

Corruption, Governance, and Institutional Capacity: India's Reform Deficit from 2030 to 2047

Rachit Baijal¹

¹Director General, Artha-Niti Institute for Governance

Abstract - This paper examines India's likely anti-corruption and governance reform deficit during the strategic window from 2030 to 2047, when the country will attempt to combine high economic growth, social protection, infrastructure expansion and democratic legitimacy. The paper uses a prospective institutional analysis based on present reform trajectories, comparative governance indicators, and sectoral risk mapping. It argues that India has built important transparency and delivery instruments, including digital procurement, direct benefit transfers, financial management platforms, grievance systems, audit institutions and statutory anti-corruption bodies. However, these reforms remain uneven because enforcement capacity, procurement law, whistle-blower protection, political finance transparency, local government capacity, data governance, judicial timeliness and federal coordination have not matured at the same pace. The central finding is that corruption between 2030 and 2047 is likely to mutate from petty extraction to higher-order capture of contracts, platforms, environmental approvals, welfare data and regulatory discretion unless institutional capacity is expanded. The paper proposes a 2047 integrity architecture built around independent enforcement, open contracting, proactive disclosure, protected reporting, algorithmic auditability, professional civil services, social accountability and state-level capacity compacts.

Key Words: Corruption, Governance, Institutional Capacity, India 2047, Public Integrity, Administrative Reform.

1. INTRODUCTION

India's centenary as an independent republic in 2047 is increasingly treated as a developmental benchmark. The phrase Viksit Bharat has placed economic growth, state capacity, social inclusion and technological governance at the centre of public debate. Yet the ambition of becoming a high-capacity democratic state cannot be assessed only by gross domestic product, infrastructure output, welfare coverage or digital adoption. It must also be assessed by the integrity of public power: whether public authority is exercised according to law, whether

public resources are allocated through fair procedures, whether citizens can challenge arbitrary decisions, and whether state institutions can detect, prevent and punish corruption without becoming instruments of political or bureaucratic discretion.

Corruption in India is not a single phenomenon. It ranges from petty payments for routine services to collusive contracting, regulatory capture, recruitment irregularities, land and infrastructure rent seeking, welfare leakage, political finance opacity, illicit lobbying and manipulation of digital systems. The governance challenge from 2030 to 2047 will be especially complex because the Indian state will be simultaneously larger, more digital, more fiscally ambitious and more embedded in private delivery networks. The risks will not disappear with digitisation; they will migrate to procurement design, algorithmic opacity, data access, beneficiary authentication, vendor ecosystems, environmental approvals and discretionary waivers.

The central argument of this paper is that India faces a reform deficit: the gap between reform instruments already created and the institutional capacity required to make them effective, accountable and abuse-resistant at national scale. This deficit does not imply the absence of reform. On the contrary, India has built major delivery and transparency platforms such as the Government e Marketplace (GeM), Public Financial Management System (PFMS), Direct Benefit Transfer (DBT) architecture, the Centralized Public Grievance Redress and Monitoring System (CPGRAMS), digital tax systems and a growing universe of open government data. The deficit lies in the incomplete conversion of these tools into durable integrity institutions with independent oversight, interoperable data, time-bound enforcement and credible consequences.

The paper treats 2030 to 2047 as a strategic reform window. By 2030, India is likely to have deeper digital public infrastructure, larger public procurement volumes, more urbanisation, bigger climate adaptation expenditure, increasing demands for state welfare and stronger expectations of administrative responsiveness. By 2047, the quality of governance will determine whether these developments produce inclusive public value or

reproduce old forms of corruption in new institutional settings.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS

The purpose of this paper is to develop a forward-looking governance diagnosis rather than a narrow legal commentary on corruption offences. It asks how corruption may change as the Indian state expands and what institutional capacity will be required to contain it between 2030 and 2047.

- To identify the principal anti-corruption and governance reforms already available in India and the gaps that continue to limit their effectiveness.
- To analyse how corruption risks may shift from petty extraction to systemic capture in procurement, regulation, data governance, welfare delivery, urbanisation and climate finance.
- To examine the institutional capacity deficits that may constrain India's reform agenda between 2030 and 2047.
- To propose a 2047 reform roadmap that links anti-corruption law, administrative reform, fiscal transparency, digital accountability and citizen oversight.

The guiding research questions are: What is the nature of India's anti-corruption reform deficit? Which domains will become most vulnerable to governance failure between 2030 and 2047? What institutional reforms are necessary to convert digital and legal reforms into sustained public integrity?

3. METHODOLOGY

The paper adopts a qualitative and prospective institutional methodology. It combines: (i) desk review of statutes, official platforms and governance indicators; (ii) institutional analysis of anti-corruption bodies, audit systems, procurement platforms, grievance redress and transparency mechanisms; (iii) sectoral risk mapping for the 2030-2047 period; and (iv) scenario analysis to assess reform pathways. The paper does not claim to predict precise corruption levels in 2047. Instead, it identifies plausible risk trajectories if current institutional gaps remain unresolved.

The baseline for analysis is drawn from publicly available indicators and institutional sources. Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) measures perceived public-sector corruption on a 0 to 100 scale, with 0 representing highly corrupt and 100 representing very clean, and ranks countries globally [1]. The World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators

(WGI) offer comparable governance measures across dimensions including government effectiveness, rule of law and control of corruption [3]. Indian sources reviewed include the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC), Lokpal, RTI regime, GeM, PFMS, DBT releases, CPGRAMS reports, CAG's audit mandate and judicial data systems [4]-[13].

The approach is normative and policy-analytic. It assumes that corruption control depends not merely on criminalisation, but on the interaction of law, incentives, data, oversight, administrative capacity, civil society access and judicial credibility. The focus is therefore on institutional capacity: the ability of public organisations to make lawful decisions, execute programmes, maintain records, detect deviations, protect complainants, coordinate across levels of government and impose consequences.

4. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: CORRUPTION, GOVERNANCE AND CAPACITY

Corruption is commonly understood as the misuse of entrusted public power for private gain. In a developing democracy, however, it is also a symptom of weak institutional design. Bribe-taking, favouritism or collusion occur when discretion is high, transparency is low, monitoring is fragmented, sanction is uncertain and citizens lack meaningful remedies. Governance refers to the rules, practices and institutions through which authority is exercised and public goods are delivered. Institutional capacity refers to the ability of those institutions to perform consistently, fairly and effectively under real administrative pressures.

This paper distinguishes five forms of corruption relevant to the 2030-2047 period. First, transactional corruption involves small payments or favours in exchange for routine services. Second, allocative corruption occurs when public contracts, land, licences or subsidies are distributed for private benefit. Third, regulatory capture occurs when regulated firms influence rules, inspections or enforcement. Fourth, political corruption involves opaque financing, patronage and abuse of state resources for electoral or partisan gain. Fifth, digital corruption arises when data, algorithms, authentication systems, vendor platforms or automated decision rules are manipulated in ways that are difficult for citizens to observe.

The reform deficit is defined as the gap between formal anti-corruption architecture and actual integrity outcomes. A country may have laws, portals, commissions and audit institutions, yet still experience weak control of corruption if complaints are delayed,

whistle-blowers are unsafe, procurement data is not open, information commissions are understaffed, investigation agencies lack autonomy, trial delays reduce deterrence or local governments lack professional capacity. In this sense, corruption control is a problem of systems engineering as much as law enforcement.

Table -1: Reform Instruments and Residual Capacity Gaps

Institutional instrument	Integrity contribution	Residual gap
Prevention of Corruption Act and disciplinary rules	Criminalises bribery, undue advantage and public-servant misconduct.	Delay in investigation, sanction, prosecution and departmental action weakens deterrence.
CVC, Lokpal and vigilance systems	Provide complaint handling, vigilance advice and institutional scrutiny.	Fragmented jurisdictions, advisory limits and uneven state-level capacity reduce impact.
RTI and proactive disclosure	Enables citizens to access records and challenge secrecy.	Backlogs, vacancies, weak Section 4 compliance and digital exclusion limit transparency.
GeM, PFMS, DBT and CPGRAMS	Digitise procurement, payments, welfare transfers and grievances.	Digital systems reduce some leakages but create new risks around data integrity, vendor behaviour and algorithmic opacity.
CAG and legislative oversight	Audit public expenditure and inform parliamentary/state accountability.	Follow-up on audit findings is often slow and politically uneven.

5. BASELINE BEFORE 2030: REFORM ACHIEVEMENTS AND LIMITATIONS

India's anti-corruption framework before 2030 is not institutionally empty. The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, amended in 2018, provides the core criminal framework for bribery and corruption offences. The 2018 amendments criminalised bribe-giving and introduced liability for commercial organisations, while also narrowing certain definitions to reduce fear of bona fide decision-making [12]. The CVC continues to function as the apex vigilance institution for central government organisations, while the Lokpal is designed as an ombudsman for complaints against specified public functionaries [4], [5]. The CAG remains a constitutional auditor with authority derived from Articles 149 to 151 of the Constitution [13].

Transparency reforms have also mattered. The Right to Information Act, 2005, remains one of India's most significant democratic accountability laws because it allows citizens to seek records from public authorities [10]. CPGRAMS has expanded the digital grievance-redress ecosystem and, according to the December 2024 state/UT report, recorded 67,193 grievances redressed by states and Union Territories in that month, with pendency at 1,85,519 as of 31 December 2024 [8]. These platforms indicate that the state is capable of producing measurable administrative feedback loops.

Digital public finance and procurement reforms have created further integrity gains. PFMS functions as an online system for payments, exchequer control, DBT accounting and reporting, with interfaces across banks, state treasuries and beneficiary systems [7]. DBT has been presented by the Government of India as a major welfare-efficiency reform, with an official release citing cumulative savings of Rs. 3.48 lakh crore and a 16-fold increase in beneficiaries in the assessment period [9]. GeM has become a central procurement platform; a 2025 release stated that it crossed Rs. 5 lakh crore in gross merchandise value before the end of FY 2024-25 and served more than 1.6 lakh government buyers [6].

These achievements, however, should not be mistaken for completed reform. The same systems that reduce face-to-face discretion can conceal new forms of manipulation in vendor qualification, contract specifications, data standards, grievance closure metrics and beneficiary authentication. Transparency International's India country profile reports a CPI score of 39/100 and rank of 91/182 in the referenced profile [2]. The CPI cannot capture all forms of corruption, but it signals that reform visibility has not yet translated into a strong public-

integrity reputation. The WGI also cautions that broad governance indicators are useful for comparison but too coarse for detailed country reform design, requiring more granular diagnostics [3].

6. THE REFORM DEFICIT: WHY INSTITUTIONS LAG BEHIND INSTRUMENTS

The reform deficit has seven components. The first is an enforcement deficit. Anti-corruption law loses credibility when investigations take years, sanctions are delayed, disciplinary proceedings are inconclusive and trials do not conclude within politically meaningful time frames. The second is a transparency deficit. Public authorities may maintain portals but not disclose usable, machine-readable and comparable data on contracts, clearances, transfers, inspections, compliance decisions or grievance outcomes. The third is a federal capacity deficit. Central platforms often depend on state, district and local execution, but state vigilance bodies, local audit systems and municipal administrative cadres remain uneven.

The fourth is a professional capacity deficit. Modern corruption increasingly requires forensic audit, digital evidence handling, procurement analytics, competition analysis, beneficial ownership tracing, environmental compliance expertise and data science. Many public agencies still rely on generalist staffing patterns and manual workflows. The fifth is an autonomy deficit. Oversight bodies cannot function effectively if appointments, budgets, staffing, reporting lines or investigative approvals expose them to political pressure. The sixth is a remedy deficit. Citizens can complain, but they frequently lack predictable escalation, compensation, witness protection or protection against retaliation. The seventh is a political-finance deficit. Public administration cannot be insulated from corruption if electoral finance, lobbying and campaign expenditure remain opaque relative to the scale of private influence over policy.

These deficits combine to create the paradox of reform without capacity. India may possess many integrity instruments, yet still struggle to produce consistent accountability because the instruments are not sufficiently integrated into a coherent public-integrity architecture. A portal may register grievances but not change departmental incentives. A procurement platform may increase competition but not prevent tailor-made specifications. A vigilance body may advise punishment but lack the power to ensure implementation. An audit may identify losses but fail to trigger recovery or reform. A law may punish corruption but not protect those who report it.

Fig -1: Integrity Capacity Chain

Lawful rule-making → Transparent decision records → Open public data → Independent audit → Protected reporting → Time-bound investigation → Credible sanction → Institutional learning

7. CORRUPTION RISKS FROM 2030 TO 2047

The corruption risks of 2030-2047 will be shaped by the scale and complexity of governance. As India urbanises, the value of land-use conversion, municipal permissions, infrastructure contracting, transport planning and climate-resilient urban assets will increase. Land and construction-related corruption may move from informal payments to strategic influence over master plans, development rights, public-private partnerships and environmental clearances. Municipal governance will therefore be one of the most important frontiers of integrity reform.

Public procurement will be another major frontier. India will require large investments in roads, railways, ports, energy, defence, water, health infrastructure, digital systems and urban services. Digital procurement platforms reduce some forms of opacity, but high-value procurement can still be distorted through restrictive specifications, cartelised bidding, post-award renegotiations, subcontracting chains, inflated life-cycle costs and weak performance monitoring. The absence of an integrated public procurement law across all levels of government leaves considerable dependence on rules, manuals, platform terms and departmental discretion.

Welfare delivery will also evolve. DBT and PFMS have reduced certain leakages and improved financial traceability, but welfare systems rely on beneficiary data quality, authentication, exclusion-error correction, grievance redress and last-mile assistance. Corruption may emerge through ghost beneficiaries, denial of eligible claims, private intermediaries in digital access, manipulation of local verification, or analytics-driven exclusion that is hard to challenge. A future welfare state must therefore combine digital delivery with due process, explainability and human appeal mechanisms.

Climate finance and environmental governance may become high-risk sectors by 2047. India will need major spending on adaptation, green energy, disaster resilience, water security, carbon markets and ecological restoration. These sectors involve complex measurement, scientific uncertainty, private investment and regulatory discretion. Without strong audit and disclosure, climate funds can be captured through inflated project costs, weak monitoring

of offsets, non-transparent concessions and regulatory leniency in the name of development.

Digital governance will create new integrity problems. Algorithmic systems may be used for tax scrutiny, welfare eligibility, policing, licensing, recruitment, procurement analytics and risk scoring. If these systems are not audited, corruption can enter through data poisoning, vendor lock-in, biased model design, privileged access, cybersecurity breaches and opaque automation. Digital corruption is particularly dangerous because it can scale silently and create a false appearance of neutrality.

Table -2: Reform Deficit Typology for 2030-2047

Domain	Likely corruption mutation	Required capacity response
Urban land and infrastructure	From petty approvals to capture of plans, concessions and PPP renegotiations.	Open land records, municipal audit cadres, disclosure of concessions and independent project appraisal.
Procurement	From opaque tendering to specification manipulation, cartels and post-award rent extraction.	Open contracting data, beneficial ownership, red-flag analytics and procurement tribunals.
Welfare and DBT	From cash leakage to exclusion manipulation, authentication rents and data errors.	Due-process appeals, beneficiary audit trails, social audit and assisted digital access.
Climate and natural resources	From local extraction to green-finance capture and regulatory forbearance.	Environmental data disclosure, climate-fund audit and independent verification.
Digital governance	From human discretion to algorithmic opacity and vendor lock-in.	Algorithmic impact assessments, code/data audit, cybersecurity and procurement safeguards.

Political finance	From informal patronage to data-driven influence and policy capture.	Stronger campaign finance disclosure, lobbying transparency and conflict-of-interest rules.
-------------------	--	---

8. FEDERALISM AND THE LOCAL STATE

India's anti-corruption future will depend heavily on states, districts, municipalities and panchayats. Many citizens experience corruption not in central ministries but in police stations, revenue offices, municipal counters, schools, hospitals, ration shops, welfare verification points and local procurement. Yet anti-corruption policy is often framed nationally, while capacity deficits are local. This creates a federal mismatch: national platforms may improve visibility but cannot substitute for local administrative professionalism. State-level Lokayuktas, vigilance departments, anti-corruption bureaus, information commissions, police prosecution units and departmental disciplinary authorities vary widely in resources and autonomy. District administrations must implement large welfare and infrastructure programmes while handling political pressure, staff shortages and legacy record systems. Municipal bodies manage high-value assets but frequently lack professional procurement, audit, engineering, finance and legal capacity. Panchayats are expected to deliver participatory governance but often operate without robust records, trained secretarial support and independent social audit systems.

A 2047 anti-corruption strategy must therefore be a federal compact rather than a central scheme. The Union can set standards for open contracting, fiscal reporting, data interoperability and whistle-blower protection. States must build independent investigation capacity, digitise land and service records, professionalise local procurement, publish grievance data and strengthen information commissions. Local governments must be given both autonomy and accountability: own-source revenue, professional staff, citizen charters, public dashboards and audit follow-up.

9. INFORMATION, TRANSPARENCY AND CITIZEN OVERSIGHT

The Right to Information regime is central to corruption control because it converts citizens from passive recipients into accountability actors. However, transparency is meaningful only when information is timely, accessible, complete and enforceable. The Report

Card of Information Commissions in India 2023-24 by Satark Nagrik Sangathan reported 4,05,509 pending appeals and complaints across 29 information commissions as of 30 June 2024, indicating that transparency enforcement itself faces capacity stress [11]. Delayed access to information often functions as denied access, especially in corruption cases where records may be altered, witnesses intimidated or public attention lost.

The future of transparency must move beyond reactive RTI applications. By 2047, India should adopt disclosure-by-design in procurement, subsidies, land, environmental clearances, public appointments, regulatory enforcement and public-private partnerships. Section 4 of the RTI Act, which requires proactive disclosure by public authorities, should be implemented through machine-readable data standards, periodic compliance audits and penalties for non-disclosure. Public dashboards should not merely count transactions; they should disclose reasons, timelines, responsible offices, appeal outcomes and financial consequences.

Citizen oversight must also be institutionalised. Social audits should be expanded beyond selected welfare schemes into local procurement, urban services, school infrastructure, health facilities and climate projects. Civil society organisations, universities and think tanks should be able to access anonymised datasets for independent evaluation. Grievance systems such as CPGRAMS must publish not only disposal numbers but also quality indicators, recurrence patterns, reasons for rejection and post-resolution feedback. A closure without remedy should not be counted as governance success.

10. JUDICIAL CAPACITY AND DETERRENCE

Anti-corruption enforcement depends on credible adjudication. If corruption trials, disciplinary appeals, procurement disputes or information appeals take years, the expected cost of corruption declines. Delay weakens deterrence, enables evidence decay, discourages complainants and allows accused officials or contractors to treat enforcement as a manageable business risk. The National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) is an important transparency instrument because it makes pendency visible across courts [14]. However, visibility is only the first step; corruption-related litigation requires specialised case management.

India should consider dedicated integrity benches or fast-track procedures for high-value public corruption, procurement disputes, public finance fraud and asset recovery. These mechanisms should not compromise due process. Their purpose should be to ensure that public-interest cases are not lost in general docket pressure. Time

standards for investigation, sanction decisions, charge framing, trial and appeal should be published. Digital evidence protocols should be standardised because future corruption cases will involve platform logs, metadata, procurement records, beneficiary databases, encrypted communications and algorithmic audit trails.

Judicial capacity also relates to remedies. Courts and tribunals should be able to order contract suspension, debarment, restitution, blacklisting review, protection of complainants and systemic corrective action. Public integrity cannot depend only on imprisonment after many years; it requires rapid administrative consequences, financial recovery and institutional repair.

11. DIGITAL GOVERNANCE: FROM EFFICIENCY TO AUDITABILITY

India's digital state has often been evaluated through efficiency: speed of payment, number of beneficiaries, reduction in paperwork, portal adoption, mobile access and transaction volume. From an anti-corruption perspective, the more important test from 2030 to 2047 will be auditability. A digital decision must leave a traceable record of inputs, authorisation, rule logic, human override, vendor role, time stamp, data source, grievance route and correction mechanism. Without auditability, digitisation may simply automate discretion.

Algorithmic governance requires special safeguards. Public authorities should maintain algorithmic registers that disclose where automated or data-driven systems are used. High-impact systems should undergo independent audits for bias, explainability, cybersecurity, data minimisation and procurement conflicts. Source code may not always be open for security or intellectual-property reasons, but logic, validation standards, error rates, data-sharing agreements and accountability officers should be disclosed. Citizens affected by automated decisions must have a right to explanation and human review.

Vendor governance is equally important. Many government platforms depend on private technology providers, system integrators and data processors. Contracts must include audit rights, data portability, cybersecurity obligations, conflict-of-interest declarations, beneficial ownership disclosure, performance standards and exit clauses. Long-term vendor lock-in can become a form of structural corruption because it converts public dependency into private bargaining power.

12. PROCUREMENT, PUBLIC FINANCE AND CONTRACTING REFORM

Public procurement is one of the highest-risk areas of corruption because it directly allocates public money to private actors. GeM has improved access, competition and traceability for many categories of goods and services, and official figures show rapid expansion in procurement volume [6]. However, high-value infrastructure, defence, energy, public-private partnerships, consultancy contracts and complex services often require bespoke procurement processes. These areas need stronger legal standards than platform participation alone can provide.

India requires an integrated public procurement framework by 2047. Such a framework should cover planning, tender design, pre-bid consultations, conflict-of-interest declarations, beneficial ownership, bidder debarment, contract award, performance monitoring, change orders, subcontracting, dispute resolution and public disclosure. Procurement data should follow open contracting standards so that journalists, auditors, legislators, competitors and citizens can detect patterns such as repeated single-bid awards, cost escalations, split tenders, circular bidding or concentration among related firms.

Public finance reform must also connect budget, release, expenditure and outcomes. PFMS already provides a foundation for payment and exchequer control [7]. The next stage should be outcome-linked financial traceability: the ability to track how a rupee moved from budget allocation to implementing agency, vendor, beneficiary or asset, and whether the intended service or infrastructure was actually delivered. This would integrate budget transparency with corruption prevention.

13. WHISTLE-BLOWER PROTECTION AND REPORTING SYSTEMS

No anti-corruption system can succeed without protected reporting. Insiders often possess the earliest evidence of collusion, manipulation of records, procurement fraud, illegal gratification or retaliation. Yet reporting corruption can expose individuals to transfers, harassment, litigation, professional isolation and physical risk. A statutory architecture that invites complaints without guaranteeing protection creates moral hazard for citizens while preserving safety for corrupt networks.

The Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014, and subsequent debates around amendments show the unresolved tension between transparency, secrecy and protection [15]. By 2047, India should operationalise a

modern protected-disclosure regime with confidential reporting channels, emergency protection orders, penalties for retaliation, independent inquiry, legal aid, witness protection coordination and compensation where harm occurs. The regime should cover public servants, contractors, consultants, civil society actors and citizens who report corruption in public functions.

Digital reporting systems should be designed carefully. Anonymous complaints can be misused, but eliminating confidentiality would deter legitimate reporting. The better approach is tiered confidentiality: secure intake, preliminary credibility assessment, protected identity disclosure to investigators only where necessary, and strict penalties for identity leakage. Complaints should be tracked through independent dashboards without revealing sensitive details.

14. POLITICAL FINANCE, LOBBYING AND POLICY CAPTURE

Administrative corruption cannot be fully separated from political finance. Contractors, regulated firms, land interests and sectoral lobbies may seek influence not only through bribes to officials but through campaign finance, favourable policy design, discretionary exemptions, appointments and post-retirement opportunities. If political finance remains opaque, anti-corruption enforcement at the lower administrative level will treat symptoms while leaving incentives untouched.

A 2047 reform agenda should include greater transparency in political donations, real-time disclosure of significant contributions, independent audit of party accounts, stricter limits on anonymous funding, public disclosure of lobbying contacts in high-impact sectors, conflict-of-interest rules for ministers and senior officials, and cooling-off standards for movement between regulators and regulated entities. Policy influence is not illegitimate in a democracy, but undisclosed influence over public decisions is incompatible with constitutional governance.

The challenge is to regulate influence without criminalising participation. Businesses, civil society organisations, professional associations and citizens should be able to submit views on policy. The integrity requirement is that meetings, submissions, beneficiaries and conflicts should be recorded and open to scrutiny in sectors involving public resources, regulation, environmental approvals, tax concessions and major contracts.

Table -3: Scenario Analysis for India 2030-2047

Scenario	Institutional trajectory	2047 governance implication
Stagnation	Digital platforms expand but oversight bodies, courts, RTI and local capacity remain weak.	Corruption shifts upward into contracts, data systems and regulatory capture.
Managed reform	Some procurement, grievance, audit and disclosure reforms are implemented unevenly across states.	Petty corruption falls in selected services, but systemic capture persists in high-value sectors.
Capacity state	Law, data, audit, local capacity, whistle-blower protection and judicial timelines are integrated.	Integrity becomes a measurable administrative function and corruption risk declines across sectors.

15. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

India requires a 2047 public-integrity architecture that is systemic rather than episodic. The following reforms are proposed as an integrated package.

- Enact a comprehensive public procurement and open contracting law covering the full procurement life cycle, including planning, tendering, award, change orders, subcontracting, performance and disclosure.
- Strengthen the CVC, Lokpal and state Lokayuktas through transparent appointments, adequate staffing, budget autonomy, jurisdictional clarity, time-bound complaint handling and mandatory publication of outcomes.
- Operationalise whistle-blower protection through secure channels, anti-retaliation penalties, witness protection coordination, legal support and compensation for harm.
- Rebuild RTI capacity by filling information-commission vacancies, enforcing Section 4 proactive disclosure, publishing pendency dashboards and penalising repeated non-compliance.

- Create a National Integrity Data Grid connecting procurement, payments, audit objections, beneficiary transfers, company ownership, blacklisting, court cases and grievance patterns, subject to privacy and due-process safeguards.

- Introduce algorithmic accountability rules for high-impact digital governance systems, including audit trails, human review, vendor accountability and disclosure of automated decision use.

- Professionalise anti-corruption enforcement through specialised cadres in forensic accounting, digital evidence, procurement analytics, competition economics, cyber investigation and public finance.

- Adopt federal integrity compacts in which states receive technical and fiscal support for meeting benchmarks on local audit, service delivery, grievance quality, RTI disposal, procurement disclosure and disciplinary timelines.

- Create fast-track procedures for corruption trials, procurement disputes and asset recovery while preserving due process and appeal rights.

- Regulate political finance and lobbying through real-time donor disclosure, conflict-of-interest registers, open consultation logs and cooling-off standards.

16. ROADMAP: 2030-2035, 2035-2040 AND 2040-2047

Table -4: Phased Governance Roadmap

Phase	Priority actions	Expected institutional outcome
2030-2035	Procurement law, RTI capacity recovery, whistle-blower rules, audit follow-up dashboards and integrity staffing.	Move from compliance reform to measurable institutional performance.
2035-2040	National Integrity Data Grid, local government audit cadres, algorithmic registers and specialised integrity courts.	Create cross-sector detection capacity and reduce enforcement delay.
2040-2047	Federal compacts, open contracting maturity, climate-finance audit,	Establish corruption control as a routine function

	political finance of democratic transparency and governance. citizen data rights.
--	---

The first phase, 2030-2035, should focus on legal and procedural foundations. India should not wait until 2047 to repair the most basic deficits: vacancies in transparency bodies, slow disciplinary proceedings, unclear procurement standards and unsafe reporting channels. This phase should prioritise rules, staffing and public data standards.

The second phase, 2035-2040, should integrate systems. By this period, anti-corruption agencies, auditors, finance departments, procurement authorities, courts and grievance platforms should be able to share structured information lawfully. The objective should be early detection: identifying red flags before losses become irreversible.

The final phase, 2040-2047, should consolidate democratic integrity. The aim should be not merely to reduce corruption cases, but to make corrupt behaviour harder to organise, easier to detect, faster to punish and less profitable. Public integrity should become a measure of state capacity equivalent to revenue collection, welfare coverage or infrastructure output.

17. DISCUSSION

India's reform deficit is ultimately a capacity deficit. Legal amendments can change definitions and penalties, but they cannot by themselves create investigators, auditors, data engineers, prosecutors, information commissioners, municipal finance professionals or protected complainants. Digital platforms can produce records, but records produce accountability only when someone has the authority, skill and independence to examine them. Citizen charters can promise timelines, but timelines matter only when breach leads to consequences.

The deeper risk for 2047 is institutional dualism. India may build world-class national platforms while local offices remain under-resourced; advanced digital payments while grievance appeals remain weak; impressive procurement volumes while contract management remains opaque; strong audit findings while follow-up remains slow; public data while citizens lack the capacity to use it. Such dualism allows the state to appear modern while corruption adapts to new systems.

A high-growth India will also face a legitimacy test. Citizens may tolerate temporary inconvenience in a developing state, but they are less likely to tolerate unfairness, arbitrary discretion and visible enrichment of public intermediaries. Corruption is not only a fiscal loss;

it is a constitutional injury because it violates equality, dignity and the rule of law. For a democracy seeking global influence by 2047, public integrity will be a strategic asset.

18. CONCLUSIONS

India has built important tools for transparency, welfare efficiency, digital finance, procurement and grievance redress. These reforms should be recognised as significant. Yet the period from 2030 to 2047 will test whether these tools can become institutions. The central challenge is not whether India has anti-corruption laws or digital platforms; it is whether those laws and platforms are backed by autonomy, expertise, open data, timely adjudication, protected reporting, local capacity and credible sanctions.

If the reform deficit persists, corruption is likely to become less visible but more systemic. Petty bribery may decline in some services, while high-value capture in procurement, land, climate finance, regulation and digital platforms may expand. If India treats corruption control as a core component of state capacity, however, the country can build an integrity architecture suited to its 2047 ambitions. The policy choice is clear: corruption can be managed episodically through scandal response, or it can be governed structurally through institutions designed for prevention, detection, enforcement and democratic accountability.

The paper therefore recommends a 2047 reform agenda built around open contracting, independent oversight, operational whistle-blower protection, RTI revival, algorithmic auditability, federal capacity compacts, fast-track integrity adjudication and transparent political finance. India's centenary will be judged not only by the size of its economy but by the quality of its public institutions. A developed India must also be an accountable India.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author acknowledges the institutional context of the Artha-Niti Institute for Governance and the broader public-policy discourse on accountable governance, administrative reform and democratic integrity in India. Any errors or interpretive limitations remain the responsibility of the author.

REFERENCES

1. Transparency International. Corruption Perceptions Index 2024. Berlin: Transparency International, 2025. Available at: transparency.org/en/cpi/2024.
2. Transparency International. India Country Profile - Corruption Perceptions Index. Available at: transparency.org/en/countries/india.
3. World Bank. Worldwide Governance Indicators, 2025 Revision. Washington, DC: World Bank Group, 2025. Available at: worldbank.org/en/publication/worldwide-governance-indicators.
4. Central Vigilance Commission. Annual Reports. Government of India. Available at: cvc.gov.in/annualreport.
5. Lokpal of India. Annual Reports, Complaint Rules and Institutional Information. Available at: lokpal.gov.in.
6. Press Information Bureau. Government e Marketplace Surpasses Rs. 5 Lakh Crore GMV Before FY 2024-25 Year-End. Ministry of Commerce and Industry, 17 March 2025.
7. Public Financial Management System. About PFMS. Office of Controller General of Accounts, Ministry of Finance, Government of India. Available at: pfms.nic.in.
8. Press Information Bureau. DARPG Released 29th CPGRAMS Report for States/UTs of December 2024. Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, 31 January 2025.
9. Press Information Bureau. India's DBT: Boosting Welfare Efficiency. Ministry of Finance, 21 April 2025.
10. Department of Personnel and Training. The Right to Information Act, 2005 (Updated). Government of India.
11. Satark Nagrik Sangathan. Report Card of Information Commissions in India 2023-24. New Delhi, 2024.
12. Government of India. The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, as amended. India Code.
13. Comptroller and Auditor General of India. Duties and Powers of the CAG under the Constitution and Law. Government of India.
14. National Judicial Data Grid. eCourts Services, Government of India. Available at: njdg.ecourts.gov.in.
15. PRS Legislative Research. The Whistle Blowers Protection (Amendment) Bill, 2015. New Delhi: PRS India.
16. Second Administrative Reforms Commission. Fourth Report: Ethics in Governance. Government of India, 2007.
17. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. United Nations Convention against Corruption. Vienna: UNODC.
18. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. OECD Recommendation of the Council on Public Integrity. Paris: OECD, 2017.
19. Hazarika, B. Public Procurement in India: Assessment of Institutional Mechanism, Challenges and Reforms. NIPFP Working Paper No. 204, 2017.
20. Kaufmann, D. and Kraay, A. The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and 2024 Update. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, 2024.

BIOGRAPHIES (Optional not mandatory)

Author Photo	Rachit Baijal is Director General of the Artha-Niti Institute for Governance. His work focuses on public policy, institutional governance, constitutional accountability, public finance and democratic reform. His research interests include state capacity, governance design, civic education and evidence-based policy reform in India.
---------------------	--