UPSC & STATE PCS CURRENT AFFAIRS · UJIYARI.COM

EDITORIAL ANALYSIS

Before the Next Transfer: Cash Schemes Need Cost Justification and Impact Evaluation

BUSINESS STANDARD

1 August 2026 · ECONOMY POLITY · GS3 GS2

CURATED & WRITTEN BY

Bharat Choudhary

UPSC Educator & Content Creator

linkedin.com/in/epicbharat

Before the Next Transfer: Cash Schemes Need Cost Justification and Impact Evaluation

Business Standard 1 August 2026 GS3 GS2

INTERVIEW ANGLE

"Impact evaluation of a welfare scheme is technically straightforward but politically awkward, since a rigorous evaluation might conclude that a popular scheme does not work. What institutional design would make evaluation routine enough that its findings are not treated as an attack on the scheme?"

Every fact web-verified against primary sources

THE LIFT LINE

A transfer scheme is easy to start, impossible to stop, and almost never measured. Two of those three are political facts. The third is a choice.

WHY THIS EDITORIAL MATTERS FOR YOUR EXAM

Welfare-scheme design, state fiscal capacity and the evaluation question sit at a GS2/GS3 intersection that UPSC increasingly favours, and the strongest answers avoid both reflexive defence of transfers and reflexive fiscal conservatism, holding the trade-off instead.

GS Paper 3: Government budgeting; issues relating to mobilisation of resources; inclusive growth.

GS Paper 2: Welfare schemes for vulnerable sections and performance of these schemes; mechanisms, laws, institutions and bodies constituted for the protection of vulnerable sections.

For **Prelims**, understand the revenue-versus-capital expenditure distinction and the fiscal-responsibility framework governing state borrowing.

CONCEPT	MEANING	WHY UPSC TESTS IT
Revenue vs capital expenditure	Revenue expenditure is recurring and creates no asset; capital expenditure creates durable assets	The core distinction underlying the crowding-out concern
Unconditional cash transfer (UCT)	A transfer made without behavioural conditions attached, unlike a conditional transfer	The specific instrument proliferating across states
Counterfactual evaluation	Assessing what would have happened without the intervention, typically through comparison groups	The methodological standard the editorial says is missing
FRBM framework	Fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management legislation constraining deficits at Union and state level	The binding constraint within which state transfer commitments must fit

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Indian states have adopted monthly cash transfer schemes at pace, most prominently women-focused transfers, with several large states committing sums running into thousands of crores annually. The schemes differ in eligibility criteria and transfer size but share a structure: a recurring monthly payment, delivered through Direct Benefit Transfer, to a large beneficiary population defined by gender and income status.

FEATURE	IMPLICATION
Recurring monthly payment	Creates a permanent revenue-expenditure commitment
Large beneficiary base	Politically irreversible once established
DBT delivery	Low leakage, high administrative efficiency
No behavioural conditions	Respects autonomy; also means no mechanism links the transfer to any measurable outcome

THE CORE ARGUMENT / ISSUE

The crowding-out mechanism, stated precisely

State budgets face binding constraints under fiscal-responsibility frameworks. Within that constraint, expenditure divides into committed items, salaries, pensions, interest, and discretionary items, of which capital expenditure is the largest genuinely flexible component. Adding a large recurring transfer does not create new fiscal space; it reallocates existing space, and the reallocation comes overwhelmingly from the flexible component. This is not a prediction but an accounting near-identity.

Why that reallocation may be self-defeating

Capital expenditure on irrigation, rural roads, power reliability and health infrastructure generates the conditions for household income to rise durably. A cash transfer supplements household income directly. If the transfer is funded by compressing exactly the investment that would raise incomes, the state has traded a durable improvement for a recurring supplement, and will need to keep paying the supplement indefinitely precisely because the durable improvement was not made.

The evaluation gap is the fixable part

The fiscal trade-off above is genuine but debatable; reasonable people weight present consumption against future income differently. What is not defensible is that states are making this trade-off without measuring the return on either side. Rigorous counterfactual evaluation of transfer schemes is methodologically well-established and not especially expensive relative to scheme cost. Its absence is a choice, not a constraint.

Why the counter-argument deserves weight

Cash transfers have real advantages that in-kind provision does not. They respect the recipient's judgment about their own needs, which paternalistic schemes do not; they reach households that targeted delivery systems miss; and international evidence broadly contradicts the assumption that recipients spend transfers wastefully. There is also a legitimate concern that "evaluate before expanding" is applied selectively, demanded of schemes benefiting politically weaker groups and waived for subsidies and concessions benefiting stronger ones. That asymmetry, where it exists, is itself a fair criticism of how the evaluation argument gets deployed.

HOW TO THINK ABOUT THIS (ANALYTICAL FRAME)

When a new recurring expenditure is added to a constrained budget, identify which existing item is being displaced, since something always is. Debate about a new scheme typically focuses on whether the scheme itself is worthwhile, which is only half the question. The other half is what the money would otherwise have funded, and because the displaced item is usually the flexible one rather than the least valuable one, the actual trade-off is frequently not the one being discussed. Apply this displacement analysis to any spending proposal within a hard budget constraint.

THE DIAGRAM IN WORDS

Picture a state budget as a jar filled almost to the top with fixed stones: salaries, pensions, interest payments. Above them sits a layer of loose sand, capital expenditure, which can be poured in or scooped out as space allows. Adding a cash transfer scheme means adding another stone, permanent and unremovable once placed. The jar does not grow. The sand is what leaves to make room, and sand is what was building the roads and canals that would eventually have raised the incomes the new stone is there to supplement.

WAY FORWARD

1. **Mandate impact evaluation statutorily** for any scheme above a defined fiscal threshold, with a published methodology and a fixed evaluation timeline built into scheme design.
2. **Require an explicit displacement statement** identifying which expenditure heads are being reduced to accommodate a new recurring commitment.
3. **Apply the evaluation requirement symmetrically**, to subsidies and tax concessions as well as to transfers, removing the selectivity objection.
4. **Build sunset-and-review clauses** into scheme design, so continuation is an affirmative decision informed by evidence rather than a default.
5. **Protect a floor for capital expenditure** in state fiscal rules, preventing indefinite compression of asset-creating spending to fund recurring transfers.

PYQ LINKAGE AND PRACTICE

UPSC has tested DBT, welfare-scheme effectiveness, state fiscal capacity and the revenue-capital expenditure balance across multiple cycles, and the current proliferation of state cash-transfer schemes provides a live case for applying that framework.

Practice question: "The question is not whether a cash transfer scheme is worthwhile, but what the money would otherwise have funded." Examine this claim with reference to the proliferation of state-level unconditional cash transfer schemes in India. (250 words, 15 marks)

Interview angle: Impact evaluation of a welfare scheme is technically straightforward but politically awkward, since a rigorous evaluation might conclude that a popular scheme does not work. What institutional design would make evaluation routine enough that its findings are not treated as an attack on the scheme?

Sources: Business Standard, Reserve Bank of India State Finances Report, Comptroller and Auditor General of India

---

KEY ARGUMENTS AT A GLANCE

State-level unconditional cash transfer schemes, particularly women-focused income transfers, have proliferated rapidly across Indian states without accompanying cost-benefit analysis or rigorous outcome evaluation, and the resulting fiscal commitment risks crowding out capital expenditure that generates the durable income streams cash transfers are meant to substitute for.

✓ SUPPORTING

- Cash transfers create a recurring, politically irreversible expenditure commitment, unlike capital projects which can be phased, meaning a state adopting one is effectively locking in a permanent claim on its revenue with no exit path.
- The absence of counterfactual evaluation means states cannot distinguish schemes that meaningfully improve household welfare from those that primarily transfer income without changing any underlying outcome, which matters because the two have identical fiscal cost and very different social returns.
- State fiscal space is finite and capital expenditure is the flexible component; when a recurring transfer is added to a constrained budget, it is almost always capital spending, on irrigation, roads, health infrastructure, that is compressed to accommodate it.

⚠ COUNTER

Direct cash transfers respect recipient autonomy in a way paternalistic in-kind provision does not, reach beneficiaries whom scheme-specific delivery systems miss entirely, and have a substantial international evidence base showing recipients generally use them productively rather than wastefully; demanding evaluation before expansion can function as a delaying tactic against redistribution that benefits politically weaker groups.

→ WAY FORWARD

Institutionalise evaluation as a routine, statutorily mandated element of scheme design rather than a precondition for approval, with a defined evaluation timeline, published methodology, and a sunset-and-review clause, so that assessment becomes normal practice rather than an obstacle deployed selectively against particular schemes.

MAINS ANSWER FRAMEWORK

QUESTION

Examine the fiscal and distributional case for mandatory cost-benefit analysis and impact evaluation of state-level unconditional cash transfer schemes in India. (250 words)

INTRODUCTION

Unconditional cash transfer schemes, particularly women-focused monthly income transfers, have expanded across Indian states with striking speed, and the proliferation has substantially outpaced any corresponding development of cost-benefit analysis or rigorous impact evaluation.

BODY

The fiscal concern is structural rather than ideological. A recurring monthly transfer to a large beneficiary population creates a permanent claim on state revenue that is, in practice, politically irreversible: no state government finds it feasible to withdraw a transfer once households have come to rely on it.

Capital expenditure, by contrast, is discretionary and phaseable, which means it is the component that absorbs the adjustment when a constrained state budget must accommodate a new recurring commitment. The result is a potential substitution of current transfers for the irrigation, road, health-infrastructure and power investment that generates the durable income streams a transfer is meant to compensate for, which if sustained would be self-defeating.

The evaluation gap compounds this. Without counterfactual assessment, a state cannot distinguish a transfer that measurably improves nutrition, school retention or women's economic agency from one that transfers income with no measurable effect on any outcome, and since both carry identical fiscal cost, that distinction is precisely what should determine whether a scheme is expanded.

The serious counter-argument is that cash transfers respect recipient autonomy, reach beneficiaries whom targeted in-kind schemes systematically miss, and have substantial international evidence supporting their productive use, and that demanding evaluation before expansion can function selectively as a brake on redistribution toward politically weaker constituencies.

CONCLUSION

The resolution is to make evaluation routine rather than exceptional: a statutory requirement that every scheme above a threshold carry a defined evaluation timeline, published methodology and a review clause, so that assessment is a normal feature of scheme design rather than an obstacle that can be deployed against some schemes and waived for others.

RELATED DAILY ARTICLES

1 Aug **Current Affairs Today, August 1, 2026**

1 Aug Rs 2.11 Lakh Crore, But From Where? Reading July's GST...

1 Aug Samudra Manthan: India Bets Rs 84,084 Crore on Offshore...

1 Aug Solar on Water: PM Surya Sarovar Yojana and the Land...

CURATED & WRITTEN BY

Bharat Choudhary

UPSC Educator & Content Creator

linkedin.com/in/epicbharat

📖 Read Full Article on Ujiyari →

https://ujiyari.com/editorials/2026/08/bs-cash-transfer-schemes-evaluation-2026/