POLICY NOTE

FROM PRINCIPLES TO PRACTICE: THE G20 AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF PEOPLE-CENTRIC DPI THROUGH SUBNATIONAL GOVERNMENTS

Mauro Solano, Observatory of Social and Economic Trends; Insight 21, Universidad Siglo 21

WORKSTREAM 3
BOOSTING INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES, INCLUDING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

2026

T20 U.S.
An informal engagement of global think tanks

From Principles to Practice: The G20 and the Construction of People-Centric DPI Through Subnational Governments

Mauro Solano (Director, Observatory of Social and Economic Trends; Insight 21, Universidad Siglo 21)

Abstract

The Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) agenda consolidated at the G20 under India's presidency in 2023 established a globally recognized set of technical and normative principles. Three years later, a structural paradox persists: DPI commitments are negotiated and adopted at the national level, while the public policies that most directly shape people's daily lives (health, education, security, social protection) are the responsibility of subnational governments. The disconnection between where DPI is designed and where citizenship is exercised is a principal obstacle to genuinely people-centric infrastructure.

The dominant challenge of the DPI agenda is no longer conceptual but one of multilevel governance. Across Latin America, provincial, state and municipal governments operate with heterogeneous capacities, fragmented regulatory frameworks and limited vertical coordination, producing digital infrastructures that replicate technical standards without grounding in local demand. The result is a DPI that speaks the language of global forums but fails to reach those it is meant to serve: in the seven Latin American countries surveyed by the OECD, national digital identity systems reach online public services in only four, and their governance covers central government almost exclusively.

Drawing on the literature on multilevel governance and digital state capacities, the paper identifies three conditions for DPI with genuine citizen ownership: data architectures with governance distributed across levels of government; participation and accountability mechanisms accessible to non-technical actors at the local scale; and subnational capacity-building strategies that are sustainable over time.

Recommendations to the G20 propose a dual movement: that the forum generate the normative, technical and financial conditions for countries to align DPI commitments with subnational governance structures; and, on the other hand, that it direct the institutions that actually deliver (the regional development banks, working with UNDP and ITU) to anchor South-South cooperation in local implementation experience, recognizing that the most replicable solutions in contexts of heterogeneous state capacity emerge from within the region itself.

DISCLAIMER: This Policy Note, authored independently and subjected to peer review, presents the views and opinions of its writers. These do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the T20 U.S. Summit Secretariat.

Policy Implementation Roadmap

Diagnosis

DPI commitments are negotiated nationally but executed subnationally, without a governance architecture bridging the two, leaving digital infrastructure technically compliant but institutionally fragile and citizen-distant.

Stakeholders

- **Lead:** G20 Digital Economy Working Group (DEWG), with the Sherpa Track and national digital government ministries.
- **Execution:** Subnational governments; regional MDBs (IDB, CAF); national digital coordination bodies; local civil society.

Action Plan

- **Capacity:** Training for subnational officials on DPI governance and citizen-centred service design, co-designed with IDB, UNDP and CAF.
- **Infrastructure:** Federated data-exchange and digital identity layers extending national systems, including existing repositories down to the subnational level.
- **Funding:** Dedicated subnational DPI window within existing MDB instruments, plus a South-South exchange fund.
- **Regulatory:** Subnational governance component required in national DPI strategies reported to the G20; the 2023 G20 DPI Framework provides the normative basis, which governments must then translate into domestic statute and regulation.

Implementation Steps

- **Guiding questions:** Does the national strategy define vertical coordination mechanisms? Are subnational actors represented in DPI governance bodies? Is there a legal basis for cross-level data sharing? Can citizens reach grievance mechanisms locally?
- **Criteria:** Subnational inclusion in governance design; legal interoperability across levels; measurable local access; reduction of territorial digital inequality.

Timeframe

- **Short (6–12 months):** DEWG endorses the subnational governance requirement; pilot capacity mapping in Brazil, Argentina and Mexico.
- **Medium (2–4 years):** South-South platform launched by the IDB and CAF, extending the Global DPI Repository to subnational cases; subnational maturity index developed.
- **Long (5+ years):** Subnational governance integrated into G20 DPI reporting cycles; peer review institutionalised.

Spaces for Articulation

G20 DEWG and Sherpa Track; Global DPI Repository (dpi.global), expanded to subnational cases; IDB and CAF governing bodies; CLAD congresses; UN World Data Forum and Global Digital Compact follow-up.

Funding and Budgetary Considerations

Estimates are benchmarked on existing MDB subnational digital transformation operations (principally PRODIGITAL–IDB–BNDES, Brazil) and on the G20 Social Impact Fund.[1]

- **Minimum (USD 5–10M):** Platform only, covering registry, secretariat and peer exchange.
- **Target (USD 25–50M):** Platform plus targeted technical assistance; comparable to the Social Impact Fund (USD 25M) and a mid-scale state operation (Piauí, USD 50M).
- **Maximum (USD 150–180M):** Dedicated lending window at PRODIGITAL scale (USD 180M), with individual subnational projects of USD 2–40M.

Monitoring and Accountability

- **Standards:** World Bank DPI Maturity Index; OECD Digital Government Index; CEPALSTAT subnational statistics.
- **Success:** Share of national strategies with a subnational component; subnational entities with interoperable access; narrowing metropolitan/non-metropolitan access gap.
- **Failure signals:** Persistent absence of vertical coordination; widening territorial digital inequality; no locally accessible grievance channels.

Conclusion & Next Steps

This roadmap extends the 2023 New Delhi mandate for accountable and inclusive DPI to the level where services are actually delivered. The win-win is clear: northern members gain credibility for frameworks that demonstrably reach citizens; southern members gain support to close a gap that is also one of territorial inequality.

The Challenge

A Promising Agenda with a Structural Gap

[1] Inter-American Development Bank, "IDB and BNDES to Accelerate Digital Transformation in Brazilian States and Municipalities with $180 Million in Financing" (PRODIGITAL), 2024, https://www.iadb.org/en/news/idb-and-bndes-accelerate-digital-transformation-brazilian-states-and-municipalities-180-million ; IDB, "IDB Approves Financing to Support Digital Transformation and Use of Artificial Intelligence in Piauí, Brazil," September 2025, https://www.iadb.org/en/news/idb-approves-financing-support-digital-transformation-and-use-artificial-intelligence-piaui-brazil ; and Government of India, Global DPI Repository and Social Impact Fund announcement, November 2023, https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleaseIframePage.aspx?PRID=1979113 .

The mainstreaming of Digital Public Infrastructure at the G20 represented a genuine inflection point in global digital governance. Under India's 2023 presidency, G20 members endorsed the *G20 Framework for Systems of Digital Public Infrastructure*, which defined DPI as shared digital systems built on open technology standards, designed to enable interoperability, inclusiveness, and accountable service delivery at scale.[2] The New Delhi Leaders' Declaration further recognized DPI as a driver of socioeconomic development and called for multilateral cooperation to support its deployment in low- and middle-income countries.[3]

There was almost universal agreement. That consensus took DPI from a contested concept, largely associated with India's own experiences of Aadhaar and UPI, to a common reference framework that subsequent G20 presidencies, namely, Brazil in 2024 and South Africa in 2025, continued to elaborate, adding dimensions of equitable data governance, AI integration and sectoral applications.

India's presidency also produced instruments to operationalize the agenda. The G20 Digital Economy Ministers acknowledged 'the existing gap in information and knowledge sharing on DPI' and endorsed a Global Digital Public Infrastructure Repository (GDPIR), a centralized hub of lessons and governance frameworks from G20 members, alongside a Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMIC) playbook and a Social Impact Fund with an initial Indian commitment of USD 25 million.[4] These instruments were designed to address the knowledge gap between countries at the national level. Yet as recent analysis of the G20's evolving digital agenda has noted, they have produced a fragmented landscape in which DPI concepts circulate across multiple forums without the cross-fertilization needed to improve implementation outcomes (particularly at the subnational level, where services are delivered).[5]

As the agenda matured, a structural gap became visible. Global frameworks describe what DPI should do (enable inclusive, interoperable, accountable service delivery) but they are designed and endorsed at the national level, while the services they purport to enable are overwhelmingly delivered at the subnational level. Health, education, social assistance registries, public safety and civil registration are, in most multilevel systems, the

[2] G20 India. "G20 Framework for Systems of Digital Public Infrastructure." Annexed to the New Delhi Leaders' Declaration, September 9, 2023. https://g20.utoronto.ca/2023/230909-declaration.html

[3] G20 India. New Delhi Leaders' Declaration. September 9, 2023. https://g20.utoronto.ca/2023/230909-declaration.html

[4] G20 India. Digital Economy Ministers Meeting Outcome Document and Chair Summary, August 19, 2023, point 11. https://g7g20-documents.org/database/document/2023-g20-india-sherpa-track-digital-economy-ministers-ministers-language-g20-digital-economy-ministers-meeting-outcome-document-and-chair-summary

[5] Joshi, Divij. "Digital Public Infrastructure at the G20: Tensions, Commitments and Continuities." ODI Global Insights, May 2026. https://odi.org/en/insights/digital-public-infrastructure-at-the-g20-tensions-commitments-and-continuities/

responsibility of provinces, states and municipalities. This is not a regional peculiarity: the OECD–UCLG World Observatory, covering 135 federal and unitary countries, finds education and health to be the largest areas of subnational spending, with subnational governments accounting for roughly 40% of public expenditure and 58% of public investment across OECD members.[6] Two distinct problems follow, and conflating them weakens both. The first is a question of federalism: where authority over DPI design and data governance sits, and whether subnational governments hold any of it. The second is a question of delivery: whether DPI reaches citizens at the last mile, wherever it was designed. Decentralised delivery can be built from the centre; devolved governance cannot. The recommendations below address the first, because the second does not resolve it.

The consequence is a structural misalignment: national governments sign DPI commitments at G20 forums and adopt national digital strategies that comply with international frameworks, while subnational governments, those closest to citizens, operate in a different institutional space, often without the technical capacity, legal authority, data governance frameworks, or financial resources to translate those commitments into locally accountable services.

The Subnational Reality in Latin America

Latin America illustrates the gap starkly. The OECD's *Government at a Glance: Latin America and the Caribbean 2024* found that although all surveyed LAC countries have adopted interoperability frameworks at the central level, digital identity governance and data exchange rarely extend coherently to subnational actors.[7] National identity systems open access to online services in only four of seven countries, and their governance covers central government almost exclusively.

Research on municipal digital transformation in Argentina documents a picture of profound heterogeneity: metropolitan municipalities with sophisticated digital units coexist with smaller jurisdictions lacking basic data infrastructure, connectivity, or trained personnel.[8] This heterogeneity is not merely a resource problem. It reflects an institutional gap: there is no systematic architecture for vertical coordination between national DPI commitments and subnational implementation realities. Nor are subnational architectures uniform across the G20. State governors, provinces, devolved administrations and municipalities differ in competence, resources and political mandate, and no single

[6] OECD and UCLG. 2022 Synthesis Report: World Observatory on Subnational Government Finance and Investment. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1787/b80a8cdb-en

[7] OECD. Government at a Glance: Latin America and the Caribbean 2024. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2024, pp. 224–226. https://doi.org/10.1787/4abdba16-en

[8] González Chmielewski, Demian and Amalia Peralta. "Transformación pública digital: la agenda municipal." Documento de Políticas Públicas No. 246. Buenos Aires: CIPPEC, July 2024. https://www.cippec.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/DPP-246-EyG-Transformacion-publica-digital-la-agenda-municipal-07.24.pdf

template will fit them. Municipal government is the most standardised of these tiers, which makes it the most tractable point of entry (a starting point for the agenda rather than the whole of it).

India, the G20's foremost DPI champion, is instructive precisely because it separates the two. India's DPI was designed from the outset with a logic of last-mile inclusion: the JAM Trinity, and a nationwide network of Common Service Centres operated by village-level entrepreneurs, carried welfare delivery into rural districts.[9] Real scale followed. Yet remote and tribal populations still faced exclusion through connectivity barriers, inconsistent state databases, and weak local grievance mechanisms. As subsequent analysis notes, the next generation of challenges will only be addressed 'if digital systems are complemented by last-mile support.'[10] In practice that means assisted service points, offline alternatives, and functioning local grievance channels. India therefore illustrates the second problem rather than the first. Common Service Centres are a national programme run in cooperation with states: a special-purpose vehicle under the Union IT Ministry sets service design and national partnerships, state agencies facilitate integration with state schemes, and village-level entrepreneurs operate the access points. Last-mile reach was achieved without devolving governance. Deconcentrated delivery is an achievement, but it is not subnational ownership, and it does not produce the local accountability people-centric DPI requires.

The challenge, in other words, is not primarily technical. It is one of multilevel governance: the distribution of authority, responsibility, and resources across levels of government in ways that allow commitments made at one level to be translated into accountable action at another. But proximity is a necessary condition for people-centric DPI, not a sufficient one: subnational governments are not automatically more accountable or more representative than national ones, and devolution without local oversight can reproduce capture rather than cure it. The conditions set out here therefore turn on accountability mechanisms and data governance, not on the transfer of authority alone.

Multilevel Governance and the DPI Blind Spot

Hooghe and Marks' theory of multilevel governance (MLG) conceptualizes the dispersal of authoritative decision-making across territorial levels and the coordination mechanisms

[9] Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (India), “Common Services Centres,” Digital India, https://www.digitalindia.gov.in/initiative/common-services-centres/. On the three-tier structure of the scheme (the CSC e-Governance Services India Limited special-purpose vehicle, State Designated Agencies and Village Level Entrepreneurs) see IMPRI Impact and Policy Research Institute, “Bridging the Digital Divide: Evaluating the Common Services Centres (CSC) Scheme in India,” June 2025, https://www.impriindia.com/insights/common-services-centres-scheme-india/.

[10] Observer Research Foundation. "India's DPI 2.0: From UPI to Universal Data Empowerment." ORF Expert Speak, February 2026. https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/india-s-dpi-2-0-from-upi-to-universal-data-empowerment

this requires.[11] MLG scholarship has consistently found that the effectiveness of policy commitments depends not only on their design at the top but on the institutional architecture that links different levels of government in their implementation. A parallel literature adds what a purely territorial lens misses. Ostrom's work on polycentric governance, recently applied to DPI, describes systems governed through multiple overlapping decision centres rather than a single hierarchy (public agencies, private providers, and standards bodies each holding partial authority). Brazil's PIX, where the central bank convenes a standing multi-stakeholder forum, is a working instance.[12] Multilevel governance explains the vertical gap; polycentricity explains why filling it cannot mean simply relocating authority one tier down.

Applied to DPI, the lens reveals a blind spot: however sophisticated technically, the G20's frameworks treat the nation-state as the primary unit of analysis and implementation. They specify what principles national systems should embody, what interoperability standards they should adopt, and what governance safeguards they should establish. But they do not address the question of how those national commitments should be vertically articulated with subnational governments that hold primary responsibility for the services DPI is supposed to enable.

This is not a trivial omission. In multilevel systems, national strategies that lack subnational governance components reproduce what Falleti characterizes as unfunded administrative decentralization: the transfer of service delivery responsibilities to subnational governments without the corresponding fiscal resources to discharge them.[13] DPI extends the same dynamic to technical and institutional capacity. The risk is precisely this: that national frameworks become technically credible at the international level while remaining institutionally hollow at the level where citizens actually encounter digital public services.

Recommendations and Next Steps

The following two recommendations are directed at the G20 as a forum, and are designed to be actionable within its existing working group structure. They reflect the dual

---

[11] Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks. "Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-Level Governance." American Political Science Review 97, no. 2 (2003): 233–243, at 233 and 239. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Liesbet-Hooghe/publication/248233581_Unraveling_the_Central_State_but_How_Types_of_Multi-level_Governance

[12] Ostrom, Elinor. “Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems.” American Economic Review 100, no. 3 (2010): 641–672, at 643. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.3.641; Schoemaker, Emrys, and Siddharth Peter de Souza. “Inclusive Digital Public Infrastructure Expands Public Power and Value.” Tech Policy Press, November 5, 2025. https://www.techpolicy.press/inclusive-digital-public-infrastructure-expands-public-power-and-value/

[13] Falleti, Tulia G. Decentralization and Subnational Politics in Latin America. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010, 35.

movement identified in the abstract: a facilitating role toward national governments, and a cooperative role toward South-South exchange.

Recommendation 1: Require a Subnational Governance Component in National DPI Frameworks as a Condition of G20 Reporting

The G20's 2023 DPI Framework is voluntary and suggestive, not binding. Nevertheless, it has functioned as a powerful normative anchor: countries that wish to demonstrate DPI credibility at the G20 align their national strategies with its principles.[14] That influence can be put to work: the G20 should use it to establish a subnational governance component as an expected element of national DPI strategies reported to the Digital Economy Working Group. No such requirement exists today: DPI progress reaches the G20 through voluntary contributions to the GDPIR and annual ministerial declarations, and compliance is tracked externally rather than self-reported. Concretely: reporting by national DPI focal points to the DEWG, for peer review rather than compliance scoring, with independent assessment supplied externally (a natural fit for the T20's New Alignment initiative, given the G20's thin institutional form). On the division of labour: the UN DPI Safeguards Framework carries the normative depth on rights and inclusion; the G20 supplies agenda-setting reach across the economies that build most DPI; the MDBs hold the only instrument approaching enforcement, lending conditionality. This recommendation goes to the G20 because agenda-setting is what it can do, and it is designed to feed the other two rather than duplicate them.

This component should address at minimum three dimensions: first, vertical coordination mechanisms, formal or informal, between national DPI governance bodies and subnational governments; second, data-sharing frameworks that enable subnational actors to connect to national data exchange layers without surrendering institutional autonomy; [15] and third, accountability mechanisms accessible to citizens at the local level, including grievance channels for DPI-enabled services delivered by subnational governments. One limit should be stated plainly. The force of this instrument is normative, not legal: the binding step occurs domestically, when governments translate G20 commitments into the statutes that govern subnational data sharing and service delivery. What the G20 can supply is the expectation that triggers that translation. Practical instruments for this already exist: the policymaker toolkit produced by the Project Liberty Institute and the Global Solutions

[14] Leukes, Pierrinne, Ibrahim Mama Hussein, Ritul Gaur, and Arielle Diamond. "Policy Plumbing of Digital Public Infrastructure: Instruments for Effective Implementation." T20 South Africa Policy Brief, November 2025. https://t20southafrica.org/publications/policy-plumbing-of-digital-public-infrastructure/

[15] Estévez, Elsa and Mauro Solano. Gobernanza de datos para la transformación digital del Estado. Buenos Aires: CIPPEC, August 2023. https://www.cippec.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Documento-3.0-Gobernanza-de-datos-para-la-transformacion-digita-del-Estado.pdf

Initiative sets out design choices for citizen-facing digital infrastructure that subnational governments can adopt without building frameworks from scratch. [16]

This recommendation does not require a new institutional architecture. It works within the existing DEWG reporting cycle, building on the precedent established by Brazil's 2024 G20 Declaration on DPI, AI and Data for Governance, which explicitly recognized the importance of equitable data governance as a condition for DPI's transformative potential.

The OECD's Digital Government Outlook 2026 found that 75% of OECD countries include subnational governments in their strategic digital frameworks (a benchmark that LAC G20 members have not yet reached consistently).[17] Making subnational governance an expected component of G20 DPI reporting would create a meaningful incentive for national governments to close this gap. The G20 also has an existing channel for the subnational voice this recommendation presupposes. The Urban 20, an official G20 engagement group convened by C40 Cities and United Cities and Local Governments, brings mayors from more than thirty G20 cities into the process through their own city sherpas and delivers a communiqué to the Presidency; its 2026 edition is co-chaired by Los Angeles and New York under the United States presidency. Inviting U20 input on the subnational component of national DPI strategies would cost the DEWG nothing institutionally and would give the requirement a constituency.

In brief: The G20 DEWG should adopt guidelines requiring that national DPI strategies submitted for G20 review include an explicit subnational governance component, covering vertical coordination mechanisms, interoperable data-sharing frameworks across government levels, and locally accessible citizen accountability mechanisms.

Recommendation 2: Establish a South-South Cooperation Platform for Subnational DPI Implementation, Anchored in Regional MDBs

The most replicable lessons for heterogeneous institutional contexts rarely come from the flagship national systems of advanced economies, but from contexts sharing similar constraints: limited fiscal space, fragmented data systems, shortages of specialized technical personnel, and the need to design services for populations with variable digital literacy.

---

[16] Nicole, Sarah, Vidisha Mishra, Jeb Bell, Christian Kastrop and Mateo Rodriguez. Digital Infrastructure Solutions to Empower Citizens: A Toolkit for Policymakers. Project Liberty Institute and Global Solutions Initiative, May 2025. https://www.global-solutions-initiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/PL_PLI-GSI-Toolkit_v3.pdf

[17] OECD. Digital Government Outlook 2026. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2026, 42. https://doi.org/10.1787/0496b2bc-en. The report notes that 27 out of 36 OECD countries (75%) include subnational governments in their strategic digital frameworks.

Latin America has accumulated significant, if uneven, experience in subnational digital transformation: from municipal data governance initiatives in large cities to provincial interoperability projects in federal systems.[18] This experience exists but is poorly documented, weakly disseminated, and not systematically available to subnational governments facing similar challenges in other LAC countries or across the Global South.

The G20 should direct the IDB and CAF to establish a South-South cooperation platform focused on subnational DPI governance. It would complement existing instruments, including the Global DPI Repository, by prioritising subnational experience and peer exchange over documentation: where the GDPIR catalogues what countries have built, this platform would capture how subnational governments have governed and made accountable the systems they operate.

It would support three activities: a registry of subnational DPI initiatives with standardized data on governance models, legal frameworks and citizen-facing outcomes; facilitated peer exchange between governments facing similar challenges; and technical assistance for those designing locally accountable governance architectures.

Financing this platform is feasible within existing MDB mandates. Both the IDB and CAF have established digital transformation lending and technical assistance programs; a subnational DPI cooperation window would represent an extension, not a departure, from their current portfolios.[19] The G20's One Future Alliance, launched in 2023 to support DPI in low- and middle-income countries, could also contribute to its capitalization. The MDBs also need not act alone. UNDP extended DPI support to 25 countries in 2024 and names the digitalization of public services at the subnational level a priority of its governance programme, while ITU contributes standards and capacity development; their joint Digital Support Facility for the Caribbean, launched with CAF, is a working precedent for the arrangement proposed here.

In brief: The G20 should mandate the IDB and CAF to co-design and capitalize a South-South cooperation platform for subnational DPI governance, with a dedicated registry of local implementation experiences, peer-exchange mechanisms, and targeted technical assistance for subnational governments in the LAC region and beyond.

The G20's Enduring Role in support of DPI: Facilitator and Connector

As DPI continues to evolve (absorbing AI governance, expanding into new sectors, proliferating across forums), the G20 cannot be the venue where every technical question

[18] González Chmielewski, Demian and Amalia Peralta. "Transformación pública digital: la agenda municipal." Op. cit.

[19] Inter-American Development Bank. "Digital Government." IDB Sector Note. Washington D.C.: IDB, 2023. https://www.iadb.org/en/sector/digital-government

is resolved. But it can be where the institutional conditions for people-centric DPI are set: conditions that extend the agenda beyond national capitals and into the spaces where citizens actually live. This is a question of global governance, not only of development cooperation: a G20 commitment that cannot be traced to the level where services are delivered is a commitment without a verifiable subject.

It is a structural feature of multilevel states generally, federal and unitary alike, and it travels directly into the next two presidencies: the United Kingdom in 2027, where health and education are devolved, and social care sits with local authorities, and the Republic of Korea in 2028, with its strong metropolitan and provincial tier. The depth of the gap varies with the degree of devolution; its existence does not. Latin America supplies the evidentiary base for this paper, not the boundary of its claim. The gap is also one of territorial digital inequality: ECLAC records connectivity reaching as little as 12% of households in the lowest income quintile against over 80% in the highest.[20] ECLAC's subnational accounts for eleven Latin American countries record per capita GDP ranging from around a fifth of the national average in some jurisdictions to more than 140% of it in others.[21] Without deliberate subnational governance, DPI risks amplifying these inequalities rather than addressing them.

By making subnational governance a condition of DPI legitimacy, and by mobilizing the institutions that actually deliver (regional development banks alongside the UNDP and ITU) to support local implementation, the G20 can ensure that its DPI agenda outlasts any single presidency and remains connected to the daily realities of the people it is designed to serve, delivering not only efficiency but equity.

[20] ECLAC. Sixth Regional Seminar on Social Development: "Inequality and Digital Inclusion: Challenges and Opportunities for Inclusive Social Development in Latin America and the Caribbean." Santiago: ECLAC, June 2026. https://www.cepal.org/en/notes/inequality-and-digital-inclusion-challenges-and-opportunities-inclusive-social-development

[21] ECLAC. Statistical Yearbook for Latin America and the Caribbean 2024. Santiago: ECLAC, 2024, 44, indicator 2.1.13 (share of per capita subnational GDP in national GDP, eleven Latin American countries). https://repositorio.cepal.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/9e2080ce-41d9-4d2d-9386-fb4a1f13a071/content

Reference List

ECLAC. Sixth Regional Seminar on Social Development: "Inequality and Digital Inclusion: Challenges and Opportunities for Inclusive Social Development in Latin America and the Caribbean." Santiago: ECLAC, June 2026. https://www.cepal.org/en/notes/inequality-and-digital-inclusion-challenges-and-opportunities-inclusive-social-development

ECLAC. Statistical Yearbook for Latin America and the Caribbean 2024. Santiago: ECLAC, 2024. https://www.cepal.org/en/pressreleases/eclac-launches-new-edition-its-statistical-yearbook-relevant-data-latin-america-and

Estévez, Elsa and Mauro Solano. Gobernanza de datos para la transformación digital del Estado. Buenos Aires: CIPPEC, August 2023. https://www.cippec.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Documento-3.0-Gobernanza-de-datos-para-la-transformacion-digita-del-Estado.pdf

Falleti, Tulia G. Decentralization and Subnational Politics in Latin America. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

G20 Brazil. "Joint Declaration on Digital Public Infrastructure, AI and Data for Governance." G20 Troika Communiqué. Rio de Janeiro, 2024. https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2074832

G20 India. Digital Economy Ministers Meeting Outcome Document and Chair Summary. August 19, 2023. https://g7g20-documents.org/database/document/2023-g20-india-sherpa-track-digital-economy-ministers-ministers-language-g20-digital-economy-ministers-meeting-outcome-document-and-chair-summary

G20 India. New Delhi Leaders' Declaration. September 9, 2023. https://g20.utoronto.ca/2023/230909-declaration.html

G20 India. "G20 Framework for Systems of Digital Public Infrastructure." Annexed to the New Delhi Leaders' Declaration. September 2023.

González Chmielewski, Demian and Amalia Peralta. "Transformación pública digital: la agenda municipal." Documento de Políticas Públicas No. 246. Buenos Aires: CIPPEC, July 2024. https://www.cippec.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/DPP-246-EyG-Transformacion-publica-digital-la-agenda-municipal-07.24.pdf

Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks. "Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-Level Governance." American Political Science Review 97, no. 2 (2003): 233–243.

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Liesbet-Hooghe/publication/248233581_Unraveling_the_Central_State_but_How_Types_of_Multi-level_Governance

IMPRI Impact and Policy Research Institute. “Bridging the Digital Divide: Evaluating the Common Services Centres (CSC) Scheme in India.” June 2025. https://www.impriindia.com/insights/common-services-centres-scheme-india/

Inter-American Development Bank. “Digital Government.” IDB Sector Note. Washington D.C.: IDB, 2023. https://www.iadb.org/en/sector/digital-government

Inter-American Development Bank. “IDB and BNDES to Accelerate Digital Transformation in Brazilian States and Municipalities with $180 Million in Financing.” Washington D.C.: IDB, 2024. https://www.iadb.org/en/news/idb-and-bndes-accelerate-digital-transformation-brazilian-states-and-municipalities-180-million

Inter-American Development Bank. “IDB Approves Financing to Support Digital Transformation and Use of Artificial Intelligence in Piauí, Brazil.” Washington D.C.: IDB, September 2025. https://www.iadb.org/en/news/idb-approves-financing-support-digital-transformation-and-use-artificial-intelligence-piaui-brazil

Joshi, Divij. “Digital Public Infrastructure at the G20: Tensions, Commitments and Continuities.” ODI Global Insights, May 2026. https://odi.org/en/insights/digital-public-infrastructure-at-the-g20-tensions-commitments-and-continuities/

Leukes, Pierrinne, Ibrahim Mama Hussein, Ritul Gaur, and Arielle Diamond. “Policy Plumbing of Digital Public Infrastructure: Instruments for Effective Implementation.” T20 South Africa Policy Brief, November 2025. https://t20southafrica.org/publications/policy-plumbing-of-digital-public-infrastructure/

Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (India). “Common Services Centres.” Digital India. https://www.digitalindia.gov.in/initiative/common-services-centres/

Nicole, Sarah, Vidisha Mishra, Jeb Bell, Christian Kastrop and Mateo Rodriguez. Digital Infrastructure Solutions to Empower Citizens: A Toolkit for Policymakers. Project Liberty Institute and Global Solutions Initiative, May 2025. https://www.global-solutions-initiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/PL_PLI-GSI-Toolkit_v3.pdf

OECD. “Digital Public Infrastructure for Digital Governments.” OECD Public Governance Policy Papers, No. 68. Paris: OECD Publishing, December 2024. https://doi.org/10.1787/ff525dc8-en

OECD. Digital Government Outlook 2026. Paris: OECD Publishing, June 2026. https://doi.org/10.1787/0496b2bc-en

OECD. Government at a Glance: Latin America and the Caribbean 2024. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1787/4abdba16-en

OECD and UCLG. 2022 Synthesis Report: World Observatory on Subnational Government Finance and Investment. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1787/b80a8cdb-en

Observer Research Foundation. "India's DPI 2.0: From UPI to Universal Data Empowerment." ORF Expert Speak, February 2026. https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/india-s-dpi-2-0-from-upi-to-universal-data-empowerment

Ostrom, Elinor. "Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems." American Economic Review 100, no. 3 (2010): 641–672. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.3.641

Schoemaker, Emrys, and Siddharth Peter de Souza. "Inclusive Digital Public Infrastructure Expands Public Power and Value." Tech Policy Press, November 5, 2025. https://www.techpolicy.press/inclusive-digital-public-infrastructure-expands-public-power-and-value/

Urban 20. "U20 Process" and "2026 — Los Angeles & New York City." Urban 20, convened by C40 Cities and United Cities and Local Governments. https://www.urban20.org/u20-process/