



Sustainable Development Goals: Issues and Challenges of Implementation in Uttar Pradesh

A Report
(2017-18)



Institute of Policy Studies and Advocacy

IPSA Working Paper No. 1

**Sustainable Development Goals:
Issues and Challenges of Implementation in
Uttar Pradesh**

**A Report
(2017-18)**



**Institute of Policy Studies and Advocacy
New Delhi**

© Institute of Policy Studies and Advocacy, 2018

IPSA Working Paper No. 1

Institute of Policy Studies and Advocacy

Delhi Office:

A58/3 Shaheen Bagh, Abul Fazl Enclave Part II
Jamia Nagar, New Delhi-110025

Uttar Pradesh Office:

544/3118, Third Lane, Near Alfia Public School
Samnan Garden, Camvell Road, Balagunj, Lucknow - 207001

Contact Us:

www.ipsaindia.org.in
ipsadelhi16@gmail.com

Project Team

Project Head

Dr. Manjur Ali

Assistant Professor



Giri Institute of Developmental Studies
(An ICSSR Institute)
Lucknow

Survey Team Leader

Imran Ansari

Project Advisor

Jawed Alam Khan

Report Editor

Abdul Rashid Agwan

Can be cited as:

Manjur Ali, Khan Jawed Alam and Agwan Abdul Rashid. 2018. Sustainable Development Goals: Issues and Challenges of Implementation in Uttar Pradesh. Working Paper No.1, Institute of Policy Studies and Advocacy: New Delhi. PP33

C o n t e n t s

S.N	Section	Page No.
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Major Objectives	3
1.2	Major Research Questions of the Study	3
1.3	Research Methodology and Data Sources	4
2	Assessing the Priorities of Union Government toward Implementation of SDGs	4
2.1	Major Focus of Policy and Programme of the Union Government	5
2.2	Issues in Fund Utilisation	8
2.3	Budgetary Priorities by the Union Government	10
2.4	Macro Indicators for the Union Budget in Terms of Resource Mobilisation	11
3	Why SDGs are Important for Uttar Pradesh	11
3.1	State Government Priorities on SDGs	14
4	Gap in the Implementation of SDGs: Story from District Balrampur	19
4.1	Respondents	21
4.2	Results of the Household Survey of the IPSA	23
4.3	Government Funds for the Balrampur District	27
5	Conclusion and Policy Implications	31

Sustainable Development Goals: Issues and Challenges of Implementation in Uttar Pradesh

This Working Paper No. 1 of Institute of Policy Studies and Advocacy (IPSA) on “Sustainable Development Goals: Issues and Challenges of Implementation in Uttar Pradesh” presents findings of the study and field survey conducted under the Institute as regards implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in the most populous state of India, Uttar Pradesh. The survey was held during a period of four months ending in March 2018 and it especially focuses on the concerning state policies and their impact on the backward sections like the OBCs and Muslim Minority in the context of SDGs.

1. Introduction

In 2015, there was major a paradigm shift in the development policy arena at national and international levels. At the international level, three historic and transformative agreements came into existence. These include the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA) on Financing for Development, the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. The Post-2015 Development Agenda, which succeeded the United Nations’ Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) was also agreed upon by the international community in the form of SDGs in September 2015.

The SDGs promised to go beyond poverty reduction and cover the issues related to social, economic, and environmental sustainability. Thus, SDGs are not merely a continuation of MDGs. The realisations about weaknesses in MDGs and changes in the world economy have certainly triggered the shift in approach towards human development. The goals under MDGs were too narrow. The concept of MDGs did not take a holistic view on development. And, most importantly, the goals in developing economies were dependent on aid from developed countries.

The UN document on SDGs, called ‘Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’, puts forward 17 goals and 169 targets that are universal, integrated and indivisible for development. At the global level, 300 indicators were developed for monitoring and review of the progress of SDGs. The global indicator

framework, were prepared by the Inter Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs), agreed on by the UN Statistical Commission. The Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly then adopted these indicators. Accordingly, national governments have also to develop their own national indicators for monitoring progress made on the goals and targets. The follow-up and review process are done by an annual SDG progress report prepared by the Secretary-General.

Box 1
Sustainable Development Goals

- Goal 1** End poverty in all its forms everywhere
- Goal 2** End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture
- Goal 3** Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
- Goal 4** Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all
- Goal 5** Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
- Goal 6** Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all
- Goal 7** Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all
- Goal 8** Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all
- Goal 9** Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation
- Goal 10** Reduce inequality within and among countries
- Goal 11** Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable
- Goal 12** Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns
- Goal 13** Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts
- Goal 14** Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development
- Goal 15** Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss
- Goal 16** Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels
- Goal 17** Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development

Source: Para 54, UN General Assembly Resolution No.70/1, Sustainable Development Goals

The annual meeting of the High-Level Political Forum on sustainable development has been playing the vital role in the review of progress towards the SDGs at the global level. The Forum also promotes accountability, fostering an exchange of best practices and supporting international cooperation. The means of implementation of the SDGs are monitored and reviewed as per the outlines prepared in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. The outcome

document of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development has to ensure that financial resources are effectively mobilized to finance the implementation of SDGs.

The national governments are not legally bound to implement SDGs. However, it was expected from them to take ownership and integrate SDGs with their national policy framework for achieving the desired result. Like other countries, Government of India has committed itself in United Nations to implement SDGs in 2015. The success of SDGs will be based on the preparation of countries for their own new development policies, plans, and programmes as per the locally felt need. To achieve the goals under the SDGs, it is expected that each participant country raises its own resources through private sector, increase in tax collection, and crackdown on illicit financial flows and corruption. SDGs have provided a new opportunity for India on the development front to align its policies, programmes and budgets with the global development priorities. In this context, it is attempted here to assess the preparedness of the national and sub-national governments vis-à-vis SDGs. Thus, in the process of assessing budgetary priorities and processes for implementation of SDGs, the policies, budgets, possible bottlenecks in the institutions, processes relating to implementation of government flagship programmes and access to benefits, etc have been analysed under the present study.

1.1 Major Objectives

1. To map the policy priorities, design and quality of development interventions made by Union, state and local governments for implementing the SDGs
2. To examine the inclusion of socially disadvantaged communities in policy and budgetary priorities
3. To analyze the adequacy of resources for certain sectors and services to implement the SDGs
4. To assess the systemic weaknesses and constraints in resource absorption capacity at different levels of governance

1.2 Major Research Questions of the Study

1. What have been the major policy initiatives made by Union, state and local/district level governance systems to implement the SDGs?
2. How far the current policy initiatives of the Centre and States are aligned with the SDGs?
3. Do current policies and budgetary processes are inclusive towards disadvantaged communities?
4. Is there any special budgetary provision to implement the SDGs in the given state and the district?

5. Whether systemic weaknesses and constraints in resource absorption capacity pose a challenge in the process of implementation of the SDGs at different levels of governance?

1.3 Research Methodology and Data Sources

To address the above mentioned research questions, the study has relied on both secondary and primary sources of data. To assess the adequacy of policy and budgetary priorities run by Union government and states for implementation of the SDGs, the study collected data from the secondary sources on public finances of Union government, Uttar Pradesh and the District Balrampur. The study has tried to understand the mapping exercise of department and ministries as per the objectives done by NITI Aayog. Further, similar examination was carried out of the mapping exercise of State Sponsored Schemes in case of Uttar Pradesh during the course of the study. To assess the budgetary priorities (quantum of allocation and extent of fund utilization), the detailed demand for grant of Uttar Pradesh has been studied. The study also carried out an assessment of select set of flagship programmes to understand the major bottlenecks and constraints in effective utilization of funds at the state and district levels. The analysis of each of the selected schemes would rely on budget data, fund flow details, planning processes, information on staff and also perceptions of relevant government officials on the aspect of fund utilization, involved in planning and implementation of the scheme.

To assess the level of access to benefits of the ongoing development programmes, a household survey was conducted in two blocks (*Gainsadi* and *Puchperwa*) of the District Balrampur, Uttar Pradesh from December 2017 to March 2018. Two Gram Panchayats *Sathi* and *GauraBhari* were selected from Gainsadi and Puchperwa blocks respectively. The field survey has covered total 557 respondents from 300 households, from both the selected Gram Panchayats.

2. Assessing the Priorities of Union Government toward Implementation of SDGs

The Government of India being the member country of United Nations has agreed to endorse the Sustainable Development Goals along with other nations and has set its due priorities in

this regard with the NITI Aayog as the nodal agency in the country for implementation, monitoring reporting to the global partners of the SDGs.

2.1 Major Focus of Policy and Programme of the Union Government

The progress of implementation of SDGs is being monitored by the National Institution for Transforming India, Government of India (NITI Aayog)¹ including a large number of institutions, Ministries and Departments of Government of India and CSOs.² At the sub-national level, State Planning Boards or State Planning Departments have been given the responsibility to monitor the SDGs. So far, responsibility of monitoring of SDGs has not been assigned to any particular department at the district level.

Box 2

National Development Agenda

1. Poverty Elimination - livelihood
2. Skill development
3. Drinking water and Swachh Bharat Abhiyan
4. Rural connectivity, electricity, access to road and communication
5. Agriculture including animal husbandry, fisheries, integrated watershed management and irrigation
6. Education and Mid-Day Meal
7. Health, nutrition, women and children
8. Housing for all - rural and urban
9. Urban transformation
10. Law and Order, justice delivery
11. Others which may include wildlife conservation and greening

Source: NITI Aayog, Government of India

To align the policies and programmes with the UN agenda, NITI Aayog has carried out the mapping of existing development programmes and schemes run by different Union Ministries and Departments according to the goals and targets of SDGs. Ministry of Statistic and Programme Implementation (MoSPI) has drafted a framework on national indicators on

¹<http://www.niti.gov.in/>

²<http://www.ris.org.in/> and <http://www.ris.org.in/fidc/>

SDGs in collaboration with the NITI Aayog and a compendium of recommendations on the indicators has also been submitted by the CSOs. WNTA³ a platform of various civil society organisations in partnership with the office of United Nations Resident Coordinator (UNRC) has been actively engaged with the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (MoSPI) and NITI Aayog in advocating the national indicators from the perspective of the most section of the society (Like religious minorities, Dalits, Adivasis, women and children). WNTA organized the national multi-stakeholders consultation on SDGs to strategise a common accountability framework for Civil Society from the prism of the most marginalized communities to achieve the agenda of 'Leave No one Behind'.

The Government of India has presented its Voluntary National Review report⁴ on SDGs at High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) on Sustainable Development in 2017 in New York. The Government of India has formed a taskforce with different concerned ministries and agencies to prepare the report. NITI Aayog is the nodal agency coordinating the process. The CSO processes were anchored by WNTA, in partnership with the different members of the CSOs to prepare the Civil Society Report on the SDGs and a detailed discussion on the strategy, methodology and time line to implement SDGs.⁵ Before discussing the role of CSOs in the implementation of SDGs, now it is appropriate to present the concept and evolutions of CSOs in India.

With regard to the national policy framework, the NITI Aayog envisioned a long-term new National Development Agenda in place of the earlier Perspective Plans and Five Years Plans for long-term development strategy of the country. The National Development Agenda includes ten sectors; namely poverty, water, sanitation, infrastructure, agriculture, education, health, housing, urban development, law and order and environment (see Box 2). However, there is nothing new in the National Development Agenda; all the ten sectors were already part of the agenda of the Planning Commission during the five year plan processes.

On the basis of the National Development Agenda, NITI Aayog intended to prepare a 15-year Vision document (2017-18 to 2031-32), a 7-year Strategy document (2017-18-2023-24) and a

³<http://wadanatodo.net/>

⁴<http://www.niti.gov.in/>

⁵Civil Society Report on SDGs Agenda-2030 India , 2017(<http://wadanatodo.net/>)

3-year Action Agenda. The Vision document, targeting a period of 15 years, aims to make India a developed country which will be almost coterminous with the period of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); whereas the 7 year Strategy Plan is in line with the mid-term period of the SDGs and the 3-year Action Agenda will be concomitant with the last three years of the 14th Finance Commission.

The NITI Aayog came out with an Action Agenda in 2017. Action Agenda covers wide ranging issues like fiscal framework, agriculture, industry, services, transport, digital connectivity, public private partnership, energy, science, technology, governance, taxation, environment, forest and water. Rather than a document infusing fresh thinking, the agenda appears more like a document collating several policy recommendations provided by experts and governments formulated over the years. Mehta (2017)⁶ argues that the Action Agenda has limited or negligible focus on implementation challenges, bureaucratic reforms and government-citizen interaction which is core to several good ideas being left unimplemented. Further, the Action Agenda does not talk much about the inclusion of SDGs and aligning it with the National Development Agenda and the scale of resources for implementing SDGs.

Box 3

SDGs and Policy Documents of the NITI Aayog

Vision: Vision document keeping in view the social, economic and environmental goals proposed for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for about 15 years, i.e. up to 2030. It aims to transform India into a prosperous, highly educated, healthy, secured, corruption free, energy abundant, environmentally clean and globally influential nation. The vision document will go beyond the traditional areas and also cover aspects of internal security and defense related issues. All the Central Ministries/Departments, States/UTs will get involved in the preparation of the Vision document.

Strategy Document: Seven year strategy document covering the period from 2017-18 to 2023-24 will convert the long term vision into implementable policies.

Action Agenda: The Action Agenda is a part of National Development Agenda with a mid-term review after three years (2017-18 to 2019-20) focusing on predictability of financial resources during the 14th Finance Commission Award period. This document would help translate the goals of the Government into actions to be achieved by 2019.

Source: NITI Aayog, Government of India

⁶ Pradeep S. Mehta, "NITI Aayog and the emperor's clothes", *Livemint*, 25 May 2017.

Interestingly, the NITI Aayog released the Action Agenda before providing the Vision and Strategy documents.⁷ Logically, the Vision and the Strategy documents should have been released before the Action Agenda. Moreover, even after three years of its existence, the Aayog did not inform on the methodology with regard to preparation of these documents.

2.2 Issues in Fund Utilisation

It is said that adequate financial resources are necessary to achieve the SDGs but good governance is necessary for rapid improvement in social, economic and environmental outcomes. Investing large volumes of money in poorly governed, corrupt or organizationally ineffective systems will not generate adequate results. Further, better designed policies and sound governance system backed by adequate resources can achieve the desired objectives of the SDGs. Moreover, it is also necessary to look at the spending priorities of the Government for interventions falling in the ambit of SDGs.

It is recognized that to achieve SDGs by 2030, there is a need to develop long term strategies on prioritizing resource mobilisation. At the global level, the UNCTAD estimates that the total investment needed for achieving SDGs is in the order of US\$5-7 trillion per annum. In this regard, India needs \$565 billion annually until 2030. It is also argued that a marginal increase in the quantum of financial resources or a small expansion of public funds for this purpose will not be sufficient and may fail to have any reasonable impact on the conditions of the poor and marginalized people. It requires an extensive mapping of the required interventions, policies, availability of current financial and human resources and other associated investments.

In the process of need assessment, the issue of absorption capacity of funds in the system is not considered. In many developing countries including India, ability to use or absorb funds is limited. Many countries lack adequate human resources, management systems, or basic infrastructure to rapidly scale up public investment. The capacity constraints can be overcome through sustained and targeted investments in human resources such as training, management systems, monitoring and evaluation over an extended period of time.

⁷ Jawed Alam Khan and Priyanka Sami. Recent Changes in the Planning Architecture in India: Consequences for Decentralised Planning and Social Equity. In *India Exclusion Report 2017*. (2017) Yoda: New Delhi. p165-190

From the discussion above, it emerged that there is a need for resource requirement to implement SDGs properly. But, before attempting the estimation of resource requirement, it is desirable to assess the existing budgetary priorities and processes for implementation of SDGs in India. Therefore, it is emphasized that there is a need to assess public policies, budgetary priorities and processes of implementation. Further, tracking public expenditure at different levels of government in general and for different sectors and section of the population in particular has become necessary in this regard.

Table 1
Total Union Budget Expenditure as a Proportion of GDP

Year	Total Expenditure from the Union Budget (Rs. Crore)	GDP at Current Market Prices (Rs. Crore)	Total Union Budget Expenditure as a Proportion of GDP (in %)
2012-13	1410372	9944013	14.18
2013-14	1559447	11233522	13.88
2014-15	1663673	12445128	13.37
2015-16	1790783	13682035	13.09
2016-17	1975194	15183709	13.01
2017-18 BE	2146735	16784679	12.79
2017-18 RE	2217750	16784679	13.21
2018-19 BE	2442213	18722302	13.04
	Excluding from the total Union Budget expenditure - "Funds collected from GST Compensation Cess, which are transferred to a non-lapsable fund in the Public Account"		
2017-18 RE*	2156419	16784679	12.85
2018-19 BE*	2352213	18722302	12.56

Note: *The figures for total Union Budget expenditure for 2017-18 RE and 2018-19 BE which do not include "Funds collected from GST Compensation Cess, which are transferred to a non-lapsable fund in the Public Account".

Source: *Compiled by CBGA from the Union Budget 2018-19 documents*

Moreover, it may be important to note that provision of adequate financial resources for unit cost of services for development centric programmes is a prerequisite for implementation of SDGs. Without adequate unit cost of services even better institutions and sound processes of

programme implementation cannot give us the desired development outcomes. However, in order to get a complete impact story of government intervention for a sector/goal, there is a need to look at not only the resources provided in the budgets but also the subsequent stages of programme implementation and actual delivery of public services. Therefore, there is a need to pay attention to the outlays provided in the budgets for any particular goal, as also at final expenditures, outputs/services delivered, and development outcomes in that goal.

Thus, in the process of assessing budgetary priorities and processes for implementation of SDGs, the proposed study would analyse the policies, budgets, possible bottlenecks in the institutions and processes relating to implementation of government flagship programmes, quality of fund utilisation and public services delivered through these programmes. Given this backdrop, the broad objective of the proposed analysis is given below.

2.3 Budgetary Priorities by the Union Government

Table 2 illustrates receipts and expenditures of the central government during previous years.

Table 2
Macro Indicators for the Union Budget in Terms of Resource Mobilisation (In Rs. Crore)

Heads	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 (BE)	2017-18 (RE)*	2018-19 (BE)*
1. Revenue Receipts	1195025	1374203	1515771	1444097	1635738
Tax Revenue (Net to Centre)	943765	1101372	1227014	1269454	1480649
2. Non Tax Revenue	251260	272831	288757	235974	245089
Capital Receipts	595758	600991	630964	712322	716475
Borrowings and Other Liabilities	532791	535618	546531	594849	624276
Total Receipts (incl. borrowing)	1790783	1975194	2146735	2156419	2352213
Total Union Budget Expenditure	1790783	1975194	2146735	2156419	2352213
Fiscal Deficit	532791	535618	546531	594849	624276
<i>Fiscal Deficit as % of GDP</i>	<i>3.89</i>	<i>3.53</i>	<i>3.26</i>	<i>3.54</i>	<i>3.33</i>

Note: *The figures for total *Union Budget Expenditure and Receipts for 2017-18 RE and 2018-19 BE, which do not include "Funds collected from GST Compensation Cess, which are transferred to a non-lapsable fund in the Public Account".

Source: *Compiled by CBGA from Union Budget 2018-19 documents*

As compared to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the country, the size of the Union Budget shows a gradual decline over the last few years from 13.37 % in 2014-15 to 12.56 %

in 2018-19 (BE). However, this is partly due to the recommendations of the 14th Finance Commission, which led to a higher proportion of the divisible pool of Central taxes being devolved to States starting from 2015-16. The magnitude of the Union Budget registers a visible increase in absolute terms from Rs. 21.56 lakh crore in 2017-18 (RE) to Rs. 23.52 lakh crore in 2018-19 (BE); but this falls short of the extent of expansion of the Indian economy (in current prices) over these two years. Hence, total Union Budget Expenditure as a Proportion of GDP shows a small decline from 12.85 % in 2017-18 (RE) to 12.56 % in 2018-19 (BE).

2.4 Macro Indicators for the Union Budget in Terms of Resource Mobilisation

Fiscal Deficit of the Union Government, as % of GDP, has declined over the last few years, and has a mirror image in the declining Total Union Budget Expenditure to GDP ratio— as Revenue Receipts have been stagnant at around 8.7 % of the Indian GDP.

3. Why SDGs are Important for Uttar Pradesh

During 5th (1974-79), 6th (1980-85) and 7th (1985-90) Five Year Plan periods Uttar Pradesh had annual average growth rate higher than or equivalent to India. In 5th Plan period, UP and India have 5.7 and 5.3 percent growth rate respectively. During the 6th Plan period, UP and India have 8.7 and 5.3 respectively. And, during the 7th Five Year Plan, UP and India had 5.7 and 5.8 percent growth rate respectively. The 6th Five Year Plan has shown the highest growth rate in Primary and Secondary sectors of the State. The Primary sector growth rate was 9.6 and the Secondary sector was growing at the rate of 9.5 percent. Henceforth, secondary and tertiary sectors have become base of the growth rate in the state. Primary sector doomed during the 7th Five Year Plan onward. It never touched three percent growth rate then onwards.

The 10th and 11th Five Year plans have seen the rebound in average annual growth rate of Uttar Pradesh. During 10 FYP, UP grew with 5.2 percent as compared to 7.8 percent growth rate of India. In 11th FYP, the state grows with 6.7 percent as compared to 7.8 percent growth rate of India. As per Table 3, Uttar Pradesh's GSDP continues to grow above 6 percent during 2014-16. In 2015-16, the UP's GSDP grew at 6.6 as compared to 7.6 percent of India's GDP.

Table 3
Growth Rate of India's GDP and GSDP of Uttar Pradesh

Year	GDP Growth in All India and GSDP growth of UP (At constant prices 2011-12)		GDP All India and GSDP of UP (in Cr. Rs.) (At current prices)		Per Capita Income (In Rs.) (at current Prices)	
	All India	UP	All India	UP	All India	UP
2011-12			8736039	721396	63460	31886
2012-13	5.6	3.9	9951344	812210	71050	35358
2013-14	6.6	4.7	11272764	946508	79412	40790
2014-15	7.2	6.2	12488205	1041997	86879	44197
2015-16	7.6	6.6	13567192	1145234	93231	48584

Source: Page 6, Annual Plan 2016-17, State Planning, UP

The growth rate, as has been noted down earlier, becomes dependent on Secondary and Tertiary sectors (Table 4). More so, now it is dependent on Tertiary sector. It has tertiary growth rate of 5.6, 6.9, 10.8 and 8.1 respectively during 2012-16. The trade, transport, finance, real estate, communication and other components of economy have taken lead in the growth. In 2013-14, the agriculture was contributing 23 percent to GSDP as compared to 35.5 percent in 1999-00. On the other hand, currently Tertiary sector is contributing 49 percent to the GSDP as compared to 42.8 percent in 1999-00. The slide down in agriculture has impacted the majority of the population in UP. According to the Census 2011, the State has 19.98 crore population, which is 16.5 percent total population of India. Of the total population, 77.7 percent lives in rural area and 97.5 lakhs are agricultural labourers.⁸ Of the total population, according to Tendulkar estimation, 29.43 percent are under poverty i.e. 5.98 crore people.

Table 4
Annual Percent Growth Rate of GSDP of UP based on New Series (2011-12)

Year	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary	GSVA (At Basic Prices)	GSDP (At Market Prices)
2011-2012					
2012-2013	5.3	0.5	5.6	4.2	3.9
2013-2014	1.5	1.5	6.9	4.0	4.7
2014-2015	-1.8	5.1	10.8	5.9	6.2
2015-2016	3.6	5.5	8.1	6.3	6.6

Source: Page 4, Annual Plan 2016-17, State Planning, UP. U.P.:2012-2013 to 2013-2014 is Provisional, 2014-15 is Quick & 2015-16 is Advance estimate

⁸Page 122, Statistical Diary 2015-16, UP

Not only that, death rate per 1000 is 7.9 in the state. It is above the national average. IMR is 64 as compared to national rate of 44. The U5MR in the state is 78, way higher than the national rate of 55. The literacy rate, per capita income, Early Childhood Care (ECC) is lower in the state than the national average (Table 5). The state lags behind on children and women related indicators.

Table 5
Development Indicators of Uttar Pradesh, 2016-17

Development Indicator	Uttar Pradesh	India
Death Rate (per 1000)	7.9	7.1
IMR	64*	44
BPL (in %), according to 2011	29.8	29.5
Per Capita Income in 2015-16 (at current prices; base year 2011-12)	Rs. 48,584	Rs. 93,231
% of Electrified Villages	88.9	94.4
Literacy Rate (in %)	69.7	74.04
U5IMR (per 1000)	78*	55
Basic Vaccination (12-23 months) (in %)	51	
Early Childhood care or Pre-School under ICDS (in %)	19	
Under age 5 Years Stunted Children (in %)	46	
Physical or Sexual Violence (in %)	34	
IHHL coverage (in %)	55.69	75.16
No. of Families Enrolled under RSBY	33.07 lakh	

Source: Annual Plan 2016-17, State Planning, UP. *NFHS 4, Uttar Pradesh

If we disaggregate the backwardness data along the socio-religious line, we found that Muslims and Dalits are at the bottom of the development indicators in Uttar Pradesh. According to a study report, Muslims exhibit higher poverty ratios than Hindus in Uttar Pradesh.⁹ “Across religious groups, Muslim households are comparatively poorer in rural as well as in urban areas. They were found to be comparatively poorer in all the regions of UP (except in the eastern region) during 2011–12. The lowest level of poverty was experienced by upper castes, followed by OBCs and SCs in all the four regions and in both urban and rural areas of UP during 2011–12.”¹⁰ To achieve the framed goals and targets of SDGs, the states at the bottom of the HDI have to perform well. Hence, inclusive development of Uttar Pradesh is must and so the allocation of required funds and deployment of sufficient trained and orientated staffs on the part of the state government to undertake their implementation.

⁹ A. Panagariya and Vishal More, “Poverty by Social, Religious and Economic Groups in India and its largest States 1993-94 to 2011-12”, Working Paper No. 2013-01, Columbia University, P. 8.

¹⁰ Akash Arora and S.P. Singh, “Poverty across Socio-Religious Groups in Uttar Pradesh – An Interregional Analysis”, *EPW*, Vol. L, No. 52, 2015, pp. 104-105.

3.1 State Government Priorities on SDGs

Taking cue from the Union government, the State has mapped its schemes and nodal departments in line of SDGs. Need more from the State Planning (minutes of the meeting, if any, etc).

Table 6
Selected Department-wise SDGs related Schemes at the Centre and Uttar Pradesh

S.N. Target of Goal	Dept	CSS	State Scheme
1.1 & 1.2	Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation (SUDA)	DeenDayal Antyodaya National Livelihood Mission	
1.3	Viklang Janvikas Vibhag	NSAP	
1.2	Rural Development	NREGA	
1.1	Rural Development	National Rural Livelihood Mission (NRLM)	
2.6	Food & Civil Supply	National Food Security Mission	
4.1	Basic Education	MDM	Samajvadi Paustik Aahar Yojna
		SSA	
4	Sec. Education	RMSA	Free Laptop & KVDY & Sakshar Bharat
6.1	Rural Development	NRDWP	State Rural Water Supply Scheme
	Rural Development	PM AwasYojna	Lohia Gramin Awas Yojna
8.7	Labour	National Child Labour Project	Identification of Child Labourer
10.3	Backward Class Welfare Department	Const. of Boys and Girls Hostel	Const. of Boys and Girls Hostel
10.4	Backward Class Welfare Department		Assistance for Marriage of Daughter

Source: *SDGs Matrix –UP 2030*

Rural Development, Panchayati Raj, Education, Agriculture, Social Welfare, Minority Welfare, Health, Food and Civil Supply, Power, Industry, Forest, Labour and Backward Class Welfare departments have been assigned major schemes and responsibility to achieve the targets of SDGs in the state (Table 6). For our purpose, we will analyse the systemic capacity – finance, function and functionaries – of the departments related with the social sector which may be regarded vital in the implementation of most of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals in the state.

Table 7
Social Sector Expenditure as Percent of Total State Budget, Uttar Pradesh

	2015-16 (Actual)	2016-17 (BE)	2016-17 (Actual)	2017-18 (BE)	2018-19 (BE)
Total State Budget Exp.	303949.34	346934.78	333425.14	384659.71	428384.52
Rev. Exp	82486.46	101789.83	91861.12	101406.86	110633.85
Cap. Exp.	11706.76	19009.48	17150.47	15111.06	22443.91
Total	94193.22	120799.31	109011.59	116517.92	133077.76
% of Total State Budget	30.99	34.82	32.7	30.29	31.1

Source: Various Years Annual Financial Statement, UP

Table 8 is relevant in understanding allocations of the major welfare schemes in UP.

Table 8
Allocation under Departments holding Major Social Sector Schemes, Uttar Pradesh
(In cr.)

Department		2015-16 (AE)	2016-17 (BE)	2016-17 (RE)	2017-18 (BE)	2018-19 (BE)
Education	School	30939.11	38066.06	36306.19	50142.00	50534.39
	Secondary	7279.20	8956.83	7485.13	9387.44	9704.23
	Higher	1795.15	2585.01	2456.91	2655.81	2807.0
	Total	40013.47	49607.90	46248.23	62185.24	63045.6
Health	Education & Training	2816.52	4218.92	4115.93	3525.45	4738.03
	Allopathic	4537.30	6259.41	5698.69	6516.66	7694.49
	Ayurvedic & Unani	568.70	870.57	767.82	1000.34	1097.44
	Homopethic	254.21	386.82	343.40	405.46	422.71
	Family Welfare	3542.53	5377.18	4257.84	5054.66	5461.23
	Public Health	384.95	714.72	650.09	677.69	742.64
	Total	12104.21	17827.62	15833.77	17180.26	20156.54
Minority Welfare		1340.8	3056.0	2816.2	2475.6	2756.98
Social Welfare		4661.60	5874.29	5435.13	4335.87	4554.94
Urban Development		5249.82	8267.80	8006.41	13189.01	13483.51
Panchayati Raj		5521.3	9187.69	9029.53	12278.11	14227.6
Rural Development		10176.75	13212.95	11535.7	15821.3	19732.4

Source: Budget Documents of Various Departments, 2018-19, Uttar Pradesh

An analysis of the department-wise allocation reveals a mix-strategy by the state. Urban Development, Panchayati Raj and Education departments have received better allocation as compared to Minority Welfare, Social Welfare and Health departments. Social Welfare budget has gone down by 26.2 percent in 2017-18 (BE) as compared to 2016-17 (BE). Minority Welfare budget has been slashed by 19 percent. Similarly, health budget allocation has been cut by 3.63 percent. The financial status would be clear by analyzing the schemes which are directly related to SDGs at the state level.

Table 9
Scheme-wise Allocation by Uttar Pradesh, 2017-18 (In Rs. Crore)

Department		Schemes	2015-16 (AE)	2016-17 (BE)	2016-17 (RE)	2017-18 (BE)
Education		Aid to the Headquarters of the Education Council / Regional Offices and Primary Schools and Assisted Junior High Schools and Nursery Schools	20645.39	22968.83	18774.70	31321.45
	SSA	Item Different from Salary (CSS 60 % + SSS 40 %)	874.64	1020.62	1020.62	1020.62
		Appointment of Teachers/SikshaMitra (60:40)	5381.18	6932.40	9932.40	14079.15
		Appointment of Teachers/SikshaMitra (60:40) District Plan	2306.22	2599.60	2599.60	0.00
		Development of Establishment Substances in Primary and Upper Primary Schools under SSA (CSS 60 % + SSS 40 % Capital Exp.	0.00	955.54	816.98	347.36
	MDM	Cooking costs etc. (CSS 60 % + SSS 40 %)	752.26	1240.58	975.84	1432.11
		RMSA	111.56	266.48	240.99	271.19
		Govt. Secondary School (Boys & Girls)	537.35	953.16	863.11	964.60
		Private secondary schools grant-in-aid (Recurrent grant)	5058.81	5300.00	4240.00	6461.62
		Grant-in-aid to Sanskrit schools	175.38	165.00	132.00	218.93
		Assistance to Non-Governmental Colleges(Male-Female)	1339.00	1581.97	1265.57	1655
		Assistance Government Degree College	216.71	349.0	315.32	358.15
	Health	Health and Food and Drug	312.44	581.62	528.60	540.92

		Control				
		Allopathy Integrative Hospital & Dispensary, Urban	1488.91	1971.97	1833.39	2144.6
		Allopathy Hospital & Dispensary (Rural)	2032.68	2572.77	2366.08	2836.38
		AYUSH (60:40)	0.00	102.13	73.53	125.00
		Rural sub center (CSS 60 %- SSS 40 %)	813.39	983.35	886.51	1109.10
		NRHM (60:40)	2056.81	3338.79	2403.93	2805.72
Minority Welfare		Modernisation of Madrasa	227.51	394.04	309.95	394.04
		Pre Matric S'ship (100 % CSS)	1.38	536.85	536.85	600
		Post Matric S'Ship (100 % CSS)	0.00008	4.58	4.58	4.58
		Merit cum Means (100 % CSS)	0.75	2.93	2.93	2.93
		Skill Development & Employment Training	0	100	78.66	0
		Capital exp. Of MSDP	175.1	480.2	539.6	345.2
	WatSan	NRDWP	986.5	788.5	674.16	788.5
		NRDWP (SCSP)	360.9	210	179.6	210
		SBM (Gramin)	640.45	640.45	503.78	2337
		SBM (Urban)	0	600	600	1000
		SBM (Gramin), SCSP	285.2	892.4	701.9	893
		Surface source based Drinking water in Bundelkhand, Poorvanchal & Vindh area	0	395	337.7	2212
Social Welfare		Scholarship for SC students in post-secondary classes	420.24	661.30	661.30	661.30
		In addition to the reserved category, post-graduate scholarship and entry fee reimbursement to the dependents of other classes (general) poor parents	754.87	666.30	666.30	666.30
		Vridhavstha / Farmer pension	120.00	150.00	117.99	675.00
		Samajwadi Pension	1785.53	2308.90	2308.90	0.00
	NSAP	NOAPS	1029.93	1140.00	896.72	1151.00
		National Family Benefit Scheme	266.27	450.00	353.97	450.00
Urban Development		Smart City Mission	24.00	600.00	600.00	1500.00
		Pradhanmantri Awas Yojna (CSS)	0.00	0.00	0.00	2342.00
		Assistance under ATAL Mission	0.00	350.00	350.00	1000.00

Source: State Budget of Various Departments, 2017-18, Uttar Pradesh

Under Primary education, Sarva Siksha Abhiyan (SSA), a Centrally Sponsored Scheme with state allocating 40 percent matching grant, has got actual increase of Rs. 3,959.4 crore.¹¹ Second major allocation in 2017-18 (BE) happened under “Aid to the Headquarters of the Education Council / Regional Offices and Primary Schools and Assisted Junior High Schools and Nursery Schools”. Under this head, allocation has increased to Rs. 31321.45 crore from Rs. 22968.8 crore i.e. by 36.4 percent. However, the increase is not sufficient enough to fill the vast gap of teachers, infrastructure and quality. According to a report, Uttar Pradesh has spent Rs. 7,613 per child at school level in 2014-15. In 2015-16, the amount got raised to Rs. 9,167. But, the amount is lesser than the expenditure of Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh. With Rs. 18,035 Maharashtra is one among the top states. It is also important to highlight the Kendriya Vidyalayas and Navodya Vidyalaya, which are considered ‘model’ government-run schools in terms of providing quality education: Rs. 27,150 and Rs. 85,000 per student were spent respectively at the elementary level in 2015-16.¹²

Rural Development Department has received an increased fund of Rs. 2608.35 crore in 2017-18 (BE) over previous year. Three schemes under – Surface Drinking water plan for Bundelkhand, Poorvanchal and Vindhya region, Swarnjyanti Swarojgar Yojna (NRLM) and PM Awas Yojna – have been prioritized in 2017-18 (BE) and received Rs. 2212, Rs. 482 and Rs. 1137.28 crore respectively. It means Rs. 1,222.9 crore have been arranged from the state schemes. Water and Sanitation schemes have received greater attention in this budget. Swachh Bharat Mission, both urban and rural, has received higher fund. In 2017-18 (BE), SBM (Gramin) got Rs. 2337 crore as compared to Rs. 640.45 crore last year, i.e. 72.6 percent of increase. SBM (Urban), in 2017-18 (BE), has received Rs. 400 more than previous year i.e. Rs. 600 crore.

By looking at the budget, one can trace a pattern in allocation. The state budget is allying itself with Central schemes and allocating more for those schemes which are at the priority of Union. For instance, SBM, ATAL, PM Awas Yojna, SSA, NRLM and PMGSY have more funding. In the process, state schemes are lagging behind. For examples, Lohia Awas Yojna, Samajwadi Pension, State Rural Drinking Water Project, Skill Development and Employment

¹¹Previous year allocation was Rs. 6932.4 crore. In 2017-18 (BE), for the appointment of teachers/Siksha Mitra under SSA, a total of Rs. 14079.15 crore allocated. This also includes Rs. 587.5 crore remained amount as revised salary. However, in 2017-18 (BE), Rs. 2599.59 crore for the appointment of teachers/Siksha Mitra under District Plan has been stopped. So, the actual increase would be Rs. 3959.4 crore.

¹²CBGA & CRY, “How Have States Designed Their School Education Budgets?”, 2016, New Delhi, pp. 24-25.

Training (Minority Welfare) have received lesser funds. There is another problem, bigger than fewer funds for the state scheme, i.e. absorption capacity at the state and district level. The lack of required quality staffs in various departments is another systemic weakness.

Table 10
Staff Position of Various Departments, Uttar Pradesh

Department	Sanctioned Post	Filled Post	Vacancy in %
Minority Welfare Dept	472	394	17
Minority Welfare (All State Data on MSDP facilitators)	137	87	63.5
Rural Development (All State Data)	24011	17748	28.12
Panchayati Raj (All State Data)	118779	109322	8
Secondary Education Teacher			50
Elementary Education Teacher		8.98 lakh*	22.9
Health (Lack of Doctors at PHC)	18,382	11,034	40 [^]
Lack of Doctor in CHC			85.3 ^{^^}

Source: *Various Dept. of the State. CBGA's report "How Have States Designed their School Education Budgets?," 2016.* [^] *Amar Ujala (19 May, 2017).* ^{^^} *Rashtriya Sahara, 6 Jan. 2018*

We have seen that in 2017-18 (BE) there is more than 3 percent budget cut in the health department. And, now the government has admitted that there is approximately 40 percent lack of doctors in the government hospitals. To have better qualified doctors, the State has to increase its health budget. Similarly, at the elementary level, the State is lacking 22.9 percent teachers. For secondary education, the teachers' vacancy stands 50 percent. Minority Welfare too has 17 percent vacancies in its staff at the state level. 63.5 percent of MSDP facilitators are also missing. Hence, state not only needs to step-up its allocation for social sector but fill also to the gap of human resources as well to achieve the SDGs in the state.

4. Gap in the Implementation of SDG: Story from District Balrampur

To improve Human Development Index and also to help the country in achieving SDGs, NITI Aayog launched programmes to rapidly transform the backward districts and identified 117 districts in 28 states for this purpose called as aspirational districts. These were selected on the basis of certain indicators such as Health and Nutrition, Education, Agriculture and Water Resources, Financial Inclusion and Skill Development and Basic Infrastructure including access to road, portable water, rural electrification and individual household toilets.

Balrampur is one of the aspirational districts selected from Uttar Pradesh. The district is located on the Nepal border in the northeastern part of the state. According to the 2011 census, Balrampur district has a population of 2,149,066, persons. The district has a sex ratio of 922 females for every 1000 males, and a literacy rate of 51.76%. It has been the part of the programmes like Backward Region Grants (BRGF) and Border Area Development Programme. Moreover, Balrampur has been classified as Minority Concentrated District (MCD) since 2007-08 where a project under the Multi Sectoral Development Programme is being implemented. In 2011, 805,975 Muslims of the district comprised 37.51% of its population and the population of other minorities was almost negligible. The male and female population of the Muslim community was noted to be 408,849 and 397,126 respectively. The populations of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the district were enumerated to be 277,212 and 24,887 respectively.

Present research study was taken up by the IPSA in the Balrampur district of Uttar Pradesh to mark the preparedness of the government at the sub-provincial level vis-à-vis SDGs. It is also important to note that this district has been at the bottom of development indicators in the state. According to the State Planning Department report (2014-15), Balrampur is one of the 14 districts which are having very low Composite Index of Development below 82. With 79.76 points, it stands on to 65th rank of the 70 districts.

The latest data from NFHS-4 show the dismal picture of health, education and basic amenities in the district. Except water from improved sources, other indicators are not up to the mark. Most of the children and mother/women are anemic. Only 35.5 percent of all mothers are getting to JSY benefit. We have much advertised UJAWALA scheme to improve the health of women, but only 9.2 percent households are using clean fuel for cooking. In rural area, this use is even lower i.e. 6.3 percent. There is a gap of more than double the literacy rate between men (76.4%) and women (36.8%). This was where from SDGs had to start in Balrampur.

By the time of the undertaken survey, two years of SDGs' implementation have already passed. At this juncture, we have conducted a total household survey in two villages of two Blocks in Balrampur. Sathi village in Gainsari Block and Gaura Bari in Pachpedwa block were taken as sample from the district. A total of 557 households have been taken up for the

survey. The findings of the survey are shown in the following table. It is evident that out of the total 557 respondents, the male and female ratio was of 74% and 26% respectively, more females shared their views in the Gainsari (30.98%) than in the Pachpedwa (22.18%).

Table 11
District Fact Sheet, Balrampur, UP (In %)

	Rural	Total
Households with electricity (%)	31.2	35.8
HH with Improved Drinking Water Source	98.4	98.5
HH using improved Sanitation Facility	9.6	13.8
HH using clean fuel for cooking	6.3	9.2
HH any member covered by a health scheme	4.7	5.1
Women Literacy	34.9	36.8
Men Literacy	74.6	76.4
Mothers who had antenatal check-up in the first trimester	15.4	16.6
Mothers who had full antenatal care	1.4	1.9
Mothers received JSY	33.6	35.5
Average OPE per delivery in public health	1642	1611
Institutional Births	30.9	30.8
Children age 6-59 months who are anaemic (<11.0 g/dl) (%)	72.7	72.4
All women age 15-49 years who are anaemic (%)	56.4	55.8
Children under 5 years who are underweight (weight-for-age)	44.1	43.5

Source: *District Fact sheet, NFHS 4, 2015-16*

4.1 Respondents

Details regarding the gender-wise composition of the respondents have been given below, which show that out of 557 respondents, 411 are males and 146 females, i.e. 74 percent and 26 percent respectively.

Table 12
Gender-wise Respondents from the Two Blocks, Balrampur

Gainsari Block		Total No.	in %
	Male	176	69.01
	Female	79	30.98
	Total	255	
Pachpedwa Block			
	Male	235	77.81
	Female	67	22.18
	Total	302	
Grand Total		557	

Source: *Field Survey, 2017-18*

Table-13 illustrates caste-wise share of the respondents. The Khans, who are predominant in the local population, outnumber other castes being 30.9 percent of the total respondents. Khan is an upper caste in the prevailing Muslim social hierarchy in the country and so in the District Balrampur.

Table 13
Major Caste-wise Respondents in Two Blocks, Balrampur

Caste	Number	% of total Respondents
Khan	172	30.9
Chamar	74	13.3
Yadav	70	12.6
Manihar	28	5.0
Nai	22	3.9
Kurmi	19	3.4
Lohar	15	2.7
Pasi	15	2.7
Teli	13	2.3
Kori	13	2.3
Jogi	12	2.2

Source: *Field Survey, 2017-18*

In fact, majority of the general castes which comprise respondents in both the blocks are Muslims (Table 14), comprising 89.7 percent of them all. Of the total respondents in Gainsari and Pachpedwa, 3.3 and 8.9 percent respondents were from the Hindu Upper castes. OBCs category is dominated by Hindus. Gender-wise analysis shows that most respondents are male.

Table 14
Socio-Religion wise Respondents in the Two Blocks, Balrampur

Block	Religion	SC	OBC	General
Gainsari	Hindu	26 (27.1)	67 (69.8)	3 (3.1)
	Muslim		70 (44)	89 (56)
Total		26	137	92
Pachpedwa	Hindu	95 (49.5)	80 (41.7)	17 (8.9)
	Muslim	0	25 (22.7)	85 (77.3)
Total		95	105	102
Fig in bracket is % share of the respective community in the Block				

Source: *Field Survey, 2017*

4.2 Results of the Household Survey of the IPSA

The major findings of the undertaken survey have been summarised in the following tables, i.e. from Table 15 to 27.

There are 522 households covered under the survey, of which 121 belong to SCs, 232 to OBCs and 169 to General categories. The majority of the families, i.e. 498, (95.4 percent) have income equal to or below Rs. 10,000 per month and only 24 families have more earnings than that. Almost all the SC families fall under the former economic category. 78.9 percent of general caste families have income equal or less than Rs. 10,000. And, 92.9 percent OBCs fall under that income cut off. It shows the overall economic backwardness this district is facing, with SCs and OBCs more prone to it.

Table 15
Social Category-wise Monthly Family Income in the Balrampur

Family Income	SCs	OBCs	General
1000	0	1 (0.17)	0
2000	1 (0.17)	2 (0.35)	2 (0.35)
3000	17 (3.05)	31 (5.6)	8 (1.43)
3500	10 (1.79)	2 (0.35)	1 (0.17)
4000	30 (5.38)	50 (8.97)	16 (2.87)
4500	1 (0.17)	0	0
5000	21 (3.77)	45 (8.07)	42 (7.54)
5200	0	1 (0.17)	0
6000	10 (1.79)	26 (4.66)	24 (4.30)
7000	13 (2.33)	15 (2.69)	14 (2.51)
8000	10 (1.79)	22 (3.94)	14 (2.51)
9000	0	4 (0.71)	2 (0.35)
10000	7 (1.25)	26 (4.66)	30 (5.38)
Total No. of Family under Rs. 10,000	120 (21.5)	225 (40.4)	153 (27.5)
15,000	1	6	10 (1.79)
50,000	0	1	5
60,000	0	0	1

Source: *Field Survey, 2017-18*

As a central government's flagship scheme, National Rural Employment Guarantee Assistance (NREGA) comprise a vital source of household income in villages in India, which was initially taken up in 200 districts in 2006 and then in all districts of the country since 2008. Table 16 shows the state affairs as regards execution of the scheme in the chosen villages of the survey. The low income forced villagers to look out for job guarantee provided by NREGA. However, not many people have access to the job guarantee. An interesting fact is that Muslim general castes have opted to work under NREGA, which is generally not the case in many villages of the state, both due to being a social taboo and their non-registration

under BPL category which is essential for availing such an employment. SCs, higher in percent, have overriding access to NREGA as compared to OBCs and General castes.

Table 16
Socio-Religious Community wise Jobs in NREGA in
Gainsari and Pachpedwa Blocks, Balrampur District (In %)

Religion	Block	Category	Yes	No
Hindu	Gainsari	SCs	34.6	65.4
		OBCs	22.4	77.6
		Gen.	0	100
	Pachpedwa	SCs	41.1	58.9
		OBCs	27.5	72.5
		Gen.	17.6	82.4
Muslim	Gainsari	OBCs	12.9	87.1
		Gen.	16.9	83.1
	Pachpedwa	OBCs	12.0	88.0
		Gen.	8.3	91.7

Source: *Field Survey, 2017-18*

Table 17 notes access of local households to public loans. It is evident that the vast majority of local people do not have such an access. Both OBCs and SCs have even lesser opportunity in availing any public loan as compared to members of the General castes. In Pachpedwa, both Muslim OBCs and Muslims General categories seem at lesser advantage in having public loans for their needs and none of them has affirmed to have availed it. The SCs and OBCs of Pachpedwa are also at similar status.

Table 17
Socio-Religious Community wise Beneficiaries of Loan in
Gainsari and Pachpedwa Blocks, Balrampur District (In %)

Religion	Block	Category	Yes	No
Hindu	Gainsari	SCs	3.8	96.2
		OBCs	1.5	98.5
		Gen.	0	100
	Pachpedwa	SCs	1.1	98.9
		OBCs	0	100
		Gen.	5.9	94.1
Muslim	Gainsari	OBCs	2.9	97.1
		Gen.	5.6	94.4
	Pachpedwa	OBCs	0	100
		Gen.	0	100

Source: *Field Survey, 2017-18*

As an affirmative action, the Public Distribution System (PDS) in India provides subsidised food items to different categories of poor and destitute. Moreover, other entitlements targeting betterment of economically weaker sections are also available for people from lower income class such as for housing, sanitation, etc. Access to these schemes is governed through registered beneficiaries who are issued specific cards for the purpose. Table 18 shows number of those families of the surveyed villages that have access these entitlements through different cards.

It is evident from the available information that the vast majority of Muslim families (around 80 percent) in Pachpedwa Block hailing from the OBCs and General Castes do not have any card to avail the entitlements under the affirmative action. The situation is somewhat satisfactory in the Gainsari Block where little more than one third families from these categories do not have such cards. It is in spite of the fact that 94.5 percent families of the surveyed villages have a monthly income of less than Rs 10,000. The Hindu families from all the three social categories and in both the blocks have better access to the government entitlements than their Muslim counterparts there.

Table 18
Social Category-wise Type of Ration Cards in
the Two Blocks of Balrampur (In %)

Block	Category	BPL Listed	Patrata Gristhi	Antyodaya	No any Card
Gainsari Block					
Hindu	SC	15.4	34.6	15.4	34.6
	OBC	14.9	34.3	11.9	38.8
	Gen.	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3
Muslim	OBCs	15.7	18.6	30.0	35.7
	Gen.	12.4	29.2	13.5	44.9
Pachpedwa Block					
Hindu	SC	9.5	34.7	2.1	53.7
	OBC	1.3	31.3	3.8	63.8
	Gen.	0.0	64.7	11.8	23.5
Muslim	OBCs	0.0	16.0	4.0	80.0
	Gen.	2.4	16.7	0.0	81.0

Source: *Field Survey, 2017-18*

The Table 19 denotes the state of beneficiaries of the PDS in the surveyed localities. More than half of the families from all three categories from both the blocks do not avail facilities under the PDS except General Hindu Castes, 70.6 percent households of which have an effective access to it followed by Hindu SCs and OBCs. The vast majority of Muslims under General category from Gainsari (74.2 percent) and Pachpedwa (91.7 percent) do not report access to the PDS. The Muslim OBCs from these blocks respectively report 44.3 percent and 16.0 positive responses to have availed benefits of the PDS. Only 8.3 percent families from the Muslim General category could have access to it.

Table 19
Socio-Religious Community wise Beneficiary of PDS in
Gainsari and Pachpedwa, Balrampur District (In %)

Religion	Block	Category	Yes	No
Hindu	Gainsari	SCs	50	50
		OBCs	34.3	65.7
		Gen.	33.3	66.7
	Pachpedwa	SCs	40	60
		OBCs	25	75
		Gen.	70.6	29.4
Muslim	Gainsari	OBCs	44.3	55.7
		Gen.	25.8	74.2
	Pachpedwa	OBCs	16.0	84.0
		Gen.	8.3	91.7

Source: Field Survey, 2017-18

It may be found shocking that all respondents from all categories of both the blocks have no knowledge regarding Pradhan Mantri Kaushal Vikas Yojana (PMKVY), a skill development scheme aimed at employment generation. Obviously, this ignorance would have led them to miss its benefits.

Table 20
Socio-Religious Community wise Awareness of PMKVY in
Gainsari and Pachpedwa, Balrampur District (In %)

Religion	Block	Category	Yes	No
Hindu	Gainsari	SCs		100
		OBCs		100
		Gen.		100
	Pachpedwa	SCs		100
		OBCs		100
		Gen.		100
Muslim	Gainsari	OBCs		100
		Gen.		100
	Pachpedwa	OBCs		100
		Gen.		100

Source: Field Survey, 2017-18

Possession of Labour Card entitles a person to avail certain benefits such as government-supported insurance against any eventuality and early death and funeral assistance, assistance in case of accident, medical expenses for treatment of major ailments. No person from the surveyed villages, in spite of one's socio-religious category, could be registered for such a card. (Vide Table 21) This denotes lack of awareness among the local people as well their inability to have proper access to labour markets around. This also tells about the failure of the system in taking the due benefits of the scheme to these villages and around.

Table 21
**Socio-Religion wise Possession of Labour Card in
 Gainsari and Pachpedwa, Balrampur District (In %)**

Religion	Block	Category	Yes	No
Hindu	Gainsari	SCs		100
		OBCs		100
		Gen.		100
	Pachpedwa	SCs		100
		OBCs		100
		Gen.		100
Muslim	Gainsari	OBCs		100
		Gen.		100
	Pachpedwa	OBCs		100
		Gen.		100

Source: *Field Survey, 2017-18*

The findings of the survey of the chosen villages showcase that majority of the population lacks the basic amenities. They don't have access to loan and information about the major government schemes such as PMKVY, credit facilities, etc. Hindus have more ration cards than their Muslim counterparts. However, surprisingly general Muslims got enrolled in the BPL list. But due to discarding of old BPL list by the government, it is of no use now. Today, in the area there are two cards are in vogue, i.e. Antodaya Card and Patrata Gristhi card. OBC Muslims in Gainsari has better access to PDS system than their counterparts in Pachpedwa. It is also because in Pachpedwa, from survey of OBC Muslims and Gen. Muslims, 80 and 81 percent respectively don't have any cards. This is socio-economic status of the two blocks, despite regular investment from the state and the centre.

4.3 Government Funds for the Balrampur District

Balrampur has been receiving funds under Border Area Development Programme, a 100 percent CSS. Under BADP, the total approved outlay for the Twelfth Plan (2012-17) is Rs. 343.75 crore against which actual expenditure for Annual Plan (2012-13) was of Rs. 55.26 crore. The anticipated expenditure for seven such districts of UP during the Annual Plan (2013-14) is Rs. 39.91 crore. The proposed outlay for the Annual Plan (2014-15) is of Rs. 62 crore.¹³

¹³Chapter 3, State Planning, Uttar Pradesh, 2014-15, p. 123.

Table 22 noted that except Basic Education and Social Welfare department, no other department has been able to allocate fund in Balrampur from what was prescribed under 12th Five Year Plan. NRLM, Rural Sanitation, Urban Development, Madhyamik Education and Rural Drinking Water, all have been marred by low expenditure. Let us look at the fund absorption capacity at the district level. Available information suggested a huge Gap of human resource at the various levels of institutions at the district level.

Table 22
Actual, Estimated and Budget Estimate for 12 FYP, Balrampur District (in Rs. Lakh)

Department	12th FYP Approved Budget	2012- 13 (A)	2013- 14 (A)	2014- 15 (Est. exp)	2015- 16 (Est. Exp.)	2016- 17 (Est. Exp.)	2017- 18 (BE)
Special Programme Village Dev (NRLM)	419.96	71.8	0	12	0	13.1	14.2
Employment Prog (NREGA)	15483.7	190	524.69	320	552.6	5673.6	6977
Basic Education (SSA+MDM+ Const. of office of BEO + HP, bound, toilet const)	2869.5	600	600	600	519	479	479
Madhyamik Education	1080	0	0	50	0	0	100
Urban Development	589.45	6	32.06	32.02	43.9	50	125.13
Rural Drinking Water (Rural Development)	6395.1	501.4	248.06	950	153.9	0	1200
Gramin Sanitation (Panchayati Raj)	9166.3	34.17	215.98	127.47	831	999	2606.56
Minority Welfare Development	745	70.8	150	170	0	0	0
Social Welfare	3172.13	619.46	633.51	685.86	763.65	0	2074.03

Source: *District Planning, 2017-18, Balrampur*

In order to consider the future of SDGs in this part of Uttar Pradesh, the gravity can also be understood from the strength of deployed staff for this purpose besides funds. In this regard, Table 23 seems illustrious as regards scheme earmarked for rural development. It shows that out of 233 sanctioned posts 52.4 percent were found vacant at the time of the survey.

Table 23**Staff Strength and Vacancy in Rural Development Department, Balrampur**

Staff/Position	Sanctioned Post	Filled Post	Vacant Post	% vacancies
MukhyaVikasAdhikari	1	1		
DDO	1	1		
Project Director	1	1		
Dy. Commissioner (Labour Employment)	1	0	1	
BDO	9	6	3	33.3
Joint BDO	3	1	2	66.6
Admin Officer	1	0	1	100
Assistant Account officer	1	1	0	0
Accountant	20	7	13	65
Assistant Accountant	10	7	3	30
Senior Assistant	11	11	0	0
Stenographer	1	0	1	100
Junior Assistant	10	11	0	0
Urdu Translator	9	7	2	22
Village Devel Officer	101	36	65	64
Village Devel Officer (M)	4	2	2	50
ISV	9	1	8	89
Driver	9	5	4	44
Postman	22	9	13	59
Peon	9	5	4	55.5
Total	233		122	52.4

Source: DRDO, Balrampur

Like in the office of DRDO, the office dealing with social welfare schemes in the Balrampur District also has many vacant posts (33.33 percent)

Table 24**Sanctioned Strength and Vacancy in DSWO, Social Welfare, Balrampur**

Staff/Position	Sanctioned Post	Filled Post	Vacant Post
DSWO	1	1	0
Senior Steno	1	0	1
Junior Steno	3	3	0
Forth Class Empl	1	1	0
Supervisor	3	1	2
Total	9	6	3 (33.3)

Source: Social Welfare, DSWO, Balrampur

The District Economic and Statistical Office of Balrampur has as many as 67 percent of the sanctioned posts vacant including those at the top level of execution, as could be marked from Table 25.

Table 25**Sanctioned Strength and vacancies in DESTO, Balrampur (As on Nov. 2017)**

Staff/Position	Sanctioned Post	Filled Post	Vacant Post
Economic & Statistical Officer	2	1	1
Additional Statistical Officer	7	2	5
Cartographic Assistant	1	0	1
Ass. Statistical Officer	2	1	1
Senior Assistant	2	2	0
Junior Assistant	2	0	2
Driver	1	1	0
Peon	3	2	1
Assi. Development Officer (Stat.)	9	0	9
Total	29	9	20 (68.96)

Source: *District Economic and Statistical Office, Balrampur*

Though the Table 26 shows that the Kaushal Vikas Yojna Organisation has all the posts duly filled but it has been noted in Table 20 that people of the surveyed villages are not aware about the skill development schemes of the government as facilitated by the concerning staff of the district.

Table 26**Sanctioned Strength and Vacancy in Kaushal Vikas Yojna Org., Balrampur**

S. N.	Staff/Position	Sanctioned Post	Filled Post	Vacant Post	% of Vacancies
1	Counselor cum MIS Manager	2	2	0	0
2	Data Entry Op.	1	1	0	0
3	Office Assistant	1	1	0	0
4	Dist.Co-coordinator	1	1	0	0

Source: *KVY, District Office Balrampur*

Table 27 shows that the District Minority Welfare Office as sanctioned posts of four staffs but all the concerning posts were found vacant at the time of the survey. It should be recalled here that Balrampur District is one of the 90 notified Minority Concentration Districts of the country and no deployment of staff for taking care of minority welfare scheme in the district is a serious lapse on the part of the state administration.

Table 27**Sanctioned Strength and Vacancy in DMWO, Balrampur**

Staff/ Position	Sanctioned Post	Filled Post	Vacant Post
MWO	1	0	1
Senior Stenographer	1	0	1
Junior Stenographer	1	0	1
Peon	1	0	1

Source: *District Minority Welfare Office, Balrampur*

The implementation of schemes for achieving the SDGs in any state or its district requires trained and oriented staff for their execution. The state of affairs in a Minority Concentration District like Balrampur does not present satisfactory scene in this regard. The Rural Development department has 52.4 percent vacant posts at the district level. The worst effected office is of Minority Welfare which has 100 percent vacant posts. 68.96 percent posts are vacant in the District Economic and Statistical Office. Social Welfare office also has 33.3 percent vacancy. If the organizations and implementing agencies do not have manpower to implement the schemes, how could SDGs be achieved?

6. Conclusion and Policy Implication

NITI Aayog has been made nodal agency to oversee the process of implementation of SDGs at the national level whereas the State Planning Department has been designated as responsible institution in Uttar Pradesh. Mapping of schemes and programmes have been carried out as per the goals of SDGs without considering the implementation challenges and the main policy documents, namely vision and strategy for prioritizing implementation of SDGs at the national as well as state levels, have not yet been brought out by the government. So far Uttar Pradesh is not prepared for implementation of SDGs given its capacity in terms of adequacy of financial and human resources and decentralized planning processes. The Planning Department, Government of Uttar Pradesh has taken similar initiatives at the state level for mapping schemes and programmes as per SDG goals, but no framework was prepared at the levels of districts and local governments. The framework adopted by the Union and state governments did not have adequate focus on the inclusion of marginalized communities and inclusive policies that is one of the three pillars of SDGs. There is lack of adequate budget and quality human resources to achieve SDGs at the state and district levels.

Policies are slowly being placed with less focus on mobilisation of resources, planning and implementation challenges on SDGs. Union Budget expenditure in terms of GDP vs. total Union Budget shows a gradual decline over the last few years from 13.37 % in 2014-15 to 12.56 % in 2018-19 (BE). Uttar Pradesh has also not made any serious effort for increasing resource mobilization and enhancing the public expenditure on social and economic services. In terms of social sector expenditure, Uttar Pradesh is lagging behind most of the States in the country. It was observed that there has been inadequacy in unit cost of services such as old

pension scheme, disability pension, widow pension, housing scheme, and Supplementary Nutrition Programme, Mid-Day Meal Schemes, Pre Matric and Post Matric Scholarships for Minorities and honorarium for frontline service provider school teachers, health workers, Workers and Helpers of Anganwadi Centre and cooks. There has been delay in fund flow due to release of funds from the state and central government due to several reasons. Systemic weakness (institutional capacity) of line departments and Panchayati Raj Institutions and Municipal Corporations, leads to poor absorption of funds. Inadequacy of human resources, training and capacity entails poor planning and implementation of schemes and programmes. Most of the line departments are understaffed and also vacancies are found at Gram Panchayats, Block Panchayats and District Panchayats. The challenges in monitoring of outcomes under SDGs have been found due to lack of availability of indicators at state, district and block levels.

It has been found that there is an irregular data reporting on outcomes and lack of capacity of data preparation at Gram Panchayats, Block Panchayats and District Panchayats. There is a poor access of basic services by SCs, OBCs and backward Muslims in the two blocks of the District of Blarampur. There is poor awareness and less community participation in implementation of SDGs at local level. The Cabinet of Uttar Pradesh should take the draft policy document for discussion and approval of it soon. It is pending with office of cabinet secretary for last one year. Assessing the needs of the state as per the SDGs requirement and find out additional challenges in terms of coverage of deprived communalities (SCs, STs & OBCs) who are left out from the development process. Accordingly, current policy initiatives and development programmes need to be assessed and there is a need to make changes in the policy design, creating new institutions and development programmes, strengthening old institutions and programmes. It is important to enhance the financial resources to have better unit cost of services and payment to staffs, who are engaged with social services. Adequacy of staff and trainings to be given top priority for implementation of SDGs. Structural changes should be made in a way that instead of creating more and more programmes, permanent institutions should be established for providing the regular economic and social services. To devolve the funds, functions and functionaries to local governments as per provision of 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendment Acts. To check the privatization in social and economic services Creating database and indicators on SDGs at the level of state and local governments. It shall be effective to make regular engagement of CSOs, NGOs, research

organisations and academic institutions with Planning Department to have better local level feedback on implementation, monitoring and evaluation of SDGs.

Policy Implication

Cabinet of Uttar Pradesh should take the draft policy document for discussion and approval of it soon. It is pending with the office of cabinet secretary for last one year. Government should assess the needs of the state as per the SDGs requirement and find out additional challenges in terms of coverage of deprived communities (SCs, STs, & OBCs) who are left out from the development process. Accordingly, current policy initiatives and development programmes need to be assessed and there is need to make changes in the policy design , creating new institutions and development programmes, strengthening old institutions and programmes. The state department must enhance the financial resources to have better unit cost of services and payment to staff engaged in social services. Adequacy of staff and trainings to be given top priority for implementation of SDGs. Structural changes should be made in a way that instead of creating more and more schemes, there is need for establishing permanent institutions for providing the regular economic and social survives. To devolve the funds, functions and functionaries to local governments as per the provision of the 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendment Acts, it is necessary to check the privatisation in the social and economic services. Creation of database, baseline survey and developing indicators on SDGs have to be done at the level of state and local governments. There is a need to make regular engagement of CSOs, NGOs, research organisations and academic institutions with Planning Department for having better local level feedback on implementation, monitoring and evaluation of SDGs.