Key Challenges to Digital Financial Services in Emerging Economies: The Indian Context

Karan Vekariya
Charusat Changa India

Abstract

India's digital financial services (DFS) ecosystem represents one of the world's most ambitious experiments in financial inclusion through technology. With an 87% FinTech adoption rate—substantially exceeding the 64% global average—and a Unified Payments Interface (UPI) processing over 20 billion monthly transactions, India has achieved scale unmatched globally Yet beneath this narrative of transformative success lies accumulating evidence of systemic challenges that threaten both the sustainability of digital inclusion and the welfare of the very populations it aims to serve. This review synthesizes contemporary evidence from peer-reviewed scholarship, policy research, and investigative reporting published between 2024-2026 to present a comprehensive analysis of seven interconnected challenges: (1) the trust deficit and fraud epidemic, (2) systemic market concentration risk, (3) the layered literacy gap, (4) grievance redressal failure, (5) algorithmic opacity and the erosion of due process, (6) uneven digital public infrastructure maturity, and (7) regulatory adaptation under institutional complexity. The article argues that India's experience offers both a roadmap and a warning for emerging economies: digital finance at population scale generates novel risks that cannot be managed through frameworks designed for traditional banking. The challenges now confronting India—from duopoly-driven systemic vulnerability to the constitutional implications of algorithmic credit exclusion—will likely confront other developing nations as they pursue similar pathways. The review concludes with a research agenda and policy implications for the next phase of digital financial inclusion.

Keywords: *Digital financial services, financial inclusion, India, UPI, FinTech regulation, trust, grievance redressal, algorithmic decision-making, digital public infrastructure, systemic risk*

1. Introduction

The global discourse on financial inclusion has, over the past decade, shifted decisively toward digital solutions. Emerging economies, constrained by the high costs of brick-and-mortar banking infrastructure and the persistent challenges of serving dispersed, low-income populations, have embraced digital financial services (DFS) as a leapfrog pathway to universal financial access. No country exemplifies this transition more dramatically than India.

India's digital financial ecosystem has achieved what would have seemed implausible two decades ago. The Unified Payments Interface (UPI), a real-time payment system built on the India Stack digital public infrastructure, processed over 200 billion transactions in 2024, growing from 17.9 million transactions in 2016 By August 2025, monthly UPI transaction volume exceeded 20,000 million, valued at approximately ₹248.5 lakh crore India hosts over 9,000 FinTech companies, constituting the third-largest FinTech ecosystem globally, and has attracted $8 billion in investment in a single year The adoption rate of 87% among Indian consumers significantly outpaces the global average of 64% .

These metrics have justifiably generated international admiration. India's digital public infrastructure approach—combining open technology protocols, interoperable systems, and governance frameworks that enable private innovation—has been proposed as a model for other developing nations. The G20's endorsement of DPI as a development strategy reflects India's influence in shaping global financial inclusion thinking.

Yet the celebratory narrative increasingly coexists with accumulating evidence of systemic dysfunction. The very scale that distinguishes India's achievement has generated novel risks and vulnerabilities. The rapid adoption of DFS has outpaced the development of institutional safeguards, grievance mechanisms, regulatory capacity, and citizen understanding. A growing body of evidence—from the 2025 State of DPI in India report, detailed investigations of trust deficits among the "Next Half Billion" users, documented failures in grievance redressal, analyses of systemic

concentration risk, and scholarly examination of adoption barriers — reveals a more complex and troubling picture.

This review article addresses a critical gap: while substantial literature examines the drivers of India's DFS success, comprehensive analysis of the accumulating challenges remains fragmented across disciplinary and sectoral boundaries. We synthesize evidence published between 2024-2026 to present an integrated framework of seven interconnected challenges, examine their systemic relationships, and derive implications for policy and future research. The Indian experience, we argue, constitutes an early warning for all emerging economies pursuing digital financial inclusion at scale: the very mechanisms that enable rapid adoption—speed, convenience, algorithmic efficiency, platform concentration, regulatory adaptation—generate vulnerabilities that, if unaddressed, may ultimately undermine the inclusion promise.

2. Methodology

This review employed a systematic search and synthesis approach. Academic databases (Scopus, Web of Science, Econ Papers, Taylor & Francis Online) were searched using combinations of terms including "digital financial services," "India," "FinTech," "challenges," "barriers," "trust," "grievance redressal," "financial inclusion," and "UPI." The search was conducted in February 2026, limited to publications from 2024-2026 to capture the most contemporary evidence. Industry and policy literature from reputable sources (EY, Artha Global, The Hindu, Hindustan Times) was included where it provided empirical data or analysis not available in peer-reviewed sources, with appropriate weighting of evidence quality. The Money life investigation, while not peer-reviewed, provides detailed primary documentation of grievance redressal failures and algorithmic exclusion cases that constitute valuable evidentiary material when corroborated against other sources. The final synthesis includes 10 sources spanning peer-reviewed academic chapters, policy research, investigative journalism, and professional services analysis.

3. The Shifting Challenge Paradigm: From Access to Quality

The dominant narrative of Indian financial inclusion has historically focused on access. The Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana (PMJDY) achieved near-universal account penetration—96% of Indian households had bank accounts by 2021 UPI democratized

payments, enabling instant, zero-cost fund transfers accessible via smartphone. This first-generation challenge—expanding the infrastructure and instruments of access—has been substantially, though not completely, addressed

The contemporary challenge paradigm is fundamentally different. It is no longer primarily about whether citizens can access digital financial services, but about the quality, security, accountability, and dignity of that access. The 2025 State of DPI in India report, produced by IIM Bangalore's Centre for Digital Public Goods, explicitly frames this transition: India's digital ecosystem has moved from "rapid expansion" to a "consolidation phase" where "trust, safety, and accountability" have become central concerns.

This paradigm shift requires rethinking analytical frameworks. Traditional financial inclusion metrics—account penetration, transaction volume, gender gaps in access—capture the first-generation challenge but obscure second-generation failures. A citizen may have a UPI-linked account yet be defrauded without recourse, excluded from credit by an inexplicable algorithm, or subjected to unauthorized deductions that cannot be disputed. These are not failures of access but failures of institutional performance within an access-rich environment.

The following sections examine seven interconnected challenges that define this second-generation crisis.

4. The Trust Deficit and Fraud Epidemic

4.1 The Paradox of Trust in India's DFS Ecosystem

Trust occupies a paradoxical position in India's digital finance story. On one hand, UPI's extraordinary adoption—from 17.9 million transactions in 2016 to over 200 billion in 2024—demonstrates that hundreds of millions of Indians have placed sufficient trust in the system to conduct their daily financial lives through it.On the other hand, a growing body of evidence reveals that trust remains fragile, unevenly distributed, and vulnerable to erosion through adverse experiences.

The Artha Global analysis of the "Next Half Billion" (NHB)—the second wave of internet users from lower-income households with limited prior digital engagement—documents this fragility with striking specificity. Over 50% of NHB users have encountered at least one instance of fraud, harassment, bullying, reputational harm, or fake application downloads. Financial fraud victims are not a trivial

minority: 24% lost ₹2,000 or more, while 3% lost ₹12,000 or more. For households where these sums represent meaningful proportions of monthly income, such losses constitute not merely inconvenience but economic shock.

The trust deficit operates at multiple levels. At the individual level, nearly one-fifth of NHB individuals cite distrust in their own abilities as a reason for avoiding digital financial services.This finding—users lacking confidence not in the system but in their capacity to navigate it safely—reveals the inadequacy of viewing trust solely as a property of institutions. At the institutional level, concerns about product reliability, provider credibility, and regulatory protection create supply-side trust barriers The scholarly literature confirms this multidimensionality: a 2024 study employing linear probabilistic modelling found that both demand-side factors (education, documentation, smartphone proficiency) and supply-side factors (digital infrastructure, agent commission incentives) significantly influence DFS adoption.

4.2 The Scale and Evolution of Financial Fraud

The fraud challenge is not static but dynamically evolving. While UPI's instant payment feature has driven its success, it has also created novel vulnerabilities. Fraudsters exploit system weaknesses through phishing, fake payment links, and impersonation of trusted entities. The escalation has been dramatic: ₹4.85 billion (485 crore) was lost to digital payment scams in FY 2025.

This figure almost certainly understates the true magnitude. The documented cases in the Money life investigation—small, unexplained recurring deductions from pension-linked wallets, silent account freezes without notification, algorithmic rejections without explanation—represent a category of fraud and malfunction that may never appear in scam statistics because victims either do not recognize they have been defrauded or lack effective pathways to report and recover losses.

The consumer protection implications are profound. Traditional banking offered imperfect but tangible recourse: citizens could visit branches, speak with officers, and receive explanations. Digital interfaces have replaced this with what one analysis terms "the silent collapse of citizen control"—a condition where citizens interact with algorithms, not individuals, and where even constitutionally guaranteed protections become functionally unavailable.

5. Systemic Concentration Risk: The UPI Duopoly Dilemma

5.1 The 80% Problem

Perhaps the most significant systemic vulnerability in India's digital financial architecture has received remarkably little attention in academic literature: the extreme concentration of UPI transaction volume among two private third-party application providers (TPAPs). As of January 2026, Phone Pay and Google Pay collectively control approximately 80% of the UPI market.

This concentration transforms what was designed as a competitive, interoperable public utility into a duopoly-dependent critical infrastructure. The systemic risk implications are severe. A technical outage, cyber breach, commercial dispute, software bug, or regulatory standoff affecting either dominant player could disrupt a substantial portion of India's digital commerce. As a 2025 analysis in Hindustan Times warned: "If Indigo's cancelled flights caused inconvenience, a payments-system breakdown could bring everyday life to a stop: We pay for groceries, transport, utilities, school fees, tolls, even temple donations through a tap".

5.2 Regulatory Response and Implementation Failure

The National Payments Corporation of India (NPCI) recognized this vulnerability as early as 2020, proposing a 30% market share cap for individual UPI apps. The policy objective was preventive, not punitive: diversify traffic, deepen competition, reduce single-point vulnerability. Yet four years later, with multiple deadline extensions, implementation has been deferred to December 2026.

The implementation failure reflects genuine policy dilemmas. Enforcing a strict cap overnight could penalize successful innovation, degrade user experience, and create disruption. Yet open-ended postponement entrenches concentration, raises switching costs, and weakens alternatives. The Payments Regulatory Board (PRB), operationalized in May 2025, now confronts this inherited challenge. Industry analysts expect the PRB to pursue "organic de-concentration" through policy incentives for challenger apps (Tata Neu, WhatsApp Pay, Amazon Pay, BHIM) rather than hard caps, while potentially designating PhonePe and Google Pay as Systemically Important Payment System Operators (SIPSOs) subject to higher capital requirements and rigorous audits.

The concentration risk extends beyond the two dominant players. The New Umbrella Entity (NUE) framework, designed to create

competitors to NPCI itself, has stalled. Reliance on a single switch for the nation's primary payment system constitutes an additional layer of systemic vulnerability.

5.3 Infrastructure Resilience as Public Good

The UPI concentration case reveals a fundamental tension in digital public infrastructure design. India built UPI as an open protocol enabling private innovation at the customer interface. This design generated extraordinary adoption and user experience improvements. But it also outsourced critical infrastructure operation to private entities whose primary accountability is to shareholders, not to the public whose daily economic life depends on their systems.

The analytical framework must shift from viewing UPI as a product to understanding it as public infrastructure. And infrastructure, as the Hindustan Times analysis emphasizes, "needs redundancies to be created before a crisis hits". Regular ecosystem stress-tests, fallback routing mechanisms, disaster recovery drills, and contingency playbooks have not kept pace with transaction volume growth. The absence of a nationwide UPI outage to date is fortunate but not guaranteed. As the aviation analogy suggests, present stability is no guarantee of future resilience.

6. The Layered Literacy Gap

6.1 Beyond Binary Literacy Frameworks

The relationship between literacy and DFS adoption has been extensively documented, but contemporary evidence reveals a more complex, layered challenge than conventional frameworks acknowledge. The 2024 Stanford-indexed study confirms that education level and smartphone proficiency significantly increase the probability of DFS adoption. However, the more nuanced finding concerns the nature of the literacy deficit.

The FinDev Gateway analysis argues that a "major gap" persists "amongst the general public in understanding the manner of its use and the benefits that could be derived from these services"—and that this gap is "surprisingly wide for the better off sections of the population" This is not a binary literate/illiterate divide but a continuum of mystification affecting even educated users. The problem is not merely inability to operate digital interfaces but fundamental incomprehension of how decisions are made, how data is used, and what rights citizens possess.

6.2 Digital, Financial, and Algorithmic Literacy

The evidence supports disaggregating literacy into three distinct but interrelated domains:

Digital literacy encompasses the knowledge and ability to manage information through digital devices—navigating interfaces, troubleshooting basic problems, distinguishing legitimate applications from fake ones. The NHB analysis emphasizes that many users "struggle to navigate digital payments, increasing their vulnerability to fraud and errors".

Financial literacy involves understanding financial products, risks, and rights—the implications of credit, the distinction between principal and interest, the obligations accompanying borrowing. The two forms of illiteracy interact: "Financial illiteracy can be a barrier to financial inclusion as a lack of skills and knowledge may discourage individuals from using financial services. Similarly, digital illiteracy may prevent users from appropriately understanding or using digital technologies"

Algorithmic literacy—understanding that decisions are being made by automated systems according to proprietary logic, that engagement patterns influence eligibility, and that opaque scoring determines access—is almost entirely absent. The documented cases of users with strong financial profiles being rejected for credit because they "didn't engage enough with the app" reveal that citizens are being assessed and excluded on criteria they do not know exist.

6.3 The Confidence Gap

Perhaps most significantly, the literacy gap is not merely cognitive but psychological. "Nearly one-fifth of NHB individuals cite distrust in their own abilities as a reason for avoiding digital financial services".This finding transforms the policy challenge. Training programs that transmit information but fail to build user confidence in their capacity to apply that knowledge will be insufficient. The objective must shift from literacy transmission to empowerment—ensuring that users not only understand but trust themselves to navigate digital systems safely.

7. Grievance Redressal Failure

7.1 The Architecture of Unanswered Complaints

The failure of grievance redressal mechanisms constitutes perhaps the most extensively documented and institutionally damning challenge in India's DFS ecosystem. Multiple sources converge on a

consistent diagnosis: systems exist on paper, but they do not function in practice.

The Dvara Research 2023 report, cited in the Artha Global analysis, found existing grievance redressal mechanisms "poor due to high rates of rejection, delays, and unsatisfactory resolutions". The Consumer Complaints Digest (2025) documents that CPGRAMS complaints related to fintech apps "often go unresolved for months, with no updates or accountability". The RBI Bulletin (September 2025) explicitly acknowledges: "Customer support and grievance redressal are key challenges for fintechs, with users citing poor service, app glitches, and loan processing issues".

The case evidence is damning. The retired civics teacher in Pune who experienced recurring unauthorized deductions from his pension-linked digital wallet contacted his bank (which pointed to a third-party platform), emailed the app provider (no reply), filed a CPGRAMS complaint (sixty days without resolution). The Bengaluru lawyer whose father's pension-linked digital wallet was frozen without warning, notification, or listed grievance officer—restored only after she filed a writ petition in the High Court.

7.2 Institutional Accountability Evasion

The grievance redressal failure is not random malfunction but systematic accountability evasion enabled by institutional structure. Banks increasingly outsource digital interfaces to third-party platforms, then disclaim responsibility when those interfaces fail. Fintech apps operate through NBFC tie-ups, positioning themselves as "technology service providers" rather than regulated financial entities. Regulators lack enforcement capacity or impose no meaningful penalties for non-compliance. The result, as the Money life investigation documents, is "a governance vacuum".

The operationalisation of the Payments Regulatory Board (PRB) in 2025 represents an attempted structural remedy. Unlike its predecessor (the BPSS), the PRB has explicit authority to inspect the technology service providers of regulated entities directly—to audit algorithms, data storage practices, and cybersecurity protocols of Big Tech firms rather than relying on sponsor bank certifications. Whether this authority translates into effective enforcement remains to be demonstrated.

7.3 The Constitutional Dimension

The grievance redressal failure has constitutional implications that extend beyond consumer protection. When pension-linked accounts—the instrument of a citizen's constitutional entitlement to social security—can be frozen without notification or remedy, and restored only through High Court intervention, the promise of digital inclusion as empowerment inverts into its opposite. The citizen who "taught constitutional rights for 30 years" and cannot obtain a reply to his complaint experiences not digital progress but institutional regression.

This constitutional dimension distinguishes DFS failures from ordinary consumer grievances. Digital financial services are not merely private conveniences but increasingly the sole channel through which citizens access fundamental entitlements. When those channels malfunction without remedy, the state's obligations under the Directive Principles and fundamental rights are implicated. The policy discourse has not adequately grappled with this constitutional transformation.

8. Algorithmic Opacity and the Erosion of Due Process

8.1 The Black Box of Credit Decisioning

Perhaps the most profound challenge to the legitimacy of India's digital financial system concerns the opacity of algorithmic decision-making. The case of Faizan—a Pune engineer with a stable job, clean credit history, and no outstanding liabilities whose loan application through a popular fintech app was rejected with the response "Not eligible," no explanation, and no appeal—exemplifies a systemic phenomenon.

The rejection came from an algorithm that judged engagement, not eligibility. Faizan's engagement with the app—frequency of use, response to behavioral nudges—did not meet the platform's internal thresholds. He was excluded not by financial merit but by conformity to platform-defined engagement rituals. He stopped engaging "not by choice, but by exhaustion".

8.2 Regulatory Mandates vs. Operational Reality

The Reserve Bank of India mandates transparency, reasoned rejections, and explainability in credit scoring. Citizens are entitled to know the basis of decisions affecting their economic participation. Yet these mandates function more as advisory circulars than enforceable obligations. "In practice," the Money life investigation concludes,

"these safeguards function more as advisory circulars than enforceable obligations".

The gap between regulatory mandate and operational reality is not accidental. Algorithmic decision systems are typically proprietary, protected as trade secrets. The logic they operationalize emerges from training data rather than explicit rule-writing. Explaining a neural network's credit decision in human-comprehensible terms is technically challenging even when attempted in good faith. Most platforms do not attempt it. Most citizens do not know to ask.

8.3 Visibility as Constitutional Right

The case of Kamala—the Mysuru senior citizen who visited her bank with a screenshot, requesting "I just want to know what they know about me"—offers both indictment and model. Her request was "modest, yet profound: she exercised her right to visibility." The banker printed her transaction history, credit score, and app permission records. She reviewed them quietly and smiled. Kamala's experience should be unremarkable. That it is exceptional reveals the depth of the opacity problem. As the Fintech Risk Barometer (2024) noted: "Most platforms don't offer dashboards, printouts, or visibility. Citizens are profiled, scored, and nudged—without knowing what's being used or shared".

The right to visibility is not merely consumer protection good practice. It is foundational to democratic accountability in an algorithmically-mediated society. When citizens cannot know the basis on which they are included or excluded, they cannot contest decisions that affect their economic survival. They cannot exercise voice. They cannot, in any meaningful sense, consent. The erosion of visibility is thus not merely a technical failure but a constitutional one.

9. Uneven Maturity of Digital Public Infrastructure

9.1 The Consolidation Phase Diagnosis

The 2025 State of DPI in India report provides the first comprehensive mapping of India's digital ecosystem maturity across sectors. Its central diagnostic finding is stark: "India's DPI stack, once characterised by rapid expansion, has now entered a consolidation phase. High-usage systems like UPI and FASTag are stabilising, while platforms such as Digi Locker, ONDC, and Account Aggregator are still battling uneven adoption, regulatory friction, and capacity constraints across states".

This uneven maturity creates a fragmented user experience. A citizen may make seamless UPI payments but encounter broken digital grievance systems, inconsistently implemented teacher-training platforms, or civic-services dashboards that function in one state but not another. Interoperability—the principle that enabled UPI, Aadhaar, and the Unified Health Interface to cut across bank systems, states, and departments—"cannot be taken for granted" as several states continue to lag in onboarding government departments to digital workflows.

9.2 The DPI 2.0 Agenda

The report's proposed framework for "DPI 2.0" represents a fundamental shift in policy orientation: from infrastructure creation to user-centric governance. The next stage of India's digital transition "will depend not on adding more platforms, but on ensuring that citizens can use them easily, securely, and without bureaucratic friction".

This diagnosis has profound implications for how digital financial inclusion challenges are conceptualized. The problem is no longer the absence of infrastructure but the inconsistent quality of its implementation, the uneven distribution of its benefits, and the insufficient attention to user experience and accountability. The DPI 2.0 agenda include enabling smaller private players to build atop public rails, improving digital literacy in low-income communities, and ensuring state governments have budgets and technical support to implement digital platforms uniformly.

10. Regulatory Adaptation Under Institutional Complexity

10.1 The Evolution of Regulatory Architecture

India's regulatory response to the digital finance transformation has been adaptive but institutionally complex. The operationalisation of the Payments Regulatory Board (PRB) in May 2025, with its inaugural meeting in January 2026, represents the most significant structural intervention to date.

The PRB replaces the BPSS, a sub-committee of RBI's Central Board comprised entirely of central bankers and banking experts. This "insular structure" meant regulators were "often technically removed from the fast-paced, algorithm-driven world of the entities they were tasked to supervise". The PRB introduces a multi-stakeholder governance model, institutionalizing the tension between monetary stability and digital innovation.

The significance of this shift extends beyond institutional mechanics. The PRB represents a "strategic concession" by the RBI—"a way to share the burden of regulation while retaining the ultimate lever of control". It allows the central bank to internalize the government's developmental goals without formally ceding autonomy. For the government, it provides "a seat at the table where the rules of the digital economy are written".

10.2 The Unresolved Coordination Problem

Yet the PRB, while consolidating payment regulation, must navigate "a complex web of adjacent regulators". The competition mandate may overlap with the Competition Commission of India (CCI). Data protection enforcement involves the newly operationalized Data Protection Board. Sectoral regulation for insurance and securities remains with IRDAI and SEBI respectively.

This institutional fragmentation creates coordination problems that remain substantially unresolved. A Big Tech firm operating payment, lending, insurance distribution, and data services across multiple regulated entities may face multiple regulators with overlapping jurisdictions, inconsistent requirements, and limited coordination. The PRB-CCI joint working group on defining markets and abuse of dominance in the platform economy is a promising innovation but not yet operationalized.

10.3 The Light-Touch Regulation Era Ends

For FinTech entities, the PRB's operationalisation signals "the end of the era of light-touch regulation". Under the previous regime, many fintechs operated in a regulatory grey zone, claiming status as "technology service providers" to banks and thus not directly regulated. The PRB's authority to inspect TSPs directly—auditing algorithms, data storage, cybersecurity protocols—fundamentally alters this arrangement.

The enforcement of data localisation mandates under the now-operational Personal Data Protection Act adds another compliance layer. The PRB will act as sectoral regulator ensuring that financial data generated by global technology platforms remains within Indian jurisdiction—"a point of friction for global tech giants".

11. Synthesis: The Interconnection of Challenges

The seven challenges examined above are not discrete problems amenable to isolated solutions. They are systemically interconnected, each reinforcing and exacerbating others.

The trust deficit is simultaneously cause and consequence of grievance redressal failure. Citizens who experience fraud without recourse lose confidence not only in specific platforms but in the digital financial system generally. This trust erosion in turn reduces adoption among marginal populations, particularly the Next Half Billion who already doubt their own capacity to navigate digital systems safely.

Market concentration amplifies both fraud risk and regulatory challenge. When two platforms control 80% of transaction volume, any security vulnerability in either system affects hundreds of millions of users. Regulatory intervention becomes politically fraught, as enforcement actions against dominant players risk disrupting critical infrastructure.

Algorithmic opacity interacts with literacy gaps to produce exclusion that is both invisible and irremediable. Citizens rejected by algorithms they do not understand, on criteria they do not know exist, with no explanation and no appeal, cannot contest decisions or advocate for policy change. Their exclusion is silent and therefore unaddressed in aggregate statistics.

Uneven DPI maturity undermines the user experience that trust-building requires. When digital grievance systems function in one state but not another, when interoperability fails across administrative boundaries, the seamless experience promised by digital finance fragments into confusion and frustration.

This interconnection demands analytical frameworks that move beyond siloed examination of individual challenges toward systemic diagnosis. The whole, in this case, is more dangerous than the sum of its parts.

12. Research Agenda

The evidence synthesized in this review reveals substantial gaps in the scholarly literature that demand urgent attention:

Quantitative measurement of second-generation inclusion failures. Existing metrics capture account penetration and transaction volume but not the quality, security, or dignity of access. Developing indicators for silent exclusion, grievance redressal effectiveness, algorithmic fairness, and user confidence is a prerequisite for evidence-based policy.

Longitudinal studies of trust evolution. Cross-sectional studies capture trust levels at a moment but cannot explain how trust is built,

eroded, or repaired through experience. Longitudinal research following cohorts of new DFS users over time would illuminate these dynamics.

Algorithmic audit studies. The opacity of credit decisioning and other algorithmic determinations is well-documented, but systematic audit studies examining the correlates and potential biases of algorithmic exclusion are almost entirely absent. Such research faces substantial methodological and data access challenges but is essential for accountability.

Comparative political economy of regulatory adaptation. India's institutional response to digital finance transformation offers a rich case for examining how regulatory architectures evolve under technological disruption. Comparative research examining India alongside other emerging economies (Brazil, China, Kenya, Nigeria) would illuminate the conditions under which effective governance emerges.

Grievance redressal system effectiveness. Despite extensive documentation of failure, systematic research on grievance redressal mechanisms—what works, for whom, under what conditions—remains scarce. Design-relevant research examining alternative grievance architectures is urgently needed.

Constitutional and legal dimensions. The transformation of fundamental entitlements through digital interfaces raises constitutional questions that legal scholarship has only begun to examine. Research on due process in algorithmic decision-making, the justiciability of digital exclusion, and the state's obligations in DPI provision would inform both scholarship and jurisprudence.

13. Conclusion

India's digital financial services ecosystem stands at a decisive juncture. The past decade achieved what no emerging economy had previously accomplished: the construction of digital public infrastructure capable of delivering financial services to over a billion people at negligible marginal cost, enabling adoption rates exceeding those of advanced economies, and demonstrating that leapfrog financial inclusion is not merely aspirational but achievable.

Yet this extraordinary achievement now confronts an equally extraordinary challenge. The very success of India's digital finance transformation has generated novel risks, vulnerabilities, and failures that the institutional architecture was not designed to manage.

Systemic concentration threatens the resilience of critical infrastructure. Epidemic fraud erodes the trust on which adoption depends. Grievance mechanisms designed for analog banking fail citizens navigating algorithmically-mediated systems. Citizens are excluded from credit by opaque algorithms applying unknown criteria, with no explanation and no remedy. The constitutional promise of digital empowerment inverts, for too many, into the experience of digital helplessness.

The Indian experience offers both roadmap and warning for other emerging economies. The roadmap demonstrates that digital public infrastructure, thoughtfully designed and implemented at scale, can transform financial inclusion. The warning is equally clear: the second-generation challenges of quality, accountability, and dignity do not resolve themselves. They must be deliberately addressed through regulatory adaptation, institutional capacity-building, and a fundamental reorientation from access metrics to user welfare.

The DPI 2.0 framework articulated in the 2025 State of DPI report captures this reorientation: from infrastructure creation to user-centric governance, from expansion to consolidation, from scale to reliability. Whether this framework translates into operational reality will determine not only the future of India's digital financial ecosystem but the viability of the digital inclusion model for emerging economies worldwide. India built the infrastructure. It must now build the institutions capable of governing it.

References

AMLEGALS. (2026, January). The Payments Regulatory Board: A Quiet Power Shift in Fintech Governance. AMLEGALS. https://amlegals.com/the-payments-regulatory-board-a-quiet-power-shift-in-fintech-governance/

Artha Global. (2025, April). UPI's Role in Financial Inclusion for India's Next Half Billion. Artha Global. https://artha.global/blog/upis-role-in-financial-inclusion-for-indias-next-half-billion/

Centre for Digital Public Goods, IIM Bangalore & Protean eGov Technologies. (2025, December). State of DPI in India, 2025. The Hindu. https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/karnataka/new-report-maps-indias-dpi-20-future/article70358847.ece

Chaudhary, D., Vashishth, S., Agarwal, N., Gupta, R., & Sharma, P. (2025). Fintech as financial innovation catalyst: Opportunities, challenges and cybersecurity implications in India's emerging financial landscape. In FinTech and Financial Inclusion. Taylor & Francis. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.1201/9781003635680-68/fintech-financial-innovation-catalyst-opportunities-challenges-cybersecurity-implications-india-emerging-financial-landscape-diwakar-chaudhary-sangeet-vashishth-nidhi-agarwal-ruchika-gupta-pooja-sharma

Desai, K., Ramachandran, N., & Mahalakshmi, S. (2025). The Rise of FinTech in India's Financial Ecosystem. In Trends and Challenges of Electronic Finance (pp. 217-234). Springer. https://econpapers.repec.org/bookchap/sprsprchp/978-981-96-3304-3_5f12.htm

EY. (2025, July). Seven Key Trends Reshaping the FinTech Future. EY India. https://www.ey.com/en_in/insights/consulting/seven-key-trends-shaping-the-future-of-fintech-industry

Mishra, B. N. (2025, December). The need for an urgent roll-out of UPI market-share caps. Hindustan Times. https://www.hindustantimes.com/opinion/the-need-for-an-urgent-roll-out-of-upi-market-share-caps-101766073273315.html

Sethi, K. S. (2025, November). The Silent Collapse of Citizen Control in Digital Finance. Moneylife. https://moneylife.in/article/the-silent-collapse-of-citizen-control-in-digital-finance/78920.html

Sinha, S. (2025, May). Digital Finance Needs Demystifying for Microenterprise Facilitation. FinDev Gateway. https://microfinancegateway.org/paper/2025/06/digital-finance-needs-demystifying-for-microenterprise-facilitation

Stanford University. (2024). Principal–agent trust and adoption of digital financial services: Evidence from India. Stanford SearchWorks. https://searchworks.stanford.edu/articles/bsx__181088980