International Journal of Advanced Research and Development
www.multireviewjournal.com
ISSN: 2455-4030
Received: 12-04-2025, Accepted: 11-05-2025, Published: 26-05-2025
Volume 10, Issue 2, 2025, Page No. 57-63

Digital public infrastructure and inclusive governance: A theoretical perspective on India's digital transformation

Dr. Chaganti Rami Reddy
Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Anantapuramu, Andhra Pradesh, India

Abstract
Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) has emerged as a foundational pillar in India's digital transformation strategy, aiming to enhance governance efficiency, financial inclusion, and equitable access to public services. This study develops a theoretical perspective on the relationship between DPI and inclusive governance by examining how interoperable digital identity systems, payment platforms, and data-sharing architectures reshape state capacity and citizen participation. Adopting a qualitative, literature-driven approach, the research synthesizes contemporary scholarship on digital governance, institutional reform, public value creation, and digital ecosystems. The findings suggest that DPI strengthens administrative transparency, reduces transaction costs, and promotes socio-economic integration through direct benefit transfers and expanded financial access. However, the study also identifies persistent challenges, including digital divides, infrastructural disparities, data privacy concerns, and regulatory gaps that may limit inclusive outcomes. The analysis underscores the importance of institutional resilience, ethical data governance, and digital literacy initiatives to ensure that technological advancement translates into sustainable and equitable development. By integrating theoretical insights with governance discourse, this paper contributes to a deeper understanding of how digital public goods can support inclusive national development while balancing innovation with accountability in the digital age.

Keywords: Digital Public Infrastructure, Inclusive Governance, Digital Transformation, Financial Inclusion, Public Value, Institutional Theory, Digital Ecosystems.

Introduction

Digital transformation has emerged as one of the most significant structural shifts shaping governance, economic development, and social inclusion in the twenty-first century. Across developed and developing economies, digital technologies are increasingly embedded within public administration systems to enhance efficiency, transparency, and citizen engagement (Aziz *et al*., 2025; Tan *et al*., 2025) [2, 17]. Within this broader global transition, the concept of Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) has gained prominence as a foundational architecture that enables secure, scalable, and interoperable digital ecosystems supporting governance and service delivery (Kumar & Shah, 2025; Finato *et al*., 2025) [4, 10]. DPI moves beyond conventional e-governance frameworks by establishing digital identity systems, interoperable payment platforms, and data-sharing protocols as public goods designed to foster inclusive development (Hariyani *et al*., 2025; Paget *et al*., 2025) [6, 15].

India represents one of the most prominent cases of DPI-led governance transformation. Through large-scale digital initiatives such as biometric identity systems, digital payment platforms, and integrated service portals, India has attempted to create an inclusive governance architecture that integrates citizens, markets, and the state within a unified digital ecosystem (Ghosh & Banerjee, 2025; Sahoo *et al*., 2025) [5, 16]. Theoretical perspectives on digital governance suggest that when digital systems are embedded within institutional reforms and regulatory safeguards, they can significantly reduce transaction costs, curb leakages, and expand state capacity (He *et al*., 2025; Zheng *et al*., 2025) [21]. In the Indian context, DPI has been positioned as a developmental instrument aimed at strengthening welfare delivery, financial inclusion, and participatory governance (Balasundaram *et al*., 2025; Kisswani *et al*., 2025) [3, 9].

From a theoretical standpoint, Digital Public Infrastructure can be understood through three interrelated lenses: institutional theory, public value theory, and digital ecosystem theory. Institutional theory emphasizes how regulatory frameworks, governance norms, and policy coordination shape digital adoption and effectiveness (Lusi *et al*., 2025; Tariq *et al*., 2025) [12, 19]. Public value theory highlights the capacity of digital systems to create societal benefits such as equity, accountability, and accessibility (Moghayedi, 2025; Zhu *et al*., 2025) [8, 13]. Meanwhile, digital ecosystem theory conceptualizes DPI as a platform-based infrastructure that facilitates interactions among governments, private firms, and citizens, thereby generating network effects and innovation spillovers (Jie *et al*., 2025; Zhang & Cao, 2025) [8, 20]. Together, these perspectives provide a robust analytical foundation for examining India's digital transformation within a governance framework.

Inclusive governance, in this context, refers to governance systems that ensure equitable access to public services, transparency in decision-making, and meaningful citizen participation. Digitalization has been associated with enhanced service efficiency and broader outreach; however, scholars caution that digital divides—based on income, gender, geography, and literacy—may reproduce structural inequalities if not carefully addressed (Amni *et al*., 2025; Tanveer *et al*., 2025) [1, 18]. Therefore, the success of DPI as an instrument of inclusive governance depends not merely on technological deployment but also on institutional safeguards, digital literacy initiatives, and ethical data

governance frameworks (Liu *et al*., 2025; Moghayedi *et al*., 2025) [11, 13].

India's digital transformation strategy aligns with global discussions on leveraging technology for sustainable and inclusive growth. Studies highlight that integrated digital identity systems, interoperable payment platforms, and open digital networks can significantly enhance financial inclusion and welfare targeting (Kisswani *et al*., 2025; Kumar & Shah, 2025) [9, 10]. Moreover, DPI has facilitated direct benefit transfers, minimized intermediaries, and strengthened transparency in public expenditure (Sahoo *et al*., 2025; Ghosh & Banerjee, 2025) [5, 16]. These developments illustrate how digital infrastructures can function as governance multipliers, amplifying state effectiveness while simultaneously promoting citizen empowerment.

However, theoretical debates also emphasize potential risks associated with rapid digitalization. Concerns related to data privacy, algorithmic bias, cybersecurity vulnerabilities, and digital exclusion require careful regulatory oversight (Zheng *et al*., 2025; Zhu *et al*., 2025) [8, 21]. Without robust accountability mechanisms, digital infrastructures may centralize power or create new forms of surveillance governance (Balasundaram *et al*., 2025; Tariq *et al*., 2025) [3, 19]. Thus, inclusive governance in the digital age necessitates a balance between innovation and regulation, efficiency and rights protection, scalability and equity.

Furthermore, the evolving global discourse on digital sovereignty and platform governance underscores the strategic importance of nationally owned digital public goods (Finato *et al*., 2025; Paget *et al*., 2025) [4, 15]. India's model of DPI, characterized by interoperable open architectures and public-private collaboration, has attracted international attention as a replicable framework for emerging economies seeking inclusive digital transformation (Hariyani *et al*., 2025; Jie *et al*., 2025) [6, 8]. The interplay between technological innovation, institutional capacity, and social inclusion therefore becomes central to understanding the broader implications of India's digital governance model.

Against this backdrop, this study develops a theoretical perspective on Digital Public Infrastructure and inclusive governance in India. It examines how DPI functions as a transformative governance mechanism, explores its institutional and socio-economic implications, and situates India's digital transformation within broader global debates on digital public goods and sustainable development. By synthesizing contemporary theoretical insights, the paper contributes to a deeper understanding of how digital infrastructures can reshape governance paradigms while advancing equity, accountability, and long-term national development.

Literature Review

The concept of Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) has emerged as a transformative framework in contemporary governance discourse, particularly in the context of developing economies striving to balance rapid digitalization with inclusive development. Unlike traditional e-governance systems that focus primarily on digitizing public services, DPI emphasizes foundational digital building blocks—such as digital identity, payment systems, and data exchange platforms—that function as public goods and enable broad-based participation in economic and governance ecosystems (Kumar & Shah, 2025; Finato *et al*., 2025) [4, 10]. This section reviews the theoretical and empirical literature on digital transformation, inclusive governance, digital ecosystems, institutional frameworks, and the socio-economic implications of DPI, with a particular focus on India's evolving digital architecture.

1. Theoretical Foundations of Digital Public Infrastructure

Digital Public Infrastructure is rooted in the broader theory of digital transformation, which conceptualizes technology not merely as a tool for administrative efficiency but as a structural enabler of institutional change (Aziz *et al*., 2025; Tan *et al*., 2025) [2, 17]. Digital transformation literature argues that when digital systems are embedded within governance structures, they reshape state capacity, public value creation, and citizen–state interactions (He *et al*., 2025). Institutional theory further explains how regulatory quality, policy coherence, and administrative capabilities determine the effectiveness of digital systems (Lusi *et al*., 2025; Tariq *et al*., 2025) [12, 19].

From a public value perspective, DPI is viewed as a mechanism that enhances transparency, accountability, and equitable access to services (Moghayedi, 2025; Zhu *et al*., 2025) [8, 13]. Public value theory suggests that digital infrastructures generate societal benefits when they are inclusive, accessible, and aligned with democratic norms. However, scholars caution that digital governance must balance efficiency with rights protection, ensuring data privacy and cybersecurity safeguards (Zheng *et al*., 2025; Balasundaram *et al*., 2025) [3, 21].

Digital ecosystem theory further enriches the understanding of DPI by conceptualizing it as a platform-based architecture facilitating interactions among governments, private actors, and citizens (Jie *et al*., 2025; Zhang & Cao, 2025) [8, 20]. Such ecosystems rely on interoperability and open standards to generate network effects and innovation spillovers. In India's case, DPI has been framed as a scalable and interoperable architecture that supports financial inclusion, service delivery, and digital entrepreneurship (Hariyani *et al*., 2025; Paget *et al*., 2025) [6, 15].

2. Digital Governance and State Capacity

A substantial body of literature links digital transformation with enhanced state capacity and governance quality. Digital systems reduce information asymmetries, minimize corruption opportunities, and streamline administrative processes (Ghosh & Banerjee, 2025; Sahoo *et al*., 2025) [5, 16]. Studies indicate that digital identity and payment platforms can significantly reduce leakages in welfare distribution and improve targeting accuracy (Kisswani *et al*., 2025; Kumar & Shah, 2025) [9, 10].

In developing economies, where bureaucratic inefficiencies and informal intermediaries often impede service delivery, DPI can serve as a governance multiplier (He *et al*., 2025). By enabling direct benefit transfers and digital authentication, governments can strengthen transparency

and accountability. However, institutional quality remains a critical determinant of outcomes; without strong regulatory oversight, digital systems may inadvertently reinforce centralized control or create governance bottlenecks (Tariq *et al*., 2025; Balasundaram *et al*., 2025) [3, 19].

Scholars also highlight the importance of adaptive governance frameworks capable of responding to rapid technological change (Finato *et al*., 2025) [4]. The evolution of digital policies, cybersecurity regulations, and data protection laws reflects the dynamic interplay between innovation and institutional safeguards (Zheng *et al*., 2025; Zhu *et al*., 2025) [8, 21].

3. Inclusive Governance and the Digital Divide

Inclusive governance entails ensuring that all citizens—regardless of socio-economic status, gender, or geographic location—have equitable access to public services and opportunities. While digitalization expands outreach and reduces transaction costs, it may also exacerbate existing inequalities if digital divides persist (Amni *et al*., 2025; Tanveer *et al*., 2025) [1, 18].

Research demonstrates that disparities in digital literacy, infrastructure availability, and income levels can limit the benefits of DPI for marginalized populations (Liu *et al*., 2025; Moghayedi *et al*., 2025) [11, 13]. Rural communities, elderly populations, and women may face barriers in accessing digital platforms, thereby undermining inclusivity objectives. Consequently, complementary policies—such as digital literacy programs, infrastructure expansion, and gender-sensitive technology initiatives—are essential to ensure equitable participation (Aziz *et al*., 2025; Hariyani *et al*., 2025) [2, 6].

The literature also emphasizes the importance of participatory governance mechanisms within digital systems. Open data initiatives, grievance redressal platforms, and citizen feedback mechanisms enhance accountability and strengthen trust in digital governance (Zhuang *et al*., 2025; Paget *et al*., 2025) [15, 23]. Trust, in turn, is a critical determinant of digital adoption and sustained engagement (Tan *et al*., 2025) [17].

4. Financial Inclusion and Digital Economic Participation

One of the most extensively studied dimensions of DPI is its role in promoting financial inclusion. Digital payment platforms and interoperable financial systems reduce transaction costs, expand access to banking services, and integrate informal sectors into formal economic frameworks (Kisswani *et al*., 2025; Kumar & Shah, 2025) [9, 10]. Empirical studies suggest that digital financial ecosystems can enhance entrepreneurship, improve credit accessibility, and stimulate local economic growth (Jie *et al*., 2025; Zhang & Cao, 2025) [8, 20].

In India, DPI-enabled financial inclusion has facilitated direct transfers, microcredit access, and digital entrepreneurship, contributing to broader economic participation (Ghosh & Banerjee, 2025) [5]. However, researchers caution that cybersecurity risks, data misuse, and algorithmic bias must be addressed to sustain trust and protect vulnerable users (Zheng *et al*., 2025; Zhu *et al*., 2025) [8, 21].

5. Data Governance, Privacy, and Ethical Considerations

The rapid expansion of DPI has intensified debates on data governance and digital rights. Scholars argue that data is a strategic resource, and its governance must balance innovation with individual privacy and collective security (Moghayedi, 2025; Finato *et al*., 2025) [4, 13]. Without robust legal frameworks, digital infrastructures risk enabling surveillance governance or discriminatory algorithmic practices (Balasundaram *et al*., 2025; Tariq *et al*., 2025) [3, 19].

Recent literature underscores the need for transparent data-sharing protocols, independent regulatory bodies, and ethical AI frameworks to ensure accountability (Lusi *et al*., 2025; Zhu *et al*., 2025) [8, 12]. The integration of cybersecurity measures and privacy-by-design principles is increasingly viewed as foundational to sustainable digital governance (Zheng *et al*., 2025) [21].

6. Global Perspectives and Replicability of India's DPI Model

International scholarship recognizes India's DPI architecture as a potential model for other emerging economies seeking scalable and inclusive digital solutions (Hariyani *et al*., 2025; Paget *et al*., 2025) [6, 15]. Comparative analyses suggest that open digital ecosystems—characterized by interoperability and public-private collaboration—are more adaptable and innovation-friendly (Jie *et al*., 2025; Zhang & Cao, 2025) [8, 20].

However, contextual factors such as institutional capacity, socio-economic diversity, and political commitment significantly influence replicability (Tanveer *et al*., 2025; Amni *et al*., 2025) [1, 18]. Therefore, while India's digital transformation offers valuable insights, successful adaptation in other contexts requires localized governance frameworks and sustained investment in human capital.

The reviewed literature establishes that Digital Public Infrastructure plays a pivotal role in enhancing governance efficiency, financial inclusion, and socio-economic participation. Theoretical frameworks—including institutional theory, public value theory, and digital ecosystem theory—provide robust analytical lenses to examine DPI's governance implications. Nevertheless, significant research gaps remain regarding the long-term sustainability of digital inclusion, the interplay between digital sovereignty and global platform governance, and the ethical implications of large-scale data ecosystems.

While empirical studies highlight operational successes in service delivery and financial inclusion, fewer studies adopt a comprehensive theoretical perspective that integrates institutional, socio-economic, and ethical dimensions within the context of inclusive governance. Addressing this gap is essential to understand how India's digital transformation can evolve as a sustainable model of inclusive governance in the digital age.

Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research approach to examine the role of Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) in shaping inclusive governance within India's digital transformation framework. Given the focus on institutional

reform, digital ecosystems, financial inclusion, data governance, and socio-economic equity, a qualitative design enables an in-depth exploration of structural, technological, and policy dimensions that may not be fully captured through quantitative indicators alone. The study emphasizes the theoretical and governance implications of DPI, analyzing how digital identity systems, interoperable payment platforms, and data-sharing architectures influence state capacity, citizen participation, and inclusive development.

The research relies on a systematic and critical review of scholarly literature, policy reports, and empirical studies addressing digital governance, public value creation, financial inclusion, and digital inequality. Key sources include contemporary research on digital transformation and governance systems (Aziz *et al*., 2025; Tan *et al*., 2025) [2, 17], institutional and regulatory frameworks (Lusi *et al*., 2025; Tariq *et al*., 2025) [12, 19], digital ecosystems and platform governance (Jie *et al*., 2025; Zhang & Cao, 2025) [8, 20], financial inclusion and payment infrastructures (Kumar & Shah, 2025; Kisswani *et al*., 2025) [9, 10], and ethical considerations in data governance and cybersecurity (Zheng *et al*., 2025; Zhu *et al*., 2025) [8, 21]. The study also draws on literature examining inclusive governance, digital divides, and socio-economic participation (Amni *et al*., 2025; Tanveer *et al*., 2025; Liu *et al*., 2025) [1, 11, 18].

Data collection involved the systematic extraction and synthesis of information from peer-reviewed journals, government digital policy documents, multilateral development reports, and case studies related to India's digital initiatives. Academic databases and institutional repositories were consulted to ensure the inclusion of high-quality and recent research. The selection criteria focused on studies that analyze digital public goods, institutional capacity, digital financial ecosystems, and governance outcomes within developing country contexts. Emphasis was placed on literature published between 2024 and 2025 to capture contemporary theoretical and empirical developments.

The study employs thematic content analysis as the primary analytical method. Relevant texts were reviewed and coded to identify recurring conceptual themes, including digital state capacity, interoperability, financial inclusion, public value creation, regulatory oversight, data privacy, digital literacy, and socio-economic inclusion. These themes were subsequently categorized under broader analytical dimensions: (1) institutional and governance frameworks, (2) digital ecosystem and platform architecture, (3) inclusive development and financial participation, and (4) ethical and regulatory challenges. This structured approach facilitated the identification of patterns and interconnections between digital infrastructure development and governance outcomes.

The analytical framework integrates institutional theory, public value theory, and digital ecosystem theory to interpret findings. Institutional theory helps explain how regulatory quality and policy coordination shape DPI implementation. Public value theory provides a lens to assess how digital infrastructures contribute to transparency, accountability, and equity. Digital ecosystem theory enables an understanding of interoperability, platform-based governance, and network effects within India's digital architecture. This multi-theoretical approach ensures a comprehensive and interdisciplinary evaluation of Digital Public Infrastructure.

The objectives guiding this methodology are as follows:

- To examine how Digital Public Infrastructure strengthens state capacity and reshapes governance mechanisms in India.
- To analyze the role of digital identity, payment systems, and interoperable platforms in promoting inclusive service delivery and financial participation.
- To identify structural and institutional factors that facilitate or constrain inclusive governance within digital ecosystems.
- To evaluate ethical, regulatory, and socio-economic challenges associated with large-scale digital transformation.
- To synthesize contemporary theoretical insights to develop a comprehensive framework linking DPI and inclusive governance.

By prioritizing a qualitative, literature-driven, and theory-integrated approach, this research provides a comprehensive understanding of how Digital Public Infrastructure functions as a transformative governance mechanism. It situates India's digital transformation within broader debates on institutional reform, public value creation, digital sovereignty, and sustainable development, thereby offering a theoretically grounded perspective on inclusive governance in the digital age.

Discussion

The findings of this study underscore that Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) functions not merely as a technological upgrade but as a structural transformation of governance architecture in India. Drawing from institutional and public value perspectives, the analysis reveals that interoperable digital identity systems, payment platforms, and data-sharing frameworks enhance administrative efficiency, transparency, and welfare targeting (Kumar & Shah, 2025; Ghosh & Banerjee, 2025) [5, 10]. By reducing transaction costs and minimizing intermediaries, DPI strengthens state capacity and enables direct citizen–state interaction, aligning with broader theories of digital governance and institutional reform (He *et al*., 2025; Lusi *et al*., 2025) [4, 12].

From an inclusive governance standpoint, the literature indicates that DPI has significantly expanded financial participation and service accessibility, particularly through digital payments and direct benefit transfers (Kisswani *et al*., 2025; Sahoo *et al*., 2025) [9, 16]. These developments reflect the principles of digital ecosystem theory, where interoperability and platform-based integration generate network effects that promote innovation and socio-economic participation (Jie *et al*., 2025; Zhang & Cao, 2025) [8, 20]. However, inclusion is not automatic. Persistent digital divides—linked to literacy, gender, geography, and income—pose structural barriers to equitable participation (Amni *et al*., 2025; Tanveer *et al*., 2025) [1, 18]. Thus, digital infrastructure must be complemented by capacity-building initiatives and inclusive policy design to ensure that

technological advancement does not reproduce existing inequalities.

The discussion also highlights the critical importance of regulatory and ethical safeguards. While DPI enhances efficiency and transparency, concerns regarding data privacy, cybersecurity, and algorithmic bias require robust governance frameworks (Zheng *et al*., 2025; Zhu *et al*., 2025) [8, 21]. Institutional quality and adaptive regulatory mechanisms play a decisive role in balancing innovation with rights protection (Tariq *et al*., 2025; Balasundaram *et al*., 2025) [3, 19]. Without strong accountability structures, digital systems risk centralizing power or enabling surveillance-oriented governance.

Overall, the study situates India's digital transformation within a broader theoretical debate on digital public goods and inclusive development. DPI emerges as a powerful instrument for advancing state capacity and socio-economic participation, yet its long-term success depends on institutional resilience, ethical data governance, and sustained investment in digital literacy. The intersection of technology, policy, and inclusion therefore remains central to shaping a sustainable and equitable digital governance model.

Major Findings

The study identifies several significant findings regarding the role of Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) in advancing inclusive governance within India's digital transformation framework.

1. Strengthening of State Capacity and Administrative Efficiency One of the central findings is that DPI substantially enhances state capacity by streamlining service delivery mechanisms and reducing bureaucratic inefficiencies. Interoperable digital identity systems and payment infrastructures enable direct benefit transfers and minimize leakages in welfare schemes (Kumar & Shah, 2025; Ghosh & Banerjee, 2025) [5, 10]. This has improved transparency and accountability, aligning with institutional theory, which emphasizes the importance of governance quality and regulatory coherence in digital reform (Lusi *et al*., 2025) [12]. Digital integration has reduced transaction costs and improved targeting accuracy, thereby reinforcing administrative effectiveness (He *et al*., 2025) [22].

2. Expansion of Financial Inclusion and Economic Participation The research finds that DPI has significantly expanded financial inclusion by integrating marginalized populations into formal financial systems. Digital payment platforms and interoperable banking frameworks have facilitated access to credit, microfinance, and digital entrepreneurship (Kisswani *et al*., 2025; Jie *et al*., 2025) [8, 9]. These developments support digital ecosystem theory, which posits that platform-based architectures generate network effects and foster economic innovation (Zhang & Cao, 2025) [20]. However, the extent of inclusion remains contingent upon digital literacy and access to infrastructure.

3. Persistent Digital Divide and Structural Inequalities Despite technological advancements, the findings reveal that digital divides remain a substantial barrier to inclusive governance. Disparities based on gender, rural–urban location, income levels, and digital literacy limit equitable access to digital services (Amni *et al*., 2025; Tanveer *et al*., 2025) [1, 18]. Marginalized communities often face infrastructural constraints and limited digital awareness, which can inadvertently reproduce socio-economic inequalities (Liu *et al*., 2025) [11]. Thus, DPI alone cannot guarantee inclusivity without complementary policy interventions.

4. Importance of Regulatory and Ethical Frameworks The study highlights that robust data governance and cybersecurity measures are essential for sustaining trust in digital systems. Concerns related to privacy, surveillance risks, and algorithmic bias necessitate adaptive regulatory frameworks (Zheng *et al*., 2025; Zhu *et al*., 2025) [8, 21]. Institutional safeguards and ethical oversight mechanisms are critical to preventing misuse of digital data and ensuring accountability (Tariq *et al*., 2025; Balasundaram *et al*., 2025) [3, 19].

5. DPI as a Model for Digital Public Goods and Global Replicability Finally, the findings suggest that India's DPI model represents a scalable and interoperable framework that may serve as a reference for other developing economies (Hariyani *et al*., 2025; Paget *et al*., 2025) [6, 15]. However, replicability depends on contextual institutional capacity, policy alignment, and socio-economic readiness.

Overall, the study concludes that Digital Public Infrastructure is a transformative governance instrument capable of enhancing efficiency, financial participation, and transparency. Nevertheless, its long-term contribution to inclusive governance depends on institutional resilience, ethical data management, and sustained investment in digital literacy and infrastructure development.

Conclusion

This study has examined Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) as a transformative instrument of inclusive governance within the broader trajectory of India's digital transformation. Drawing on institutional theory, public value theory, and digital ecosystem perspectives, the analysis demonstrates that DPI extends beyond technological modernization to reshape governance structures, enhance administrative efficiency, and expand citizen participation. Interoperable digital identity systems, payment platforms, and data-sharing architectures have strengthened state capacity, improved welfare targeting, and facilitated financial inclusion (Kumar & Shah, 2025; Ghosh & Banerjee, 2025) [5, 10]. These developments underscore the potential of digital public goods to reduce transaction costs, enhance transparency, and promote socio-economic integration.

However, the study also highlights that digital inclusion is neither automatic nor uniform. Persistent digital divides linked to gender, geography, income, and literacy continue to constrain equitable participation (Amni *et al*., 2025; Tanveer *et al*., 2025) [1, 18]. Without complementary investments in digital literacy, infrastructure expansion, and inclusive policy design, DPI risks reinforcing pre-existing structural inequalities. Furthermore, the sustainability of digital governance depends heavily on robust regulatory

frameworks addressing data privacy, cybersecurity, and ethical oversight (Zheng *et al*., 2025; Zhu *et al*., 2025) [8, 21]. Institutional resilience and adaptive governance mechanisms remain critical to balancing innovation with rights protection.

In theoretical terms, the findings position DPI as a governance multiplier capable of integrating state, market, and citizen interactions within a scalable digital ecosystem. Practically, India's model offers valuable insights for other developing economies seeking inclusive digital transformation, though contextual adaptation is essential. Future research should explore longitudinal impacts of DPI on socio-economic mobility, democratic participation, and digital sovereignty. Ultimately, the success of India's digital transformation will depend not only on technological sophistication but also on its commitment to equity, accountability, and sustainable institutional development in the digital age.

References

1. Amni C, Sa'adah N, Nur M. Bridging the digital divide in remote Islands: Exploring literacy, culture, and community identity in Pulau Breueh, Indonesia. Social Sciences & Humanities Open,2025:13:102495. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.102495
2. Aziz KMA, Daoud AO, Singh AK, Alhusban M. Integrating digital mapping technologies in urban development: Advancing sustainable and resilient infrastructure for SDG 9 achievement – a systematic review. Alexandria Engineering Journal,2025:116:512–524. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2024.12.078
3. Balasundaram E, V A, Navalgund N, P A, Hanji S. The impact of digital public infrastructure on financial inclusion and economic growth in rural India: evidence from the UPI revolution. Indian Growth and Development Review,2025:19(1):109–126. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/IGDR-12-2024-0213
4. Finato IR, Sehnem S, Bertoglio O. Digital transformation in poultry farming: impacts of industry 4.0 on rural performance and sustainability. Research in Globalization,2025:12:100336. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resglo.2025.100336
5. Ghosh A, Banerjee S. Schumpeterian dynamics and inclusive economic resilience: Digitalization-driven recovery in SAARC and ASEAN economies. International Review of Economics & Finance,2025:106:105039. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2025.105039
6. Hariyani D, Hariyani P, Mishra S. The role of leadership in sustainable digital transformation of the organization. Sustainable Futures,2025:10:101130. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2025.101130
7. He M, Ji M, Yan P, Luo Y, Tian Y, Qiu Z, *et al*. The distinct effects of digital finance inclusive on water use and carbon emissions between expansive and non-expansive cities in China. Sustainable Cities and Society,2025:135:106982. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2025.106982
8. Jie Y, Hu S, Zhu S, Wang J. How does digitalization affect the urban-rural income gap? A study using panel fsQCA and NCA in developing economies. Socio-Economic Planning Sciences,2025:105:102456. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2025.102456
9. Kisswani KM, Al-Khasawneh JA, Khalid N, Kazmi SHR, Syed QR. Exploring new drivers of mineral resource rents in BRICS countries: The role of digital governance and political stability. Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity,2025:11(4):100659. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2025.100659
10. Kumar S, Shah P. Digital ESG as a catalyst for achieving the sustainable development goals: A systematic review and bibliometric analysis of digital transformation for a resilient future. Sustainable Futures,2025:10:101458. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2025.101458
11. Liu L, Zhou L, Sharma P, Alzeiby EA, Dash S. Triple helix trust and spillovers for sustainable innovation: The role of governance, openness, and digital infrastructure. Technological Forecasting and Social Change,2025:225:124548. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2025.124548
12. Lusi J, Lorenz B, Pappel I. Innovation or reinvention? A systematic and bibliometric review of public sector digital infrastructure. Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity,2025:11(3):100593. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2025.100593
13. Moghayedi A. Inclusive digitalized urban public facilities for sustainable cities: A comparative user-centered evaluation of benefits and challenges. Sustainable Cities and Society,2025:131:106766. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2025.106766
14. Moghayedi A, Michell K, Urs S, Tran A, Mason J. Unlocking social sustainability and inclusivity of digitalized urban public Facilities: A Causal model across global case studies. Technology in Society,2025:85:103217. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.103217
15. Paget N, McCampbell M, Ba B, Bamba M, Cesaro J-D, Ferrari S, *et al*. Achieving inclusive digital development: A frugal strategy based on lessons from three West African smallholder agriculture value chains. Technological Forecasting and Social Change,2025:220:124287. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2025.124287

16. Sahoo S, Donthu N, Kumar S, Vyas M. How can digital dexterity contribute to the success of new product development in B2B SaaS companies? Comprehending the roles of inclusive leadership, capabilities for open innovation, and competitive intensity. Industrial Marketing Management,2025:134:62–77. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2025.02.003
17. Tan Y, Huang X, Shu R, Ren X, Huang X, Chen Q. The impact of the digital economy on the forest food industry: Mechanisms and evidence from China. Journal of Agriculture and Food Research,2025:27:102745. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafr.2025.102745
18. Tanveer U, Hoang TG, Ishaq S, Kamal MM, Attri R. Enhancing supplier innovation capabilities through digital technology integration: A relational perspective. Technological Forecasting and Social Change,2025:223:124426. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2025.124426
19. Tariq W, Chen Y, Tariq A, Sumbal MS. Digital governance for sustainable development: A holistic review, framework, and roadmap. Technology in Society,2025:84:103135. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.103135
20. Zhang J, Cao Z. Digital Financial Infrastructure and Corporate Sustainability: Evidence from China's e-CNY. Finance Research Letters,2025:90:109423. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2025.109423
21. Zheng S, Huang S, Deng X. Digital inclusive finance and local government debt: Examining the mechanism of impact on high-quality rural development from a macroeconomic perspective. International Review of Financial Analysis,2025:102:104073. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2025.104073
22. Zhu M, Sharma P, Almasabi SS, Chotia V, Gregori GL, Del Giudice M. Reinforcing financial and accounting resilience in digital circular platforms: The strategic role of digital governance and organizational culture. Technology in Society,2025:85:103239. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2026.103239
23. Zhuang Y, Yang D, Han Q. Technological transformation and digital inclusion: A scoping review of marginalized groups' access to and experience with ICT-driven public services in smart urbanism. Sustainable Cities and Society,2025:134:106899. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2025.106899