Page: 968-992 URL: www.lijdlr.com

ISSN: 2583-7753

LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research

[ISSN: 2583-7753]

Volume 3 | Issue 4

2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70183/lijdlr.2025.v03.162

REGULATORY EQUILIBRIUM IN EMERGING MARKETS: SAFEGUARDING CONSUMERS WHILE PRESERVING FINTECH INNOVATION UNDER NATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORKS IN SOUTH ASIA

Anmol Singhal[1]

I. ABSTRACT

The rapid proliferation of financial technology across South Asian economies has created unprecedented opportunities for financial inclusion and digital transformation, yet simultaneously exposed regulatory gaps that threaten consumer interests and systemic stability. This paper examines the critical nexus between innovation facilitation and consumer protection mechanisms within existing national regulatory frameworks across the region. Drawing on comparative analysis of regulatory approaches in India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and other South Asian jurisdictions, the study investigates how policymakers navigate the inherent tensions between fostering a competitive fintech ecosystem and implementing robust safeguards against predatory practices, data breaches, and systemic risks. The paper argues that effective regulation requires not merely restrictive compliance but rather a calibrated, innovation-aware legal architecture that accommodates emerging business models, including digital lending platforms, payment service providers, and alternative investment mechanisms, whilst maintaining stringent consumer protection standards. Through examination of licensing frameworks, prudential norms, and grievance redressal mechanisms, this work demonstrates that the regulatory challenge in South Asia transcends traditional binary approaches. Instead, it necessitates dynamic legal instruments capable of evolving alongside technological advancement, supported by institutional capacity-building among regulators and meaningful stakeholder participation. The research concludes that sustainable fintech governance depends on establishing enforceable consumer protection standards, transparent algorithmic accountability and cross-border regulatory coordination, without imposing prohibitive compliance burdens that stifle legitimate innovation.

[1] 4th Year B.A. LL.B Student at Bharati Vidyapeeth (Deemed to be University) New Law College, Pune (India). Email: anmolsinghal793@gmail.com.

Ultimately, this paper contributes to ongoing policy discourse by proposing a contextualised regulatory framework suited to South Asia's development imperatives and technological trajectory.

II. KEYWORDS

Consumer protection, FinTech regulation, Financial innovation, Emerging market governance, Digital financial inclusion

III. INTRODUCTION

A. THE FINTECH PARADOX IN SOUTH ASIA

South Asia stands at a critical juncture in its financial history. The region, encompassing India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, and Nepal, hosts over 1.8 billion people, yet remains characterised by persistent financial exclusion. Simultaneously, financial technology has emerged as a potentially transformative force, which offers pathways to unprecedented financial inclusion and economic participation. However, this promise has been accompanied by major regulatory challenges that existing legal frameworks were never designed to address.

The challenge confronting South Asian regulators is uniquely multifaceted. Unlike developed economies where regulatory frameworks have evolved gradually alongside technological change, South Asian jurisdictions must simultaneously manage rapid technological disruption, institutional capacity constraints and competing developmental imperatives. The International Finance Corporation estimates a financing gap of approximately $5.2 trillion for micro, small and medium enterprises globally [2], with substantial portions concentrated in South Asian emerging markets. In India alone, nearly 190 million adults remain unbanked, relying instead on informal credit sources often characterised by exorbitant interest rates and exploitative terms.[3] Digital lending platforms have emerged to fill this

---

[2] *Championing Digital Inclusion, Financial Literacy and Consumer Protection*, All. for Fin. Inclusion, https://afi-global.org/publication/championing-digital-inclusion-financial-literacy-and-consumer-protection/ (last visited Nov. 29, 2025).

[3] Malavika Kaur Makol, *India's Digital Loan Sharks Face RBI Crackdown as Predatory Lending Complaints Mount*, The Print (Jan. 3, 2022), https://www.theprint.in/economy/indias-digital-loan-sharks-face-rbi-crackdown-as-predatory-lending-complaints-mount/794566/.

void, yet the very mechanisms that enable their efficiency- sophisticated data analytics, algorithmic credit assessment and streamlined collection processes, have simultaneously created new vectors for consumer harm and systemic vulnerability.

The regulatory response across South Asia has been instructive precisely because it is varied. India's Reserve Bank has adopted a layered, calibrated approach through successive digital lending guidelines and self-regulatory organisation frameworks. Bangladesh has evolved mobile financial services regulations through a dedicated legal instrument coupled with ongoing amendments reflecting on-ground realities. Sri Lanka pioneered a regulatory sandbox approach that deliberately creates space for innovation whilst maintaining supervisory oversight. These diverse approaches, whilst reflecting national contexts and institutional capacities, share a common underlying principle, that is, the necessity of balancing competing goods- innovation and protection, growth and stability, accessibility and safeguard.

This paper examines how South Asian regulatory frameworks navigate this equilibrium. Rather than viewing regulation and innovation as inherently antagonistic, the paper argues that effective governance requires recognition of their interdependence. Overly restrictive regulation stifles the legitimate innovation necessary to achieve financial inclusion; conversely, inadequate regulation perpetuates predatory practices and systemic vulnerabilities that ultimately undermine market confidence. The path forward lies not in choosing between these poles but in constructing calibrated legal architectures that accommodate emerging business models whilst maintaining enforceable consumer safeguards.

B. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- To examine the regulatory approaches adopted by South Asian jurisdictions in governing FinTech innovation
- To analyze the effectiveness of consumer protection mechanisms within South Asian FinTech frameworks
- To identify regulatory gaps and propose contextually appropriate policy recommendations

 (ISSN: 2583-7753)

C. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- How do South Asian regulatory frameworks balance innovation facilitation with consumer protection?
- What are the key challenges in implementing effective FinTech regulation in emerging markets?
- To what extent have existing regulatory approaches succeeded in addressing predatory practices?

D. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

- Calibrated, innovation-aware regulatory frameworks are more effective than restrictive prohibition in achieving both consumer protection and innovation objectives
- Regulatory sandbox mechanisms enhance financial innovation without compromising systemic stability

E. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This paper employs doctrinal legal research methodology, utilizing comparative analysis of primary legal sources including statutes, regulatory directives, and central bank guidelines across India, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka. Secondary sources including academic literature, policy reports, and empirical studies supplement the doctrinal analysis. The research examines regulatory frameworks as of December 2025.

F. LITERATURE REVIEW

The rapid expansion of financial technology (FinTech) in South Asia has spurred significant progress in financial inclusion, yet it also presents new challenges for regulators aiming to protect consumers while fostering innovation. Recent literature has examined the complex interplay between regulation and innovation in emerging markets, particularly in the context of South Asia, where financial exclusion is a persistent issue.

 (ISSN: 2583-7753)

- **Financial Inclusion and Technological Innovation**: Several studies highlight the potential of FinTech to overcome traditional barriers to financial access, particularly in regions with significant unbanked populations like South Asia. Mobile money platforms (e.g., bKash in Bangladesh) and digital lending models have demonstrated substantial benefits in expanding access to financial services for previously excluded populations. However, gaps remain, particularly in rural areas and for populations with low digital literacy, impeding full financial inclusion .
- **Consumer Protection Challenges**: A central concern in the literature is the dual challenge of ensuring consumer protection while encouraging innovation. Researchers have pointed out that the rapid growth of digital financial services has led to an increase in predatory lending practices, data breaches, and algorithmic discrimination. The need for robust consumer protection mechanisms is critical, especially as South Asian markets struggle with inadequate regulatory frameworks to tackle these emerging risks. Studies have emphasized the importance of creating a regulatory environment that can adapt to the evolving nature of digital finance while safeguarding consumer interests .
- **Regulatory Innovation and Sandboxes**: The regulatory sandbox model has been identified as an effective approach in South Asia for testing new FinTech products in a controlled environment, balancing innovation with consumer protection. Sri Lanka's use of regulatory sandboxes has been noted for promoting experimentation without compromising regulatory oversight . However, the literature also points to the need for continuous adaptation of these sandboxes to address systemic risks and market dynamics that change rapidly .
- **Data Privacy and Security**: With the increased reliance on consumer data, data privacy has emerged as a significant area of concern. India’s Digital Personal Data Protection Act (2023) and other regional laws are seen as foundational steps toward securing personal data in digital

transactions . Research suggests that strengthening data protection laws, along with transparency in algorithmic decision-making, is essential to building consumer trust and ensuring fairness in the FinTech ecosystem .

In conclusion, while South Asia's FinTech sector holds considerable promise for advancing financial inclusion, its success hinges on the development of regulatory frameworks that are flexible, innovation-friendly, and capable of mitigating the risks posed to consumers and systemic stability. The literature supports the argument that regulation and innovation should not be viewed as opposing forces but as interdependent, with balanced frameworks being key to the region's sustainable FinTech growth.

IV. THE SOUTH ASIAN FINTECH LANDSCAPE: OPPORTUNITIES AND VULNERABILITIES

A. FINANCIAL INCLUSION IMPERATIVES AND FINTECH'S PROMISE

The financial inclusion agenda has become central to South Asian development strategy, particularly following the global financial crisis and the subsequent recognition that financial exclusion perpetuates poverty and limits economic dynamism. Traditional banking institutions, constrained by infrastructure limitations, high operational costs and stringent eligibility criteria, have historically excluded vast populations from formal financial services. Digital financial services present an alternative model capable of transcending these constraints.

The impact of FinTech-enabled financial inclusion has been demonstrable. Mobile money platforms such as bKash in Bangladesh have fundamentally altered payment ecosystem dynamics[4], with millions of rural households accessing formal payment mechanisms for the first time. Digital lending platforms have enabled credit access for individuals lacking traditional collateral or credit histories. Studies examining South Asian jurisdictions have established a positive relationship between FinTech adoption and financial inclusion both in the long-term and short-term, with a one-

[4] *Kash Case Study*, Int'l Fin. Corp. (Oct. 28, 2016), https://ifc.org/content/dam/ifc/doc/MGT/CASE%20STUDIES%20-%20PUBLICATIONS/bKash%20case%20study%20FINAL%2010%2028%2016.pdf.

percent increase in FinTech leading to approximately 0.1772 unit rise in financial inclusion indices.[5] Payment platforms like BHIM in India have incorporated inclusive design features enabling participation by first-time digital users unfamiliar with conventional interfaces.

These achievements, however, mask considerable complexity. Financial inclusion- the availability and accessibility of basic financial services including savings, credit, insurance and digital payments to all individuals regardless of income or location- remains unevenly distributed across South Asian jurisdictions. Barriers including limited financial infrastructure, regulatory hurdles and persistent digital literacy gaps continue constraining adoption rates. The necessity of balancing financial inclusion imperatives with consumer protection represents a defining regulatory tension in South Asia.

B. SYSTEMIC RISKS AND CONSUMER VULNERABILITY

The darker dimensions of South Asian FinTech markets have become increasingly apparent. Between 2022 and 2024, India witnessed explosive growth in digital lending applications, with estimates suggesting over 1,100 platforms operating across the ecosystem, yet analysis by the Reserve Bank of India revealed that more than half these providers were functioning entirely outside any formal regulatory framework.[6] The digital lending market in India, valued at approximately $150 billion in 2020, had expanded to $350 billion by 2023-[7] a growth trajectory remarkable for its speed and concerning for its regulatory oversight.

Consumer harm has emerged as a persistent challenge. Predatory lending platforms have employed aggressive collection tactics including accessing borrower contact lists, call histories and social media data without explicit informed consent, then

---

[5] Misbahol Yaqin et al., *FinTech and Financial Inclusion in Emerging and Developing Economies: A New Index and Evidence from Panel Data*, 12 Cogent Bus. & Mgmt. 1 (2025), https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23311975.2025.13714419.

[6] *Summary: RBI Report on Digital Lending Including Predatory Lending Apps*, MediaNama (Nov. 19, 2021), https://medianama.com/2021/11/summary-rbi-report-digital-lending-including-predatory-lending-apps/.

[7] *Digital Lending Revolutionizing Financial Inclusion*, Cedar IBSI Cap., https://cedaribsicapital.vc/digital-lending-revolutionizing-financial-inclusion/ (last visited Nov. 29, 2025).

weaponizing this information for "debt-shaming" campaigns that reportedly leveraged public humiliation to enforce repayment. Evidence from Kenya and Tanzania, jurisdictions with similar developmental contexts, revealed that over 50 percent of digital borrowers reported late repayments, with default rates between 12 and 31 percent. Critically, a significant proportion of borrowers reported incomplete understanding of loan terms and associated costs, with some individuals reportedly reducing food purchases to meet repayment obligations. Over-indebtedness has emerged as a structural vulnerability in digital lending ecosystems where rapid approval mechanisms and minimal verification requirements combine to facilitate multiple simultaneous borrowing relationships.

Systemic risk represents another dimension of vulnerability. Emerging markets face particular susceptibility to FinTech induced systemic risk given immature regulatory environments, under-designed technology profiles and speed of FinTech adoption significantly which exceeds regulatory capacity. The digital nature of FinTech platforms creates interdependencies through which failures cascade rapidly across financial networks. Algorithm-driven operations introduce opacity that makes regulatory scrutiny problematic; decentralised structures characteristic of peer-to-peer lending and decentralised finance create trust asymmetries and control deficits that magnify systemic shocks. Unlike traditional banking failures, which may be localised, FinTech platform failures propagate instantaneously across customer bases and connected financial institutions.

V. MAPPING SOUTH ASIAN REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

A. INDIA'S CALIBRATED MULTI-REGULATOR MODEL

India's approach to FinTech regulation reflects constitutional federalism, institutional specialisation, and dynamic regulatory learning. The Reserve Bank of India functions as the primary regulator for banking, digital payments, lending, and non-banking financial companies. The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) regulates fintech entities dealing with financial instruments, investment platforms and wealth management solutions. The Insurance Regulatory and Development

Authority addresses insurance-linked fintech innovations. This multi-regulator architecture creates both strengths and complexities. Specialisation enables regulator expertise; however, gaps arise at regulatory boundaries where innovative business models defy traditional categorisation.

The RBI's approach has evolved significantly, moving from initial reluctance toward structured accommodation of FinTech innovation. The Reserve Bank's 2019 regulatory initiative provided controlled environments for testing innovative products, explicitly indicating regulatory openness to experimentation. However, the foundational shift occurred through successive digital lending guidelines. The September 2022 Digital Lending Guidelines, which were subsequently refined in 2025 Digital Lending Directions, represented a fundamental recalibration of RBI philosophy. Rather than adopting either laissez-faire permissiveness or prohibitive restriction, the RBI constructed a calibrated legal framework that acknowledged distinct roles for regulated entities, unregulated lending service providers and loan marketplaces.

The 2025 directions exemplified regulatory maturation. The framework introduced several innovations. First, it extended the regulatory perimeter to encompass all-India financial institutions including NABARD, SIDBI, and EXIM Bank- entities previously not explicitly subject to digital lending-specific compliance despite their increasing engagement with technology-led lending. Second, it formalised the Default Loss Guarantee regime, which had previously existed in regulatory grey area and established clear parameters to govern guarantee invocation and ensure that credit risk attribution remained transparent despite complex partnership arrangements.

Particularly innovative was the mandatory digital lending application disclosure framework. The RBI required all regulated entities to report all digital lending applications, both their own and those of partner lending service providers, via the Centralised Information Management System portal, with the compiled list made publicly accessible by June 2025. This mechanism, whilst not involving RBI validation of reported applications, shifted compliance burden onto regulated entities and empowered consumers to verify application legitimacy before such engagements. This represented a pragmatic recognition that information asymmetries, rather than prohibitions, constituted the core consumer vulnerability.

The framework also addressed algorithmic opacity. The 2025 directions placed affirmative obligations on lending service providers to ensure loan marketplaces did not devolve into preference-ranking engines lacking logic or explanation. This directly brought into picture the consumer protection principles from securities regulation, where algorithmic nudges and interface bias had been identified as material investment risks, into the digital lending context. Consumer safeguards included mandatory Key Facts Statements standardised across all digital and physical lending by regulated entities, to harmonise disclosure methodology and enabling consumer comparison.

B. BANGLADESH'S MOBILE FINANCIAL SERVICES EVOLUTION

Bangladesh's regulatory trajectory reflects a distinct developmental pathway. With approximately 60 percent of Bangladesh's population residing in rural areas, many lacking bank accounts and formal economic participation, mobile financial services emerged not as technological luxuries but as critical financial infrastructure. The mobile financial services regulatory framework, formalised through the 2022 MFS Regulations, represented evolution rather than revolutionary innovation. Bangladesh Bank, the central bank, iteratively amended MFS regulations reflecting operational experience and emerging risks.

Bangladesh's regulatory challenge proved particularly acute because it lacked several foundational infrastructures facilitating digital finance elsewhere. The absence of widely accepted electronic know-your-customer systems constrained KYC efficiency. The lack of a unified payment interface analogous to India's Unified Payments Interface (UPI) limited ecosystem interoperability. Digital infrastructure remained uneven, particularly in rural areas where financial inclusion imperatives were greatest. Furthermore, Bangladesh lacked robust settlement regulations specifically governing digital money transfers, which created vulnerability to fraud and limiting customer recourse mechanisms.

Despite these constraints, Bangladesh Bank pursued a pragmatic accommodation approach. MFS providers became de facto financial infrastructure operators, particularly bKash and Rocket, which launched mobile money services enabling millions to access payments, remittances and microfinance. Regulatory frameworks recognised this reality rather than resisting it. The regulatory approach emphasised oversight mechanisms, compliance requirements and consumer protection provisions rather than restrictive licensing conditions that would have stifled this critical infrastructure.

Bangladesh Bank also adopted limited forms of regulatory sandboxing and experimentation. The Central Bank's recognition that digital lending platforms posed distinct risks compared to traditional MFS led to exploration of sandbox mechanisms which enabled controlled product testing. However, institutional capacity constraints and regulatory bandwidth limitations slowed implementation compared to comparable initiatives elsewhere in South Asia.

C. SRI LANKA'S REGULATORY SANDBOX INNOVATION

Sri Lanka adopted a distinctive approach through developing FinTech regulatory sandbox implementation.[8] Launched in February 2020 by the Central Bank of Sri Lanka, the regulatory sandbox represented explicit regulatory accommodation of innovation experimentation within defined constraints. The framework consisted of various innovative elements.

First, it provided for a partnership requirement: innovators seeking sandbox access were obliged to partner with Central Bank licensed financial institutions (unless applicants were themselves licensed), which ensured ecosystem integration and limiting unregulated platform proliferation. Second, it required prior third-party verification that proposed solutions had been tested in laboratory environments, that established technical credibility before real-market experimentation. Third, it created

[8] *Decoding Sri Lanka's FinTech Regulatory Sandbox*, Ceylon Chamber of Com., https://chamber.lk/decoding-sri-lankas-fintech-regulatory-sandbox/ (last visited Nov. 29, 2025).

a dedicated Financial Technology Advancement Committee functioning as the decision-making body for sandbox approvals.

The Sri Lankan approach addressed critical regulatory tensions through institutionalised learning. Regulators gained genuine visibility into emerging innovations and associated risks, which enabled more informed policy development. Innovators accessed regulatory guidance and managed regulatory uncertainty through structured experimentation rather than speculative compliance interpretation. Essentially, the framework acknowledged that regulatory sandboxes themselves required external coordination mechanisms, as research by the Consultative Group to Assist the Poor indicated that single-authority sandbox establishment might disadvantage innovators in interlinked sectors including insurance and telecommunications.

VI. CONSUMER PROTECTION ARCHITECTURE: SUBSTANTIVE SAFEGUARDS AND MECHANISMS

A. DATA PRIVACY AND PROTECTION FRAMEWORKS

South Asian jurisdictions have increasingly recognised data privacy as foundational to consumer protection in digital finance. The challenge proved particularly acute given that digital financial services fundamentally depend on consumer data- yet historical regulatory regimes predated digital ecosystems and consequently lacked data-specific governance frameworks.

India's response involved layered statutory innovation. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, established comprehensive personal data governance applicable across economic sectors, including fintech. The legislation imposes stringent security standards which govern the collection, storage, processing, and disposal of personal data. FinTech companies must classify data into distinct categories- customer-consented data, sensitive data, and non-personal data- with calibrated protections reflecting sensitivity. This legislation mandates authenticated customer-initiated transactions, explicit consent for data processing and secure encrypted data storage within Indian territory.

Significantly, the DPDP Act designates certain data processors as "Significant Data Fiduciaries" which is subject to certain obligations. FinTech firms handling financial data are presumptively included within this category, requiring appointment of dedicated Data Protection Officers and independent Data Auditors. The Act recognises "deemed consent" in specific circumstances, such as compliance with legal judgements, fraud prevention, debt recovery and credit scoring, but subjects even deemed consent to use-purpose limitations. Non-compliance attracts penalties exceeding ₹250 crore (approximately USD 30.5 million), representing substantial deterrents.

The RBI's Digital Lending Guidelines complemented broader data protection legislation with finance-specific provisions. Regulated entities must limit data collection to what is genuinely necessary, obtain borrower express approval prior to collection and maintain detailed audit records of data access. Critically, digital lending applications are prohibited from accessing extraneous device data including media, contact information, call logs and phone features unless explicitly necessary for legitimate lending purposes. Data destruction protocols mandate time-bound deletion upon purpose completion or relationship termination. The August 2024 Data Security and Privacy Standards Framework for credit card bill payments further categorised customer data and mandated authenticated transactions, explicit consent for processing and secure encrypted storage within Indian territory.

Bangladesh's approach, whilst less comprehensively legislated than India's, embedded data protection principles within MFS regulations and fintech oversight mechanisms. Emphasis centred on customer due diligence requirements, transaction monitoring protocols and fraud detection capabilities that necessarily implicated data handling safeguards.

B. GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL AND CONSUMER RECOURSE MECHANISMS

South Asian regulatory frameworks have established increasingly sophisticated grievance redressal mechanisms recognising that consumer protection ultimately depends on effective recourse mechanisms enabling consumer harm remediation.

These mechanisms operate through multiple tiers reflecting escalation pathways and institutional specialisation.

In India, the framework operates through nested mechanisms. Regulated entities including NBFCs must establish internal grievance redressal mechanisms[9] with designated Grievance Redressal Officers responsible for complaint tracking and resolution. Complaints must receive responses within specified time frames, with procedures and timelines published on institutional websites. Complaints wholly or partly rejected by internal mechanisms undergo automatic escalation to internal ombudsmen, who are the senior officials appointed by regulated institutions specifically to review disputed complaints and render independent decisions.

Complaints unresolved through these internal mechanisms access the NBFC Ombudsman Scheme established by the RBI, through which senior RBI-appointed officials redress customer complaints against NBFCs for service deficiencies falling within specified grounds. Customers dissatisfied with NBFC responses or not receiving responses within eight days can escalate to the Ombudsman, who conducts independent investigation and issues binding determinations. The cumulative effect creates a three-tier redressal architecture: internal institutional mechanisms, internal ombudsmen for institutional escalation and external ombudsman for final determination.

Bangladesh's grievance redressal architecture, whilst less formally layered, embedded escalation pathways within MFS regulations requiring provider compliance with customer complaint procedures, investigation requirements and resolution timelines. Complaints exceeding institutional resolution capacity could access Bangladesh Bank's supervisory complaint mechanisms.

Sri Lanka's regulatory sandbox framework incorporated grievance elements, with CBSL oversight ensuring sandbox participants maintained adequate complaint-handling mechanisms and consumer protection standards.

---

[9] *Customer Grievance Redressal Policy of NBFCs*, Chaitanya India, https://chaitanyaindia.in/customer-grievance-redressal-policy-of-nbfcs/ (last visited Nov. 29, 2025).

Across South Asia, digital mechanisms emerged as increasingly important. The RBI's online complaint portal (cms.rbi.org.in) enabled digital complaint filing, tracking and status updates, which reduced documentation burdens and increasing accessibility for geographically dispersed borrowers. NPCI Bharat BillPay Limited implemented digital complaint resolution mechanisms for digital payment platforms. These mechanisms recognised that effective grievance redressal depended not merely on procedural availability but on accessibility, transparency and speed.

VII. PRUDENTIAL AND REGULATORY ARCHITECTURE

A. LICENSING AND AUTHORISATION FRAMEWORKS

Licensing frameworks constitute foundational regulatory architecture through which jurisdictions establish who operates within financial systems and under what conditions. South Asian approaches reflected tension between enabling market entry for innovators and maintaining systemic integrity through managed entry pathways.

India's licensing framework for digital lending differentiated between regulated entities (banks, NBFCs, all-India financial institutions) and unregulated lending service providers. This bifurcation acknowledged that complete universalisation of licensing, requiring all entities touching lending to obtain banking licenses, would prohibitively restrict market entry and stifle financial inclusion. Conversely, allowing completely unregulated digital lending platforms would recreate predatory conditions observed prior to 2022 regulatory interventions. The solution created a managed middle ground: lending service providers could operate without direct license but only through partnerships with regulated entities bearing ultimate credit risk and regulatory accountability.

This architecture involved deliberate risk allocation. Regulated entities retained ultimate responsibility for underwriting quality, customer protection compliance and financial stability. Lending service providers could innovate in technology, customer acquisition and operational efficiency but remained subordinated to regulated entity oversight and RBI regulatory authority. The framework explicitly prohibited lending service providers from retaining customer funds, engaging in

 (ISSN: 2583-7753)

deposit-taking, or bearing credit risk- activities centralised within the regulated institution. The approach represented pragmatic regulatory design acknowledging that some risks could be effectively managed at platform margins while core systemic risks required traditional regulatory oversight.

Bangladesh's mobile financial services licensing reflected similar pragmatism. Rather than requiring all MFS providers to obtain full banking licenses (which would have prohibited market entry for the small, technically sophisticated startups that ultimately pioneered the sector), Bangladesh Bank created purpose-specific MFS licenses enabling payment and remittance services without full banking authority. This licensing innovation directly enabled the emergence of services like bKash and Rocket that fundamentally transformed financial inclusion.

Singapore and Malaysia developed more sophisticated payment services licensing frameworks. Singapore's Payment Services Act 2019 established three license categories-money-changing licenses, standard payment institution licenses and major payment institution licenses, each carrying calibrated requirements reflecting risk profiles. Standard payment institutions faced AML/CFT requirements which were less stringent than major payment institutions and enabled proportional regulation. This licensing architecture anticipated that some payment service providers served predominantly lower-risk functions and consequently deserved lighter regulatory burdens.

B. PRUDENTIAL NORMS AND CAPITAL ADEQUACY FRAMEWORKS

Prudential regulation- imposing capital adequacy, liquidity and risk management requirements on regulated entities, constitutes traditional regulatory architecture ensuring that financial institutions maintain capacity to absorb losses without threatening systemic stability. South Asian prudential frameworks have evolved to accommodate fintech business models whilst maintaining stability safeguards.

India's Scale-Based Regulatory Framework for NBFCs established differentiated prudential requirements calibrated to systemic importance. Base-layer NBFCs, typically smaller institutions, faced lighter capital requirements, streamlined governance procedures and reduced compliance burden. Middle-layer NBFCs,

 (ISSN: 2583-7753)

traditionally classified systemically important institutions with assets exceeding ₹1,000 crore, required more substantial capital buffers, enhanced governance standards and closer supervisory oversight. Upper-layer entities, identified through RBI scoring methodologies, required compliance with Large Exposure Frameworks, minimum CET1 capital requirements and leverage restrictions comparable to banking regulations.

The calibration reflected regulatory recognition that standardised requirements would disproportionately burden smaller institutions seeking innovation whilst failing to impose meaningful discipline on genuinely systemic entities. This proportionality principle- that regulatory requirements should scale with systemic significance rather than size alone- represented regulatory maturation acknowledging that one-size-fits-all regulation creates perverse incentives.

The framework specifically addressed digital lending risks through prudential caps on lending service provider participation. A regulatory cap of 5 percent applied to the proportion of underlying loan portfolios that could involve lending service providers, limiting systemic concentration in unregulated intermediaries. This prudential discipline acknowledged that whilst lending service providers could enhance efficiency, excessive reliance on unregulated intermediaries created unmanaged systemic vulnerabilities.

VIII. EMERGING CHALLENGES AND FRONTIER REGULATORY ISSUES

A. PREDATORY LENDING AND DEBT-SHAMING PRACTICES

Despite substantial regulatory advancement, predatory lending persists within South Asian digital finance ecosystems. The Indian experience proved particularly instructive. During COVID-19 pandemic periods when digital lending platforms proliferated, lax regulatory oversight enabled emergence of predatory operators employing aggressive collection methodologies

Including:

- Unsolicited contact with borrowers' relatives and employers obtained from unauthorised device data access
- Public shame campaigns leveraging social media platforms to publicise borrower defaults
- Exorbitant annualised interest rates estimated between 360 percent and 1,200 percent
- Rapid loan escalation through multiple simultaneous platform borrowing arrangements
- Predatory data access during onboarding requiring consent to access contact lists, call histories, SMS records and social media data

The regulatory response involved several components. The RBI's 2025 Digital Lending Directions explicitly prohibited digital lending applications from accessing extraneous device data[10], created mandatory disclosure requirements preventing collection methodology surprises and standardised recovery procedures limiting harassment potential. Application stores including Google Play Store and Apple App Store implemented strengthened vetting procedures, flagging and eliminating applications demonstrating predatory characteristics. Public litigation in Indian courts established legal precedent holding collection agents liable for harassment-related harms. Media investigations and activist campaigns created reputational consequences for predatory operators.

However, predatory lending persistence highlighted regulatory gaps. The very speed that enabled digital lending efficiency simultaneously enabled predatory operators to proliferate before regulatory discovery. The fragmented regulatory architecture, with multiple regulators addressing different fintech dimensions, created blind spots where predatory platforms operating outside traditional regulatory perimeters escaped supervision. The challenge motivated ongoing regulatory innovation including mandatory registration of all digital lending

---

[10] *RBI Warns Customers About Predatory Digital Lending Apps*, MediaNama (Apr. 2024), https://medianama.com/2024/04/medianama-rbi-warns-customers-about-predatory-digital-lending-apps/.

applications and strengthened supervisory mechanisms targeting application-layer risks rather than solely regulated institutional risks.

B. SYSTEMIC RISK AND PLATFORM CONCENTRATION

As digital lending platforms achieved market scale, concentration risks emerged from growing dependency on single platforms or ecosystem clusters. The interconnectedness created through platform lending (where multiple lenders accessed customer information through single platforms), payment service provider concentration and data aggregator intermediation created fragility whereby platform failures could cascade through financial systems.

Research examining systemic risk in South Asian emerging markets identified several vulnerability dimensions. Pakistan's rapid digital banking network expansion created operational resilience improvements yet simultaneously increased technology dependency risks. Nepal's limited digital integration created lower immediate platform concentration risks whilst simultaneously constraining financial innovation. Bangladesh's mobile financial services dominance, with bKash and Rocket commanding substantial market share, created concentration risks wherein institutional failures could disrupt critical financial infrastructure serving millions.

Regulatory responses involved several initiatives. Prudential caps limiting lending service provider participation recognised that whilst platform engagement enhanced innovation and inclusion, excessive concentration in unregulated intermediaries created unmanaged systemic risks. Settlement regulation improvements aimed to enhance transparency in digital fund transfers, enabling better monitoring of system-wide liquidity flows.

However, fundamental tensions remained. Digital platforms' efficiency advantages derived partly from economies of scale and network effects that naturally pushed toward concentration. Regulatory restrictions on concentration, whilst addressing systemic risk, potentially sacrificed efficiency and financial inclusion benefits that platform consolidation enabled. Balancing these competing imperatives represented an unresolved regulatory frontier.

IX. TOWARD CONTEXTUALISED REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS: POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CALIBRATED INNOVATION ACCOMMODATION

South Asian regulatory frameworks should continue moving toward explicitly calibrated innovation accommodation rather than residual prohibition.

This entails the following:

- Expanding regulatory sandbox mechanisms to enable controlled experimentation with novel business models, products, and technologies within defined risk parameters
- Creating purpose-specific licensing categories enabling market entry for entities serving particular functions (payment services, microfinance, investment services) without requiring universal banking licenses
- Implementing regulatory proportionality principles ensuring that compliance burdens scale with systemic significance rather than applying uniform requirements across heterogeneous market participants
- Establishing regulatory roadmaps to provide visibility into evolving policy directions, enabling fintech entrepreneurs to align innovation trajectories with regulatory expectations

B. CONSUMER PROTECTION AS COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE

Consumer protection mechanisms should be reconceptualised not as regulatory burdens constraining innovation but as competitive differentiators enabling market trust and sustainable growth.

This involves:

- Establishing enforceable, standardised consumer protection standards applicable uniformly across regulated and lesser-regulated entities, preventing predatory operators from gaining competitive advantage through consumer harm

- Creating transparent grievance redressal mechanisms with clear escalation pathways, accessible complaint procedures and binding remediation authority
- Implementing mandatory disclosure standards enabling consumer comparison of service terms, pricing and algorithmic decision-making processes
- Establishing periodic consumer financial literacy initiatives to address digital finance specific knowledge gaps

C. ALGORITHMIC ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

Recognising that algorithmic decision-making will become increasingly central to financial services delivery, regulatory frameworks should embed algorithmic accountability through,

- Establishing algorithmic testing and validation requirements prior to deployment at scale
- Mandating explanations of algorithmic decision logic at consumer-facing stages, enabling customers to understand why specific credit decisions were rendered
- Implementing bias testing protocols ensuring that algorithmic systems do not systematically discriminate against protected classes
- Creating internal governance structures ensuring that algorithmic systems remain subject to human oversight and control
- Establishing independent algorithmic auditing capabilities, either within regulatory agencies or through contracted third parties

D. DATA PRIVACY AND SECURITY STANDARDS

Data protection must be recognised as fundamental to consumer protection in digital financial services.

This requires:

- Establishing comprehensive personal data protection legislation applicable across financial services
- Implementing security standards mandating encrypted data storage, restricted access controls and incident reporting protocols
- Creating explicit data minimisation requirements limiting collection to genuinely necessary information
- Establishing data destruction protocols ensuring timely deletion upon purpose completion
- Implementing significant penalties for data misuse, establishing credible deterrents against predatory data practices

E. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY AND CONTINUOUS LEARNING

Given FinTech's rapid evolution, regulatory agencies must maintain genuine technological expertise and capacity for continuous learning.

- Recruiting technologists, data scientists and fintech entrepreneurs into regulatory positions
- Establishing dedicated FinTech regulatory divisions with specialised expertise
- Creating ongoing engagement mechanisms with market participants enabling regulators to maintain situational awareness of emerging developments
- Facilitating international technical cooperation enabling regulators to benefit from peer learning and best practice adoption
- Implementing regular regulatory review cycles enabling framework updates as technologies and markets evolve

F. CROSS-BORDER COORDINATION AND HARMONISATION

South Asian regional economic integration requires regulatory frameworks accommodating cross-border financial flows whilst maintaining individual jurisdictional safeguards.

- Establishing bilateral and multilateral information-sharing agreements enabling supervisory coordination on cross-border risks
- Creating regional regulatory harmonisation initiatives establishing common standards for systemic risk management, consumer protection and anti-money laundering compliance
- Facilitating cross-border regulatory sandbox cooperation enabling innovators to test novel services across multiple jurisdictions under coordinated supervision
- Developing South Asian regulatory coordination forums addressing region-wide systemic risks and best practice sharing

X. CONCLUSION

South Asia stands at a critical juncture in financial services regulation. The region's traditional banking systems, whilst valuable, have structurally excluded vast populations from formal financial participation. FinTech presents genuine opportunities for transcending these historical constraints and enabling unprecedented financial inclusion. However, enabling this potential requires regulatory frameworks that neither stifle innovation through excessive prohibition nor permit predatory practices through inadequate safeguards.

The analysis presented in this paper demonstrates that South Asian jurisdictions have begun constructing calibrated, innovation-aware regulatory architectures reflecting this fundamental insight. India's layered digital lending frameworks, Bangladesh's pragmatic mobile financial services regulation and Sri Lanka's regulatory sandbox approach each represent distinct manifestations of shared underlying principle: regulation and innovation need not be antagonistic, but rather interdependent.

The path forward requires continued regulatory evolution. Emerging challenges including algorithmic accountability, systemic platform concentration, and cross-border regulatory coordination demand ongoing innovation in regulatory design. However, the momentum established across South Asia provides genuine hope that policymakers possess both intellectual clarity and institutional will to construct genuinely balanced frameworks serving development imperatives without sacrificing financial stability or consumer protection.

Ultimately, the measure of regulatory success in emerging markets is not the sophistication of regulatory frameworks in isolation but their effectiveness in enabling millions of previously excluded individuals to access affordable, reliable financial services that enhance economic opportunity and security. By this measure, South Asian regulatory frameworks represent work in progress, advancing substantially from predecessor regimes yet requiring continued refinement and innovation. The challenge remains profound, but the trajectory increasingly suggests that regulatory equilibrium, whilst difficult, represents an achievable objective if policymakers maintain commitment to calibrated, learning-oriented governance serving genuine development imperatives.

XI. REFERENCES

- Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2017). FinTech, RegTech, and the Reconceptualization of Financial Regulation. *Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business*, 37(3), 371-413.
- Zohari, I. (2020). Financial Inclusion and FinTech in Developing Economies. *Journal of Digital Finance*, 15(1), 5-20.
- Narayan, S., & Soni, M. (2021). The Role of FinTech in Consumer Protection in India. *South Asian Economic Review*, 22(2), 45-60.
- Kaur, R. (2022). Regulatory Sandboxes in South Asia: Enhancing Financial Innovation While Ensuring Consumer Protection. *Asian Journal of Financial Regulation*, 19(4), 78-92.
- Jain, M., & Sharma, P. (2023). The Impact of Digital Lending on Consumer Protection: A Case Study of India. *Financial Services Review*, 28(1), 33-47.

- Gupta, A., & Raghavan, S. (2019). Data Privacy and Consumer Protection in South Asia's Digital Economy. *Journal of Law and Technology*, 12(3), 125-144.
- Hossain, M., & Rahman, S. (2020). FinTech and Financial Inclusion in Bangladesh: Regulatory Challenges and Opportunities. *Journal of Emerging Markets*, 18(2), 93-105.
- Singh, A. (2021). Balancing Innovation with Consumer Protection in South Asian Financial Systems. *Global Finance and Regulation Journal*, 13(2), 99-118.
- Yadav, V., & Jain, K. (2021). Exploring the Digital Lending Ecosystem in South Asia: The Regulatory Perspective. *International Journal of Financial Regulation*, 14(4), 50-70.
- Sharma, T., & Raj, V. (2023). Systemic Risk in FinTech: The Case of South Asia. *South Asian Journal of Financial Stability*, 9(1), 25-41.
- Sinha, R., & Mehta, P. (2019). Mobile Financial Services and Financial Inclusion: A Review of Bangladesh's Regulatory Landscape. *International Journal of Financial Inclusion*, 8(1), 56-72.
- Sharma, K. (2022). Data Security in FinTech: A Comparative Study of India and Sri Lanka. *Journal of Financial Technology and Data Protection*, 10(2), 44-59.
- Jha, A., & Kumar, R. (2020). Regulatory Approaches to FinTech in South Asia: Lessons from Sri Lanka. *Journal of South Asian Economics*, 23(3), 121-138.
- Malik, P., & Bhatia, S. (2021). Consumer Financial Protection in the Digital Era: Regulatory Approaches in Emerging Markets. *Global Consumer Protection Law Review*, 14(2), 89-104.
- Lee, S., & Kim, J. (2021). Cross-Border FinTech Regulation: Challenges and Opportunities in South Asia. *Journal of International Financial Law*, 29(4), 11-29.