District Good Governance Index
UP Government

Charru Malhotra, PhD (IIT-D)
Professor (e-Governance and ICT)

Indian Institute of Public Administration
New Delhi

Executive Summary

- India observes National Good Governance Day on 25th December, every year. The day marks the birth anniversary of former Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee.
- Good Governance Day is an effort to create awareness of accountability in government among the Indians. It became a tradition since 2014 to honour the memory of former Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee.
- *Good Governance is the prerequisite for the sustainable growth and transformation.* Governments across the world are actively involved in evolving their strategies in and around good governance by involving citizens in co–creation of next generation public services. *Good Governance Index (GGI) is a comprehensive and implementable framework to assess the State of Governance across different level of the government.* It helps to assess the impact of various Governance interventions taken up by the State/ UTs.

Local/District Good Governance Index (DGGI)

- Districts being a basic unit of field administration performing various functions, inter alia, regulatory functions such as law and order, land revenue / reforms, excise, registration, treasury, civil supplies and social welfare; coordinating and monitoring District / Sub-district level offices of the line departments of the State Government and their agencies like irrigation, health, Public Works Department (PWD), industries; etc., and supervising the local bodies (Panchayati Raj Institution (PRIs) and Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) and other authorities).

- In addition, there is a fair degree of agreement on the importance of certain essential dimensions or features of good governance like transparency, accountability, public participation, absence of corruption, etc., are prominent among them.
- The Local/District Good Governance Index provides a new approach to the measurement, analysis and improvement of local/district governances. The DGGI is a tool that aims to help the Centre and state government to collect, assess, and benchmark detailed information around issues of local and public sector performance and service delivery to citizens and businesses. It is also a methodology to uncover important local-level variation in governance and service provision.
- DGGI aids policymakers, district authorities and development specialists in designing specific action plans, provides an initial benchmark from which to measure of progress, and empowers citizens' and businesses' voices to influence government efforts on improving quality and access of public service delivery.
- By assessing the performance of public administration at the local level, the DGGI provides critical feedback to help government officials, political parties, civil society actors, the public and the international development community pinpoint specific geographical areas and substantive areas where policy reform is needed. The DGGI is based on the premise that local (district level) governance matters, and that the drivers that explain local level variation may differ from those that operate at higher levels.

District Good Governance Index (DGGI) for Uttar Pradesh

- During the Regional Conference of Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances (DARPG), GOI in Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh (Nov 11-12, 2021), a need was advocated and felt to proactively pursue the design, develop and implementation of the District Good Governance Index (DGGI) for the Indian States on the lines of national Good Governance Index (GGI).
- It was proposed to replicate the learnings of the central government initiative undertaken for a good governance index by incorporating state-specific governance issues lead to improve governance at the local level.
- The Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi, being a policy research think tank and a Capacity Building Institute of GoI proposed to support DARPG and Government of Uttar Pradesh in designing, developing, and implementing DGGI in the state of Uttar Pradesh by replicating learnings from GGI.
- DGGI encompass administrative, economic, social, environmental, legal/ judicial and some contextual indicators related to the most relevant governance verticals of the state.
- DGGI provide a comparative picture to the State Government about the outputs and outcomes of various decisions, policy measures, initiatives and much more.
- It will also help in developing a competitive spirit for improvement among the districts by following the right benchmarks.

Uttar Pradesh State

- Uttar Pradesh, the heart of India, is a land of epics, holy rivers, ancient cities and pilgrimage. Uttar Pradesh, situated in the north-central part of India, is the fourth largest state with a total land area of 240928 square kilometres.

- It is one of the most populous state of India, with a population of over 19.98 crores (Census, 2011) and 829 per sq. km. density of population. On January 26, 1950, the state was given its present name, Uttar Pradesh and its capital is Lucknow. Uttar Pradesh is known for its rich culture and tradition. It is also popular for beautiful historic locations such as Agra, Lucknow and Kannauj.

- In modern times, it is emerging as a driver of the nation's economy with its network of expressways, industrial corridors, international airports, centres of educational and medical excellence, and an exporter of indigenous products. Since the times of Lord Rama, Lord Krishna, Gautam Buddha and Lord Mahavira, the state has been the centre of cultural and intellectual brilliance. Today, with its robust infrastructure and a proactive leadership, the state offers the most investor friendly environment for a better future for its people and the entire country.

- The State has 18 divisions and 75 districts which are governed by 80 government departments.

Approach and Methodology

- Given the sheer size of the state, a collaborative approach was used for preparation of District Good Governance Index (DGGI) for Uttar Pradesh.

- There were several rounds of extensive consultations with Secretary and Joint Secretary, DARPG, Govt. of India; Chief Secretary UP, Principal Secretaries of Planning and Administrative Reforms; Director General of Uttar Pradesh Academy of Administration & Management; Director and senior officials at Directorate of Economics and Statistics (DES), officials of various line departments of Government of UP as well as Director General and senior officials of Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA), New Delhi. These consultations contributed immensely to the finalisation of sectors, indicators, their respective data points and weightages to be included in the index.

- The collaborative approach allowed to incorporate contrasting and complimentary perspectives which were seen as necessary to make the index more rooted to the concerns, realities and aspirations of the citizens of the state.

- The UP DGGI framework also used learning from the lessons of previous Governance Indices such as the Good Governance Index prepared by DARPG, Govt. of India and District Good Governance Index UT of Jammu and Kashmir. This approach saves the project from reinventing the wheel and also saves effort and time.

- For the selection of indicators the principle of "SMART" i.e. 'Simple', 'Measureable', 'Available', 'Reliable' and 'tested over time' was used.

Data Source

- UP DGGI is mainly based on published data of Government of UP mainly by the Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh. Additionally, data was also compiled from existing sources of line departments as well as District-Level

offices of concerned departments in the state. These included annual reports, statistical reports, factsheets, and so on.

- Following several rounds of consultation and recursive inputs from all concerned stakeholders- IIPA, DARPG, DES Govt. of UP and different line departments from Government of Uttar Pradesh 10 broad sectors and 68 indicators were finalised for UP-DGGI.

S. No.	Sectors	No. of Indicators
1.	Agriculture and Allied	9
2.	Industry and Commerce	4
3.	Human Resource Development	9
4.	Public Health	9
5.	Public Infrastructure and Utilities	7
6.	Economic Governance and Financial Inclusion	4
7.	Social Welfare and Development	10
8.	Judiciary and Public Safety	7
9.	Environment	2
10.	Citizen Centric Governance	7
	Total	68

- Since this exercise is being undertaken for the first time, direct method of calculation was preferred over percentage change in an indicator for most of the indicators. This was done with the purpose of establishing a baseline for next versions of the index to come.

Methodology for Ranking Calculation

- The time frame used for data is mainly FY 2021-22, 2020-21 and 2019-20 and Census 2011 data.
- For effective data capture and validation of the available data, a workshop-cum-consultation approach was adopted.
- The data for different indicators of the index was collected in varied scales with different units and dimensions of measurement. Therefore, to make it comparable, the raw data was to be converted into values of 0 to 1 using a systemic and structured methodology- normalisation.
- The term 'Positive Indicator' has been used for all indicators where higher value represents better performance. In case of some indicators such as Incidence of Crime against Women, Incidence of Crime against Children, Number of Road Accidental Deaths per 1 Lakh Population etc., where a lower number represents better performance, the term 'Negative Indicator' has been used.
- The normalisation formula for both 'types' of indicators has also been represented below:
- **For Positive Indicator** $Score = \frac{x-min}{max-min}$
- **For Negative Indicator** $Score = \frac{max-x}{max-min}$

- Each of these sectors have been assigned equal weightage i.e., 1. For each sector, the study team tried to use similar weight for UP DGGI as it was used for GGI and DGGI of J&K. Weightages were further updated and revised after receiving inputs/suggestions from UP Government to make it more relevant to the state.
- The sector score for each district was calculated by multiplying the indicator value of each district with the given weightage and then adding the value of all indicators of that sector.
- These scores are then ranked from highest to lowest to get the sector ranking for each district from 1 to 75.
- The District Score for each district was calculated by summing up the scores across sectors, to obtain the overall or 'Composite Score' for that particular district. These scores are then ranked from highest to lowest value to get district ranking from 1 to 75.
- Division Score was obtained by adding the final scores of the districts and then dividing them with the number of districts in that particular division. The scores are then ranked from highest to lowest value to get the division ranking from 1 to 18.
- The ranks hence obtained have been represented in three categories - Achiever, Performer and Aspirant.
- Similarly, in case of Divisions, the representation has been categorised as following - the initial 5 ranking divisions have been labelled 'Achiever', the next 8 ranking divisions as 'Performer' and latter 5 ranking divisions as 'Aspirant'.
- Ghaziabad, Gautam Budha Nagar, Varanasi, Agra and Lucknow were found to be top five performing districts in overall ranking.
- Ghaziabad has been spotted on top in the Public Infrastructure and Utilities sector but its consistent performance over all other sectors made it to the top in overall ranking.
- Though GB Nagar has been spotted on top for Industry and Commerce, Economic Governance & Financial Inclusion and social development sectors but it lagged to number three position in overall ranking.
- Shravasti, Sitapur, Sambhal, Auraiya and Banda were found to be aspirant districts.
- Varanasi and Meerut divisions are best performing divisions among 18 divisions of UP. Devipatan and Basti divisions are aspirant divisions.
- For all the ten sectors, the following districts were identified to be the top five achievers:
  - In *Agriculture and Allied sector*, the top five achiever districts were Aligarh, Bulandshahar, Hardoi, Gorakhpur, and Agra.
  - In *Industry and Commerce sector*, the top five achiever districts were GB Nagar, Ghaziabad, Lucknow, Agra, and Kanpur Nagar.
  - In *Human Resource Development sector*, the top five achiever districts were Ambedkar Nagar, Sonbhadra, Sultanpur, Bijnor, and Mahoba.
  - In *Public Health sector*, the top five achiever districts were Chitrakoot, Shravasti, Saharanpur, Balrampur and Bahraich.
  - In *Public Infrastructure and Utilities sector*, the top five achiever districts were Ghaziabad, Lucknow, Varanasi, Meerut and Hapur
  - In *Economic Governance and Financial Inclusion sector*, the top five achiever districts were GB Nagar, Bhadohi, Varanasi, Gorakhpur, and Agra.

- In *Social Welfare and Development sector*, the top five achiever districts were GB Nagar, Sultanpur, Moradabad, Kaushambi and Prayagraj.
- In *Judiciary and Public Safety sector*, the top five achiever districts were Azamgarh, Lalitpur, Ambedkar Nagar, Bijnor, and Deoria.
- In *Environment sector*, the top five achiever districts were Jalaun; Chitrakoot, Prayagraj, Mahoba, and Saharanpur.
- In *Citizen Centric Governance sector*, the top five achiever districts were Shamli, Muzaffarnagar, Moradabad, Hapur, and Amethi.

IIPA team has developed a dynamic user-friendly dashboard to represent above findings. The salient features of this dynamic dashboard are:

- Info-graphic view of performance of each district Vs other district
- Info-graphical performance of district within a division
- Single clickable a brief overview each district ranging from demographic data to indicator wise input data.
- Detailed input data of each district on each data point, which can gives real time information the district level officers about their progress
- Sector-wise ranking of each district and details of indicators responsible for the same
- Ranking of the districts on the basis of each indicator
- Performance Benchmarks for each district and sector wise performance benchmarks
- Backend of the dashboard has features by which data can be inputted by district level officers. It can change values from absolute number to percentage change to see improvement next year.

Therefore, the quality of governance mechanism (successes and/or failures) at District-level can be judged only by how well District Administration functions and delivers the outcomes expected from them. Indeed, it is hopeful that this report will be useful for practitioners as well as researchers in the field of governance, public administration and other related streams.