DIGITAL PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE AND LABOR WELFARE: BRIDGING GOVERNANCE DEFICITS AND STRUCTURAL PRECARITY

Mohit Mishra, Amity Law School, Amity University, Patna

1. Introduction: The Paradigm Shift in Labor Welfare Delivery

The traditional framework of labor governance in developing economies has historically suffered from acute informational asymmetries, bureaucratic friction, and prohibitive transaction costs. In India, where over 85 percent of the total workforce operates within the unorganized and informal sectors, statutory protections under classical industrial jurisprudence have consistently failed to achieve universal coverage.[1] The advent of Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI)—anchored upon open, interoperable, and publicly governed digital rails—has emerged as a transformative mechanism to reconceptualize welfare administration. Rather than treating social security as a localized, enterprise-dependent entitlement tethered to physical workplaces, DPI abstracts welfare delivery into programmatic, citizen-centric protocols.

By decoupling welfare administration from rigid physical documentation and localized employer-employee relationships, DPI platforms facilitate the creation of portable economic identities. This structural transition is critical for migrant and informal labor, whose precarious socio-legal existence is characterized by spatial mobility, absence of proof of employment, and recurring documentation deprivation. However, while DPI reconfigures the mechanics of targeted delivery, it also introduces acute jurisprudential, constitutional, and operational dilemmas regarding digital exclusion, platform-mediated surveillance, and algorithmic subordination.[2]

[1] National Commission for Enterprises in the Unorganised Sector (NCEUS), *Report on Conditions of Work and Promotion of Livelihoods in the Unorganised Sector* (Government of India 2007) 34-42.
[2] Jean Drèze and Amartya Sen, *An Uncertain Glory: India and its Contradictions* (Princeton University Press 2013) 98-102.

2. Theoretical Framework: Architectural Neutrality vs. Socio-Economic Realities

DPI is theoretically characterized by three foundational, modular layers: foundational identity (e.g., biometric identity systems), payment rails (e.g., instant clearing engines), and open data-exchange protocols. In the context of welfare economics, this architecture operates under the assumption of institutional friction reduction. By deploying low-cost electronic authentication and verifiable digital registries, the state seeks to convert an invisible, fragmented labor force into a legible administrative constituency.[3]

From an economic perspective, DPI drastically diminishes search, identification, and verification costs. The informal labor market has persistently suffered from severe adverse selection and moral hazard. Informal employers cannot verify the credentials or credentials-based social protections of casual day-wage workers, and the state cannot reliably trace mobile labor across interstate migration corridors. DPI functions as an open public utility that neutralizes these informational rents, effectively replacing traditional physical intermediaries with automated clearing mechanisms.

Yet, this theoretical efficiency relies on the presumption of technological neutrality. In practice, the interface between an informal laborer and a digital infrastructure is mediated by structural digital illiteracy, device unaffordability, and reliance on unregulated private intermediaries. When access to statutory entitlements under Article 21 and the Directive Principles of State Policy under Article 41 of the Constitution of India becomes contingent upon biometric authentication, infrastructural failure ceases to be a mere administrative glitch and transforms into substantive rights deprivation.[4]

3. Structural Pillars of India's Labor-Centric DPI Architecture

3.1 Digital Identity and Identity-Linked Registries: The e-Shram Model

The baseline prerequisite for targeted welfare delivery is legal and administrative legibility. The rollout of the national e-Shram portal represents the state's primary endeavor to construct a centralized, authenticated database of unorganized workers seeded with unique identification

[3] Pramod Varma et al., 'Designing Digital Public Infrastructure for Population Scale: The India Stack Experience' (2022) 14(2) *Communications of the ACM* 64, 69.
[4] *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India* (2017) 10 SCC 1 (establishing the fundamental right to privacy and the constitutional doctrine of proportionality in state-administered digital identification systems).

credentials. Unlike enterprise-specific registers maintained under individual factories or establishment acts, e-Shram generates a universal, portable registry designed to facilitate direct benefit transfers (DBT) and statutory social security disbursements.

However, registry architecture must contend with the realities of manual labor. Manual and agricultural laborers frequently experience biometric deterioration—where fingerprints become worn or scarred from physical exertion—leading to persistent authentication failures during automated e-KYC workflows.[5]

3.2 Direct Fiscal Intermediation via Instant Payment Protocols

The second structural pillar is the deployment of direct, account-to-account settlement systems to bypass fiscal leakages. In conventional distribution models, cash transfers to informal workers suffered from gatekeeping by labor contractors (*thekedars*) and lower-tier administrative rent-seekers. By routing fiscal relief directly through central payment clearing networks, DPI achieves near-zero marginal distribution costs during macroeconomic shocks, as demonstrated during emergency pandemic relief transfers.[6]

Nevertheless, direct payment systems introduce distinct failure points, including dormant bank accounts, unnotified transaction rejections, and zero institutional accountability for rectifying failed transaction batches.

4. The Jurisprudential Dilemma: Interoperability, Algorithmic Control, and Precarity

4.1 Algorithmic Subordination vs. Decent Work

The convergence of DPI and labor welfare presents an acute paradox within the platform and gig economy. Gig platforms leverage public digital infrastructure—such as national payment rails, public identity verification, and geospatial data—to orchestrate hyper-efficient labor allocation. However, these commercial entities simultaneously classify gig workers as "independent contractors" or "delivery partners" rather than statutory employees, actively evading traditional obligations under occupational safety, minimum wage, and maternity

[5] Reetika Khera, 'Digital Footprints in Welfare Governance: Efficiency Gains versus Systemic Errors' (2021) 56(38) *Economic and Political Weekly* 45, 48.
[6] World Bank, *Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2022: Correcting Course* (World Bank Group 2022) 112-115.

benefit legislation.[7]

The algorithmic management inherent to these platforms introduces automated scoring, opaque deactivation mechanisms, and dynamically fluctuating compensation rates without human oversight. In the absence of an open protocol enforcing algorithmic transparency, the state's DPI apparatus risks functioning as an unintentional subsidy for platform capitalism, providing the public infrastructure that allows private aggregators to extract value from insecure labor pools without bearing social safety costs.[8]

4.2 Data Protection, Consent Architecture, and Labor Surveillance

Under contemporary data protection frameworks, the classical doctrine of "notice and consent" remains fundamentally flawed when applied to asymmetric employment relationships. An informal worker or platform delivery partner does not possess equal bargaining power to withhold consent for invasive data harvesting. The continuous collection of live telemetry, customer ratings, route deviations, and biometric identifiers creates profound informational asymmetry.[9] Without stringent statutory firewalls preventing the commercial exploitation and unauthorized inter-departmental linkage of worker registries, DPI infrastructure risks morphing into an apparatus of continuous labor surveillance.

5. Systemic Vulnerabilities and Implementation Gaps

- **Biometric Deterioration and Administrative Exclusion:** Manual laborers regularly face e-KYC rejection rates due to worn papillary ridges on fingertips, leading to systemic exclusion from statutory pensions and food subsidies.

- **Federal Interoperability Deficits:** State-level welfare boards (such as Building and Other Construction Workers Boards) continue to operate in digital silos, preventing seamless cross-state transferability of accrued welfare funds for inter-state migrant

[7] Mark Graham, Isis Hjorth and Vili Lehdonvirta, 'Digital Labour and Development: Impacts of Global Digital Labour Platforms and the Gig Economy on Worker Livelihoods' (2017) 23(2) *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research* 135, 141.
[8] *The Indian Federation of App-based Transport Workers (IFAT) v. Union of India* (Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1068 of 2021) (seeking declaration of gig workers as "unorganised workers" entitled to statutory social security under Article 21).
[9] Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power* (PublicAffairs 2019) 178-182.

laborers.[10]

- **Absence of Human-Centric Redressal Mechanisms:** When digital identity mismatches or algorithmic deactivations occur, workers are confronted by automated interactive voice responses (IVRs) and chatbots, lacking accessible human administrative recourse.

[10] Supreme Court of India, *In Re: Problems and Miseries of Migrant Labourers* (Suo Motu Writ Petition (Civil) No. 6 of 2020) (directing the universal registration of unorganized workers and interstate portability of welfare schemes).