni Dave					
F/N	Shradha Jadhav Trushna	SS	4	1	3	0	N	Harun Khan	NCP	1	3	6	5
F/N	Vishwasrao*	SS	4	2	3	1	N	Mangal Kadam	MNS	1	0	0	0
171	Hemangi		-	2	5	-		Mangarkadam	IVIIVO	-	0	U	0
F/S	Chemburkar	SS	5	4	9	9	N	Pratiksha Ghuge	NCP	4	1	2	1
	Nandkishor												
F/S	Vichare#	SS	8	6	4	3	N	Pravin Cheda	INC	5	4	8	8
	Pallavi												
F/S	Mungekar	INC	1	1	1	2	N	Rakhi Jadhav	NCP	2	1	7	3
F/S	Sanjay Ambole	SS	1	3	0	0	N	Ritu Tawade	BJP	11	9	11	10
F/S	Shweta Rane	SS	0	0	1	0	N	Sanjay Bhalerao	MNS	2	1	2	2
F/S	Sunil More	INC	1	1	1	1	N	Suresh Awale#	MNS	5	1	5	2
- 10	Vaibhavi				-	_				_	-	-	-
F/S	Chavan	SS	4	1	6	5	N	Ajit Bhandari	SS	5	3	3	3
G/N	Anusha Kodam	SS	0	1	1	N/A	P/N	Anagha Mhatre	SS	4	2	2	2
C /N	Ganga Kunal Mane ²⁰			N1 / A		C		Dhamaina Dathad		4	1	1	2
G/N		INC		N/A	_	6	P/N	Bhomsing Rathod	INC	4	1	1	3
G/N	Jyotsna Parmar	SP	0	0	0	0	P/N	Cyril D'souza	IND	5	1	2	2
G/N	Manish Chavan	MNS	3	3	6	1	P/N	Deepak Pawar	MNS	3	4	6	4
G/N	Rajendra Suryavanshi	SS	3	6	1	7		Gyanmurti Sharma	BJP	3	10	11	8
5/11		(RPI)	5	5		,		Qumarjahan	551	5	10		5
G/N	Sabreddy Bora	(A)	2	0	1	0	P/N	Siddiqi	INC	2	3	6	10
	Sandeep	. ,						·					
G/N	Deshpande*	MNS	3	8	3	5	P/N	Manisha Patil	SS	3	0	0	0

¹⁹ Y1 is refers to March 2012 to December 2012, Y2 is January 2013 to December 2013 and Y3 is January 2014 to December 2014, Y4 is January 2015 to December 2015
²⁰Ganga Kunal Mane has been elected in the place of Anusha R. Kodam for P/N Ward Committee.



	Councillor			Total Q	uestion	ľ				Total Question			n
w	Name	Party	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	W	Councillor Name	Party	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4
		raity	14	12	13	14		Parminder	raity	••	12	13	14
G/N	Shraddha Patil#	MNS	1	6	2	2	P/N	Bhamra	INC	0	2	5	6
G/N	Sudhir Jadhav	MNS	6	20	8	13	P/N	Prashant Kadam	SS	2	1	4	3
								Ramnarayan					
G/N	Vakil Shaikh	INC	1	3	3	5	P/N	Barot	BJP	2	2	4	3
G/N	Virendra Tandel	MNS	5	1	2	11	P/N	Rupali Raorane	NCP	4	6	7	4
G/N	Vishnu Gaikwad	IND	0	5	3	5	P/N	Sayali Warise	SS	0	1	3	0
- (-	Hemangi						- 6.			_			
G/S	Worlikar	SS	27	23	17	29	P/N	Siraj Shaikh	INC	2	4	1	N/A
G/S	Hemlata Wange	MNS	0	1	0	0	P/N	Sunil Gujar	SS	2	3	2	3
G/S	Kishori Pednekar	SS	3	6	1	3	P/N	Vinod Shelar#	BJP	5	4	3	2
0/3	Fedilekai	- 33	5	0	1	5	F/IN	Vishwas	DJF	5	4	5	2
G/S	Mansi Dalvi	SS	1	2	5	4	P/N	Ghadigaonkar ²¹	SS		N/A		3
G/S	Ratna Mahale	NCP	7	6	10	10	P/N	Jitendra Walvi	SS	0	3	7	3
G/S	Santosh Dhuri	MNS	4	7	10	21	P/S	Kiran Patel	INC	0	2	2	2
_,	Seema	_							_	_			
G/S	Shivalkar#	MNS	4	6	1	4	P/S	Lochana Chavan	SS	1	4	3	4
G/S	Snehal Ambekar	SS	1	5	Ma	yor	P/S	Pramila Shinde#	SS	0	4	8	1
G/S	Sunil Ahir	NCP	5	4	7	6	P/S	Rajan Padhye	SS	3	2	1	6
H/E	Anil Trimbakkar	SS	0	6	8	8	P/S	Sneha Zagde	INC	0	1	4	3
								Sunil Vaman		Ma	ayor		
H/E	Brian Miranda	INC	2	15	10	14	P/S	Prabhu	SS		-	3	2
	Danash Dhuthan	66	2		10		D/C	Varsha Tanakur Ilan		0	-		4
H/E	Deepak Bhutkar	SS	2	11	10	8	P/S	Tembvalkar	SS	0	5	4	4
H/E	Gulistan Shaikh	INC	0	9	11	7	R/C	Asavari Patil	BJP	1	5	1	5
H/E	Ilyas Bashir Shaikh	IND	1	2	2	4	R/C	Bina Doshi	BJP	3	3	3	2
	Krishna Dhondu		-	-	-	-	ių e		231	5	5	5	-
H/E	Parkar	BJP	1	9	2	4	R/C	Chetan Kadam	MNS	3	6	2	1
	Рооја							Manisha					
H/E	Mahadeshwar	SS	3	3	3	3	R/C	Chaudhari	BJP	6	7	9	0
H/E	Priyatama Sawant	INC	6	7	4	5	R/C	Mohan Mithbaokar	BJP	0	1	1	5
					4	2					1 2	1 5	3
H/E	Snehal Shinde	MNS	1	3			R/C	Pravin Shah	BJP	0			
H/E	Sukhada Pawar	MNS	0	3	1	3	R/C	Riddhi Khursange	NCP	2	14	10	7
H/E	Sunaina Potnis	SS	1	2	2	1	R/C	Sandhya Doshi	NCP	4	8	8	8
H/W	Alka Kerkar	BJP	7	5	3	11	R/C	Shilpa Chogle	MNS	1	4	3	3
H/W	Asif Zakaria	INC	6	8	11	15	R/C	Shivanand Shetty	INC	2	4	1	11
н/w	Geeta Chavan#	MNS	1	6	6	1	R/N	Abhishek Ghosalkar	SS	3	4	0	3
- 17 VV	Karen D'mello	CUIN	1	0	0	L		GIIUSaikdi		3	4	0	3
H/W	Allen	INC	0	1	2	0	R/N	Hansaben Desai#	SS	2	1	0	2

²¹ Vishwas Ghadigaonkar has been elected in the place of Siraj Iliyas Shaikh for P/N Ward Committee.



	Councillor Name		Total Question			1	W Councillor Name		Total Question				
w	Name	Party	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4			Party	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4
H/W	Sunita Wavekar	INC	0	2	4	5	R/N	Sheetal A Mhatre	INC	3	3	4	2
	Mohd, Tanveer												
H/W	Mohd. Patel	INC	1	2	0	2	R/N	Prakash Darekar	MNS	3	2	1	5
K/E	Anant Nar	SS	7	16	18	30	R/N	Sheetal M Mhatre	SS	4	2	6	13
	Bhalchandra					_	- 4				_	_	
K/E	Aambure Jyoti Parag	MNS	1	4	1	5	R/N	Shubha Raul	SS	1	8	0	0
K/E	Alavani	IND	3	2	5	8	R/N	Udesh Patekar	SS	5	3	3	3
K/E	Kesarben Patel	INC	1	0	0	0	R/S	Ajanta Yadav	INC	6	9	15	20
K/E	Manisha Panchal	SS	4	4	2	4	R/S	Geeta Yadav	INC	8	7	8	5
								Mukeshkumar					
K/E	Manjiri Parab#	SS	1	3	0	7	R/S	Mistry	BJP	1	2	1	1
K/E	Pramod Sawant	SS	7	3	17	10	R/S	Neha Patil#	INC	4	5	3	1
K/E	Sandhya Yadav	SS	0	1	5	3	R/S	Prajakta Sawant	SS	3	9	17	16
K/E	Shivani Parab	SS	0	4	1	4	R/S	Ramashish Gupta	INC	3	5	5	5
	Shubhada												
K/E	Patkar	SS	2	1	4	3	R/S	Sagar Thakur	INC	0	3	6	4
K/E	Smita Sawant	SS	3	3	7	7	R/S	Shailaja Girkar	BJP	8	9	4	7
	Sunita							Shrikant					
K/E	Elawadekar	SS	0	6	2	3	R/S	Kavathankar	SS	5	7	7	6
K/E	Sushma Rai	INC	6	2	1	7	R/S	Sunita Yadav	BJP	0	9	8	8
K/E	Ujjwala Modak	BJP	0	0	0	0	R/S	Yogesh Bhoir	INC	6	17	10	13
K/E	Winnifred D'souza	INC	1	0	0	1	S	Anisha Majgaonkar	MNS	0	5	4	4
K/W	Ameet Satam	BJP	6	4	2	0	S	Ashok Patil	SS	3	1	1	4
	Bhavna	DJF	0	4	2	0	5	ASHOK Fath		5	1		4
K/W	Mangela#	IND	2	4	4	9	S	Avinash Sawant#	MNS	7	3	0	3
K/W	Binita Vora	INC	3	5	7	12	S	Chandan Sharma	NCP	6	4	0	1
к/W	Changez Multani	IND	2	0	0	0	S	Dhananjay Pisal*	NCP	4	2	0	2
к/W	Devendra Amberkar*	INC	1	2	0	1	S	Mangesh Pawar	IND	1	6	2	4
к/W	Dilip Patel	BJP	2	3	5	6	S	Priyanka Shrungare	MNS	4	10	1	9
17 44				5	5		5	Ramesh	CALLAR		10		
K/W	Jyoti Sutar	SS	5	7	2	8	S	Korgaonkar	SS	3	0	2	2
к/W	Jyotsna Dighe	INC	4	2	2	12	S	Rupesh Waingankar	MNS	5	1	1	2
, К/W	Mohsin Haider	INC	4	6	6	6	S	Suresh Koparkar	INC	1	2	3	2
K/W	Raju Pednekar	SS	4	7	5	7	S	Tavaji Gorule	SS	3	2	2	2
K/W	Sanjay Pawar	SS	9	11	15	16	S	Vaishnavi Sarfare	MNS	3	5	4	5



	Councillor	Politi	liti Total Question						Politi	Total Question			
w	Name	cal Party	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	W	Councillor Name	cal Party	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4
к/W	Vanita Marucha	INC	5	6	1	7	S	Vishwas Shinde	SS	0	0	2	1
к/w	Yashodhar Phanse	SS	7	6	4	6	т	Bhavna Jobanputra	BJP	2	4	6	0
L	Anuradha Pednekar	SS	8	21	13	14	т	Manoj Kotak*	BJP	2	2	1	2
L	Ashraf Ansari	SP	3	8	14	6	т	Nandakumar Vaity	NCP	4	5	5	3
L	Darshana Shinde	SS	2	3	2	1	т	Prakash Gangadhare	BJP	6	7	1	0
L	Dilip Lande	MNS	10	15	5	7	т	Samita Kamble	BJP	2	4	3	8
L	Dilshad Azmi	SP	0	2	2	1	Т	Sujata Pathak	MNS	3	4	2	7
L	Ishwar Tayade	MNS	2	4	4	1							

Inference

Rahul Shewale was elected to the Parliament in May'14; while, Ameet Satam, Ashok Patil, Manisha Chaudhari, Selvan Tamil and Sunil Prabhu were elected to the Maharashtra Assembly in November 2014. However, they all still continue to be Municipal Councillors. There average attendance was an abysmal 21% in the ward committees; while Ameet Satam, Manisha Chaudhari, Selvan Tamil and Rahul Shevale didn't ask a single question and Ashok Patil asked four questions and Sunil Prabhu asked only two questions.



Supported by





USO House, 6, Special Institutional Area, New Delhi – 110 167, India Phone: +91-11-2686 2064 / 2686 3846 Fax: +91-11-26862042 www.southasia.fnst.org | www.stiftung-freiheit.org Delegation of the European Union to India 5/5, Shantiniketan, New Delhi - 110 021 Phone: +91-11-66781919 Fax: +91-11-66781955 Website: http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/ondia/index_en. htm

This report has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. The European Union is made up of 28 Member States who have decided to gradually link together their know-how, resources and destinies. Together, during a period of enlargement of 50 years, they have built a zone of stability, democracy and sustainable development whilst maintaining cultural diversity, tolerance and individual freedoms. The European Union is committed to sharing its achievements and its values with countries and peoples beyond its borders.

The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of Praja Foundation and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the position of the European Union