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## 1. Background of National Clean Air Programme

1.1 Ministry of Environment, Forest \& Climate Change (MoEF\&CC) has launched National Clean Air Programme (NCAP) in 2019 for reducing Particulate Matter levels by $20-30 \%$ in next 5 years.
1.2 Under NCAP, 131 cities are being targeted for improving air quality. Of these 131 cities, 123 cities (NACs) are identified under NCAP based on non-conforming to national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) consecutively for five years. In addition, million plus cities (MPCs) are also covered, those identified by 15th Finance Commission (XV-FC), for receiving performance based grant for air quality improvement. Out of 42 MPCs, 34 cities are common under NCAP. Thus, 131 cities (NACs and MPCs) are being monitored under the NCAP for improving air quality.
1.3 "Swachh Vayu Survekshan" a new initiative by MoEF\&CC is proposed to rank cities on the basis of air quality and also on implementation of activities approved under city action plan in 131 Non-attainment cities.

## 2. Objectives

The objectives of Swachh Vayu Survekshan are:
a. To create awareness among all sections of the society
b. Inform citizens about the health impacts related due to exposure
c. Comparing air quality conditions at different locations/cities
d. To achieve the goal of NCAP "Clean air for all".

## 3. Applicability

These guidelines will be applicable on all stakeholders viz. MoEF\&CC, CPCB, Environment Department, states/union territories (UTs), State Pollution Control Boards (SPCBs)/Pollution Control Committee (PCCs), urban local bodies (ULBs)/ local authorities/ agencies of NACs, etc. identified under NCAP and XVFC.

## 4. Criteria

The Criteria for Ranking of cities for ambient air quality will be on population basis. 131 cities are divided into 3 categories mentioned below:

| Category | No. of <br> Cities | Population | List of cities |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Category 1 | 47 cities | above 10 Lakh plus population <br> (5 nos. of NCAP funded cities are <br> also Million plus cities (MPCs) <br> apart from 42 MPCs under XV-FC) | List of 47 cities <br> are attached at <br> Annexure-I. |
| Category 2 | 44 cities | above 3 to 10Lakh population | List of 44 cities <br> are attached at <br> Annexure-II. |
| Category 3 | 40 cities | under 3 Lakh population | List of 40 cities <br> are attached at <br> Annexure-III. |

*Population 2011 census
5. Tenure

These guidelines for ranking of cities under NCAP will be applicable for the period of four years from FY 2022-23 to FY 2025-26.

## 6. Budget Provision \& Financial Allocation

6.1 The programme "Swachh Vayu Survekshan" is covered under the sub-component3 "National and State level interventions and public outreach activities" of the component "National Mission for Clean Air" (NMCA) of central sector scheme "Control of Pollution".
6.2 Total financial outlay under the programme is Rs. 2700 crore for the period of five years and the year-wise budget provision under component 3 of NMCA given in Annexure-IV.
6.3 An amount of Rs. 21 crores have been allocated for distribution of cash prize as award to best performing cities for the period of four years from FY 2022-23 to FY 2025-26.
6.4 Better performing cities i.e top 3 cities in each category, will be rewarded by the Ministry of Environment, forest and Climate change with cash price, trophy and Certificate with title "National Clean Air City" under National Mission for Clean Air on $7^{\text {th }}$ September every year on "International day of Clean Air for Blue skies".
6.5 Year-wise and total financial outlay of the programme "Swachh Vayu Survekshan" is tabulated below:

| Category |  | Award Cash Prize (₹ in crores) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2 - 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 3 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 4 - 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5 - 2 6}$ | Total |
| Category 1 | $1^{\text {st }}$ | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 6.00 |
|  | $2^{\text {nd }}$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
|  | $3^{\text {rd }}$ | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 2.00 |
|  | $1^{\text {st }}$ | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 3.00 |
|  | $2^{\text {nd }}$ | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 2.00 |
|  | $3^{\text {rd }}$ | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 1.00 |
| Cotategory 3 | $1^{\text {st }}$ | 0.375 | 0.375 | 0.375 | 0.375 | 1.50 |
|  | $2^{\text {nd }}$ | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 1.00 |
|  | $3^{\text {rd }}$ | 0.125 | 0.125 | 0.125 | 0.125 | 0.50 |
|  |  | $\mathbf{5 . 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 0 0}$ |

## 7. Fund Flow

The channel of fund flow for disbursing the funds shall be the same as ongoing disbursement of funds to non-attainment cities for implementation of city action plans through CPCB. In this regard, CPCB has been notified as Central Nodal Agency (CNA) and dedicated CNA account has been opened with Union Bank of India (UBI).

## 8. Evaluation and Monitoring Mechanism

8.1 Assessment will be done on the basis of self - assessment report submitted by ULBs. MoEF\&CC will assign CPCB/Third party to evaluate the assessment reports and supporting documents. Ranking will be done on the basis of assessment framework given in this guideline.
8.2 Ranking as well as the detailed assessment report shall be uploaded on the PRANA website, ULBs website as well as on the website of state environment department.

## 9. Guiding Principles

9.1 The necessary precondition for consideration of a city for ranking shall be meeting the respective PM10 reduction, as defined in;
9.1.1 Guideline for Release \& Utilization of Fund under NCAP (for 82 cities) and
9.1.2 Operational Guidelines for implementation of the recommendations on Urban Local body grants (ambient air quality component, for 42 nos. of Million plus cities/UA)
9.2 Assessment will be done every year and performance assessment for ranking of cities shall be made for the period (financial year i.e $1^{\text {st }}$ April to $31^{\text {st }}$ March) of the preceding financial year.

## 10 Right to Amend the Guidelines

MoEF\&CC reserves the rights to change, modify or amend the Guidelines for ranking of cities under NCAP.

## 11 Assessment Framework

## Assessment Framework 1: For 47 Cities above 10 Lakh population

## Assessment Framework 2: For 44 Cities above 3 to 10 Lakh population

Assessment Framework 3: For 40 Cities below 3 Lakh population

Assessment Framework 1: For 47 Cities above 10 L population: 200 Marks


| Components | Marks <br> (M) | Marking Methodology |  | Authorizing Agency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Measures to abate emissions from biomass burning | 40 |  |  | Signed declaration by ULB |
|  |  | Table 1 |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 10M |  |
| ected |  | $>60$ to $80 \%$ | 8 M |  |
| a) of solid wast | 10 | $>40$ to 60\% | 6 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| b) \% of solid waste processed against generated | 10 | Ref-Table |  |  |
|  |  | Table 2 |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Capacity to process } \\ & >\quad 10 \text {-thousand-ton } \\ & \text { waste (TTW) } \end{aligned}$ | 5 M |  |
|  | 5 | $>8$ to 10 (TTW) | 4 M |  |
|  |  | $>6$ to 8 (TTW) | 3 M |  |
|  |  | $>4$ to 6 (TTW) | 2M |  |
|  |  | $>2$ to 4 (TTW) | 1M |  |
|  |  | <2 (TTW) | NIL |  |
|  |  | Table 3 |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 5 M |  |
| d) \% of legacy waste processed |  | $>60$ to $80 \%$ | 4 M |  |
| against existing total legacy | 5 | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 3 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to $20 \%$ | 1 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
|  |  | Complaints of waste bu (yearly) | ning in PGRS |  |
|  |  | No complaints | 5 M |  |
| e) Ban imposed on burning of | 5 | 1-5-complaints | 4 M |  |
| solid waste | 5 | 6-10 complaints | 3 M |  |
|  |  | 11-15 complaints | 2M |  |
|  |  | 16-20 complaints | 1M |  |
|  |  | >20 complaints | NIL |  |
| f) \% of plastic waste collected against generated | 5 | Ref-Table |  |  |





Components
Marks
Marking Methodology
Authorizing Agency

| 3. Measures to abate dust from C\&D waste | 10 |  |  | Signed declaration by ULB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. \% of C\&D waste collected against generated | 2 | Table 1 |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | >60 to 80\% | 1.6 M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to 60\% | 1.2 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 0.8 M |  |
|  |  | >10 to 20\% | 0.4 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| b. \% of C\&D processed against generated | 2 | Ref. Table 1 |  |  |
| c. \% of C\&D Utilised against generated | 2 | Ref. Table 1 |  |  |
| d. \% of sites under real time monitoring | 2 | Ref. Table 1 |  |  |
| e. \% of construction sites where the guidelines for dust mitigation were complied as per the CPCB guidelines | 2 | Ref. Table 1 |  |  |



## 4. Measures to abate Vehicular

 Emissions; weightage - 20\%| Components | Marks | Marking Methodology |  | Authorizing Agency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4. Measures to abate vehicular emissions | 40 |  |  | Submission of relevant signed documents from RTO |
| 1. Monitoring of PUC for vehicles and data on compliances, number of vehicles monitored vis-a-vis registered vehicles. | 20 |  |  |  |
| a) Adequate number of PUC testing centre | 5 | - At least 6 PUC Centres per $1,00,000$ vehicles- 5 M <br> - At least 4 to 5 PUC Centres per $1,00,000$ vehicles- 3 M <br> - Less than 4 PUC centers/100000 vehicles-NIL |  |  |
| b) \% Of PUC testing centre integrated with centralized server. | 5 | Table 1 |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 5 M |  |
|  |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 4M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to 60\% | 3 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 2M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 1M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| c) Registered vehicles with PUC certificate | 10 | - More than $90 \%$ of vehicles with PU 10M <br> - $50 \%$ of registered PUC certificate-5 <br> - Less than $50 \%$ - N | istered rtificate- <br> icles with |  |
| 2. Public transport infrastructure (per 1L population) | 5 | Table 2 |  |  |
|  |  | Minimum 30 buses | 5 M |  |
|  |  | 25-30 | 4 M |  |
|  |  | 20-25 | 3 M |  |
|  |  | 15-20 | 2M |  |
|  |  | 10-15 | 1M |  |
|  |  | Less than 10 | NIL |  |


| 3. No. of fuel stations inspected for fuel adulteration | 5 | Ref -Table 1 |  | Declaration by Dist Supply Office/ULB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E-mobility- registered vehicles (e-buses, 3 wheelers, 2 wheelers, 4 wheelers etc.) | 5 | Table 3 |  | Submission by RTO |
|  |  | >5\% | 5 M |  |
|  |  | 4\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | 3\% | 3 M |  |
|  |  | 2\% | 2M |  |
|  |  | 0.5 to 1\% | 1M |  |
|  |  | <0.5\% | NIL |  |
| 5. EVs charging infrastructure in the city. (Develop charging infrastructure for EVs as per the growth of EV). | 5 | Table 4 |  | State Government |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|lcc\|} \hline \text { Min } \quad 1 & \text { charging } \\ \text { station } / 15 & 15 & 15 \mathrm{~km} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 5 M |  |
|  |  | $>15$ to $20 \times 20 \mathrm{Km}$ | 4M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to $25 \times 25 \mathrm{Km}$ | 3 M |  |
|  |  | $>25$ to $30 \times 30 \mathrm{Km}$ | 2M |  |
|  |  | $>30$ to $35 \times 35 \mathrm{Km}$ | 1M |  |
|  |  | $>35 \mathrm{Km}$ | NIL |  |

## 5. Measures to abate emissions

## from Industries; weightage - 20\%

| Components | Marks | Marking Methodology |  | Authorizing Agency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5. Measures to abate emissions from Industries | 40 |  |  | Signed declaration by SPCB |
| a. \% of Online Continuous | 10 |  |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 10M |  |
|  |  | >60 to 80\% | 8 M |  |
|  |  | >40 to 60\% | 6 M |  |
|  |  | >20 to 40\% | 4M |  |
|  |  | >10 to 20\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| b. \% of industrial clusters complying with emission norms | 20 | Table 2 |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 20 M |  |
|  |  | >60 to 80\% | 15 M |  |
|  |  | >40 to 60\% | 10 M |  |
|  |  | >20 to 40\% | 5M |  |
|  |  | >10 to 20\% | 2.5 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| c. \% of Industries shifted to clean fuel | 10 |  |  |  |



Components
Marks
Marking Methodology
Authorizing
Agency

| 7. ICE activities / Public awareness programmes | 5 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Advertisements on Dos and Don'ts on social media, each on twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and also permanent display on departments websites | 1 | Table 1 |  | Signed declaration by ULB and SPCBs |
|  |  | Minimum 15 ads per month |  |  |
|  |  | 12 to 14 | 0.8 M |  |
|  |  | 10 to 12 | 0.6 M |  |
|  |  | 8 to 10 | 0.4 M |  |
|  |  | 5 to 8 | 0.5 M |  |
|  |  | Less than 5 ads per month | NIL |  |
|  |  | Table 2 |  | Signed |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 2 M | declaration |
| b. \% of houses covered for |  | >60 to 80\% | 1.6 M |  |
| Door to door campaign | 2 | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 1.2 M |  |
|  |  | >20 to 40\% | 0.8 M |  |
|  |  | >10 to 20\% | 0.4 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| c. \% of schools covered out of all schools for awareness programmes | 2 | Ref. Table |  | Signed declaration by ULB and SPCBs |



| 8. Improvement in PM 10 concentration (Integrated value of NAMP \& CAAQMS year on year basis i.e improvement in past 1 year. <br> * NAAQS- National Ambient Air Quality Standards for PM10 = $60 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ | 5 |  |  | Signed declaration by ULB and SPCBs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PM10 improvement | M |  |
|  |  | > $10 \%$ or NAAQS | 5 M |  |
|  |  | $>8$ to $10 \%$ | 4 M |  |
|  |  | >6 to 8\% | 3 M |  |
|  |  | >4 to 6\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | <4\% improvement | NIL |  |

## Assessment Framework 2: For 44 Cities above 3 to 10 L population:



1. Measures to abate emissions from biomass/municipal solid waste burning; weightage - 20\%

| Components | Marks | Marking Methodology |  | Authorizing Agency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Measures to abate emissions from biomass burning | 40 |  |  | Signed declaration by ULB |
| a) \% of solid waste collected against generated | 10 | Table 1 |  |  |
|  |  | >80 to 100\% | 10M |  |
|  |  | $>60$ to $80 \%$ | 8 M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to 60\% | 6 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| b) \% of solid waste processed against generated | 10 | Ref-Table 1 |  |  |
| c) Installed capacity to process the generate waste | 5 | Table 2 |  |  |
|  |  | Capacity to process >10thousand ton waste (TTW) | 5 M |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $>8$ to 10 (TTW) | 4 M |  |
|  |  | $>6$ to 8 (TTW) | 3 M |  |
|  |  | $>4$ to 6 (TTW) | 2M |  |
|  |  | $>2$ to 4 (TTW) | 1M |  |
|  |  | <2 (TTW) | NIL |  |
| d) \% of legacy waste processed against existing | 5 | Table 3 |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 5 M |  |
|  |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to 60\% | 3 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 1 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| e) Ban on burning of solid waste enforced | 5 | Complaints of waste burning in PGRS (yearly) |  |  |
|  |  | zero burning | 5 M |  |
|  |  | 1-5-complaints | 4 M |  |
|  |  | 6-10 complaints | 3 M |  |
|  |  | 11-15 complaints | 2M |  |
|  |  | 16-20 complaints | 1M |  |
|  |  | >20 complaints | NIL |  |
| f) \% of plastic waste collected against generated | 5 | Ref-Table 3 |  |  |

2. Measures to abate Road Dust; weightage - 20\%

Marks 40 40

Marking Methodology

| Components | Marks | Marking Methodology |  | Authorizing Agency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. Measures to abate road dust emissions | 40 |  |  | Signed declaration by ULB |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 10M |  |
| a. \% of all types of roads |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 8 M |  |
| maintained/ pothole free | 10 | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 6 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 7.5 M |  |
| b. \% of pavements made |  | $>60$ to $80 \%$ | 6 M |  |
| against total length of road | 7.5 | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 5 M |  |
| shoulders |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 2.5 M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 1M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 15 M |  |
| c. \% of roads to be metalled |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 12 M |  |
| against total length of | 15 | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 8 M |  |
| unmetalled road |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 6 M |  |
|  |  | >10 to 20\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| d. \% of area covered by |  | > 80 to 100\% | 2.5 M |  |
| greenbelt against total area/ |  | $>60$ to $80 \%$ | 2 M |  |
| road length to be greened | 2.5 | $>40$ to 60\% | 1.5 M |  |
| including along road side |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 1M |  |
| and on dividers |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 0.5 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 5 M |  |
| e. \% of road length sweeped |  | $>60$ to $80 \%$ | 4 M |  |
| including through | 5 | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 3 M |  |
| mechanical road sweepers |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 2M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 1M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |

2. Measures to abate road dust emissions

Signed declaration by ULB
Table 1
a. \% of all types of roads maintained/ pothole free road

Components

| Components | Marks | Marking Methodology |  | Authorizing Agency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. Measures to abate road dust emissions | 40 |  |  | Signed declaration by ULB |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 10M |  |
| a. \% of all types of roads |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 8 M |  |
| maintained/ pothole free | 10 | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 6 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 7.5 M |  |
| b. \% of pavements made |  | $>60$ to $80 \%$ | 6 M |  |
| against total length of road | 7.5 | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 5 M |  |
| shoulders |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 2.5 M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 1M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 15 M |  |
| c. \% of roads to be metalled |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 12 M |  |
| against total length of | 15 | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 8 M |  |
| unmetalled road |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 6 M |  |
|  |  | >10 to 20\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| d. \% of area covered by |  | > 80 to 100\% | 2.5 M |  |
| greenbelt against total area/ |  | $>60$ to $80 \%$ | 2 M |  |
| road length to be greened | 2.5 | $>40$ to 60\% | 1.5 M |  |
| including along road side |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 1M |  |
| and on dividers |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 0.5 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 5 M |  |
| e. \% of road length sweeped |  | $>60$ to $80 \%$ | 4 M |  |
| including through | 5 | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 3 M |  |
| mechanical road sweepers |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 2M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 1M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |



| Components | Marks | Marking Methodology |  | Authorizing Agency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3. Measures to abate emissions from C\&D waste | 10 |  |  | $\qquad$ |
| a. \% of C\&D waste collected against generated | 2 |  |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 1.6 M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 1.2 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 0.8 M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 0.4 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| a. \% of C\&D processed against generated | 2 | Ref. Table 1 |  |  |
| b. \% of C\&D Utilised against generated | 2 | Ref. Table 1 |  |  |
| c. \% of sites under real time monitoring | 2 | Ref. Table 1 |  |  |
| d. \% of sites where the guidelines for dust mitigation were complied | 2 | Ref. Table 1 |  |  |



## 4. Measures to abate Vehicular

 Emissions; weightage - 20\%| Components | Marks | Marking Methodology |  | Authorizing Agency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4. Monitoring of PUC for vehicles and data on compliances, number of vehicles monitored vis-a-vis registered vehicles. | 40 |  |  | Submission of relevant signed documents from RTO |
| a. Adequate number of PUC testing centre | 5 | - At least 6 PUC Centres per $1,00,000$ vehicles- 5 M <br> - At least 4 to 5 PUC Centres per 1,00,000 vehicles- 3 M <br> - Less than 4 PUC centers/100000 vehicles-NIL |  |  |
| b. \% of PUC testing centre integrated with centralized server. | 5 | Table 1 |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 5 M |  |
|  |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to 60\% | 3 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 2M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 1M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| c. Registered vehicles with PUC certificate | 10 | - More than $90 \%$ of re vehicles with PUC <br> - $50 \%$ of registered ve PUC certificate-5 M <br> - Less than 50\%- NIL | stered ificate10M les with |  |
| d. Public transport infrastructure | 7.5 | Table 2 |  |  |
|  |  | Minimum 25 buses | 7.5 M |  |
|  |  | 20-25 | 6 M |  |
|  |  | 15-20 | 5 M |  |
|  |  | 10-15 | 2.5 M |  |
|  |  | 05-10 | 1M |  |
|  |  | Less than 5 | NIL |  |
| e. No. of fuel stations inspected for fuel adulteration | 5 | Ref-Table 1 |  | Declaration by Dist Supply Office/ULB |
| f. E-mobility - registered vehicles (e-buses, 3wheelers, 2 wheelers, 4 wheelers etc.) | 7.5 | Table 3 |  |  |
|  |  | >2\% | 7.5 M |  |
|  |  | 1.75\% to 2\% | 6 M |  |
|  |  | 1.5 to 1.75\% | 5 M |  |
|  |  | 1to 1.5\% | 2.5 M |  |
|  |  | 0.5\% to 1\% | 1M |  |
|  |  | <0.5\% | NIL |  |



| Components | Marks | Marking M | ology | Authorizing Agency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6. Measures to abate other emissions | 30 |  |  |  |
| a. \% of houses covered under LPG/PNG scheme | 7.5 |  <br> $>80$ to $100 \%$ <br> $>60$ to $80 \%$ <br> $>40$ to $60 \%$ <br> $>20$ to $40 \%$ <br> $>10$ to $20 \%$ <br> $<10 \%$ | 7.5 M <br> 6 M <br> 5 M <br> 2.5 M <br> 1 M <br> NIL | Signed declaration by ULB |
| a. \% of brick kilns shifted to zigzag including within 10 km from sides of the ULB limits | 7.5 | Ref. Table 1 |  | Signed declaration by ULB |
| b. Electricity Supply | 7.5 | Table <br> 24 hours <br> 22 to 24 hours <br> 18 to 22 hours <br> 16 to 18 hours <br> 14 to 16 hours <br> Less than 14 hours |  7.5 M <br> 6 M  <br> 5 M  <br> 2.5 M  <br> 1 M  <br> NIL  | Signed declaration by Electricity board |
| c. \% of wards covered under door to door collection facility | 5 |  <br> $>80$ to $100 \%$ <br> $>60$ to $80 \%$ <br> $>4$ to $60 \%$ <br> $>20$ to $40 \%$ <br> $>10$ to $20 \%$ <br> $<10 \%$ |  <br> 5 M <br> 4 M <br> 3 M <br> 2 M <br> 1 M <br> NIL | Signed declaration by ULB |
| d. Public Grievances Redressal System (PGRS) <br> \% Of air pollution related complaints resolved against registered | 2.5 | Table <br> $>80$ to $100 \%$ <br> $>60$ to $80 \%$ <br> $>40$ to $60 \%$ <br> $>20$ to $40 \%$ <br> $>10$ to $20 \%$ <br> $<10 \%$ |  <br> 2.5 M <br> 2 M <br> 1.5 M <br> 1 M <br> 0.5 M <br> NIL | Signed declaration by SPCB/ULB |

Components
Marks
Marking Methodology
Authorizing
Agency

| 7. ICE activities / Public awareness programmes | 5 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Advertisements on Dos and Don'ts on social media, each on twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and also permanent display on departments websites | 1 | Table 1 |  | Signed declaration by ULB and SPCBs |
|  |  | Minimum 15 ads per month | 1 M |  |
|  |  | 12 to 14 | 0.8 M |  |
|  |  | 10 to 12 | 0.6 M |  |
|  |  | 8 to 10 | 0.4 M |  |
|  |  | 5 to 8 | 0.5 M |  |
|  |  | Less than 5 ads per month | NIL |  |
| b. \% of houses covered for Door to door campaign (segregation of waste at source etc) | 2 | Table 2 |  | Signed declaration by ULB |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | >60 to 80\% | 1.6 M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 1.2 M |  |
|  |  | >20 to 40\% | 0.8 M |  |
|  |  | >10 to 20\% | 0.4 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| c. \% of schools covered out of all schools for awareness programmes | 2 | Ref. Table |  | Signed declaration by ULB and SPCBs |



## Assessment Framework 3: For 40 Cities below 3 L population:



2. Measures to abate Road Dust; weightage - $25 \%$

| Components | Marks | Marking Methodology |  | Authorizing <br> Agency |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. Measures to abate road dust <br> emissions | 50 |  | Signed <br> declaration <br> by ULB |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |



| Components | Marks | Marking Methodology |  | Authorizing <br> Agency |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. Measures to abate road dust <br> emissions | 50 |  | Signed <br> declaration <br> by ULB |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

2. Measures to abate road dust emissions maintained/ pothole free road
b. \% of pavements made against total length of road shoulders
c. \% of roads to be metalled against total length of unmetalled road
d. \% of area covered by greenbelt against total area/ road length to be greened including along road side and on dividers
e. \% of road length sweeped including through mechanical road sweepers

Marks
Marking Methodology
Marks

> Signed declaration by ULB


Components
Marks
Marking Methodology
Authorizing Agency

| 3. Measures to abate emissions from C\&D waste | 10 |  |  | Signed declaration by ULB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. \% of C\&D waste collected against generated | 2 | Table 1 |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 1.6 M |  |
|  |  | >40 to 60\% | 1.2 M |  |
|  |  | >20 to 40\% | 0.8 M |  |
|  |  | >10 to 20\% | 0.4 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| b. \% of C\&D processed against generated | 2 | Ref. Table 1 |  |  |
| c. \% of C\&D Utilised against generated | 2 | Ref. Table 1 |  |  |
| d. \% of sites under real time monitoring | 2 | Ref. Table 1 |  |  |
| e. \% of sites where the guidelines for dust mitigation were complied | 2 | Ref. Table 1 |  |  |



## 4. Measures to abate Vehicular

 Emissions: weightage - 15\%| Components | Marks | Marking Methodology |  | Authorizing Agency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4. Monitoring of PUC for vehicles and data on compliances, number of vehicles monitored vis-a-vis registered vehicles. | 30 |  |  | Submission of relevant signed documents from RTO |
| a. Adequate number of PUC testing centre | 5 | - At least 6 PUC Ce 1,00,000 vehicles- <br> - At least 4 to 5 PUC 1,00,000 vehicles- <br> - Less than 4 PUC c vehicles-NIL | res per $M$ Centres per ters/100000 |  |
| b. \% of PUC testing centre integrated with centralized server. | 5 | Table 1 |  |  |
|  |  | >80 to 100\% | 5 M |  |
|  |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to 60\% | 3 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 2M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 1M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| c. Registered vehicles with PUC certificate | 10 | - More than 90\% of re vehicles with PUC c <br> - $50 \%$ of registered ve PUC certificate-5 M <br> - Less than $50 \%$ - NIL | istered ificate- 10 M les with |  |
| d. Public transport infrastructure | 5 | Table 2 |  |  |
|  |  | Minimum 20 buses | 5 M |  |
|  |  | 15-20 | 4 M |  |
|  |  | 10-15 | 3 M |  |
|  |  | 7-10 | 2M |  |
|  |  | 5-7 | 1M |  |
|  |  | Less than 5 | NIL |  |
| e. No. of fuel stations inspected for fuel adulteration | 5 | Ref-Table 1 |  | Declaration by Dist Supply Office/ULB |



Components

| 5. Measures to abate emissions from Industries | 30 |  |  | Signed declaration by SPCB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. \% of Online Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems (OCEMS) | 10 | Table 1 |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 10M |  |
|  |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 8 M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to 60\% | 6 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| b. \% of industries complying with emission norms | 15 | Table 2 |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 15 M |  |
|  |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 12 M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to 60\% | 8 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 6 M |  |
|  |  | >10 to 20\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| c. \% of Industries shifted to clean fuel | 5 | Table 3 |  |  |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 5 M |  |
|  |  | $>60$ to $80 \%$ | 4 M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to 60\% | 3 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 2M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 1M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{6.1}{\text { Em }} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | 6. Measures to abate Other Emissions: weightage - 15\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Components | Marks | Marking | dology | Authorizing Agency |
| 6. Measures to abate other emissions | 30 |  |  |  |
| a. \% of houses covered under LPG/PNG scheme | 5 |  |  | Signed declaration by ULB |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 5 M |  |
|  |  | >60 to 80\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to 60\% | 3 M |  |
|  |  | >20 to 40\% | 2M |  |
|  |  | >10 to 20\% | 1M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | 0 M |  |
| b. $\quad \%$ of brick kilns shifted to zigzag including within 10 km from sides of the ULB limits | 10 | Table 2 |  | Signed declaration by ULB |
|  |  | $>80$ to 100\% | 10M |  |
|  |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 8 M |  |
|  |  | $\bigcirc>20$ to 40\% | 4 M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 2M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | 0M |  |
| b. Electricity Supply - | 7.5 | Table 3 |  | Signed declaration by Electricity board |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 7.5 M |  |
|  |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 6M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 5 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 2.5 M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 1M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | 0 M |  |
| c. \% of wards covered under door to door collection facility | 5 | Ref. Table 1 |  | ULB |
| d. Public Grievances <br> Redressal System (PGRS) \% Of air pollution related complaints resolved against registered | 2.5 | Table 4 |  | Signed declaration by SPCB/ULB |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 2.5 M |  |
|  |  | $>60$ to 80\% | 2 M |  |
|  |  | $>40$ to 60\% | 1.5 M |  |
|  |  | $>20$ to 40\% | 1M |  |
|  |  | $>10$ to 20\% | 0.5 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | 0 M |  |

Components
Marks
Marking Methodology

Authorizing
Agency

| 7. ICE activities / Public awareness programmes | 5 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Advertisements on Dos and Don'ts on social media, each on twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and also permanent display on departments websites | 1 | Table 1 |  | Signed declaration by ULB and SPCBs |
|  |  | Minimum 15 ads per month | 1 M |  |
|  |  | 12 to 14 | 0.8 M |  |
|  |  | 10 to 12 | 0.6 M |  |
|  |  | 8 to 10 | 0.4 M |  |
|  |  | 5 to 8 | 0.5 M |  |
|  |  | Less than 5 ads per month | 0.2 M |  |
|  |  | Table 2 |  | Signed |
|  |  | > 80 to 100\% | 2 M | declaration |
|  |  | >60 to 80\% | 1.6 M |  |
| Door to door campaign | 2 | $>40$ to $60 \%$ | 1.2 M |  |
| gregation of waste at |  | >20 to 40\% | 0.8 M |  |
|  |  | >10 to 20\% | 0.4 M |  |
|  |  | <10\% | NIL |  |
| c. \% of schools covered out of all schools for awareness programmes | 2 | Ref. Table |  | Signed declaration by ULB and SPCBs |



## List of Cities- Population above 10 Lakhs

| S1.No. | City/ Town | Sl. No. | City/ Town |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 1 | Delhi | 30 | Ludhiana |
| 2 | Thane | 31 | Vishakhapatnam |
| 3 | Srinagar | 32 | Vijayawada |
| 4 | Howrah | 33 | Surat |
| 5 | Chandigarh | 34 | Ahmedabad |
| 6 | Bangalore | 35 | Rajkot |
| 7 | Ranchi | 36 | Vadodara |
| 8 | Jamshedpur | 37 | Trichy |
| 9 | Dhanbad | 38 | Chennai |
| 10 | Patna | 39 | Madurai |
| 11 | Gwalior | 40 | Asansol |
| 12 | Bhopal | 41 | Kolkata |
| 13 | Indore | 42 | Faridabad |
| 14 | Jabalpur | 43 | Durg Bhilai |
| 15 | Greater Mumbai | 44 | Raipur |
| 16 | Aurangabad | 45 | Jodhpur |
| 17 | Nashik | 46 | Jaipur |
| 18 | Pune | 47 | Kota |
| 19 | Nagpur |  |  |
| 20 | Vasai Virar |  |  |
| 21 | Varanasi |  |  |
| 22 | Allahabad |  |  |
| 23 | Kanpur |  |  |
| 24 | Lucknow |  |  |
| 25 | Meerut |  |  |
| 26 | Agra |  |  |
| 27 | Ghaziabad |  |  |
| 28 | Hyderabad |  |  |
| 29 | Amritsar |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |

## List of cities- Population from 3 to 10 Lakhs

| Sl.no | City/ Town | Sl.no | City/ Town |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Bareily | 24 | Kadapa |
| 2 | Guwahati | 25 | Anantapur |
| 3 | Solapur | 26 | Alwar |
| 4 | Hubli-Dharwad | 27 | Chandrapur |
| 5 | Moradabad | 28 | Navi Mumbai |
| 6 | Bhubaneswar | 29 | Badlapur |
| 7 | Jalandhar | 30 | Patancheruvu |
| 8 | Gorakhpur | 31 | Barrackpore |
| 9 | Guntur | 32 | Korba |
| 10 | Cuttack | 33 | Jammu |
| 11 | Gulburga | 34 | Amravati |
| 12 | Ujjain | 35 | Noida |
| 13 | Ulhasnagar | 36 | Firozabad |
| 14 | Sangli | 37 | Durgapur |
| 15 | Kurnool | 38 | Dehradun |
| 16 | Udaipur | 39 | Nellore |
| 17 | Gaya | 40 | Kolhapur |
| 18 | Jalgaon | 41 | Rourkela |
| 19 | Patiala | 42 | Jhansi |
| 20 | Devanagere | 43 | Rajahmundry |
| 21 | Akola | 44 | Sagar |
| 22 | Muzaffarpur |  |  |
| 23 | Latur |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |

## List of cities- Population less than 3 Lakh

| Sl. No. | City/ Town | Sl.no |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Kohima | 21 | Dewas |
| 2. | Gobindgarh | 22 | Jalna |
| 3. | Sangareddy | 23 | Eluru |
| 4. | Gajraula | 24 | Vizianagaram |
| 5. | Sibsagar | 25 | Thoothukudi |
| 6. | Kalinga Nagar | 26 | Ongole |
| 7. | Naya Nangal | 27 | Haldia |
| 8. | Angul | 28 | Raebareli |
| 9. | Talcher | 29 | Chitoor |
| 10. | Baddi | 30 | Silchar |
| 11. | Nalbari | 31 | Pathankot/Dera Baba |
| 12. | Dera Bassi | 32 | Nalgonda |
| 13. | Paonta Sahib | 33 | Nagaon |
| 14. | Sunder Nagar | 34 | Srikakulam |
| 15. | Anpara | 35 | Balasore |
| 16. | Nalagarh | 36 | Khurja |
| 17. | Parwanoo | 37 | Khanna |
| 18. | Damtal | 38 | Dimapur |
| 19. | Byrnihat | 39 | Kashipur |
| 20. | Kala Amb | 40 | Rishikesh |

Total fund allocation under National Mission for Clean Air
(Amount in Rs. Crore)

| Activity | Fund required (Rs Cr) |  |  |  |  | Budget for 5 <br> yrs |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FY 2021- <br> $\mathbf{2 2}$ | FY <br> $\mathbf{2 0 2 2 - 2 3}$ | FY 2023- <br> $\mathbf{2 4}$ | FY 2024- <br> $\mathbf{2 5}$ | FY 2025- <br> $\mathbf{2 6}$ |  |
| Component 1- <br> City specific fund | 96.62 | 597 | 597 | 597 | 597.38 | 2485.0 |
| Component 2 - <br> Funds for <br>  <br> Office Expenses | - | 34.0 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 33.0 | 135.0 |
| Component 3- <br> National and State <br> level interventions <br> and Public <br> Outreach <br> Activities | 2.13 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 20.87 | 80.0 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | $(5 \%)$ |

Note: Re-appropriation of funds can be done from component 2 and 3 to component 1 for carrying out city specific activities, however, re-appropriation of funds from component 1 to other activities is not permissible.

