International Journal in Management and Social Science
Volume 14 Issue 10, October 2026 ISSN: 2321-1784 Impact Factor: 8.088
Journal Homepage: http://ijmr.net.in, Email: irjmss@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal

IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: OPPORTUNITIES, CHALLENGES AND THE FUTURE OF ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE

Dr. P. Nagaraju
Department of Public Administration, Osmania University, Hyderabad (India)

Abstract: *Artificial Intelligence (AI) is emerging as an important force in the transformation of public administration in India. Its applications in public service delivery, administrative decision-making, document processing, grievance management, policy analysis, and fraud detection offer opportunities to improve efficiency and institutional capacity. The IndiaAI Mission and the India AI Governance Guidelines demonstrate the growing importance of developing AI capabilities while addressing issues of fairness, safety, accountability, and inclusion. However, the adoption of AI in public administration also raises significant concerns regarding algorithmic bias, data privacy, transparency, administrative discretion, digital inequality, and the accountability of automated decisions. This paper examines the impact of AI on Indian public administration, focusing on its administrative applications, institutional implications, and ethical challenges. It adopts a qualitative and analytical methodology based on secondary sources, including academic literature, government publications, and international policy reports. The paper proposes a framework for responsible AI adoption based on five dimensions: administrative efficiency, decision-making quality, institutional accountability, social inclusion, and public trust. It argues that AI should complement rather than replace administrative judgment, professional responsibility, and democratic oversight. The study concludes that the successful integration of AI into Indian public administration requires institutional capacity-building, transparent decision-making, effective human supervision, strong data governance, and citizen-centred safeguards.*
Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Public Administration, India, AI Governance, Administrative Efficiency, Algorithmic Accountability, Digital Governance, Public Service Delivery.*

Introduction

Public Administration is the institutional mechanism through which governments implement policies, manage public resources, regulate social and economic activities, and deliver services to citizens. In India, public administration operates within a complex environment characterized by federal governance, socioeconomic diversity, large-scale welfare programmes, and increasing public expectations regarding service quality and accountability.

Traditional administrative systems rely on established procedures, bureaucratic hierarchy, official records, and human judgment. Although these arrangements provide institutional continuity and legal accountability, they may also encounter problems such as excessive paperwork, delays, fragmented information, and difficulties in coordinating services across departments.

Artificial Intelligence offers new possibilities for addressing some of these administrative challenges. AI systems can analyse large datasets, classify documents, identify patterns, generate summaries, assist with communication, and support forecasting. When appropriately designed and implemented, these capabilities may improve administrative productivity and help public officials make better-informed decisions.

In India, AI is becoming relevant to government through digital public infrastructure, data-driven service delivery, public-sector innovation initiatives, and administrative capacity-building. The IndiaAI Mission supports AI development and adoption across multiple sectors, including governance. According to a government update published in July 2026, the mission had identified 762 AI use cases across 62 ministries and departments, indicating the breadth of potential applications being considered across government. This figure represents identified use cases, not proof that all of them have been deployed or produced measurable improvements.

The release of the India AI Governance Guidelines on 5 November 2025 also marks an important development in the policy environment. The guidelines emphasize trust, a people-first approach, fairness, accountability, understandability, and safety in AI development and deployment.

Nevertheless, the use of AI in public administration is different from its use in private business. Government decisions can determine access to welfare benefits, public services, licences, and other important entitlements. Errors or biased outcomes can therefore have serious consequences for citizens.

The central argument of this paper is that the impact of AI on Indian public administration should be evaluated not merely in terms of technological efficiency, but also in terms of administrative responsibility, procedural fairness, social inclusion, and public trust.

Statement of the Problem

The growing use of AI presents Indian public administration with a dual challenge. On one hand, AI can help public institutions process information efficiently, improve service delivery, and strengthen administrative coordination. On the other hand, its use may introduce new forms of error, opacity, exclusion, and dependence on technological systems.

A conventional administrative decision can often be traced to an identifiable official, established procedure, or written order. When AI contributes to a decision, responsibility may become less clear. Officials may rely heavily on system-generated recommendations without fully understanding how they were produced. Citizens may also find it difficult to challenge an adverse decision if the administrative authority cannot explain the system's reasoning.

These concerns are particularly important in India because government services operate across regions with different levels of digital infrastructure, literacy, institutional capacity, and access to technical support.

The research problem is therefore to understand how AI can improve administrative functioning without weakening accountability, fairness, and citizens' ability to exercise their rights.

Research Gap

Existing scholarship has examined AI applications in the public sector, the transformation of digital government, and the ethical challenges associated with automated decision-making. Wirtz, Weyerer, and Geyer (2019), for example, provide a systematic perspective on the applications and challenges of AI in public administration. The OECD's *Governing with Artificial Intelligence* (2025) further examines AI applications across core government functions and identifies the importance of institutional capabilities, safeguards, and accountability.

In India, policy initiatives increasingly address AI development, governance, and responsible deployment. However, the administrative implications of AI need to be examined in relation to the specific conditions of Indian governance, including the federal structure, welfare administration, regional inequalities, and the responsibilities of frontline officials.

This paper addresses that analytical need by connecting the operational benefits of AI with its institutional and social consequences. It focuses particularly on how AI affects administrative discretion, responsibility for decisions, the accessibility of public services, and citizens' ability to seek explanations and remedies.

The paper's proposed contribution is a five-dimensional framework for evaluating AI in public administration. The framework is conceptual and requires empirical testing; it is not presented as a model already validated through field research.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are:

1. To examine the emerging role of AI in Indian public administration.
2. To identify the major administrative applications of AI in government.
3. To analyse the potential impact of AI on efficiency, decision-making, and public service delivery.
4. To examine the ethical, institutional, and social challenges associated with AI adoption.
5. To assess the implications of AI for administrative discretion, accountability, and citizen rights.
6. To propose measures for promoting responsible, inclusive, and accountable AI adoption in Indian public institutions.

Research Questions

The study addresses the following research questions:

1. How can AI transform administrative processes and public service delivery in India?
2. What opportunities does AI create for improving administrative efficiency and decision-making?
3. How may AI affect the accountability and professional responsibilities of public officials?
4. What risks do algorithmic bias, privacy concerns, and digital inequality create for citizens?
5. What institutional safeguards are required for responsible AI adoption in Indian public administration?

Research Methodology

The study adopts a qualitative, descriptive, and analytical research design based on secondary sources.

Sources of data: The paper draws on academic journal articles, government publications, AI governance guidelines, policy documents, and reports published by international organizations.

Method of analysis: The collected material is analysed thematically under the following categories: administrative efficiency, decision-making, service delivery, accountability, social inclusion, and institutional capacity.

Analytical approach: The study connects established public administration perspectives with emerging debates about AI governance. It distinguishes between potential benefits, documented policy initiatives, and risks that require further empirical investigation.

Scope of the study: The paper focuses on the use of AI by Indian public institutions at the central, state, district, and local levels. Illustrative applications include document processing, citizen assistance, welfare administration, policy analysis, and administrative monitoring.

Limitations: This paper relies on secondary sources and does not include an original survey, interviews, or a statistical evaluation of specific AI systems. It therefore identifies likely impacts and institutional challenges without claiming that AI has already produced measurable improvements in all the areas discussed.

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

Traditional Public Administration

Traditional Public Administration emphasizes hierarchy, formal rules, defined authority, procedural consistency, and professional responsibility.

These principles remain essential when AI is introduced into government. Technology should operate within established legal mandates, and the use of automated systems should not obscure the identity of the authority responsible for a decision.

AI may support administrative processes, but public officials must retain responsibility for ensuring that decisions are lawful, fair, and consistent with public obligations.

New Public Management

New Public Management emphasizes efficiency, performance measurement, managerial flexibility, and results-oriented administration.

AI is relevant to this perspective because it can automate repetitive tasks, assist in allocating resources, and help monitor administrative performance. However, an exclusive focus on speed or cost reduction may overlook fairness, access, and the quality of decisions.

In public administration, performance must be assessed in terms of both operational efficiency and the public interest.

Public Value Theory

Public value theory, particularly the work of Mark H. Moore (1995), emphasizes the value created by public institutions for society.

Applied to AI, this perspective suggests that technological adoption should be justified by its contribution to public outcomes, including accessible services, fair treatment, effective administration, and public trust.

An AI system that reduces processing time but increases wrongful rejection of applications would not necessarily create public value. Its overall performance must be assessed against the rights and needs of affected citizens.

Algorithmic Accountability

Algorithmic accountability concerns the ability to understand, examine, challenge, and correct decisions influenced by computational systems.

In government, this principle requires clear responsibility for AI-assisted decisions, suitable documentation, risk assessment, independent scrutiny where appropriate, and effective complaint procedures.

The OECD's 2025 analysis of AI in government identifies the importance of governance arrangements, technical capacity, transparency, and safeguards for trustworthy adoption.

This perspective is particularly relevant to India, where AI may increasingly influence services affecting large and diverse populations.

Major Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Indian Public Administration

Automation of Administrative Processes

Public institutions process large quantities of applications, forms, reports, correspondence, and supporting documents. AI can assist in classifying documents, extracting information, preparing summaries, and directing applications to the appropriate departments.

Such tools may reduce repetitive clerical work and allow officials to concentrate on tasks requiring judgment and interaction with citizens.

The government has identified intelligent document processing as one of the application areas being pursued under the IndiaAI Mission, including initiatives connected with the Union Public Service Commission. The existence of such initiatives demonstrates an area of experimentation and implementation, but their overall effectiveness must be established through evaluation.

Improvement in Public Service Delivery

AI-enabled chatbots and virtual assistants can answer routine questions about application procedures, eligibility requirements, deadlines, and service status.

In a multilingual country such as India, well-designed language technologies could help citizens access information in regional languages and reduce dependence on intermediaries.

However, these tools must provide accurate information, identify their limitations, and refer complex cases to human officials. Incorrect automated guidance can cause citizens to miss deadlines or misunderstand eligibility conditions.

Welfare Administration and Beneficiary Services

AI can potentially assist public institutions in identifying inconsistencies in records, detecting duplicate entries, prioritizing applications for review, and analysing patterns in programme implementation.

These applications may help officials improve administrative monitoring and identify cases requiring further examination.

However, the distinction between identifying a potential discrepancy and deciding that a citizen is ineligible is crucial. An algorithmic alert should not automatically be treated as evidence of fraud or grounds for denying a benefit.

Before AI is used in welfare administration, authorities should assess data quality, error rates, fairness, and the consequences of incorrect decisions. Beneficiaries should have access to explanations and procedures for correcting records.

Policy Formulation and Decision Support

AI can assist policymakers in analysing large volumes of reports, identifying patterns in administrative data, summarizing public consultations, and comparing policy options.

These capabilities may improve the speed and breadth of preliminary analysis. They may also help officials identify emerging problems that require further investigation.

Nevertheless, AI-generated analysis may contain errors, reflect incomplete datasets, or overlook local conditions. Policy decisions involve value judgments, legal constraints, political accountability, and competing public interests that cannot be delegated entirely to an algorithm.

AI should therefore function as a decision-support mechanism rather than an independent source of administrative authority.

Public Grievance Redressal

Government grievance systems receive complaints concerning delays, service failures, incorrect records, and administrative misconduct.

AI may help categorize complaints, identify recurring issues, route submissions to the appropriate department, and generate summaries for officials.

Such applications could improve case management and help identify persistent administrative problems.

However, automated classification may misinterpret complaints written in regional languages or in non-standard formats. Vulnerable citizens may also struggle to formulate complaints in ways that digital systems recognize.

Human review, appeal mechanisms, and monitoring of unresolved complaints are therefore essential.

Agriculture and Rural Administration

Agricultural and rural development programmes involve diverse information about weather, crops, markets, irrigation, public schemes, and local conditions.

AI tools may help analyse agricultural information, provide advisory services, support the monitoring of development projects, and identify areas requiring administrative attention.

For rural communities, such applications could improve access to information and strengthen the delivery of selected services.

However, agricultural and rural applications must account for regional variation, language differences, limited connectivity, and the practical needs of small and marginal farmers. Advice generated from incomplete or inappropriate data may produce misleading results.

Public Health Administration

AI can assist in analysing health-service data, forecasting demand, managing administrative records, and identifying possible gaps in service availability.

At the administrative level, these applications may support planning for staffing, supplies, and service delivery.

Their use must be accompanied by appropriate privacy protections, clinical or professional oversight where relevant, and safeguards against inappropriate conclusions drawn from incomplete data.

Public Finance and Audit

AI-assisted tools can help analyse expenditure records, identify unusual transactions, classify financial documents, and support risk-based auditing.

Such tools may help audit and finance personnel direct attention towards transactions requiring further examination.

However, an unusual transaction is not necessarily an irregular one. Automated flags should guide professional investigation rather than replace established audit procedures, evidentiary requirements, or opportunities for explanation.

Human Resource Management

AI may support recruitment administration, training needs analysis, workforce planning, and the identification of skill gaps.

In public employment, however, decisions concerning recruitment, promotion, appraisal, and disciplinary action require particular caution because they affect fairness, equal opportunity, and professional rights.

AI systems used in these areas should be assessed for discriminatory outcomes, and consequential decisions should remain subject to appropriate human review.

Positive Impact of AI on Public Administration

Greater Administrative Efficiency

Automation of repetitive activities may reduce processing time and clerical workload. Officials

may be able to devote more time to complex cases, coordination, and public interaction.

The magnitude of these benefits will depend on system reliability, data quality, workflow redesign, and the cost of implementation and maintenance.

Better Use of Administrative Information

AI can help officials identify patterns in large datasets and organize information for analysis. This may improve the ability of departments to monitor programmes and identify emerging problems.

However, better data processing does not necessarily guarantee better decisions. The quality of administrative conclusions still depends on the relevance, accuracy, and representativeness of the available information.

Improved Responsiveness

Automated information services can provide assistance outside conventional office hours and support the handling of routine enquiries.

For citizens, faster access to information may reduce uncertainty and repeated visits to administrative offices.

The benefits are greatest when automated services are integrated with effective human assistance and reliable escalation procedures.

Support for Evidence-Informed Policymaking

AI may help policymakers analyse administrative records, summarize research, and examine alternative scenarios.

This can strengthen evidence-informed decision-making, provided that officials verify the information, consider uncertainty, and incorporate knowledge of local conditions.

Potential Reduction in Certain Administrative Irregularities

AI-assisted monitoring can identify patterns that may indicate duplicate records, unusual payments, or procedural inconsistencies.

These capabilities may strengthen internal controls and help auditors prioritize investigations.

Nevertheless, AI cannot eliminate corruption by itself. Effective prevention also requires sound procedures, institutional independence, reliable records, whistleblower protections, and appropriate enforcement.

Major Challenges of AI in Indian Public Administration

Algorithmic Bias and Discrimination

AI systems learn patterns from data. When the underlying data are incomplete, unrepresentative, or affected by historical inequalities, the system may produce systematically unfair results.

In India, where socioeconomic conditions differ significantly across regions and communities, an AI system trained on limited data may not perform equally well for all citizens.

A system used in welfare administration, recruitment, or public service allocation must therefore be assessed for differences in error rates and adverse outcomes across relevant population groups.

Lack of Transparency and Explainability

Some AI systems, particularly complex models, may not provide straightforward explanations for their outputs.

This creates difficulties when citizens seek to understand why an application was rejected, why a

case was flagged, or why a particular administrative recommendation was made.

Public authorities should be able to explain the role of AI in consequential decisions in language that affected citizens can understand. Where a decision cannot be adequately explained or reviewed, its suitability for high-impact public use should be reconsidered.

Data Privacy and Security

AI systems may require access to large quantities of administrative data, including personal and potentially sensitive information.

Inadequate security, inappropriate data sharing, or unauthorized use can undermine citizens' privacy and trust.

Public institutions must establish lawful purposes for data processing, restrict access appropriately, maintain security controls, and comply with applicable data protection requirements.

Digital Inequality

AI-enabled public services may benefit citizens who have access to reliable internet, appropriate devices, and sufficient digital literacy.

Others may experience difficulties using automated services, especially when interfaces are available only in unfamiliar languages or when human support is unavailable.

This challenge is particularly significant for rural residents, older people, people with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged communities.

Overdependence on Technology

Officials may place excessive confidence in automated recommendations, especially when systems appear technically sophisticated.

This can weaken professional judgment and encourage the acceptance of inaccurate outputs without adequate verification.

Administrative training should therefore emphasize the limitations of AI, the importance of independent judgment, and the responsibility of officials to verify consequential recommendations.

Shortage of Technical and Administrative Expertise

Responsible AI adoption requires more than purchasing software. Government institutions need expertise in data management, procurement, cybersecurity, risk assessment, system evaluation, and administrative law.

Departments without these capabilities may struggle to assess vendor claims, identify system limitations, or monitor performance after deployment.

Procurement and Vendor Dependence

Public agencies may depend on external providers for AI models, cloud infrastructure, maintenance, and technical support.

Poorly designed contracts can limit institutional control over data, increase long-term costs, or make it difficult to change systems.

Public procurement should therefore address data ownership, audit access, system portability, security, service standards, liability, and the ability to terminate or replace unsuitable systems.

Accountability for Automated Decisions

When AI contributes to an administrative decision, responsibility may become fragmented among the department, system developer, technology provider, and individual official.

This fragmentation must not leave citizens without a clear authority to approach when a decision

is incorrect.

Public institutions should establish explicit responsibility for decisions, maintain appropriate records, and provide accessible review and appeal mechanisms.

Inaccurate or Fabricated Outputs

Generative AI systems can produce convincing but incorrect information, including inaccurate summaries, fabricated references, and misleading explanations.

If such outputs are used without verification in government reports, official communications, or policy documents, they may damage administrative reliability.

Human verification and appropriate restrictions on the use of public or confidential information are therefore necessary.

AI Governance in India: Policy and Institutional Context

India's approach to AI governance is evolving through national initiatives, existing legal frameworks, and policy guidance.

IndiaAI Mission

The IndiaAI Mission supports AI infrastructure, development, innovation, skills, and applications. Its relevance to public administration lies in the opportunity to develop AI capabilities for Indian institutional needs and encourage applications in governance and public service delivery.

The mission's identified government use cases indicate a broad interest in applying AI to administrative problems. However, the number of identified use cases should not be confused with evidence of successful implementation or improved public outcomes.

India AI Governance Guidelines

The India AI Governance Guidelines, released in November 2025, provide a policy framework for responsible AI development and deployment. The guidelines emphasize principles including trust, people-first development, fairness and equity, accountability, understandability, and safety.

For public administration, these principles are relevant to system design, procurement, risk management, monitoring, and citizen redressal.

Their practical value will depend on how principles are translated into operational procedures, institutional responsibilities, technical standards, and enforceable requirements where applicable.

Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023

The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, is an important component of India's legal framework for personal data processing.

Its application to particular administrative systems depends on the relevant statutory provisions, commencement arrangements, rules, and any applicable exemptions. Public institutions must therefore assess the legal basis and obligations relevant to each use case rather than assume that all data processing is governed identically.

AI deployment should be aligned with applicable data protection requirements and supported by suitable security and accountability measures.

Need for Institutional Coordination

AI-related responsibilities may involve multiple ministries, departments, regulators, and technical agencies.

Effective governance requires coordination among these institutions, clear responsibility for oversight, and appropriate mechanisms for reporting and responding to AI-related incidents.

The India AI Governance Guidelines identify institutional coordination and accountability as important elements of responsible AI governance.

International Lessons

The OECD's *Digital Government Outlook 2026* emphasizes that effective AI adoption requires a combination of institutional capabilities, technical infrastructure, safeguards, skills, and mechanisms for measuring outcomes. It also identifies persistent gaps in algorithmic transparency, impact assessment, and citizen engagement across the countries examined

These findings provide useful comparative lessons for India, but international statistics should not be treated as direct measurements of Indian administrative performance.

Proposed Framework for Evaluating AI in Indian Public Administration

This paper proposes a five-dimensional framework for examining the impact of AI.

Dimension 1: Administrative Efficiency

This dimension examines whether AI reduces processing time, repetitive work, administrative costs, and unnecessary procedural burdens.

Possible indicators include average application-processing time, cost per transaction, frequency of errors, and staff time saved.

Dimension 2: Decision-Making Quality

This dimension examines the accuracy, consistency, relevance, and reliability of AI-assisted recommendations.

Possible indicators include error rates, the frequency of corrected decisions, the quality of supporting information, and the performance of systems across different administrative settings.

Dimension 3: Institutional Accountability

This dimension examines whether responsibility for decisions is clearly assigned and whether AI-assisted decisions can be explained, reviewed, and challenged.

Possible indicators include the availability of documented procedures, audit records, human review, appeal mechanisms, and timely resolution of complaints.

Dimension 4: Social Inclusion and Fairness

This dimension examines whether AI-enabled services are accessible to different groups and whether system performance varies across socioeconomic or geographical categories.

Possible indicators include service access across regions, accessibility for people with disabilities, regional-language support, differential error rates, and the availability of assisted alternatives.

Dimension 5: Public Trust and Citizen Experience

This dimension examines whether citizens understand how AI is used and whether they consider the resulting services reliable, fair, and responsive.

Possible indicators include user satisfaction, complaints concerning AI-assisted services, confidence in explanations, and citizen feedback.

These dimensions should be evaluated together. A system that improves efficiency but performs poorly on fairness and accountability should not automatically be considered successful.

The framework offers a basis for future empirical research using administrative records, interviews, surveys, and comparative case studies.

Recommendations for Responsible AI Adoption

Adopt a Risk-Based Approach: AI applications should be assessed according to the potential consequences of errors. Low-risk administrative support tools may require different safeguards from systems that influence welfare eligibility, recruitment, enforcement, or other consequential decisions.

Preserve Human Responsibility: Officials should retain meaningful oversight of consequential administrative decisions. They must be able to question system outputs, examine relevant evidence, and correct errors. Human review should be substantive rather than a formality in which officials automatically approve machine-generated recommendations.

Establish Pre-Deployment Risk Assessments: Before an AI system is introduced, the responsible institution should examine its intended purpose, data requirements, accuracy, potential biases, privacy implications, security risks, and possible effects on citizens.

The assessment should determine whether the proposed system is appropriate for the administrative task and identify safeguards needed before deployment.

Maintain Documentation and Audit Trails: Government agencies should maintain records of important AI-assisted decisions, system versions, relevant inputs, human interventions, and significant corrections. Such records can support internal review, external audit, investigation of complaints, and accountability for administrative outcomes.

Improve Data Governance: Public institutions should maintain accurate and relevant datasets, establish clear data access rules, protect personal information, and avoid unnecessary collection or sharing of data. Data quality and governance should be treated as essential components of AI readiness.

Build the Capacity of Public Officials: Training should cover AI literacy, system limitations, data privacy, cybersecurity, procurement, ethics, and administrative responsibility. Officials should understand both the potential benefits and the risks of AI, enabling them to use technological tools critically and appropriately.

Ensure Regional-Language Accessibility: AI-enabled public services should accommodate India's linguistic diversity through reliable regional-language interfaces and appropriate human assistance. Services should be tested with intended users, including those with limited digital literacy, before large-scale deployment.

Strengthen Citizen Grievance Mechanisms: Citizens should be able to identify when AI has materially influenced an administrative decision, seek an understandable explanation, correct inaccurate records, and request human review. Complaint procedures should specify the responsible authority, expected timelines, and escalation mechanisms.

Improve Public Procurement: Contracts for AI systems should address security, data rights, transparency, independent evaluation, system maintenance, and responsibility for errors. Departments should also consider long-term costs, interoperability, and the possibility of changing vendors without losing essential administrative records.

Evaluate Outcomes Before Scaling: Pilot projects should be assessed before they are expanded across departments or regions. Evaluation should measure not only cost and processing speed but also accuracy, fairness, citizen experience, and unintended consequences.

Independent assessment may be particularly important for systems that affect important rights or entitlements.

Findings and Discussion

The analysis produces several important observations.

First, AI offers meaningful opportunities to support administrative work in India, especially in document processing, information management, citizen assistance, policy analysis, and administrative monitoring.

Second, the impact of AI depends on institutional readiness. Reliable data, trained personnel, suitable infrastructure, and effective administrative procedures are necessary for useful and responsible deployment.

Third, AI changes the conditions under which administrative accountability operates. When technology contributes to decisions, public institutions must ensure that responsibility remains identifiable and that citizens can obtain explanations and remedies.

Fourth, social inclusion is a central concern. Differences in digital access, language, literacy, and socioeconomic conditions may affect who benefits from AI-enabled public services.

Fifth, existing policy initiatives provide an emerging foundation for responsible AI adoption, but implementation must be evaluated through evidence about actual administrative outcomes.

Finally, the proposed five-dimensional framework suggests that AI performance should be assessed through a combination of efficiency, decision quality, accountability, inclusion, and public trust.

These observations are analytical conclusions based on the literature and policy documents reviewed. They are not findings from an original field survey or a causal evaluation of specific AI systems.

Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence has the potential to transform Indian public administration by improving information processing, supporting decision-making, assisting citizens, and strengthening selected administrative functions. The IndiaAI Mission and the India AI Governance Guidelines provide an important policy context for examining this transformation.

However, the use of AI in government cannot be assessed solely through technological capability or administrative speed. Public institutions must also consider the fairness of decisions, protection of personal information, accessibility of services, clarity of responsibility, and citizens' ability to challenge errors.

The principal challenge is to ensure that AI strengthens rather than weakens the constitutional and ethical foundations of public administration. This requires meaningful human oversight, effective institutional coordination, responsible data governance, skilled personnel, transparent procedures, and accessible grievance mechanisms.

The future of AI in Indian public administration should therefore be guided by the principle that technology is a means of improving public service, not a substitute for public responsibility. AI can assist officials in managing complex tasks, but decisions affecting citizens must remain subject to lawful authority, appropriate scrutiny, and effective remedies.

Ultimately, the success of AI in Indian public administration will depend on whether it improves the quality of governance for citizens across different regions and social groups. A balanced approach that combines innovation with accountability and inclusion can help India develop administrative institutions that are more capable, responsive, and trustworthy.

References

1. Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal*, *13*(4), 447–468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x
2. Government of India, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2025). *India AI Governance Guidelines*. Office of the Principal Scientific Adviser to the Government of India. https://psa.gov.in/CMS/web/sites/default/files/publication/India%20Al%20Governance%20Guidelines%205%C2%A0Nov%C2%A02025.pdf
3. Government of India, Press Information Bureau. (2026, July 29). *IndiaAI Mission advances AI-driven governance and public service delivery through collaborative roadmaps, innovation challenges and capacity building*. https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2291062
4. Government of India. (2023). *The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023*. Ministry of Law and Justice. https://www.meity.gov.in/
5. Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Harvard University Press.
6. OECD. (2025). *Governing with artificial intelligence: The state of play and way forward in core government functions*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/795de142-en
7. OECD. (2026). *Digital Government Outlook 2026: From foundations to transformational impact*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/0496b2bc-en
8. Wirtz, B. W., Weyerer, J. C., & Geyer, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence and the public sector—Applications and challenges. *International Journal of Public Administration, 42*(7), 596–615. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2018.1498103
9. Government of India, National e-Governance Division. (2025, November 6). *MeitY unveils India AI Governance Guidelines under IndiaAI Mission to ensure safe, inclusive, and responsible adoption of artificial intelligence across sectors*. https://negd.gov.in/press_release/meity-unveils-india-ai-governance-guidelines-under-indiaai-mission-to-ensure-safe-inclusive-and-responsible-adoption-of-artificial-intelligence-across-sectors/
10. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2024). *United Nations E-Government Survey 2024*. United Nations. https://desapublications.un.org/publications/un-e-government-survey-2024