

**Implementation of Scheduled Caste Sub Plan &
Tribal Sub Plan
in the Union and State Budgets of India**

A Study Report

2011



Implementation of the Scheduled Caste Sub Plan & Tribal Sub Plan

in the Union and State Budgets of India

(Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh)

2011

Study Conducted by

**Centre for Budget and
Governance Accountability
(CBGA)**

and

**Dalit Arthik Adhikar
Andolan (DAAA)
National Campaign on Dalit
Human Rights (NCDHR)**

Authors: Jawed Alam Khan (CBGA), Ashutosh Kumar Vishal, Ragini Sharma and Umesh Babu (DAAA-NCDHR)

Editors: N. Paul Divakar (DAAA-NCDHR), Subrat Das and Pooja Parvati (CBGA)

Research Inputs: Gargi Basu, Bhumika Jhamb, Sakti Golder, Khwaja Mobeen Ur Rehman, Saumya Srivastava (CBGA) and Adikanda Singh, Kailash Chand Bairwa, Reena Sahani, Shailendra Pratap, Nirmal Das Mankar, Mohit Jain and Radha Mohan Jogi (DAAA-NCDHR)

Study Supported by: **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

For more details, please contact:

Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability

Email: jawed@cbgaindia.org

National Campaign on Dalit Human Rights

Email: ashutoshvishal@ncdhr.org.in

Foreword

To be written up

Acknowledgments

Contents

	Index	Page No.
	Foreword	4
	Acknowledgments	5
	List of Tables and Boxes	7
	Abbreviations	10
	Executive Summary	11
Chapter 1	Introduction	15
Chapter 2	Analysis of the Union and State Budgets through the Lens of <i>Dalits</i> and <i>Adivasis</i>	27
Chapter 3	Implementation of SCSP and TSP in Select Schemes: An Assessment	43
Chapter 4	Analysis of the State Budgets through the Lens of <i>Dalits</i>	58
Chapter 5	Analysis of the State Budgets through the Lens of <i>Adivasis</i>	81
Chapter 6	Summary Findings and Recommendations	93
	Annexure	99
	Bibliography	124

List of Tables & Boxes

S. No.	Index	Page No.
Tables		
2.1	An Analysis of Statement 21 from 2005-06 to 2010-11	
2.2	Plan Allocations Earmarked for SCs in Union Budgets (2004-05 to 2010-11)	
2.3	Plan Allocations Earmarked for STs in Union Budgets (2004-05 to 2010-11)	
2.4	Plan Allocations Earmarked for SCs in Union Budget 2011-12	
2.5	Plan Allocations Earmarked for STs in Union Budget 2011-12	
2.6	Analysis of Plan Allocation through Detailed Demand for Grants (2008-09 to 2010-11)	
2.7	Proportion of Funds Allocated for Scheduled Castes (2008-09 to 2010-11)	
2.8	Proportion of Funds Allocated for Scheduled Tribes (2008-09 to 2010-11)	
2.9	Department-wise Plan Allocation for Scheduled Castes (2007-08 to 2010-11)	
2.10	Department-wise plan allocation for Scheduled Tribes (2007-08 to 2010-11)	
2.11	Department-wise share of allocation for SCs in Total Plan Outlay	
2.12	Department-wise Share of Allocation for STs in Total Plan Outlay	
2.13	Resource Allocation under 2225, 4225, 3601, 2552, 789,796 from DDGs	
3.1	A Review of Overall Performance under IAY	
3.2	Physical Performance under IAY for SCs and STs during 2009-10	
3.3	Financial Performance under IAY for SCs and STs during 2009-10	
3.4	Dropout Rate during 2001-02 and 2007-08	
3.5	Analysis of Fund Flow targeted for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Key Schemes	
3.6	Comparison of Allocation in Statement 21 & 21 A with DDGs in 2011-12	
3.7	Status of Total Plan Expenditure on Higher Education in 11 th Plan	
3.8	Allocation for Major Components of Higher Education (in Rs. Crore)	
3.9	Analysis of Fund Flow targeted for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in NRHM	
4.1	Share of SCSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Bihar State Plan(2009-10 and 2010-11)	
4.2	Share of SCSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Bihar State Budget (2008-09 to 2010-11)	
4.3	Analysis of Expenditure during 11th Five Year Plan (in Rs. Crore)	
4.4	Percentage of Fund Utilisation in Bihar	
4.5	Budget Allocation under different Services in Bihar	
4.6	Schemes for Scheduled Castes in Bihar	

- 4.7 Expenditure Classification of Schemes in Bihar State Budget (in %)
- 4.8 Intra-shifting of Money within SC/ST & OBC Welfare Department in Bihar
- 4.9 Share of SCSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Rajasthan State Plan (2008-09 to 2010-11)
- 4.10 Share of SCSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Rajasthan State Budget (2008-09 to 2010-11)
- 4.11 Missing SCSP Money
- 4.12 Comparison between Revised Estimate and Actual Expenditure under SCSP
- 4.13 Budget Allocation under different Services in Rajasthan
- 4.14 Schemes under SCSP in Rajasthan
- 4.15 Schemes with Allocations of Less Than Rs. 10 Crore
- 4.16 Schemes for Scheduled Castes in Rajasthan
- 4.17 Share of SCSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Odisha State Plan (2009-10 and 2010-11)
- 4.18 Share of SCSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Odisha State Budget (2009-10 and 2010-11)
- 4.19 Comparison between Revised Estimate and Actual Expenditure under SCSP in Odisha
- 4.20 Violation of SCSP Guidelines: Examples from Home Department in Odisha
- 4.21 Violation of SCSP Guidelines: Examples from Works Department in Odisha
- 4.22 Expenditure Classification of Schemes in Odisha State Budget (in %)
- 4.23 Literacy Status of SC population in Uttar Pradesh
- 4.24 Population below poverty line in Uttar Pradesh
- 4.25 Representation of SC & ST in Uttar Pradesh Government Services (2004)
- 4.26 Occupational Pattern in Uttar Pradesh (Census 2001)
- 4.27 Assessing the Allocation in Uttar Pradesh State Annual Plan
- 4.28 Sector-wise SCSP Allocation under Uttar Pradesh State Annual Plan
- 4.29 Department-wise Allocation under Uttar Pradesh State Annual Plan
- 4.30 Sector-wise Classification of Budget Provisions in Uttar Pradesh
- 4.31 Allocations for Key Components in Uttar Pradesh State Budget
- 4.32 Scrutiny of Allocations for SSA and IAY in Uttar Pradesh
- 4.33 Demand-wise Allocation under SCSP in Madhya Pradesh
- 4.34 Schemes with Highest Allocations in Madhya Pradesh
- 5.1 Plan Allocation for STs: Comparison between Annual Plan and Detailed Demand for Grants in 2009-10
- 5.2 Plan Allocation for STs: Comparison between Annual Plan and Detailed Demand for Grants in 2010-11
- 5.3 Plan Allocation for SCs and STs: Comparison between Annual Plan and Detailed Demand for Grants in 2010-11
- 5.4 Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Bihar State Plan (2009-10 and 2010-11)

- 5.5 Department-wise Allocation under TSP in Bihar
- 5.6 Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Bihar State Budget (2007-08 to 2010-11)
- 5.7 Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Uttar Pradesh State Plan (2009-10 and 2010-11)
- 5.8 Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Uttar Pradesh State Budget (2008-09 to 2010-11)
- 5.9 Department-wise Allocation under TSP in Uttar Pradesh
- 5.10 Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Rajasthan State Plan (2009-10 and 2010-11)
- 5.11 Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Rajasthan State Budget (2008-09 to 2010-11)
- 5.12 Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Odisha State Plan (2009-10 and 2010-11)
- 5.13 Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Odisha State Budget (2008-09 to 2010-11)
- 5.14 Administrative Classification of TSP by Union Government

Boxes

- 1.1 Population Profile and Development Indicators of SCs & STs
- 1.2 Constitutional Provisions for SCs and STs
- 2.1 SCSP and TSP: A Plan Strategy for the Development of SCs and STs
- 2.2 Key Recommendations of Jadhav Task Force

Abbreviations/Acronyms

AWCs	Anganwadi Centres
BPL	Below Poverty Line
CAG	Comptroller and Auditor General of India
CHCs	Community Health Centre
CPA	Central Plan Assistance
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
CSS	Centrally Sponsored Scheme
DDGs	Detailed Demand for Grants
DLHS	District Level Household and Facility Survey
DRDA	District Rural Development Agency
EOCs	Equal Opportunity Cells
GER	Gross Enrolment Ratio
GIAs	Grants in Aid
HRD	Human Resource Development
HUPA	Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation
ICDS	Integrated Child Development Services
IHSDP	Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme
IIMs	Indian Institutes of Management
IITs	Indian Institutes of Technology
IMR	Infant Mortality Rate
ITDA	Integrated Tribal Development Agency
ITDP	Integrated Tribal Development Project
JNNURM	Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission
KGBV	Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya
MADA	Modified Area Development Approach
MMR	Maternal Mortality Ratio
MSME	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises
MTA	Mid Term Appraisal
NPEGEL	National Programme for Education of Girls at Elementary Level
NRHM	National Rural Health Mission
PHCs	Primary Health Centre
RAY	Rajiv Awaas Yojana
SC	Sub-Centre
SCA	Special Central Assistance
SCOVA	Standing Committee of Voluntary Agencies
SCSP	Special Component Plan
SCs	Scheduled Castes
SCSP	Scheduled Caste Sub Plan
SSA	Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan
STs	Scheduled Tribes
TSP	Tribal Sub Plan
UGC	University Grants Commission
UIDSSMT	Urban Infrastructure Development for Small and Medium Towns

UIG	Urban Infrastructure and Governance
NSSO	National Sample Survey Organisation
NCEUS	National Commission for Enterprises in the Unorganised Sector
NCAER	National Council for Applied Economic Research

Executive Summary

In order to ensure direct “policy-driven” benefits for Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs) through specific interventions, the Planning Commission during the 1970s introduced plan strategies known as the Special Component Plan (SCP) and the Tribal Sub Plan (TSP). The earlier approach for development intervention for SCs and STs relied solely upon “incidental” benefits flowing to them from various interventions by the government. The main objective of SCP* and TSP was for channeling Plan funds for the development of SCs and STs in accordance with the proportion of these communities in the total population (16% and 8% respectively at the national level as of 2001). However, even though the SCSP and TSP have been operational for over 30 years, numerous problems exist in terms of the way they are being implemented:

- i. From the analysis, it is found that Plan allocation and release of plan funds by the Union Governments and in the States of Bihar and Rajasthan have not been made in proportion to the population of SCs and STs till 2010-2011. There has been a marked improvement in the budget of 2011-12 in both the states.
- ii. A large amount of funds under SCP and TSP are ‘Notional’ allocations in states as well as in the Union budget. Because, notional allocations are mere paper figures that do not flow through special schemes directly benefitting SCs or STs.
- iii. There exist anomalies between SCSP statements given by the Planning Commission/Departments at Union and State levels and the respective DDG (Detailed Demand for Grants) allocations in the Union and State Budgets passed by Parliament and State Assemblies.
- iv. The plan allocation by various line departments meant for SCs and STs does not have enough scope for tailor-made projects and Schemes suitable to their specific needs. Most of the current schemes are for **survival**, and not for development or empowerment, scant focus on entrepreneurship, employment and skill development projects.
- v. There remain critical administrative bottlenecks in implementation of the development programmes/schemes. Sufficient administrative, executive and accountability mechanism meant for SCs and STs related programme are not in place in States and districts. Budgetary norms are not being followed appropriately.
- vi. Funds meant for SCSP and TSP funds have been diverted to other sectors and purposes.
- vii. There has been poor utilisation of the allocated funds for the welfare of SCs and STs.
- viii. Lack of transparency in many state budget, in terms of accessing public information on SCs and STs, many State budgets do not publish summary statement on SCSP/TSP
- ix. Poor service delivery mechanisms in the field level also constrain attainment of development outcomes.

*The name **Special Component Plan for SCs (SCP)** was changed to **Scheduled Caste Sub Plan (SCSP)** in 2006. Activists are of the opinion that segregating a small chunk of the total funds for the welfare of the SCs into a Sub Plan is extremely objectionable as it effectively pushes the concerns of the SCs to the very margins of government policy. However, for the sake of uniformity in the analysis and the presentation of the study findings, we will be using **Scheduled Caste Sub Plan SCSP** henceforth in the report.

The study entitled “**Implementation of Scheduled Castes Sub Plan and Tribal Sub Plan in the Union and State Budgets**” evaluates the magnitude of budgetary resources being earmarked for SCs and ST and its composition in the Union and select state budgets. It attempts to assess the implementation of the guidelines of select Plan schemes of the Central government. The study covered the Union Budget and five State Budgets - Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Odisha, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan for the years 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11. A thorough review was undertaken of the Union Budget and the detailed budget books at the state level, i.e., the Detailed Demands for Grants (DDGs) of the five states. The guidelines, budgetary resources and beneficiary data on SCs and STs of some select Central government schemes were also examined. In the Union Budget 2011-12, some changes in the manner of presenting the budget allocations earmarked for the SCs and the STs have been observed that are encouraging.

Findings from the Analysis of the Union Budget

The analysis of the Union Budgets using Statements 21 and 21A and the Detailed Demands for Grants (DDGs) reveal several gaps in the implementation of SCSP and TSP guidelines. A look at Statement 21 from 2004-05 to 2010-11 shows that the aggregated plan allocation for SCs and STs varies from 7 to 11 percent for the combined population of SCs and STs, which was 24 percent of the total population as per census 2001. Statements 21 and 21 A in the Union Budget 2011-12 highlight the percentage share of allocations for SCSP and TSP to be 9 percent and 5 percent of the total plan allocation as the table-1 shows the estimates that are far short of the recommended allocations by the Jadhav Task Force, 2010.

Table-1: Plan Allocation under SCSP and TSP in the Union Budget (in Rs. Crore)

	2010-11	2010-11	2011-12
	BE	RE	BE
A. Total Plan Allocation earmarked for SCs	23795.6	23153.2	30551
B. Total Plan Allocation earmarked for STs	8989.91	9221.31	18436.15*
C. Total Plan Allocation of Union Govt. (excluding Central Assistance to State & UT Plans)	284284	302500	340255
A as % of C	8.37	7.65	8.98
B as % of C	3.16	3.05	5.42

Source: Compiled by CBGA from Statement 21, Expenditure Budget of Vol-1 of Union Budget, 2011-12

* The Statement 21A shows Rs. 17371.35 crore as total plan allocation for STs While summing up all 27 entries from ministries and department in the above mentioned table we find Rs. 18,436.15 crore, so there is a difference of Rs 1064.8 crore.

The combined plan allocations for SCs and STs from an analysis of the DDGs are as low as 2.54 percent in 2008-09 (Budget Estimates), 2.36 percent in 2009-10 (BE) and 2.45 percent in 2010-11 (BE). Budgetary allocation for SCs as a proportion of the total plan allocation is found to be as low

as 1.10 percent (2008-09), 0.84 percent (2009-10) and 1.28 percent (2010-11) for the reference periods. Similarly, budgetary allocations for STs range between 1.25 percent and 1.4 percent as a proportion of the total plan allocation.

The DDGs reveal that the Union Ministries of Social Justice and Empowerment and Tribal Affairs contribute a sizeable amount of funds that are allocated for the SCs and STs. Apart from these two ministries, there are some other ministries like Labour and Employment; Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME); Home Affairs (Chandigarh, Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Daman & Diu); and Food and Public Distribution that have allocated the funds.

The setting up of the Narendra Jadhav Task Force in 2010 and the recommendations given by it are progressive steps that reflect a sense of urgency on the part of the government to address the deficits like separate budget statement for SCs and STs, opening the minor heads and targeting the Central plan Assistance (CPA) for welfare of SC and STs. Recommendation for a Non-Lapsable Central Pool of Resources for SCs and another for STs is very helpful. There is a concern about putting the 43 ministries/departments in a non obligatory category under SCSP and TSP.

The scrutiny of the non-obligatory 43 ministries/departments for 2010-11 reveals that not all of them are regulatory departments/ministries. There is enough scope to create some exclusive schemes for development of SCs and STs. Besides, the percentage share of allocation determined by the task force under SCSP and TSP under the three remaining categories, as mentioned above, is not adequate to address the given development deficit of SCs and STs. Ministries like MSME, Commerce, Information Technology, and Science and Technology falling under category II, have been directed to allocate less than 15 percent of the total fund under SCSP and TSP, which are critical for long term development of SCs and ST.

In Union Budget 2011-12, the government introduced two separate budget statements - Statement 21 that specifically catered to SCs and Statement 21A for STs. Allocations were thus made under separate Minor Heads (789 and 796) for 25 Central ministries and departments. The study finds that the total quantum of allocations as shown in Statement 21 & 21A almost match the corresponding outlays from the DDGs. This is another improvement in the Union Budget of 2011-12.

Analysis of six schemes/interventions reveals that Indira Awas Yojana, which has a large allocation (Rs.3530 crore for 2011-12) also, it has mechanisms and guidelines to address the concerns of the SCs and STs through the scheme design. This is possible because of clear guideline and opening the Minor Head code of 789 and 796 in the DDG by Ministry of Rural Development. However, Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) is an interesting case. SSA outlines the policy framework for inclusion of concerns specific to SC/ST children. While the framework¹ flags key issues of SC/ST children and suggests a programme for Equity, the DDGs reveal that Rs. 3817.70 crore has been allocated for SCP. A closer scrutiny of the Framework reveals that there are no clear guidelines issued for the

¹ Sarva Siksha Abhiyan – Framework for Implementation, Min. HRD, Dept of School Education and Literacy, March 2011, pp30

Scheme on Equity. Thus, it is not clear where the amount of Rs. 3817 crore is flowing? Other Schemes still lack clarity in their norms/guidelines in physical targeting and financial allocation under each component. Recently, the two programmes (NRHM and ICDS) have made some changes in their scheme design to cover the need of SCs and STs, but still there is a requirement in it. Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) has not made any comprehensive policy provision to address the development deficits of SCs and STs in urban areas. Also, schemes like National Rural Health Mission (NRHM) and Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS) do not provide data on SC and ST beneficiaries.

Findings from the Analysis of the State Budgets

An assessment of the Annual Plans of the study states for 2009-10 and 2010-11 reveals that there are anomalies in the figures given by the State Planning Departments and DDGs in the three states (Bihar, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh). As per the Planning Departments, Bihar, Odisha, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh have allocated the funds as stipulated by the SCSP guidelines (table 2 & 3), where the analysis of DDGs shows that Rajasthan and Bihar have not set aside funds for SCs in proportion to the SC population in 2010-11. However, the estimates of fund allocations for the SCs based on an analysis of the DDGs vary widely across these five states. In Bihar, SCs were allocated 1.2% in 2007-08(AE), 1.1% in 2009-10 (RE) and 1.2% in 2010-11 (BE). In the case of Rajasthan, the plan fund varies from 3 to 4 percent for SCs for the same time period. The analysis of the department and scheme-wise allocations highlight many instances of fund diversion and misappropriation of funds that were earmarked for SCs.

Table 2: Variation between Planning Committee figures and DDGs figures for SCP in States

State	2009-10 BE				2010-11 BE			
	SCP State Plan (Planning Committee)		SCP -DDG		SCP State Plan (Planning Committee)		SCP -DDG	
	Rs. Cr.	%	Rs. Cr.	%	Rs. Cr.	%	Rs. Cr.	%
Bihar	2497	17.6	177	1.1	3375	16.8	231.5	1.2
Rajasthan	2780	16.0	373	2.9	3674	16.4	573.0	3.9
Uttar Pradesh	8538	20.0	8538	20.0	9100	19.9	9099.8	19.9
Orissa	1563	16.4	1396	15.4	1818	16.5	1547.0	16.6
Madhya Pradesh	2856	14.8	2856	14.8	3303	15.0	3303.0	15.0

Source: DDGs from several State Budget Documents

Fund allocations for STs in Odisha and Uttar Pradesh, as reported by the Annual Plan and the DDGs, are comparable. However, for Bihar and Rajasthan, the amounts mentioned in the Annual Plan and

the DDGs vary significantly. In 2011-12, Bihar made proportional allocation in terms of SC population under SCP.

Table-3: Status of plan fund Allocation under TSP in the States Budget

States	% of ST Population (2001)	% share of TSP in Total Plan Allocation in 2009-10	% share of TSP in Total Plan Allocation in 2010-11
Bihar	0.9	0.13*	0.14
Rajasthan	12.6	2.84*	3.94
Orissa	22.1	20.21	20.32
Uttar Pradesh	0.1	0.04	0.04

Source: Calculated and compiled from the State Budgets of several states

* Revised Estimates

It must be mentioned that among the five states studied, Uttar Pradesh seems to be in a relatively better-off position with regard to the implementation of SCP due to the following reasons. 1) Executive Budget Documents have a separate Demand for SCP and TSP. 2) Allocations are made as per population. 3) The amounts allocated can be traced in detail in the DDGs. 4) Efficient website management where the budget documents may be downloaded. 5) SCP plan documents are maintained and matched to the budget documents. 6) Dept of Social Welfare is the nodal organisation, which is pooled across the ministries, and coordinates with line ministries for implementation of the schemes and programmes. Overall, the study of DDGs reveals, the nature of the quality of expenditures in the States is matter of prime concern.

Apart from the problems in allocation and budgetary process, there has been poor utilisation of funds due to poor absorption history in the states. And sometime there is a lack of 'real policy concern' on part of policy makers and officials to ensure the policy and guidelines are effectively implemented. An assessment of the implementation approaches under TSP reveals that Integrated Tribal Development Projects (ITDP/ITDA) are not functional due to several reasons such as lack of adequate and trained staff, poor planning processes, inadequate office infrastructure and basic facilities for staff. In many states, project officers at ITDP do not have sufficient work experience.

Recommendations

Taking into account the major gaps in implementation of SCSP and TSP, much more concerted efforts are required by the government to strengthen the implementation of SCSP and TSP. Some broad recommendations that emerge based on the analysis are summed up as follows:

- I. Finance Ministry in consultation with the Planning Commission and the concerned ministries at the Union and State levels to be made responsible for the allocation to SCSP and TSP as per the guidelines.
- II. Non-Lapsable Central Pool of Resources for SCs and STs to be created and all the unspent amounts to be transferred accordingly (Jadhav Committee Recommendation)
- III. Funds exclusively meant for the welfare of SCs and STs should not be used for other purposes/sectors. Several instances have been found from some of the states wherein SCSP and TSP funds have allegedly been diverted for other purposes such as expenditure on the Commonwealth Games 2010; construction of roads, bridges, stadiums, buildings and other State-owned assets like hospitals, flyovers and engineering colleges.
- IV. The line ministries and departments of the Union and State governments that have not allocated the earmarked funds for SCSP and TSP so far must do so by introducing special/exclusive projects. There are around 43 Union ministries and departments which are not obliged to allocate funds for SCs and STs due to their nature of engagement either as regulator, their primary role of policy making, or being responsible for creating infrastructure.
- V. Without corresponding schemes / tailor made project, no allocation to be made for SCSP or TSP. Many departments and ministries have made notional allocations without exclusive schemes benefitting the SCs and STs. The 'general sector' schemes should revise their norms and guidelines for creating special provisions and tailor made projects for the development of SCs and STs. Several of the major development schemes of the Union government have no clear mechanism to earmark funds for SCs or STs. Nor do they have the required data on the proportion of SCs and STs among their beneficiaries. Funds allocated for SCs and STs are either spent through the 'exclusive' schemes, wherein 100 percent of the outlays are meant for SCs and STs, or through 'general sector' schemes. The plan allocation by various line departments meant for SCs and STs does not have the enough scope for tailor made project suitable to their specific need. Most of the schemes are rendering the social services, have very less focus on entrepreneurship and skill development. The general sector schemes (like SSA, schemes in higher education, ICDS, NRHM and JNNURM) do not have much clarity in their norms and guidelines about the specific provisions for SCs and STs. Scheme guidelines of IAY, that stipulate providing at least 40 percent of the total outlays for SCs and 20 percent of the allocation for STs, are worth emulating. Likewise, the guidelines of Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY), which focuses on creating livelihood, seeks to ensure that SCs and STs would account for at least 50% of the assisted beneficiaries.
- VI. Comparable beneficiary-disaggregated data on SCs and STs for each scheme must be provided as against the data on the scheme outlays. A few schemes present beneficiary data in their reporting format. While ICDS and NRHM report fund allocations under minor heads, the supporting data on beneficiaries is not provided. Further, important documents of Union ministries like Annual Reports, Outcome Budgets and Results Framework Documents

(RFD) are not providing adequate information about the priority for SCs and STs in terms of physical targets and financial allocations.

- VII. Central Plan Assistance (CPA) for states should allocate funds for SCs and STs with proper revision in the norms and guidelines. Apart from the Centrally Sponsored Schemes and Central Sector Schemes, a substantial amount of funds goes through the Central Plan Assistance (CPA) to states without outlining any physical and financial provisions for SCs and STs. Schemes like Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY), Backward Regions Grant Fund (BRGF), JNNURM and Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) are not allocating funds for SCs and STs.
- VIII. An independent Authority/Commission under the chairmanship of Prime Minister to be created for the Progression of SC and STs with necessary administrative, executive and accountability mechanisms to monitor SCSP and TSP up to district : In order for the SCSP and TSP to have the necessary priority in implementation, the Union and State governments may consider bring an act which ensures clear policy guidelines, executive and administrative mechanisms and resource allocation with accountability measures on the lines of NREGA (social audit . grievance redressal mechanism, NREGS council at national and state level)

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Setting the Context

Over the past decade, the policy discourse on tracking public expenditure in the country has gained more importance. One of the main reasons for the increasing scrutiny of government budgets and their implementation has been the strategies followed by civil society organisations (CSOs), mass movements and international development agencies working in the country. These stakeholders have laid emphasis on decentralisation, i.e., empowering the local people through devolution of power to the panchayats (as key institutions for preparing local plans and budgets for inclusive development); using the Right to Information Act, 2005, as a tool to seek greater transparency in governance; and, analysis of budgets by CSOs as the key to assessing priorities underlying public policies and effective implementation of development schemes from the perspective of marginalised and disadvantaged sections of the population .

Among the disadvantaged sections of society, SCs and STs have been the most excluded and neglected throughout the process of development programmes and policies of successive Union and state governments. They have remained the most disadvantaged sections due to socio-economic exploitation and isolation over a long period. For thousands of years, they have been pushed to low income generating occupations, inferior trades, unhygienic environment and menial jobs. Although untouchability has been abolished by the Constitution, caste rigidities continue to confine many SC workers to low-status occupations (see population profile in Box 1.2).

Box 1.1: Population Profile and Development Indicators of SCs & STs

Scheduled Castes account for around 166.6 million people in the country, representing 16.23 % of the total population (2001 Census). The main concentration of SCs is in Uttar Pradesh (35.1 million), West Bengal (18.4 million), Tamil Nadu (11.8 million), Andhra Pradesh (12.3 million) and Bihar (11.3 million). SCs mostly inhabit rural areas (78 %) and a majority of them are agricultural labourers (46 %) with only 20 % of them being cultivators. The vital development indicators of literacy (54.7 %), Infant Mortality Rate (83 %), rural poverty (36 %), urban poverty (38 %) show large disparities as compared to the status of the general population.

The tribal population of the country, as per the 2001 Census, is 84.3 million, constituting 8.2 % of the total population. More than half the STs population is concentrated in the states of Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra, Odisha, Jharkhand and Gujarat. According to the 2001 Census, 44.70 % of the ST population are cultivators, 36.9 % agricultural labourers, 2.1 % household industry workers and 16.3 % are other occupation workers. The percentage of STs living below the poverty line is 47.2 % in rural areas and 39.9 % in urban areas, as per official estimates in 2004-2005. The literacy rate among STs has increased from 29.62 % to 47.10 % during the period 1991 to 2001. The literacy rate among ST males has increased from 40.65 % to 59.17 % while that of females has gone up from 18.19 % to 34.76 % in the corresponding period.

The Constitution of India provides many safeguards for the welfare, development and protection of SCs and STs in order to address their socio-economic exploitation and isolation over the centuries (Box 1.2).

Box 1.2: Constitutional Provisions for SCs and STs

There are many constitutional safeguards for the welfare, development and protection of SCs and STs in the country:

- Article 14 – Equal rights and opportunities,
- Article 15 - Protection against discrimination on the grounds of caste, religion, race, sex
- Article 46 - Educational and economic interests of weaker sections,
- Article 275 (1) – Grants-in-Aid for promoting the welfare of STs and raising the level of administration,
- Article 330, 332 and 335 - Stipulates reservation of seats in the Lok Sabha, Legislative Assemblies and government services, Protection of Civil Rights (PCR) Act, 1955 & Prevention of Atrocities (POA) Act, 1989 – Protection of STs and SCs from social discrimination like untouchability, exploitation and atrocities.

The two statutory Commissions viz., National Commission for Scheduled Castes and National Commission for Scheduled Tribes have an important role in protecting the rights, interests and welfare of the SCs and STs. There are constitutional provisions in the Fifth and Sixth Schedule for administrative dispensation and protection of tribes in the central Indian states and north-eastern region.

In 1996, a constitutional provision was made with the enactment of the Provision of Panchayats (Extension to the Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996, that conferred special powers to the Gram Sabha in Fifth Schedule areas. Further, the government enacted the Forest Rights Act 2006 and the Land Rehabilitation & Resettlement Policy in 2007, in an attempt to address the basic concerns of land and forest rights. Though these constitutional provisions are in place, their effective implementation by the state governments has proved to be a great impediment for the welfare and development of the SCs and STs.

While the constitutional provisions address the legal rights and attend to concerns of ‘social justice’ of the disadvantaged, these groups have largely remained economically backward for more than 50 years. Despite these provisions, effective implementation of government schemes that attempt to address ‘economic empowerment’ of SCs and STs remains a critical area of concern.

According to National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) data 2004-05, the incidence of poverty by caste and occupation indicate that 75% of households among SCs belong to agricultural labourers and 67% are in urban casual labour categories, while for STs the numbers are higher at 56% and 75% respectively. The incidence of poverty and its intensity are higher among SCs and STs as compared to the national average.

A study conducted by the National Commission for Enterprises in the Unorganised Sector (NCEUS) in 2007 states that '88 per cent of the SCs and STs belong to the poor and vulnerable group in India'. While SC/STs are also denied from economic and productive assets (such as land), education becomes a significant attribute towards gainful, remunerative and productive employment for them. However, here too, SCs and STs trail behind the national average – having lower literacy rates (including higher gender disparity), lower enrolment rates, and higher rates of educational deprivation. The gaps in school dropout rate between the SC and general population shows an increasing trend in the higher levels of schooling. Further, in the area of higher education, the gross enrolment ratio for SCs is 6.4 % as against 10% for the country as a whole in 2000 (Eleventh Plan). This is further supported by a study conducted by the National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER) in 2004-05 which states that in comparison to 34% upper caste families who have at least 1 graduate in the household, only 14% SC and 12% ST households can boast of 1 graduate in the family and only 1.7 SC and 0.6 ST households work in modern services.

Data from the National Family Health Survey-III (2005-06) clearly highlights the caste differentials in relation to health status, which includes reduced access to maternal and child healthcare, stunting, wasting, underweight and anaemia in children and anaemia in adults. Similarly, neonatal, postnatal, infant, child and under-five statistics clearly suggest a higher mortality among the SCs and the STs.

In this regard, the Planning Commission has come to play a vital role by adopting a plan strategy for balanced and equitable development across various regions and sections of the population. Ever since Independence, the Government of India has adopted the strategy of preparing annual and five-year plans to reduce regional disparities and to meet the development needs of the marginalised communities. However, the planning process has largely been top-down in nature and, hence, not catered to the needs of the disadvantaged sections of society. Over the past one-and-a-half decades, development issues relating to economic growth, international trade, industry, agriculture, poverty, unemployment and regional disparity have been the subject of intense debate among policy analysts and other stakeholders. Despite its professed focus on the development of the SCs and STs, none of the five-year plans since 1951 have been able to weave in the pressing concerns of the SCs and STs with regard to the above-mentioned sectors/issues.

The most important initiative by the Planning Commission was creation of the Special Component Plan for SCs (SCSP) and the Tribal Sub Plan (TSP) in the 1970s recognising the special need for a distinction between 'incidental' benefits for SCs and STs from the existing government interventions and 'direct policy-driven' benefits, wherein the government designed special programmes and interventions for them. The Planning Commission introduced specific strategies of SCSP and TSP for channelling Plan funds for the development of SCs and STs in accordance with the proportion of SCs and STs in the total population (that is, 16% and 8% respectively, at the national level as of 2001) . The funds earmarked for SCSP/TSP should be placed under separate budget heads/sub-heads by each ministry/department. The fund cannot be diverted for any other purposes and should be used exclusively for the benefit of SCs and STs

The 11th Five-Year Plan also echoed this through its slogan of “inclusive growth”, by introducing new schemes/programmes and additional budget support for the development of the marginalised. The 11th Plan promised to restructure policies for faster, more broad-based and inclusive growth of SCs. For overall empowerment of the tribal people, the Plan proposed that STs should participate and manage their own development process. In this regard, the adoption and implementation of the Maharashtra SCSP and TSP model are to be taken up in other states as well. The Maharashtra Model is based on the concept of single-demand budgeting.

1.2 Implementation of SCSP and TSP: A Critical Review

Even though the SCSP and TSP have been in place for over 30 years, the results in terms of welfare and development of SCs and STs remain way below expectation. This is revealed by several research studies and the performance audit on SCSP and TSP by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (CAG), 2006-07, that point to numerous problems in implementation of the sub plans.

- In 2009-10 and 2010-11, plan allocation and release of plan funds by the Union Governments and many States like in Bihar and Rajasthan have not been made in proportion to the population of SCs and STs. There has been a remarkable improvement in the allocation in Bihar and Rajasthan budgets in 2011-12.
- A large amount of fund under SCP and TSP is real allocations in states as well as in the Union budget. It's a kind of notional allocations which show mere paper figures and do not flow through special schemes or tailor made project directly benefitting SCs or STs.
- There exist anomalies between SCSP statements given by the Planning Commission/Departments at Union and State levels and the respective DDG (Detailed Demand for Grants) allocations in the Union and State Budgets passed by Parliament and Sate Assemblies.
- The plan allocation by various line departments meant for SCs and SCs does not have the enough scope for tailor made projects and Schemes suitable to their specific needs. Most of the current schemes are for survival, and not for development or empowerment. No focus on entrepreneurship, employment and skill development projects.
- There remain critical administrative bottlenecks in implementation of the development programmes/schemes. Sufficient administrative, executive and accountability mechanism meant SCs and STs are not in place in States and districts. Budgetary norms are not being followed appropriately.
- There has been poor utilisation of the allocated funds for the welfare of SCs and STs.
- Funds meant for SCSP and TSP funds have been diverted to other sectors and purposes.
- Lack of transparency in many state budget in terms of accessing public information on SCs and STs , many State budgets do not publish summary statement on SCSP/TSP
- Poor service delivery mechanisms in the field level also constrain attainment of development outcomes.

A Research Study on “Livelihood Options and Assets Creation in SCSP and TSP Schemes and its Impact among SCs and STs” (Planning Commission, November 2007) covers the seven states of Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Odisha, Punjab and Tamil Nadu. The finding of the study reveals that the state governments are adopting different mechanisms to implement SCSP and TSP. Even the guidelines – that are issued by the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment; Ministry of Tribal Affairs; Planning Commission on implementation of Special Central Assistance (SCA) to SCSP, SCA to TSP and Grants in Aid under Article 275(1) of the Constitution to TSP – are not being followed by the states.

Another norm that is being violated is that the allocation of funds towards SCSP and TSP are not proportionate to the share of population of SCs and STs in most of the states. The state governments are allocating funds for SCSP and TSP in the “divisible” (sectors where the benefits of the interventions can be divided in terms of number of beneficiaries covered, e.g., education, health, housing) and “indivisible” sectors (sectors where the benefits of the interventions cannot be divided in terms of number of beneficiaries covered, e.g., roads, information technology, commerce). Funds to the tune of 60-65% are being allocated in the indivisible sectors like irrigation, agriculture, industry, power, roads & bridges which have only 10% to 15% coverage of SC and ST areas and even less percentage share of actual beneficiaries (Planning Commission, November 2007).

The direct benefits accrued to SCs and STs through programmes pertaining to education and economic development are being undertaken by the Social Welfare and Tribal Welfare Departments and State SC/ST Finance and Development Corporations. The physical coverage of SC and ST beneficiaries in those programmes is very less.

The selection of beneficiaries and the accessibility of the various schemes of SCSP and TSP indicate that the schemes/programmes covered depend on the programme criteria/guidelines in various sectors while the involvement of local bodies and panchayats is limited. The beneficiary data also indicates that the awareness was not conducted about the schemes among eligible SCs and STs and therefore, the benefits of schemes are not availed by them. Majority of the schemes which are accessed by the SC and ST beneficiaries are welfare programmes (old age/widow/disabled pension, nutrition, marriage subsidy), housing schemes (construction, repair, extension), scholarships, hostels and rural development and poverty alleviation programmes. Agriculture, irrigation and income generating schemes have been availed by a very small proportion of the SC and ST beneficiaries (Planning Commission, November 2007).

The approach towards TSP is basically area based with Integrated Tribal Development Project/Agency (ITDP/ITDA), Modified Development Area Approach (MADA) and cluster-based but with no proper planning, effective implementation and monitoring at the field level; it hinders the delivery mechanism and completion of infrastructure projects in time, particularly in Koraput, Bolangir and Kalahandi (KBK) districts of Odisha. In ITDP, MADA, District, Block and village-wise planning in tribal dominated States of Odisha, Chattisgarh and Gujarat, single line administration

and implementation of programmes are not being attempted with adequate care. It is only ad-hoc and makeshift arrangements that are being attempted in tribal areas.

With regard to SCA to SCSP, SCA to TSP and grants under Article 275(1) of the Constitution, these are not released in time by the Central government at the beginning of the financial year. Another problem is that the money is not released directly to the Social Welfare and Tribal Welfare departments. These departments get the funds through Finance department and the bottlenecks and procedural delays result in non-utilisation of funds properly in Punjab, Bihar and Chhattisgarh. In states like Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Odisha and Haryana, SCA to SCSP funds are being utilised mostly through the Scheduled Caste Finance Development Corporation (SCFDC) whereas in other states these are utilised by the Social Welfare Department and SCFDC.

The findings of the Performance Audit of Educational Development of SCs and STs by the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) of India (2006-07) in various schemes for the educational development of SCs and STs also reveal critical gaps. The audit was conducted during June-October 2006 concluded that implementation of the educational schemes by the two ministries (Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment & Ministry of Tribal Affairs) was unsatisfactory. It also detailed weaknesses in financial management such as inaccurate/ unrealistic budgeting, non-utilisation of funds, inter-state imbalances in release of Central assistance, non-availability of Central assistance, unspent balances, and delayed/short/non release of funds and diversion of funds across all the schemes. With regard to the pre-matric scholarship scheme for the children of those engaged in unclean occupations and post-matric scholarship scheme, deficiencies in the implementation stage included short coverage of beneficiaries, payment of scholarship to ineligible beneficiaries, delays in payment of scholarship, and deficiencies in the system of selection of beneficiaries.

In the case of the “Scheme for the establishment of Ashram schools in Tribal Sub Plan areas”, construction of schools was delayed in several cases and maintenance of schools was not given enough priority by the state governments. The effectiveness in the scheme for upgradation of Merit of SCs and STs was compromised due to delays in release of funds. Implementation of the Book Bank Scheme suffered from lacunae such as delay in establishment of book banks, procedural irregularities in the purchase of books, purchase of inappropriate books and delays in purchase.

Another initiative, “Scheme of Hostels for SC/ST community students”, suffered due to delays in completion of construction, lack of facilities and non-utilisation of facilities. With regard to the “Coaching and allied scheme for STs and for weaker sections including SCs, OBCs and Minorities”, deficiencies included defunct Pre-Examination Training Centres, inadequate number of sessions, non-availability of basic facilities, and poor record maintenance.

Appropriate monitoring mechanism was absent for pre and post matric scholarship schemes, the state governments did not ensure submission of periodical reports/returns regarding various schemes from the implementing authorities. Neither of the two ministries (Social Justice and Empowerment and Tribal Empowerment) prepared databases of beneficiaries for monitoring purposes. Inspection was not conducted in a systematic manner and independent evaluation was not

conducted at the Union government level as well as in most of the states. Internal audit of the schemes was also not conducted at the Union level and in many states, the CAG pointed out in 2006-07).

The Eleventh Report of the Standing Committee on Social Justice and Empowerment (2010-11), which examined the Scholarship Schemes for Scheduled Castes/Other Backward Classes pointed out that there are several inherent problems underlying the various schemes for SCs/OBCs. For instance, although the budgetary allocations for scholarship schemes have significantly increased in 2010-11, there has been a substantial delay in the revision of unit costs of post-matric scholarship schemes which was last revised in 2003. Keeping in view the considerable price hike, the Committee felt that there is an urgent need to increase the rates as per the present consumer price index.

The Standing Committee also observed that there are different rates as well as income ceiling limits for SCs/OBCs/STs and minorities and there is no coordinated view while effecting revisions under different schemes. The data on educational outcomes from the Selected Educational Statistics 2006-07 (published by the Ministry of Human Resource Development) reveals that the dropout rate for SCs students at pre-matric stage is as high as 70% and when compared to all categories students, it is 10% higher. The Committee further noted that pre-matric scholarship scheme for SC students, which can be instrumental in reducing the dropout rate, is limited to students of parents engaged in unclean occupations. It also pointed out that there is a considerable delay in sanction and disbursement of scholarships and this delay is caused by the state governments not spending the money under their committed liability on time.

In addition, field visits for on-the-spot assessment of implementation of various schemes could not be undertaken due to pre-occupation of officials during the winter and Budget sessions of Parliament and in processing the proposals of states/UTs and other implementing agencies. The Committee observed that the objective of the pre-matric scholarship for children of those engaged in unclean occupations is to promote education to children to wean them away from their traditional occupations. It noted that the number of beneficiaries under the scheme, which was 7.35 lakh in 2007-08, came down to 6.22 lakh in 2008-09 while in 2009-10, the number increased.

The Committee observed that although the scheme of Top Class Education launched in 2007-08 provides for 1250 scholarships every year, the scholarships awarded during the last three years, i.e., 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10 has been 195, 378 and 541 respectively. The main reason attributed for not availing the scholarship could be due to inadequate awareness. It also observed that under the scheme, in most cases the admission was done on the basis of All India Common Entrance Tests and in some cases, like CPL training, Tata Institute of Social Sciences. However, there was no provision under the scheme for giving special training to students to get admissions in notified institutions that was needed for them to successfully compete with general category students for admission in premier institutes.

With regard to overseas education, a National Overseas Scholarship Scheme was launched in 1954-55. However, only 732 students were offered awards up to 1994-95 out of which 524 students availed the benefits of the scheme. The Committee found that for the period 1995-96 to 1997-98, no selection was made as the Committee for Non Plan Expenditure had approved the continuation of the scheme only from 1998-99 to 2000-2001 and also no selection was made during the years 2000-01 to 2003-04. It also noted that the scheme targets were not always achieved. In this process, no formal training is imparted to the selected students for admission into foreign universities.

Under the Rajiv Gandhi National Fellowship for SC students every year, 1333 fellowships are awarded for Scheduled Caste students. The number of applications received under the scheme (4372 during 2006-07, 5909 during 2007-08 and 6895 during 2008-09) has been increasing while the number of awards per year has remained the same. The number of applications received is more than 5 times the fellowships awarded under the scheme and students are selected on the basis of merit. It was observed that no relaxation was given to SC students hailing from rural areas.

A review of implementation of SCSP and TSP for Annual Plan 2008-09 by the Planning Commission in the form of *Mid Term Appraisal (MTA) of 11th Plan* revealed that most of the states are earmarking funds as per the percentage of SC population in the state under SCSP. Some states such as Assam (2.01 per cent), Goa (0.78 per cent), Gujarat (0.89 per cent), Karnataka (12.34 per cent), Rajasthan (14.87 per cent), and Tamil Nadu (14.87 per cent) have earmarked funds less than the corresponding share of population of the state. The situation is somewhat better under TSP wherein most states except Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka and Sikkim have earmarked funds under TSP as per the percentage of ST population.

With regard to physical targeting, apart from a few States such as Tamil Nadu and Gujarat, other States do not seem to be fixing realistic physical targets for the SCSP and TSP schemes programmes. Several States are not conducting benchmark surveys or preparing perspective plans, vision documents for long term goals and outcomes of the schemes/programmes. States such as Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Odisha, Chhattisgarh, and Madhya Pradesh have adopted the practice of pooling funds from all the sectoral/line departments and placing these under the nodal Department of SC and ST Welfare.

A prerequisite is the preparation of SCSP and TSP documents earmarking funds in each Annual Plan as per the guidelines with prioritised schemes that benefit the SCs and STs. However, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Goa, Himachal Pradesh, J&K, Jharkhand, Kerala, Punjab, Tripura and West Bengal did not submit the SCSP and TSP documents along with their Annual Plans for 2008-09. Though the state governments are earmarking funds under SCSP and TSP as per the guidelines, the actual expenditure met under SCSP and TSP is typically way below the desired level of expenditure. The state governments need to ensure full utilisation of funds and that the intended benefits are reaching the target groups in terms of measurable outcomes.

Expenditure incurred during the first two years of the 11th Five Year Plan i.e., 2007-08 and 2008-09 under Special Central Assistance (SCA) to SCSP was Rs. 501.15 crore and Rs. 601.59 crore while that under TSP was Rs. 678.26 crore and Rs. 780.87 crore respectively. Grants under Article 275(1) of the Constitution are 100 per cent Central Assistance provided to the states to supplement the efforts of the state governments. During Annual Plans 2007-08 and 2008-09, Rs. 400 crore and Rs. 416 crore respectively were made available to the states for Scheduled Area Administration and to raise their level of administration at par with other regions. The Planning Commission guidelines emphasise the need to set up SCSP Cell in the Central Ministries/Departments. Yet, the ministries/departments have not set up the cells to look after the implementation of SCSP and TSP. Recently, some of the ministries/departments expressed willingness to formulate schemes and earmark funds under SCSP and TSP. They need to prepare SCSP and TSP documents which will provide a definite plan of action and roadmap for the sectoral role and contributions towards socio-economic development of SCs and STs.

In 2010, a Task Force was setup by the Planning Commission under the Chairmanship of Narendra Jadhav to review and re-examine the SCSP and TSP guidelines. It found that the implementation of the earlier guidelines has remained inadequate and hardly any ministry is reporting its SCSP/TSP outlays under a separate Budget Head (major head 2225 and minor heads 789 & 796). Whatever allocation was shown by the ministries has been notional and with no clear-cut criteria. It is impossible to quantify the total amount allocated and/or spent by the Central government under SCSP/TSP.

Given the ineffective implementation of SCSP and TSP, many civil society organisations and mass movements in the country have started engaging in assessment of budgets. Budget analysis is done at various levels through different lenses with the primary objective of making budgets and governance more responsive to the needs of the disadvantaged sections.

Scope and Objectives of the Study

One of the major reasons for the continued exclusion of SCs and STs has been the weaknesses in government interventions meant for their development. These weaknesses, in turn, could be rooted in one or more of the following gaps: (a) gaps in public policies for development of SCs and STs, (b) gaps in budget allocations for SCs and STs and (c) gaps in implementation of government interventions for SCs and STs. In this context, allocation and actual utilisation of budgetary resources for development of SCs and STs is now widely considered as an effective indicator of the 'priority' accorded by the government to these excluded sections. The present study/action research has attempted to identify gaps in first tow areas looking at gaps in public policies for development of SCs and STs and budgetary allocations for SCs and STs at the Union and state level and it also includes assessment of select government schemes and interventions for SCs and STs. The approach of study is based on the process evaluation of SCP and TSP; it has not attempted to capture the aspect of impact of SCP and TSP on beneficiaries.

Further, it attempts to find out what part of total expenditure by the government is meant for providing direct policy-driven benefits (as opposed to incidental benefits) to SCs and STs and what is the composition of this expenditure. This requires looking at various programmes/schemes under the different ministries of a government through functional Major Heads and Minor Heads. Any framework for carrying out an in-depth assessment of this kind would have to take into account some of the important features of planning and budgeting processes followed in India.

In this process, Swadhikar/NCDHR and Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability (CBGA) have carried out an orientation programme for civil society activists and conducted a research study to inform future advocacy efforts. The broad objectives of the study are as follows.

Part I

1. To demystify the policies, framework and specific mechanisms adopted by the Central and state governments for responding to the development needs of SCs and STs through budgets.
2. To identify major gaps in policies, budget allocations and budgetary processes of the Central and state governments from the perspective of (development of) SCs and STs and suggest ways of strengthening state government budgets in the five selected States and the Union Budget;

Part II

3. To build the capacity of a number of CSOs working for protecting the rights of SCs and STs, to comprehending these issues and replicating the methodology for such an assessment of budgets in various states.
4. To establish research and advocacy centres in these states for research and tracking of SCSP/TSP at the state and district levels
5. To inform CSOs, parliamentarians/legislators and policymakers about the insights generated through the study.

Part I of the objectives, which would motivate the research efforts, could be spelt out as follows:

- (a) To assess the norms and guidelines of selected Central government schemes from the perspective of SCs and STs.
- (b) To examine the data collected on allocation and fund utilisation in the selected schemes meant for SCs and STs.
- (c) To assess the magnitude of expenditure on SC and ST beneficiaries in the selected schemes vis-à-vis the allocations earmarked for them as per the Union Budget Statement on *Schemes for the Development of SCs and STs*.
- (d) To assess the composition of expenditure/allocation earmarked for SCs and STs from the Union Budget and its implications for the development of SCs and STs.
- (e) To examine whether the selected states are following the strategies of SCSP and TSP, and if so, to what extent are they fulfilling the guidelines of SCSP and TSP.
- (f) To compare the actual magnitude of expenditure on SC and ST beneficiaries in the selected states with allocations earmarked under SCSP and TSP.

(g) To appraise the composition of expenditure/allocation earmarked under SCSP and TSP and its implications for the development of SCs and STs in the selected states.

Part-II of the objectives motivates promotion and capacitation of the groups and formation of a strong network:

- a) Identify CSOs (at least 5-10) in each state which have the capacity and interest in doing budget work.
- b) Identify panchayat leaders, community leaders and legislators who could form pressure groups for strengthening SCSP and TSP in the states.
- c) Design modules for orientation and capacitation of the relevant stakeholders.
- d) Encourage a broad network of panchayat leaders, legislators and activists at the state level to demand better implementation of SCSP and TSP.
- e) Formally set up research and advocacy centres in each state within the capacitated network.
- f) Engage with the state for better implementation of SCSP and TSP.
- g) Analyse the Union and state budgets as and when these are presented in Parliament and the legislative assemblies.

Methodology and Data Sources

A research team comprising staff from CBGA and NCDHR carried out the research and capacity building activities in the study. Large volumes of information on Union and state budgets, norms and guidelines for selected schemes, and the data on intended beneficiaries of the selected schemes under the study was collected. The information was also procured from the relevant Union Ministries and selected state government offices.

The Detailed Demands for Grants of the five selected states and the Union Budget have been examined thoroughly along with the Budget Statement of the Union Budget. The study focuses on documents, both of Union and state budgets, for the last two financial years, viz., 2009-10 and 2010-11. It has captured actual expenditure figures for 2008-09 (BE) 2008-09 (RE) 2008-09 (AE) 2009-10 (BE) 2009-10 (RE) and 2010-11 (BE)

The Union Budget papers and documents of the nodal Union Ministries for SCs and STs were also examined carefully for analysing the impact and outcomes of the Central government schemes. In addition, documents available with the nodal ministries pertaining to the norms and guidelines for the schemes and the kind of beneficiary data being collected in the schemes were studied in detail.

The guidelines of some select schemes were reviewed from the perspective of SCs and STs as well as an analysis of fund allocation and beneficiary data on SCs and STs was carried out. These schemes related to rural housing (IAY) Higher Education (UGC, IIT, and IIM), School Education (SSA), Health (NRHM), Child Development (ICDS) and Urban Development (JNNURM).

Chapterisation of the Study Report

Chapter 1 presents an overview of government policies and programmes for the development of SCs and STs in India. It covers the constitutional provisions for the welfare of SCs and STs, a critical review of implementation in government policies and programmes for the development of SCs and STs since independence, along with listing the objectives of the study, its methodology and data sources.

Chapter 2 analyses the Union Budgets through the lens of *dalits* and *adivasis*. It tries to capture the magnitude of Plan funds through an analysis of Statement 21, 21 A and Detailed Demand for Grants (DDGs) for 2009-10 & 2010-11. This apart, a quick review of Jadhav Task Force has also been done to look at the government response to the recommendation of Task Force through the analysis of DDGs 2011-12.

Chapter 3 focuses on implementation of SCSP and TSP in some selected schemes. It reviews the scheme guidelines and analyses fund allocation and beneficiary data in select schemes related to education, health, child development and livelihood/entrepreneurship for SCs and STs.

Chapter 4 examines the State Budgets through the lens of *adivasis* (Odisha, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh). It attempts to capture the magnitude of Plan funds through an analysis of State Annual Plan and DDGs.

Chapter 5 reviews the State Annual Plan and DDGs in five States from the perspective of *adivasis*. This also includes an assessment of implementation Approach in TSP areas.

In **Chapter 6**, a summary of the findings and key recommendations are presented.

Chapter 2: Analysis of Union Budgets through the Lens of *Dalits* and *Adivasis*

This chapter assesses the magnitude of plan allocation for SCs (*dalits*) and STs (*adivasis*) over the years. In order to assess the quantum of plan allocation meant for SCs and STs, we have analysed the Statement 21 from 2005-06 to 2010-11. In addition, the two Statements introduced in 2011-12 separately for SCs and STs Viz. Statement 21 and 21 A respectively have been examined. The Detailed Demand for grants (DDGs) of different ministries and departments for the years 2009-10 and 2010-11 have also been examined to verify the actual flow of plan allocation for SCs and STs given in these Statements. The analysis will try to provide information regarding the quantum of funds put under the minor head 789, meant for SCs and 796, meant for STs. The chapter also attempts to study the budgetary and accounting processes through which the plan fund meant for SCs and STs flows from the Centre to the states. Lastly, a quick review of DDGs for 2011-12 was done to gain insights into the government's response to the recommendations of the Narendra Jadhav Task Force, 2010

2.1. Plan Strategy for the Development of SCs and STs

The concept of **Special Component Plan** for SCs (now Scheduled Caste Sub Plan) was introduced in 1979 and a **Tribal Sub-Plan** (TSP) for STs was started in 1974. The strategies of SCSP and TSP are meant to ensure that outlays and benefits from the general sectors of the Plan flow to *dalits* and *adivasis* **at least in proportion to their shares in the total population**, both in physical and financial terms. These allocations are meant for umbrella programmes under which various schemes implemented by the government need to be dovetailed for addressing different needs of *dalits* and *adivasis*. The Planning Commission has issued several government orders and guidelines to the Central government ministries and state governments with regard to implementation of these strategies of SCSP and TSP.

Box 2.1: SCSP and TSP: A Plan Strategy for the development of SCs and STs

Some of the salient features of SCSP /TSP guidelines, in this regard, are:

- Funds should be earmarked for SCSP/ TSP from the Central government ministry's/department's plan outlay **at least** in the proportion of SC/ST population to the total population of the country.
- The funds earmarked for SCSP/TSP should be placed under separate budget heads/ sub-heads for each ministry/department for implementing SCSP and TSP. In this context, in the 'Detailed Demands for Grants' (in State and Union Budgets), **Tribal Sub Plan (with code 796)** and **Special Component Plan (with code 789)** can be opened as **minor heads below the functional major head/sub major head** wherever necessary.
- Outlays for area-oriented schemes directly benefiting SC hamlets/ villages having a majority of Scheduled Castes population/tribal hamlets and villages shall be

- included in SCSP and TSP.
- Designing proper and appropriate developmental programmes/schemes/activities specifically relevant/useful for the overall development of SCs and STs both within the existing general programmes across sectors, and also conceiving new avenues/programmes for this purpose, if not there so far.
 - Designing a special mechanism and making the same as the special agency responsible and accountable for formulation and implementation of SCSP and TSP effectively and meaningfully.
 - Only those schemes should be included under SCSP/TSP that ensures **direct benefits** to individuals or families belonging to SCs/STs.
 - Wage component, especially under rural employment schemes, should not be included under SCSP/TSP.
 - Non-earmarking of funds under SCSP and TSP may result in non-approval of Plans of the States/UTs.
 - Ensuring timely release of SCSP and TSP funds for the purpose(s) they are meant for. SCSP and TSP funds should be **non-divertible** and **non-lapsable**.
 - The SCSP strategy needs to be evaluated at the end of the year in terms of financial allocations made and the expenditure incurred, and assessment of their impact through gauging physical achievements and ultimate outcomes.
 - Adoption and implementation of the Maharashtra Model of SCSP and TSP by all the States/UTs.

Source: Planning Commission Guidelines for SCSP and TSP

Apart from provisions in the SCSP and TSP guidelines for allocating funds for SCs and STs, in the recent past, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh had in the 51st National Development Council Meeting held on 27 June 2005, also emphasised that “SCSP and TSP should be an integral part of annual plans as well as five year plans, making provision therein non-divertible and non-lapsable with the clear objective of bridging the gap in socio-economic conditions of the SCs and STs within a period of 10 years”. Since 2005-06, the Planning Commission has set up a dedicated unit for monitoring of implementation of SCSP and TSP.

Further, over the last few years, there has been intense pressure from civil society organisations (CSOs) across the country. The CSOs have been advocating with the Union Government and also with the nodal Union Ministries responsible for the welfare of SCs and STs and reforming the SCSP and TSP guidelines. Consequently, the Planning Commission in June 2010 constituted a Task Force chaired by Dr. Narendra Jadhav to review, re-examine, and revise the existing SCSP/TSP guidelines. A report was submitted on 25 November 2010 which highlighted the gaps in implementation of SCSP and TSP. It was found that the implementation of the earlier guidelines had remained inadequate and hardly any ministry was showing its SCSP/TSP outlays under the respective separate Budget Heads (major head 2225 and minor head 789 & 796 for SCs and STs respectively). Most of the allocations shown by the ministries/departments were notional and the assumptions underlying placing specific quantum of funds remained unclear. Hence, it was impossible to quantify the total amount allocated and/or spent by the Central government under SCSP/TSP.

Taking into account these problems, the Task Force recommended that substantial reforms to be introduced in the implementation of SCSP/TSP from 2011-12.

As mentioned in the guidelines of SCSP and TSP, the Union ministries/departments should earmark plan outlay for SCs/STs in proportion to their population. However, in addition to the Union Ministries and Departments, there are several other sources of funding under SCSP and TSP such as, (a) allocation of plan funds under SCSP and TSP from State/Union territory plans and Central ministries/departments; (b) Special Central Assistance (SCA) to SCSP and TSP; (c) Grants under Article 275 (1) for improving the governance of tribal populated pockets in States/UTs; (d) Funds through Central sector schemes and Centrally Sponsored Schemes; and (e) Institutional Finance (National Scheduled Castes Finance Development Corporation and National Scheduled Tribes Development Finance Corporation).

The SCA gave thrust to the development programmes relevant for economic development of SCs and to open up more avenues for their excellence in high-end income generating activities, capacity building programmes. It is being implemented in 27 States/Union Territories. The SCA to TSP is provided by the Ministry of Tribal Affairs since the 5th Five Year Plan as an additive to State/U.T Plan to 21 States and 2 U.Ts which are implementing TSP for supporting the tribal population below the poverty line (BPL). Grants under Article 275(1) of the Constitution are also being provided to all the 21 TSP states and 4 tribal majority states as additional Central Assistance for the promotion of welfare of STs and for raising the level of administration of Scheduled Areas at par with the rest of the state.

The information on fund flow for SCSP and TSP, provided by most of the state governments cover only the State Plan Schemes, and not the Central Plan Schemes (CPS) or Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSS). At present, CPS and CSS account for a major share of total plan expenditure in the states. Hence, a lot more attention needs to be paid to the availability and reliability of relevant information on budget outlays for the benefit of SCs and STs in the Union Budget papers.

There are two major sources of information in the Union Budget for capturing the expenditure on SCs and STs. These include - (a) Budget Statement 21 (Schemes for Development of SCs) and 21 A (Schemes for Development of STs) provided in the Expenditure Budget Volume I and (b) Detailed Demand for Grants of ministries and departments. The latter document provides data /information on allocation/ expenditure for SCs and STs in the six tier accounting system (Major Head, Sub Major Head, Minor Head, Sub Minor Head, Object Head and Detailed Head) with actual, revised and the current year's figures.

2.2. Assessing the Plan Allocation through Budget Statement

Until 2005-06, there was no reporting in the budget papers on total expenditure/allocation incurred for SCs and STs by the Union government. Hence, it was not easy to get the total quantum of funds allocated for these sections of the population in the budget papers. Besides, the budget papers did not have the distinction between "incidental" benefits and "direct" policy-driven benefits

given for disadvantaged sections. Realising the need for a budget statement to show the quantum of funds earmarked for SCs and STs by Union ministries/departments, the government introduced Statement 21 in 2005-06 on *Schemes for Development of Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes which reflects the allocation for SCSP and TSP by the ministries and departments*. The statement consists of two parts. Part 'A' details schemes in which there is 100 percent provision for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and Part 'B' reflects schemes where at least 20 percent of the allocation is earmarked for SCs and STs. However, what was missing from Statement 21 was the disaggregated data for SCs and STs. Therefore, it was impossible to gauge total plan allocation earmarked for SCs and STs Separately.

2.2.1 Combined Plan Allocation Earmarked for SCs for STs from the Union Budget

Here, we refer to the Statement 21 of the Union government from 2004-05 to 2010-11 to assess the total allocations earmarked for SCs and STs who together account for roughly 24 percent of the total population. During the period from 2004-05 to 2010-11, the allocations mentioned in the Statement were not disaggregated for SCs and STs. The following table reveals that in 2004-05, the aggregate plan allocation for SCs and STs was just 7 percent for the combined population of SCs and STs. Although the allocation increased in 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08, it declined in 2008-09. Overall, the allocation has shown a fluctuating trend with the share of SCs and STs not exceeding 11.53 percent in 2010-11, which is below the half-way mark as chalked out by in the SCSP and TSP guidelines.

Table 2.1: An Analysis of Statement 21 from 2005-06 to 2010-11

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
A. Total Plan Allocation earmarked for SCs and STs from Union Budget (in Rs. Crore)	5993.18	10823.93	14095.94	19875.81	23952.96	25140.87	32771.75
B. Total Plan Allocation of Union Govt. (excluding Central Assistance to State & UT Plans) (in Rs. Crore)	85061	109900	129804	152313	208252	233919	284284
A% of B	7.05	9.85	10.86	13.05	11.50	10.75	11.53

Source: Compiled by CBGA from Statement 21, Expenditure Budget Volume I, Union Budget, GoI, Various Years.

Note: the figures from 2004-05 to 2009-10 are Revised Estimate & the figure for 2010-11 is Budget Estimate.

2.2 Segregating the Plan allocation on SCs and STs from Statement 21

As stated above, Statement 21 in the Union Budget does not segregate the funds earmarked for SCs and those for STs separately, which is problematic especially in Part B of this Statement. Hence, to assess the quantum of plan funds earmarked for SCs and STs separately since 2004-05 to 2010-11, with regard to the schemes in Part B of this Statement, we assume that two-third of total funds earmarked are for SCs and the remaining one-third for STs.

Table 2.2 presents the quantum of funds allocated by the ministries/departments for SCs. It shows that allocation of funds for SCs increased gradually over the years up to 2007-08 (RE), after which it declined in the next two budgets. It crossed the halfway mark of the SCSP norm of 16 percent only once in 2007-08 (RE). So, it is clear that the allocation under SCSP has not achieved even the halfway mark of what was promised by the Planning Commission 30 years ago.

Table 2.2: Plan Allocations Earmarked for SCs in the Union Budget (2004-05 to 2010-11)

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
A. Total Plan Allocation earmarked for SCs (in Rs. crore)	3611.2	6578.6	8473.9	12367.8	14727	14623.5	20466.13
B. Total Plan Allocation of Union Govt. (excluding Central Assistance to State & UT Plans) (in Rs. Crore)	85061	109900	129804	152313	208252	233919	284284
A % of B	4.25	5.99	6.53	8.12	7.07	6.25	7.19

Source: Compiled by CBGA from Statement 21, Expenditure Budget Volume I, Union Budget, GoI, Various Years

Note: the figures from 2004-05 to 2009-10 are Revised Estimate & the figure for 2010-11 is Budget Estimate

Table 2.3 shows the proportion of total Plan Outlay of the Union government earmarked for STs, which increased from 2004-05 (RE) to 2007-08 (RE) but declined during 2008-09 (RE) and 2009-10 (RE). This was inadequate considering the proportion of STs in the total population of the country (roughly 8 percent).

Table 2.3: Plan Allocations Earmarked for STs in the Union Budget (2004-05 to 2010-11)

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
A.Total Plan Allocation earmarked for STs (in Rs. Crore)	2382	4175.5	5564.9	7447	8771	8600.63	12226
B. Total Plan Allocation of Union Govt. (excluding Central Assistance to State & UT Plans) (in Rs. Crore)	85061	109900	129804	152313	208252	233919	284284
A as % of B	2.8	3.8	4.29	4.89	4.21	3.67	4.3

Source: Compiled by CBGA from Statement 21, Expenditure Budget Volume I, Union Budget, GoI, Various Years

Note: the figures from 2004-05 to 2009-10 are Revised Estimate & the figure for 2010-11 is Budget Estimate.

2.3 Assessing the Implementation of SCSP and TSP Post Jadhav Task Force recommendations

In Union Budget 2011-12, the government introduced two separate budget statements - Statement 21 and 21 A for SCs and STs respectively. This was a long overdue demand by the civil society organisations. The Jadhav Task Force also promised to fulfil the demand of 16 percent and 8 percent allocation for SC and STs through its revised guidelines. The following two tables assess the progress made on the recommendations of the Task Force (For main recommendations, refer to Box below).

Box 2.2: Key Recommendations of Jadhav Task Force

- No obligation for 43 ministries and departments to implement SCSP and 40 ministries and departments to implement TSP.
- Provide Plan allocation for SCs and STs in proportion to their population.
- Show earmarked allocations for SCs and STs in Minor heads 789 and 796 respectively from 2011-12 budget

2.3.3A Assessment of Fund Allocation for SCs through Statement 21

Table 2.4 looks at the implementation of SCSP with regard to Union Budget 2011-12 outlays for SCs. As per the recommendation of Jadhav Task Force, barring 43 ministries/departments, all ministries/departments have to allocate plan funds in proportion to SC population. These 43 ministries and departments have been kept outside the preview of SCSP on the grounds of their

engagement in regulation, policy making, involvement in scientific research, and implementing the infrastructure projects where benefits for SCs are not quantifiable.

An analysis of Union Budget 2011-12 reveals that of the 105 Union departments and ministries, only 24 have allocated funds under SCSP. The recommended percentage of allocation for SCSP has not been fulfilled even in Union Budget 2011-12. The table shows that the allocation under SCSP is only 9 percent of the total plan allocation.

Table 2.4: Plan Allocations Earmarked for SCs in Union Budget 2011-12

	2010-11 BE	2010-11 RE	2011-12 BE
A. Total Plan Allocation earmarked for SCs(in Rs.cr)	23795.61	23153.19	30551
B. Total Plan Allocation of Union Govt. (excluding Central Assistance to State & UT Plans) (in Rs Crore)	284284	302500	340255
A as % of B	8.37	7.65	8.98

Source: Compiled by CBGA from Statement 21, Vol- 1 from Union Budget 2011-12

2.3.2B Assessment of Fund Allocation for STs through Statement 21 A

As far as implementation of TSP with regard to Union Budget 2011-12 outlays is concerned (Table 2.5), only 27 of the 105 department have allocated funds as per the provision of the Task Force on TSP. The Task Force again cites the problem of indivisibility of funds as the primary reason for other departments and ministries failing to allocate funds under TSP.

Table 2.5 shows the allocations earmarked for the STs in Union Budget 2011-12. In 2010-11 (BE) and 2010-11 (RE) the allocation was just 3 percent of the total budgetary outlay. The Task Force on TSP, 2010 recommended that the allocation should be around 8 percent in 2011-12. An assessment of Statement 21 A, however, shows that it is just 5 percent.

Table 2.5: Plan Allocations Earmarked for STs in the Union Budget 2011-12

	2010-11 BE	2010-11 RE	2011-12 BE
A. Total Plan Allocation earmarked for STs (in Rs. Crore)	8989.91	9221.31	18436.15*
B. Total Plan Allocation of Union Govt. (excluding Central Assistance to State & UT Plans) (in Rs. Crore)	284284	302500	340255
A as % of B	3.16	3.05	5.42

Source: Compiled by CBGA from Statement 21, Expenditure Budget of Vol-1 of Union Budget, 2011-12

* The Statement 21A shows Rs. 17371.35 crore as total plan allocation for STs While summing up all 27 entries from ministries and department in the above mentioned table we find Rs. 18,436.15 crore, so there is a difference of Rs 1064.8 crore.

2.3. Assessing the Plan Allocation through Detailed Demands for Grants

From the above analysis of budget statements, it is clearly evident that the government was not able to allocate the plan funds at the desired level. The Detailed Demands for Grants (DDGs) is another set of documents which gives the details about allocation/ expenditure on SCs and STs in the Union Budget. The SCSP and TSP guidelines state that the plan allocation made for SCs and STs must be reflected in relevant major and minor heads in DDGs i.e., 789 for SCs and 796 for STs. The allocation for SCs and STs under different major and minor heads (2225, 4225, 6225, 3601, 3602 and 789 & 796) in ministries and departments has been captured for the analysis. Thereafter, the allocation captured from DDGs was kept aside separately for SCs and STs thorough the functional major head and minor head relevant for each of them. The Ministry of Labour and Employment has allocated plan fund for SCs and STs under the Major Head 2225 without opening Minor Head 789 & 796. In this process, we have taken the proportion of SCs and STs in total population of the country (i.e. 16.2 % for SCs and 8.2 % for STs) to segregate the allocation for them.

Table 2.6 enumerates the quantum and percentage share of combined plan resources for SCs and STs through analysis of DDGs of 2009-10 and 2009-11. The table shows that budgetary allocation for SCs and STs as proportion of total plan allocation was found to be as low as 2.54 percent, 2.36 percent and 2.45 percent in 2008-09 (BE), 2009-10 (BE) and 2010-11 (BE) respectively. Further, when .the RE figures of 2008-09 and 2009-10 are looked at, there has been a decline in the allocation from BE figures. If the AE figure of 2008-09 with BE is compared, it shows that the percentage share of allocation in total allocation has declined from 2.54 percent to 1.91 percent. From this analysis, it is clear that the government was unable to utilise even the small amount it had allocated for SCs and STs.

Table 2.6: Analysis of Plan Allocation through Detailed Demand for Grants (2008-09 to 2010-11)

	2008-09 (BE)	2008-09 (RE)	2008-09 (AE)	2009-10 (BE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
Total Plan Allocation in DDGs (in Rs. Crore)	4563.573	4254.059	3987.859	5655.618	4197.532	6961.4276
Total Plan Allocation of Union Govt. [excluding Central Assistance to State & UT Plans] (in Rs. Crore)	179951	204128	208252	239840	233919	284284
Total Percentage share for SCs and STs in total allocation	2.54	2.08	1.91	2.36	1.79	2.45

Source: DDGs, Various Years

Table 2.7 assesses the quantum of plan resources for SCs through analysis of DDGs of 2009-10 and 2010-11. It shows that budgetary allocation for SCs in proportion of total plan allocation was found to be a mere 1.10 percent, 0.84 percent and 1.28 percent in 2008-09 (BE), 2009-10 (BE) and 2010-11 respectively. The table also shows that the actual utilisation of funds in 2008-09 declined to 0.91 percent from 1.10 from BE for the same year. Therefore, the government has neither been able to allocate the desired amount of funds for SCs nor utilise it properly.

Table 2.7: Proportion of Funds Allocated for the Scheduled Castes (2008-09 to 2010-11)

	2008-09 (BE)	2008-09 (RE)	2008-09 (AE)	2009-10 (BE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
A. Total Plan Allocation earmarked for SCs (in Rs. Crore)	2267.42	2151.23	2013.32	2304.59	2115.46	3643.88
B. Total Plan Allocation of Union Govt. (excluding Central Assistance to State & UT Plans) (in Rs. Crore)	179951	204128	208252	239840	233919	284284
A as % of B	1.26	1.05	0.97	0.96	0.90	1.28

Source: Detailed Demand for Grants of Union Government, 2009-10; Expenditure Budget Vol.1, 2009-10 & 2010-11

Table 2.8 shows that reporting of plan allocation for STs in DDGs has been better than SCs. This has been due to allocations made to UTs by different line ministries via the Ministry of Home Affairs through Minor Head 796. However, the budgetary allocation for STs in proportion of total plan allocation was also found to be as low as 1.25 percent, 1.4 percent and 1.2 percent in 2008-09 (BE), 2009-10 (BE) and 2010-11 respectively. Further, looking at the figures of 2008-09 (RE), 2008-09 (AE) and 2009-10 (RE) in the table, there is a decline in the percentage share as compared with 2008-09 (BE) and 2009-10 (BE). It can be inferred that despite meagre allocations for STs, the government was not able to utilise the funds effectively.

Table 2.8: Proportion of Funds Allocated for Scheduled Tribes (2008-09 to 2010-11)

	2008-09 (BE)	2008-09 (RE)	2008-09 (AE)	2009-10 (BE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
A. Plan Allocation earmarked for STs (in Rs. Crore)	2241.63	2098.81	1974.54	3294.02	2082.08	3317.54
B. Total Plan Outlay of Union Govt. [excluding Central Assistance to State & UT Plans] (in Rs. Crore)	179951	204128	208252	239840	233919	284284
A as % of B	1.25	1.03	0.95	1.37	0.89	1.17

Source: Detailed Demand for Grants of Union Government, 2009-10; Expenditure Budget Vol.1, 2009-10 & 2010-11

Before 2011-12, the analysis of Statement 21 on schemes for welfare of SCs and STs shows that out of 105, only 17 ministries/departments were allocating funds for SCs, whereas, the analysis of DDGs of 2009-10 and 2009-11 shows that budgetary allocation has been made only under 4 ministries - Ministry of Labour and Employment, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Ministry of Home Affairs and Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME). Moreover, at the Union government level, there has been uneven allocation of funds for SCs across ministries and departments in terms of percentage share. The table 2.9 reveals that the Ministry of Social Justice and Employment shares around 90 percent of the total allocation among ministries and departments reporting the expenditure on SCs in DDGs.

Table 2.9: Department-wise Plan Allocation for Scheduled Castes (2007-08 to 2010-11)

Name of the Department	2007-08 (AE)	2008-09 (BE)	2008-09 (RE)	2008-09 (AE)	2009-10 (BE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
Ministry of Labour and Employment	191.47 (9.05)	227.63 (10.02)	105.99 (4.92)	0.72 (0.04)	165.56 (7.16)	0.00 (1.21)	3.95 (0.11)
Ministry of Social Justice and Employment	1922.87 (90.90)	2043.25 (89.93)	2048.2 (95.03)	1805.90 (89.70)	2145 (92.79)	1925.45 (91.13)	3341 (91.69)
Chandigarh(Home Ministry)	0.97 (0.05)	0.94 (0.04)	0.94 (0.04)	1.01 (0.05)	0.93 (0.04)	0.93 (0.04)	0.83 (0.02)
Daman and Diu(Home Ministry)	0.06 (0.00)	0.1 (0.00)	0.1 (0.00)	0	0.1 (0.00)	0	0
Micro, Small & medium enterprises	0	0	0	205.70 (10.21)	0	186.53 (8.83)	298.1 (8.18)
Total Plan Allocation of SCs	2115.39 (100)	2271.92 (100)	2155.23 (100)	2013.32 (100)	2311.59 (100)	2112.91 (100)	3643.88 (100)

Source: Detailed Demand for Grants of Union Government, 2010-11&2009-10

* The allocation for Chadigarh is reported in the DDGs of Ministry of Home Affairs

The analysis of Detailed Demand for Grants (DDGs) of 2009-10 and 2010-11 shows that budgetary allocations for STs have been made under the four Union Ministries of Labour and Employment, Tribal Affairs, Home Affairs (Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu), and Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises besides the Department of Food and Public Distribution. Moreover, based on the analysis of DDGs, there has been a very uneven allocation of funds for STs across ministries and departments at the Union government level, in terms of percentage share. The table reflects that the percentage shares of allocation by the Ministry of Tribal Affairs ranges from 91 percent to 95 percent of the total allocation among ministries and departments reporting the expenditure on STs in DDGs. The ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises comes after Ministry of Tribal Affairs in terms of fund allocation for STs.

Table 2.10: Department-wise Plan Allocation for Scheduled Tribes (2007-08 to 2010-11)

	2007-08 (AE)	2008-09 (BE)	2008-09 (RE)	2008-09 (AE)	2009-10 (BE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
Ministry of Labour and Employment	95.74 (5.76)	113.82 (4.97)	52.99 (2.52)	0.36 (0.18)	82.78 (2.48)	1.27 (0.06)	1.98 (0.06)
Ministry of Tribal Affairs	1523.76 (91.71)	2119.5 (92.49)	1969.5 (93.84)	1805.21 (91.42)	3204 (95.81)	1944.05 (93.37)	3112.01 (93.80)
Andaman and Nicobar Islands(Home Ministry)	40.27 (2.42)	56.68 (2.47)	74.68 (3.56)	61.79 (3.13)	55.31 (1.65)	36.97 (1.78)	43.41 (1.31)
Dadra and Nagar Haveli(Home Ministry)	0.70 (0.04)	0.7 (0.03)	0.7 (0.03)	0.64 (0.032)	0.9 (0.03)	0.84 (0.04)	0.84 (0.02)
Daman and Diu(Home Ministry)	1.03 (0.06)	0.95 (0.04)	0.95 (0.05)	1.94 (0.09)	1.04 (0.03)	2.22 (0.11)	2.57 (0.08)
Micro, small & medium enterprises	0	0	0	103.58 (5.25)	0	96.72 (4.65)	156.74 (4.72)
Food and public distribution	0	0	0	1.02 (0.05)	0	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
Total allocation for STs	1661.50 (100)	2291.65 (100)	2098.83 (100)	1974.54 (100)	3344.09 (100)	2082.08 (100)	3317.54 (100)

Source: Detailed Demand for Grants of Union Government, 2009-10 and 2010-11

*The allocation for these Union Territories is reported in the DDGs of Ministry of Home Affairs

Table 2.11 assesses the department-wise share for SCs in total allocation. It shows that only the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment shares largest part of allocation in total allocation among the ministries/departments (mentioned below) from 2008-09 to 2010-11. Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises and Ministry of Labour and Employment have insignificant proportions in the total allocation. Thus, from the table it can be inferred that except for the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, other ministries are not showing interest in allocating the funds for SCs.

Table 2.11: Department-wise Share of Allocation for SCs in Total Plan Outlay (%)

Demand No./Name of the Department	2008-09 (BE)	2008-09 (RE)	2008-09 (AE)	2009-10 (BE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
Labour and Employment	0.12	0.05	0.0003	0.07	0.001	0.001
Chandigarh	.0005	0.0004	0.0004	.0004	0.0004	0.0003
Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises	0	0	0.09	0	0.079	0.104
Social Justice and Empowerment	0.97	(0.85)	0.87	0.77	0.82	1.17

Total Plan Allocation of Union Govt. (excluding Central Assistance to State & UT Plans)	179951 (100)	204128 (100)	208252 (100)	239840 (100)	233919 (100)	284284 (100)
---	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Source: Detailed Demand for Grants of Union Government, 2010-11&2009-10

*The allocation for Chadigarh is reported in the DDGs of Ministry of Home Affairs

Table 2.12 shows department-wise share for STs in total allocation. The table indicates that only the Ministry of Tribal Affairs is allocating substantial amount of funds as a proportion of the total allocation from 2008-09 to 2010-11. Again, the Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises, Ministry of Labour and Employment and UTs have been allocating minuscule amounts of funds.

Table 2.12: Department-wise Share of Allocation for STs in Total Plan Outlay (%)

	2008-09 (BE)	2008-09 (RE)	2008-09 (AE)	2009-10 (BE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
Ministry of Labour and Employment	0.06	0.02	0.0001	0.03	0.0005	0.0006
Ministry of Tribal Affairs	1.15	0.96	0.9	1.32	0.83	1.09
Andaman and Nicobar*						
Islands	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01
Dadra and Nagar Haveli*	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003
Daman and Diu*	0.0005	0.0005	0.0009	0.0005	0.0009	0.0009
Micro, small & medium enterprises	0	0	0.05	0	0.04	0.05
Food and public distribution	0	0	0.0004	0	0	0
Total Plan Allocation of Union Govt. (excluding Central Assistance to State & UT Plans)	179951 (100)	204128 (100)	208252 (100)	239840 (100)	233919 (100)	284284 (100)

Source: Detailed Demand for Grants of Union Government; Expenditure Budget Vol.1, 2010-11&2009-10

*The allocation for these Union Territories is reported in the DDGs of Ministry of Home Affairs

Further, the guidelines of SCSP and TSP stipulate that the allocations for SCs and ST in the Union Budget by ministries and departments must be reported in the Minor Heads 789 and 796. The analysis of the Major Heads and Minor Heads for SCs and STs in the Union Budget DDGs shows an interesting picture. The Major Heads include - 2225, 4225, and 6225, 2552, 4552, 6552, 3601, 3602 and minor heads are 789 and 796. The Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Ministry of Tribal Affairs and Ministry of Minority Affairs come under major head 2225.

Analysis of DDGs 2009-10 and 2010-11 reveals that a sizeable chunk of allocations for SCs and STs is shown under major heads 3601 and 2225 which are dedicated major heads for Grants-in-Aid (GIAs) to states and Welfare of SCs/STs/OBCs and Minorities. Ministry of Social Justice and

Empowerment and Ministry of Tribal Affairs have provided large amount of funds in the form of GIAs to state governments in several schemes. The GIAs were given to states to prepare projects and plans for SCs and STs as per the locally felt needs. While, under SCSP (minor head 789), no fund allocation was reported in 2008-09 and 2009-10, only 9.5 percent of the total outlay is shown in 2010-11.

Table 2.13 reveals that fund allocation is being reported in TSP since 2008-09; though it shows fluctuation over the years. In 2010-11, 2.8 percent of the total outlay was made for STs through minor head 796. Most of the plan fund captured through 796 comes from the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises and Union Territories (Andaman Nicobar and Daman Diu) through the Ministry of Home Affairs. Around 12 ministries and departments are routing funds to these UTs through the Home Ministry. While minor head 789 gets plan allocation from the Union ministries of Social Justice and Empowerment, and Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, MSME is allocating funds separately under 789 and 796. Further, the ministry of Food and Public Distribution is allocating funds for STs under the minor head 800-other expenditure. From this analysis, it can be surmised that the guidelines of SCSP and TSP were not adhered to route the plan funds through 789 and 796 and to stop the diversion of funds of SCs and STs for other purposes.

Table 2.13: Resource Allocation under 2225, 4225, 3601, 2552, 789,796 from DDGs

Major Head/Minor Head	Functions / Sub - Functions	Resource Allocation for SCs and STs (amount in Crore and % share in Bracket)		
		2008	2009	2010
2225	Welfare of SCs/STs/OBCs and Minorities	489.34 (10.7)	457.01 (8.1)	202.4 (3)
4225+6225	Capital and loans for welfare of SCs,STs,OBCs and Minorities	176.19 (3.9)	176.19 (3.1)	70.6 (1.01)
2552+4552+6552	Revenue, Capital outlay and loans for North Eastern Areas	135.5 (2.9)	147 (2.6)	103.6 (1.5)
3601	Grants-in-aid to State governments	3695.4 (81)	4808.82 (85)	5709.8 (82)
3602	Grants-in-aid to Union Territory	9.8 (0.2)	10.61 (0.2)	7.6 (0.1)
789	Welfare of SCs	0	0	667.6 (9.5)
796	Welfare of STs	57.3 (1.3)	56 (1)	199.72 (2.8)
Total		4563.6 (100)	5655.6 (100)	6961.4 (100)

Source: Compiled from DDGs, 2009-10, 2010-11 (BE figures), percentage in bracket

2.4. Assessing the Government's Response to the Recommendations of Jadhav Task Force

The analysis of DDGs for 2009-10 and 2010-11 has shown that old guidelines (Refer to Box 1) was not adhered by the Union Government ministries/departments in terms of allocation of plan fund and operationalisation of minor heads 789 and 796. As mentioned above, the Jadhav Task Force recommended substantial reforms in the implementation of SCSP/TSP from 2011-12. In this regard, it categorised the Central ministries/departments into 4 categories in terms of fund allocation. Further, the Task Force recommended that the allocation made for SCs and STs would reflect in the minor heads concerned relating to SCSP and TSP in DDGs of ministries/departments by opening 789 and 796 codes. The Task Force has attempted to categorise 105 ministries and departments into four parts to ensure 16 percent and 8 percent plan allocation for SCs and STs in total plan allocation respectively.

Category 1: There are 40-43 ministries which have no obligation to earmark money under SC/ST sub-plans respectively due to their nature of engagement in regulatory functions, basic scientific research, and large infrastructure projects whose benefits to SCs/STs may be difficult to quantify. The important excluded ministries and departments are Home Affairs, External Affairs, Law and Justice, Civil Aviation, Economic Affairs, Coal and Pharmaceuticals.

Category 2: There are 10 ministries/departments under SCSP and 13 ministries/departments for TSP which implement beneficiary-oriented schemes and have to earmark less than 15 percent of their total plan outlays. It includes Power, Textiles, MSME, Information Technology, Commerce, Science and Technology, Environment & Forest, Ayurveda, Yoga and Naturopathy, Unani, Siddha and Homoeopathy (AYUSH), and so on.

Category 3: There are 9 ministries under SCSP and 10 Ministries for TSP which are in the primary sector and have to earmark between 15 to 16.2 percent of Total Plan outlays. These include Labour and Employment, Panchayat Raj, Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Health and Family Welfare, Higher Education, Land Resources and Youth Affairs and Sports among others.

Category 4: This category includes 6 ministries under SCSP and 5 ministries under TSP that have to allocate more than 16.2 percent of the Plan outlays. This includes Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment, Women and Child Development, Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Rural Development, Drinking Water Supply, School Education and Literacy and others.

Further, apart from the categorisation of Central ministries/departments, the Task Force has for the first time categorised the Central Plan Assistance (CPA) to States and UTs into two categories, namely (I) transfer to state and UTs through Demands for Grants of ministries/departments (II) transfer to states and UTs through Demand No. 35 of the Ministry of Finance. So far, the CPA had been kept out of the preview of SCSP and TSP in terms of plan allocation and implementation.

The Task Force felt that CPA, as reflected in Statement 16 of the Expenditure Budget (Volume I), should apply to at least (1) Accelerated Irrigation Benefit Programme (AIBP) and other Water Resources Programmes (2) Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (3) National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP) including Annapurna Yojana (4) Backward Regions Grant Fund

(BRGF) – State and District Components (5) MPs Local Area Development (MPLAD) Scheme (6) Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana.

Some Key Concerns with regard to the Task Force Recommendations

Overall, the constitution of the task force and its recommendations is a welcome step in terms of strengthening the implementation of SCSP and TSP. But it has raised a major cause of concern by placing 43 ministries/departments under a no obligation category. The scrutiny of plan size allocation of these 43 ministries/departments for 2010-11 shows that the plan size of at least 12 ministries/departments ranges from Rs. 1,200 to Rs. 18,000 crore. Under these 43 ministries/departments, there is enough scope to create some exclusive schemes for development of SCs and STs. Besides, the percentage share of allocation determined by the task force under SCSP and TSP under three remaining categories, as mentioned above, is not adequate to address the given development deficit of SCs and STs. Ministries like MSME, Commerce, Information Technology and Science and Technology falling under category II, (which are very crucial for long term development of SCs and ST) have been directed to allocate less than 15 percent of the total fund under SCSP and TSP. Similarly, under other two categories (III & IV), allocations to be made between 15 to 16.2 percent and more than 16.2 percent respectively are also not adequate to address the given development deficit of SCs and STs.

Union Budget 2011-12

Statements 21 and 21 A and Detailed Demand for Grant of Union Budget 2011-12 have been examined in the light of the task force recommendations. The assessment reveals that there are still weaknesses on the part of the government in terms of perspective and sense of urgency to address the major gaps in SCSP and TSP implementation as recommended by the Jadhav Task Force.

Further, to verify the allocations in Statement 21 & 21 A, the DDGs for 2001-12 across ministries and departments have been assessed. **Firstly**, looking at DDGs of 22 ministries and departments, having minor heads 789 & 796 do not show the amount in the BE and RE columns of 2009-10. When we try to compare the allocation between Statement 21 and 21 A and DDGs for SCs and STs in Union Budget 2011-12 With regard to percentage share of allocation for SCs, Statement 21 and DDGs shows 7.65 percent and 0.17 percent in total allocation at RE respectively, while at BE figure it is 8.89 percent and 8.35 in statement 21 and DDGs. **Secondly**, in Statement 21, 24 ministries and departments have shown the allocation for SCs. The scrutiny of DDGs shows that the Department of Biotechnology and UTs of Chandigarh Department of Water and sanitation and Department of AIDS Control are not showing the allocation. Similarly, Statement 21 A for STs Shows that 26 ministries have allocated the plan fund, while in DDGs, the Ministry of Civil Aviation, Department of Biotechnology, Ministry of Water Resources have not allocated funds for STs. **Thirdly**, two separate Statement namely Statement 21 & 21 on schemes for development of SC and STs was brought out, a

minor heads 789 and 796 have been opened in most of the respective ministries and departments except Ministry of Civil Aviation, Department of Biotechnology, Ministry of Water Resources. **Fourthly**, with regard to targeting Central Plan Assistance (CPA) for SCs and STs, the schemes and programmes under Rashtriya Krishi Yojna are allocating the funds for SCSP and TSP as recommended by Central plan assistance like Backward Region Grant Funds, Jawahar Urban Renewal Mission etc are not allocating the funds for SCs and STs.

Conclusion

The analysis of the Union Budgets from the lens of *dalits* and *adivasis* using Statements 21 and 21A and the Detailed Demands for Grants reveals several gaps in implementation of SCSP and TSP. Although the setting up of the Jadav Task Force and recommendations given by it are progressive steps and reflect some urgency on part of the government in addressing the deficits, a range of issues persist. Moreover, leaving out some of the mainstream ministries and putting no obligation at all on them to earmark funds for SCs and STs is a serious cause for concern. Much more concerted efforts are required by the government in order to strengthen the implementation of SCSP and TSP.

Chapter 3: Implementation of SCSP and TSP in Select Schemes: An Assessment

In the previous chapter SCSP and TSP funds earmarked for SCs and STs were examined and the amount placed under separate budget heads/sub-heads by each ministry/department for implementing the schemes and programmes. For this purpose, the ministries/departments showed minor heads – 789 for SCs and 796 for STs in the Detailed Demands for Grants below the functional major head/sub major head. The guidelines of SCSP and TSP also focus on the implementation mechanism relating to schemes and programmes. It mentions that proper and appropriate developmental programmes/schemes/activities should also be designed specifically for the overall development of SCs and STs within the existing general programmes and by conceiving new avenues/programmes. The guideline also says that outlays may be targeted for area-oriented schemes which are directly benefiting SCs and STs hamlets, villages and pockets having a majority of population of them.

The present chapter tries to assess a few Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSS) related to rural housing, education, health, child development and urban development in the light of SCSP and TSP guidelines. The objective of the analysis is to substantiate the evidence gathered on the total quantum and magnitude of plan allocation for SCs and STs in the Union Budget from *Statements 21 and 21 A* and *Detailed Demand for Grants*. The guidelines of some select schemes have been reviewed from the perspective of SCs and STs along with analysis of fund allocation and beneficiary data on SCs and STs in the respective schemes. Overall, the chapter tries to examine whether these programmes have really been able to address the development deficits of SCs and STs through the schemes.

1. INDIRA AWAS YOJANA (IAY)

The main objective of IAY is to provide houses to the people living below the poverty line in rural areas. It is a CSS, implemented by the Ministry of Rural Development with the help of the Department of Rural Development in the states and District Rural Development Agency (DRDA)/Zilla Parishad in the districts. The funds under the scheme are shared between the Centre and the states in the ratio of 75:25. However, the fund share between the Centre and North Eastern states are in the ratio of 90:10. In case of Union Territories, 100 percent assistance is provided by the Central government.

The financial assistance is provided to shelterless rural Below Poverty Line (BPL) households, for construction of their dwelling units. In terms of unit costs, financial assistance of Rs. 45, 000 for plain areas and Rs. 48,000 for hilly areas is provided. The criteria for allocation of financial and

physical targets to states are based on 75:25 weightage to housing shortage and poverty ratio respectively. For districts, it is 75:25 weightage to housing shortage and rural SC/ST population respectively.

Provision for Marginalised Sections of the Population

With regard to provision for SCs and STs in the scheme, at least 40 percent and 20 percent of the total funds and physical targets under IAY are required to be utilised for construction of houses for SC and ST BPL families respectively. Similarly, 3 percent of IAY funds are meant for physically and mentally challenged persons. Since 2006-07, 15 percent of funds are being earmarked for minorities also. Dwelling units are to be allotted preferably in the name of a female member of the beneficiary household

Budgetary Allocation

Regarding the performance of IAY (as shown in Table 3.1), overall fund utilisation under the scheme has been poor. Utilisation figures for IAY show that the scheme has been unable to meet its physical targets due to non-utilisation of available financial resources. The table also shows that in 2007-08, the completion rate of houses was just 31 percent; though it improved in 2008-09 and 2009.

Table 3.1: A Review of Overall Performance under IAY

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10*
Total Available Fund (in Rs. Crore)	6527.17	12308.28	12308.28
Expenditure (in Rs. Crore)	5464.54	8348.34	8554.47
<i>Percentage of Utilisation</i>	<i>83.72</i>	<i>57.35</i>	<i>69.5</i>
Total Target (Units in lakh)	21.27	21.27	40.52
Houses Constructed (Units in lakh)	6.64	17.90	27.21
<i>Percentage of completion</i>	<i>31.24</i>	<i>84.18</i>	<i>67.15</i>

*Data up to February, 2009-10

Source: Compiled by CBGA from Ministry of Rural Development, Govt. of India. Demand for Grants, 2010-11, Lok Sabha Secretariat

The Mid-Term Appraisal Report of the 11th Five Year Plan reveals that the quality of housing (like sagging foundation, use of temporary materials for roofing or leaving the construction incomplete) remains a problem because of inadequate finances. Most of the houses remain without plastering or flooring. The main reason for poor quality of houses is cited as dearth of technical expertise among the beneficiaries and low unit costs.

Table 3.2 presents the percentage share of houses for SCs and STs in total sanctioned houses in IAY in the five states as well as at the all-India level during 2009-10. As the guidelines of IAY states, it would provide 40 percent and 20 percent of the total houses for SCs and STs respectively at the all-India level, while in the states, it would be contingent on the housing shortage and poverty ratio. At the all-India level, SCs and STs have been allotted 39 percent and 19 percent of houses respectively. The table reflects that the government has almost achieved the desired target in sanctioning the houses to SCs and STs.

Table 3.2: Physical Performance under IAY for SCs and STs during 2009-10

States	Total Houses Sanctioned (Unit)	Houses Sanctioned for SCs (Unit)	% of SCs in Total Houses Sanctioned	Houses Sanctioned for STs (Unit)	% of STs in Total Houses Sanctioned
Bihar	955806	481040	50.33	31758	3.32
MP	108234	27441	25.35	39115	36.14
Odisha	237649	77923	32.79	65659	27.63
Rajasthan	94820	38491	40.59	17933	18.91
UP	473705	271141	57.24	1705	0.36
All India	4238474	1649841	38.93	772809	18.23

Source: Compiled by CBGA from Bharat Nirman website

Table 3.3 shows the fund utilisation for SCs and STs in IAY in the five states as well as at the all-India level during 2009-10. As mentioned earlier, IAY would utilise 40 percent and 20 percent of the total fund for SC and STs at the all-India level, while in the states it would vary as per the housing shortage and poverty ratio respectively. At the all-India level, the fund utilisation for SCs and STs has been 32 percent and 15 percent respectively while the national average is 81 percent. The table indicates that the government was unable to achieve the desired target of fund utilisation for SCs and STs,.

Table 3.3: Financial Performance under IAY for SCs and STs during 2009-10

States	Total Available fund (in Rs. Crore)	Total Expenditure on SCs (in Rs. Crore)	% of utilization for SCs	Total expenditure on STs (in Rs. Crore)	% of utilization for STs	Total Expenditure (in Rs. Crore)	% of utilization in Total Expenditure
Bihar	4355	1532	35.18	93	2.12	2995	68.78
MP	354	91	25.74	117	33.03	341	95.93
Odisha	1159	249	21.52	223	19.21	769	66.36
Rajasthan	347	132	38.31	53	15.19	298	86.02
UP	2018	910	45.14	727	0.36	1587	78.64
All India	16352	520278.7	31.82	2431	14.86	13325	81.49

Source: Compiled from Bharat Nirman website

With regard to reporting of the expenditure for SCs and STs in the Union Budget papers, the plan allocation for SCs and STs was being shown in Statement 21 since 2005-06. Later on, two newly introduced Budget Statements 21 and 21 A and also DDGs have reported the expenditure separately for them in 2011-12. Prior to 2011-12, these allocations were not shown in the minor head 789 and 796 in the DDGs of Ministry of Rural Development. From the above analysis, it is found that somehow IAY has tried to cover SCs and STs in its scheme design and budgetary provision and physical allocation.

2. SARVA SHIKSHA ABHIYAN (SSA)

SSA is one of the largest social sector programmes for universalisation of elementary education. Its guidelines envisage universal access and retention, bridging of gender and social category gaps in elementary education and also achieving significant enhancement in the learning levels of children. The scheme covers all states and UTs and reaches out to an estimated 19.4 crore children in 12.3 lakh habitations in the country.

Provision for Marginalised Sections of the Population

One of the main objectives of SSA is to give special focus to the education of children from SCs and STs to bridge social category gaps. Given the social and economic backwardness of these sections, there is a need for special attention in the area of education for them. In order to make the education facilities more accessible and improve the educational development of this group, SSA has provided some specific interventions. The main provisions made for the education of SC/ST children are given as follows:

- Provision of up to Rs. 15 lakh per district per year for taking up innovative interventions for education of SC/ST children for better retention, attendance and learning levels.
- Schools to be set up within one kilometre of all un-served habitations.
- Provision of free text books.
- Hostel facilities in remote, sparsely populated areas.
- Special teaching support as per needs, with teacher's sensitisation programmes for promoting equitable learning opportunities.
- Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidhyalaya (KGBV) for girls in the upper primary level where minimum 75 percent seats are for SC/ST/OBC/Muslim girls.
- Additional funds for girls' education in educationally backward blocks under National Programme for Education of Girls at Elementary Level (NPEGEL) especially in SC/ST areas.

Besides, Special Focus Districts (SFDs) based on SC, ST and minority population have been selected to overcome infrastructural gaps and other disparities. In this respect, the government has identified 61 SC and 109 ST concentration districts to implement the provisions of SSA. The criteria for identified districts are based on indicators such as (a) number of out of school children, (b) gender gap, (c) infrastructure gap, (d) districts with low retention rates, and (e) concentration of SC/ST/ Minority population.

While assessing outcomes, there is still a gap inspite of several provisions in SSA made for the educational development of general, SC and ST populations. The findings of a study commissioned by the Ministry of Human Resource Development in 2009 shows that 81 lakh children are out of school in the age group of 6-14 even after 10 years of SSA implementation,. The Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER) at the upper primary level in 2007-08 was found to be quite low at 77.5 percent only. Moreover, among the different social groups, the estimated percentage of out of school children is reported as 5.20 percent for STs, 5.96 percent for SCs, 2.67 percent for OBCs and 4.6 percent for the girls. From available statistics, it can be concluded that the goal of bridging of social gaps in elementary education has not been achieved. The overall dropout rate of SC/ST student up to 2007-08 at the elementary and primary levels is much above the national average as evident from Table 3.4. The dropout rate at the elementary level is especially a cause for serious concern.

Table 3.4: Dropout rate during 2001-02 and 2007-08 (Figure in %)

	Primary Level		Elementary Level	
	2001-02	2007-08	2001-02	2007-08
SC	45.18	31.85	60.73	52.62
ST	52.34	32.23	69.52	63.36
National Level	39.03	25.55	54.65	43.03

Source: DISE data as cited in Department-Related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Human Resource Development, Department of School Education & Literacy (Ministry Of Human Resource Development) (Two Hundred Thirty Second Report), Rajya Sabha Secretariat New Delhi March, 2011

The department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Education (2011-12) observed in its report that it is difficult to explain the reasons for more than 50 and 60 per cent dropout for SCs and STs respectively at the elementary in 2007-08. The committee also felt that it required urgent corrective measures and special efforts not only in terms of financial allocation but also social mobilisation and bringing the psychological change in the SC and ST communities. It emphasised that there is a need for a sustained publicity campaign about the benefits of these interventions/schemes to be carried out through Involvement of panchayats, local community leaders and dedicated NGOs.

The 11th Five Year Plan document pledged to increase public spending on education to 6 percent of the GDP. The proposed outlay for in the 11th Five Year Plan was Rs. 71,000 crore and the Union Budget has allocated Rs. 79371 crore against the proposed outlay. The allocation of the fund for SSA comes to around 112 percent against the proposed outlay in the 11th Plan.

From the analysis of the budgetary provision, as seen in Statements 21 and 21 A in 2010-11 (RE) and 2011-12 (BE) in a few of the elementary education schemes like Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA), Mid-Day Meal Scheme and Scheme for setting up of 6000 Model Schools at Block level as Benchmark of Excellence, the allocation in SSA and Mid-Day Meal for SCs and STs has been in proportion with their population. In the Model School Scheme, the allocation for SCs is below their proportion of population but it is proportionate or more than proportionate to ST population.

Table 3.5: Analysis of Fund Flow targeted for SCs and STs in Key Schemes

Schemes	Total allocation (in Rs. Crore)		SCSP (in Rs. Crore)		% share of SCSP		TSP (in Rs. Crore)		%share of TSP	
	2010-11 RE	2011-12 BE	2010-11 RE	2011-12 BE	2010-11 RE	2011-12 BE	2010-11 RE	2011-12 BE	2010-11 RE	2011-12 BE
Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA)	19000	21000	3078	4200	16.2	20	2229	2247	11.7	10.7
Mid Day Meal Scheme	9440	10380	1529	2076	16.2	20	755	1111	8	10.7
Scheme for setting up of 6000 Model Schools at Block level	1500	2423.9	79.22	240	5.28	9.90	120	259	8	10.7

Source: Expenditure Budget Vol.1, 2011-12

Similarly, the analysis of minor head 789 & 796 of DDGs shows that allocation in SSA for SCs and STs does not match the figures mentioned in Statements 21 and 21 A. In case of SCSP, the allocation is less in DDGs than the Statement while the opposite is in case of TSP. The allocation for SCs and STs under MDMS is found almost equal in both the Statements and the DDGs. In the case of the Model School Scheme, the allocation made for SCs matches that of DDGs while the allocation in DDGs for TSP is less than what was mentioned in Statement 21.

Table 3.6: Comparing Allocations in Statement 21 & 21 A with DDGs in 2011-12 (in Rs. Crore)

Schemes	SCSP		TSP	
	Statement 21 2011-12 BE	DDGs 2011-12 BE	Statement 21 A 2011-12 BE	DDGs 2011-12 BE
SSA	4200	4022.22	2247	2424.79
Mid Day Meal Scheme	2076	2076	1111	1110.66
Scheme for setting up of 6000 Model Schools at Block level as Benchmark of Excellence	240	240	259	228.4

Source: Expenditure Budget Vol.1 and DDGs, 2011-12

3. Higher Education

The 11th Five Year Plan gave a major thrust to expansion and inclusion of the higher education system, to ensure improvement in quality throughout the system by initiating major institutional

and policy reforms. In this process, expansion in Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs), Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) and central universities was planned through opening new institutions and upgrading the existing ones. At the same time, the focus was also on taking concrete measures to improve the quality of higher education. In this regard, “inclusiveness” was a major concern. In order to make the higher education more inclusive, the government has started many new schemes such as Women’s Hostels, Model Colleges in Educationally Backward Districts and Education Loans and Interest Subsidies. Besides, it has made special provisions for reservation of seats for the disadvantaged sections (SCs, STs and OBCs) to ensure inclusiveness in the institutions of higher learning.

Provision for Marginalised Sections of the Population

University Grants Commission (UGC)

To improve inclusiveness in higher education, the University Grants Commission (UGC) is implementing a number of schemes to cater to the needs and constraints of students belonging to disadvantaged social groups as given below.

- a) Establishing Equal Opportunity Cells (EOCs) for SC s/STs/OBCs/Minorities.
- b) Opening Residential Coaching Academy for SCs/STs/Minorities and Women’s Universities and Colleges.
- c) Providing Post-Doctoral Fellowship for SC/ST students.
- d) Providing Post-Graduate Scholarships for SC/ST students in professional courses.
- e) Provision for Rajiv Gandhi National Fellowship for SC/ST students

The EOCs were started for learning and creating space for the deprived groups to bring them to the mainstream. Further, they have to run specific schemes of coaching for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, OBCs (non creamy layer) and Minorities in order to enhance their employability. A one-time grant of Rs. 2.00 lakh for establishing the office of EOCs is provided by UGC to 22 central universities, 89 state universities and 12 institutions deemed to be universities. UGC has assisted 118 universities including 23 central universities, 12 institutions deemed to be universities and 83 state universities, under the coaching schemes for disadvantaged sections of society. It has provided grants to the extent of Rs. 46.31 crore to 4 universities (3 central and 1 deemed university) for establishment of residential coaching academies for students from the minority community in 2009-10. {Departmentally-related Committee on Human Resource Development (HRD), 2010-11}

With regard to data reporting on beneficiaries, the Committee did not have the details of functioning status of Equal Opportunity Cells and the monitoring mechanism and status of Residential Coaching Academies for SCs and STs. As regards the Post-Doctoral Fellowship for SC/ST candidates, UGC has awarded 100, 91 and 100 fellowships in 2006- 07, 2007-08 and 2008-09 respectively.

The Departmentally-Related Standing Committee on HRD felt that the Department of Higher Education should furnish the requisite information on the beneficiary data. Further, an outcome assessment is necessary which has not yet been conducted by the UGC in the Coaching Schemes. Wide publicity through the print and electronic media at regular intervals and also at the university/college and local level is required to attract eligible students by the institution concerned, with adequate support from the UGC. Only then would the targeted beneficiaries be covered optimally.

IIMs and IITs

During the 11th Five Year Plan, the government promised setting up of 7 IIMs and 8 IITs to achieve 15 percent GER in higher education. With regard to the inclusiveness policy relating to IIMs and IITs, the scrutiny of schemes guidelines available on the website of Department of Higher Education does not give any details on special provisions for SCs and STs in IIMs and IITs except for reservation in admission. The Central Educational Institutions (Reservation Admission) Act, 2006, made special provisions for reservation of seats for the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Other Backwards Classes in admissions to central educational institutions. Apart from that, through the strategy of SCSP and TSP, plan fund allocation is being made for SCs and STs in IIMs and IITs but it is difficult to know where and how the money is being spent.

Data on SC and ST Beneficiaries

The higher education system in India covers more than 500 university level institutions and over 20,000 colleges, both publicly and privately funded. It caters to around 12.5 million students enrolled in the formal higher education system. To achieve 15 percent GER in the 11th Plan, the country recorded an increase of 13.1 percent in 2008-09 which was 6.6 percent in 2007-08 (UGC Annual Report, 2007-08 cited in the report of the Departmentally-Related Standing Committee HRD, 2011-12). The enrolment shares for SCs and STs in higher education is still lower in relation to their total population. The enrolment of SC and ST students as a percentage of total enrolment in higher education (Including Open University & Polytechnics) is 12 percent and 5 percent respectively. At the doctoral level, the enrolment share of SCs and STs is 11 percent and 4 percent respectively. Their enrolment in science courses both at the masters and bachelors' levels are also low. (Report to the People on Education, 2009-10, MHRD-2010)

The government's aim is to increase the GER to 25 percent by the end of the 2015-16 and to 30 percent by 2020. The GER in higher education in India is about half the world's average GER (24 percent), two thirds of that of developing countries (18 percent) and way behind that of developed countries (58 percent). To achieve this, the enrolments in universities/colleges need to be substantially raised at an annual rate of 8.9 percent to reach 21 million by 2011-12. This requires an additional enrolment of 870,000 students in universities and 6.13 million students in colleges (cited in the report of the Departmentally-Related Standing Committee on HRD, 2011-12)

Budgetary Provisions

The plan allocation for higher education shows that there has been a substantial increase in the plan allocation during the 11th Plan vis-à-vis the 10th Five Year Plan. As against a total allocation of Rs. 9,500 crore during the 10th Plan, allocation of higher education during the 11th Plan went up to Rs. 84,943 crore, which represents a 9 fold increase.

Table 3.7 shows that the plan allocation had to be reduced at the RE stage every year and even that reduced allocation remained under-utilised for higher education. Only Rs. 17,632.4 crore could be spent in the first three years of the plan period. Plan allocation for Higher Education during the 11th Plan has been Rs. 47,767.98 crore against the proposed outlay of Rs. 84,943 crore which indicates poor fund absorption capacity. Given the level of utilisation of allocated funds, the Committee is apprehensive about the outcome of the departments' efforts to increase GER from 12.4 percent to 15 percent by 2010-11.

Table 3.7: Status of Total Plan Expenditure on Higher Education in 11th Plan

Years	BE (In Rs. Crore)	RE (In Rs. Crore)	Actual (In Rs. Crore)	Percentage of Utilisation over BE
2007-2008	6479.48	3261.32	3139.26	48.45
2008-2009	7593.5	6800	6711.96	88.39
2009-2010	9600	7952	7781.18	81.05
2010-11	10996	9799		
2011-12	13103			
Total Allocation in 11th Plan	47771.98	27812.32	17632.4	

Source: Departmentally related Committee on MHRH, 2010-11 & Note on Demand of Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (Expenditure Budget Vol-II) of Union Budget 2011-12.

Table 3.8 compares the plan allocation of Statements 21 and 21 A with the amount given in DDGs for SCs and STs in UGC, IIMs and IITs. The purpose of this comparison is to ascertain whether the allocation for SCs and STs of Statements 21 and 21 A reflects in minor heads 789 and 796 of DDGs and also if the amount mentioned in Statements 21 and 21 matches those figures. The scrutiny of the DDGs of Ministry of HRD shows that for SCs and STs, the allocations in UGC, IIMs and IITs get reflected in minor heads 789 and 796, but it does not provide the RE and previous year's BE figure. Under the UGC, the allocation made in minor heads 789 and 796 does not match the BE figure of Statement 21 and 21, while allocation made for IIMs and IITs do match in both the documents.

3.8: Allocation under Some Major Component of Higher Education (in Rs. Crore)

	Statement 21 and 21 A				DDGs	
	SCSP		TSP		SCSP	TSP
	2010- 11 RE	2011- 12 BE	2010- 11 RE	2011- 12 BE	2011- 12 BE	2011-12 BE

UGC	663.89	799.62	331.94	393	695.1	341.55
IIMs	16.13	31.5	8.07	15.75	31.5	15.75
IITs	144.39	240	72.2	120	240	120
Total	824.41	1071.12	412.21	528.75	966.6	477.3

Source: Source: Compiled by CBGA from Statement 21 and 21 A (Expenditure Budget Vol-I) & Detailed Demand for grants of Union Budget 2011-12.

With regard to implementation of SCSP and TSP in higher education, the Departmentally-Related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Education (2011-12) observed that SCSP allocation for these disadvantaged social groups has decreased from 16.2 percent in 2009-10 to 13.2 percent 2010-11. In terms of amounts, Rs. 330 crore was denied to the SCSP. Similarly, the allocation for TSP works out to only 4.5 percent as against 8.1 percent last year which means it was allocated Rs. 392 crore less. Given this declining trend of allocation, the Committee is of the opinion that the objectives of inclusive education would remain elusive.

4. National Rural Health Mission (NRHM)

NRHM is an umbrella programme initiated in 2005-06 after subsuming the existing programmes of health and family welfare, including the Reproductive Child Health (RCH-II), National Disease Control Programmes for Malaria, TB, Kala Azar, Filariasis, Blindness & Iodine Deficiency and Integrated Disease Surveillance Programme. One of the key objectives of NRHM is to provide improved healthcare services through creation of adequate number of Health Sub-Centres (SCs), Primary Health Centre (PHCs) and Community Health Centres (CHCs) with adequate infrastructure, human resources and supply of drugs. The basic goal of NRHM is to reduce Infant Mortality Rate (IMR), Maternal Mortality Ratio (MMR) and to provide comprehensive public health services with facilities like water, sanitation, hygiene, immunisation, and nutrition in the rural areas. Further, it focuses on prevention and control of communicable and non-communicable diseases, including locally endemic diseases.

Provision for Marginalised Sections of the Population

The NRHM Mission document (2005-2012) does not have any special provision for SCs and STs in terms of physical and financial targets. It seeks to improve access of basic health to rural people, especially poor women and children and provide equitable, affordable, accountable and effective primary healthcare.

In 2010-11, the Detailed Guidelines for preparation of District Annual Plan identified backward areas for greater attention (such as difficult, Naxal-affected, minority, SC, ST and gender). In this process, special incentives may be given to medicos and para medicos for coverage of difficult areas. Around 235 High Focus Districts (35 percent or more with SC/ST population) have been identified based on the ranking of 13 health indicators from District Level Household Survey (DLHS)-III data.

Financial Provisions

With regard to financial provision and fund flow, the funds should be released to the states through Standing Committee of Voluntary Agencies (SCOVA), 1986, to 18 High Focus States. However, the Mission envisages an additional 30 percent over existing Annual Budgetary Outlays every year, to raise the outlays for Public Health from 0.9 percent of GDP to 2-3 percent of GDP. The states have to contribute their share to public health. Ten percent of the total financial assistance under NRHM goes to support the Mission activities.

The budgetary allocation for the health sector has been substantially hiked from Rs. 36,378 crore in the 10th Plan to Rs. 1,31,650.92 crore in the 11th Plan. The approved outlay for NRHM in the 11th Plan is Rs. 90,558 crore. The annual plan allocations during the 11th plan period have shown a gradual increase. However, substantial plan allocation still remains to be released. Out of the total approved outlay of Rs. 90,558 crore for NRHM, total allocation for the 11th Plan amounts to Rs. 68,246 crore with a balance of Rs. 22,312 crore. The shortfall has been reported every year in the utilisation of the allocated funds. The utilisation status has simply not kept pace with the increase in allocation as observed by the Departmentally-Related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Health (2011-12).

It is also observed that in 2007-08 and 2008-09, there was a huge amount of unspent balance under two major components of NRHM like Mission Flexible Pool and RCH Flexible Pool. The study states of Bihar, Odisha, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh were unable to utilise more than 30 percent of the total allocated funds under these two components.

Also, the Committee was of the view that the basic goal of NRHM has failed to achieve the desired results. This has been reiterated in the latest Performance Audit of NRHM conducted by the CAG (2009-10). The Committee expressed its concern regarding lack of adequate rural health infrastructure and human resources, especially in High Focus States even after five years of the intervention being launched in Mission mode. It observed that NRHM promotes creation of new health infrastructure but it has to consolidate the existing health infrastructure before creating new infrastructure and that human resources have to be adequately placed wherever the physical infrastructure is developed.

Allocation of Resources for SCs and STs under NRHM

As stated above, the Mission document does not have any special provision for SC and ST community, but as per SCSP and TSP guidelines, some components of NRHM do allocate funds for the two groups. Form the analysis of Statement 21 and 21 A, we find that the allocation for SCs and STs are made in proportion to their population. Likewise, the Detailed Demands for Grants show the same amount of allocation under minor head 789 (SCSP) and minor head 796 (TSP) as reported in Statement 21 and 21A (Table 3.9) .

Table 3.9: Analysis of Fund Flow Targeted for SCs and STs in NRHM

	Total allocation	% share of SCSP	% share of TSP
--	-------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

	(in Rs. Crore)					
Schemes	2010-11 RE	2011-12 BE	2010-11 RE	2011-12 BE	2010-11 RE	2011-12 BE
National Vector Borne Disease control Programme	352.51	437.28	20.9	18.1	11.3	9.8
National Programme for Control of Blindness	234	261	16.8	16.9	9.1	9.2
Revised National TB Control Programme	330	380	16.1	16.1	8.7	8.7
National Leprosy Eradication Programme	36.32	39.52	16.8	17.0	9.1	9.1
Supply Drugs & Contraceptive	362.8	298.18	10.7	12.7	5.8	6.9
Immunisation	1286	1174	15.8	16	8.5	8.7
IEC	188.08	162.95	16.5	10.4	8.9	5.5
Area Projects	16.67	0.2	15.1	0.0	8.2	0.0
Flexible Pool for State PIPs	6855.18	8775.5	17.3	27.2	9.3	15.2

Source: Compiled by CBGA from Statement 21 and 21 A (Expenditure Budget Vol-I) & Note on Demand of Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (Expenditure Budget Vol-II) of Union Budget 2011-12.

From the above analysis, it is apparent that financial resources are being allocated for SCs and STs under NRHM in the Union Budget, but there is no clarity regarding the basis/criteria for fund allocation to these groups. Also, the scheme does not provide beneficiary data on SCs and STs.

5. Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS)

ICDS, started in 1975, is one of the world's largest programmes for early childhood development for providing pre-school education along with reducing the incidence of malnutrition, morbidity, mortality and school dropouts in the age-group 0-6 years. The main objectives of the scheme are to improve the nutritional and health status of children for proper psychological, physical and social development. It also focuses on enhancing the capability of the mother to look after the normal health and nutritional needs of the child through proper nutrition and health education. These objectives have to be achieved through effective coordination of policy and implementation among the various departments.

To achieve the above mentioned objectives, there are five packages of services comprising supplementary nutrition, immunisation, health check-ups, referral services, pre-school non-formal education and nutrition & health education to be given to children and mothers. ICDS currently covers 8.63 crore children and pregnant and lactating women (Mid-Term Appraisal of the 11th Five Year Plan).

ICDS is a CSS implemented through the state governments/UT administrations. Before 2005-06, 100 percent financial assistance for inputs was being provided by the Government of India. In view of resource constraints in states, it was decided in 2005-06 to support states up to 50 percent of the financial norms or to support 50 percent of expenditure incurred by them on supplementary nutrition (whichever is less). From the financial year 2009-10, the sharing pattern of supplementary nutrition in respect of North-Eastern States and the Centre has been changed from 50:50 to 90:10 ratio, inclusive of all other components of ICDS. For other States and UTs, the existing sharing pattern of 50:50 would be continued. However, for all other components of ICDS, the ratio has been modified to 90:10 (100 percent Central Assistance earlier).

Provisions for Marginalised Sections

States have to ensure registration of all eligible beneficiaries under the scheme. The revised guidelines state that there is a special focus on coverage of SC/ST and Minority populations in Universalisation of ICDS and 3rd phase (October, 2008) of expansion of the scheme for 792 additional projects, 2.13 lakh additional Anganwadi Centres (AWCs) and 77,102 Mini-AWCs, as per the revised population norms. In the recent past, the Ministry of Women and Child Development has undertaken the task of universalisation of the scheme by increasing the number of AWCs to 14 lakh with a provision of 20,000 AWCs on demand with special focus on coverage of SC/ST population. The Government of India has reiterated its directions to certify that the revised requirement of AWCs/Mini-AWCs in every habitation in the states will be covered under ICDS as per norms and saturating SC/ST & Minority Habitations.

Budgetary Provisions

Budgetary allocation for ICDS increased from Rs. 10,391.75 crore in the 10th Plan to Rs. 42,400 crore in the 11th Plan period. Assessment of the Child Budget Statement shows that during the 11th Plan period, the government allocated Rs. 38,384 crore which is 90.5 percent of total recommended outlay for the scheme. With regard to budgetary provisions for SCs and STs in the Union Budget, Statement 21 has been showing the allocation of plan funds for them since 2005-06, but these allocations were not reported in the major head 2225 and minor head 789 and 796 in the Detailed Demands for Grants (DDGs). Union Budget 2011-12 has started allocating plan funds separately for SCs and STs; this allocation has also been reported in the DDGs.

6. Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM)

According to Census 2001, around 28 percent or 285 million people of India's total population live in urban areas. It was expected that due to liberalisation of economic policies adopted by the government, urban population may increase to about 40 percent of the total population by the year 2021. As per the Planning Commission's estimates, the total urban population in 2004-05 was 31.24 crore and the estimated number of poor was Rs. 8.08 crore. Urban poverty accounts for 26 percent of total poverty ratio which is 27.5 percent. With this realisation, the Government of India launched the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission in 2005-06 for seven years to

develop urban areas. The Mission statement says “The aim is to encourage reforms and fast-track planned development of identified cities. Focus is to be on efficiency in urban infrastructure and service delivery mechanisms, community participation, and accountability of ULBs/Parastatal agencies towards citizens.”

The main objectives of JNNURM is to provide integrated development of infrastructure services; linkages between asset-creation and asset-management through reforms; bring about planned development of identified 65 cities including peri-urban areas; scale up delivery of civic amenities and provide utilities with emphasis on universal access to the urban poor; put in place an urban renewal programme for old city areas to reduce congestion; provide basic services to the urban poor including security of tenure at affordable prices, improved housing, water supply and sanitation; and ensure delivery of other existing universal services of the government for education, health and social security.

The main components of the Mission are (1) Basic Services for Urban Poor (BSUP), (2) Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (IHSDP), (3) Sub Mission on Urban Infrastructure and Governance (UIG), (4) Urban Infrastructure Development for Small and Medium Towns (UIDSSMT), (5) Rajiv Awas Yojana (RAY). The Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation (HUPA) is the nodal ministry for BSUP, IHDP and Ray whereas the Ministry of Urban Development is the nodal ministry for Sub-Mission on UIG and UIDSSMT.

Provisions for Marginalised Sections

There is no particular mention of SCs and STs in the Mission guidelines. Further, the review of Demands for Grants (2010-11) of the Ministry of Urban Development and Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation conducted by the Departmentally-Related Standing Committee on Urban Development does not give any information on fund allocation and beneficiary data on SCs and STs except for a provision for 10 percent beneficiary contribution in house construction under the component of BSUP and IHSDP. According to the 2001 Census, 20.2 percent and 8.3 percent of SCs and STs in the total population live in urban areas but the government has not made any special provision for them.

Budgetary Provisions

The plan fund under JNNURM goes to states in the form of Central Assistance for State and Union Territory Plans which reflects in Statement 16 of Expenditure Budget Vol. I of the Union Budget. The Central Assistance for different components is provided to states for implementation of the projects. The central share in the form of Additional Central Assistance is released from the Ministry of Finance to States and the Ministry of Home Affairs to Union Territories. The Jadhav Task Force, 2010, was of the view that the CPA as reflected in Statement 16 of the Expenditure Budget (Volume I) prima facie earmarking under SCSP/TSP should apply to JNNURM. Union Budget 2011-12 has not made any provision to allocate funds for SCs and STs in JNNURM.

The Mid-Term Appraisal of the 11th Five Year Plan reveals that by September 2009, JNNURM had approved 2,523 projects with a Central assistance commitment of Rs. 52,687 crore, amounting to

nearly 80 percent of the total programme funds. In turn, this Central assistance has been matched by Rs. 44,334 crore in complementary commitment from the states and the ULBs, translating to a total of Rs. 97,021 crore of new committed investment into urban project proposal during the plan period till date. Already, 17 states have submitted projects exceeding 75 percent of their allocation target. Out of this combined commitment from the Centre, states and ULBs, Rs. 50,340 crore has been in UIG, Rs 12,820 crore in UIDSSMT, Rs. 25,343 crore in BSUP and Rs. 8,517 crore in IHSDP. Out of the Rs. 52,687 commitment from the Centre, Rs. 21,513 crore has been released to the states till 2009-10, i.e., around 40 percent of the approved funds.

The Departmentally-Related Standing Committee on Urban Development was very critical about the dismal performance under all the components of JNNURM. It observed that after five years of its implementation, there is huge amount of unspent balance due to delay in release of funds from the Centre such as delay in submission in projects and slow progress in process of governance reforms in many cities.

Conclusion

From the analysis of six schemes, it is found that the scheme design of IAY, SSA and UGC have tried to address the concerns of SCs and STs. Other programmes like NRHM and ICDS have made some revisions in their scheme design to cover the need of SCs and STs. JNNURM has no policy provision to address the development deficit of SCs and STs in urban areas. With regard to allocation of financial resources for SCs and STs, all the above mentioned programme and schemes except JNNURM have made plan allocation exclusively for SCs and STs which reflects in budget documents like Budget Statements and DDGs with opening of minor head 789 and 796. IAY has created a column for reporting the beneficiary data on SCs and STs. The beneficiary data on elementary education (SSA) and higher education are provided in the form of GER and dropout rates. Schemes like NRHM and ICDS do not provide data on SC and ST beneficiaries. The Departmentally-Related Standing Committees on Rural Development, Human Resource Development, Health and Urban Development have been critical regarding overall implementation of these schemes. They have consequently highlighted low utilisation of funds and poor outcomes. These problems are having an indirect negative impact on the process of socio-economic development of SCs and STs.

Chapter 4: Analysis of the State Budgets through the Lens of *Dalits*

This chapter assesses the State Budgets from the perspective of *dalits* in the five states of Bihar, Rajasthan, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh). The quantum/magnitude of plan funds for development of SCs has been captured through assessment of Annual Plan and DDGs of the states for 2009-10 and 2010-11. In terms of the annual plan allocation, the quantum and percentage share of SCs in the total plan size and in individual departments have been examined. Further, the state DDGs have been assessed department-wise through the scrutiny of functional major heads and minor heads. The chapter has been divided into five sections focusing on each of the study states. Each section is preceded by a brief on the socio-economic indicators of SCs.

(1) Assessing the Special Component Plan of Bihar

Socio Economic Profile of *Dalits* in Bihar

In Bihar, SCs constitute 15.7 percent of the total population (8.30 crore) as per the 2001 census. The state ranks 3rd among states and UTs in terms of SC population. Overall, it accounts for 1.3 percent of the total SC population of the country. The overall sex ratio of the SC population in Bihar is 923 females per 1000 males, which is lower than the national average of 936 in respect of all SCs.

The literacy rate among SCs in Bihar is much lower than the national average of 54.7 percent, standing at 28.5 percent. Gender disaggregated data shows that male and female literacy rate among SCs was 40.2 percent and 15.6 percent respectively as compared to 66.6 percent and 41.9 percent respectively at the national level. Among the literates, 39.7 percent of SCs are either without any educational attainment or have attained education below primary level. The proportion of literates educated up to the primary and middle levels constitute 28.4 percent and 13.1 percent respectively.

The percentage of SCs below the poverty line in rural Bihar is 59.8 percent compared to 44.2 percent for all and 51.9 percent in urban Bihar compared to 32.9 percent for all. According to the NSSO 2004-05 reports, 59.3 percent of *dalits* are engaged in casual labour and 30.5 percent are self-employed in rural Bihar. Under casual labour, *dalits* are mainly agricultural labourers. In urban Bihar, 30.2 percent are engaged in casual labour, 18.7 percent are salaried and 38.2 percent are self-employed.

When it comes to land holdings, the situation of *dalits* in Bihar is the worst as compared to the rest of the population of the state. 2.4 percent of *dalits* are without land and 91.7 percent of them have 0.001 to 1 hectare of land, 4.4 percent have land between 1 and 2 hectare, 1.1 percent have between 2 to 4 hectares and merely 0.3 percent have land above 4 hectares.

Assessment of SCSP in Bihar

According to the Annual Plan of Bihar, as per the stipulated percentage of allocation is required for SCSP in 2009-10 and 2010-11, the state allocated more plan funds than the proportion of the SC population in the state i.e., 15.7%. The Total Plan Outlay for 2009-10 was Rs. 14,183.46 crore and it had earmarked Rs. 2,497.38 crore for SCSP i.e., 17.61 percent of the total plan outlay. Similarly in 2010-11, the total state plan was Rs. 19,999.95 crore and Rs. 3,375.07 crore was earmarked for SCSP which is 16.88 percent (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: Share of SCSP in Total Plan Outlay for 2009-10 and 2010-11 as per Bihar State Plan

2009-10			2010-11		
Total Plan Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	SCSP allocation (in Rs. Crore)	% share of SCSP	Total Plan Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	SCSP allocation (in Rs. Crore)	% share of SCSP
14183.5	2497.38	17.61	20000	3375.07	16.88

Source: Planning and Development Department, Bihar

But when the plan expenditure of Bihar from the DDGs of the state for the years 2009-10 and 2010-11 is examined, SCSP allocations appear very low. The total plan budget of financial year 2009-10 was Rs. 14,183.46 crore and under SCSP, only Rs. 177.4 crore was allocated, which amounts to 1.1 percent of the total plan budget. Similarly, the total plan budget of the financial year 2010-11 was Rs. 19,999.6 crore. As per the Scheduled Castes Sub Plan guidelines, *dalits* should have been allocated Rs. 2,999.94 crore for their empowerment but in reality, only Rs. 231.56 crore was allocated, which is just 1.2 percent of the total plan funds of the state (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Share of SCSP in Total Plan Outlay for 2009-10 and 2010-11 as per Bihar State Budget

2008-09(AE)			2009-10 (RE)			2010-11(BE)		
Total Plan Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	SCSP allocation (in Rs. Crore)	% share of SCSP	Total Plan Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	SCSP allocation (in Rs. Crore)	% share of SCSP	Total Plan Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	SCSP allocation (in Rs. Crore)	% share of SCSP
12335.8	146.8	1.2	14183.46	177.4	1.1	19999.95	231.56	1.2

Source- Bihar Plan Expenditure 2009-10 and 2010-11

Since the government allocated 1.2 percent, 1.1 percent, 1.2 percent and 1.2 percent respectively in 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11, the gap in what was supposed to be allocated and what has been allocated is huge. The table also shows that in 2008-09, the state government was supposed to spend Rs. 1,936.7 crore out of the total plan allocation of Rs. 12,335.8 crore but it used only Rs. 146.8 crore. So, Rs. 1,789.9 crore was not spent on *dalit* welfare schemes. Similarly, in 2009-10 (RE) and

2010-11 (BE), Rs. 2,342.2 crore and Rs. 2,908.1 crore were not allocated. The Table 4.3 shows how in 4 years, i.e., from 2007-2010, Rs. 8,443 crore were not allocated for SCSP.

Table 4.3: Analysis of Expenditure during 11th Five Year Plan (in Rs. Crore)

Financial Year	Total Plan Expenditure	Due as per SCSP	SCSP Allocation	Missing Amount
2007-08 (Actual)	9700.25	1522.94	120.17	1402.77
2008-09 (Actual)	12335.8	1936.72	146.8	1789.92
2009-10 (RE)	16076.1	2523.95	181.7	2342.25
2010-11 (BE)	19999.1	3139.86	231.7	2908.16

Source- Bihar Plan Expenditure 2009-10 and 2010-11

Department wise SCSP allocation

Further, analysis shows that out of 56 departments, allocations under SCSP have been made for only by 6. These include department of Information and Publicity, Welfare of SC/ST and OBCs, Crop Husbandry, Dairy Development and Fisheries and Co-operation. Apart from SC Welfare Department (Rs. 1 60 crore), the allocation by other departments such as Information and Publicity, and Fisheries that allocated Rs. 0.8 crore and Rs. 0.3 crore respectively is miniscule. The second highest allocation after social welfare was the Department of Crop Husbandry that allocated Rs. 12.8 crore in 2009-10 (Refer to Annexure).

Utilisation of Funds in SCSP

The second important aspect is that the allocated funds have not been utilised to the fullest. The data available for 2008-09 shows that while the Revised Estimate was Rs. 168.67 crore, Actuals got reduced to Rs. 147.1 crore.

Table 4.4: Percentage of Fund Utilisation in Bihar

	2008-09 BE	2008-09 AE	Utilisation (%)
Total	168.67	147.1	87.21

Source: DDGs, Govt of Bihar

Looked at in further detail, the Department of Information and Publicity has used only 78 percent of the allocated money. SC/ST & OBCs Welfare Department in its minor head Economic Development was allocated only 1 crore and 83 percent of that marginal allocation was used. The department utilised 85 percent of its total allocated money. In Education, out of Rs. 55.1 crore, a mere 0.21 crore was utilised. And again in the minor head of Other Expenses, the department failed to use any money and 27.43 crore remained with the Treasury. The money allocated in Fisheries also remained partially utilised. The Department of Cooperation also failed to use any money in the

same year. Overall, the government was able to use only 87 of the total SCSP budget. (For details, see Annexure ii.)

Sector wise allocations

Another issue relates to the nature of expenditure. In 2010-11 (BE), the share of SCSP in Social Services was 2.95 % SCSP while the share in Economic services was merely 2.7 percent against 57.49 percent of the total state plan. It means that SCSP allocations have only been done in social sectors, not in the sector which is related to economic growth, infrastructure, employment and other economic development services. (See table 4.5)

Table 4. 5: Budget allocation under different Services in Bihar (Rs. in Crore)

2010-11	General Services	Social Services	Economic Services
Total State Plan	738.3	7762.9	11498.2
Total SCSP	0.00	228.92	2.7
%	0.00	2.95	0.02

Source- Bihar Plan Expenditure 2009-10 and 2010-11, Explanatory Memorandum and Annual Financial Statement 2009-10 and 2010-11

Schemes and Programmes for SCs

Most of the schemes are not very clear in terms of its norms and guideline and the operational details are missing. The allocations of 2010-11 BE show that out of 14 schemes, 9 have token allocations i.e. less than Rs. 10 crore. Only 2 schemes have allocations between Rs.10-20 crore and 3 schemes more than Rs. 20 crore. (Annexure iii)

Table 4. 6: Schemes running for Scheduled Castes in Bihar

Year	Schemes having allocation between Rs. 1 to 10 Crore	Schemes having allocation between Rs. 10-20 Crore	Schemes having allocation more than 20 Crore	Total number of schemes
2010-11 BE	9	2	3	14

Table 4.6 shows that there are 9 schemes which have allocated less than Rs. 10 crore. It is difficult to say how departments can plan for any development activities with such small amounts. Regional Publicity Scheme has Rs. 0.75 crore, Command and Administration Rs. 1.41 crore, Family Oriented Production Rs. 1 crore, SCSP for Rural Dairy Rs. 0.5 crore, SCSP for Fishermen Help Rs. 0.35 crore and Bihar State SC Corporation Rs. 1 crore. It is unclear how these small amounts have finally helped or been utilised by the targeted entitlement holders. Per Capita Expenditure on *dalits* for some schemes like Bihar State SC Corporation was Rs. 0.78 paisa and for Rural Dairy Rs. 0.38 paisa. The schemes don't have details and it is difficult to assess how it is targeted at *dalits*.

Table 4.7 below classifies the expenditure of schemes in the Bihar State Budget into four categories 1. Administration, which comprises all components used to run the system like salary, office and other related costs, 2. Programme, which includes schemes and related expenses meant for the community, 3. , Subsidiary Grants and 4. Lumpsum Provisions. Details for the latter two categories have not been provided in the state budget documents.

The share of total SCSP expenditure under the Programme head has decreased from 61.8 percent in 2009-10 to 50 percent in 2010-11. A considerable amount has been allocated under Lumpsum provisions and Subsidiary Grants. In 2008-09, Rs. 60.8 crore was allocated under these heads - Rs. 65.3 crore in 2009-10 and Rs. 113.4 crore in 2010-11. The share of both increased from 41.4 percent in 2008-09 (Actual Expenditure) to 49 percent in 2010-11 (BE). Nearly half the allocations lack details and it is difficult to assess how the state adheres to the guidelines of SCSP to benefit the *dalit* community.

Table 4.7: Expenditure Classification of Schemes in Bihar State Budget (in %)

Categories of Expenditure (%)	2008-09 (Actuals)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
Administration	0.91	0.48	0.22
Programme	57.09	61.77	50.02
Subsidiary Grant	22.81	0.82	0.15
Lumpsum Provision	19.14	35.99	49.00

Source: Bihar Plan Expenditure 2009-10 and 2010-11

The analysis of 2008-09 (BE) and 2008-09 (AE) depicts instances where the money allocated for Programme has been spent in Administration and other costs which are not directly related to *dalit* benefits. For instance in the **Annexure to Chapter 4** (*Annexure (iv): Intra-shifting of SCSP Money*), the **Department of** Information and Technology has allocated Rs. 0.57 crore under the Regional Publicity Scheme meant for SCSP but in Actual Expenditure (AE), the money was reduced and spent on office costs and other charges. Again, in Table 4.8 below, there has been a head wise shifting of money whereby much of the Programme money has been utilised for Administration and other charges instead.

Table 4.8: Intra-shifting of Money in SC/ST & OBC Welfare Department in Bihar (in Rs. Crore)

Scheme	Object Head	2008-09(BE)	Object Head	2008-09 (AE)
Command	14(Workshop/Poster	0.25	01(Salary)	0.016

			03(Jivan Yapan Allowance)	0.011
			04(House Rent)	0.001
			06 (Medical Allowance)	0.0002
			07 (other Allowance)	0.00001
			01(Advertisement & Publication)	
			01(Business & Special Service)	
			01 (Subsidiary Grant)	0.045
			01 (Other Charge)	0.177
	Total	0.25		0.25

Source: Bihar Plan Expenditure, 2009-10 and 2010-11

Command & Administration allocated Rs. 0.25 crore for workshops/seminars/posters but Rs. 0.17 crore was spent on other charges, Rs. 0.4 crore for subsidiary grants and Rs. 0.28 crore on salary and other allowances. In *Annexure iv*, the allocation for Family Oriented Production was Rs. 0.10 crore, but it was spent on subsidiary grants, scholarships, other-charges and administration. The shifting of money in different heads and creation of new heads appear to be a regular practice. In another instance, Rs. 0.56 crore was allocated for Girls' Hostel, and Rs., 0.25 crore for Prevention of SC/ST Atrocities Act but the money was not spent for these purposes. Total money under this head was Rs. 0.91 crore, but only Rs. 0.21 was spent. This trend indicates that though the allocations are shown under SCSP, the Department fails to utilise the funds for the benefit of SCs. Rather the money is shifted to other object heads or new heads are created. (Refer to **Annexure to Chapter 4** on Bihar for details)

Analysis of SCP in the Budget 2011-12

Bihar State Budget: In Bihar in 2010-11, the allocation under SCP was Rs. 231.56 cr which was 1.16% only. Only 4 Departments made allocation under SCP. This year in 2011-12 Bihar government has increased allocation to Rs.4249.69 cr. This is 17.7% of the Total Plan size of the Bihar Budget. Out of 62 Departments 26 have done allocations under SCP. 25 departments have opened 789 code in this year state budget. They are Departments of General Education, Sports and Youth Services, Art and Culture, Water Supply and Sanitation, Housing, Urban Development, Information and Publicity, Labour and Employment, Social Security and Welfare. Crop Husbandry, Soil and Water Conservation, Animal Husbandry, Dairy Development, Fisheries, Forestry And Wild Life, Agriculture Research And Education, Special Programme for Rural Development, Rural Employment, Other Rural Development Programmes, Medium Irrigation, Minor Irrigation, Village And Small Industries, Industry and Telecom And Electronic Industry.

(2) Assessing the Special Component Plan of Rajasthan

Socio Economic Profile of Dalits in Rajasthan

In Rajasthan, *dalits* comprise 17.2 percent of the total population (Census 2001). SCs are predominantly rural as 79.8 percent of them live in the villages. The overall sex ratio of the SC population in Rajasthan is 913 females per 1000 males which is lower than the national average of 936 for SCs. The sex ratio among SC children in the age group 0-6 years is 919 which is lower than than at the national level (939).

The overall literacy rate of SCs is 52.2 percent which is slightly lower than the national average (54.7 %) for SCs. Around 47.7 percent of the total SC literates are either without any educational level or have attained below primary level education. The proportion of SC literates who are graduates and above is 2.3 percent while non-technical and technical diploma holders constitute a negligible 0.1 percent. The Infant Mortality Rate among SCs is 60.3 percent. In rural Rajasthan, 49.1 percent of SCs are self-employed mainly in agriculture-related work and 40.7 percent are employed as casual labour. In urban Rajasthan, 42.2 percent are self-employed, 38.9 percent are salaried and 11.8 percent are casual labourers. In terms of land holdings, 2.6 percent of the *dalit* population is without any land and 69.9 percent have land between 0.001 and 1 hectare. In 1999-2000, 19.62 percent of *dalits* in rural areas were below the poverty line compared to 13.65 percent for the entire population of the states while the statistics for urban areas showed that 41.8 percent SCs were poor compared to 19.85 percent for the entire population.

Assessment of SCSP in Rajasthan

Given that over 17 percent of Rajasthan's population are *dalits*, it is expected that each department of the state spends 17 percent of its Total Plan Budget under SCSP, with the Department of Social Justice & Empowerment as the nodal department for implementing the component plan.

Annual Plan

According to the Planning department of Rajasthan, allocation for SCSP is around 16 percent of the Total Plan Outlay in 2010-11 i.e., one percent less in comparison to the SC population. Total plan outlays for the year 2008-09 (AE) was Rs. 14915.76 crore of which Rs. 3,106.66 crore was allocated under SCSP, which is about 15.75 percent of the Total Plan Outlay. In a progressive trend, a gradual increase in allocations for SCSP from the Total Plan Outlay has been noticed from 2008-09 to 2010-11, with the proportional increase from 15.75 to 16.39 percent.

Table 4.9: Share of SCSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Rajasthan State Plan (2008-09 to 2010-11)

2008-09 (AE)			2009-10 (RE)			2010-11 BE		
Total Plan Outlay	SCSP allocation	% share of SCSP	Total Plan Outlay	SCSP allocation	% share of SCSP	Total Plan Outlay	SCSP allocation	% share of SCSP
14915.76	2349.36	15.75	17333.18	2780.49	16.04	22421.59	3674.19	16.39

Note: AE - Actual Expenditure, RE - Revised Expenditure & BE - Budget Estimate

Source: Planning Department of Rajasthan, Year 2009-12 & 2010-11

Comparison between Annual Plan & DDGs

While analysing the State Annual Plan of Rajasthan, it appears that the Planning Department Budget does not match the Detailed Demands for Grants (DDGs) of the State (refer to Table 4.10).

Table 4.10: Share of SCSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Rajasthan State Budget (2008-09 to 2010-11)

2008-09(AE)			2009-10(RE)			2010-11(BE)		
Total Plan Outlay	SCSP allocation	% share of SCSP	Total Plan Outlay	SCSP allocation	% share of SCSP	Total Plan Outlay	SCSP allocation	% share of SCSP
11866	359.84	3.03%	13061	372.49	2.85%	14678	573.01	3.90%

Note: AE - Actual Expenditure, RE – Revised Expenditure & BE - Budget Estimate

Source: Rajasthan Budget Book, Volumes 2D and 3A, Years 2009-10 & 2010-11

The Annual Plan Budget document brought out by the Planning Department shows that around 16 percent of plan allocation was made under SCSP, but if the Total State Plan Budget and SCSP allocation under DDGs is analysed, only 4 percent is allocated under SCSP. There is a huge difference between the SCSP allocation in the Annual Plan document and DDGs (table 4.11).

Table 4.11 shows that the Total Plan Outlay is Rs. 11,866 crore and SCSP allocation is only Rs. 359.84 crore which is about 3.03 percent of the Total Plan Outlay. In 2009-10 the Total Plan Outlay increased by 9.15 percent from Rs. 11,866 crore to Rs. 13,061 crore but the SCSP allocation decreased by 0.18 percent, from 3.03 to 2.85 percent. In 2010-11, SCSP allocation increased from 1.05 percent to 3.90 percent of the Total Plan Outlay. But in comparison to the total population of SCs in Rajasthan, the gap was Rs. 1,681.1 crore in 2008-09, Rs. 1,874 crore in 2009-10 RE, and Rs. 1,951.6 crore in 2010-11 (BE). This shows that in three years, *dalits* in the state were shortchanged a total amount of Rs. 5,506.7 crore.

Table 4.11: The amount of fund not allocated under SCSP

Year	Total State Plan (in Rs. Crore)	Due as per SCSP (in Rs. Crore)	SCSP allocation (in Rs. Crore)	Missing Amount (in Rs. Crore)
2008-09 AE	11866	2040.95	359.8	1681.15
2009-10 RE	13061	2246.49	372.49	1874.00
2010-11 BE	14678	2524.62	573.01	1951.61

Source: DDG Rajasthan 2009-10 and 2010-11

Analysis of the Fund Utilisation in DDGs

As is evident, the Rajasthan government is already allocating very less in comparison to the total population of SCs in the state. Moreover, if the total expenditure is tallied in comparison with total

allocation made in DDGs, Actual Expenditure is even less than the limited allocations made. In Table 4.12, the total expenditure against the allocations made in the year 2007-08 is 98.2 percent while in 2008-09 the Actual Expenditure decreased by 18.13 percent from 98.2 to 80.07 percent.

Table 4.12: Comparison between Revised Estimate and Actual Expenditure under SCSP (Amount in Crore)

2007-08			2008-09		
Revised Estimate	Actual Expenditure	% Utilisation	Revised Estimate	Actual Expenditure	% Utilisation
312.73	307.08	98.20%	441.79	353.76	80.07%

Service-wise Allocation of Detailed Demands for Grants of State Plan Budget

The government allocates the budget through three different services – economic, social and general services. Economic services include economic activities like agriculture, animal husbandry, irrigation, industries etc. The increased spending in economic activities enhances the economy and generates more employment and entrepreneurship opportunities for people to attain a better quality of life. Social services mean cater to the basic needs of the people. Spending on social services helps in improving the health, education and nutrition status of the poor and marginalised people as also providing the social security necessary for children, women, the disabled, and the elderly (Table 4.13).

The Total Plan Budget for social services in Rajasthan is Rs. 6,299.34 crore while the share of SCSP under it is Rs. 289.31 crore which is only 4.59 percent of the Total Plan Budget on social services. The indicators of health, nutrition and education for SCs need special attention in light of the low priority accorded to these services. Further, the table shows that the Total Plan Budget for economic services is Rs. 8,075.57 crore and the share of SCSP under it is Rs. 270.14 crore which is only 3.35 percent of the Total Plan Budget on Economic Services. Increased spending in the economic sector will increase employment opportunities among SCs, but statistics show that the government has not been doing so.

Table 4.13: Expenditure in Different Services (in Rs. Crore)

Expenditure in Social and Economic services			
2010-11	Total Plan Budget for Social Services	Share of SCSP under Plan Budget	% Share of SCSP
Social Service	6299.34	289.31	4.59%
Economic Services	8075.57	270.14	3.35%

Source: Detailed Demand for Grants

Schemes Running for SCs under SCSP in Rajasthan

Table 4.14 illustrates that of the 66 schemes meant for SCs in Rajasthan, 46 have allocations between Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 1 crore, 12 have allocations between Rs. 1 and 10 crore, 4 have

allocations between Rs. 10 and 20 crore and only 4 schemes have allocations above Rs. 20 crore. Hence, the schemes are running in the name of SCs with negligible amounts of allocation.

Table 4.14: Schemes under SCSP in Rajasthan

Schemes with allocation between one thousand to Rs. 1 Crore allocation	Schemes with allocation between Rs. 1 - 10 Crore	Schemes with allocation between Rs. 10 - 20 Crore	Schemes with allocation more than Rs. 20 crore	Total Schemes
46	12	4	4	66

In Table 4.15, we can find many schemes with allocations of less than Rs. 10 crore. Many of these schemes are for the direct development of SCs. For example, the outlay for the Scheme of Scholarship and Stipends has remained stagnant at Rs. 0.15 crore from 2008-09 to 2010-11. The budget for Pre-Matric Scholarships for SC children in 2008-09 to 2010-11 increased by Rs. 0.05 crore i.e., Rs. 0.65 to 0.70 crore while the Rural Water Supply Scheme saw a marginal increase from Rs 3 crore in 2008-09 to Rs 4 crore in 2010-11. The allocation for Sambal Gram Yojana, which is targeted at villages having more than 40 percent *dalit* populations, was Rs. 4 crore in 2009-10 and 2010-11. Under the scheme, the government provides money to the villages for infrastructural development. There are 4,110 identified Sambal Villages with Rs. 9,732.3 given per village for development of *dalits*. In 2010-11, allocation for the Mission for Livelihood Scheme reduced from Rs. 1.95 crore to Rs. 0.75 crore. Schemes like Agriculture Exhibition, Abolition of Insects and Diseases, Soil Improvement, Intensive Cotton Development Programme, Boond-Boond Irrigation State Scheme and Grants for Seeds Development have also been allocated budgets of less than Rs. 1 crore (refer to Annexure i).

Table 4.15: Schemes with Allocations of Less than Rs.10 crore

1	Special Component Plan for Schedule Caste Scholarships & stipends	0.15	0.15	0.15
2	Pre-Matric Scholarship for the children of Schedule Caste	0.65	0.7	0.7
3	Rural Water Supply Schemes	3.33	3.5	4
4	Development of Sambal Villages	2	4	4
5	Mission for Livelihood	1.78	1.95	0.75

Source: DDG Rajasthan, 2009-10 and 2010-11

Out of 66 schemes for SCs supposedly being implemented in Rajasthan, there are eight having allocations of more than Rs. 10 crore and of these, two schemes have outlays of more than Rs. 100 crore. Table 4.16 reveals that Scholarships and Stipends, Crop Compensation and Nutrition Programme have Rs. 114.38 crore, Rs. 178 crore and Rs. 97.02 crore respectively. The highest allocation under the schemes for SCs is only given by Department of SC/ST Welfare, Crop Husbandry and Department of Women & Child Development respectively. Schemes like Palahaar for Homeless Children of Schedule Castes, Scholarship to the Children of Doing Unclean Work, Crop Insurance, and Integrated Scheme for Tilhen, Pulses, and Maize & Oilpalm & Palanhaar for

Homeless Children of SCs have allocations of more than Rs. 10 crore. However, the allocations seem to be very less for running these schemes in 33 districts of Rajasthan,.

Table 4.16: Schemes Running for SCs in Rajasthan

Schemes having Rs. 10 - 20 crore allocation in 2010-11			
S. no.	Department	Scheme	Allocation
1	Welfare of Schedule Castes & Tribes	Palanhar for Homeless children of Schedule caste	11.37
2	Welfare of Schedule Castes & Tribes	Scholarship to the children doing unclean work	13.01
3	Crop Husbandry	Crop Insurance	18.00
4	Crop Husbandry	Integrated scheme for Tilhen, Pulses, Oilpalm & Maize	12.24
Schemes having allocation above Rs. 30 crore in 2010-11			
S. no.	Department	Scheme	Allocation
1	Welfare of Schedule Castes & Tribes	Scholarship and Stipend	114.38
2	DWCD	Nutrition Crèche Programme	97.20
3	Welfare of Schedule Castes & Tribes	Palanhar for Homeless Children of Schedule Castes	22.00
4	Crop Husbandry	Crop Compensation (50 % State and Centre Share)	178.00

Analysis of SCP in the Budget 2011-12

In Rajasthan in 2011-12 the SCP allocation has increased from 3.8% to 13.5%. In 2010-11 allocation under SCP was Rs. 573.01 crores and 2011-12 it has increased to Rs.2452.7 crores. 2010-11 the number of departments which allocated was 13 and in 2011-12 the number has increased to 38. In Rajasthan around 33 departments had 789 prior to 2010-11 but from this year 9 new departments have opened this code – 1) Department of Administration of Justice, 2) Land Revenue, 3) Police, 4) Jails, 5) Public Works, 6) Cooperation, 7) Medium Irrigation, 8) Road and Bridge and 9) Civil Supplies. It will now be possible to track and audit SCP money.

(3) Assessing the Special Component Plan of Odisha

Socio-Economic Profile Dalits in Odisha

Dalits constitute 16.5 percent of the total population of Odisha (Census 2001). They are predominantly rural with 88.4 percent residing in the villages. The overall sex ratio of the SC population in Odisha is 979 females per 1000 males which is higher than the national average of 936. The overall literacy rate of SCs in the state is 55.5 percent. Male literacy has increased from 52.4 percent to 70.5 percent while female literacy has gone up from 20.7 percent to 40.3 percent between 1991 and 2001 but those educated up to matric/higher secondary constitute 12.6 percent only. Graduates and above are 2.3 percent while non-technical & technical diploma holders

constitute less than half percent (0.4 per cent). Agricultural Labourers constitute the highest proportion (45.7 percent) among all SC workers, which is almost equal to the national average (45.6 percent). Persons working as Cultivators account for 18.2 percent which is at par with the national average of 20 percent. Those workers engaged in Household Industry (HHI) constitute 6 percent and this figure is significantly higher than that of all SCs at the national level (3.9 percent).

Assessing the Annual Plan

As per the SCSP guidelines, each department in Odisha needs to spend 16.53 percent of its Total Plan Budget on the SCP in proportion with the percentage of the SC population in the state. According to the Planning Department of Odisha, allocation for SCSP is 16.53 percent of the Total Plan Outlay. Table 4.11 shows that the Total Plan Outlay for the year 2009-10 was Rs. 9,500.02 crore and Rs. 1,563.03 crore was allocated for SCSP which is around 16.45 percent of the plan outlay. In 2010-11, the plan outlay was Rs. 11,000 crore and Rs. 1,817.9 crore was allocated for SCSP, which is about 16.53 percent of the Total Plan Outlay. The Total Plan Outlay and allocation for SCSP have both seen a slight increase from 2009-10 to 2010-11. Allocation for SCSP rose from 16.45 to 16.53 percent (Table 4.17).

Table 4.17: Share of SCSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Odisha State Plan (2009-10 and 2010-11)

2009-10			2010-11		
Total Plan Outlay in Rs. Crore	SCSP allocation in Rs. Crore	% share of SCSP	Total Plan Outlay in Rs. Crore	SCSP allocation in Rs. Crore	% share of SCSP
9500.02	1563.03	16.45	11000	1817.9	16.53

Source: Planning Department of Odisha, Year 2009-12 & 2010-11

Comparison between Annual Plan & Detailed Demand for Grants (DDGs)

An analysis of the State Annual Plan of Odisha shows that the allocations in the Planning Department Budget are almost reflects in the Detailed Demands for Grants (DDGs) of the state (Table 4.18 below). The Odisha government allocated more funds than the population of SCs in the state. However, a scrutiny of the DDGs, vis-à-vis the Annual Plan Budget document brought out by the state's Planning Department shows almost similar. Thus, there is no difference between the SCSP allocation in the Annual Plan document and the DDGs.

Table 4.18: Share of SCSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Odisha State Budget (2009-10 and 2010-11)

2009-10 RE			2010-11 BE		
Total Plan Outlay	SCSP allocation	% share of SCSP	Total Plan Outlay	SCSP allocation (in Rs. Crore)	% share of SCSP

(in Rs. Crore)	(in Rs. Crore)		(in Rs. Crore)		
8419.86	1396.4	15.44%	10016.03	1547.04	16.58

Note: AE - Actual Expenditure, RE – Revised Expenditure & BE - Budget Estimates

Source: DDG Odisha, 2009-10 and 2010-11

Table 4.19 shows that in 2008-09, the utilisation of fund has been 64 per cent at RE figure which is very less.

Table 4.19: Comparing Revised Estimates and Actual Expenditure under SCSP in Odisha

	2008-09 RE (in Rs. Crore)	2008-09AE (in Rs. Crore)	% Utilisation
Total SCSP	472.34	302.13	63.96

Source: DDG Odisha 2009-10 and 2010-11

Misallocation of Funds

Table 4.20 details Total Expenditure against the allocation made in the year 2008-09 as being Rs. 472.34, the Actual Expenditure being Rs 302.13 crore, and 63.96 percent of the allocated funds being spent. Some important departments like the Labour and Employment, Women and Child Development, and Information Technology have utilised very nebulous amounts. The Labour and Employment Departments was able to use only 6.55 percent of the allocated money while the Women and Child Development Department spent 38.89 percent. (Annexure. i)

A careful examination of budget-related documents brought out by the state government of Odisha reveals a number of violations of the SCSP guidelines. There have been allocations in schemes and programmes that are unrelated to *dalit* welfare. For example, the Home Department has shown allocations for Construction of Jail Buildings, Office Building and Residential Building, Building for Fire Services and Buildings for Police Welfare. For construction of Jail Buildings, the state government spent Rs. 4.78 crore of SCSP money in 2010-11 while for construction of Building of Fire Services Rs. 4.12 crore was utilised from the SCSP pool. Similarly, Rs.7.5 crore was spent in 2009-10 for construction of Buildings for Police Welfare (For other expenses of Home Department, refer to Annexure ii).

Table 4.20: Violation of SCSP Guidelines: Odisha Home Department

Schemes	2009-10 BE	2010-11 BE
2377- Construction of Building for Jails	2.30	4.77
2379 - Construction of Building for Fire Services	3.32	4.11
2380 - Construction of Building for Police Welfare (37062- Construction of Office building through O.S.P.H & W Corporation)	7.49	1.70

Source: DDG Odisha, 2009-10 and 2010-11

Works Department

The state Works Department too has made allocations in schemes in contravention of the SCSP guidelines. It has apportioned funds for construction of buildings for various departments including the Revenue Department which allocated Rs 2.2 crore in 2010-11 and spent Rs.1.95 crore for its own purposes. (Refer to Annexure for more schemes of expenditure of the Works Department). The following table shed light on some instances of violations of SCSP guidelines, pertaining to selected schemes, by the Works Department. It shows that expenditure incurred on the Construction of Roads and Road Improvement Component was Rs. 46.6 crore and Rs. 17.7 crore in 2009-10 and 2010-11 respectively. For the Odisha Roads Project, the department spent Rs. 3 crore on Land acquisitions, Utility Shifting and other Non-Reimbursable Expenses and under Public-Private Partnership Road Projects, Rs. 1.6 crore was used on Environment Clearances, Utility Shifting, DPR Preparation and other expenses. (More details in Annexure)

Table 4.21: Violation of SCSP Guidelines: Examples from the Works Department in Odisha

Schemes	2009-10 BE	2010-11 BE
2198- Construction of building of Revenue and D.M. Deptt.	2.68	2.19
2199- Construction of building of Works Deptt.	0.53	1.95
0197- Construction of Roads	32.00	46.60
1994- Odisha State Roads Project- Road Improvement Component	28.96	17.78
1999- Odisha Roads Project- Land Acquisition, Utility shifting and other Non-Reimbursable Expenses	2.07	2.99
2516- PPP- Road Projects- Land Acquisition	0.00	1.12
2517- PPP- Road Projects- Environment Clearances, Utility Shifting, DPR Preparation and other expenses	0.00	0.48

Source: DDG Odisha 2009-10 and 2010-11

Categories of Expenditure

If the details are categorised, almost 56 percent of the money was spent on other purposes instead of the benefits accruing to the *dalits* (Table 4.22 below). Infrastructure, in this case means Expenditure on construction of buildings, roads, major works like dams and canals, infrastructure for other development purposes, land acquisition, compensation, and so on. The other categories are Grants-in-Aid where further details are missing and Administration which consists of expenses on salary, wages, office expenses and other expenses required for administration and financial obligation of the government. A perusal of the budget documents shows that the expenditure is not as per SCSP guidelines. In some cases, SCSP money has apparently been used for Establishment of Embryo Transfer Technology, Goat Frozen Semen Bank and New Sperm Station.

Table 4.22: Expenditure Classification of Schemes in Odisha State Budget (in %)

2010-11	Rs. in Crore	% of Total
---------	--------------	------------

		SCSP
Infrastructure	518.97	29.14
Grants	325.90	18.30
Administrtaion	147.42	8.28

Source: DDG Odisha 2009-10 and 2010-11

(4) Assessing the Special Component Plan of Uttar Pradesh

Socio-Economic Profile of Dalits in Uttar Pradesh

Uttar Pradesh is the most populous state of India. The SC population in Uttar Pradesh contributes 21.1 percent to the total population. The gap in the literacy rate between SCs and Others has remained the same during different census periods (as shown in Table 4.23).

Table 4.23: Literacy Status of SC Population in Uttar Pradesh

Year	Total Population (%)			Scheduled Caste Population (%)		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1971	31.50	10.55	21.70	17.13	2.46	10.20
1981	38.76	14.04	27.16	24.83	3.89	14.96
1991	55.73	25.31	41.60	40.80	10.69	26.85
2001	68.80	42.20	56.30	60.30	30.50	46.30

Source: Plan Publication of UP Government

The Central and state governments have introduced a number of welfare schemes that are particularly aimed at helping SCs. These include programmes for self-employment and other economic benefits like land distribution, housing, education and health and legislation for safeguarding SCs/STs against atrocities and exploitation. However, these provisions have not been implemented properly.

Table 4.24: Population Below Poverty Line in Uttar Pradesh

Year	Classification	U.P.		India	
		Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
1993-1994	Total	42.28	35.39	37.27	32.36
	Scheduled Castes	58.99	58.02	48.11	49.48
1999-2000	Total	31.22	30.90	27.11	23.65
	Scheduled Castes	43.65	43.51	36.25	38.47

Source: Plan Publication of UP Government

The combined factors of untouchability, atrocities, low literacy level and BPL status appear responsible for the largely low level of representation of SC candidates in government services in the state of Uttar Pradesh (Refer to Table 4.25).

Table 4.25: Representation of SC &ST in Uttar Pradesh Government Services (2004)

Class	Fulltime total employees	SC/ST total employees	Percentage to SC & ST Employees to Total Employees
A	10755	1309	12.17
B	29453	4427	15.03
C	500971	89017	17.77
D	248785	94426	37.95
Total	789964	189179	23.95

Source: Plan Publication of UP Government

From Table 4.26, it is evident that the increase in Scheduled Caste workers in percentage terms is somewhat higher as compared to general workers and they are engaged mostly in low income generating activities such as wage earners in agriculture.

Table 4.26: Occupational Pattern in Uttar Pradesh (Census 2001)

(Workers in Lakh)

Category	Total Workers	Scheduled Caste Workers	General Workers
Cultivators	184.80 (46.98)	31.43 (39.54)	153.21 (48.86)
Agricultural labourers	59.57 (15.14)	23.86 (30.02)	35.63 (11.36)
Non-agricultural labourers	149.01 (37.88)	24.20 (30.44)	124.75 (39.78)
Total main Workers	393.38 (100.00)	79.49 (100.00)	313.59 (100.00)

Note: Figures in brackets denote %age.

Source: Plan Publication of UP Government

Allocation in SCSP

In accordance with the National Accounting procedures, the Government of Uttar Pradesh operationalised the required Minor Head Codes 789 for Special Component Plan (SCSP) and 796 for Tribal Sub Plan (TSP) during the financial year 2009-10². From the financial year 2009-10 onwards, the data of SCSP/TSP can be captured under these standard provisions. The earlier allocations were not as per the National Accounting procedures because of which the data of allocation and expenditure under SCSP/TSP for the year 2008-09 and 2009-10 are not matching. Therefore, the calculation of allocation and expenditure for the year 2008-09 and 2007-08 is not taken into consideration in this analysis.

The government is mandated to allocate at least 21.1 percent of its state plan budget for SCSP. According to Annual Plan and Detailed Demands of Grants, the allocations made for SCSP in Uttar Pradesh was 20.07 percent in 2009-10 and it decreased slightly to 19.94 percent in 2010-11 (Table 4.27).

² Letter of the UP Government dated 14th Oct 2008

Table 4.27: Assessing the Allocation in Uttar Pradesh State Annual Plan

Year	Total Plan Outlay	SCSP allocation	% share of SCSP
2009-10	42533	8538.3	20.07
2010-11	45645	9099.8	19.94

Source: State Annual Plan

When it comes to distribution of SCSP money across sectors, it is clear from Table 2.28 below that 50.5 percent constituted expenditure related to social services in 2009-10, and this increased to 56.8 percent in 2010-11. There is no allocation in General Services. Economic Services constituted 49.4 percent in 2009-10 and it decreased to 43.2 percent in 2010-11. (More in Annexure)

Table 4.28: Assessing the Sector-wise SCSP Allocation under Annual Plan

Services	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11
	RE	BE	RE	BE
Total General Services	9.0	1.7	0.1	0.0
Total Social Services	4308.1	5166.1	50.5	56.8
Total Economic Services	4221.2	3932.0	49.4	43.2
Grand Total	8538.3	9099.8	100.0	100.0

In General Education, Rs. 827.55 crore was allocated which is more than the previous year but it is still very less. As per the Uttar Pradesh government's letter to the Central government, the state's annual share in the cost of implementing the RTE Act comes to Rs 8,000 crore. In technical education only Rs. 0.36 crore is allocated which is 1.25 percent of the total plan of the department.

In the Department of Sports and Youth Services, there is no allocation for SCSP. The Health Department has decreased its budget from Rs. 453.67 crore to Rs. 326.68 crore. It is also very strange to see very less allocations in departments like Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, and Dairy Development. The Department of Fisheries had no allocation and allocation for Department of Water Supply and Sanitation was only 8.9 percent in 2010-11. Departments like Family Welfare, Housing, Electricity, Industries, Civil Aviation, Major and Medium Irrigation and Telecom and Electronics have also nil allocations. Though a larger segment of the SC population resides in villages, there has not been any significant effort to promote village and small industries as reflected in the Budget Estimate, with only 12.48 percent budgetary provision by the Department of Village and Small Industries under SCSP. (More in annexure)

Major allocations have been made in Urban Development, Roads and Bridges and Rural Development Programme. These departments shared 58.8 percent of the total SCSP in 2009-10 and 52.2 percent in 2010-11.

Table 4.29: Assessing the Department-wise Allocation under Uttar Pradesh Annual Plan
(in Rs. Crore)

Departments	2009-10	2010-11
General Education -	369.57	827.55
Technical Education	0.18	0.36
Medical and Public Health	453.67	326.68
Crops and Agriculture Farming	55.33	63.58
Animal Husbandry	21.08	24.71
Dairy development	3.2	6.5
Fisheries	0	0
Cooperation	0.9	0.9
Village & small industries	12.22	18.64

Source: DDG, Uttar Pradesh, 2009-10 and 2010-11

Schemes under SCSP

There are approximately 207 programmes or schemes in operation for the welfare and development of SCs. Allocation to these schemes are given separately in Table 2.30.

Table 2.30: Sector-wise Classification of Budget Provisions in Uttar Pradesh (in Rs. Crore)

Sectors	Financial Year 2010-11		Financial Year 2009-10	
	Budget Provision	Proportion to total SCSP	Budget Provision	Proportion to total SCSP
Primary Education	1027.57	10.97	502.65	5.94
Higher Education	107.96	1.15	69.79	0.83
Employment	775.59	8.28	638.71	7.55
Entrepreneurship	102.77	1.10	95.73	1.13
Road	2051.00	21.90	2454.00	29.02
Housing and Electrification	2304.90	24.61	1917.59	22.68
Health	335.35	3.58	371.62	4.39
Social Security /Household exp	2475.37	26.43	2119.93	25.07
Other	186.18	1.99	285.51	3.38
Total	9366.69	100.00	8455.52	100.00

The share of Primary Education out of total SCSP allocated in 2010-11 was 10.97 percent. The share of Higher Education was 1.1 percent, Health was 3.58 percent and Employment was 8.28 percent, which is an issue of concern. Roads, Housing & Electrification and Social Security have more shares respectively - 21.9 percent, 29 percent and 26.4 percent in the same year. Entrepreneurship has only 1.1 percent share in this.

Categories of Expenditure of SCSP

Taking stock of how the money has been expended, Grants-in-Aid and Grants-in-Aid to Capital Expenditure account for 30 and 23 percent respectively. Grants-in-Aid does not give clear details as to how it was spent. Large-Scale Construction comprises 17.47 percent of the SCSP. It is not clear as to how large-scale constructions benefit the *dalits*. Expenditure on Salary is 4.45 percent of the total SCSP even though salary and wage components are not part of the SCSP mandate.

Contribution to Scholarship and Stipend during 2009-10 was 1.39 percent of the total SCSP size and while during 2010-11 it was 2.33 percent. This indicates that direct education support is the lowest priority of the state. Contrary to this, education is the top priority for SCs. (Refer to Table 4.31)

Table 4.31: Allocations for Key Components in Uttar Pradesh State Budget (in Rs. Crore)

Object Name	2009-10 RE		2010-11 BE	
	Budget	% to Total Budget	Budget	% to Total Budget
Grants-in-Aid	2045.14	24.19	2839.69	30.32
Grants-in-Aid for capital expenditure	2587.00	30.60	2122.00	22.65
Large-Scale Construction	2007.86	23.75	1636.39	17.47
Subsidy	849.04	10.04	879.43	9.39
Other Expenditure	147.39	1.74	791.91	8.45
Salary	335.51	3.97	416.85	4.45
Scholarship and stipend	117.89	1.39	217.81	2.33
Total	8089.83	95.68	8904.08	95.06
Total size of SCSP	8455.53		9366.74	

Table 4.32 below scans the allocation patterns in the two schemes, Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan) and Indira Awas Yojana. Targets shown are taken from the State SCSP Plan Document. Other figures are from the State Budget.

Table 4.32: Scrutiny of Allocations for SSA and IAY in Uttar Pradesh

Financial Year 2010-11					
Scheme Code	Scheme Name	Object code	Object Name	Budget Provision	Performance / Target
2202017890101	SSA (Central 65 / 35 State)	20	Grant in aid	100.00	74 lakh text books, 32 lakh uniform, 17 thousands SC Shiksha Mitra honorarium
2202017890102	SSA (District Plan) (Central 65 / 35 State)	20	Grant in aid	40.00	
2202017890103	Mid Day Meal Program (Central 75 / 25 State)	20	Grant in aid	420.00	
Financial Year 2009-10					

2202017890101	SSA (Central 65 / 35 State)	20	Grant in aid	100.00	74 lakh text books, 32 lakh uniform, 17 thousands SC Shiksha Mitra honorarium
2202017890102	SSA (District Plan) (Central 65 / 35 State)	20	Grant in aid	40.00	
2202017890103	Mid Day Meal Program (Central 75 / 25 State)	No allocation			
Details of Indira Awas Yojana					
Financial Year 2010-11					
Schem Code	Scheme Name	Object code	Object Name	Budget Provision	Performance Target
2505017890101	Indira Awas Yojana (Central 75 / 25 State)	27	Subsidy	228.60	3 Lakh
Financial Year 2009-10					
2505017890101	Indira Awas Yojana (Central 75 / 25 State)	27	Subsidy	135.00	2.4 Lakh

Funds under these two programmes are spent as Grants-in-Aid and Subsidy. In this expenditure, there are important points to be noted: SSA is a general programme with the provision for free textbooks and uniforms to all. It is not specifically designed for SCs or STs. Therefore, there is no question of accounting SSA expenditure under SCSP. The second gap is the payment of salary to the Shiksha Mitras. In this context, the Planning Commission guidelines dated 31st Oct 2005 do not mandate payment of salary or wages under SCSP or TSP. In any case, Shiksha Mitras are not only teaching SCs but others as well.

(5) Assessing the Special Component Plan of Madhya Pradesh

Socio-Economic Profile of Dalits in Madhya Pradesh

SCs constitute 15.17 percent of the total population of Madhya Pradesh and 5.49 percent of the total SC population in India. The sex ratio of SCs in the state is 915 and literacy rate is 58.6 percent. The literacy rate among SCs has increased from 34 percent registered at 1991 Census to 58.6 percent at 2001 Census. This is higher than the national average of 54.7 percent aggregated for all SCs. Male and female literacy rates (72.3 percent and 43.3 percent respectively) are higher in comparison with those at the national level (66.6 percent & 41.9 percent). The proportion of literates who have attained education up to the primary and middle school levels constitute 28.5 percent and 13.9 percent respectively. Literates educated up to matric/higher secondary level constitute 10.8 percent. Graduates and above are 2.5 percent. A majority (75.5 per cent) of the SC population resides in the rural areas. Agricultural Labourers constitute the highest proportion (42.5 percent) among

all workers. This is lower than the national average of 45.6 percent recorded for all SCs in this category.

Assessment of SCSP in Madhya Pradesh

In the Madhya Pradesh budget, SCSP is presented in three demands. Demand No. 15 is Financial Assistance to Panchyati Raj Institutions, under Special Component Plan, Demand. No. 53 is Financial Assistance to Urban Local Bodies under Special Component Plan, and Demand No. 64 is Special Component Plan. Since all these demands are for the welfare and development of SCs, they all are taken together as SCSP for the purpose of this budget analysis.

In the financial year 2010-11, the total budget size of the state is Rs. 57,429 crore and the plan size is Rs. 21,939 crore (around 38 percent of the total budget). While the allocation under SCSP is Rs. 3,303.18 crore, out of the total plan outlay, it constitutes 15.05 percent for SCs. The allocation is marginally lower than the requisite 15.17 percent. Although the allocation under SCSP in the state seems to be almost appropriate, only 33 departments out of 60 have allocated funds for SCSP under their plan budget (Refer to Table 4.33).

In the financial year 2009-10, the budget for the state was Rs. 52,735 crore, out of which the plan budget was Rs. 19,028 crore or 36.08 percent of the total budget. The allocation under SCSP was Rs. 2,855.6 crore which is 14.85 percent of the total budget. Out of the total funds allocated for SCSP in 2010-11, 69.5 percent is on revenue expenditure and 30.5 percent on capital expenditure. Out of the 33 departments, 7 departments have allocated funds less than 10 percent of their plan. A few important departments like Public Health and Family Welfare, Commerce and Industry and Employment and Water Resources have allocated only 6.5 percent, 5.2 percent and 4.67 percent respectively.

Table 4.33: Demand-wise Allocations under SCSP (in Rs. Crore)

Demand No.	2008-09 AE	2009-10 RE	2010-11 BE
15	557.22	788.97	1172.18
53	89.23	93.94	126.1
64	1385.97	1972.78	2004.91
Total	2032.42	2855.69	3303.19

Source: MP Budget Book No. 50, 2009-10 and 2010-11

For nutrition-related programmes there were no allocations during the 2007-08 and 2008-09. However, during 2009-10, it has the highest allocation (Rs. 192.84 crore) amongst all the schemes in operation. How the data was available for the earlier budget and how it has been prepared and considered for the year 2009-10 requires a serious study. Also, how are the disbursement agencies disbursing funds to directly benefit the SCs needs further clarification?

Allocation is the second highest for Power Generation and Distribution,. It was Rs. 164.19 crore during 2009-10. The question is how many power plants are separately built and operated for the purpose of generating power for development of SCs. Even if built, does it fall under the State Policy? Such programmes are not mandated under SCSP. The third highest allocation is under the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) i.e., Rs 130.25 crore for 2009-10. It is however not mandated under SCSP as per the guidelines dated 31st Oct 2005, issued by the Planning Commission. It clearly states those salary and wage components need not to be taken under SCSP.

Roads and Bridges are never built for SCs only unless it is in the premises of their hamlets. So far, the hamlet-connecting roads have not been a priority of the state government. The allocation of Rs. 83.39 crore is for the area. How this area denotes a hamlet is not clear. MDMS and SSA are also general programmes. They are not exclusively designed for SCs. The only programme that is directly targeting SCs is the Scholarship Scheme.

Table 4.34: Schemes with Highest Allocations in Madhya Pradesh (in Rs. Crore)

Demand No	Major Head	Page no.	Scheme	2007-08 AE	2008-09 RE	2009-10 BE
64	2236	119	Goods and others for special nutrition requirement programme	0.00	0.00	192.84
64	4801	49	Loan for power transmission and distribution agencies	52.00	117.51	164.19
15	2505	30	NREGA	41.35	113.70	130.25
15	2501	28	SGSY for Backward Regions	13.00	129.15	119.67
64	5054	65-66	Capital Exp on Roads and bridges in area where SC population is higher	64.74	53.12	83.39
64	2202	68	Grants for SSA - Govt primary schools	97.96	116.79	81.89
64	2225	135	Post Metric Scholarship for SCs	49.67	68.41	74.63
15	2515	30	Mid-Day Meal	96.82	56.00	72.00
Total				415.55	654.68	918.86

Source: MP DDG No.50 2009-10 and 2010-11

Mid-Day Meal Scheme, Power Generation, SSA, etc; all are for the general purposes. In this situation, as for these nine schemes are concerned, Rs 844.23 crore (i.e. Rs. 918.86 – 74.63 = 844.23 crore) is spent on the programmes that have no link with sustainable livelihood of SCs. This amount contributes 29.87 percent to SCSP Size equaling Rs. 2,826.34 crore for the year 2009-10.

Misallocation of SCSP

There are many allocations which raise questions about the nature of allocations made under SCSP for micro-level income generating benefits and bridging social gaps. There are some allocations given under SCSP but they do not follow the norms for SCSP allocation. In Sagar Medical Collage under Medical Education Department, Rs. 81 lakh is allocated for salaries, D.A, other allowances and similar activities and Rs. 3.9 crore have been booked for postal and telegraph, telephone, furniture and equipments, petrol, uniforms and similar activities. In Department of Medical Education, Rs. 22 lakh have been booked for purchase of furniture and equipments for establishing Homeopathy and Ayurvedic clinics. Water Resources Department has allocated Rs. 6.4 crore for the construction of channels. For Narmada Valley Development Project, Rs. 40 lakh is allocated for survey and mapping of the detailed project for Narmada Valley Development. Again, Rs. 236 Crore is allocated under department of Public Works Department for construction of State highways, Bridges and other expenses. Under Department of Power, Rs. 8 crore has been allocated for Satpura Thermal power station and Rs. 10 crore for Malwa Thermal Power station. The same Department of Power has allocated Rs. 30.45 Crore for strengthening of distribution system. Under Higher Education department, there is a provision of Rs. 1 Crore for construction of Staff room. Under Department of Science and Technology, there is a provision of Rs 5 lakh for documentation of conventional knowledge and its scientific verification. Under Department of Women and Child Development, there is a provision of Rs. 3.46 crore for “Mangal Diwas”. Department of Sports and Youth welfare has allocated Rs. 2.90 crore for construction and functioning of Sports Academies.

Conclusion

The analysis has attempted to track the share of plan funds in State Annual Plans and DDGs for SCs in the budgets of the five study states (Bihar, Rajasthan, Odisha, UP and MP). The assessment of annual plans for the study states for 2009-10 and 2010-11 reveals that all five states have allocated funds in the Total Plan Outlay in proportion to the population of SCs. However, the analysis of DDGs shows that Bihar and Rajasthan have not allocated funds for SCs in proportion to SC population, while Odisha, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh have allocated funds as stipulated by the SCSP guidelines. In Bihar, SCs were earmarked 1.2 percent in 2007-08(AE), 1.1 percent in 2009-10 (RE) and again 1.2 percent in 2010-11(BE). In the case of Rajasthan, the plan fund varies from 3 to 4 percent for SCs for the same time period. The analysis of the department and scheme-wise allocations shows that there are many instances of fund diversion and misappropriation of funds earmarked for SCs.

Chapter 5: Analysis of the States Budgets through the Lens of *Adivasis*

This chapter examines the State Budgets through the lens of the *adivasis* (STs) and includes five States – Odisha, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh. Among the five selected study states, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar have less than 1 percent tribal populations while Odisha and Rajasthan have 22 percent and 13 percent tribal populations. The Madhya Pradesh (MP), the tribal population constitute 20.30 per cent of the total population. The average landholding size and literacy rate is found to be lower among STs as compared to the general population. The chapter tries to capture the quantum/magnitude of plan funds for development of STs through assessing the Annual Plan and Detailed Demands for Grants (DDGs) of the states for 2009-10 and 2010-11. The quantum and percentage share of STs in the total plan size and in individual departments have been examined in order to measure annual plan allocations. The state DDGs have also been assessed department-wise through scrutiny of functional major heads and minor heads. In addition, the issues involved in the approach adopted for TSP implementation has been discussed. The chapter is divided into three parts – (1) Summary of assessment of plan allocation under TSP in four states; (2) State-wise analysis in terms of allocation and utilisation of funds; and (3) approach of implementation adopted for implementation of TSP in the study states.

5.1. Plan Allocation under TSP in Four States: Summary of Assessment

Table 5.1 compares the allocation under State Annual Plan and DDGs in proportion with the ST population in the three states of Bihar, Rajasthan and Odisha for 2009-10. In the case of Bihar, where the ST population is 0.9 percent, it was found that 1.02 percent allocation was made for STs in total State Annual Plan. However, the allocation under DDGs shows 0.13 percent of the total State Plan which is much less than the ST population in the state. Similarly, in Rajasthan which has a 13-percent ST population, the Annual Plan shows allocation almost equal to ST population, but the analysis of state DDGs shows that the allocation for STs is just 2.84 percent in comparison with the *adivasi* population of 13 percent. In case of Odisha, the percentage share of ST population matches with Annual Plan allocation of the state, while allocation made for STs in DDGs is slightly less than the ST population in the state.

Table 5.1: Plan Allocation for ST: Comparison between Annual Plan and Detailed Demand for Grants in 2009-10

State	% ST Population (2001 Census)	State Annual Plan			Detailed Demands for Grants (BE)		
		Total Plan Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	TSP	% Share	Total Plan Outlay(RE) (in Rs. Crore)	TSP	%Share of Total
Bihar	0.9	16000	163.38	1.02	16076.15	20.49	0.13
Rajasthan	12.56	17322	2115.35	12.6	13061.40	370.79	2.84
Odisha	22.1	9500	2171.48	22.1	10853.47	2193.62	20.21

Source: State Annual Plan and Detailed Demands for Grants

Table 5.2 presents a comparative analysis of plan allocation between State Annual Plan and DDGs regarding share of ST population in the states of Bihar, Rajasthan and Odisha for 2010-11. In Bihar, the allocations in Annual Plan and DDGs for 2010-11 are similar to the previous year. In Rajasthan, the allocation in Annual Plan is almost at par with the ST population and the DDGs show that the outlay for STs increased to 3.94 from 2.84 percent. However, this is still inadequate in terms of the ST population in the state. In Odisha, no change has been observed in the allocation of Annual Plan with respect to share of ST population but allocation in DDGs was found over 1 percent short of the percentage of the *adivasi* population in the state.

Table 5.2: Plan Allocation for ST: Comparison between Annual Plan and Detailed Demand for Grants in 2010-11

State	% ST Population (2001 Census)	State Planning Board			Detailed Demands for Grants (BE)		
		Total Plan Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	TSP	% Share	Total Plan Outlay(BE) (in Rs. Crore)	TSP	% Share
Bihar	0.9	20000	222.49	1.11	20000	27.74	0.14
Rajasthan	12.56	24000	2857.41	11.91	14677.79	579.02	3.94
Odisha	22.1	11000	2463.08	22.39	11722.6	2382.36	20.32

Source: State Annual Plan, Detailed Demands for Grants

Table 5.3 shows the comparison between Annual Plan and DDGs in terms of SCs and STs in Uttar Pradesh. The Annual Plan document does not provide segregated data for SCs and STs in its document. Therefore, the allocations of SCSP and TSP have had to be put together from the DDGs and then the allocation under Annual Plan and DDGs compared with the combined population. As per the Census 2001, SCs and STs constitute 21.15 percent and 0.06 percent of the total population in Uttar Pradesh. The table indicates that there is not much difference in percentage of SC and ST population in the Annual Plan but the allocation under DDGs is slightly less than their percentage of population.

Table 5. 3: Plan Allocation for SCs and STs: Comparison between Annual Plan and Detailed Demands for Grants in 2010-11

State	% SC & ST Population (2001 Census)	State Planning Board			Detailed Demands for Grants (BE)		
		Total Plan Outlay (Rs. In Crore)	SCSP and TSP	%Share of Total	Total Plan Outlay(RE) (in Rs. Crore)	SCSP and TSP	%Share of Total
U.P.	21.21	42000	8912	21.22	45645.17	9165.18	20.08

Source: Annual Plan, Detailed Demands for Grants

Note: A separate table has been made for Uttar Pradesh as data was available only for 2010-11, because there was no bifurcation between the SC/ST allocations provided by Planning commission. Therefore, the figures for SCSP and TSP have been taken together.

5.2. Plan Allocation under TSP in Four States: State wise analysis

In continuation of the above analysis, this section examines the total quantum of allocation and department-wise allocations for STs under the Annual Plan and DDGs.

5.2.1 Assessment of Allocation under TSP in Bihar

Table 5.4 explains department-wise and sector-wise allocations for STs in the Annual Plan in 2009-10 and 2010-11 in Bihar. It appears that the percentage share of allocation for STs has been insignificant in critical sectors like economic services, rural development, agricultural and services. On the positive side, the annual plan gave more focus on Special Area Development Programme (3 percent), Community and Social Services (2 percent), Science and Technology (1 percent) and Industries and Minerals (1 percent).

Table 5.4: Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Bihar State Plan (2009-10 and 2010-11)

Heads of Development	Annual Plan 2009-10			Annual Plan 2010-11		
	Approved Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	of which earmarked for TSP (in Rs. Crore)	%share of TSP in approved outlay	Approved Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	of which earmarked for TSP (in Rs. Crore)	%share of TSP in approved outlay
Agriculture & Allied Services	659.35	5.88	0.89	1193.24	11.41	0.96
Rural Development	989.88	7.71	0.78	997.53	9.13	0.92
Special Area Programme	759.91	23.59	3.10	752.49	21.75	2.89
Irrigation & Flood Control	1829.50	0	0	2064.03	0	0
Energy	864.45	0	0	1682.23	0	0
Industries & Minerals	462.22	4.62	1.00	472.45	4.72	1.00
Transport	3347.63	10.50	0.31	4522.49	9.32	0.21
Science & Technology	165.92	2.19	1.32	270.69	2.90	1.07
Economic Services	571.05	0.23	0.04	503.19	0.40	0.08
Social and Community Services	6066.31	108.67	1.79	7156.04	162.85	2.28
General Services	283.78	0.00	0.00	385.63	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	16000	163.38	1.02	20000	222.49	1.11

Source: Annual Plan, Government of Bihar

Table 5.5 shows that of the 56 departments in Bihar, allocations under TSP have been made for only 2 departments which are related to Welfare of SCs/STs and OBCs and Agriculture Development. The SC and ST Welfare Department allocates a major chunk of funds for STs in DDGs, while the allocation under the Agriculture Department is not significant. The plan budget for STs in the State Budget has increased from Rs. 16.06 crore in 2008-09 (BE) to Rs. 27.74 crore in 2010-11 (BE). Looking at actual utilisation for 2008-09 shows, it was Rs. 14 crore against BE figure of Rs 16.06 crore. The table reflects that the state government could not absorb funds inspite of the low amount of allocation for STs,

Table 5.5: Department-wise Allocation under TSP in Bihar (in Rs. Crore)

S. no	Departments	Major Heads	2008-09 (BE)	2008-09 (RE)	2008-09 (AE)	2009-10 (BE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
1	SC & ST Welfare	Total of 2225	15.96	16.47	14.09	18.74	18.74	26.64
2	SC & ST Welfare	Total of 4225	0.1	2.1	0	0.96	0.96	1.1
3	Agriculture Department	Total of 2401	0	0.1	0.10	1.07	0.8	0
Total TSP allocation			16.06	18.67	14.19	20.77	20.49	27.74

Source: Detailed Demands for Grants, Bihar

It is evident from Table 5.6 that there is a mismatch in the allocation of funds for STs when the DDGs are compared with the ST population. For example, in Bihar, where the ST population is 0.9 percent as per the 2001 Census, the DDGs of the State Budget shows a percentage share of a minuscule 0.21 towards STs in 2007-08 (AE) which is higher than other years. It has declined by 0.11 percent in 2008-09 (RE). In 2010-11 (BE), it has gone up to 0.14 percent.

Table 5.6: Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Bihar State Budget (2007-08 to 2010-11)

	2007-08 (AE)	2008-09 (BE)	2008-09 (RE)	2008-09 (Actual)	2009-10 (BE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
Allocation under TSP	19.973	16.064	18.671	14.190	20.765	20.498	27.740
Total Plan size	9700.25	13500	17577.87	12335.9	16000	16076.15	20000
Percentage share of TSP in total allocation	0.21	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.13	0.13	0.14

Source: Detailed Demands for Grants of Bihar

5.2.2 Assessment of Allocation under TSP in Uttar Pradesh

The annual plan document of Uttar Pradesh does not provide allocations separately for SCs and ST. Table 5.7 shows that the Department of Rural Development (50 percent), Transport, General

Economic services (14 percent) and Social Services (30 percent) provided a sizeable amount of funds in 2009-10. These departments allocated funds higher than the proportion of the SC and ST population. The Special Area Programme and Agriculture and Allied Services Department and Industry and Minerals also allocated 19 percent, 12 percent and 14 percent respectively. The table also projects a sharp decline in allocation in Agriculture & Allied Services and General Economic Services in 2010-11.

Table 5.7: Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per UP State Plan (2009-10 and 2010-11)

Heads of Development	Annual Plan 2009-10			Annual Plan 2010-11		
	Approved Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	of which earmarked for SCSP/TSP (in Rs. Crore)	%share of SCSP/TSP in approved outlay (in Rs. Crore)	Approved Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	of which earmarked for SCSP/TSP (in Rs. Crore)	%share of SCSP/TSP in approved outlay
Agriculture & Allied Services	2671.72	374.83	14.03	3324.59	280.12	8.43
Rural Development	2591.33	1335.93	51.55	2656.62	1332.88	50.17
Special Area Programme	1007.93	192.60	19.11	996.32	193.18	19.39
Irrigation & Flood Control	3214.57	25.96	0.81	3603.82	28.40	0.79
Energy	5628.91	100.25	1.78	4313.59	285.47	6.62
Industries & Minerals	3414.29	12.61	0.37	4517.28	626.73	13.87
Transport	4435.33	1351.00	30.46	3273.28	800.00	24.44
Science & Technology	28.39	0	0	25.32	0	0
General Economic Services	840.46	318.54	37.90	2522.11	439.77	17.44
Social Services	14930.05	4563.28	30.56	16581.77	4925.45	29.70
General Services	237.02	0	0	185.3	0	0
Grand Total	39000	8275	21.22	42000	8912	21.22

Source: Annual Plan, Government of Uttar Pradesh

As per Table 5.8, the government of Uttar Pradesh has allocated 0.04 percent under TSP in the total plan allocation in 2009-10 (RE) and 2010 (BE) which is less than the ST population (0.05 percent of the the total population of the state).

Table 5.8: Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per UP State Budget (2008-09 to 2010-11)

	2008-09 (AE)	2009-10 (BE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
--	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Allocation under TSP (in Rs. Crore)	13.54	19.53	18.85	18.57
Total Plan size (in Rs. Crore)			42532.89	45645.17
% share of TSP in total allocation			0.04	0.04

Source: Detailed Demand for Grants, Government of Uttar Pradesh

Table 5.9 presents department-wise fund allocations for STs in DDGs. TSP is being implemented in Uttar Pradesh since 2008-09. In this process, the government has opened a separate minor head 789 to route the allocation for STs. Moreover, there is separate demand number 81 for STs (SC/ST and OBC Welfare) in which all the 9 departments have reported their expenditure. The table indicates that there are mainly three departments – Welfare of SCs and STs and (Rs. 14.21 crore), Water Supply (Rs. 2.75 crore) and Soil Conservation (Rs. 2.05 crore) which allocate major amounts of funds under TSP in 2009-10. There have not been any significant changes in allocation in these departments from 2009-10 to 2010-11.

Table 5.9: Department-wise Allocation under TSP in UP (in Rs. Crore)

S. no	Departments	Major Heads	2008-09 (AE)	2009-10 (BE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
1	Water Supply	2215	2.69	2.75	2.75	2.75
2	SC/ST/OBC Welfare	2225	8.36	14.20	13.52	13.23
4	Farming	2401	0.078	0.09	0.09	0.09
5	Soil & Water Convection	2402	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05
6	Fishery	2405	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	Co-Operative	2425	0.005	0.01	0.01	0.01
8	Other Village Development Program	2515	0.12	0.23	0.23	0.23
9	Village & Small Industry	2851	0.24	0.21	0.21	0.21
Total TSP allocation			13.54	19.53	18.85	18.57

Source: Detailed Demands for Grants, Government of UP

5.2.3 Assessment of Allocation under TSP in Rajasthan

Table 5.10 assesses department/sector wise plan allocations under TSP made by the Rajasthan State Planning Board. It shows that the departments/sectors that have allocated plan funds for STs in proportion to their population in 2009-10 are Rural Development, Agriculture & Allied Services, Special Area Programme and Energy. Departments and sectors that made allocations of around 10

percent are Irrigation & Flood Control, Industries & Mines, Transport and Social and Community Services. In 2010-11, Agriculture & Allied Services showed a sharp decline to 4.33 percent from 15.34 percent in 2009-10. In 2009-10, the plan allocation under the Department of Rural Development also declined by 4 percent from the previous year's allocation. The allocation under Science & Technology dipped from 6 percent in 2009-10 to 1.64 percent in 2010-11. General Services have not allocated any funds in the two years analysed.

Table 5.10: Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Rajasthan State Plan (2009-10 and 2010-11)

Heads of Development	Annual Plan 2009-10			Annual Plan 2010-11		
	Approved Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	of which earmarked for TSP (in Rs. Crore)	%share of TSP in approved outlay	Approved Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	of which earmarked for TSP (in Rs. Crore)	%share of TSP in approved outlay
Agriculture & Allied Services	685.0695	105.07	15.34	1348.15	58.31	4.33
Rural Development	1217.48	240.42	19.75	1305.92	199.26	15.26
Special Area Programme	92.25	12.13	13.15	96.19	12.81	13.32
Irrigation & Flood Control	949.1648	93.44	9.84	853.07	71.60	8.39
Energy	7483.971	964.98	12.89	12434.00	1551.00	12.47
Industries & Mines	140.1038	11.92	8.51	149.43	12.78	8.55
Transport	709.596	74.07	10.44	896.76	108.71	12.12
Science & Technology	2.2	0.13	5.94	8.42	0.14	1.64
Economic Services	100.2504	0.09	0.09	151.69	3.55	2.34
Social and Community Services	5872.653	613.10	10.44	6655.73	839.24	12.61
General Services	69.261	0.00	0.00	100.64	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	17322	2115.35	12.21	24000.00	2857.41	11.91

Source: Annual Plan, Government of Rajasthan

Of the 50 departments responsible for Plan outlays for STs, only 29 departments have allocated funds. Moreover, the percentage share of TSP in the Total Plan Outlay is very low when compared to the minimum earmarked allocation in proportion to the population of Scheduled Castes in Rajasthan. The two departments that stand out are the Departments of Welfare of SC/ST and OBCs (Major Head 2225) with a significant amount of allocation of Rs. 127 crore for STs and Other departments like Nutrition (Rs. 34 crore) and General Education (Rs. 32 crore), Minor (Rs. 30 crore) Irrigation and Rural Development (Rs. 27 crore) in 2008-09. But the the departments have under performed in terms of utilisation of the total funds allocated in 2008-09. No department was able to realise the allocated funds for STs. Further, the allocation for the same departments mentioned in 2008-09 has increased in 2009-10 and 2010-11.

Like Bihar, a similar situation is noticed in Rajasthan as well. Analysis of data of the financial year 2009-10 from the Detailed Demands for Grants and ST population in Rajasthan reflects a mismatch in the allocation of funds to the STs. The utilisation of funds was also seen to be very poor due to the low absorption capacity of funds in the states (Refer to Table 5.11).

Table 5.11: Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Rajasthan State Budget (2008-09 to 2010-11)

	2008-09 (AE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
Allocation under TSP (in Rs. Crore)	295.8	370.79	579.02
Total Plan size (Rs in Crore)	11866.41	13061.40	14677.79
%share of TSP in total allocation	2.49	2.84	3.94

Source: Detailed Demands for Grants, Government of Rajasthan

5.2.4 Assessment of Allocation under TSP in Odisha

Table 5.12 assesses the share of plan allocation for STs in total annual plan size of Odisha in 2009-10 and 2010-11. Special Area Programme, Rural Development, Social Services, Transport, Irrigation & Flood Control departments have allocated more than the share of the ST population in the state in 2009-10. However, there is a decline in the share of plan allocation for the Transport Department and Industry & Mines Department in 2010-11. In the General Services, the share of plan allocation for STs constitute around 19-20 percent in total allocation in 2009-10 and 2010-11. In this regard, the only surprising case was the allocation under Economic Services in TSP which is very less at 3 percent and 1 percent respectively in 2009-10 and 2010-11. In the annual plan, the allocation made for STs is equal to their population share in the state.

Table 5.12: Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Odisha State Plan (2009-10 and 2010-11)

Heads of Development	Annual Plan 2009-10			Annual Plan 2010-11		
	Approved Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	of which earmarked for TSP (in Rs. Crore)	%share of TSP in approved outlay	Approved Outlay (in Rs. Crore)	of which earmarked for TSP (in Rs. Crore)	%share of TSP in approved outlay
Agriculture & Allied Services	359.625	61.846	17.20	726.3743	110.768	15.25
Rural Development	260.757	71.673	27.49	259.367	71.541	27.58
Special Area Programme	1016.84	383.07	37.67	1176.55	456.41	38.79

Irrigation & Flood Control	1788	425.86	23.82	2111.09	507.974	24.06
Energy	1973.42	318.552	16.14	1462.2895	231.347	15.82
Industries & Mines	38.35	7.729	20.15	74.8	11.045	14.77
Transport	931.77	211.844	22.74	1273.6	215.447	16.92
Science & Technology	242.6019	44.86	18.49	307.7905	55.646	18.08
Economic Services	274.856	8.526	3.10	333.67	4.476	1.34
Social Services	2501.685	616.5677	24.65	3139.2937	770.357	24.54
General Services	112.095	20.95	18.69	135.175	28.07	20.77
Grand Total	9500	2171.4777	22.86	11000	2463.081	22.39

Source: Annual Plan, Government of Odisha

In terms of department-wise fund allocation under DDGs, the Department of Social Welfare contributes a major share under TSP which was Rs. 318 crore in 2009-10 and Rs 343 crore in 2010-11. Besides, the combined allocation under Major Irrigation, Command Area Development, Minor Irrigation, and Flood Control Projects constituted Rs. 570 crore in 2009-10 and Rs. 718 crore in 2010-11. Likewise, the total allocation under Special Area Development Programme for Rural Development, Rural Development and other Rural Development Programme also contributed to a large chunk of the total allocation – Rs. 162 crore and Rs. 178 crore in 2009-10 and 2010-11 respectively. The Department of General Education and Nutrition, Social Security & Welfare have also allocated a sizeable amount under TSP. Although there is increase in absolute amounts of the plan allocation for TSP in Industries & Mines and Transport departments, there is a significant decline in the share of plan allocation in these departments during 2009-10 to 2010-11.

Table 5.13 shows that the allocation of funds for STs in the DDGs is not in proportion to their population in the state as it was in the Annual Plan. It is slightly less than their population which ranges from 1 to 2 percent taking in to account all the financial years mentioned in the table.

Table 5.13: Share of TSP in Total Plan Outlay as per Odisha State Budget (2008-09 to 2010-11)

	2008-09 (AE)	2009-10 (BE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
Allocation under TSP (in Rs. Crore)	1875.17	1933.52	2193.62	2382.36
Total Plan size (in Rs. Crore)	8933	9913.48	10853.47	11722.6
% share of TSP in total allocation	20.99	19.50	20.21	20.32

Source: Detailed Demands for Grants, Odisha

5.2.5 Assessment of Allocation under TSP in Madhya Pradesh

In Madhya Pradesh (MP), the tribal population constitute 20.30 per cent of the total population (census 2011). In terms of every development indicators, the tribal in MP are lagging behind to

general population of the state. The Tribal Sub Plan in MP is being implemented since a long time. To capture the total fund allocation for TSP, there are three main source of document which needs to be assessed. The documents are part -1 financial detail, part -3, summary of demand for grant and demand for grants (book 49). In book 49, there are demand numbers – 41, 42, 52 and 68 which gives the details of allocation for TSP.

Demand Number 41: Tribal Sub Plan

Demand Number 42: Public works (roads and bridges) under Tribal Sub Plan

Demand Number 52: Financial assistance to PRIs Tribal Sub Plan

Demand Number 68: Financial assistance to urban local bodies under Tribal Sub Plan

The table -5.14 shows that in 2010-11, 35 departments have reported their expenditure in the state budget and total Rs. 4881 crore have been allocated under TSP, while total allocation in 2008-09 and 2009-10 were Rs. 3149 and 4248 respectively. The break-up of allocation under each demand shows that demand 41 constitute 64.2 per cent of total allocation under TSP , while demand -42,52 and 68 share 6.4 ,28.9 and 0.6 per cent respectively of TSP allocation. The analysis shows that allocation under TSP has been in proportion to the Tribal population but proper utilisation of those allocated fund has been a major challenge. Further, the analysis of expenditure for several years under TSP reveals that average actual expenditure from 20001-02 to 2005-06 has been 26.74 per cent; it has gradually increased after 2006-07.

Table 5.14: Status of Fund Allocation under TSP in MP

	Allocation (in Crore)	Percentage Share of TSP in Total Plan Allocation
2008-09	3149	21.3
2009-10	4248	21.08
2010-11	4881	22.2

Source: Compiled Sanket Development Group, Bhopal from budget book of Madhya Pradesh Government.

5.3. Implementation Issues in TSP

TSP follows the *area* approach as against the SCSP which focuses on the *basti* approach. Basically, the geographical location of tribes makes the basis to adopt an area approach. There are some geographical areas where the tribals have high concentrations in terms of population while in other areas tribals form only a small portion of the total population. There are some tribal groups which still practice shifting cultivation and are in the food gathering stage, some others are pursuing primitive forms of agriculture. To make faster development of the tribal community, the tribal areas in the country have been divided into three broad categories. The first category consists of those states and Union Territories that have a majority tribal population. The second category consists of states and Union Territories that constitute substantial tribal population but majority tribal

population in particular administrative units, such as blocks and *tehsils* (sub-divisions of districts). The third category consists of those states and Union Territories with dispersed tribal populations.

Tribal majority states like Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland and Union Territories such as Lakshadweep have not been included in TSP. The TSP approach was adopted in the second and third category of states and Union Territories. To implement the TSP in a coordinated manner in states, Integrated Tribal Development Projects (ITDP/ITDA) were conceived during 5th Five Year Plan and these have been continued ever since. During the 6th Five Year Plan, the Modified Area Development Approach (MADA) was adopted to cover smaller areas of tribal concentration. The TSP strategy during the 7th Five Year Plan was extended further to cover even smaller areas of tribal concentration and thus the cluster approach was adopted. The Scheduled Areas as per the Constitutional orders have been declared in eight states viz Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha and Rajasthan. The Constitution has made various enactments and regulations promulgated in those states for the welfare of Scheduled Tribes and their protection from social and economic exploitation.

TSP (with twin objectives of socio-economic development of STs and protection of tribals against exploitation) are being implemented through ITDPs/ ITDAs. ITDPs are generally contiguous areas of the size of a *tehsil* or block or more in which STs comprise 50 percent or more of the total population. The second approach is called MADA, identifying pockets with concentrations of 50 % or more ST population within a total minimum population of 10,000. MADA pockets do not have separate administrative structures to implement development programmes. The third is the Cluster approach identifying pockets of tribal concentration of 50 percent or more within a total population of 5,000 or more. Finally, the Primitive Tribal Groups (PTGs) are tribal communities among the STs who live in near isolation in inaccessible habitats. They are characterised by a low rate of growth of population, pre-agricultural level of technology and extremely low levels of literacy. So far, 75 PTGs have been identified. The following table enumerates the TSP strategies.

Table 5.15: Administrative Classification of TSP by Union Government

Implementation Approaches under TSP	All India	MP*	UP	Bihar*	Odisha	Rajasthan
ITDP/ITDA	194	49	1	14	21	5
MADA	259	39	1	41	46	44
Clusters	82	7		7	13	11
PGTs	75	8			14	1

Source: Ministry of Tribal Affairs, government of India

* Numbers are based on the undivided MP and Bihar States

The studies commissioned by the Ministry of Tribal Affairs (Adoption of TSP Approach in Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and MP) and the Planning Commission (Livelihood Options Assets Creation out of SCSP and TSP schemes and its impact among SCs and STs) found several problems in the functioning of ITDP and ITDAs to implement the strategy of TSP. In many states, project officers at ITDP do not have sufficient work experience. Often times, they come from a junior grade

level which has serious consequences on their ability to ensure good performance. The Block Development Officer (BDO) is considered superior to Project officers at ITDP. In Project offices at ITDP, the staff is inadequate and many staff members work on contractual basis. On top of that, the staff is not adequately trained.

Integrated planning was the major plank of the TSP approach through functional integration. One of the weaknesses in the process of implementing TSP is lack of proper planning process under Special Central Assistance under TSP and Grants-in-Aid under Article 275(1) of the Constitution relating to TSP at ITDPs. Further, whatever plans are made lack integrated planning. Planning without convergence and integration with line departments is also a big problem; the line departments operate independently in ITDPs. In addition, the participation of tribal communities in planning under ITDP is very limited. These studies also observed that office infrastructure is poor; there is a lack of basic facilities for staff in areas of ITDP, which is why officers do not want to stay there for a longer period. Under TSP, it is found that there is poor data management due to lack of sufficient accountants and Management Information System (MIS) and a lack uniformity in the formats for data reporting. As a result, each IDP has its own reporting format.

In light of the problems relating to the functioning ITDPs and ITDA, substantive reforms in its implementation mechanism are required. The implementation process of TSP could be strengthened by effectuating the Provision of the Panchayats Extension to the Scheduled Areas Act, 1996, (PESA) in its true spirit. PESA was envisioned through the constitutional amendment in Part IX of The Constitution to implement it in eight states coming under the Fifth Schedule.

Conclusion

From the assessment of Annual Plans in four states, it is seen that the allocation for STs is either equal to or more than the proportion of their population in the states while the analysis of DDGs shows that the allocation made for STs in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan and Odisha is lower than their population share. The gap in plan allocation in DDGs and ST population is quite high in Rajasthan and Bihar while the situation is somewhat better in Uttar Pradesh and Odisha.. In Odisha and Uttar Pradesh, allocations under Annual Plan and DDGs are almost similar while in Bihar and Rajasthan, there is a huge difference. The analysis also shows that there has been poor utilisation of funds due to poor absorption capacity in the states. The assessment of implementation approaches under TSP reveals that ITDP/ITDA are unable to function due to reasons ranging from lack of adequate and trained staff, poor planning processes, and lack of adequate office infrastructure to basic facilities for staff. Besides, in several states, Project Officers at ITDP do not have sufficient work experience which compromises their ability to perform.

Chapter 6: Summary Findings and Recommendations

Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs) have historically been among the most disadvantaged sections of Indian society owing to their socio-economic exploitation and isolation over the centuries. In the Post-Independence era, they have remained neglected in the process of planning and implementation of development interventions of the Union and state governments for a long time. It was in the 1970s that the Planning Commission stepped in and put in place a mechanism that would ensure that government policies percolated down to the *dalits* and *adivasis* through introduction of the Special Component Plan for SCs (SCSP) and the Tribal Sub Plan (TSP). Under SCSP and TSP, there was an aprovision for earmarking plan funds in proportion to the *dalits* and *adivasis population* .The results in terms of welfare and development of SCs and STs have been way below expectations despite over 30 years since these strategies became operational.

Several research studies and the performance audit conducted by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (2006-07) point to several key problems in implementation of SCSP and TSP. By 2010-11, Plan allocation and release of plan funds by the Union Governments and many States like in Bihar and Rajasthan have not been made in proportion to the population of SCs and STs. In the budget 2011-12, improvement allocation in Bihar and Rajstahn has been observed. A large amount of fund under SCP and TSP is 'Notional' allocations in states as well as in the Union budget. Notional allocations are mere paper figures that do not flow through special schemes directly benefitting SCs or STs. There exist anomalies between SCSP statements given by the Planning Commission/Departments at Union and State levels and the respective DDG (Detailed Demand for Grants) allocations in the Union and State Budgets passed by Parliament and Sate Assemblies. The plan allocation by various line departments meant for SCs and SCs does not have the enough scope for tailor made projects and Schemes suitable to their specific needs. Most of the current schemes are for survival, and not for long tern development or empowerment. No focus was given on entrepreneurship, employment and skill development projects.

In SCSP and TSP, still there has been a critical administrative bottleneck in implementation of the development programmes/schemes. Sufficient administrative, executive and accountability mechanism meant SCs and STs are not in place in States and districts. Budgetary norms are not being followed appropriately. There has been poor utilisation of the allocated funds for the welfare of SCs and STs. Funds meant for SCSP and TSP funds have been diverted to other sectors and purposes. Lack of transparency in many state budget in terms of accessing public information on SCs and STs, many State budgets do not publish summary statement on SCSP/TSP. Poor service delivery mechanisms in the field level also constrain attainment of development outcomes.

The study evaluates the magnitude of budgetary resources being earmarked for SCs and STs and its composition in the Union and state budgets. It also tries to assess the implementation of guidelines of six CSS. The study covers the allocations made for the two planned strategies (including fund utilisation and implementation) thorough the Union and State Budgets of the five selected states of

Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Odisha, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. Besides, the Detailed Demands for Grants (DDGs) of the five states and the Union Budget have been scrutinised along with the Budget Statements of the Union Budget. The guidelines, budgetary resources and beneficiary data on SCs and STs of some selected Central government schemes are also examined.

6.1 Implementation of SCSP and TSP in the Union Budget

The SCSP and TSP guidelines stipulate that plan funds should be earmarked for the sub plans from the Union ministry's/department's plan outlay at least in keeping with the proportion of the SC/ST population in country. The guidelines also mention that the funds earmarked for SCSP/TSP should be placed under separate budget heads/sub-heads for each ministry/department that implements SCSP and TSP. In this context, in the Detailed Demands for Grants (in State and Union Budgets), Tribal Sub Plan (with code 796) and Scheduled Caste Sub Plan (with code 789) can be opened as minor heads below the functional major head/sub major head wherever necessary.

The analysis of the Union Budgets using Statements 21 and 21A and the DDGs for 2010-11 reveals several gaps in implementation of SCSP and TSP. Although the setting up of the Jadhav Task Force, 2010, and recommendations given by it are progressive steps reflecting urgency on the part of the government to address the deficits, a range of issues persist. Moreover, leaving out 43 mainstream ministries and putting no obligation at all on them to earmark funds for SCs and STs is a serious cause for concern. Among the 43 ministries, 12 have plan budgets amounting up to Rs. 18,000 crore in 2010-11.

From the assessment of Statement 21 from 2005-06 to 2010-11 and DDGs for 2009-10 and 2010-11, shortcomings in terms of magnitude of plan fund allocation for SCs and STs remain. Statement 21 highlights that in 2004-05, the aggregated plan allocation for SCs and STs was just 7 percent as against 24 percent of the combined SC and ST population in the country in that year. Overall, the allocation has fluctuated with the overall share of allocations for SCs and STs are not crossing 11.53 percent in 2010-11. Similarly, the SCs and STs disaggregated allocation, by assuming the share of allocations between SCSP and TSP, has also not achieved the halfway mark. An analysis of the recently-introduced Statement 21 and 21A in Union Budget 2011-12 shows that the percentage share of allocations for SCSP and TSP at 9 percent and 5 percent respectively of the total plan outlay. This is still far short of the recommended allocations by the Task Force.

The analysis of DDGs to ascertain the quantum of plan resources flowing towards SCs and STs finds the share to be as low as 2.54 percent, 2.36 percent and 2.45 percent in 2008-09 (BE), 2009-10 (BE) and 2010-11 respectively. It also shows that the share of budget for SCs as a proportion of total plan allocation is as low as 1.10 percent, 0.84 percent and 1.28 percent for the same period. Similarly, the budgetary allocation for STs as a proportion of total plan allocation range between 1.25 percent and 1.4 percent. The analysis of DDGs reveals that the Union Ministries of Social Justice and Empowerment and Tribal Affairs contribute a major part of funds for SCs and STs. Apart from these two ministries, there are few other ministries like Labour and Employment, Micro, Small and

Medium Enterprises, Home Affairs (Chandigarh, Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Daman & Diu) and Food and Public Distribution that have allocated funds.

An analysis of the major heads 2225, 4225, 6225, 2552, 4552, 6552, 3601, 3602 and minor heads 789 and 796 in 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 reveals that a sizable share of allocation for SCs and STs are shown under major head 3601 and 2225 which are meant for Grants-in-Aid to states and Welfare of SCs/STs/OBCs and Minorities. The study also reveals that the Ministries of Social Justice and Empowerment, Tribal Affairs have provided large amounts in the form of GIAs to state governments in several schemes. The GIAs were given to the states to prepare the projects and plan for SCs and STs as per the local felt needs.

Moreover, the fund allocation is being reported in minor head 796 since 2008-09 though it has fluctuated over the years. In 2010-11, 2.8 percent of the total outlay was made for STs through minor head 796. Most of the plan funds captured through 796 come from Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises and Union Territories (Andaman Nicobar and Daman Diu) through Ministry of Home Affairs. Twelve ministries and departments are routing funds to these UTs through the Home Ministry. The ministries of Social Justice and Empowerment; and Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises allocate under minor head 789.

In Union Budget 2011-12, some kind of improvement is observed in the budgetary allocations and processes in response to the recommendations of the Jadhav Task Force. For instance, it is for the first time that the Union Budget has brought out a separate Budget Statement called 21 and 21 A specifically catering to SCs and STs with the allocations to be made under separate minor heads 789 and 796. Further, to assess the government response to the recommendation of the task force through DDGs for 2011-12 across ministries and departments, it seems that Minor heads 789 and 798 that have been opened in the DDGs of ministries and departments mentioned in Statement 21 & 21A do not show BE & RE figures of 2010-11. The total quantum of allocation mentioned in Statement 21 & 21A does match those in the DDGs; it is more or less same as outlays shown in the DDGs. Under Statement 21, 24 Union ministries and departments show allocations for SCs but the scrutiny of DDGs shows that the Department of Biotechnology, UT of Chandigarh, and Department of AIDS Control are not reporting any allocation. Likewise, under Statement 21 A for STs, 26 ministries have allocated the plan fund. But, an analysis of the DDGs reveals that the Ministry of Civil Aviation, Department of Biotechnology have not allocated funds for STs. Minor heads 789 and 798 have been opened by most of the Union ministries and departments that report allocations in DDGs. Also, two separate budget statements were introduced on schemes for SCs and STs. With regard to targeting Central Plan Assistance (CPA) for SCs and STs, the Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana allocates for SCSP and TSP as recommended. CPAs like Backward Regions Grant Fund, Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission are not allocating funds for SCs and STs.

The guidelines of SCSP and TSP also focus on the implementation mechanism of schemes. They mention that proper and appropriate developmental programmes/schemes/activities should be designed to ensure that they are relevant for the overall development of SCs and STs both through the existing general programmes and through introducing new avenues/programmes for the

purpose. In this process, outlays for area-oriented schemes directly benefiting SCs and STs in hamlets, villages and pockets having a majority of SCs and STs Population should be included in SCSP and TSP, according to the guidelines.

From the analysis of six schemes, it is found that the scheme design of IAY, SSA and UGC have tried to address the concerns of SCs and STs. Other programmes like NRHM and ICDS have made some revisions in their scheme design to cover the needs of SCs and STs. Still, these schemes do not have much clarity in their guidelines on SC and STs. JNNURM has no policy provision to address the development deficits of SCs and STs in urban areas. With regard to allocation of financial resources for SCs and STs, all the above mentioned programmes and schemes except JNNURM have made plan allocations exclusively for SCs and STs. These outlays reflect in budget documents like the Budget Statements and DDGs through minor heads 789 and 796. IAY has created a column for reporting the beneficiary data on SCs and STs. The beneficiary data on elementary education (SSA) and higher education are provided in the form of GER and dropout rates.

Schemes like NRHM and ICDS do not provide data on SC and ST beneficiaries. The Departmentally-related Standing Committees on Rural Development, Human Resource Development, Health and Urban Development have been critical regarding overall implementation of these schemes. They have highlighted low utilisation of funds and poor outcomes. These problems thus have an indirect negative impact on the process of socio-economic development of SCs and STs.

6.2 Implementation of SCSP and TSP in the State Budgets

The assessment of Annual Plans for the study states for 2009-10 and 2010-11 reveals that all five states have allocated earmarked funds for SCs in proportion to the population of SCs. However, the allocation through DDGs varies across the five states. Bihar and Rajasthan have not allocated funds for SCs in proportion with their population in the state while Odisha, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh have allocated funds as stipulated by the SCSP guidelines. In Bihar, SCs were allocated 1.2 percent in 2007-08(AE), 1.1 percent in 2009-10 (RE) and 1.2 percent in 2010-11(BE) whereas in Rajasthan, the plan fund varies between 3 and 4 percent for SCs for the same time period. A department and scheme wise analysis of allocations points to several instances of fund diversion and misappropriation in earmarked allocated for SCs. In 2011-12, Bihar has allocated funds for SCs in proportion with their population and in Rajasthan remarkable improvement in the allocation has been observed.

With regard to the quantum of fund allocation for STs in the state budgets 2009-10 and 2010-11, from the assessment of Annual Plan in five states, it has been found that the allocation for STs is either equal to or more than the proportion of their population in the state. The analysis of DDGs shows that the plan allocation made for STs in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan and Odisha is lower than the ST population. In Rajasthan, the gap in plan allocation in DDGs and ST population is quite high. Likewise, the gap for Uttar Pradesh, Odisha and Bihar is not as high as it is in Rajasthan. Since a long time, MP has allocated funds for STs in proportion with their population.

In Odisha and Uttar Pradesh, the allocation under Annual Plan and DDGs gives almost similar figures but in the case of Bihar and Rajasthan, the amount mentioned in Annual Plan and DDGs shows a huge difference. The analysis also shows that there has been poor utilisation of funds due to poor absorption capacity in the study states. Further, an assessment of implementation approaches under TSP reveals that ITDP/ITDA are unable to function due to several reasons such as lack of adequate and trained staff, poor planning processes, lack of adequate office infrastructure and basic facilities for staff. In many states, project officers at ITDP do not have sufficient work experience which compromises their ability to perform.

6.3 Key Policy Recommendations

From the analysis of the budgetary allocations and processes under SCSP and TSP in the Union and States budgets, it is clear that there exists a huge gap in the budgetary allocations for SC and STs. Much more concerted efforts are required by the government in order to strengthen the implementation of SCSP and TSP. A set of key recommendations emerge bearing in mind the major findings from the implementation of SCSP and TSP. like , allocation should be in proportion to the SC and ST population in the Union Budget and State Budgets. Funds meant exclusively for the benefits for SCs and STs should not be used for other sectors. Union and state government line ministries/departments that have not earmarked funds so far for SCs and STs must allocate funds by introducing special/exclusive projects for SCs and STs. Growth and skill development oriented ministries and departments should also be under SCSP. The general sector schemes should revise their norms and guidelines for creating special provisions for the development of SCs and STs. Comparable beneficiary-disaggregated data on SCs and STs for each scheme must be provided against the allocated amount of fund for them. Central Plan Assistance (CPA) for states should allocate funds for SCs and STs with proper revision in the norms and guidelines. An independent Authority/Commission under the chairmanship of Prime Minister to be created for the progression of SC and STs with necessary administrative, executive and accountability mechanisms to monitor SCSP nad TSP up to the district level.

Key Challenges and Recommendations

S.N	Item	Challenge	Recommendation
1	Allocation	The Allocations in the current Union Budget 2011-12 to SCP is only 9% of total Plan outlay. It is 7.2% less, amounting to Rs. 24,570 crore ⁱ .	Strict allocations for SCSP to be ensured in the Union Budget.
		The allocation in the Statement 21 does not get fully reflected in the DDG (detailed Demand for Grants). This is another form of notional allocation which does not reach the individual SC families, individuals.	Planning Commission to issue clear instructions of allocations to be reflected in DDGs and in real schemes.
		Allocation is made by only by 24 Departments. Even among them, the following departments - Environment and Forest, Panchayati Raj, Biotechnology, Info and Technology, Science and Technology, New and Renewable Energy allocate negligible or very less (<3%) outlay to the SCP. Textile and Handloom Sector	These growth sectors must be ensured that full allocation is made.
		Allocations not as per the population of SCs in the state – BH. a) Allocation of Rs. 230 Cr (Plan) ⁱⁱ . Total allocation for SC/ST Welfare is Rs. 260.4 Cr (232.7 Plan + 27.7 Non Plan). It is only 1.3% of total State Plan Budget of Rs. 19999.63 Cr.	There should be at least 15.7% allocation from Plan Budget to SCP & TSP.
		Allocations made as per the population but – mostly notional and do not reach nor result in any real development or welfare of SC population. a) Orissa – Allocation for Construction of Jail Buildings Rs.4.77 Cr ⁱⁱⁱ Allocation for the construction of National Highway Rs. 40.51 Cr Establishment of West Orissa Development Council Rs. 13.09 Cr ^{iv} Bank protection works on river embankments Rs. 18.25 Cr ^v b) UP - Allocation made but mostly in Notional Allocation Homeopathic Hospital, UP Govt Rs. 6.36 Cr. ^{vi} Allocation for State allopathic medical college Kannauj, UP Rs. 23.90 Cr ^{vii} Allocation for State allopathic medical college Jalaun, UP Rs. 23.84 Cr ^{viii} Allocation for ITI Aliganj, Lucknow for Staff training Rs. 14.41 Cr ^{ix} Capital expenditure on Medical and Public Health Rs. 269.32 Cr ^x Allocation for Panchayati Raj Institutions Rs. 518.32 Cr ^{xi}	All notional components of SCP & TSP should be replaced by the direct benefit oriented schemes. Allocation made under SCP & TSP Plan Documents should verifiable with Budget Documents. All notional components of SCP & TSP should be replaced by the direct benefit oriented schemes.
2	Budgeting Norms	a) Minor Meads – 789: The budget allocations made to the SCP & TSP should be shown in minor head 789 separately in the budget documents.. At present at least Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan (20 Departments have not opened 789), Gujrat, and Bihar don't have any budgeting norms to show the allocation and expenditure under Minor Head 789.	For this purpose the Planning Commission should monitor strictly the allocation shown in this minor head in the State budget. There should be clear guideline for not to consider Non-Plan allocations under SCP & TSP. Any allocation beyond

			minor head 789 should not be accounted under SCP & TSP.
		b) Partial Minor Head allocation: Delhi State has budgeting norms but only for a fraction of amount say 1.7%. Rest of the budget does not have any 789 minor head allocated.	To avoid the conflict, all SCP & TSP amount should be taken into consideration for the purpose of SCP & TSP Plan Document and Budget Document
		c) Divisibility and Indivisibility: Many departments don't do allocation under SCP & TSP claiming of indivisibility of the programmes. Some state do allocations separating divisible and indivisible and count indivisible allocation as SCP & TSP	All departments (barring regulatory departments) should develop divisible schemes and indivisible allocations should not be considered as SCP & TSP allocation.
		d) SCP& TSP Link book: Some states have link book, or SCP & TSP plan book, which collates all the SCP & TSP allocations and in separate statement shows SCP & TSP allocations and schemes. This enables MPs and MLAs and executives to track the funds allocated. TN has a state link book. UP Govt. used to publish linked book only up to 2008-09. Many times there is lots of difference between SCP & TSP Plan Book and Details of Demands for Grants.	It should be mandatory for all States to publish SCP & TSP Plan Document (a link book to budget document) and its report annually. There should not be differences between the SCP & TSP Plan Book and Details of Demands.
3	Accounting Norms	At present funds are being sanctioned for any kind of expenditure and booked under SCP & TSP. Above examples are sufficient to understand the facts. Accounting procedures don't consider that what is SCP & TSP and what is non-SCP & TSP. The States like UP, Orissa, etc. are simply making arithmetic calculation to show population percentage plan expenditure fund under SCP & TSP.	Once the budgeting norms are set, the accounting procedure should follow to book the expenditure should follow to sanction and accept the expenditure of only those kind that directly benefit to the individual, families and hamlet belonging to SC
4	Institutional Mechanism	There is no separate cell in all departments for SCP & TSP, it makes difficult in planning, monitoring and coordination of schemes and programmes related to SCP & TSP. The Monitoring Committee on SCP & TSP at District level and Block level is either not created or dysfunctional which has resulted in poor execution of schemes. This also undermines local demands to be included in the District Plan and subsequently accepted at State Plan.	A separate cell on SCP & TSP to be formed in all Departments. District, Block Level and Panchayat level Committee to be made functional with power to plan and monitor SCP & TSP.
		Lots of money allocated every year under SCP & TSP remains unutilized and unspent money gets dissolved.	SCP & TSP money should be non lapsable if it is unspent .A separate pool of fund should be created and all unspent money should be collected there and used in next fiscal year.
5	Formulation of Schemes	At present Planning commission of Union and State Planning Departments are not formulating any plan for SCs/STs with a concrete vision for SCs in next five or ten years. This has resulted into continuation of similar schemes since 1979 there is no sufficient exercise on SCs need with respect to emerging markets. SC/ST welfare Department operates at minimal level within the available expertise.. They don't have sufficient human resources and financial strength.	Planning Commission of Union and Planning Departments of the States has expertise in plan formulation. They should offer their expertise in formulating the schemes under SCP & TSP.A 5 year-10 year target for SCs to be set and in accordance plan should be developed.
		Normally in SCP allocation is made for Primary education, services and poverty alleviation programmes. However, higher education, employment and entrepreneurship programmes	Priority to be given to employment, skill development, entrepreneurship development and higher education in

		neither have sufficient allocations not have any priority. Till these programmes are designed, SCP will not have the needed impact on the lives of SCs	SCP.
6	Executive Implementation	a) Nodal Officer: The implementing agencies have several excuses. There are no nodal officers in any of the department except the Delhi State and UP States. Nodal officers are handicap because nearly all programs are notional.	Nodal officers should have clear instructions to formulate, implement and monitor SCP & TSP in respective department / ministries / district / blocks
		b) Implementation of Schemes: Implementation of schemes in this situation has no meaning. The monitoring agency, SC/ST Welfare Department, does not bother for anything. The Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment and States SC/ST Welfare Departments are busy in making excuses by way of reflecting mathematical calculations instead of physical and Financial performance.	There should be clear cut responsibility of the monitoring agency to ensure that designated schemes are monitored well in time and should reach to the targeted beneficiaries. For non implementation of any scheme or under-implementation of schemes the nodal department should make monthly evaluation
7	Review of the SCP & TSP	There is clear guideline to review the performance quarterly. But none of the ministry or department reviews the SCP & TSP performance. The review report of SCP & TSP is not available for any State /UT or Union. The nodal authorities are not taking interest in it.	This review mechanism should be broadened and it should be made possible for SCs/STs to participate in the review process at village level, block level, district level and state level every month. Sanction for forthcoming month should have mandatory provision for getting the wrong addressed first.
8	Participation of SCs	At present SCs/STs are not being called fairly to participate in the plan formulation. It is either bureaucratic or political tactics to keep them away. The interest of all other groups like industries, agriculture, real state, etc are considered while making plan either at national or state or district level. But SCs/STs are always left. It should be resolved at the earliest	SC/ST should be motivated and called through open and fair invitation to participate in planning processes at District and State level. It should be made possible for them to join. There must be a mandatory law for not to final any schemes without SC/ST participation.
9	Audit Mechanism	All data of implementation, both physical and financial, should be made public for the audit purposes. The internal departmental audit and audit by the civil society should be taken into consideration by the CAG for its final comment.	The audit of the SCP & TSP should be made mandatory. It should be three tire audit – Internal Audit and and Audit by CAG. A Society should be registered by Social Welfare Department in all states which will perform Social Audit, Citizen Report Card, Public and others method with help of Dalit NGOs.

Annexure

Annexure to Chapter 1: Development Strategies for SCs & STs in the Five Year Plans

Five Year Plan	Plan Strategies for SCs	Plan Strategies for STs
First Five Year Plan (1951-56)	Removal of untouchability and improving the living conditions of SCs. Untouchability was abolished in 1955.	Principle of general development programmes to target the backward classes including STs
Second Five Year Plan (1956-61)	Improving their social status and providing them full educational and economic opportunities.	Forty-three Special Multi-Purpose Tribal Blocks (SMPTBs) were created for about 25,000 people as against 65,000 in a normal block.
Third Five Year Plan (1961-66)	Supplementing benefits from programmes of agriculture, cooperation, irrigation, small industries, communications, education, health, housing, rural water supply.	Approach of equity of opportunity and to bring about reduction in disparities.
Fourth Year Plan (1969-74)	Proposal for full integration of SCs with the development plans of the district, providing house-sites to SCs and other weaker sections, and conferring proprietary rights on homestead land already occupied by them.	Special development projects in the agency areas of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, and Odisha.
The Fifth five year Plan (1974-78)	Various agricultural programmes, Finance and Development Corporations and 20-Point Economic Programme was announced by the Prime Minister in 1975. Special Component Plan for SCs (SCSP) was introduced in 1979.	The TSP stipulated that funds of the states and the Centre should be quantified on ST population proportion basis
Sixth Five Year Plan (1980-85)	The other strategies adopted in this Plan are Special Central Assistance (SCA) to SCSP, Scheduled Castes Development Corporations in the states through cluster and saturation approach at the block, district and state levels.	A Modified Area Development Approach (MADA) was adopted for tribal concentrated pockets
Seventh Five Year Plan (1985-90)	Economic development of SCs for raising their income to cross the poverty line; National Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Finance and Development Corporation (NSFDC) to extend loans-cum-subsidies to various income-generation activities and enactment of the Prevention of Atrocities (POA) Act, 1989 for welfare of SCs and STs.	Tribal Cooperative Marketing Development Federation (TRIFED) Scheduled Tribes Finance and Development Corporation (NSFDC)
Eighth Five Year Plan (1992-97)	Elimination of scavenging and rehabilitation of scavengers. National Safai Karamchari Finance and Development Corporation.	Land alienation, non-payment of minimum wages and restrictions on right to collect minor forest produce.
Ninth Five Year Plan (1997-2002)	SCs Participation in Panchayati Raj Institutions in pursuance of the constitutional 73rd and 74th amendments. The strategies adopted are Social Empowerment, Economic Empowerment, Social Justice, and to accelerate the socio-economic status of SCs.	An exclusive Ministry of Tribal Affairs was set-up in 1999 for a focussed approach to the development and welfare of tribals.
Tenth Plan (2002-07)	Economic empowerment through employment-cum-income generation activities and social justice through elimination of all types of discrimination.	There was a substantial increase in the outlays for STs development for various schemes in this plan period with emphasis on education, minor irrigation and development

		of forest villages.
Eleventh Plan (2007-12)	Restructuring of policies for faster, more broad -based and inclusive growth for SCs, adoption and implementation of Maharashtra SCSP& TSP model.	Overall empowerment of tribal people through tribal participative ,managed development process

Annexure to Chapter 2 (i): Plan Allocations Earmarked for SCs and STs from different Union Ministries /Depts. (in Rs. Crore)

Min./Dept.	2004-05 RE	2005-06 RE	2006-07 RE	2007-08 RE	2008-09 RE	2009-10 RE	2010-11 BE
Dept. of Science & Technology	90	5	5	6	6	6	6
Ministry of Finance			4.53		0	0	0
Ministry of Tribal Affairs	1069.45	1398.82	1652.68	1719.71	1970	2000	3206.5
*Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment	986.13	1097.64	1342.27	1756.5	1882.7	1981.76	3461.4
*Dept. of Rural Development	3847.2	4157.5	3439.5	4701.5	6455	6455	7492
*Ministry of Labour & Employment	0.4	0.72	0.79	0.92	1.01	3.82	5.93
*Ministry of Women & Child Development		703.46	961.86	2241.6	1701	2203.74	2349
Department of Food & Public Distribution						2.38	2.38
*Dept. of Higher Education (Ministry of HRD)		399.5	388.92	680.28	1480.75	1922.78	2166.14
*Dept. of School Education and Literacy (Ministry of HRD)		3041.36	4109.79	5264.48	6084.47	5927.66	8668.74
*Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports		19.93	19.56	26.84	31.1	222.4	248.5
*Ministry of Agriculture				204.56	342.24	391.1	423.4
*Dept. of Information Technology			10.6	30	29	34	53.2
*Dept. of Health & Family Welfare			1866.52	2514.28	2827.82	3152.63	3612.34
*Dept. of Small Scale Industries(MMSME)				205.2	316.15	283.25	454.84
*Ministry of Textiles				121.4	126.08	133.75	178.2
Dept. of Biotechnology				3.75	3	3	5.25
Ministry of Culture				4.4	5.9	7.4	7.8
Ministry of Pnachyat Raj				39.92	41.85	44	50
*Union Territories of Andaman & Nicobar Island, Daman & Diu, Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Lakshadweep			293.92	354.47	291.89	366.2	380.13
Total Plan Exp. for SCs from Union Budget	5993.18	10823.93	14095.94	19875.81	23595.96	25140.87	32771.75

Source: Compiled by CBGA from Statement 21, Expenditure Budget Volume I, Union Budget, GoI, Various Years

Annexure to Chapter 2 (ii): Plan Allocations Earmarked for STs from Different Union Ministries/Departments (in Rs. Crore)

Ministries / Departments	2004-05 RE	2005-06 RE	2006-07 RE	2007-08 RE	2008-09 RE	2009-10 RE	2010-11 BE
--------------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

Dept. of Science & Technology	0	2.5	2.5	3	3	3	3
Ministry of Finance	0	0	1.51	0	0	0	0
Ministry of Tribal Affairs	1069.45	1398.82	1652.68	1719.71	1970	2000	3206.5
*Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment	0	0	25.03	34.9	36.25	58.38	110.8
*Dept. of Rural Development	1282.4	1385.83	1146.5	1567.17	2151.67	2151.67	2497.33
*Ministry of Labour & Employment	0.13	0.24	0.26	0.31	0.34	1.27	1.98
*Dept. of Women & Child Development	0	234.49	320.62	747.2	567	734.58	783
Department of Food & Public Distribution					0.81	0.8	0.8
*Dept. of Secondary Education & Higher Education (Ministry of HRD)	0	133.16	129.64	226.76	493.58	640.93	722
*Dept. of Elementary Education & Literacy (Ministry of HRD)	30	1013.79	1369.93	1754.83	2028.16	1975.89	2889.58
*Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports	0	6.64	6.52	8.95	10.37	74.13	82.83
*Ministry of Agriculture	0	0	0	68.19	114.08	13.37	141.13
*Dept. of Information Technology	0	0	3.53	10	9.67	11.33	17.73
*Dept. of Health & Family Welfare	0	0	622.17	838.09	942.6	450.88	1204.11
*Dept. of Small Scale Industries(MMSME)	0	0	0	68.4	105.38	94.42	151.61
*Ministry of Textiles	0	0	0	40.47	42.03	44.58	59.4
Dept. of Biotechnology	0	0	0	1.25	1	1	1.75
Ministry of Culture	0	0	0	1.47	1.97	2.47	2.6
Ministry of Pnachyat Raj	0	0	0	13.31	13.95	14.67	16.67
*Union Territories of Andaman & Nicobar Island, Daman & Diu, Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Lakshadweep	0	0	284	342.96	279.98	327.26	333.4
Total Plan Exp. for STs from Union Budget	2381.98	4175.47	5564.89	7446.97	8771.03	8600.63	12226.22

Source: Statement 21 of Expenditure Budget Vol. I, Union Budget

Annexure to Chapter 2 (iii): Plan Allocations Earmarked for SCs from Different Union Ministries/Departments (in Rs. Crore)

Min./Dept.	2004-05 RE	2005-06 RE	2006-07 RE	2007-08 RE	2008-09 RE	2009-10 RE	2010-11 BE
Dept. of Science & Technology	0	2.5	2.5	3	3	3	3
Ministry of Finance	0	0	3.02	0	0	0	9
Ministry of Tribal Affairs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
*Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment	986.13	1027.78	1260.14	1661.29	1779.25	1923.38	3350.6
*Dept. of Rural Development	2564.8	2771.67	2293	3134.33	4303.33	4303.33	4994.67
*Ministry of Labour & Employment	0.27	0.48	0.53	0.61	0.67	2.55	3.95

*Dept. of Women & Child Development	0	468.97	641.24	1494.4	1134	1469.16	1516
Department of Food & Public Distribution					1.62	1.59	1.59
*Dept. of Secondary Education & Higher Education (Ministry of HRD)	0	266.33	259.28	453.52	4026.31	1281.85	1444
*Dept. of Elementary Education & Literacy (Ministry of HRD)	60	2027.57	2739.86	3509.65	987.16	3951.77	5779.16
*Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports	0	13.29	13.04	17.9	20.73	148.27	165.67
*Ministry of Agriculture	0	0	0	136.37	228.16	261	282.26
*Dept. of Information Technology	0	0	7.06	20	19.33	22.67	35.47
*Dept. of Health & Family Welfare	0	0	1244.35	1676.19	1885.22	901.75	2408.23
*Dept. of Small Scale Industries(MMSME)	0	0	0	136.8	210.77	188.83	303.23
*Ministry of Textiles	0	0	0	80.93	84.05	89.17	118.8
Dept. of Biotechnology	0	0	0	2.5	2	2	3.5
Ministry of Culture	0	0	0	2.93	3.93	4.93	5.2
Ministry of Panchayati Raj	0	0	0	26.61	27.2	29.33	33.33
*Union Territories of Andaman & Nicobar Island, Daman & Diu, Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Lakshadweep	0	0	9.92	11.51	11.91	38.94	8.47
Total Plan allocation for SCs from Union Budget	3611.2	6578.59	8473.94	12367.77	14727	14623.5	20466.1

Source: Statement 21 of Expenditure Budget Vol. I, Union Budget

Annexure to Chapter 2 (IV): Assessment of Fund Allocation for SCs through Statement 21&DDGs-2011-12

		Statement 21 (Rs.crore)		Detailed Demand for Grants(Rs.crore)	
S.No	Ministry/Department	2010-11RE	2011-12BE	2010-11RE	2011-12BE
1	Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries	0	259.2		
2	Ministry of Labour & Employment	5.84	216.6	0	210.6
3	Ministry of New and Renewable Energy	0	42	0	42
4	Department of Science & Technology	3	58.75	0	58.75
5	Dept. of Biotechnology	3.5	4.67	0	0
6	Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment	3413.93	4051	2545.93	4051
7	UTs of Chandigarh and Daman & Diu	10.97	13.74		
8	Ministry of Agriculture	272.5	1500.44		1500.44
9	Department of Industrial Policy & Promotion	30.73	30.01	0	30.01
10	Department of Information Technology	53.2	60	0	60
11	Ministry of Environment & Forest	0	1	0	64.5
12	Department of Health & Family Welfare	2163	3582	0	3582

13	Department of AIDS Control	0	258.4	0	0
14	Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation	0	247.5	0	247.5
15	Department of School Education & Literacy	5509.38	7791.4		7791.4
16	Department of Higher Education	1242.59	1956.38		1965.515
17	Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises	276.26	324.2	276.26	324.2
18	Ministry of Panchyati Raj	11	14.59	0	832.69
19	Department of Rural Development	7492	4375.06	0	4375.06
20	Department of Land Resources	0	445.37	0	445.37
21	Department of Drinking Water & Sanitation	0	2420	0	2420
22	Ministry of Textiles	139.2	250	0	250
23	Ministry of Women and Child Development	2349	2530	0	2530
24	Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports	177.09	118.69	0	118.69
	Total Plan Exp. for SCs from Union Budget	23153.2	30551	2822.19	30899.725

Source: Compiled by CBGA from DDG 2011-12

Annexure to Chapter 2 (v): Assessment of Fund Allocation for STs through Statement 21 A & DDGs-2011-12

S. N	Ministry/Department	Statement 21 A(Rs.crore)		Detailed Demand for Grants(Rs.crore)	
		2010-11RE	2011-12BE	2010-11RE	2011-12BE
1	Ministry of Civil Aviation	0.05	0.05		
2	Ministry of Labour & Employment	0	106.6	0	106.6
3	Department of Science & Technology	3	58.75	0	58.75
4	Dept. of Biotechnology	1.75	2.33	0	0
5	Ministry of Tribal Affairs	3203.3	3674.51	3203.3	3674.51
6	UTs of Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu and Lakshadweep	367.13	542.16		164.4529
7	Ministry of Agriculture	139.3	665.96		740.96
8	Department of Telecommunications	0	8.57	0	8.57
9	Department of Information Technology	0	201	0	201
10	Department of Food & Public Distribution	0	1.4	0	1.4
11	Ministry of Culture	7.4	16	0	15.7
12	Department of Health & Family Welfare	1167	1932	0	1932
13	Department of AYUSH	8.21	18	0	18
14	Department of AIDS Control	0	139.4	0	0
15	Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation	0	26.4	0	26.4
16	Department of School	3441.06	4168.43		4168.43

	Education & Literacy				
17	Department of Higher Education	621.29	974.67		982.7415
18	Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises	147.32	221.7	147.32	221.7
19	Ministry of Panchayati Raj	11	7.36		421.46
20	Department of Rural Development	0	3081.94	0	3081.94
21	Department of Land Resources	0	269.92	0	269.92
22	Department of Drinking Water & Sanitation	0	1100	0	1100
23	Ministry of Textiles	27.6	60	0	60
24	Ministry of Tourism	0	27.5	0	27.5
25	Ministry of Water Resources	0	11.6	0	0
26	Ministry of Women and Child Development	0	1037.3	0	1037.3
27	Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports	75.9	82.6	0	82.6
	Total Plan Exp. for STs from Union Budget	9221.31	18436.15*	3350.62	18401.9344

Source: Compiled by CBGA from DDG 2011-12

*This amount does not match with allocation which is mentioned in the Statement 21A due to some error in the document. The Statement 21A shows Rs. 17371.35 crore as total plan allocation for STs While summing up all 27 entries from ministries and department in the above mentioned table we find Rs18436.15 crore, so there is a difference of Rs 1064.8 crore.

Annexure to Chapter3: Assessment of Fund Allocation in Centrally Sponsored Scheme for SCs and STs in Schemes through DDGs-2011-12

S.N	Schemes	Department/ Ministries	SCSP		TSP	
			2010-11 (RE)	2011-12 (BE)	2010-11 (RE)	2011-12 (BE)
1	Higher Education (UGC, IIT , IIM)	Department of Higher Education, MHRD		966.6		477.3
2	Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan	Department of School Education, MHRD		4022.2305		2424.7695
3	Rural Housing - Indira Awas Yojana	Department of Rural Development		3530		2470
4	Livelihood-Swaranjayanti Gram Swarozgar	Department of Rural Development		845.06		611.94
5	JNNURM- UIDSSMT	Ministry of Urban Development				
6	NRHM	Department of Health and Family Welfare		1896		1068
7	Integrated Child Development Services	Ministry of Women and Child Development		2300		787.3

8	PM Employment Generation Programme	Ministry of Medium , Small and Micro enterprises		155.77		112.22
---	------------------------------------	--	--	--------	--	--------

Source: Compiled by CBGA from DDG 2011-12

Annexure to Chapter4:

Bihar

Annexure (i): Bihar Department wise SCSP allocation(Rs. in Crore)

Department	Major Heads	2008-09(AE)			2009-10(RE)			2010-11(BE)		
		Total Plan Outlay	SCSP allocation	% share of SCSP	Total Plan Outlay	SCSP allocation	% share of SCSP	Total Plan Outlay	SCSP allocation	% share of SCSP
Information and Publicity	2220 & 4220	11	0.39	3.57	4.33	0.6	13.86	8.51	0.75	8.81
Welfare of SC/ST and OBC'S	2225 & 4225	190.14	114.38	60.16	261.66	160.61	61.38	341.33	228.91	67.06
Crop Husbandry	2401 & 6401	482.05	32.455	6.73	395.42	12.8	3.24	613.739	0	0
Dairy Development	2404	84.51	0.4647	0.55	23.675	2.1	8.87	30	0.6	2.00
Fisheries	2405	3.5	0.024585	0.70	26.325	0.25	0.95	35.597	0.3	0.84
Co-operation	2425-4425-6425	35.02	0	0	11.67	1	8.57	41.527	1	0

Bihar Plan Expenditure 2009-10 and 2010-11

Annexure (ii): Comparison between RE and AE under S CSP (Rs. in Crore)

Departments	Minor Heads	2008-09		
		RE	Actuals	% Utilisation
Information and Publicity	106 (Area Publicity)	0.5	0.39	78
Welfare of SC/ST and OBC'S	102 (Economical Development)	1	0.83	83
Welfare of SC/ST and OBC'S	277(Education)	55.1	0.21	0.38
Welfare of SC/ST and OBC'S	800 Other Expenses	27.43	0	0
Dairy Development	102 Dairy Development Project	0.4	0.3	75
Fisheries	101 Inland Fisheries	0.42	0.2	47.62

Industry	80 General	0.14	0	0
Co-operation	108 Investment in Other Co-operative Societies	1	0	0

Annexure (iii): Bihar Plan Expenditure 2009-10 and 2010-11 (Rs in Crore)

Major Head	Minor Head	Sub-minor Head	Object Head	2008-09 (Actual)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
2220	Area Publicity	102 (Regional Publicity Scheme for SCSP)	Administration	0.39	0.00	0.00
			01 (Lump Sum provision)	0.00	0.60	0.75
2225	Command & Administration	0101(Command &Administration)	Administration	0.20	1.41	1.41
			Subsidiary Grant	0.05	0.00	0.00
2225	Economical Development	Family oriented production(5% support)	Administration	0.17	0.00	0.00
			Subsidiary Grant	0.59	0.00	0.00
			Programme	0.07	0.00	0.00
			Lump Sum provision	0.00	1.00	1.00
2225	Economically Development	Development for Mahadalit	01(Lump Sum provision)	12.00	36.80	91.00
2225	Help of Block panchayat	Scholarship	Administration	0.14	0.00	0.00
			Programme	13.26	15.63	19.63
2225	Help of Gram Panchayat	Scholarship	Programme	53.28	63.60	60.00
2225	Education	Education	Subsidiary Grant	0.15	0.00	0.00
			Programme	0.06	1.65	3.30
2225	Education	Education	Administration	0.64	0.00	0.00
			Programme	17.62	28.62	32.83
4225	051 Build	Build &Repairing of Residential School, hostel, other building	Lump Sum Provision	0.00	11.90	12.75
4225	277 Education	To Build hostel building for SC Student	Lump Sum Provision	16.27	0.00	0.00
4225	800 Other Expenses	Anganbari training for Mahdalit by Finance commission recommendation	Lump Sum Provision	0.00	0.00	7.00
2401	110 (Crop Insurance)	For SCSP N.Ag.I.S.Make-Up Grant	Subsidiary Grant	30.83	0.00	0.00
			Lump Sum Provision	0.00	12.53	0.00
2401	110 (Crop Insurance)	Crop Insurance for primiyam Grant Of SCSP	office Expenses	0.00	0.27	0.00
			Subsidiary Grant	1.63	0.00	0.00
2404	102 Dairy Development Project	SCSP Training	Programme	0.04	0.05	0.10
2404	102 Dairy Development project	SCSP Rural Dairy	Administration	0.00	0.85	0.50
			Subsidiary Grant	0.43	1.20	0.00

2405	101 Inland Fisheries	SCSP Fisherman's help	Subsidiary Grant	0.02	0.25	0.35
4425	108 Investment Other Co-operative Societies	Bihar State SC Co-o-pration Dev. Corporation	Lump Sum Provision	0.00	1.00	1.00

Annexure (iv): Intra-shifting of SCSP Money (Rs. in Crore)

Department	Scheme	Object Head	2008-09(BE)	Object Head	2008-09 (AE)
Information and Technology	Regional Publicity	(Regional Publicity Scheme for SCSP)	0.573800	Office Expense	0.002880
		(Official Expense)		Lump Sum provision	0.000000
		(Other Expense)		Other Charge	0.390452
		Total	0.573800	Total	0.393331
SC/ST & OBC Welfare Department	Command & Administration	(Workshop/Poster/Seminar Etc.)	0.250000	Salary	0.015917
				Jivan Yapan Allowance	0.011234
				House Rent	0.000882
				Medical Allowance	0.000207
				Other Allowance)	0.000009
				01(Advertisement & Publication)	
				01(Business & Special Service)	
				01 (Subsidiary Grant)	0.045000
				01 (Other Charge)	0.176512
		Total	0.250000		0.249761
SC/ST & OBC Welfare Department	Economic Development	0101 (Family Oriented Production 5% support)	1.000000	01(Office Expense)	0.053000
		09(Subsidiary Grant)		01(Subsidiary Grant)	0.590000
				01(Scholarship)	0.072000
				01(Lump Sum provision)	
			0.000000	01(Other Charge)	0.117699
		Total	1.000000	Total	0.832699
SC/ST & OBC Welfare Department	Help to Gram Panchayat	04(Scholarship for High School)	13.528700	01(Office Expenses)	0.138946
				01(Scholarship)	13.258699
		Total	13.528700	Total	13.397645

SC/ST & OBC Welfare Department	Education	39(For Manual Scavenging Worker's Children)	0.100000	01(Subsidiary Grant)	0.154546
		02(Main Foundation work of Hostel for Girls)	0.565000	01(Scholarship)	0.063892
		02 (Prevention Atrocity Act 1989)	0.250000	01(Main foundation Work)	
		Total	0.915000	Total	0.218438
SC/ST & OBC Welfare Department	Education	04(High school Scholarship)	3.510000	01(office Expenses)	0.640610
		06(Entrance Scholarship)	6.000000	06(Dress)	0.717278
		07(Technical Scholarship)	0.420000	01(Scholarship)	16.898250
		12(Primary & Middle School Scholarship)	7.000000		
		16(Sport Scholarship)	0.030000		
		03(Girls Dress)	1.000000		
		08(Musahar Scholarship)	0.400000		
		Total	18.360000	Total	18.256139

Rajasthan

Annexure (i): Nature of the Schemes having less than rupees 10 Crore in Rajasthan (Rs in Crore)

	Sub- Minor head	2008-09 AE	2009-10 RE	2010-11 BE
1	Special Component Plan for Schedule Caste Scholarships & stipends	0.15	0.15	0.15
2	Pre-Matric Scholarship for the children of Schedule Caste	0.65	0.70	0.70
3	Special Component Plan for Schedule Caste	0.08	0.13	0.13
4	Special Component Plan for Schedule Caste	0.06	0.10	0.10
5	Rural Water Supply Schemes	3.33	3.50	4.00
6	Inducement Amount for Inter-Caste Marriage	0.45	0.50	0.50
7	Maintenance of Hostel	4.25	3.43	4.55
8	Book Bank	0.35	0.35	0.35
9	Grant for Citizen Security	2.06	3.73	3.00

102	Sambal Gaoun ka Vikas	2.00	4.00	4.00
11	Aid to Schedule Tribe Development Corporation, Rajasthan	1.00	1.23	1.00
12	Under German Grant	0.49	0.50	0.60
13	Annuprati Yojanaatergat	1.79	0.75	1.00
14	Assistant under (Sahayog) Support Scheme	2.78	7.00	4.50
15	Management of College Level Residential School	0.18	0.70	0.70
16	Residential School under German Aid	3.14	4.65	0.00
17	Construction of Girls hostel	0.67	1.70	3.79
18	Hostel Construction work for Students	5.33	5.22	8.05
19	Share Capital to N.M.D.C	0.00	2.73	0.00
20	Hostel Building Constructions work for College Girls/ boys students	1.99	1.59	7.03
21	Construction work of Staff Quarters in Residential School	1.03	0.67	0.28
22	Agriculture Exhibition	0.01	0.02	0.02
23	Abolition of Insects and deases	0.02	0.04	0.02
24	Water Plan	0.10	0.00	0.18
25	Marketing & Advertising of Agriculture tools & equipments	0.03	0.03	0.03
26	Soil Improvement	0.08	0.01	0.00
27	Intensive Cotton Development Programme	0.20	0.36	0.42
28	Agriculture Expansion Services	0.67	0.70	0.70
29	New Programmes	1.72	1.82	0.80
30	Work Plan	3.30	3.15	2.50
31	Mission for Livelihood	1.78	1.95	0.75
32	Agriculture Technology Management Agency	0.15	0.00	0.00
33	Bond Bond irrigation State Scheme	0.30	0.00	0.00
34	Grants for Seed Development	0.00	0.00	0.10
35	National Floriculture Mission	1.95	0.00	1.60
36	Modification of pravah irrigation to Boond- Boond irrigation	1.45	2.05	2.50
37	Bond-Bond Irrigation State Scheme	0.00	1.61	1.00
38	Grants to Schedule caste in Special Component Region for Work Plan	1.70	2.83	3.27
39	Development of Water Borne Lives in Sweet Water	0.03	0.00	0.02
40	Gurugolwalkars Public Contribution Development scheme	4.99	0.00	0.00
41	Drought Area Development Program	1.11	0.96	0.85

42	SelfSanity District Development Scheme	1.03	2.84	0.52
43	Cluster Development	0.06	0.05	0.18
44	Interest Assistance to Artist	0.03	0.03	0.03
45	Unsettled Domestic Industry Works Development	0.04	0.05	0.05

Odisha**Annexure –(i)FUND UTILISATION UNDER SCSP in Odisha**

Departments	Demand no.	Major Heads	2008-09 RE		
			2008-09 RE	2008-09 Actuals	% Utilization
HOME DEPARTMENT	1	2070	9.12	6.54	71.71%
REVENUE AND DISASTER MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT	3	2029	0.47	0	0.00%
HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE DEPARTMENT	12	2210	25.48	20.54	80.61%
LABOUR & EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT	14	2230	1.68	0.11	6.55%
PANCHYAT RAJ	17	2501	194.1	172.34	88.79%
INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT	19	2203	9.07	7.94	87.54%
TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT	21	2041	2.13	0.15	7.04%
FISHERIES AND ANIMAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT DEPT.	33	2403	11.2	7.45	66.52%
WOMEN & CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT	36	2202	206.79	80.4	38.88%
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT	37	2852	3.87	1.4	36.18%
HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT	38	2202	8.43	5.26	62.40%
Total			472.34	302.13	63.96%

Annexure (ii)Fund Allocation in Schemes in Odisha

Schemes	2009 -10 BE	2010 -11 BE
2377- Construction of Building for Jails	0.00	4.77
2379- Construction of Building for Fire Services	0.00	1.78
2380- Construction of Building for Police Welfare(37062- Construction of Office building through O.S.P.H & W Corporation)	0.00	1.95
2379- Construction of Building for Fire Services	2.61	0.00
2377- Construction of Building for Jails	1.67	0.00
2380- Construction of Building for Police Welfare(37062- Construction of Office building through O.S.P.H & W Corporation)	3.19	0.00
2379- Construction of Building for Fire Services(37066- Construction of Residential Building through OSPH & W Corp.)	0.00	2.32
2380- Construction of Building for Police Welfare(37048- Construction of Barracks through OPH & WC)	0.00	1.70

37066- Construction of Residential Building through OSPH & W Corp.	0.00	1.83
2377- Construction of Building for Jails	0.63	0.00
2379- Construction of Building for Fire Services(37066- Construction of Residential Building through OSPH & W Corp.)	0.71	0.00
2380- Construction of Building for Police Welfare(37048- Construction of Barracks through OPH & WC)	4.30	0.00
37066- Construction of Residential Building through OSPH & W Corp.	0.94	0.00

Annexure (iii) Fund Allocation in Schemes in Odisha

Schemes	2009 -10 BE	2010 -11 BE
2211- Construction of building of G.A Deptt.	0.45	0.00
2198- Construction of building of Revenue and D.M. Deptt.	2.68	2.19
2199- Construction of building of Works Deptt.	0.53	1.95
2194- Construction of Building of Labour and employment Deptt.	0.08	0.09
2213- Construction of building of H & F W Deptt.	0.00	1.65
2198- Construction of building of Revenue and D.M. Deptt.	0.90	0.50
2199- Construction of building of Works Deptt.	0.95	0.37
2194- Construction of Building of Labour and employment Deptt.	0.40	0.23
0197- Construction of Roads	5.00	10.85
2456- Road works under Core Road Network	0.00	2.45
1994- Odisha State Roads Project- Road Improvement Component	28.96	17.78
1995- Odisha State Roads Project- PPP Component	0.50	0.35
1996- Odisha State Roads projects- ISAP and operating costs	2.11	1.70
1998- Odisha State Road Project- Rehabilitation & Resettlement	1.56	0.80
1999- Odisha Roads project- Land Acquisition, Utility shifting and other Non reimbursable expenses	2.07	2.99
2516- PPP- Road Projects- Land Acquisition	0.00	1.12
2517- PPP- Road Projects- Environment clearances, utility shifting, DPR preparation and other expenses	0.00	0.48
2518- PPP Projects - Viability Gap Funding	0.00	0.00
2006- One time ACA	0.00	2.00
1219- Road Works under Road Development Programme	18.07	26.75
2456- Road works under Core Road Network	0.00	2.98
2161- Rural Infrastructure Development Fund (RIDF)	28.69	34.75
1223- Roads works under Road Devp. Programme in KBK districts from SCA under RLTA	0.00	2.90
1581- Works executed from Central Road Fund	0.00	8.35
2006- One time ACA	11.24	7.99
0197- Construction of Roads	13.50	9.75
2161- Rural Infrastructure Development Fund (RIDF)	0.00	11.24
0197- Construction of Roads	0.00	16.25
0197- Construction of Roads	27.00	19.50
2341- Construction of Sports Stadium / Complex	0.33	0.44
1581- Works executed from Central Road Fund	10.50	4.50

Uttar Pradesh

Annexure (i) Sector Wise Allocation under SCSP in Uttar Pradesh

Departments	Major Heads	2009-10	2010-11
		RE	BE
General Services			
Secreteriate General Service	2052	8.57	0
Other administrative service	2070	0.45	1.68
Total General Services		9.02	1.68
Social Services			
General Education - Basic Education	2202	242.50	665.60
Technical Education	2203	0.18	0.36
Medical and Public Health	2210	16.18	57.36
Water Supply and Sanitation	2215	90.00	90.00
Urban Development	2217	227.50	896.73
SC/ST/OBC - General Welfare of Scheduled Castes	2225	537.09	543.66
Labour & Employment	2230	30.02	33.05
Social Security and Welfare	2235	1214.01	1596.09
Education, Sportes, Art& Culture	4202	127.07	161.95
Madical& Public Health	4210	437.49	269.32
Water Supply & Sanition	4215	20.00	20.00
Urban Development	4217	1250.00	750.00
Welfare of SC,ST & OBC	4225	92.54	53.65
Other Social services	4250	23.52	28.35
Total Social Services		4308.10	5166.12
Economic Services			
Crops and Agri Farming	2401	55.33	63.58
Animal Husbandary	2403	21.08	24.71
Dairy development	2404	3.20	6.50
Fisheries	2405	0.00	0.00
Corporetion	2425	0.90	0.90
Special programe for rural development	2501	69.15	76.87
Rural imployment	2505	135.00	228.60
Land reformsw	2506	0.10	0.10
Other rural development programes	2515	926.62	866.20
Miner irrigation	2702	45.25	40.25
Non-conventiol sources of energy	2810	0.25	4.00
Village & small industries	2851	12.22	18.64
Foresty and wild life (Social Forestry)C.C.L.District Plan	4406	30.00	33.22
Other rural development programs	4515	1262.00	1442.00
Other special aria programme	4575	180.00	180.00
Miner irrigation	4702	20.71	18.00
Power projects	4801	100.00	120.00

Roads & Bridges	5054	1356.95	806.00
Loan Welfare OF SC,ST	6225	2.00	2.00
Loan for Cooperation	6425	0.40	0.40
Total Economic Services		4221.16	3931.97
Grand Total		8538.28	9099.77

Source: DDGs, Govt of Uttar Pradesh

Annexure (ii) Allocation by Social Welfare Department under SCSF

Object Name	Budget Provision	
	2009-10	2010-11
Salary	335.51	416.85
Wages	2.71	5.03
Dearness Allowance	68.89	134.77
Travel Expenses	0.19	0.23
Expenses on Transfer Travel	0.11	0.12
Other Allowances	20.66	34.38
मानदेय	9.97	14.75
Office Expenses	0.32	1.27
Electricity Bill Payment	2.21	5.65
Water charges	0.04	0.1
Stationary and Form printing	0.22	0.63
Office furniture and materials	0.37	0.84
Telephone Expenses	0.07	0.11
Vehicles usage and purchase for office	0	0.4
Maintenance and Fuel Expenses of the Vehicles	0.1	0.12
Payments for the commercial and special services	0.02	3.02
किराया, उपशुल्क और कर-स्वामिस्व	0.39	0.42
Publication	0.21	0.22
Advertisement and sales expenses	0.56	0.84
Grant in Aid	2045.14	2839.69
Scholarship and stipended	117.89	217.81
Large Scale Construction	2007.86	1636.39
Small Scale Constructioun	14.08	1.81
Machinery and Equipments	88.96	62.88
Subsidy	849.04	879.43
अनुरक्षण	1.15	7.04
Investment / Loan	107.5	127.5
सामग्री और सम्पूर्ति	16.72	18.65
Medicine and Chemicals	5.25	10.06
औषधालय सम्बन्धी आवश्यक सज्जा	0.15	0.27
Food	10.35	23.45
Other Expenditure	147.39	791.91
Grant in aid for salary, etc.	6.88	1.09
Administrative and travel expenses for training	5.7	5.53
Leave travel expenses	0.08	0.09
Software / Hardware purchase for computer	0.05	0.47
Computer stationary	0.08	0.13
Grant in aid for capital expenditure	2587	2122
Medical expenses	1.66	0.73
Uniform expenses	0.05	0.06

Total	8455.53	9366.74 ³
-------	---------	----------------------

Source: DDGs, Govt of Uttar Pradesh

Madhya Pradesh**Annexure: (i) Department wise Allocation under SCSP for the state of Madhya Pradesh (Rs in Crore)**

S.no	Department no.	Department	2010-11 (BE)			2009-10 (BE)		
			Total Plan	Total SCSP	% Allocation	Total Plan	Total SCSP	% Allocation
1	2	Home department	11.95	3.00	25.07	21.32	2.97	13.93
2	7	Revenue department	81.72	7.23	8.85	70.63	7.22	10.21
3	9	Sports and Youth Welfare	75.02	9.60	12.80	54.36	8.00	14.72
4	10	Forest department	541.01	24.03	4.44	523.99	13.40	2.56
5	11	Commerce, Industry and Employment	233.90	11.98	5.12	111.41	8.01	7.19
6	13	Power	1354.50	164.50	12.14	1107.79	164.19	14.82
7	14	Farmer welfare and Agriculture Development	817.46	100.53	12.30	761.88	128.69	16.89
8	15	Cooperative	132.90	23.12	17.40	68.39	11.43	16.71
9	17	Public Health and Family welfare	483.78	31.74	6.56	372.73	32.10	8.61
10	18	Urban Administration and Development	813.92	126.10	15.49	766.08	103.14	13.46
11	19	Public works	1938.17	236.19	12.19	1915.42	241.75	12.62
12	20	School Education	1396.77	216.47	15.50	1348.91	150.73	11.17
13	21	Law and Lesislaetive	2.65	0.50	18.96	2.50	0.48	19.20
14	22	Panchyat	620.29	122.09	19.68	1102.06	108.39	9.84
15	23	Planning, Economy and Statistics	325.22	58.94	18.12	307.75	48.90	15.89
16	24	Public Relation	4.15	0.75	18.07	3.93	0.66	16.81
17	26	Social welfare Department	896.66	211.38	23.57	776.52	216.17	27.84
18	27	Narmada vally development	1143.41	75.44	6.60	1211.10	75.30	6.22
19	29	Food and Public Distribution	79.57	0.00	0.00	8.86	0.15	1.69
20	30	Culture	12.84	1.35	10.55	16.61	1.31	7.89
21	31	Water resources	2014.68	94.09	4.67	1282.07	83.41	6.51
22	34	Public Health Engineering	728.27	152.52	20.94	678.14	159.06	23.46
23	35	Cattel Farming	107.60	10.25	9.52	83.11	8.88	10.69
24	36	Fisheries	17.62	1.87	10.61	19.15	3.04	15.90
25	38	Higher Education	61.78	10.00	16.19	59.76	9.70	16.23
26	41	Science and Technology	18.10	1.90	10.50	20.15	1.90	9.42

³ The variance of this amount to the table -5 is due to that that figures of the table 6 are after the revision of the budget 2010-11.

27	42	Jan Shakti niyojan	123.15	18.74	15.22	130.63	18.62	14.25
28	45	Aviation	1.00	0.30	30.00	2.50	0.30	12.13
29	50	Woman and Child development	1700.35	215.09	12.65	1637.28	281.80	17.21
30	52	Village Industry	71.27	9.81	13.76	56.56	6.91	12.21
31	53	Medical Education	61.84	38.92	62.94	40.42	8.09	20.01
32	55	SC welfare	520.93	489.65	94.00	476.37	476.37	100.00
33	58	Rural Development	3610.05	820.50	22.73	2400.13	430.70	17.94
34	59	Industrialisation and Food Processing	107.96	14.61	13.53	108.01	14.58	13.50
Total of the Dept allocating under SCSP			20110.46	3303.19	16.43	17546.51	2826.34	16.11
Total State Plan Size			21939.12			19028.02		

* Source: Demand of Grants, State of MP, Document no. 50, for financial year 2010-11 and 2009-10

Annexure to Chapter5 (i): Department Wise Allocation in TSP in Rajasthan 2010-11 (In Rs. crore)

Department	2008-09 (Actuals)		2009-10 (BE)		2009-10 (RE)		2010-11 (BE)	
	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan
General Education	370.3406	24.1859	444.7618	45.629	447.9279	54.1638	484.3407	71.7643
Sport and Youth Sev.	0.0615	2.82	0.065	0.1201	0.065	0.12	0.065	0.12
Art and Culture Education	0	0	0	0.0814	0	0.0825	0	0.079
Medical and Public Health	51.7442	6.8273	69.9105	10.3783	65.8131	9.0747	69.774	13.9824
Family Welfare	0	3.9762	0	5.7051	0	3.6	0	3.5002
Water Supply and Sanitation	0	17.7649	0	16.5	0	17.5	0	16.5
Urban Development	0.0613	0	0.0791	0.0001	0.0491	0.0001	0.0729	0.0001
Information and Publicity	0.2217	0	0.3187	0	0.3187	0	0.3187	0
Welfare of SC,ST&OBC	8.3189	124.5202	10.0572	113.0615	11.0647	176.1182	11.4273	199.9787
Labour and Employment	2.9367	0.7074	3.8933	0.8883	3.5992	0.7216	3.6053	2.0259
Social Security and Welfare	0.1859	0.3139	0.2567	0.75	0.2316	0.6	0.2377	0.65
Nutrition	0	28.3636	0	41.4249	0	38.6595	0	55.6782
Crop Husbandry	15.0457	11.4642	16.1407	11.6134	17.122	22.8941	18.1222	166.3425

Soil and Water Conservation	0	1.0675	0	1.0478	0	1.4609	0	1.1249
Animal Husbandry	16.1795	1.7193	22.2972	1.3703	20.3127	0.9872	22.1445	1.7018
Fisheries	0.4426	0.1023	0.5015	0.185	0.4965	0.14	0.5285	0.188
Forest and wild life	4.931	3.7642	6.704	3.61	5.8185	4.929	6.019	0.3922
Agriculture Research and Education	0	0.1386	0	0.1477	0	0.1109	0	0.1109
Corporation	0	0.0125	0	2.0261	0	2.0261	0	0.0262
Other Rural Development Program	0	21.1685	0	24.5961	0	23.9091	0	22.078
Other Special Area Program	0	13.522	0	12.0995	0	12.0887	0	12.866
Major Irrigation	0	28.6607	93.3576	0.0002	96.2601	0.0004	95.1423	0.0002
Minor Irrigation	0	0.2101	0	0.01	0	0.2858	0	3.06
Petroleum	0	0	0	0.0001	0	0.0001	0	0.0001
Village and Small Industries	0	0.0737	0	0.0501	0	0.11	0	0.1801
Industries	0.5948	0.0461	0.9051	0.0431	0.67	0.0428	0.7601	5.043
Non-Ferrous Mining and Metallurgical Industries	0	0.3261	0.4566	0.0002	0.4266	0.0002	0.4066	0.0002
Others Science Research	0	0.0396	0	0.042	0	0.042	0	0.055
Ecology and Environment	0	0.01	0	0.0051	0	0.125	0	0.075
Tourism	0	3.9999	0	1.3001	0	1	0	1.5001
Total	471.0644	295.8047	669.705	292.6859	670.1757	370.7929	712.9648	579.0232

Source: Detailed Demand for Grants,Rajasthan

Annexure to Chapter5 (ii): Department Wise Allocation in TSP Rajasthan 2009-10 (in Rs. crore)

Department	2007-08 (Actuals)		2008-09 (BE)		2008-09 (RE)		2009-10 (BE)	
	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan
General Education	256.0342	31.0522	307.4741	31.8903	366.5234	26.8071	444.7618	45.629

Sport and Youth Sev.	0.03	1.6542	0.065	2.88	0.065	2.82	0.065	0.1201
Medical and Public Health	37.5071	5.6113	46.5255	11.3321	54.4336	8.8478	21.5469	3.7513
Family Welfare	0	3.9326	0	3.765	0	4.5764	0	5.7051
Water Supply and Sanitation	0	13.4454	0	12	0	15.5554	0	16.5
Urban Development	0.0474	0	0.0566	0.0001	0.0736	0.0001	0.0791	0.0001
Information and Publicity	0.1389	0.0149	0.2187	0	0.2647	0	0.3187	0
Welfare of SC,ST&OBC	5.8797	142.6938	6.9419	127.012	8.2678	131.352	10.0572	113.0615
Labour and Employment	2.2164	0.9212	2.6145	0.8492	3.1803	0.7523	3.8933	0.8883
Social Security and Welfare	0.1761	0.2969	0.1937	0.75	0.2287	0.5	0.2567	0.75
Nutrition	0	22.6839	0	34.4495	0	29.1	0	41.4249
Crop Husbandry	9.5964	11.9858	10.0826	13.2811	13.1407	11.9535	16.1407	11.6134
Soil and Water Conservation	0	0.8812	0	1.22	0	1.4207	0	1.0478
Animal Husbandry	10.9079	1.4418	14.3412	1.7402	17.6821	1.7277	22.2972	1.3703
Fisheries	0.2849	0.178	0.4065	0.159	0.4115	0.1028	0.5015	0.185
Forest and wild life	3.689	10.6383	4.4422	3.025	5.3535	3.835	6.704	3.61
Agriculture Research and Education	0	0.1143	0	0.1386	0	0.1386	0	0.1477
Corporation	0	0.027	0	0.0251	0	0.0126	0	2.0261
Other Rural Development Program	0	31.1789	0	27.3501	0	24.56	0	24.5961
Other Special Area Program	0	11.593	0	9.0676	0	13.378	0	12.0995
Major Irrigation	0	23.6015	72.9602	12.2301	75.0239	28.467	93.3576	0.0002
Minor Irrigation	0	67.6892	0	30.2501	0	30.25	0	78.1301
Petroleum	0	0	0	0.0001	0	0.0001	0	0.0001
Village and Small Industries	0	0.1	0	0.1001	0	0.05	0	0.0501
Industries	0.4267	0.0401	0.5881	0.043	0.7411	0.0454	0.0431	0.9482
Non-Ferrous Mining and Metallurgical Industries	0.2271	0	0.2466	0.0002	0.3661	0.0001	0.4566	0.0002
Others Science Research	0	0.0461	0	0.042	0	0.0419	0	0.042
Ecology and Environment	0	0.01	0	0.01	0	0.0101	0	0.0051
Tourism	0	3.4998	0	4.5501	0	4	0	1.3001
Total	327.1618	385.3314	467.1574	328.1609	545.756	340.3049	620.4794	365.0027

Source: Detailed Demand for Grants, Rajasthan

Annexure to Chapter5 (iii): Major Head Wise Analysis TSP in Odisha

Sno	Demand no.	Major Heads	2008-09 (AE)	2009-10 (BE)	2009-10 (RE)	2010-11 (BE)
1	1	2055+4059	10.62	23.69	23.48	16.92
2	3	2029+2245+2030+4059	0.00	22.57	20.60	18.76
3	7	4059+4202+4210+4216+5054	240.20	139.30	140.51	190.90
4	9	2408	2.29	2.40	2.40	2.40
5	10	2202+4202	72.17	110.65	144.20	161.32
6	11	2225	277.97	311.39	318.70	343.70
7	12	2210+2211	28.33	32.40	32.43	27.57
8	13	2215+2217+3054+4215	60.59	70.55	73.57	63.93
9	14	2230	0.14	2.23	2.23	2.37
10	15	2204	4.13	3.08	3.18	4.06
11	16	3451+4575+5054	104.57	74.54	93.22	104.54
12	17	2501+2505+2515+4215	170.16	162.31	210.10	178.47
13	19	2203+2230+2250+2851+2885+4202	11.50	14.52	14.52	22.79
14	20	2700+2705+4702+4711	498.15	569.89	629.86	718.74
15	21	2041	0.13	1.50	1.50	1.50
16	22	2406+2415+4406	69.54	46.08	46.08	47.77
17	23	2401+2402+2501	52.92	49.56	52.59	94.88
18	25	2220+2250+2251	1.82	0.61	0.71	0.41
19	27	2810+2801+3425	3.64	3.56	3.52	5.92
20	28	2215+4059+4210+4215+4216+5054	99.09	61.87	109.92	67.09
21	30	2801	20.80	20.22	20.22	45.34
22	31	2851+4860	3.89	4.50	4.57	7.87
23	32	2205+4059	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.70
24	33	2403+2404+2405+4403+4405	10.11	9.95	14.51	15.48
25	34	2401+2425+2435+4425+4435+6451	22.65	15.54	16.73	20.78
26	36	2202+2235+2236	106.13	155.40	188.97	184.01
27	37	2852	1.46	4.53	4.53	10.90
28	38	2202+4202	2.16	20.70	20.77	23.25
Total TSP allocation			1875.17	1933.52	2193.62	2382.36

Source: Detailed Demand for Grants, Odisha

Bibliography

- Annual Plan Documents (2009-10 & 2010-11) of Government Bihar, Odisha, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan & Madhya Pradesh.
- Annual Reports (2008-09 & 2009-10) of relevant Union Ministries and Department, Government of India.
- Annual Reports: Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment and Ministry of Tribal Affairs for 2008-09 and 2009-10.
- Departmentally related Standing Committee on Social Justice and Empowerment, Human Resource Development, Urban Development, Rural Development, 2009-10 & 2010-11, Lok Saba Secretariat.
- Detailed Demand for Grants (2009-10 & 2010-11) of Government of Bihar, Odisha, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan & Madhya Pradesh.
- Detailed Demand for Grants (2009-10 & 2010-11), Union Budget, Government of India.
- Evaluation report "Adoption of TSP Approach in Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and M.P.", Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Government of India.
- Five Year Plans Document; from the first plan to eleventh plan (1951-2012).
- Guideline for Implementation "Scheduled Caste Sub Plan", Planning Commission (2006).
- Mid Term Appraisal for Eleventh Five Year Plan (2007-12), Planning Commission, Yojana Bhavan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi -110001.
- Outcome Budget (2009-10 & 2010-11) of relevant Union Ministries and Department, Government of India.
- Performance Audit of Educational Development of SCs and STs, 2006-07; Comptroller and Auditor General of India, 9, Deen Dayal Upadhyay Marg, New Delhi
- Report of Jadhav Task Force to Review Guidelines on Scheduled Castes Sub-Plan (SCSP) and Tribal Sub-Plan (TSP), June, 2010, Planning Commission.
- Research Study on Livelihood Options Assets Creation out of Special Component Plan (SCSP) and Tribal Sub Plan (TSP) Schemes and its Impact among SCs and STs in India- Socio Economic and Educational Development Society (SEEDS) sponsored by Planning Commission, Government of India, November 2007.
- Result Framework document (2009-10 & 2010-11) of relevant Union Ministries and Department, Government of India.
- Scheme guidelines of IAY, SSA, Higher Education, NRHM, ICDS and JNNURM.
- Scholarship Schemes for Scheduled Castes/ Other Backward Classes- Eleventh Report of Standing Committee on Social Justice and Empowerment (2010-11), Fifteenth Lok Sabha, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, November, 2010.

ⁱ Union Budget 2011-12, Vol 1, Statement 21

ⁱⁱ Bihar State Budget Document, Major Head 2225&4225

ⁱⁱⁱ Orissa State Budget document, Head 4059-60-789

^{iv} Orissa State Budget document, Head 3451 - 789 - 2173 - 41080

^v Orissa State Budget document, Head 4711- 01-789- 0101- 37107

^{vi} UP State Budget Document 2010-11, Demand No. 83, 2210-04-789-04, Page No. 182

^{vii} UP State Budget Document 2010-11, Demand No. 83, 2210-05-789-03-0301, Page No. 183

^{viii} UP State Budget Document 2010-11, Demand No. 83, 2210-05-789-03-0302, Page No. 184

^{ix} UP State Budget Document 2010-11, Demand No. 83, 2230-03-789-03, Page No. 206

^x UP State Budget Document 2010-11, Demand No. 83, 4210, Page no. 242

^{xi} UP State Budget Document 2010-11, Demand No. 83, 2515-789-04-0401, Page No. 227