

Condition of Solid Waste Management in India: Current Status, Challenges, Institutional Gaps and Pathways towards Sustainable Management

Dr. Ravindra Kumar Pandey

¹*Department of Botany, Dr. SPM Govt. Degree College, Bhadohi, India, Affiliated to Kashi Naresh University Bhadohi, India*

Abstract- Solid waste management (SWM) has emerged as one of the most complex environmental and public-health challenges confronting India. Rapid urbanization, population growth, rising incomes, changing consumption patterns, expansion of packaged goods, increasing commercial activity and the proliferation of single-use products have substantially altered both the quantity and composition of waste generated across the country. Although India has progressively strengthened its regulatory and institutional framework, particularly through the Solid Waste Management Rules, 2016, Swachh Bharat Mission–Urban, extended producer responsibility mechanisms and subsequent regulatory reforms, the implementation of an integrated and scientifically sound waste-management system remains uneven. The problem is not merely one of insufficient collection; it encompasses deficiencies in source segregation, transportation, material recovery, biological treatment, recycling, resource recovery, sanitary landfilling, legacy-waste remediation, data management, financial sustainability and institutional accountability. The Indian situation is characterized by considerable regional and inter-city variation. Large metropolitan corporations have increasingly adopted mechanized collection, material recovery facilities, composting, biomethanation and waste-to-energy systems, while numerous smaller urban local bodies continue to depend heavily on open dumping and inadequately controlled disposal. Informal waste workers make a major contribution to recycling and material recovery, yet their labour frequently remains inadequately recognized and protected. The high organic fraction of Indian municipal waste creates substantial opportunities for composting, anaerobic digestion and other biological processes, while relatively low and variable calorific value limits the suitability of indiscriminate incineration and poorly designed waste-to-energy systems. The regulatory landscape has also evolved significantly. The Solid Waste Management Rules, 2016 expanded regulatory coverage and emphasized source segregation, door-to-door collection, processing and scientific disposal. The government subsequently introduced Solid Waste Management Rules, 2024, and, most significantly for the present assessment, Solid Waste Management Rules, 2026, which came into force on 1 April 2026 and superseded the 2016 framework. The 2026 Rules extend the applicability of solid-waste regulation to urban and rural local bodies and a much broader range of waste generators and institutions.

This paper critically examines the condition of solid waste management in India through the perspectives of waste generation, collection, segregation, treatment, recycling, disposal, governance, finance, environmental impacts, informal-sector participation and policy implementation. It argues that India's central challenge has shifted from the absence of policy to the gap between regulatory ambition and implementation capacity. A sustainable transition requires movement from a disposal-oriented model towards a circular, decentralized and resource-recovery-oriented system based on prevention, segregation, biological treatment, recycling, formal recognition of waste workers, producer responsibility, scientific residual-waste disposal and transparent performance monitoring.

Keywords- Solid waste management; municipal solid waste; India; urbanization; source segregation; recycling; composting; waste-to-energy; landfill; circular economy; informal sector; sustainability.

I. INTRODUCTION

Solid waste is an inevitable consequence of human settlement, production and consumption. Its management is therefore not simply a sanitation function but an essential component of urban governance, environmental protection, public health and resource conservation. In India, the challenge has acquired particular significance because of the simultaneous growth of urban population, economic activity, infrastructure, consumption and material throughput. Municipalities are required to manage heterogeneous waste streams generated by households, markets, institutions, commercial establishments, restaurants, streets and public spaces while operating under substantial constraints of land, finance, infrastructure, technical capacity and administrative coordination [1].

Historically, municipal solid waste management in India developed predominantly as a public-cleansing activity. The conventional model consisted of sweeping, collection, transportation and disposal. Treatment and resource recovery received comparatively little attention.

It was observed that Indian municipal solid waste systems traditionally concentrated on generation, collection, transportation and disposal, with inadequate attention to scientific processing and final disposal [2]. This linear approach-take, consume and discard-became increasingly unsuitable as cities expanded and the composition of waste changed.

The problem has become more complex because municipal solid waste is no longer a predominantly biodegradable stream consisting of kitchen residues, ash and inert materials. Contemporary Indian waste contains plastics, multilayer packaging, paper and cardboard, textiles, metals, glass, sanitary waste, electronic components and other materials associated with modern consumption. At the same time, organic matter remains a substantial component of municipal waste, creating both an opportunity for biological treatment and a major challenge when mixed with dry recyclable materials.

The scale of the problem has been repeatedly documented. CPCB's annual reporting system monitors municipal solid waste generation, collection, segregation, processing, landfilling, waste-to-energy plants and disposal sites across states and urban local bodies. The CPCB Annual Report for 2021–22 specifically identifies processing, landfilling gaps, collection, segregation, transportation and waste-to-energy infrastructure as major components of the national Solid Waste Management (SWM) assessment [3]. Earlier national assessments demonstrated substantial discrepancies between waste generation, collection and scientific processing, while reviews consistently identified inadequate segregation, financing, infrastructure and institutional capacity as major constraints [4, 5].

The significance of SWM extends far beyond visible litter. Poorly managed organic waste decomposes anaerobically and generates methane; uncontrolled burning releases particulate matter and toxic compounds; leachate from disposal sites can contaminate soil and water; plastics can enter terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems; and decomposing waste can support disease vectors. The environmental consequences therefore occur across the atmosphere, hydrosphere, lithosphere and biosphere. The Government of India's greenhouse-gas reporting has also recognized the waste sector as a contributor to national emissions, with waste-sector emissions associated particularly with solid-waste disposal and wastewater treatment [6].

At the same time, waste should not be understood exclusively as an environmental burden. A considerable proportion of municipal waste contains recoverable materials and organic resources.

Paper, metals, plastics, glass and textiles can enter recycling chains, while biodegradable material can be converted into compost, biogas or other useful products. This makes SWM an important component of the emerging circular economy. The challenge is to recover resources without compromising environmental protection or occupational health.

The Indian policy framework has evolved substantially. The Municipal Solid Waste (Management and Handling) Rules, 2000 were replaced by the Solid Waste Management Rules, 2016. The 2016 framework expanded applicability beyond conventional municipal areas and mandated source segregation, door-to-door collection and channelization of waste towards reuse, recycling and recovery [7]. The government subsequently introduced additional waste-specific regulations concerning plastic, construction and demolition waste, e-waste, biomedical waste, hazardous waste and batteries.

More recent regulatory developments are particularly important for assessing the present condition. The Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change notified the Solid Waste Management Rules, 2024, and subsequently notified the Solid Waste Management Rules, 2026. The latter came into force on 1 April 2026 and superseded the 2016 Rules. They extend the regulatory framework to urban and rural local bodies and cover a wide range of domestic, institutional, commercial and non-residential waste generators [8]. Thus, an assessment of India's contemporary SWM system must recognize that the country is currently transitioning into a new regulatory phase.

The principal argument of this paper is that the condition of solid waste management in India should neither be characterized simply as a failure nor as a completed success. India has achieved important improvements in collection coverage, public awareness, regulatory development, processing capacity and technological experimentation. Nevertheless, substantial deficiencies remain in source segregation, quality of collected waste, treatment performance, scientific disposal, institutional capacity, financial sustainability and integration of informal workers. The central issue is therefore implementation: whether legal requirements, infrastructure investments and technological solutions can be translated into reliable everyday practices at the level of households, markets, neighbourhoods, municipalities and disposal sites.

II. PRESENT CONDITION OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT IN INDIA

A. Waste Generation and Changing Composition

Waste generation in India is closely related to demographic structure, urbanization, income, consumption and lifestyle. Urban areas generate considerably greater quantities of waste per person than many rural areas, although rural waste-management challenges are increasingly important because of expanding markets, packaged products and changing consumption practices.

The growth in waste generation has been accompanied by qualitative changes. Traditional Indian municipal waste generally contained a large proportion of biodegradable material, while contemporary waste streams increasingly include plastics, packaging, multilayer materials, disposable products and sanitary waste. It was highlighted that the diversity of India's geographical, climatic and socio-economic conditions and its implications were responsible for waste composition [4]. This diversity makes the adoption of a single technological solution inappropriate.

Waste characterization is consequently fundamental to system design. A city with a high biodegradable fraction requires adequate composting or anaerobic digestion capacity, whereas a city with a significant dry recyclable fraction requires effective material recovery infrastructure. Waste with sufficient and relatively consistent calorific value may support refuse-derived fuel or carefully designed thermal treatment. In contrast, wet, mixed and low-calorific-value waste is generally unsuitable for efficient combustion without appropriate preprocessing.

Indian waste composition also changes seasonally and geographically. Food habits, agricultural practices, festivals, tourism, climatic conditions and socioeconomic differences affect the quantity and composition of waste. Consequently, waste-management planning based on outdated or nationally averaged waste-composition data can result in inappropriate infrastructure.

A major methodological problem has historically been the reliability and comparability of waste-generation data. Different institutions may use different definitions of municipal waste, different measurement periods and different methods of estimating uncollected waste. Waste generation is also sometimes estimated from population and assumed per-capita generation rather than measured directly. This creates uncertainty in planning and can lead to over- or under-designed facilities [9].

The importance of accurate data has increased with the development of large treatment facilities. A waste-to-energy plant, composting facility or material recovery facility requires reasonably reliable estimates of quantity, composition, moisture content and calorific value. Without representative data, infrastructure can operate below capacity or produce poor-quality outputs.

B. Collection and Transportation

Collection represents one of the most visible components of municipal waste management and one of the areas in which many Indian cities have made significant progress. Door-to-door collection has expanded substantially, particularly following the Swachh Bharat Mission. Mechanized vehicles, GPS-enabled fleets, route optimization, transfer stations and other technologies have increasingly been introduced in urban areas [10].

However, collection should not be equated with effective waste management. The purpose of collection is not merely to remove waste from households but to ensure that separately collected material remains separate and reaches the appropriate treatment or recovery pathway.

The literature has repeatedly identified mixed collection as a major weakness of Indian SWM. Even when households possess separate containers, waste can be recombined during collection or transportation. Once biodegradable, recyclable and sanitary materials are mixed, recovery becomes technically more difficult and economically less attractive. It was emphasized that the source segregation and collection deficiencies as central barriers to effective municipal waste management [4, 5].

Transportation itself presents several challenges. Waste vehicles need to be appropriately designed, maintained and routed. Open transportation can result in litter, odour and spillage. Long-distance transport of wet waste increases fuel consumption and operating costs. The establishment of transfer stations can improve efficiency in large metropolitan areas, but such facilities require appropriate design, location and environmental controls.

Another major issue is the relationship between collection systems and informal waste recovery. Informal waste pickers often remove valuable materials before municipal collection or from community bins, streets and disposal sites. Although this can reduce the quantity requiring final disposal, unregulated recovery may expose workers to occupational hazards and create fragmented material flows.

The ideal collection system should therefore be based on source segregation, separate collection streams, appropriately designed vehicles, reliable schedules, digital monitoring and integration of authorized informal-sector workers.

C. Source Segregation: The Critical Weakness

Source segregation is arguably the single most important operational requirement for sustainable SWM. The fundamental principle is simple: materials should be separated where they are generated rather than after contamination has occurred. The Solid Waste Management Rules, 2016 explicitly required waste generators to segregate waste and recognized the importance of separate handling of biodegradable and recyclable materials [11]. The subsequent regulatory framework has retained and strengthened this principle.

In practice, however, segregation remains inconsistent. Several factors explain this gap. Households may lack convenient storage space or suitable containers; residents may have insufficient awareness; collection workers may mix separately stored waste; municipalities may not provide differentiated collection infrastructure; and enforcement of local bye-laws may be weak. The problem is partly behavioural but should not be reduced to individual responsibility. Behaviour depends strongly on system design. If households separate waste but municipal vehicles combine it, segregation loses credibility. Similarly, if residents are expected to segregate five or more categories but receive only one collection stream, the system becomes administratively unrealistic.

Effective segregation therefore requires an integrated chain: appropriate household-level containers, clear instructions, separate collection, transport without recombination, receiving facilities capable of processing individual streams and transparent monitoring of final destinations.

D. Processing and Resource Recovery

India's waste-management transition increasingly emphasizes processing rather than disposal. Composting, vermicomposting, anaerobic digestion, biomethanation, material recovery, refuse-derived fuel and waste-to-energy technologies have been adopted to varying degrees. The high organic content of Indian municipal waste creates strong potential for biological treatment. Composting can convert biodegradable material into a soil amendment, while anaerobic digestion can generate biogas and digestate. These approaches can substantially reduce the volume requiring landfill disposal.

Nevertheless, the performance of biological treatment depends heavily on feedstock quality. Mixed waste frequently contains plastics, glass, metals and other contaminants. Compost produced from mixed municipal waste may contain undesirable contaminants and therefore face market limitations. Source-separated wet waste is consequently much more suitable for high-quality compost and biogas production.

The literature increasingly supports decentralized processing for biodegradable waste. The importance of appropriate recycling and treatment strategies was emphasized and it was noted the need for systems compatible with India's waste characteristics [12]. Decentralized facilities can reduce transportation distances and allow local treatment of wet waste, particularly in institutional campuses, markets, residential complexes and smaller urban settlements.

Material recovery facilities represent another critical component. Their function is to sort and prepare dry waste for recycling. However, mechanical sorting cannot fully substitute for source segregation. Cleaner recyclable materials have higher recovery value and lower processing costs. Recycling in India has traditionally depended heavily on informal networks. Waste pickers, itinerant buyers, scrap dealers and aggregators form extensive material-recovery chains. These systems often recover materials that municipal systems would otherwise send to disposal facilities. Some authors highlighted the important but historically underrecognised role of rag-pickers in Indian SWM⁴. Formal integration of informal workers can therefore provide both social and environmental benefits. Registration, identity cards, protective equipment, health support, access to sorting facilities, training and inclusion in municipal contracts can improve working conditions while maintaining valuable recycling networks.

E. Waste-to-Energy: Potential and Limitations

Waste-to-energy (WtE) has received considerable attention in India because of the twin pressures of growing waste volumes and demand for renewable or alternative energy. Thermal treatment can reduce waste volume and generate electricity or heat. Refuse-derived fuel can also be used in industrial processes under appropriate conditions. However, WtE should not be treated as a universal solution. The feasibility of thermal treatment depends on moisture, calorific value, composition, preprocessing, emission controls and stable feedstock supply. Indian municipal waste often contains a substantial wet organic fraction and relatively high moisture, which can reduce the net energy efficiency of direct combustion.

In a review it was noted that integrated SWM should combine different technologies-including composting, anaerobic digestion, refuse-derived fuel, material recovery and sanitary landfilling-according to the characteristics of the waste stream [13]. This is a more appropriate approach than treating incineration as the primary destination for mixed municipal waste. WtE facilities also require stringent emission control, continuous monitoring and competent operation. Poorly segregated feedstock can produce operational problems, ash-management challenges and economic difficulties. The hierarchy of waste management should therefore place prevention, reuse and recycling above energy recovery, with thermal treatment primarily addressing appropriate residual fractions after material recovery and biological processing.

F. Landfills, Dumpsites and Legacy Waste

Land disposal remains a major component of India's SWM system. The distinction between a sanitary landfill and an open dump is crucial. A scientifically designed sanitary landfill includes engineered liners, leachate collection, gas management, controlled deposition, compaction, cover systems, monitoring and environmental safeguards. An open dump generally lacks these controls. Historically, many Indian cities relied on open dumping or poorly engineered disposal sites. In earlier decades there was the extensive dependence on unscientific disposal². Although the situation has improved in several cities, legacy dumpsites remain a major national problem. Legacy waste refers to accumulated waste deposited over years or decades. Such sites may contain biodegradable matter, plastics, metals, soil and other materials. They occupy large areas, generate odour and landfill gas and can create leachate. Fires and uncontrolled methane release are additional concerns.

Biomining and bioremediation have therefore become important components of Indian urban waste policy. The objective is to excavate old waste, recover recyclable material, stabilize biodegradable fractions, recover usable soil-like material where appropriate and reduce the volume requiring final disposal. However, legacy-waste remediation must be scientifically managed. Excavated material cannot automatically be classified as harmless merely because it appears soil-like. Characterization, contaminant assessment, appropriate utilization and residual disposal are necessary. The long-term objective should be to eliminate dependence on open dumping and establish scientifically engineered disposal systems for the genuinely non-recoverable residual fraction.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL, PUBLIC-HEALTH AND SOCIOECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Poor SWM produces interconnected environmental impacts. The first is air pollution. Open burning of mixed municipal waste can release particulate matter, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds and other hazardous pollutants. Plastics and other synthetic materials can generate particularly problematic emissions when burned under uncontrolled conditions. Landfills and dumpsites represent another major source of environmental pressure. Anaerobic decomposition of organic waste produces methane, while uncontrolled landfill fires release smoke and pollutants. The Indian government's greenhouse-gas reporting identifies the waste sector as a measurable source of national emissions [14]. Water contamination is also a major concern. Rainwater percolating through waste can produce leachate containing dissolved organic matter, nutrients, salts, metals and other contaminants. Where disposal sites lack engineered liners and leachate collection, contaminants can migrate into surrounding soil and groundwater. Several reviews identify water, soil and air pollution among the principal environmental consequences of poorly managed MSW. Plastic leakage creates another dimension. Lightweight plastic materials can be transported by wind and storm water into drains, rivers and other ecosystems. Blocked drains can contribute to urban flooding, while fragmentation of plastics creates persistent environmental contamination [4].

The public-health dimension is equally important. Waste workers may experience exposure to sharp objects, pathogens, dust, chemical substances and other occupational hazards. Informal waste workers face additional risks because sorting often occurs without appropriate protective equipment or regulated working environments. Communities living near dumpsites can also experience odour, smoke, insects, rodents, traffic and perceived or actual contamination. Environmental injustice is therefore an important aspect of waste management. Disposal facilities and transfer stations are frequently located near communities with comparatively limited political and economic influence.

The socioeconomic dimension should not be overlooked. Poor SWM increases municipal expenditure through repeated cleaning of littered streets, drain maintenance, transportation of mixed waste and management of legacy dumpsites. Conversely, effective recovery creates employment and economic value through recycling, compost production, biogas, repair and reuse industries.

Waste management can thus be viewed as both a cost centre and a potential economic sector. The transition to a circular economy requires shifting emphasis from disposal expenditure towards resource recovery and prevention.

IV. INSTITUTIONAL AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

India's SWM governance is distributed across national, state and local institutions. The Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change establishes regulatory frameworks, while the Central Pollution Control Board develops technical guidance, collects information and supports monitoring. State Pollution Control Boards and Pollution Control Committees undertake state-level regulatory functions. Urban local bodies have major operational responsibilities for collection, transportation, processing and disposal. This multilevel structure is necessary but can create coordination problems. A municipality may be responsible for service delivery while depending on state-level approvals, contractors and financial transfers. Environmental regulation may be exercised by pollution-control institutions that do not directly operate municipal services. Effective governance therefore requires coordination rather than merely the existence of multiple authorities [15].

A. Evolution of the Regulatory System

The regulatory evolution demonstrates India's increasing recognition of SWM as an environmental-management issue rather than merely a municipal-cleaning issue. The Solid Waste Management Rules, 2016 replaced the earlier Municipal Solid Waste (Management and Handling) Rules, 2000. The 2016 framework expanded applicability and placed greater emphasis on segregation, door-to-door collection, processing and resource recovery. The broader waste-policy architecture also includes separate rules for plastic waste [16], e-waste [17], biomedical waste [18], hazardous and other wastes [15] and construction and demolition waste [19]. The Ministry's regulatory archive shows continuing amendments to these waste-specific rules. The regulatory situation has now entered another phase. The Solid Waste Management Rules, 2024 were notified in December 2024, followed by the Solid Waste Management Rules, 2026, which came into force on 1 April 2026. The 2026 Rules apply to urban as well as rural local bodies and a wide range of institutions and waste generators. They also distinguish municipal solid waste from categories governed by separate regulatory regimes such as hazardous waste [20], biomedical waste, e-waste and battery waste.

This regulatory expansion is important because the boundary between "municipal" and "non-municipal" waste has historically created gaps in responsibility. Broader coverage can improve accountability, provided that enforcement capacity grows correspondingly. The 2026 framework also emphasizes institutional responsibilities, registration and reporting, door-to-door collection of segregated waste, city solid-waste action plans, infrastructure assessment and monitoring through centralized digital systems. These provisions indicate a shift towards measurable, digitally monitored service delivery.

B. Swachh Bharat Mission and Urban Sanitation

The Swachh Bharat Mission transformed public discussion of sanitation and waste management in India. Its emphasis on cleanliness, toilet access, open-defecation elimination and solid-waste management helped elevate waste management within political and administrative priorities. One of its important contributions was the expansion of door-to-door collection and citizen engagement. However, the long-term success of such programmes depends on institutionalization rather than campaign-based implementation [21]. Waste management is a daily service requiring continuous financing, staffing, maintenance and monitoring.

C. Municipal Finance and Institutional Capacity

Municipal finance remains a fundamental challenge. SWM is labour-intensive and requires continuous expenditure on vehicles, fuel, workers, equipment, transfer stations, treatment facilities, landfill operation and environmental monitoring. Small and medium municipalities often have weaker technical and financial capacities than large metropolitan corporations. They may struggle to prepare detailed project reports, assess technologies, negotiate contracts or supervise private operators.

User charges can contribute to financial sustainability, but charging systems need to be socially equitable and linked to reliable service. The 2016 regulatory framework recognized user fees as part of local waste-management arrangements, while subsequent regulatory frameworks have strengthened local-body responsibilities. Public-private partnerships can mobilize investment and technical expertise, but contractual design is critical. Poorly designed contracts can create incentives for transportation rather than resource recovery. Performance-based contracts should instead reward segregation, recycling, biological treatment and reduction of residual disposal.

D. Data and Monitoring

Reliable data are indispensable for evidence-based SWM. CPCB's annual reporting system represents an important national monitoring mechanism and includes information on generation, processing, landfilling, collection, segregation, transportation and waste-to-energy facilities [22]. Nevertheless, data quality remains an important issue. Waste generation estimates should ideally be based on measured quantities rather than assumptions. Digital weighing systems, GPS tracking, facility-level input-output records, material-balance analysis and third-party verification can improve data reliability. The 2026 Rules' emphasis on centralized online reporting and infrastructure assessment provides an opportunity to strengthen this system. The real value of digital monitoring, however, depends on the accuracy of data entered into the system and the willingness of authorities to use the information for corrective action.

V. MAJOR CHALLENGES AND PATHWAYS TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

India's SWM problem is ultimately a systems problem. Individual interventions cannot solve it in isolation. A modern collection fleet cannot compensate for mixed waste; a composting plant cannot compensate for contamination; a recycling centre cannot compensate for poor collection; and a landfill cannot compensate for unlimited waste generation.

The first priority should therefore be waste prevention and reduction. The most sustainable waste is waste that is never generated. Policies should promote durable products, repair, reuse, refill systems, packaging reduction and responsible consumption. Producer responsibility should encourage product designs that facilitate recycling and minimize unnecessary packaging.

The second priority is universal source segregation. Indian cities should develop simple, consistent and enforceable segregation systems. At minimum, biodegradable and dry recyclable streams should remain separate, with sanitary and special-care waste managed according to applicable requirements. The system should be convenient for citizens and supported by genuinely separate collection.

The third priority is decentralized biological treatment. Organic waste should be treated as close to its point of generation as technically and economically feasible. Composting and anaerobic digestion can reduce transportation costs, landfill demand and methane emissions. Markets, vegetable markets, institutions, residential complexes and small communities are suitable

locations for decentralized facilities when properly managed.

The fourth priority is strengthening material recovery and recycling. Dry waste should move through material recovery facilities and established recycling chains. Municipalities should develop formal linkages with recycling enterprises and integrate informal waste workers into these systems.

The fifth priority is formal recognition of informal waste workers. The informal sector should not be treated merely as a temporary feature that disappears when formal infrastructure expands. Waste pickers possess knowledge of materials, collection routes and market values. Integration can improve recycling efficiency while improving worker safety and social protection.

The sixth priority is scientific management of residual waste. Even a highly efficient circular economy will generate residues. These should be deposited only in engineered facilities with appropriate leachate and landfill-gas management. Open dumping should be progressively eliminated.

The seventh priority is legacy-dumpsite remediation. Cities with large dumpsites should develop scientifically evaluated biomining and remediation programmes. The objective should not merely be to relocate waste but to recover materials, stabilize residual fractions and restore land where environmentally feasible.

The eighth priority is careful selection of waste-to-energy technologies. WtE should be based on measured waste characteristics rather than assumptions. Source segregation, preprocessing and reliable feedstock are prerequisites for successful thermal treatment.

The ninth priority is occupational health and safety. Waste workers require gloves, footwear, masks where appropriate, vaccination, training, safe equipment and access to medical services. Mechanization should reduce hazardous manual handling rather than simply transfer risks to informal workers.

The tenth priority is public participation. Public awareness campaigns should move beyond slogans and explain exactly what citizens need to do, when collection occurs and where segregated waste goes. Trust is crucial. Citizens are less likely to maintain segregation if they believe separated waste is subsequently mixed.

The eleventh priority is performance-based municipal governance. Municipal SWM should be evaluated using indicators such as percentage of households receiving segregated collection, segregation quality, recycling rate, organic-waste processing rate, residual waste per capita, landfill dependence, treatment-plant performance, worker safety and citizen satisfaction.

The twelfth priority is life-cycle assessment. Technology choices should be evaluated on the basis of environmental, economic and social performance throughout the system. A facility that reduces landfill volume but consumes excessive energy or creates difficult-to-manage residues should not automatically be considered sustainable.

India should also increasingly adopt a circular-economy perspective. Circularity requires redesigning the relationship between production, consumption and disposal. Materials should remain in productive use for as long as possible. Waste-management authorities should therefore work with producers, retailers, consumers and recyclers rather than treating waste as a problem generated exclusively at the municipal level [23].

A further requirement is stronger intergovernmental coordination. The central government can establish national standards and regulatory frameworks, states can provide technical and financial support, while municipalities implement services locally. The division should be clear enough to prevent responsibility gaps.

Finally, scientific capacity-building is essential. Municipal engineers, planners, environmental officers and waste workers need continuous training. Waste management is increasingly multidisciplinary, requiring knowledge of environmental engineering, microbiology, public health, economics, urban planning, behavioural science, logistics and data analytics.

VI. DISCUSSION

The condition of solid waste management in India reveals a paradox. On one side, India has developed an increasingly sophisticated regulatory framework and invested substantially in sanitation infrastructure. On the other, many waste-management practices remain inconsistent with the principles established by those regulations. This paradox can be explained by the difference between formal capacity and operational capacity. Formal capacity consists of rules, policies, standards, institutions and plans. Operational capacity consists of the ability to implement those requirements every day. India's progress in the first category has been faster than its progress in the second.

The transition from the 2000 Rules to the 2016 Rules represented a major conceptual change. The 2016 framework recognized segregation, processing and resource recovery as central components. The 2024 and 2026 reforms demonstrate continued regulatory evolution. The 2026 Rules, in particular, broaden applicability to rural as well as urban local bodies and establish more extensive responsibilities for local authorities and waste generators.

However, regulation alone cannot generate sustainable waste systems. Regulations must be accompanied by financial resources, personnel, technical capacity, infrastructure, enforcement and public cooperation. The historical focus on collection also requires reconsideration. Collection is necessary but not sufficient. If waste is collected and transported only to an uncontrolled dumpsite, the environmental problem has merely been relocated. The relevant performance measure should therefore increasingly be the quality of the entire material pathway, not the quantity of waste removed from streets [24].

The distinction between waste management and resource management is also becoming increasingly important. Plastics, metals, paper and organics represent material stocks that can retain economic value. Treating all waste as an undifferentiated disposal burden is therefore economically inefficient. The Indian informal sector provides evidence of this principle. Informal waste workers recover materials because economic incentives make recovery worthwhile. Formal systems should learn from and strengthen these existing material networks rather than attempting to replace them without understanding their function.

The organic fraction presents another major opportunity. India's climatic conditions and dietary patterns generate substantial quantities of biodegradable waste. Decentralized composting and anaerobic digestion can therefore become major pillars of urban waste systems. Their success depends on source-separated organic waste and quality control.

The role of landfills should similarly be redefined. A landfill should not be the destination for all municipal waste. It should be the final repository for residues that cannot reasonably be prevented, reused, recycled or biologically or materially recovered. Such a hierarchy corresponds broadly to the principles of integrated solid waste management identified in the scholarly literature. Reviews of Indian SWM repeatedly conclude that integrated approaches combining recycling, composting, anaerobic digestion, appropriate thermal processing and sanitary landfilling are preferable to dependence on a single technology.

A further issue is spatial inequality. India's waste-management conditions vary dramatically among cities. Some municipalities have introduced advanced processing infrastructure and sophisticated collection systems, while others remain dependent on open dumping. National policy therefore needs to provide common standards without imposing identical technical solutions on every locality.

The appropriate approach is context-sensitive standardization: national environmental standards and minimum service requirements combined with local flexibility in technology selection [25].

Another major concern is climate change. Waste systems can either increase or reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. Open dumping and uncontrolled organic decomposition produce methane; open burning creates air pollution; long-distance transport consumes fuel. Conversely, prevention, recycling, composting, anaerobic digestion and landfill-gas capture can reduce emissions. Waste policy should therefore be integrated with India's broader climate strategy.

Circular-economy planning also requires cooperation beyond municipal boundaries. Recycling markets, compost demand, energy systems and industrial users operate across cities and states. Regional material-recovery networks may therefore be more efficient than isolated municipal systems in some circumstances.

VII. CONCLUSION

Solid waste management in India is at an important transitional point. The country has moved considerably beyond the traditional model of street sweeping, collection and indiscriminate disposal. Regulatory development, public awareness, door-to-door collection, processing infrastructure, recycling initiatives, digital monitoring and legacy-waste remediation have created a stronger foundation for sustainable SWM.

Nevertheless, the condition remains uneven. Mixed waste, incomplete source segregation, inadequate processing quality, dependence on dumpsites, legacy waste, weak financial capacity, insufficient data quality and fragmented institutional responsibilities continue to constrain progress. Earlier scholarly reviews identified many of these limitations, and subsequent research has continued to demonstrate that India's waste problem cannot be solved by a single technological intervention.

The most important transformation required is conceptual. Waste should no longer be viewed primarily as material that must be collected and disposed of. It should be regarded as a flow of materials that must be prevented where possible and otherwise separated, reused, recycled, biologically processed or recovered, with only the unavoidable residue sent to scientifically managed disposal facilities.

The regulatory transition from the Solid Waste Management Rules, 2016 to the subsequent 2024 and 2026 frameworks provides a significant institutional opportunity.

The 2026 Rules, effective from 1 April 2026, extend the regulatory framework to a broader range of local bodies and waste generators and strengthen requirements for planning, collection, infrastructure and reporting. Their success, however, will ultimately depend upon implementation at the local level.

India's future SWM strategy should consequently be based on five interconnected principles: waste prevention, universal source segregation, decentralised biological treatment, high-value material recovery and scientific management of residual waste. These principles should be supported by strong municipal finance, reliable data, occupational protection, producer responsibility, informal-sector integration and public participation.

A sustainable Indian waste-management system will not emerge simply through larger landfills or more sophisticated machinery. It will emerge through a coordinated system in which households segregate, municipalities collect separately, organic waste is biologically treated, dry materials enter recycling markets, producers accept responsibility for problematic products and packaging, waste workers are formally recognized, residuals are scientifically disposed of and performance is continuously measured.

Thus, the present condition of solid waste management in India can best be described as a transition from disposal-oriented municipal sanitation towards integrated resource management, with significant progress in policy and infrastructure but a persistent implementation gap. Closing that gap is essential not only for cleaner cities but also for public health, climate mitigation, resource conservation, employment generation and the long-term ecological sustainability of India's rapidly urbanizing society.

Acknowledgement

The author gratefully acknowledges the financial assistance provided by the Higher Education Council, Government of Uttar Pradesh, under its research and development grant scheme. This support has been instrumental in carrying out the present research work. The author also expresses sincere gratitude to the Department for its encouragement and support in promoting academic research and scholarly activities.

REFERENCES

- [1] Agarwal, A., Singhmar, A., Kulshrestha, M. and Mittal, A. K. 2005. Municipal solid waste recycling and associated markets in Delhi, India. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 44(1), 73–90.
- [2] Sharholi, M., Ahmad, K., Mahmood, G. and Trivedi, R. C. 2008. Municipal solid waste management in Indian cities: A review. *Waste Management*, 28(2), 459–467

- [3] Central Pollution Control Board. 2023. *Annual Report on Solid Waste Management, 2021–2022*. CPCB, Government of India.
- [4] Joshi, R. and Ahmed, S. 2016. Status and challenges of municipal solid waste management in India: A review. *Cogent Environmental Science*, 2(1), 1139434.
- [5] Gupta, N., Yadav, K. K. and Kumar, V. 2015. A review on current status of municipal solid waste management in India. *Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 37, 206–217.
- [6] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. 2021. *India's Third Biennial Update Report to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. Government of India.
- [7] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. 2016. *Solid Waste Management Rules, 2016*. Government of India.
- [8] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. 2026. *Solid Waste Management Rules, 2026*. Government of India.
- [9] Ahluwalia, I. J. and Patel, U. 2018. Solid waste management in India: An assessment of resource recovery and environmental impact. Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations.
- [10] Annapu, R. K. 2012. *Sustainable solid waste management in India*. Columbia University, Earth Engineering Center.
- [11] Press Information Bureau. 2016. *New Solid Waste Management Rules*. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India.
- [12] Soni, A., Das, P. K. and Kumar, P. 2023. A review on the municipal solid waste management status, challenges and potential for the future Indian cities. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 25, 12.
- [13] Kumar, A., Agrawal, A. and others. 2019. Review on Indian municipal solid waste management practices for reduction of environmental impacts to achieve sustainable development goals. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 248, 109238.
- [14] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. 2024. *Solid Waste Management Rules, 2024*. Government of India.
- [15] Chintan Environmental Research and Action Group. (various years). *Informal recycling and waste-pickers in India*. New Delhi.
- [16] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. 2016. *Plastic Waste Management Rules, 2016*. Government of India.
- [17] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. 2016. *E-Waste Management Rules, 2016*. Government of India.
- [18] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. 2016. *Bio-Medical Waste Management Rules 2016*. Government of India.
- [19] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. 2016. *Construction and Demolition Waste Management Rules, 2016*. Government of India.
- [20] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. 2016. *Hazardous and Other Wastes (Management and Transboundary Movement) Rules, 2016*. Government of India.
- [21] Kumar, S., Smith, S. R., Fowler, G., Velis, C., Kumar, S. J., Arya, S., Rena, Gupta, R. and Cheeseman, C. 2017. Challenges and opportunities associated with waste management in India. *Royal Society Open Science*, 4, 160764.
- [22] Central Pollution Control Board. 2018. *Annual report on implementation of Solid Waste Management Rules, 2016*. CPCB, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India.
- [23] Waste Management Bulletin. 2023. Municipal solid waste: Opportunities, challenges and management policies in India: A review. *Waste Management Bulletin*, 1(1), 4–18.
- [24] World Bank. 2018. *What a Waste 2.0: A Global Snapshot of Solid Waste Management to 2050*. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- [25] Zhu, D., Asnani, P. U., Zurbrugg, C., Anapolsky, S. and Mani, S. 2008. *Improving municipal solid waste management in India: A sourcebook for policymakers and practitioners*. World Bank, Washington, DC.