ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue IV, April 2026

# Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC):A Comparative Conceptual Review of India and Global Economies

**Vidhya V, Dr. J. Sofia Vincent**

**Department of Management Studies, Panimalar Engineering College**

**DOI: https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.150400047**

**Received: 09 April 2026; Accepted: 14 April 2026; Published: 06 May 2026**

## ABSTRACT

Sovereign digital money is becoming a policy reality in economies at every level of development, rather than just a theoretical idea. By comparing India's e-Rupee project with initiatives in China, the European Union, the United States, the Bahamas, Nigeria, and Sweden, this study examines the conceptual, technological, and macroeconomic aspects of Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs). Based on an interdisciplinary evaluation of current research (Agur et al., 2022; Cunha et al., 2021; Kosse & Mattei, 2023), the study unifies regulatory ideologies, architectural decisions, and disparate national agendas into a single analytical framework. A sizable body of research warns against underestimating privacy erosion, disintermediation pressure on commercial banks, and growing cyber threats (Tronnier & Qiu, 2024; Wenker, 2022; Vucic & Luburic, 2022), despite the transformative promise of CBDCs encompassing monetary policy precision, payment system modernization, and financial inclusion (Yang & Zhou, 2022; Echarte Fernandez et al., 2021). With India serving as the main reference case, the study summarizes these conflicts and suggests a five-pillar governance architecture adapted to the circumstances of rising market countries.

**Keywords:** Central Bank Digital Currency, e-Rupee, Digital Money, Reserve Bank of India, Financial Inclusion, Monetary Policy, Blockchain, Fintech.

## INTRODUCTION

Seldom does money remain motionless. It has evolved over ages from metals and shells to printed money and, more recently, to strings of cryptographic data under the control of independent organizations. Peneder (2022) describes this development as a qualitative rearrangement of the nature of monetary exchange itself, where the underlying token becomes an informational substrate instead of a physical one. At the forefront of this restructuring are CBDCs, which are legally recognized digital instruments issued by the state that mimic a central bank's liabilities without the need for a physical representation. Importantly, this sets them apart from decentralized cryptocurrencies, which have no government guarantee and whose value is determined more by speculation than by monetary policy (Cunha et al., 2021; Kayani & Hasan,2024).

CBDC development has moved from scholarly discourse into operational policy due to a number of convergent pressures. Over the past ten years, the use of cash has drastically decreased in sophisticated economies (Hrvatska narodna banka, 2019). Stablecoins and private payment systems have filled the void in ways that give rise to valid concerns over monetary sovereignty. CBDCs have been suggested as a means of expanding the monetary system's reach into the gaps left by the large populations in the developing world who are still denied access to official financial services (Nanez Alonso et al., 2020; Nanez Alonso et al., 2021). The COVID-19 epidemic increased the urgency by highlighting the shortcomings of cash-dependent disbursement infrastructure as well as the importance of direct digital transfers in crisis response (Echarte Fernández et al., 2021).

India's place in this landscape is structurally unique. Through the Unified Payments Interface (UPI), the nation has developed one of the most advanced retail payment ecosystems in the world, and studies show that Indian consumers' cumulative digital payment experience produces a quantifiable inclination toward CBDC adoption (Gupta et al., 2023). In October 2022, the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) published a concept note outlining its goals for digital currency. This was followed by a series of pilot programs in the wholesale and retail sectors.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue IV, April 2026

Studying India alongside peer economies offers an exceptionally rich foundation for comparative study because each jurisdiction represents unique decisions regarding who owns digital currency, who can use it, and what restrictions apply to its use.

The theoretical origins and classification of CBDCs; technological and design trade-offs in their architecture; country-specific implementation trajectories; a cross-national attribute comparison; macroeconomic and stability implications; and a policy synthesis are the six main questions that make up this paper. To place findings within the expanding global body of evidence, each part specifically references recent peer-reviewed research.

## Conceptual Foundations of CBDC

### Definition and Taxonomy

Fundamentally, a CBDC is a digital claim on a central bank that has the same legal tender status as actual money and is valued in the sovereign unit of account. This liability structure sets it apart from commercial bank deposits or privately issued e-money, whose security is dependent on the solvency of the issuing institution rather than government support (Cunha et al., 2021). The accounting implications of this distinction are significant because, in contrast to traditional digital assets, CBDC is neither a speculative instrument nor a financial investment, and its inclusion on institutional balance sheets presents new challenges for both regulators and auditors (Alsalmi et al., 2023).

CBDCs split along two main axes in terms of taxonomy. The first is the access boundary: wholesale CBDCs are limited to regulated financial intermediaries for the purposes of reserve management and interbank settlement, whereas retail CBDCs are available to any member of the public and serve as a digital equivalent of banknotes. The second axis relates to identity: token-based systems incorporate value into the instrument itself, allowing transfers without prior identity verification, while account-based systems require verified user credentials and link each transaction to an authenticated identity (Agur et al., 2022; Wenker, 2022). Tronnier and Qiu (2024) have empirically confirmed that identity disclosure requirements dramatically reduce adoption intentions among privacy-conscious user segments, indicating that this second axis is closely related to privacy protection.

### Theoretical Foundations and Scholarly Debates

There are multiple streams of monetary economics in the conceptual lineage of CBDCs. The aggregate welfare implications of central bank digital issuance were modeled in early theoretical work, which predicted positive GDP impacts due to decreased interest rate distortions and lower taxes associated to seigniorage (Barrdear & Kumhof, 2016). The relationship between CBDC and the shadow economy has been the subject of more recent contributions: Through a formal model, Oh and Zhang (2022) show how the traceability built into CBDC systems reduces the competitive advantage that physical cash gives to operators in the informal sector, reducing undeclared economic activity and increasing the fiscal base. This result has significant implications for economies like India, where informal activity is still significant.

As a novel tool, CBDC has received more attention in the literature on monetary policy transmission. According to Yang and Zhou (2022), the issuing of CBDCs reduces leakage through cash hoarding and unofficial financial channels, strengthening the central bank's control over the money supply. This theoretical work was given empirical urgency by the COVID-19 episode: Echarte Fernández et al. (2021) describe how the fiscal-monetary restrictions revealed during the pandemic motivated central banks to use CBDC as a method for quick, focused stimulus delivery. From a different perspective, Ozili (2022) contends that CBDC's programmability—the capacity to incorporate conditional spending regulations into the currency itself—opens up new avenues for encouraging circular economic behavior and tying monetary design to environmental goals. Empirical research is also being done on the effects of CBDC advancements on the financial market: According to Helmi et al. (2023), central bank statements pertaining to CBDCs cause statistically significant responses in the cryptocurrency and equity markets, indicating that the CBDC policy signal has information value outside of the monetary domain.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue IV, April 2026

**Money's Long Transition and the Question of Sovereignty**

Peneder (2022) places CBDCs in the larger context of monetary history and contends that every significant change in the nature of money—from commodity to fiat to digital—has rearranged the interactions between issuers, users, and intermediaries. The current shift is unique in that it raises the possibility of re-centralizing the day-to-day management of transactional money, a task that has been assigned to commercial banks for centuries. There are both domestic and global ramifications to this re-centralization. Huang and Mayer (2022) place the growth of CBDCs in the context of the US and China's struggle for monetary hegemony, contending that digital currency infrastructure has turned into a strategically competitive arena. By arguing that China's digital yuan is being developed as an alternative settlement train that can route international payments outside of dollar-denominated institutions, Deng (2023) expands this argument infrastructurally. In this context, trust is a geopolitical asset rather than just a design parameter: Bodó and Janssen (2022) caution that public trust in digitalized state financial infrastructure is brittle and hard to rebuild after perceived abuse.

**Design Architecture and Technological Infrasture**

**Technology Paradigms**

Three broad technology paradigms for CBDC implementation are identified by Dashkevich et al. (2020) in their systematic review of blockchain applications in central banking: (i) fully centralized ledgers maintained solely by the central bank; (ii) permissioned distributed ledger systems in which multiple regulated nodes jointly validate transactions; and (iii) hybrid arrangements combining elements of both, frequently allocating retail settlement to a distributed layer while anchoring wholesale finality on a central ledger. In an IEEE-documented prototype, Zhang et al. (2021) formalize the third option, showing that a blockchain-anchored hybrid architecture can accomplish both regulatory auditability and retail anonymity without necessitating a binary decision between the two. After testing CBDC deployment on live blockchain infrastructure, Sethaput and Innet (2023) discovered scalability and latency trade-offs that continue to be active technical problems at commercial transaction volumes.

The choice of technology has an impact on policy results. Although centralized architectures concentrate systemic risk in a single point of failure, they provide more control over monetary policy execution and transaction monitoring. Although distributed models can incorporate privacy protections at the protocol level and increase robustness, they also complicate governance and may cause settlement ambiguity. In their analysis of China's e-CNY, Xia et al. (2023) discover that institutional legitimacy and perceived system reliability are better indicators of adoption than technological complexity in and of itself, indicating that the user-facing experience of trust is just as important as the underlying architecture.

The RBI gives digital tokens to licensed intermediaries, who then distribute them through wallet applications, as part of the current two-tier token-based approach used by India's e-Rupee. By extending the RBI's financial reach to the retail level, this strategy maintains current banking connections. According to Gupta et al. (2023), familiar interaction design considerably reduces behavioral barriers to acceptance since Indian customers with established UPI habits show more readiness to embrace CBDC wallet interfaces.

**Interoperability Across Borders**

Any CBDC system's long-term strategic worth is influenced by cross-border operability, but its domestic success also depends on how well it interacts with the current payment infrastructure. In a cross-national empirical analysis, Kosse and Mattei (2023) find that the strength of a nation's bilateral trade and remittance ties, as well as the quality of its current digital payment infrastructure, are important indicators of the future rate of CBDC adoption. Project mBridge from the BIS Innovation Hub is one example of a multilateral program that has started stress-testing multi-CBDC systems that can settle international transactions in real time without the need for correspondent banking chains. The cost-reduction potential of CBDC-enabled remittances is significant for India, whose inward remittance receipts make up the largest volume in the world. However, its realization necessitates both technical interoperability and harmonized regulatory frameworks across sending and receiving jurisdictions.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue IV, April 2026

**Privacy Architecture and Cyber Risk**

To what extent is a CBDC aware of its users? In the literature on CBDC design, this question has emerged as maybe the most politically fraught. Users in high-trust regulatory environments are willing to accept moderate transaction disclosure requirements in exchange for convenience, while those in low-trust environments view any disclosure as a deterrent, according to Tronnier and Qiu's (2024) quantification of the relationship between privacy architecture and adoption willingness. Wenker (2022) suggests a tiered anonymity architecture that strikes a practical balance between authorized law enforcement access and the realistic expectations of regular users about financial privacy, with full pseudonymity below a predetermined threshold and progressive disclosure above it. Bodó and Janssen (2022) supplement this with an institutional argument: openness regarding the storage, access, and deletion of CBDC data is not just a legal necessity but also a prerequisite for the civic legitimacy that any state-backed currency must have.

Regarding operational security, Vucňić and Luburić (2022) place CBDC in the larger context of cyber risk associated with fintech, contending that the combination of digital networks and monetary infrastructure generates attack surfaces that traditional central banking has never encountered. For any organization thinking about issuing CBDCs, their risk-based architecture suggests real-time anomaly detection, sector-wide incident response procedures, and ongoing threat modeling as minimum requirements. Aligning CBDC cybersecurity standards with global best practices will need both technological and legal work for India, whose data protection laws are still developing.

**Global CBDC Landscape: Country Case Studies**

**China: E-CNY**

The operational magnitude of China's e-CNY is unmatched by any national CBDC scheme. Since 2014, the People's Bank of China has worked to establish digital currencies; by 2023, its pilot ecosystem had hundreds of millions of registered users, dozens of cities, and transactions worth hundreds of billions of yuan. Three main adoption drivers are identified by Xia et al. (2023) in their structured adoption analysis of the e-CNY: social network effects within pilot communities, perceived transactional convenience in comparison to current mobile payment platforms (Alipay, WeChat Pay), and institutional trust in the PBoC. The governance-over-gadgetry lesson that appears repeatedly in CBDC case studies is reinforced by the fact that technological competence was ranked lower as a driver than the institutional variables.

Beyond local payment modernization, the e-CNY has a strategic significance on a global scale. Its internationalization trajectory is framed by Huang and Mayer (2022) as a deliberate attempt to undermine the structural advantages that the dollar denomination bestows on US foreign policy. Deng (2023) elaborates on this point at the infrastructure level, contending that the cross-border architecture of the e-CNY is being purposefully created as a transaction routing substitute for SWIFT with the long-term goal of establishing a parallel monetary order less vulnerable to coercion based on sanctions. Geopolitical alignments and third-country central banks' readiness to take on PBoC settlement commitments will determine if this goal can actually be achieved.

**European Union: Digital Euro**

October 2021 was the official start of the European Central Bank's digital euro probe, which ended its preparation phase in late 2023. Policymakers in Europe have carefully balanced promoting digital innovation with preventing threats to the stability of banks. Concern that unrestricted CBDC ownership could lead to deposit migration from commercial banks during times of financial stress is reflected in a planned individual holding limit that has been widely reported at 3,000. Given the GDPR-anchored data protection culture in the region, privacy concerns are particularly important in the European context. According to Tronnier and Qiu (2024), European respondents have some of the highest levels of privacy sensitivity worldwide, making the ECB's commitment to robust anonymity protections not only morally right but also strategically essential for adoption viability. A sovereignty argument has also been crystallized in the Digital Euro debate: in the absence of a publicly issued digital alternative, European individuals may become dependent on non-European platforms for their daily digital transactions, giving commercial players some degree of monetary agency (Huang & Mayer, 2022).

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue IV, April 2026

**United States: Digital Dollar**

With regard to CBDC, the US has continued to hold an attitude of measured ambivalence. High-throughput CBDC infrastructure is architecturally viable at the scale needed by a major economy, according to technical study carried out by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston's Project Hamilton. However, this engineering validation has not resulted in a governmental commitment. From the standpoint of monetary hegemony, Huang and Mayer (2022) contend that American reluctance can be partially explained by the dollar's dominant position in international trade invoicing and reserve holdings, which makes the US less motivated to innovate than competitors looking to overtake it. This is reinforced by domestic political economy issues, such as the lobbying power of incumbent payment networks, financial privacy concerns among civil liberties organizations, and congressional skepticism. As a result, the US has a watching brief in global CBDC governance, keeping a watchful eye on developments without making any commitments.

**Bahamas: Sand Dollar**

In October 2020, the Central Bank of the Bahamas issued the Sand Dollar, the world's first fully functional retail CBDC, marking a historic first for the Bahamas. The policy objective was clearly geographic: the fragmented island structure of the archipelago poses structural obstacles to traditional branch banking that are difficult to overcome by regulatory encouragement. The most thorough empirical analysis of the Sand Dollar's effects to date is provided by Giraldo-Gordillo and Bustillo-Mesanza (2025), who find evidence of modest substitution from unofficial mobile money services but negligible impact on bank credit markets. They interpret this pattern as reflecting the pilot's still-limited transaction scale rather than the lack of structural effects. According to their analysis, smartphone penetration, consumer digital literacy, and merchant acceptance networks are binding limits on CBDC velocity that need to be addressed in tandem with the currency's technical debut.

**Nigeria: ENAIRA**

Launched in October 2021, Nigeria's eNaira was the first CBDC on the African continent and one of the most significant in the developing world, considering Nigeria's economic significance on the continent and its position as the main recipient of remittances in sub-Saharan Africa. In order to map the eNaira's ramifications for Nigerian monetary law and financial regulation and to identify areas where the current legal framework needs to be amended to meet the innovative liability structure a CBDC provides, Omotubora (2024) closely examines the eNaira's legal architecture. In keeping with the CBN's goal of bringing informal digital transactions inside the official regulatory perimeter, Giraldo-Gordillo and Bustillo-Mesanza (2025) track the market effects of the eNaira and discover a statistically significant drop in informal mobile money usage in affected areas.

The CBN introduced USSD-based wallet access to expand the eNaira's reach to consumers without cellphones due to early adoption issues caused by infrastructure shortages, low merchant engagement, and public apprehension. This adaption demonstrates Kosse and Mattei's (2023) more general conclusion that demand-side ecosystem readiness, rather than supply-side technological competence, is the fundamental restriction on CBDC dissemination in developing economies and offers obvious lessons for India's rural financial inclusion program.

**Sweden: E-KRONA**

Sweden offers a conceptually unique CBDC motivation: resilience in a nearly cashless society rather than inclusion in an underbanked one. Nowadays, cash makes up a very small portion of transactions in Sweden (Hrvatska narodna banka, 2019). The Riksbank is worried that citizens would have no way to make payments if the private payment networks that support this cashless system failed due to a cyberattack, commercial insolvency, or technical malfunction. The e-Krona is intended to be a public contingency tool that is always accessible, always liquid, and unaffected by any commercial middleman.

Although token and account structures were investigated in pilot testing on R3's Corda platform (Dashkevich et al., 2020; Sethaput & Innet, 2023), the implementation process has been hindered by legislative concerns regarding whether the Riksbank's statutory mission covers the issuing of digital currencies.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue IV, April 2026

**India's E-Rupee: Architecture, Rollout, And Strategic Implications**

## Contextual Foundations and Policy Logic

The institutional framework built over the last ten years is inextricably linked to India's decision to seek a CBDC. While UPI changed retail payment behaviour at a scale and speed that few observers predicted, the Jan Dhan-Aadhaar-Mobile (JAM) architecture gave hundreds of millions of previously unbanked citizens a digitally-anchored financial identity. This cumulative UPI experience serves as a cognitive and behavioural on-ramp into CBDC, according to direct empirical data from Gupta et al. (2023). Users who are accustomed to fast digital transfers are quantifiably more inclined to try out a new digital currency form factor. This research suggests that the current UPI user base of over 300 million active users represents a ready initial adoption cohort, which has practical consequences for rollout strategy.

The RBI's October 2022 Concept Note stood out for its extensive justification. The Note raised the possibility of programmable money e-Rupees that could be intended to expire if unspent, directed toward particular categories of expenditure, or activated conditionally upon verified household behaviour, in addition to the standard arguments about payment system efficiency and remittance cost reduction. According to Ozili's (2022) theory, programmability serves as a link between the goals of the circular economy and monetary policy. It envisions conditional digital cash instruments that incentivize ecologically sound consumption choices. It's unclear if India will eventually implement programmability at the policy level, but the RBI's readiness to do so indicates a broad understanding of what digital money might accomplish.

## Pilot Architecture and Rollout Strategy

An clear risk management concept was reflected in the order of India's CBDC pilots. Initiated in November 2022, the wholesale pilot limited testing to interbank government securities settlement, a high-value, low-volume setting where any disruption would be contained within the regulated banking system. The retail trial began in December 2022 with a purposefully small initial boundary of four banks and four cities. As operational learning accrued, the perimeter was gradually increased. To give regular users some transactional privacy, the token-based design where value is stored in the digital token rather than in an account entry—was selected (Agur et al., 2022; Wenker, 2022).

Zhang et al.'s (2021) hybrid blockchain model, in which retail pseudonymity coexists with wholesale auditability on a shared infrastructure, represents one technically validated pathway for scaling this architecture without sacrificing oversight capacity.

## Financial Inclusion Potential and Constraints

India's financial geography is characterised by stark disparities between urban digital connectivity and rural infrastructure scarcity. Nanez Alonso et al. (2020) develop a multi-dimensional vulnerability index for financially excluded rural communities, and many of the characteristics they identify geographic remoteness, limited income, restricted access to bank branches map directly onto segments of India's semi-urban and agrarian population. An offline-capable e-Rupee, able to process transactions without live network connectivity, would be a pre-condition for meaningful inclusion in these contexts. Nanez Alonso et al. (2021) further show, through a multi-criteria country assessment, that India ranks among the nations with the strongest structural preconditions for successful CBDC deployment, particularly on dimensions of government commitment and digital infrastructure depth, though last-mile connectivity gaps remain a binding constraint.

Beyond access, programmability offers a qualitatively distinct inclusion instrument. Direct Benefit Transfers disbursed as programmable e-Rupees could eliminate the leakage and diversion that afflict current cash and bank-transfer modalities, directing resources toward their intended beneficiaries with greater assurance. Ozili (2022) notes that such instruments could additionally embed circular economy incentives for example, conditioning subsidy activation on the purchase of approved energy-efficient goods linking the inclusion and sustainability agendas within a single monetary instrument.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue IV, April 2026

## Risk Landscape and Regulatory Challenges

Economic, technological, and governance risks are all present in the e-Rupee. The subject of bank disintermediation is crucial from an analytical perspective on the economic front. The best CBDC design under a competitive banking equilibrium is modeled by Agur et al. (2022), who demonstrate that the welfare-maximizing instrument combines substantial but not maximal anonymity with restricted compensation. Although the equilibrium holding limit beyond which deposit outflows become destabilizing has not been empirically calibrated for India's unique banking structure, the non-interest-bearing, capped design of the current e-Rupee pilot is generally consistent with this prescription (Yang & Zhou, 2022). The dynamics of the informal economy further complicate matters. According to Oh and Zhang's (2022) model of the relationship between the CBDC and the informal economy, the use of CBDCs reduces the anonymity advantage of physical currency, which in turn decreases informal activities.

The dynamics of the informal economy further complicate matters. Oh and Zhang (2022) model the relationship between the CBDC and the informal economy and discover that the adoption of CBDCs reduces the anonymity advantage of physical cash. This formalization effect is both a financial benefit and a social disruption for households whose livelihoods depend on informal arrangements. Complementary social protection measures will be necessary to manage this transition in an equitable manner. Fintech-integrated financial infrastructure is a materially enhanced cyber risk environment at the operational level, necessitating proactive rather than reactive security governance, according to Vucnic and Luburic (2022). Lastly, Alsalmi et al. (2023) highlight issues with undervalued accounting and regulatory classification: how CBDC holdings should be treated on institutional and household balance sheets is a question that existing accounting standards do not cleanly resolve, and regulatory clarity will be necessary before institutional adoption can scale.

## Comparative Analysis: CBDC Attributes Across Economies

| Economy | CBDC Name | Type | Technology Model | Current Status | Primary Driver |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| India | e-Rupee (e₹) | Retail + Wholesale | Two-tier, Token-based | Active pilot (2022–) | Inclusion, Payment efficiency |
| China | e-CNY (Digital Yuan) | Retail | Two-tier, Centralised | Large-scale pilot | Monetary control, Internationalisation |
| European Union | Digital Euro | Retail | Hybrid (under design) | Preparation phase | Monetary sovereignty |
| United States | Digital Dollar | Retail/Wholesale | Research only | No decision taken | Strategic monitoring |
| Bahamas | Sand Dollar | Retail | DLT-based | Live (Oct 2020–) | Geographic inclusion |
| Nigeria | eNaira | Retail | DLT-based | Live (Oct 2021–) | Formalisation, Remittances |
| Sweden | e-Krona | Retail | Corda (DLT) | Pilot stage | Payment system resilience |

Table 1: Cross-national CBDC comparison. Compiled from Kosse & Mattei (2023), Xia et al. (2023), Giraldo-Gordillo & Bustillo-Mesanza (2025), Omotubora (2024), and respective central bank publications.

## Macroeconomic And Financial Stability Implications

### Monetary Policy Transmission

Because intermediaries have their own balance sheet restrictions and incentive systems, the process by which central bank decisions are translated into actual economic activity has always been flawed. By lowering the amount of economic activity that eludes monetary supervision through cash hoarding and unofficial transactions, Yang and Zhou (2022) contend that the issuance of CBDCs increases this channel. The central bank receives a more comprehensive and timely view of monetary flows when CBDC replaces cash as the main transaction medium, increasing the accuracy of its actions. The crisis dimension is added by Echarte Fernández et al. (2021), who highlight in their analysis of monetary reactions during the COVID-19 pandemic that CBDC would have allowed stimulus to reach households in days instead of weeks, avoiding the administrative latency associated with bank-mediated disbursement.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue IV, April 2026

The ramifications are especially important for India's monetary system. Stressed balance sheets and behavioral rigidities in deposit rate adjustment are two structural aspects of the banking industry that have historically reduced the transmission from RBI rate changes to retail loan pricing. Through programmable instrument design, a scaled e-Rupee might potentially enable targeted interventions in certain sectors or areas without the bluntness of system-wide rate changes. It would also enhance the RBI's visibility into retail monetary flows. By bringing more transactions into the formal monetary circuit, Oh and Zhang's (2022) model of the shrinkage of the informal sector will further broaden the scope of monetary policy effectiveness.

**Disintermediation and Banking Sector Stability**

More academics and regulators are concerned about the possibility that citizens may prefer to hold CBDC over commercial bank deposits than any other CBDC design concerns. The issue is structurally simple: sensible depositors may shift toward CBDC if it offers a safer claim than bank deposits with no counterparty risk, no bail-in exposure, and instant liquidity, especially during stressful times when bank solvency is uncertain. Such a long-term change would reduce the loan supply, weaken the deposit base that supports bank credit, and possibly increase the cost of borrowing across the board (Agur et al., 2022; Yang & Zhou, 2022).

A non-remunerated CBDC with intermediate anonymity minimizes welfare losses from disintermediation while still providing inclusion and payment efficiency gains, according to Agur et al. (2022), who derive an ideal CBDC design that internalizes this risk. Examining early empirical data from the Bahamas and Nigeria, Giraldo-Gordillo and Bustillo-Mesanza (2025) conclude that credit market effects are statistically indistinguishable from zero at current adoption scales. However, they appropriately note that inference about equilibrium outcomes is constrained by the limited penetration of current pilots. The RBI's declared commitment to maintaining limitations and the non-interest-bearing design of India's e-Rupee are practical preemptive measures in line with the theoretical research.

**Cross-Border Payment Dynamics and Geopolitical Dimensions**

Technically speaking, it is impossible to evaluate the global aspect of CBDC development. The speed and ambition of China's e-CNY program, according to Huang and Mayer (2022), reflect a purposeful strategic goal of diminishing the dollar's structural advantages in trade invoicing, reserve holding, and sanctions leverage. This places it squarely within the competition for monetary hegemony between the United States and China. This interpretation is supported by Deng's (2023) detailed infrastructure study, which links the political-economic reasons behind the architectural decisions made in the cross-border design of the e-CNY. Other economies, like India, face both opportunities and risks as a result of this competition: the chance to negotiate bilateral CBDC agreements that lower remittance costs and trade friction, as well as the risk of being pulled into a fragmented multi-CBDC world where interoperability is weaponized rather than facilitated. Cross-border payment efficiency is one of the best empirical indicators of CBDC adoption aspiration at the national level, according to Kosse and Mattei (2023).

**Informal Sector, Circular Economy, and Broader Structural Effects**

There are two structural aspects of the macroeconomic impact of CBDC that need special consideration. First, Oh and Zhang's (2022) thorough model of the informal economy nexus indicates that the traceability of CBDC undermines the transaction anonymity that now makes cash appealing for unreported activities. This formalization pressure has two sides in India, where the informal sector accounts for a significant portion of employment and output: it broadens the tax base and monetary control domain, but it may also result in adjustment costs for low-income households whose informal arrangements fulfill welfare functions that formal systems do not yet replace. Second, programmable CBDC can reroute spending flows toward sustainable goods and services in ways that traditional fiscal or monetary instruments cannot accomplish with comparable precision, according to Ozili's (2022) circular economy dimension, which links monetary instrument design to environmental policy. The technical potential is evident, but whether India will include circular economy conditions into the e-Rupee design is a policy decision that will take time.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue IV, April 2026

**A Policy Framework for Responsible CBDC Adoption**

The comparative and analytical foregoing sections converge on a set of design and governance principles that, taken together, constitute a framework for responsible CBDC adoption. Five pillars are proposed, each grounded in the empirical and theoretical literature reviewed:

1. Deliberate, Evidence-Gated Rollout: Authorities should work through distinct phases with predetermined evaluation criteria before moving on to the next, as opposed to scaling CBDC quickly to take advantage of first-mover advantages. According to Kosse and Mattei (2023), institutional readiness rather than technical ambition is a key predictor of adoption pace; early scaling runs the danger of producing unfavorable results that could irreversibly erode public confidence in the instrument.

2. Privacy as Constitutional Commitment: Rather than being viewed as modifiable operational criteria, privacy protections ought to be incorporated into the CBDC regime's legal framework. While Bodó and Janssen (2022) establish that institutional legitimacy for state digital infrastructure depends on verifiable data governance commitments rather than just policy assurances, Tronnier and Qiu (2024) and Wenker (2022) show that perceived surveillance risk is a primary adoption deterrent.

3. Structural Safeguards for Bank Stability: Any retail CBDC framework should include non-remunerative CBDC design, calibrated holding restrictions, and access to central bank emergency funding for institutions with depleted deposits. These precautions have theoretical support from Agur et al. (2022), and early empirical evidence of their efficacy at pilot scale is provided by Giraldo-Gordillo and Bustillo-Mesanza (2025).

4. Universal Access by Design: Once the technical architecture has been decided upon, financial inclusion cannot be a rhetorical afterthought. Multilingual interfaces, USSD-based wallet access for feature phone users, and offline transaction capability ought to be integrated into the core standard rather than added as add-ons. Nigeria's USSD-eNaira adaptation shows that inclusive design is operationally viable even with limited resources, while Nanez Alonso et al. (2020) outline the aspects of financial fragility that CBDC must address.

5. Multilateral Governance Architecture: No national CBDC framework is an island. Geopolitical CBDC competition, as documented by Huang and Mayer (2022) and Deng (2023), can only be managed through proactive multilateral engagement. India should actively participate in BIS, G20, and IMF-led CBDC governance workstreams to shape interoperability standards, cross-border AML/CFT protocols, and data-sharing arrangements that prevent the fragmentation of the international monetary system.

## CONCLUSION

Although the global CBDC experiment is still in its early stages, the body of research already supports a number of conclusive findings. First, CBDC development is a diverse collection of national responses to locally specific monetary challenges, such as geopolitical competition in China, cash decline in Sweden, monetary sovereignty anxiety in the EU, or geographic exclusion in the Bahamas (Cunha et al., 2021; Kosse & Mattei, 2023; Peneder, 2022). India's situation is unique because it has a very large and digitally prepared potential user base (Gupta et al., 2023), a diverse financial geography that offers both substantial last-mile constraints and rich inclusion opportunities, and a geopolitical setting where claiming digital monetary sovereignty has independent strategic value.

Second, the main risk features of CBDC privacy erosion, disintermediation in the banking sector, cyber vulnerability, and disruption in the informal sector are well-theorized and, in certain instances, starting to be observed empirically. Calibrated holding limits (Agur et al., 2022), tiered privacy architectures (Wenker, 2022; Tronnier & Qiu, 2024), institutional trust-building techniques (Bodó & Janssen, 2022), and proactive cyber risk governance (Vucicic & Luburic, 2022) are some of the policy tools available to mitigate these risks. Instead of viewing them as obstacles to be overcome in the pursuit of quick adoption, what is needed is the institutional and political will to implement them consistently.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue IV, April 2026

Third, the story of CBDC's revolutionary potential goes beyond traditional monetary policy and payments efficiency. The decision about how to create and manage a digital currency has repercussions that extend well beyond the central bank's balance sheet, as evidenced by the links to international monetary order (Huang & Mayer, 2022; Deng, 2023), circular economy incentivization (Ozili, 2022), and informal economy formalization (Oh & Zhang, 2022). Future adopters, including India at scale, can draw from a growing body of evidence thanks to the empirical lessons learned from pioneer deployments in Nigeria and the Bahamas (Giraldo-Gordillo & Bustillo-Mesanza, 2025; Omotubora, 2024) and the changing accounting and regulatory landscape (Alsalmi et al., 2023).

## REFERENCES


1. Giraldo-Gordillo, F. E., & Bustillo-Mesanza, R. (2025). The effects of CBDCs on mobile money and outstanding loans: Evidence from the eNaira and Sand Dollar experiences.. FinTech, 4(3), 39. https://doi.org/10.3390/fintech4030039
2. Mastromatteo, G., & Rossi, S. (2025). Central bank digital currencies: Much ado about nothing?. Review of Political Economy. https://doi.org/10.1080/09538259.2024.2445752
3. Chang, H., Grinberg, F., Gornicka, L., Miccoli, M., & Tan, B. J. (2024). Central bank digital currency and bank disintermediation in a portfolio choice model.. IMF Working Paper No. 2023/236. International Monetary Fund. https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400261237.001
4. Dionysopoulos, L., Marra, M., & Urquhart, A. (2024). Central bank digital currencies: A critical review.. International Review of Financial Analysis, 91, 103031. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2023.103031
5. Genc, H. O., & Takagi, S. (2024). A literature review on the design and implementation of central bank digital currencies.. International Journal of Economic Policy Studies, 18(1), 197–225. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42495-023-00122-8
6. Kayani, U., & Hasan, F. (2024). Unveiling cryptocurrency impact on financial markets.. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 17(2), 58. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm17020058
7. Omotubora, A. (2024). Same naira, more possibilities!. Journal of African Law, 68(2), 245–262. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021855324000044
8. Reshidi, E. (2024). Central bank digital currency adoption: Inclusive strategies for intermediaries and users.. IMF Fintech Note 2024/005. International Monetary Fund. https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400272851.063
9. Tronnier, F., & Qiu, W. (2024). Privacy concerns and CBDC adoption.. Quantitative Finance and Economics, 8(1), 126–152. https://doi.org/10.3934/QFE.2024006
10. Vardoulakis, A. P. (2024). Financial stability implications of CBDC.. Finance and Economics Discussion Series 2024-021. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. https://doi.org/10.17016/FEDS.2024.021
11. Alsalmi, N., Ullah, S., & Rafique, M. (2023). Accounting for digital currencies.. Research in International Business and Finance, 64, 101897. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2023.101897
12. Deng, H. (2023). Negotiating currency internationalization: An infrastructural analysis of the digital RMB.. Finance and Society, 9(2). https://doi.org/10.2218/fas.2023.2
13. Gupta, M., Taneja, S., Sharma, V., Singh, A., Rupeika-Apoga, R., & Jangir, K. (2023). Does previous experience with the unified payments interface (UPI) affect the usage of central bank digital currency (CBDC)?. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 16(6), 286. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm16060286
14. Helmi, M. H., Çatık, A. N., & Akdeniz, C. (2023). The impact of central bank digital currency news on the stock and cryptocurrency markets.. Research in International Business and Finance, 65, 101968. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2023.101968
15. International Monetary Fund. (2023). Central bank digital currency: Initial considerations.. IMF Policy Paper No. 2023/048. https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400246280.007
16. Keister, T., & Sanches, D. R. (2023). Should central banks issue digital currency?. Review of Economic Studies, 90(1), 404–431. https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdac016
17. Kosse, A., & Mattei, I. (2023). Central bank digital currency: What factors determine its adoption?. Economic Policy, 38(114), 199–254. https://doi.org/10.1093/epolic/eiac011

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue IV, April 2026


18. Sethaput, V., & Innet, S. (2023). Blockchain application for CBDCs.. Cluster Computing. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10586-022-03962-z
19. Tan, B. J. (2023). Central bank digital currency and financial inclusion.. IMF Working Paper No. 2023/069. International Monetary Fund. https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400238277.001
20. Xia, H., Gao, Y., & Zhang, J. Z. (2023). Adoption context of China's digital currency.. Financial Innovation, 9, 63. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-023-00467-5
21. Agur, I., Ari, A., & Dell'Ariccia, G. (2022). Designing central bank digital currencies.. Journal of Monetary Economics, 125, 62–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2021.05.002
22. Bodó, B., & Janssen, H. (2022). Maintaining trust in a technologized public sector.. Policy and Society, 41(3), 414–429. https://doi.org/10.1093/polsoc/puac019
23. Chen, H., & Siklos, P. L. (2022). Central bank digital currency: A review and some macro-financial implications.. Journal of Financial Stability, 60, 101030. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2022.101030
24. Huang, Y., & Mayer, M. (2022). Digital currencies, monetary sovereignty, and U.S.–China power competition.. Policy & Internet, 14(2), 324–347. https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.302
25. Oh, E. Y., & Zhang, S. (2022). Informal economy and central bank digital currency.. Economic Inquiry, 60(4), 1520–1539. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecin.13105
26. Ozili, P. K. (2022). Circular economy and central bank digital currency.. Circular Economy and Sustainability, 2, 1501–1516. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43615-022-00170-0
27. Peneder, M. (2022). Digitization and the evolution of money.. Journal of Evolutionary Economics, 32(1), 175–203. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00191-021-00729-4
28. Reserve Bank of India. (2022). Concept note on central bank digital currency.. Mumbai: RBI.
29. Vučić, M., & Luburic, R. (2022). Fintech, risk-based thinking and cyber risk.. Journal of Central Banking Theory and Practice, 11(2), 27–53. https://doi.org/10.2478/jcbtp-2022-0012
30. Wenker, K. (2022). Retail CBDC and financial privacy.. FinTech, 1(4), 345–361. https://doi.org/10.3390/fintech1040023
31. Yang, J., & Zhou, G. (2022). CBDC influence on monetary policy.. PLOS ONE, 17(7), e0268471. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.026847
32. Cunha, P. R., Melo, P., & Sebastião, H. (2021). From Bitcoin to central bank digital currencies: Making sense of the digital money revolution.. Future Internet, 13(7), 165. https://doi.org/10.3390/fi13070165
33. Echarte Fernández, M. A., Nanez Alonso, S. L., Jorge-Vázquez, J., & Reier Forradellas, R. F. (2021). Central banks' monetary policy in the face of the COVID-19 economic crisis: Monetary stimulus and the emergence of CBDCs.. Sustainability, 13(8), 4242. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13084242
34. Nanez Alonso, S. L., Jorge-Vázquez, J., & Reier Forradellas, R. F. (2021). Central banks digital currency: Detection of optimal countries.. Journal of Open Innovation, 7(1), 72. https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7010072
35. Zhang, J., Tian, R., Cao, Y., Yuan, X., Yu, Z., Yan, X., & Zhang, X. (2021). Hybrid CBDC model based on blockchain.. IEEE Access, 9, 53589–53602. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3071033
36. Dashkevich, N., Counsell, S., & Destefanis, G. (2020). Blockchain application for central banks: A systematic mapping study.. IEEE Access, 8, 139918–139937. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3012295
37. Nanez Alonso, S. L., Jorge-Vázquez, J., & Reier Forradellas, R. F. (2020). Detection of financial inclusion vulnerable rural areas.. Sustainability, 12(18), 7480. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12187480
38. Hrvatska narodna banka. (2019). Cashless society – The future of money or a utopia?. Journal of Central Banking Theory and Practice, 8(3), 53–66. https://doi.org/10.2478/jcbtp-2019-0026
39. Barrdear, J., & Kumhof, M. (2016). The macroeconomics of central bank issued digital currencies.. Bank of England Staff Working Paper No. 605.