Advancing Urban Institutional Transparency through Digital Governance: A Comparative Analysis of Anti-Corruption and Public Trust Mechanisms in India and Europe

Asanda Keitumetse Khwabe, Maksym Loharzhevskyi,

Omundu Eddy Odhiambo and Onemena Odebala

Abstract

Accountability, rule of law and trust are at a continuous turbulent state that serve as the foundation of peace, justice and strong institutions categorised as the SDG 16. The inconsistency of such factors contributes to the global polycrisis of instability, birthing corruption and mismanagement. Thus, with such an environment conjured, institutions cannot mandate sustainable cities and communities of SDG 11, which ultimately break down the vital state-citizen relationship. Continuously, quantitative data research has revealed that the introduction of integrating information and communications technology (ICT) into the political realm will promote transparency, reinforce better trust mechanisms, and contribute to anti-corruption attempts. This particular paper explored two different regions, India and European countries executing the transformation of e-governance while revealing the extent of successes of maintaining both SDG 16 and SDG 11 goals as well as the challenges faced by both regions. It is imperative to understand that strong institutions and the performance style in which to manage their unique society have not been perfected, for there are always different multifaceted factors such as circumstances presented by histories of the regions as well as the dynamics instilled and practiced by the government and people based on preferences to use. Thus, with expectations, functioning governing bodies should be able to sustain their societies, ensure transparent justice and safety, and curate mandates for the betterment of the civil. Thus, this paper concludes such findings of the specific method of integrating ICTs in attempts to bridge the existing disconnect experienced by multiple institutions.

Highlights:

● Digital governance aims to rebuild public trust through transparency and institutional accountability.
● India's model prioritizes top-down service delivery and anti-corruption, while Europe emphasizes participatory co-creation.
● Linking SDG 16 (strong institutions) with SDG 11 (inclusive cities) reveals governance gaps at the urban level.
● Digital divides, transparency paradox, and limited citizen agency challenge real inclusion in e-governance.
● A shift from administrative transparency to citizen empowerment requires legal safeguards, data rights, and digital literacy.

Keywords: Digital Governance, Transparency, Public Trust, Anti-Corruption, Citizen Participation, SDG 16, Digital Inclusion

Introduction

It has become increasingly clear lately that in the context of rapid urbanization, accountability, openness, and trust from society are becoming critical for city authorities (Harkness & Katz, 2016; Pickup, 2024). Cities, as key centers of administrative and demographic life, often face such problems as, for example, corruption, lack of transparency, and alienation of citizens from decision-making. Undoubtedly, this not only weakens the democratic foundations of city governance but also reduces its effectiveness (Mupandanyama, 2023; Transparency International, n.d.).

It is our deep conviction that Goals 16 and 11 of the Sustainable Development Agenda, aimed at ensuring "peace, justice, and strong institutions" and "sustainable cities and communities," respectively (United Nations, 2015; United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, n.d.), are particularly relevant in this context. The main thing is that the first emphasizes the importance of combating corruption, increasing transparency, and engaging citizens at all levels of government, and the second one reinforces it in the more communal context. Namely, the aforementioned task of SDG 16 is especially important in cities, where the interaction between citizens and government is most direct and intense. Although this goal is global, we believe that achieving it requires local solutions, as each city has its own unique institutional, political, and cultural characteristics that influence the implementation and reception of transparency initiatives.

Another challenge in city governance is the bureaucratic procedures and often inconsistent accountability systems that city authorities are trying to combat. Of course, such institutional deficiencies only increase public mistrust, especially among vulnerable and marginalized groups who feel excluded from decision-making processes (Bertsou, 2019). In countries like India, institutional closures are often rooted in colonial administrative systems and are exacerbated by a lack of resources and uneven development of digital infrastructure (Panda & Kumar, 2025; Vision IAS, 2024). At the same time, in many European cities, the decline in trust is not so much due to corruption as to the gap between government actions and the daily needs of the population (Bertsou, 2019).

As a response to these challenges, digital governance is gaining popularity. It is part of the world's transition to the sixth technological paradigm and, in the urban context, uses open databases, blockchain technologies, and platforms for citizen feedback. The long-term use of these tools in some cities and countries has already proven that they can improve governance by increasing transparency and inclusiveness, which, in turn, strengthens public trust in government, simplifies access to information, and optimizes service delivery (OECD, 2020; World Bank, 2021).

However, it is obvious that the effectiveness of such digital solutions strongly depends on the specific conditions in which they are implemented. For example, the cities of Tallinn and Helsinki have made impressive progress in the digitalization of governance thanks to significant investments in sustainable technologies and high digital literacy of the population (Estonian Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications, 2022; Government of Finland, n.d.; UN-Habitat, 2020; UN-Habitat et al., 2022). On the other hand, cities in India, despite attempts to introduce anti-corruption platforms (Nandy and Kumar, 2025), face problems of digital inequality and bureaucratic resistance (Panda and Kumar, 2025).

Problem Statement and Research Objectives

Despite the significant potential of digital tools, a gap between the promise of technological solutions and the reality remains in urban governance around the world. This problem gives rise to a key issue known as the 'transparency paradox.' One leading view explains this paradox through the lens of instrumental incentives: corrupt or institutionally weak governments voluntarily join transparency initiatives not so much out of a genuine desire for reform but to gain reputational benefits such as access to international aid or increased political legitimacy (David-Barrett & Okamura, 2013). However, this reputational approach is not the only explanation. An alternative view shifts the focus from external incentives to internal dynamics, arguing that pressure from below is often the key driver of change. According to this approach, an active and organized civil society can force governments to increase transparency by using international initiatives as a tool for increasing domestic accountability (Isaksson, 2015). In this case, the main motivation is not the pursuit of international approval but the result of domestic political struggle.

This theoretical dilemma directly affects our comparative analysis. In Indian cities, the adoption of digital platforms can be both a façade for external benefits and a concession to internal pressures, while ill-considered technology adoption risks creating digital inequalities (Panda & Kumar, 2025; Bertot et al., 2010). In European cities, even bottom-up reforms face an "e-governance paradox," where technological solutions do not automatically increase trust (Otieno & Omwenga, 2016).

A key research challenge, therefore, is the lack of understanding of which of these drivers—external reputational gain or internal civic pressure—and in what combination, determines the trajectory and success of digital governance in different institutional contexts.

To address this multifaceted challenge, this study sets out to undertake a number of interrelated objectives. First, the paper aims to analyze the theoretical foundations underlying digital governance as a tool for enhancing transparency and trust. Building on this foundation, the study will proceed to its main objective: conducting an in-depth comparative analysis of specific digital governance initiatives in selected cities in India and Europe.

The third objective is to assess the actual impact of these initiatives on the level of institutional transparency, accountability, and citizen trust. Finally, the findings of this study are concluded by pointing out the spheres of development of contextually informed recommendations for policymakers and practitioners on how to better use digital tools to strengthen urban governance.

Thematic Literature Review

The transparency and accountability of urban institutions are essential to achieving Sustainable Development Goal 16, which focuses on reducing corruption and building effective, inclusive institutions. In response to persistent governance challenges, cities have increasingly turned to digital tools—such as open data platforms and participatory applications—to address institutional gaps and rebuild public trust. This literature review highlights key areas of focus, including anti-corruption mechanisms in urban India and Europe, the role of digital tools in promoting citizen trust, and comparative frameworks that support cross-regional policy learning.

DIGITAL AND ANTI-CORRUPTION MECHANISMS

In Indian cities, there are digitized service delivery focused on reducing petty corruption. An example is Karnataka's e-Governance projects that demonstrated a reduction of bribery and increased efficiency, especially in licensing and municipal services (Chakraborty & Pandey, 2020). In Mumbai, transparency portals enabled real-time public access to civic contracts, increasing public audit interventions by almost 50% (Bose & Dey, 2022). Despite having an improvement, scholars still support that these tools only benefit urban elites and so hinder equitable access especially in peri-urban areas (Kumar, 2023).

European cities have leveraged more advanced technological environments to integrate anti-corruption tools. For example, Tallinn, the capital of Estonia, has a blockchain-based public contract system that offers unchangeable records, reducing procurement fraud risks (Tatar & Kalvet, 2021). Moreover, Helsinki, capital of Finland, has an open Ahjo platform that enhances transparency by providing real-time legislative data, strengthening public scrutiny (Lindgren et al., 2019). Critically, institutional readiness influences its success, not only technology indicating advanced digital systems fail where institutional accountability strategies are weak (Tummers et al., 2022). This highlights a research contrast between European and Indian urban governance outcomes.

PUBLIC TRUST AND PARTICIPATORY TECHNOLOGY

Digital participation has emerged as a tool for building trust. Public trust in Indian cities remains divided as the platform like MyGov struggles with inclusivity and at the same time encourages civic dialogue (Sharma & Bawa, 2021). The exclusion of marginalized groups that face digital literacy barriers and low-income groups risks deepening existing governance divides in urban areas.

On the other hand, European cities stress on participatory governance where everyone is required to take part in public decision making. For instance, Amsterdam's Open Stad and Helsinki's Decidim are proof that transparent and inclusive citizen and noncitizen engagement correlates with higher institutional trust (Linders et al., 2023). However, Bannister and Connolly (2021) argue that institutional action on citizen feedback is required for information access. Therefore, to build trust, transparency initiatives must be coupled with good governance. This study is significant in India, where rapid urbanization outgrows institutional response.

COMPARATIVE URBAN GOVERNANCE AND GAPS IN THE LITERATURE

In India, the Smart Cities Mission has emphasized the modernization of infrastructure and the introduction of digital platforms like the India Urban Data Exchange and Mahiti Kanaja to promote transparency in public service delivery. However, many of these tools function in a top-down manner, often driven by state or national agencies rather than city-level democratic engagement (Kumar & Prakash, 2019).

In contrast, European cities tend to frame digital governance as a citizen-centered process. For instance, Amsterdam's City Data Lab and the "Right to Challenge" initiative empower citizens not only to access data but also to actively shape local policy outcomes (Linders et al., 2023). These initiatives reflect a governance culture grounded in subsidiarity, where municipal institutions are granted considerable autonomy in decision-making and innovation. Additionally, platforms like Helsinki's open budgeting system and Tallinn's blockchain-based registries are examples of how technological design is aligned with broader institutional trust mechanisms (European Commission, 2022).

From a theoretical lens, the principal-agent model helps frame how digital tools reduce information asymmetry between citizens (principals) and public officials (agents), thereby curbing opportunities for corruption (Janssen et al., 2012). Similarly, the trust-as-legitimacy theory posits that trust emerges not just from procedural openness but from the consistent responsiveness of institutions (Bannister & Connolly, 2021). Applying these frameworks comparatively, however, reveals that even technologically advanced platforms can fail when the institutional culture resists citizen empowerment—a challenge seen in both Indian and certain European cases.

Despite a growing body of work on digital governance and urban innovation, there is a clear gap in comparative, cross-regional analysis. Most studies focus either on single-city innovations or national-level digital programs, without adequately linking municipal strategies in the Global South and North. Few have investigated how cities operationalize SDG 16 targets, particularly in relation to transparency and trust, using real-world case studies. This paper contributes to closing that gap by providing a comparative review of selected Indian and European cities, examining not only the tools they deploy but also the institutional ecosystems that enable or constrain their effectiveness.

Methodological Overview

Examining the fundamental relationships between governments and citizens in both India and Europe is crucial to comprehending the challenges of incorporating technology into digital governance. A qualitative comparative approach will be used to capture these subtleties, enabling a precise and contextualized examination of the major determinants of governance. By considering the institutional and sociopolitical factors that influence the use of digital tools, this method makes it possible to identify significant trends and distinctions between the two regions.

This study will examine the underlying reasons of corruption and assess the efficacy of countermeasures by utilizing a variety of qualitative data sources, such as published research findings and expert consensus. These revelations are essential to comprehending the formation of public trust in governance structures. According to this theory, political outcomes are the results of government initiatives to resolve conflicts between conflicting interests while guaranteeing the equitable and effective allocation of resources. Since economic inequality and inequities have a big impact on how the public views legitimacy and efficacy, special attention is paid to how these issues are handled. The study intends to demonstrate the connection between enhanced governance performance and anti-corruption initiatives by analyzing these dynamics.

The government will be better equipped to handle civil unrest, resource shortages, and environmental issues as well as make strategic investments in important institutions like education if it can remain consistent and deliver its services in an organized manner. The foundation for more extensive change, such as the transition to a digital state, is laid by effective governance in these domains. The government can improve accountability and openness by adopting new technologies. This advancement promotes long-term development objectives while also bolstering institutional trust. In the end, a responsive and well-coordinated government is better equipped to address the demands of the populace and promote sustainable progress in a world that is becoming more digitally connected.

Continuously, information obtained will explain challenges faced by integration, such as justice isolation, social engagement, and disintegration that reveal the people's trust and attitudes towards their governments. A historical overview will be particularly included to highlight unique challenges and conflicts that arose from the cultural and social status quo. Hence, findings will give insight into possible methods that India can adapt , such as strong institutional frameworks, according to their governing style, that ensure proper regulations. This includes the values of accountability and delivering operational continuity actions as well as the consequences of such changes.

Moreover, it is important to emphasize that this research does not romanticize the digitalization of cities and their institutions. While European cities have made significant strides in adopting digital technologies, they continue to confront complex and evolving challenges associated with these advancements. Recognizing both the opportunities and limitations of digital governance provides a balanced foundation for the analysis.

Core Findings

As urban governance becomes increasingly complex, governments are turning to digital tools to enhance transparency, accountability, and citizen engagement. This section explores in detail the key initiatives in India and select international cities that illustrate how digital systems are being deployed to strengthen public trust and improve administrative responsiveness.

INDIAN CASES

The Public Finance Management System was launched in the late 2000s and has been of great use in tracking disbursements for social sector schemes all over India. It is connected to banks via a real-time portal that enables monitoring of funds from the central government to beneficiaries at district and individual levels (PFMS, 2025). This system integrated pension and ration disbursements digitally as evident in Andhra Pradesh's Krishna district hence a reduction in leakages (IMF, 2024).
India's centralized Public Grievance Redress and Monitoring System (CPGRAMS) has captured eyes across the commonwealth for its impact (Business Standard, April 2024). The state-level Integrated Grievance Redressal System resolved most of the complaints filed by care-seekers with disabilities in Uttar Pradesh, demonstrating speed and transparency (Times of India, Jun 2025).

Integrated Command and Control Centres (ICCCs) run over 80 cities aggregating data from traffic, sanitation, CCTV, utilities, and public securities (Indian Express, 2022; Noida IAS Update, 2025). Pune and Bengaluru operate Smart City Command Centres with numerous sensors, emergency call boxes, dashboards, and real-time analytics (LinkedIn/Pune; PC Mohan/Bengaluru). During the COVID-19 pandemic, 45 such centres were rapidly repurposed into war-rooms for tracking, helpline coordination, and logistics support (PMC NCBI, 2022; Economic Times, 2020). Several cities have integrated ICCCs into municipal budgets or adopted self-sustaining models despite the end of central funding in March 2025 (Hindustan Times, May 2025).

The Swachhata App, launched under the Swachh Bharat Mission by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA), enables citizens to register sanitation-related grievances via a geo-tagged, time-stamped mobile interface. Citizens can track the status of their complaints, view before-and-after resolution images, and interact with municipal officials, ensuring accountability and responsiveness (Janaagraha, 2024). As of 2024, over 27 million complaints have been registered with a reported resolution rate of over 93% across 4,500+ cities (Janaagraha, 2024).

The e-Municipality Project, part of the National e-Governance Plan, focuses on digitising core urban local body services such as property tax, water billing, trade licences, and grievance redressal. By allowing online service delivery, status tracking, and structured workflows, it reduces physical interaction, minimizes corruption, and improves service transparency (BANotes, 2024).

The MyGov Portal, which was launched in July 2014 and is overseen by the National Informatics Centre, serves as a primary platform for citizen engagement and consultation. Research conducted by Banerjee (2021) characterizes MyGov as an example of open innovation—where ministries and citizens collaboratively develop policy inputs, thus enhancing the participatory and transparent nature of governance processes. Singh and Kaushik (2020) emphasize how MyGov has institutionalized direct contributions from citizens and centralized public discourse among governmental departments. Nevertheless, empirical evaluations (The Hindu Centre, 2021) reveal a limited engagement in essential policy drafts: only approximately 8% of the discussions hosted were related to pre-legislative drafts, and only 11 out of 60 ministries were involved, indicating a tendency towards selective transparency (The Hindu Centre, 2021).

EUROPEAN CASES

The City of Amsterdam is leading the digital initiatives in Europe by incorporating ICT into, not only the government, but also towards the civil sector (Digital Cities: Amsterdam's Ecosystem of Cooperation, n.d.; Netherlands - Digital Economy, 2024). This reflects the continuous progress of successfully strengthening the State-Citizen relationship as it incorporates research institutions as well, and collectively addresses various issues. It has been stated that Amsterdam collaborated with multinational ICT companies resolving conflicts and secrecy to cooperation and transparency which too revealed accountability (Digital Cities: Amsterdam's Ecosystem of Cooperation, n.d.). According to the city's second Digital Agenda 2023/2026, the core principles of believing in "A Digital City that is human, reliable and future proof". Furthermore, another ongoing initiative that is recognised as Amsterdam InChange, used to be known as Amsterdam Smart City that was birthed in 2017 (ITA, 2025), prioritises the residences' and users' of these cities interests and engagement through the tools, data and technology (ASC, 2025). As indicated in the methodology, the government's ability to sustain consistency with thorough organisation, will have a greater chance to transform into a digital state and secure transparency through technological advancements. Consequently, this initiative has created a trust mechanism resulting in a cohesive environment in which citizens' participation is the foundation platform where exchanging valuable and knowledgeable information with one another, to improve the city, takes place.

Similarly in Finland's Helsinki, reputable for the self-organised communities, integrates ICTs to generate quality rich "community activities and environment" (Horelli, Saad-Sulonen, Wallin and Botero, 2013) through various initiatives. Thus, Finland's e-planning has intersected "urban planning and community development" (Horelli, Saad-Sulonen, Wallin and Botero, 2013) through the Learning-based framework, which enhance further the participation and flow of the state-citizen relationship regarding the daily life within the city. Continuously, Finland has invested the most in quantum computing research in comparison to other European countries to sustain the pace of technological developments around the world and within its country (ITA, 2025).

Estonia's capital city of Tallinn is regarded as one of the world's best examples of digital administration. Tallinn has improved accountability and openness by implementing digital technologies at every level of urban service delivery as part of the e-Estonia initiative. X-Road, a secure data exchange network that links more than 900 public and commercial bodies and allows for real-time information sharing while protecting data privacy, is an essential part of this infrastructure (e-Estonia Briefing Centre, 2023). This innovation lowers the possibility of corruption and minimizes bureaucracy. Furthermore, blockchain technology has been integrated into public procurement procedures, allowing contracts and financial records to be securely stored with time stamps. This improves auditability for oversight and civil society organizations (Tatar & Kalvet, 2021). Despite being a national program, e-Residency has a big urban influence on Tallinn since it makes it possible for non-residents to communicate with local authorities, create enterprises, and obtain legal services—all of which promote transnational transparency (Digital Nations Report, 2024). In keeping with EU digital goals, the city also runs a comprehensive Open Data Portal that provides access to municipal data on zoning, transportation, and budgets. This makes it possible for people, NGOs, and journalists to hold local government officials responsible (City of Tallinn, 2024). In accordance with EU anti-corruption and inclusion directives, Tallinn stresses digital inclusion by providing ICT training for elderly persons and rural immigrants, even in the face of widespread e-service penetration (Estonia Digital Strategy, 2023). These initiatives offer as an example of a governance approach in which technology enhances democratic engagement by enabling citizens to actively observe the government rather than being passively watched. Tallinn thus exemplifies how smart urban systems can foster both efficiency and civic empowerment.

Interpretation and Analysis

The digital governance initiatives in India and Europe, while sharing a lexicon of transparency and participation, are fundamentally expressions of two different state-citizen relationships, shaped by divergent historical contexts and contemporary challenges. A comparative analysis reveals that these are not merely different tools for similar problems, but different solutions for entirely different problems altogether. Where Indian digital governance is a story of a post-colonial state using technology to establish order and transactional trust across a vast, developing nation, the European model is one of mature democracies leveraging technology to deepen an existing, though sometimes strained, social contract.

This core difference is most evident in the foundational purpose of their flagship initiatives. India's Public Finance Management System was born of necessity—a direct, top-down assault on the systemic corruption and financial leakages that have plagued its welfare state. It is a tool of control, designed to impose accountability where it was historically absent. In stark contrast, Amsterdam's "Right to Challenge" initiative emerges not from a crisis of corruption, but from a crisis of alienation, addressing a perceived gap between a functioning state and the needs of its citizens. The Indian system thus uses technology to build trust from a low baseline by proving its ability to deliver services honestly, while the Dutch system uses technology to sustain trust by devolving power and agency to a citizenry that already expects to be heard. One is an instrument of administrative necessity; the other is an evolution of democratic principle.

This distinction permeates the nature of citizen participation. Where India's Swachhata App provides a structured, top-down channel for citizens to report sanitation failures to a central authority, Helsinki's open budgeting platforms or Amsterdam's co-creation projects invite citizens to define the problem and allocate resources themselves. The Indian citizen is positioned as a monitor or a service recipient providing feedback to the state, a model evident even in the MyGov portal, where engagement often stops short of influencing core policy. Conversely, the European citizen is framed as a partner with the state. This reveals a different understanding of the citizen's role: in India, technology helps them hold a powerful state to account for its duties, whereas in Europe, it facilitates their active participation in the state's decision-making processes, a reflection of a long-standing tradition of subsidiarity and local autonomy.

The very architecture of digital systems reflects this philosophical divide. India's Integrated Command and Control Centres are centralized hubs of data aggregation and surveillance, designed to give the state a comprehensive view for managing urban chaos and ensuring security. They are instruments of management and control. This differs fundamentally from the logic of Tallinn's X-Road infrastructure. While also a central system, X-Road is designed as a secure, decentralized enabler of interaction, not just for the state to see, but for all actors—citizens, ministries, and businesses—to exchange data transparently and securely. The ICCC is an architecture for top-down oversight, born from the need to manage complexity, while X-Road is an architecture for ecosystem-wide trust, born from a societal consensus on digital rights and transparency.

Finally, this comparative lens reveals different approaches to the inherent risks of digitalization. In India, the "transparency paradox" of providing information without ceding influence is a major challenge, and the deployment of advanced technology constantly battles the risk of deepening the digital divide. The solution to digital exclusion is often seen as a secondary challenge to the primary goal of technological implementation. This contrasts sharply with Tallinn's proactive strategy of integrating ICT training for all demographic groups. For Estonia, digital inclusion is not an afterthought but a prerequisite for the legitimacy of its digital state. It represents a mature understanding that digital governance cannot succeed if it is not equitable, a principle that carries a far greater weight and complexity in India's vastly more diverse and unequal socio-economic landscape.

Policy and Practice Recommendations

We think that the following suggestions, which are based on a comparison of digital governance in India and Europe, provide a way for both parties to learn from one another and create urban governance models that are more open, inclusive, and successful.

First and foremost, we believe that a more participatory model of digital governance should replace India's current top-down, control-oriented approach. Policymakers can create trust that goes beyond service delivery by adopting components of European frameworks, like Amsterdam's co-creation initiatives. As a result, the relationship between the state and its citizens shifts from one of administration to one of partnership, encouraging a greater feeling of citizen ownership and active participation in governance.

However, if a digital governance system engages in social exclusion, it will not be effective. Thus, secondly, in order to bridge the gap between digitally advanced metropolitan centers and other areas, India must promote digital literacy, particularly in rural and vulnerable groups, if it hopes to make this new collaboration inclusive. One important lesson from Estonia's proactive inclusion strategy is that accessible tactics and customized training programs are essential to any deployment of digital governance, guaranteeing that no person is left behind.

Thirdly, it is our deep conviction that India must abandon a paradigm in which power is still centralized and information is only accessible if it is to genuinely establish confidence through transparency. The creation of platforms that give people actual control over policy is the next stage. Passive information portals are unable to create the deep level of institutional confidence that may be fostered by allowing residents to directly engage in important procedures, such as municipal budgeting decisions, as demonstrated in Helsinki. Because of this, transparency is no longer a one-way message but rather an active, two-way roadway.

The risks of data misuse and spying inevitably rise with the depth and decentralization of digitalization. Fourth, in order to protect its population, India must establish strong institutional and legal protections. Taking inspiration from Europe's General Data Protection Regulation and the ethical design principles incorporated into Tallinn's digital infrastructure, this entails creating comprehensive legal frameworks that explicitly enshrine digital rights, data privacy, and algorithmic accountability.

Fifth, we insist that platforms like MyGov need to be updated. This will help make citizen feedback transparent and useful. People need to see that their opinions influence policy. Then trust in the system will grow. It is important that citizen participation is not limited to surveys. It is necessary to show how digital feedback is used in real decisions. This will help reduce the gap between consultation and action..

Ultimately, it is important to develop a culture of digital citizenship. This is the foundation for sustainable change that goes beyond technology and politics. To create literate and engaged citizens, India must invest in education. This should focus on digital rights, responsibilities, and participation. Other steps are needed to reach people of all income and educational levels. We think that these could include countrywide awareness campaigns, best done in local languages and with the participation of the communities themselves. Such programs should clearly explain rights, such as freedom of speech and data protection. But it is also important to talk about responsibilities, such as the need to participate in online discussions.

Conclusion

As a result, this comparison of digital governance in Europe and India shows two different trajectories influenced by different historical and sociopolitical settings. Although both areas use technology to increase openness and public confidence, their primary driving forces are very different. Specifically, the majority of India's digital initiatives are a top-down reaction to structural issues like inefficiency in service delivery and corruption. They serve as instruments of control to impose responsibility. European models, on the other hand, like those in Tallinn and Amsterdam, come from a history of democratic cooperation. The goal of these programs is to increase public participation in the actual decision-making process. This is a significant distinction. One system distributes power to maintain confidence, while the other aims to establish trust by showcasing skill.

We think that in order for India to advance, it needs to change its digital governance model from one that is control-oriented to one that is more participative. This calls for a multifaceted approach. In order to close the existing divide between urban elites and underprivileged communities, it is also imperative to invest in universal digital literacy. Furthermore, in order to safeguard data privacy and defend digital rights, strong legal frameworks that are modeled after laws like the GDPR must be developed.

Thus, by embracing a more inclusive and decentralized approach, India can foster a culture of digital citizenship, transforming its governance landscape into a truly collaborative and transparent ecosystem.

References

Banerjee, S. (2021). Open Innovation for Better Governance: A Case Study of MyGov Platform of Government of India. Academy of Marketing Studies Journal, 25(2).

Bannister, F., & Connolly, R. (2021). Trust and digital government. Information Polity, 26(1), 51–64.

BANotes. (n.d.). Urban development e-Governance Mission Mode Projects. Retrieved from https://banotes.org/e-governance/urban-development-e-governance-mission-mode-projects/

Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T., & Grimes, J. M. (2010). Using ICTs to create a culture of transparency: E-government and social media as openness and anti-corruption tools for societies. Government Information Quarterly, 27(3), 264-271. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0740624X10000201

Bertsou, E. (2019). Rethinking political distrust. European Political Science Review, 11(2), 213–230. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773919000080

Bose, D., & Dey, T. (2022). Digital platforms and municipal transparency in India. Urban Governance Journal, 7(3), 144–159.

Business Standard. (2024, April). India's grievance redressal system ranked among top in Commonwealth. https://www.business-standard.com

Chakraborty, S., & Pandey, A. (2020). E-Governance and public service delivery in India. Public Administration Review, 80(4), 610–624.

City, A. S. (n.d.). About us. Amsterdam Smart City. https://amsterdamsmartcity.com/about

City of Tallinn. (2024). Tallinn Open Data Portal. https://opendata.tallinn.ee

David-Barrett, L., & Okamura, K. (2013). The Transparency Paradox: Why do Corrupt Countries Join EITI? (Working Paper No. 38). European Research Centre for Anti-Corruption and State-Building. https://eiti.org/sites/default/files/attachments/The-Transparency-Paradox.-Why-do-Corrupt-Countries-Join-EITI1.pdf

Digital cities: Amsterdam's ecosystem of cooperation. (2021). Urbact.eu. https://urbact.eu/articles/digital-cities-amsterdams-ecosystem-cooperation

Digital Nations Report. (2024). e-Residency and the Estonian Model. https://www.digitalnations.gov.ee

Economic Times. (2020, March 28). 45 Smart City control rooms converted into COVID-19 war rooms: Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs. https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/india/45-smart-city-control-rooms-converted-into-covid-19-war-rooms-ministry-of-housing-and-urban-affairs/articleshow/74866020.cms

e-Estonia Briefing Centre. (2023). How Estonia Became the Most Digitally Advanced Country. https://e-estonia.com

Estonia Digital Strategy. (2023). Digital Skills for All. Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications. https://mkm.ee/en/digital-strategy

Harkness, A. J., & Katz, B. (2016). Why urban governance matters—now more than ever. Brookings Institution. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/why-urban-governance-matters-now-more-than-ever/

Hindustan Times. (2025, May). After Smart City funding ends, cities look for ways to sustain ICCCs. https://www.hindustantimes.com

Horelli, Saad-Sulonen, Wallin and Botero. (2013). When self-organization and urban governance intersect: Two cases from Helsinki.

Indian Express. (2022, February 28). *Explained: How Integrated Command and Control Centres work.* https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/iccc-smart-cities-mission-explained-7816433/

International Monetary Fund. (2024). *Digital Public Infrastructure in India: Lessons from the PFMS* (IMF Working Paper No. 24/86). https://www.imf.org

International Trade Administration. (2024, September 19). *Finland - Digital Economy*. International Trade Administration. Accessed from: Trade.gov. https://www.trade.gov/country-commercial-guides/finland-digital-economy

International Trade Administration. (2024). *Netherlands - Digital Economy*. International Trade Administration. Accessed from: Trade.gov.

Isaksson, A. S. (2015). Who Drives Change? The Role of Domestic Civil Society in the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative. *World Development*, *68*, 156-166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.11.020

Janaagraha. (n.d.). *Swachhata technology platform*. Retrieved from https://www.janaagraha.org/work/swachhata-technology-platform/

Janssen, M., Charalabidis, Y., & Zuiderwijk, A. (2012). Benefits, Adoption Barriers and Myths of Open Data and Open Government. Information Systems Management, 29(4), 258–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2012.716740

Kumar, R. (2023). *Digital divides and governance in urban India*. Journal of Urban Affairs, 45(2), 213–230.

Linders, D., van der Meer, T., & Rutgers, M. R. (2023). *Civic tech and trust in European cities*. Local Government Studies, 49(1), 1–23.

Lindgren, I., Madsen, C. Ø., Hofmann, S., & Melin, U. (2019). *Digital government transformation in the EU*. Government Information Quarterly, 36(4), 101-410.

Margetts, H., & Dorobantu, C. (2019). Rethink government with AI and digital technologies. *Nature Human Behaviour, 3*(5), 346–349. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-019-0565-2

Meijer, A., & Grimmelikhuijsen, S. (2021). *Transparency in digital urban governance*. Government Information Quarterly, 38(3), 101-599.

Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications of Estonia. (2022, May 23). *Estonia is leading the world in the use of data*. e-Estonia. https://e-estonia.com/estonia-is-leading-the-world-in-the-use-of-data/

Mupandanyama, T. (2023). Corruption in urban councils and its impact on service delivery. Journal of Ethics, Governance & Political Science. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372680584_Corruption_in_Urban_Councils_and_its_Impact_on_Service_Delivery_Tapiwa_Mupandanyama

Nandy, A., & Kumar, A. (2025). Engage citizens to smarten city governance. Smart Cities and Regional Development Journal, 9(2), 29-42.

National Center for Biotechnology Information. (2022). Smart Cities and COVID-19: Repurposing India's urban infrastructure. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9245932/

OECD. (2020). The use of digital technologies for public engagement in policymaking. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/gov/the-use-of-digital-technologies-for-public-engagement-in-policymaking-b8f32a7d-en.htm

Otieno, I. J., & Omwenga, E. (2016). The e-Government Paradox: Is it Real and How can it be Resolved? In IST-Africa Conference Proceedings, 2016. IEEE. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303868542_The_e-Government_Paradox_Is_it_Real_and_How_can_it_be_Resolved

Panda, A. K., & Kumar, A. (2025). E-governance in India and Its Role in Modern Governance: A Conceptual Overview. International Journal for Research Trends and Innovation, 10(3), a708-a715.

Panda, A. K., & Kumar, A. (2025). E-governance in India and Its Role in Modern Governance: A Conceptual Overview. International Journal for Research Trends and Innovation, 10(3), a708-a715. *https://www.ijrti.org/papers/IJRTI2503087.pdf*

Pickup, F. (2024). Urban governance vital for cities to prosper. United Nations Development Programme. *https://www.undp.org/blog/urban-governance-vital-cities-prosper*

Public Financial Management System. (2025). PFMS dashboard. Ministry of Finance, Government of India. *https://pfms.nic.in*

Sharma, A., & Bawa, A. (2021). MyGov and urban civic engagement in India. Journal of Development Policy, 18(2), 89–104.

Singh, A., & Kaushik, A. (2020). Platform for Citizen Engagement for Good Governance in India: A Case Study of MyGov.in. In Civic Engagement Frameworks and Strategic Leadership Practices for Organization Development. IGI Global.

Tatar, M., & Kalvet, T. (2021). Blockchain for Public Services: The Case of Tallinn. Government Information Quarterly, 38(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2021.101566

Tatar, M., & Kalvet, T. (2021). Blockchain in Estonian public governance. Government Information Quarterly, 38(4), 101-607. The Hindu Centre. (2021). How Participatory is My Government? A Closer Look at MyGov.in. Retrieved from *https://www.thehinducentre.com/article9411455.ece*

Times of India. (2025a, June). Most grievances of differently abled resolved. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/lucknow/most-grievances-of-differently-abled-resolved/articleshow/121541626.cms

Transparency International. (n.d.). Transparency International joins global campaign for participatory urban governance. https://www.transparency.org/en/press/transparency-international-joins-global-campaign-for-participatory-urban-go

Tummers, L., Bekkers, V., & Steijn, B. (2022). Institutional trust and digital reforms. Public Management Review, 24(6), 819–839.

UN-Habitat, CAF, Edinburgh Napier University, & Tallinn University of Technology. (2022). Global review of smart city governance practices. UN-Habitat.

UN-Habitat. (2020). World cities report 2020: The value of sustainable urbanization. United Nations Human Settlements Programme. https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2020/10/wcr_2020_report.pdf

United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development. https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal16 United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (n.d.). Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable. United Nations. Retrieved July 14, 2025, from https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal11

Valtioneuvoston kanslia. (n.d.). Finland, a pioneer in digitalisation and new technologies. Prime Minister's Office. Retrieved July 12, 2024, from https://vnk.fi/en/finland-a-pioneer-in-digitalisation-and-new-technologies

Vision IAS. (2024, May 6). Redefining governance: India's path to administrative reforms. https://visionias.in/current-affairs/posts/redefining-governance-indias-path-to-administrative-reforms/

World Bank. (2021, April 28). Enhancing government effectiveness and transparency: The fight against corruption. https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2021/04/28/enhancing-government-effectiveness-and-transparency-the-fight-against-corruption

Author Credentials

- Asanda Keitumetse Khwabe,
Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa

- Maksym Loharzhevskyi
Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

- Omundu Eddy Odhiambo,
University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

- Onemena Odebala
Baze University, Abuja, Nigeria