International Research Journal of Management and Commerce
ISSN: (2348-9766)
Impact Factor 8.098 Volume 13, Issue 05, May 2026
©Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)
www.aarf.asia, **Email** : editoraarf@gmail.com

FinTech Operational Architectures in Indian Agritech: A Conceptual Framework for Resolving Information Asymmetry, Transaction Costs, and Credit Rationing in Agricultural Value Chains

Amit Ravindra Kale[1], Dr. U.S. Kollimath[2], Dr. Satish Kumar Lakshkar[3]
[1]PhD Research Scholar, Neville Wadia Institute of Management Studies & Research, SPPU, Pune
[2]Research Guide, NWIMSR, SPPU, Pune; Associate Professor, APIMR, Manchar, Pune
[3]Associate Professor, School of Management, IILM University, Gurugram
Corresponding Author Email ID: amitkale2225@gmail.com

Abstract

Background. Indian agriculture supports 46% of the workforce yet contributes only 18% of gross value added (Ministry of Finance, 2024), with non-institutional credit still accounting for roughly 30% of rural household debt despite three decades of policy intervention (NABARD, 2023). Against this backdrop, Indian Agri-FinTech ventures attracted cumulative funding exceeding USD 2.4 billion between 2017 and 2023 (Inc42, 2023).

Objective. Existing literature documents that FinTech improves rural financial inclusion, but the operational architectures through which Agri-FinTech firms convert digital capability into corrected market failure remain under-theorised. This paper develops a conceptual framework explaining how FinTech operational models resolve three persistent failures in the Indian agricultural value chain: information asymmetry, transaction costs, and credit rationing.

Methodology. A theory-building design combines a PRISMA-adapted systematic literature review (Page et al., 2021) with a purposive multiple-case analysis of nine Indian Agri-FinTech ventures (Eisenhardt, 1989; Yin, 2018): Arya.ag, DeHaat, Ninjacart, Jai Kisan, Samunnati, Growpital, Finsyst Innovations, CropIn, and Kissht. Data are triangulated across regulatory disclosures, RBI and NABARD reports, sectoral publications, corporate filings, and peer-reviewed scholarship.

Key Findings. Four operational archetypes emerge: alternative-data credit scoring, embedded B2B supply-chain financing, warehouse-receipt-backed post-harvest lending, and parametric or embedded crop insurance. Each archetype maps to a distinct combination of theoretical mechanisms drawn from Transaction Cost Economics (Williamson, 1985), Information Asymmetry Theory (Akerlof, 1970; Stiglitz & Weiss, 1981), and the Resource-Based View (Barney, 1991). An integrative matrix links each archetype to specific value-chain nodes, with boundary conditions surfaced through counter-evidence including the 2023–2024 valuation correction.

Implications. For the RBI, findings support expanding the Account Aggregator framework to recognise Agri-data fiduciaries and recalibrating Priority Sector Lending norms to credit digital-origination flows. For NABARD, the analysis suggests refinance designs that reward alternative-data underwriting and treat Farmer Producer Organisations as data-aggregation nodes. For founders, the framework clarifies the strategic trade-off between asset-light platform models and balance-sheet-led lending architectures.

Keywords: Agri-FinTech; transaction cost economics; information asymmetry; credit rationing; agricultural value chain; embedded finance; India.

1. Introduction

1.1 The Persistent Paradox of Indian Agricultural Finance

Indian agriculture accounts for approximately 18.2% of gross value added but absorbs 45.8% of the workforce, a ratio that has compressed only marginally over two decades (Ministry of Finance, 2024). The structure of land holdings amplifies this imbalance: 86.1% of operational holdings are below two hectares and these smallholdings cultivate just 47.3% of operated area (Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers

Welfare, 2020). Smallness drives limited surplus, weak bargaining power, and chronic dependence on credit for both production and consumption needs.

The NABARD All India Rural Financial Inclusion Survey reports average rural household debt of INR 91,407, of which 30.3% originates from non-institutional sources at effective interest rates two to four times the formal banking system (NABARD, 2023). This persists despite the Kisan Credit Card reaching over 73 million accounts, the doubling of agricultural credit targets, and the operational rollout of the Account Aggregator framework (RBI, 2023). Something other than supply-side push is binding.

That something, as four decades of scholarship has argued, is the informational and contractual structure of agricultural markets. Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) demonstrated credit rationing under unverifiable borrower risk. Akerlof's (1970) lemons logic, extended by Hoff and Stiglitz (1990), explains systematic price disadvantage for less-informed parties. Williamson's (1985) transaction cost economics names the cost categories that informational frictions produce: search costs in fragmented mandis, bargaining costs under asymmetric power, and enforcement costs that yield 21–45 day payment cycles for routine produce sales (Bain & Company and ThinkAg, 2022).

1.2 The FinTech Inflection and Its Conceptual Under-Specification

Beginning around 2015, Indian ventures began claiming digital technology could resolve these classical failures. The substrate was real: Jan Dhan opened 530 million accounts (Department of Financial Services, 2024); Aadhaar penetration crossed 99% of adults; UPI processed over 17 billion monthly transactions by mid-2025 (NPCI, 2025). Together with the Account Aggregator framework and the emerging Agri Stack and Unified Lending Interface, this digital public infrastructure forms what Carrière-Swallow and Haksar (2019) call a public-good substrate on which private FinTech can ride.

Cumulative private capital flowing into Indian Agritech crossed USD 2.4 billion between 2017 and 2023, with embedded credit, B2B supply-chain financing, and digital insurance distribution dominant by deal count (Inc42, 2023; Tracxn, 2024). Ventures such as Arya.ag, DeHaat, Ninjacart, Jai Kisan, and Samunnati have each built operational architectures combining logistics, transactional data, and credit underwriting into integrated workflows.

Yet the academic literature remains thinly theorised. One stream treats FinTech as financial inclusion intervention measuring aggregate outcomes (Demirgüç-Kunt et al., 2022; Sahay et al., 2020). A second offers descriptive case accounts catalogueing what firms do without explaining why operational choices resolve specific market failures (Singh & Rani, 2021; Sharma & Joshi, 2022). Neither answers the precise question: through what operational mechanism does a given FinTech architecture correct a given market failure, and what theoretical principles explain the correction? This is the gap this study addresses.

1.3 Contribution and Research Questions

The paper makes three contributions. First, it integrates three theoretical lenses rarely deployed jointly: Information Asymmetry Theory (why the market fails), Transaction Cost Economics (how the failure manifests as a cost stack), and the Resource-Based View (which firms can sustainably arbitrage it). Second, through systematic review and multiple-case analysis, it derives four operational archetypes capturing strategic variation in Indian Agri-FinTech. Third, it offers a policy-managerial matrix translating the framework into concrete recommendations for the RBI, NABARD, NITI Aayog, and operating founders.

The study is organised around three research questions:

RQ1. How do FinTech operational models within Indian Agritech reconfigure the structural failures of agricultural finance information asymmetry, ex-ante transaction costs, and credit rationing?

RQ2. Which operational architectures (digital credit scoring via alternative data, embedded supply-chain financing, parametric insurance, warehouse-receipt lending) demonstrate strongest theoretical and empirical fit for resolving specific value-chain nodes?

RQ3. What conceptual model can integrate TCE, IAT, and the RBV to explain operational logic and competitive positioning of Indian Agri-FinTech ventures?

These questions are explanatory and theory-building rather than predictive. A secondary-data conceptual study can credibly deliver a defensible framework, an evidence-grounded typology, and propositions that downstream empirical work can test (Snyder, 2019; Paul & Criado, 2020). The unit of analysis is the firm's operational architecture, most reliably reconstructed from corporate disclosures, regulatory filings, and triangulated journalistic and analytical coverage rather than perceptual data.

2. Literature Review

The relevant scholarship sits at the intersection of three established literatures agricultural finance and credit market failure, financial inclusion through digital channels, and the strategy of platform-based and FinTech firms. Each strand has matured independently; their joint application to Indian Agri-FinTech remains thin.

2.1 Agricultural Credit Markets and Their Documented Failures

Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) demonstrated that under asymmetric information, lenders ration credit rather than clearing the market. Hoff and Stiglitz (1990) extended this to developing-economy rural credit, showing how monitoring costs, enforcement difficulties, and absent collateral interact to produce persistent under-lending. Besley (1995) catalogued institutional responses including group lending and interlinked transactions. Indian evidence has accumulated: Burgess and Pande (2005) showed branch expansion significantly reduced rural poverty; Kumar et al. (2010) documented the segmented credit market; the Mor Committee Report (RBI, 2014) consolidated the diagnostic view that supply expansion alone, without addressing informational frictions, would not close the gap. Hoda and Terway (2015) and Mukherjee and Pal (2019) refined the picture, with informal dependence rising sharply for the bottom land quartile. This strand is theoretically rich but predates the digital substrate; its policy prescriptions assume traditional collateral and branch-based monitoring.

2.2 Financial Inclusion and the Digital Turn

A second body of work emerged through the 2010s around digital financial inclusion. The Global Findex (Demirgüç-Kunt et al., 2022) and Sahay et al. (2020) documented macroeconomic gains from digital inclusion, particularly during COVID-19. The Indian variant focuses on the JAM trinity. Carrière-Swallow and Haksar (2019) treat the resulting digital public infrastructure as a quasi-public good that lowers marginal delivery cost. D'Silva et al. (2019) analyse the Indian stack as deliberate policy architecture. This literature establishes that digital infrastructure changes the unit economics of inclusion, but the operational architecture of the firm its data pipeline, underwriting model, and risk-sharing structure remains a black box.

2.3 FinTech, Platforms, and Strategic Management

A third strand, drawing more from strategy and information systems, examines FinTech firms as a category. Gomber et al. (2018) offer a taxonomy of FinTech functions; Frost et al. (2019) situate FinTech credit within the broader credit market; Philippon (2016) argues that incumbent inefficiency creates the rent FinTech entrants capture. Adjacent platform-strategy work (Parker et al., 2016; Cusumano et al., 2019; Teece, 2018) is relevant because most Indian Agri-FinTech firms operate as multi-sided platforms. This strand offers theoretical sophistication but limited Indian-context specificity, with agriculture's fragmentation, seasonality, weather risk, and APMC-shaped regulation not central to the canon.

2.4 Indian Agri-FinTech: The Emerging But Thin Literature

Singh and Rani (2021) survey the segment descriptively; Sharma and Joshi (2022) examine blockchain applications; Kumar (2020) reviews Indian FinTech more broadly. Industry publications (Inc42, 2023; Bain & Company and ThinkAg, 2022; KPMG and FICCI, 2023) provide rich operational detail but stop short of theoretical synthesis. Two recent peer-reviewed contributions deserve note: Pal et al. (2022) found heterogeneous effects of digital platforms across crops and regions; Choudhury and Goswami (2023) studied FPO digitalisation and credit access. Neither attempts the integrative theoretical framing this paper proposes.

2.5 The Gap Stated Precisely

Three observations follow. First, the agricultural credit failure literature explains the problem rigorously but predates the digital substrate. Second, the digital financial inclusion literature measures outcomes but does not theorise firm-level mechanics. Third, the FinTech and platform-strategy literature offers conceptual tools rarely applied with sufficient adaptation to Indian agriculture. The present paper occupies this triangulated gap.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 Why Three Lenses

Information Asymmetry Theory tells us why agricultural credit markets fail but says little about how the cost of that failure is distributed. Transaction Cost Economics tells us how informational frictions translate into observable cost categories but offers limited guidance on which firms can profitably arbitrage them.

The Resource-Based View explains firm-level competitive advantage but presupposes the market failures that create the rent. The three lenses are complementary: each addresses a question the others leave unanswered.

3.2 Information Asymmetry Theory in Agricultural Markets

The foundational insight (Akerlof, 1970) is that when one party holds material information the other cannot verify, the market underperforms relative to the symmetric-information benchmark. Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) showed that in credit markets, adverse selection and moral hazard combine to produce rationing equilibria. The Indian agricultural context concentrates these problems: the smallholder typically lacks audited financial records, formal land title, or documented transaction history, and the lender's screening costs exceed expected return on small-ticket loans.

What changes with Agri-FinTech is the marginal cost of information. Alternative-data underwriting draws on signals either exogenous to borrower volition (satellite imagery, weather data, mandi price feeds) or generated as byproducts of transactional participation (e-NAM histories, FPO ledgers, payment flows on B2B Agritech platforms). The screening cost per loan collapses, and the rationing constraint loosens.

Proposition 1. *Agri-FinTech platforms that systematically ingest exogenous and transactional alternative data reduce the screening and adverse-selection costs faced by lenders, thereby expanding the credit-accessible population of smallholders beyond the boundary set by traditional documentation requirements.*

A corollary: credit expansion will be greater where the alternative-data signal is most independent of borrower volition. Data quality, not quantity, drives the rationing-relaxation effect.

3.3 Transaction Cost Economics and the Value Chain

Williamson (1975, 1985) decomposes the cost of any exchange into search and information costs ex ante, bargaining and decision costs at exchange, and policing and enforcement costs ex post. The Indian agricultural value chain exhibits all three at unusually high levels: search costs amplified by mandi fragmentation; bargaining costs by power asymmetry; enforcement costs by informal contracting producing 21–45 day payment cycles (Bain & Company and ThinkAg, 2022).

Agri-FinTech architectures attack each category. A B2B platform such as Ninjacart or DeHaat bundles discovery, bargaining, and enforcement into a single platform-mediated event. Embedded credit and payment products extend the bundling, financing the transaction itself and collapsing what was a sequential cost stack.

Proposition 2. *Embedded payment-and-financing layers within B2B Agritech platforms compress the transaction cost stack by integrating discovery, bargaining, settlement, and credit into a unified workflow, thereby capturing efficiency gains that decentralised market exchange cannot replicate.*

The efficiency gain is greatest at value-chain nodes where the unbundled transaction cost is highest. Post-harvest aggregation, dominated by search and enforcement costs, should show the largest gains.

3.4 The Resource-Based View and Sustainable Positioning

The first two propositions explain why a market opportunity exists; the RBV (Wernerfelt, 1984; Barney, 1991; Peteraf, 1993) addresses why a particular firm can sustainably capture it. Barney's VRIN criteria provide the diagnostic: competitive advantage accrues to resources that are Valuable, Rare, Inimitable, and Non-substitutable. Three resource categories warrant examination in Agri-FinTech: (i) proprietary alternative-data accumulation generated through operational scale a new entrant cannot replicate; (ii) network density on a two-sided platform producing switching costs and indirect network effects (Parker et al., 2016); and (iii) integrated regulatory licence bundles NBFC registration, insurance distribution authorisation, warehousing accreditation, and lender partnerships that take years to assemble. Teece's (2007) dynamic capabilities framework adds a temporal dimension: the firm that can sense, seize, and reconfigure resources as the agricultural environment shifts maintains advantage.

Proposition 3. *Sustained competitive positioning in Agri-FinTech accrues to firms whose proprietary data assets, network density, and regulatory-licence bundles exhibit Barney's VRIN properties, and whose dynamic capabilities permit recombination of these resources as the agricultural and regulatory environment evolves.*

3.5 The Integrative Logic and Scope Conditions

The framework is not a sum of three independent perspectives but a sequenced argument: IAT explains the gap, TCE locates and measures it, RBV identifies who can credibly close it. In summary form: the Agri-FinTech opportunity exists because of information asymmetry, is captured by compressing transaction costs, and is defended by accumulating VRIN resources. The framework applies to ventures whose core economic activity is financial intermediation or financial-service-enabled value chain operation in agriculture, to the post-2016 Indian regulatory and digital-infrastructure context, and assumes the JAM substrate is operationally functional at scale.

4. Methodology

4.1 Design Rationale

The study employs a theory-building qualitative design combining a systematic literature review with purposive multiple-case analysis. The rationale rests on three considerations: the research questions are explanatory rather than predictive; the unit of analysis is the firm's operational architecture, reliably reconstructed from corporate disclosures, regulatory filings, sectoral analyses, and triangulated coverage; and recent methodological scholarship recognises systematic synthesis and case-based theory building as legitimate primary contributions (Eisenhardt, 1989; Tranfield et al., 2003; Snyder, 2019; Paul & Criado, 2020). The review follows PRISMA-adapted procedure (Page et al., 2021); the case component follows Eisenhardt (1989), Yin (2018), and Gioia et al. (2013).

4.2 Systematic Literature Review Protocol

Four databases were searched Scopus, Web of Science, EBSCO Business Source Complete, and SSRN across Food Policy, World Development, Agricultural Finance Review, Technological Forecasting and Social Change, Journal of Rural Studies, Information Systems Research, and Strategic Management Journal. Boolean strings combined three clusters: FinTech ("fintech" OR "financial technology" OR "digital finance" OR "embedded finance" OR "alternative credit"); agriculture ("agriculture" OR "agritech" OR "agribusiness" OR "smallholder" OR "farmer" OR "rural credit"); India ("India" OR "Indian"). The window spanned January 2014 (Jan Dhan launch) to October 2025. Inclusion required peer-reviewed publication or working paper, substantive engagement with Indian Agri-FinTech or directly adjacent topics, and analytical content. The initial 1,840 records reduced to 1,267 after deduplication, 184 after title/abstract screening, and a final corpus of 73 articles after full-text screening.

4.3 Case Selection: Theoretical Sampling

Case selection followed theoretical-sampling logic (Eisenhardt, 1989). Four criteria applied: operational headquarters in India; minimum five years of continuous operation; documented FinTech functionality as core rather than peripheral activity; and public disclosure availability via MCA-21 filings, Tracxn and Inc42, credible long-form outlets, and corporate communications. The final cohort comprises nine ventures representing the four archetypes with at least two exemplars per archetype.

Table 1. Case Cohort Profile

Venture	Founded	Primary Archetype	Selection Rationale
Arya.ag	2013	Warehouse-receipt financing	Cleanest illustration of post-harvest financing with WDRA accreditation
DeHaat	2012	Embedded supply-chain finance	Full-stack platform with documented credit operations
Ninjacart	2015	Embedded supply-chain finance	B2B platform with explicit working-capital products
Jai Kisan	2017	Alternative-data credit scoring	Rural NBFC-FinTech hybrid with documented underwriting innovation
Samunnati	2014	Supply-chain finance + alt-data scoring	Established agri-value-chain lender with FPO focus
Growpital	2020	Adjacent: agri-investment platform	Captures investment-side innovation; comparative case
Finsyst Innovations	2018	Alternative-data scoring	Emerging case with documented technology focus
CropIn	2010	Parametric / embedded insurance enablement	Data-driven insurance and credit enablement; comparative case
Kissht	2015	Alt-data scoring (partial agri exposure)	Boundary case useful for testing scope conditions

4.4 Data Sources, Triangulation, and Analytical Procedure

Five concentric layers of secondary data were assembled with cross-validation. Regulatory and institutional sources included RBI publications (Annual Report, Trend and Progress of Banking, Financial Stability Reports, working papers), NABARD publications, NITI Aayog working papers, the Agricultural Census, and the Economic Survey. Sectoral sources included Inc42, Tracxn, Bain & Company and ThinkAg, KPMG and FICCI, and BCG. Corporate sources included websites, press releases, MCA-21 filings, and long-form interviews in The Ken, Mint, Moneycontrol, ETPrime, and YourStory. Academic sources comprised the systematic-review corpus plus working papers from NCAER, ISID, NIPFP, and CPR. Journalistic sources were used cautiously and only with corroboration. Any non-trivial operational claim required support from at least two independent sources across two different layers.

Analysis proceeded in two coding cycles (Gioia et al., 2013; Suddaby, 2006). Cycle one applied a deductive codebook derived from IAT, TCE, and RBV (adverse selection, moral hazard, screening cost, search cost, bargaining cost, enforcement cost, VRIN resources, dynamic capabilities). Cycle two surfaced inductive patterns the deductive codebook did not anticipate, including data-flywheel dynamics, regulatory arbitrage between NBFC and bank-led models, and FPO-mediated origination. Validity safeguards included two-source corroboration (construct validity), pattern matching with explicit examination of disconfirming evidence (internal), replication across cases (external), and an explicit audit trail (reliability).

4.5 Acknowledged Limitations of Secondary-Data Design

Three limitations warrant explicit acknowledgement. Secondary data inherits the framing biases of producers industry reports tend toward optimism, regulatory reports toward conservatism, corporate disclosures toward success. The case cohort skews toward well-funded, surviving ventures; firms that failed quietly are under-represented. And the rapidly evolving substrate (Account Aggregator framework, Agri Stack, ULI) means the findings have a defined shelf life. Triangulation mitigates but does not eliminate these constraints.

5. FinTech Operational Models in Indian Agritech

5.1 From Theory to Operational Archetypes

The systematic review and multiple-case analysis converged on four operational archetypes. The archetypes are not mutually exclusive many ventures combine elements of two or more but each is analytically distinct in addressing a specific market failure with a specific operational mechanism, and each maps to identifiable value-chain nodes. The four are: Archetype A, alternative-data credit scoring and digital origination; Archetype B, embedded B2B supply-chain financing; Archetype C, warehouse-receipt and post-harvest financing; and Archetype D, parametric and embedded crop insurance. Section 5.6 examines the cross-cutting public-infrastructure layer on which all four increasingly depend.

5.2 Archetype A: Alternative-Data Credit Scoring and Digital Origination

Definition and mechanism. Alternative-data credit scoring supplements or substitutes traditional credit-bureau records by ingesting non-conventional borrower signals. Three signal classes apply: exogenous environmental data (satellite imagery, weather, soil quality) that the borrower cannot manipulate; transactional behavioural data generated as byproducts of platform participation (e-NAM histories, mandi records, FPO ledger entries, payment flows); and documentary digital footprint data (Aadhaar-linked identity, mobile usage, AA-consented financial data). A lending entity either an NBFC or originating partner of a regulated lender ingests these signals through APIs, applies an ML underwriting model, and disburses credit digitally. Loan sizes range INR 15,000–5,00,000, tenors 3–18 months, pricing between bank rates and informal moneylender rates.

Value-chain node and theoretical mapping. The archetype primarily addresses the production-stage credit gap. It maps directly to Proposition 1: substituting exogenous and transactional data for traditional documentation collapses screening cost per loan, and the Stiglitz-Weiss (1981) rationing equilibrium shifts because the lender can distinguish risk types previously indistinguishable at affordable cost.

Case illustration Jai Kisan. Founded in 2017, Jai Kisan operates as a rural-focused NBFC-FinTech hybrid combining borrower-supplied information with platform-aggregated transactional and exogenous signals (Jai Kisan, 2024; Inc42, 2023). Its Bharat Khata digital ledger for rural businesses serves both customer acquisition and data generation, illustrating the data-flywheel dynamic.

Case illustration Samunnati. Founded in 2014, Samunnati is an agricultural value-chain lender with particular focus on FPOs and Agri-enterprises (Samunnati, 2024; Choudhury & Goswami, 2023). FPO-mediated origination is theoretically interesting because the FPO itself becomes a data-aggregation node: by transacting through the FPO, individual farmers generate verifiable histories that inform credit scores. Samunnati's relationships with over 1,500 FPOs constitute a network resource meeting Barney's (1991) inimitability criterion.

Boundary case - Kissht. Kissht is included as a boundary case rather than core illustration. Its primary exposure is urban consumption finance with partial agricultural exposure (Kissht, 2024). It tests scope conditions: alternative-data scoring is not Agriculture-specific in itself the agricultural specificity comes from exogenous farm-level signals and the targeted value-chain node.

Counter-evidence and boundary conditions. Three caveats apply. Alternative-data scoring remains untested at scale through a full agricultural distress cycle. Data quality is uneven satellite-derived farm health is reliable for some crops and regions, FPO ledger data reliable where FPO governance is strong. The 2023–2024 valuation correction (Inc42, 2024) has surfaced unit-economics questions particularly affecting alternative-data lenders, since customer acquisition and data ingestion costs are non-trivial.

5.3 Archetype B: Embedded B2B Supply-Chain Financing

Definition and mechanism. Embedded B2B supply-chain financing refers to credit layered onto transaction flows already running through a B2B Agritech platform. Financing decisions, disbursement, and collection are integrated into the transactional workflow rather than offered as standalone products. Product categories include invoice discounting for sellers, dealer credit for buyers, and input-purchase financing for farmer-customers. The mechanism exploits a specific information advantage: a B2B platform processing significant monthly transaction volume between farmers and buyers possesses real-time visibility into volume, counterparty behaviour, price realisation, and payment patterns visibility an external lender could not match without expensive data acquisition. The platform either lends directly through an in-house NBFC, partners with regulated lenders on co-lending or referral terms, or operates a pure marketplace where financing is the lender's decision but the data is the platform's.

Value-chain node and theoretical mapping. The archetype primarily addresses post-harvest aggregation and distribution, where the unbundled transaction cost stack is historically highest. It maps to Proposition 2: Williamson's (1985) search, bargaining, and enforcement categories are jointly compressed by being integrated into a single platform-mediated transactional event.

Case illustration Ninjacart. Founded in 2015, Ninjacart operates a B2B fresh-produce supply chain platform with explicit financing capability including retailer working capital and earlier-disbursement options for farmers (Ninjacart, 2024; Inc42, 2023). A farmer selling through Ninjacart faces lower search costs (aggregated demand), faster settlement (platform-mediated), and access to financing underwritten on documented platform transaction history (KPMG and FICCI, 2023). Ninjacart's 2022–2024 restructuring (The Ken, 2023; Inc42, 2024) does not invalidate the underlying logic but underscores that compression must produce sustainable unit economics.

Case illustration DeHaat. Founded in 2012, DeHaat operates a full-stack platform integrating input supply, advisory, output marketing, and embedded financial services (DeHaat, 2024; Bain & Company and ThinkAg, 2022). Its documented products include input-credit lines for farmers and working-capital financing for dealers. The full-stack architecture is theoretically distinctive: a single farmer relationship generates input-purchase, advisory, and output-sales data simultaneously, producing a richer underwriting signal than any single-node platform a VRIN-qualifying resource (Barney, 1991).

Counter-evidence and boundary conditions. Efficiency gains are contingent on transaction volume sufficient to amortise platform fixed costs. Below a critical scale, operational cost exceeds transaction-cost savings and unit economics break. The 2022–2024 cohort experience shows this threshold is non-trivial (Inc42, 2024; The Ken, 2023). A regulatory boundary applies: the marketplace-versus-lender line determines which RBI regime applies, navigated through varying combinations of in-house NBFC, co-lending, and referral arrangements (RBI, 2023).

5.4 Archetype C: Warehouse-Receipt and Post-Harvest Financing

Definition and mechanism. Warehouse-receipt financing involves collateralised lending against electronic negotiable warehouse receipts (eNWRs) issued by WDRA-accredited warehouses. A farmer deposits produce, receives an eNWR representing ownership, and pledges it as collateral for a loan typically 70–

80% of prevailing market value. The economic logic addresses a long-standing distress dynamic: smallholders historically sell at harvest because they need cash and lack storage, even though prices typically rise post-harvest. Warehouse-receipt financing breaks the bind: the farmer accesses liquidity through the loan and sells later when prices recover. The lender's credit risk is bounded by collateral value, which is verifiable, storable, and partially price-hedged.

Value-chain node and theoretical mapping. The archetype is unique among the four in being node-specific by design, addressing post-harvest storage and liquidity. It maps to all three propositions but most strongly to Proposition 3: WDRA-accredited infrastructure, eNWR digitisation, lender partnerships, and operational expertise in commodity storage constitute a resource bundle difficult to replicate. A new entrant cannot acquire 200 accredited warehouses across multiple states by purchase the infrastructure must be built.

Case illustration Arya.ag. Founded in 2013 as Arya Collateral and rebranded as Arya.ag, the firm is the cleanest single illustration of Archetype C, with WDRA-accredited warehouses across multiple states, eNWR issuance, and a lending channel against receipts (Arya.ag, 2024; NABARD, 2023). Documented capacity in millions of metric tonnes and lending volumes in thousands of crores represent the resource accumulation the framework predicts (KPMG and FICCI, 2023). Two distinctive features: the technology layer is built on top of, not in place of, physical infrastructure; and the firm partners with multiple lenders rather than lending only from its own balance sheet, scaling credit volume beyond its capital base while retaining data and origination value.

Comparative reference and boundary conditions. No other Indian Agri-FinTech currently operates Archetype C at Arya.ag's scale and operational depth. The high resource requirements produce concentration, consistent with the RBV prediction. The archetype's applicability is constrained by commodity characteristics: storable, non-perishable commodities with active forward markets (grains, pulses, oilseeds, some spices) are suited; perishables, which constitute a large share of smallholder income in many regions, are not. The WDRA accreditation pipeline remains a binding factor in geographic extension (WDRA, 2024).

5.5 Archetype D: Parametric and Embedded Crop Insurance

Definition and mechanism. The archetype combines two innovations. Parametric insurance products pay out on observable exogenous triggers (rainfall thresholds, temperature, satellite-derived vegetation indices) rather than ex-post loss assessment. Embedded insurance is distributed through digital channels integrated with other agricultural services. The mechanism resolves two failures of traditional crop insurance: moral hazard (under indemnity insurance the insured has reduced loss-mitigation incentive parametric triggers based on uninfluenceable parameters eliminate this) and cost of claim (field-level loss assessment is expensive, slow, and contestable; parametric formulas collapse settlement from months to days).

Value-chain node and theoretical mapping. The archetype addresses the risk-management layer overlaying the production cycle, with relevance at credit origination (insurance substituting for collateral) and post-harvest loss. It maps most strongly to Proposition 1 (parametric triggers resolve moral-hazard variants of information asymmetry); also engages Proposition 2 (claim-settlement transaction cost) and Proposition 3 (weather, satellite, yield data as VRIN resources at scale).

Case illustration CropIn. Founded in 2010, CropIn operates as a data and analytics platform serving agricultural enterprises, financial institutions, and insurers (CropIn, 2024; Bain & Company and ThinkAg, 2022). Its position within Archetype D is enablement rather than direct insurance: CropIn supplies the data and analytics layer allowing partner insurers to offer parametric and yield-linked products, with satellite-derived yield assessment the core technical capability. This enablement model is analogous to credit bureaus in traditional finance.

Policy-led illustration PMFBY. The Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana, launched in 2016, has progressively integrated satellite-based crop-cutting experiments and smart-sampling protocols (Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, 2023). It is not an Agri-FinTech venture but illustrates the same parametric and embedded principles at policy scale, clarifying the boundary between private innovation in Archetype D and public insurance infrastructure operating alongside.

Counter-evidence and boundary conditions. Parametric insurance carries basis risk the parametric trigger and actual loss may diverge. A farmer may suffer loss for reasons unrelated to the measured parameter (pest damage, localised disease) and receive no payout, or vice versa. Basis risk has constrained parametric adoption globally, with Indian implementation facing similar issues (RBI, 2023; Ministry of

Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, 2023). Smallholder enrolment also depends on advisory channels and credit-linked bundling that remain works in progress.

5.6 Cross-Cutting Operational Enablers: The Public Infrastructure Layer

The four archetypes depend on a public digital infrastructure layer that has expanded substantially. The Account Aggregator framework (operational since 2021) allows individuals to consent to financial data sharing across regulated entities through a standardised API architecture (RBI, 2023), reducing the cost of borrower-consented data access. The electronic National Agricultural Market (e-NAM), launched in 2016, connects regulated mandis through a unified digital platform capturing transaction-level price and volume data (Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, 2023), providing borrower transaction history and price-realisation evidence for underwriting. UPI processing of agricultural payments has expanded rapidly, with monthly volumes crossing 17 billion in mid-2025 (NPCI, 2025), enabling instant settlement and shortening working-capital cycles. The emerging Agri Stack aims at a unified digital infrastructure including a national farmer registry, land-records integration, and crop-sown registries (Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, 2024; NITI Aayog, 2023). The Unified Lending Interface, piloted by the Reserve Bank Innovation Hub, aims to standardise lender access to consented borrower data (RBI, 2024). In Williamson's terms, this layer is a system-wide transaction cost reduction; in RBV terms, it is a resource not rare and therefore not a source of advantage by itself advantage accrues to firms that complement the public substrate with proprietary capabilities.

6. Discussion and Synthesis

6.1 The Integrative Conceptual Model

The argument converges on an integrative model with three vertically stacked layers operating through a recursive mechanism. At the base sits the substrate layer the public digital infrastructure of Section 5.6 which lowers the marginal cost of entry for all participants. In Williamson's (1985) terminology, it is a system-wide transaction cost reduction, shared across the population of firms. The operational layer above contains the four archetypes from Section 5; each is a distinct mechanism for resolving a specific market failure identified by IAT and translating that resolution into Williamsonian transaction-cost savings. Many ventures occupy multiple positions simultaneously. The resource layer at the top contains firm-specific accumulated assets proprietary data lakes, network density, regulatory licences, and dynamic capabilities that determine competitive positioning. This is the locus of Barney's (1991) VRIN properties and Teece's (2007) dynamic capabilities, explaining why two ventures operating the same archetype on the same substrate generate different outcomes.

The model operates recursively: the operational layer generates data that feeds the resource layer, and the resource layer enables operational improvements that generate more data. This data-flywheel dynamic, documented in the cases of Jai Kisan, Samunnati, DeHaat, and Ninjacart, is what gives the framework its temporal dimension. Positioning is not static firms that capture early operational scale accumulate resources that compound over time.

6.2 The Operational-Innovation-to-Value-Chain-Efficiency Matrix

The integrative model can be operationalised into a matrix mapping the four archetypes against principal agricultural value-chain nodes. Table 2 records the dominant mechanism through which each archetype, when active at a node, generates efficiency.

Table 2. Operational Archetype × Value Chain Node Efficiency Matrix

Archetype	Input Procurement	Production	Post-Harvest Aggregation	Storage & Liquidity	Risk Management
A: Alternative-data credit scoring	Working-capital credit; screening-cost reduction via alt-data	Production credit on exogenous/platform signals; rationing relaxation	Limited direct presence; underwriting may use harvest data	Limited; partial collateral substitution	Indirect via risk-based pricing
B: Embedded B2B supply-chain finance	Input-credit lines; dealer financing	Limited direct production exposure	Search/bargaining cost compression; instant settlement	Limited unless integrated with Archetype C	Indirect via counterparty diversification

Archetype	Input Procurement	Production	Post-Harvest Aggregation	Storage & Liquidity	Risk Management
C: Warehouse-receipt financing	Not applicable	Not applicable	Aggregation via deferred-sale capacity	Core: collateralised liquidity via eNWRs; distress-sale resolution	Partial price-risk hedging via storage timing
D: Parametric & embedded insurance	Indirect via input-credit bundling	Yield-loss coverage; moral-hazard elimination	Limited direct presence	Bundling with C conceptually possible but rare	Core: claim-cost compression; basis-risk-bounded coverage

Three patterns are notable. The archetypes are not uniformly distributed: Archetype B clusters at post-harvest aggregation and market access; Archetype C concentrates at storage and liquidity; Archetype D operates as a cross-cutting risk layer; Archetype A is most diffuse. The densest cells, where archetypes converge, correspond to value-chain nodes where market failure is most acute particularly post-harvest aggregation, where legacy intermediaries extract the largest share of farmer-realised value. Empty or limited cells identify operational frontiers the current cohort has not adequately addressed, particularly in storage-liquidity beyond Archetype C and cross-archetype risk-management integration.

6.3 Theoretical Contributions

The integration produces three theoretical contributions. First, an extension of TCE to digitally-mediated two-sided agricultural platforms: in such platforms, the platform does not internalise the transaction classically; instead it reduces the transaction cost of an exchange continuing between external parties (farmer and buyer). The cost reduction is jointly produced by data architecture and physical logistics, and accrues partly to transacting parties and partly to the platform as captured rent. Second, a refinement of IAT through the concept of exogenously-verified signals: classical IAT treats information as belonging to one party. Alternative-data underwriting introduces a third category information that neither party generates but an external source produces and both can equally access through API or consent. This bypasses the manipulation problem of self-reported data and represents a different information equilibrium than classical IAT contemplates. Third, specification of VRIN resources in the Indian Agri-FinTech context: three resource categories most reliably meet the VRIN test proprietary alternative-data accumulation at scale, network density on two-sided platforms, and integrated regulatory licence bundles. Other commonly-cited resources (talent, technology platforms) are valuable but typically fail inimitability.

6.4 Engaging with Counter-Evidence

Three sources of counter-evidence warrant engagement. The 2023–2024 valuation correction (Inc42, 2024; The Ken, 2023) is sometimes cited as evidence that the sector's logic is flawed. The framework offers a more nuanced reading: the correction primarily affected the unit-economics tier rather than market-failure-resolution logic. The reasons agriculture exhibits information asymmetry, transaction costs, and credit rationing did not change what changed was the cost and patience of capital, exposing ventures whose scale had not yet produced sufficient resource accumulation. Ventures whose resource positions were stronger have weathered the correction better, a falsifiable claim. Basis risk in parametric insurance is a feature of the operational mechanism, not a flaw in theoretical logic; hybrid products combining parametric triggers with limited ex-post verification are emerging (RBI, 2023). The persistent role of non-institutional credit (still 30% of rural household debt; NABARD, 2023) reflects two scope conditions: the population reached by Agri-FinTech remains a subset of smallholders weighted toward those with alternative-data footprint or FPO participation; and informal credit serves consumption and emergency needs current products are not designed to address.

6.5 Comparative Reflection and Strategic Trade-Off

Brief comparative perspective tests generalisability. Kenya's mobile-money-enabled agricultural finance scales in a different institutional context, leaning more heavily on M-Pesa-style payment flows and less on platform-aggregated alternative data (Suri & Jack, 2016; Aron, 2018), suggesting the substrate layer differs most across countries while operational and resource layers exhibit greater commonality. Brazilian agribusiness FinTech scales around large-farmer financing and commodity-linked instruments (Reardon et al., 2019), with substantive similarity to Indian Archetypes B and C but distinctive smallholder-specific Archetypes A and D. The comparison supports a measured claim: framework logic generalises with appropriate substrate adjustment, but archetype distribution is shaped by national agricultural structure and digital substrate.

The framework also clarifies a recurring strategic choice: whether to operate as an asset-light platform or a balance-sheet-led lender. Asset-light models (DeHaat, Ninjacart in their pure forms) accumulate data and network resources without bearing lending capital cost, partnering with regulated lenders and capturing origination and data value. Economics scale on transaction volume; unit growth cost is low but rent per transaction is modest. Balance-sheet-led models (Samunnati, Jai Kisan in NBFC operations, Arya.ag in parts of its lending) bear capital cost but capture the full lending spread, with economics scaling on AUM. Hybrid models combining in-house NBFC and partner lender relationships have emerged as the dominant pattern in the mature cohort consistent with the framework: the in-house NBFC produces direct lending capability and regulatory positioning while partner relationships extend lending capacity beyond own capital.

7. Policy and Managerial Implications

The framework's central lever is not direct subsidy or credit-target prescription, both of which have shown diminishing returns over decades, but infrastructure provision and regulatory recognition of operational innovations the substrate makes possible. This shift from supply-push to substrate-and-recognise is the underlying logic connecting specific recommendations below.

7.1 Implications for the Reserve Bank of India

Recommendation 1: Expand the Account Aggregator framework's data fiduciary list to include agricultural data sources. The AA framework currently aggregates financial data from regulated entities (RBI, 2023). Its design permits expansion. The highest-value candidates are mandi transaction records via e-NAM, FPO ledger data, accredited warehouse-receipt records under WDRA, and crop-sown registry data through the Agri Stack. Recognising these as legitimate data fiduciaries with appropriate consent and privacy architecture would substantially strengthen Archetype A by enabling consent-flow-based access to agricultural transaction history.

Recommendation 2: Recalibrate Priority Sector Lending norms to recognise digital-origination flows. PSL norms have not been fully updated to reflect operational reality where Agri-FinTech platforms source, underwrite, and service agricultural loans sitting on regulated lenders' balance sheets. Explicit and proportionate PSL credit for genuine digital-origination flows, with safeguards against routing and round-tripping, would align regulatory recognition with operational reality and reduce friction constraining Archetype B's scaling.

Recommendation 3: Clarify the regulatory perimeter for Agri-FinTech NBFCs and platform-lender hybrids. The marketplace-versus-lender boundary remains under-specified, with ventures navigating it through varying combinations of in-house NBFC, co-lending, and referral arrangements (RBI, 2023). A clearer framework recognising and supervising platform-lender hybrids including digital lending guidelines applied to the agricultural use case would reduce uncertainty and lower regulatory-arbitrage incentives shaping architectural choices.

Recommendation 4: Develop supervisory guidance specific to alternative-data underwriting risk. Alternative-data scoring remains untested through a full agricultural distress cycle. Supervisory guidance requiring stress-testing of alt-data models against historical distress scenarios, and establishing minimum disclosure standards for model performance, would address this risk before sectoral failure. The approach is consistent with RBI's emerging FinTech supervision under the Digital Lending Guidelines (RBI, 2022).

7.2 Implications for NABARD

Recommendation 5: Design refinance products that reward alternative-data underwriting. NABARD refinance currently extends liquidity against agricultural lending portfolios (NABARD, 2023). Pricing that recognises alt-data adoption conditional on disclosure standards and performance reporting would target underwriting innovation rather than borrower category, accelerating diffusion across the lender population.

The logic, drawn from Proposition 1, is that screening-cost compression is the mechanism most likely to extend the credit-accessible population.

Recommendation 6: Treat Farmer Producer Organisations as data-aggregation nodes within the credit architecture. FPO-mediated origination, exemplified by Samunnati, is theoretically interesting because the FPO becomes a verifiable transaction-history aggregator. NABARD's programme to promote 10,000 FPOs (NABARD, 2023) provides substantial substrate. Explicitly designing FPO support around the data-aggregation role with digital ledger infrastructure, governance standards for data sharing, and AA-framework integration would convert FPOs into a national-scale alternative-data infrastructure.

Recommendation 7: Strengthen warehouse-receipt infrastructure beyond the current WDRA footprint. Archetype C addresses a specific commodity subset, and WDRA accreditation remains a binding factor in geographic extension. NABARD's role in supporting warehouse infrastructure through capital-investment subsidy schemes and partnership financing can be targeted at expanding the accredited footprint in underserved states and crop categories.

7.3 Implications for NITI Aayog and Central Ministries

Recommendation 8: Accelerate operational maturation of the Agri Stack and Unified Lending Interface. The Agri Stack aims at a unified digital substrate integrating farmer registry, land records, and crop-sown data (Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, 2024; NITI Aayog, 2023). The ULI, piloted by the Reserve Bank Innovation Hub, aims to standardise consented lender access (RBI, 2024). Operational maturation of these initiatives is the single most consequential medium-term policy variable for the sector. Specific accelerants include integrating land-record digitisation with the eNWR system, integrating e-NAM transaction data with the AA framework, and developing a public-good API layer reducing bilateral negotiation costs.

Recommendation 9: Develop a coherent classification and disclosure framework for Agri-FinTech operations. Divergent sector-funding estimates, inconsistent definitions of Agri-FinTech versus general FinTech, and limited firm-level disclosure constrain both research and informed policymaking. NITI Aayog, with the RBI and Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, is positioned to develop minimum disclosure standards for Agri-FinTech ventures particularly those in lending and insurance distribution. This would support evidence-based supervision, more credible research, and better capital allocation.

7.4 Implications for Founders and Operators

Implication 1: The asset-light versus balance-sheet-led choice is consequential, not tactical. The choice determines resource accumulation, regulatory positioning, and unit-economics. The emerging hybrid pattern is consistent with the dynamic-capability logic and should be evaluated as the likely terminal architecture rather than discovered through trial and error.

Implication 2: Data infrastructure is a competitive resource, not an engineering function. Decisions about data architecture, retention, partnerships, and engineering are resource-accumulation decisions with long-term competitive consequences. The data-flywheel dynamic is real and compounding but operates only when data architecture is deliberately designed for it.

Implication 3: Unit-economics discipline is the binding constraint at scale. The 2023–2024 correction demonstrated that operational scale does not in itself produce sustainable unit economics. Contribution-margin analysis at the cohort or vintage level should be continuous discipline, not a fundraising exercise.

Implication 4: Regulatory licence accumulation is a long-cycle investment. NBFC registration, insurance distribution authorisation, warehousing accreditation, and lender partnership architectures cannot be assembled quickly under capital pressure. Founders building toward Archetypes B, C, or D should treat licence accumulation as a multi-year commitment informing early architectural decisions.

Implication 5: Boundary conditions matter operationally, not just analytically. Section 5's archetype-specific boundary conditions distress-cycle sensitivity, embedded-finance unit-economics thresholds, warehouse-receipt commodity-specificity, parametric basis-risk define the operational frontier within which each archetype can sustainably scale. Founders should map target population, geography, and product portfolio against these conditions explicitly rather than discovering them post-hoc.

8. Conclusion, Limitations, and Future Research

8.1 Conclusion

The paper opened with a paradox: Indian agriculture supports roughly 46% of the workforce, contributes around 18% of GVA, and continues to depend on non-institutional credit for approximately 30% of rural household debt despite three decades of policy intervention (Ministry of Finance, 2024; NABARD, 2023). The paradox has classical roots in information asymmetry, transaction costs, and credit rationing, only recently confronted by a digital public infrastructure that changes the marginal cost of resolving these failures.

The paper's primary contribution is to integrate three theoretical traditions explaining what a generation of Indian Agri-FinTech ventures has built. IAT explains why the market fails; TCE explains how the failure manifests as a cost stack; RBV explains which firms can sustainably arbitrage it. The integrative substrate-operational-resource model is the paper's primary theoretical claim. Three subsidiary contributions follow: the four operational archetypes provide a typology organising a heterogeneous and rapidly evolving sector; the operational-innovation-to-value-chain-efficiency matrix surfaces both convergence patterns and operational frontiers; and the policy-managerial recommendations translate the framework into specific addressed action items.

The framework does not predict that Indian agriculture's structural credit gap will close imminently. It predicts the gap will close unevenly in patterns shaped by which value-chain nodes the archetypes most effectively serve, which borrower populations the alternative-data substrate makes legible, and which firms accumulate the resource bundles sustaining operational scale. The 30% non-institutional debt share will not fall uniformly. It will fall faster in segments where archetypes and policy recognition align, and persist longer where they do not. This is a more specific and falsifiable claim than the broad financial-inclusion narrative the field has so far produced.

8.2 Limitations

Four limitations warrant explicit acknowledgement. First, the secondary-data design constrains unit-of-analysis depth: the framework is defensible at architectural-type level but sensitive to operational detail the public record does not always surface. Second, the case cohort is constrained by visibility, systematically excluding ventures that failed quietly, pivoted away, or operate below the disclosure threshold; the findings describe the visible operational frontier and may understate failure modes. Third, temporal scope is bounded by the substrate the post-2016 Indian context and the AA framework, Agri Stack, and ULI are still evolving, so specific predictions carry a defined shelf life. Fourth, the framework is theory-building rather than theory-testing: propositions are derived and supported through pattern-matching but not causally identified.

8.3 Future Research Directions

Five directions follow. First, mixed-method validation through founder and lender interviews would test whether reconstructed architectures match operational reality as reported by participants (Gioia et al., 2013). Second, panel-data econometric tests of Proposition 1 the rationing-relaxation hypothesis using successive NABARD Rural Financial Inclusion Survey waves combined with administrative Agri-FinTech lending data could exploit AA-rollout, e-NAM coverage, or Agri Stack pilot variation for identification. Third, network analysis of the inter-firm ecosystem would test whether ecosystem centrality predicts sustained positioning. Fourth, systematic comparative analysis applying the framework to Kenya, Indonesia, Brazil, and the Philippines would test generalisability. Fifth, longitudinal tracking of cohort unit economics over 2024–2028 would directly test the framework's prediction that pre-correction resource positions predict post-correction trajectories. A sixth direction concerns the climate-finance interface: as climate volatility increases and parametric products mature, the interaction between Archetype D and the other archetypes is likely to become a primary site of operational innovation.

8.4 Closing Statement

The paper has argued that the operational integration of FinTech into Indian agritech is theoretically tractable, that the integration resolves identifiable market failures through identifiable mechanisms, and that resolution is uneven, contingent on substrate, and shaped by resource accumulation. The framework is a starting point, not a closure. The Indian agricultural credit gap has persisted long enough to defeat several generations of policy ambition. Whether the current generation, equipped with a digital substrate and an emerging set of operational archetypes, will close more of the gap than its predecessors did, remains an empirical question. The contribution of this paper is to specify the question precisely enough that future research, and future policy, can engage it productively.

References

Aggarwal, S., & Klapper, L. (2013). Designing government policies to expand financial inclusion: Evidence from around the world. The World Bank Working Paper Series.

Akerlof, G. A. (1970). The market for "lemons": Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 84(3), 488–500.

Aron, J. (2018). Mobile money and the economy: A review of the evidence. The World Bank Research Observer, 33(2), 135–188.

Arya.ag. (2024). About Arya.ag: Integrated grain commerce platform. Retrieved from https://www.arya.ag

Bain & Company, & ThinkAg. (2022). Indian Agritech: Investment trends and outlook. Bain & Company.

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120.

Besley, T. (1995). Savings, credit and insurance. In J. Behrman & T. N. Srinivasan (Eds.), Handbook of Development Economics (Vol. 3, pp. 2123–2207). Elsevier.

Burgess, R., & Pande, R. (2005). Do rural banks matter? Evidence from the Indian social banking experiment. American Economic Review, 95(3), 780–795.

Carrière-Swallow, Y., & Haksar, V. (2019). The economics and implications of data: An integrated perspective. IMF Departmental Paper No. 19/16.

Choudhury, P., & Goswami, R. (2023). Digitalisation of Farmer Producer Organisations and credit access: Evidence from India. Journal of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development, 9(2), 145–168.

CropIn. (2024). CropIn: AI-powered agri-intelligence platform. Retrieved from https://www.cropin.com

Cusumano, M. A., Gawer, A., & Yoffie, D. B. (2019). The business of platforms: Strategy in the age of digital competition, innovation, and power. HarperBusiness.

DeHaat. (2024). About DeHaat: Full-stack agritech platform. Retrieved from https://www.dehaat.com

Demirgüç-Kunt, A., Klapper, L., Singer, D., & Ansar, S. (2022). The Global Findex Database 2021: Financial inclusion, digital payments, and resilience in the age of COVID-19. World Bank.

Department of Financial Services. (2024). Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana: Progress report. Ministry of Finance, Government of India.

D'Silva, D., Filková, Z., Packer, F., & Tiwari, S. (2019). The design of digital financial infrastructure: Lessons from India. BIS Papers No. 106.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. Academy of Management Review, 14(4), 532–550.

Frost, J., Gambacorta, L., Huang, Y., Shin, H. S., & Zbinden, P. (2019). BigTech and the changing structure of financial intermediation. BIS Working Paper No. 779.

Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. Organizational Research Methods, 16(1), 15–31.

Gomber, P., Kauffman, R. J., Parker, C., & Weber, B. W. (2018). On the FinTech revolution: Interpreting the forces of innovation, disruption, and transformation in financial services. Journal of Management Information Systems, 35(1), 220–265.

Hoda, A., & Terway, P. (2015). Credit policy for agriculture in India: An evaluation. NITI Aayog Working Paper.

Hoff, K., & Stiglitz, J. E. (1990). Imperfect information and rural credit markets: Puzzles and policy perspectives. The World Bank Economic Review, 4(3), 235–250.

Inc42. (2023). State of Indian Agritech report. Inc42 Media.

Inc42. (2024). Indian startup funding and valuation correction report. Inc42 Media.

Jai Kisan. (2024). Bharat Khata and rural financial services. Retrieved from https://www.jaikisan.com

Kissht. (2024). Kissht: Digital lending platform. Retrieved from https://www.kissht.com

KPMG, & FICCI. (2023). Indian Agritech: Charting the next phase of growth. KPMG India.

Kumar, A. (2020). FinTech in India: An overview. Journal of Banking and Finance Studies, 12(3), 45–62.
Kumar, A., Singh, K. M., & Sinha, S. (2010). Institutional credit to agriculture sector in India: Status, performance and determinants. Agricultural Economics Research Review, 23, 253–264.
Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare. (2020). Agricultural Census 2015–16: All India report on number and area of operational holdings. Government of India.
Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare. (2023). Annual report 2022–23. Government of India.
Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare. (2024). Agri Stack initiative: Progress and architecture. Government of India.
Ministry of Finance. (2024). Economic Survey 2023–24. Government of India.
Mukherjee, S., & Pal, P. (2019). Impediments to the spread of formal credit in rural India: Evidence from the NSSO. Economic and Political Weekly, 54(34), 39–46.
NABARD. (2023). NABARD All India Rural Financial Inclusion Survey 2021–22. National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development.
National Payments Corporation of India. (2025). UPI product statistics. NPCI.
Ninjacart. (2024). Ninjacart: Agri-supply chain platform. Retrieved from https://www.ninjacart.com
NITI Aayog. (2023). Digital agriculture: Towards an integrated framework. Government of India.
Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ, 372, n71.
Pal, A., De', R., & Herath, T. (2022). The role of mobile payment technology in sustainable and human-centric development: Evidence from the post-demonetization period in India. Information Systems Frontiers, 24, 1027–1056.
Parker, G. G., Van Alstyne, M. W., & Choudary, S. P. (2016). Platform revolution: How networked markets are transforming the economy. W. W. Norton.
Paul, J., & Criado, A. R. (2020). The art of writing literature review: What do we know and what do we need to know? International Business Review, 29(4), 101717.
Peteraf, M. A. (1993). The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view. Strategic Management Journal, 14(3), 179–191.
Philippon, T. (2016). The FinTech opportunity. NBER Working Paper No. 22476.
Reardon, T., Echeverria, R., Berdegué, J., Minten, B., Liverpool-Tasie, S., Tschirley, D., & Zilberman, D. (2019). Rapid transformation of food systems in developing regions. Agricultural Systems, 172, 47–59.
Reserve Bank of India. (2014). Report of the Committee on Comprehensive Financial Services for Small Businesses and Low Income Households (Mor Committee Report). RBI.
Reserve Bank of India. (2022). Guidelines on Digital Lending. RBI Circular.
Reserve Bank of India. (2023). Annual Report 2022–23. RBI.
Reserve Bank of India. (2024). Reserve Bank Innovation Hub: Unified Lending Interface pilot update. RBI.
Sahay, R., Allmen, U. E., Lahreche, A., Khera, P., Ogawa, S., Bazarbash, M., & Beaton, K. (2020). The promise of FinTech: Financial inclusion in the post COVID-19 era. IMF Departmental Paper No. 20/09.
Samunnati. (2024). Samunnati: Agricultural value chain finance. Retrieved from https://www.samunnati.com
Sharma, P., & Joshi, A. (2022). Role of blockchain and FinTech in Indian agriculture. Indian Journal of FinTech and Innovation, 4(2), 88–104.
Singh, A., & Rani, S. (2021). Agriculture 4.0: The role of technology in agricultural financing. Agritech India Review, 7(1), 33–52.
Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. Journal of Business Research, 104, 333–339.
Stiglitz, J. E., & Weiss, A. (1981). Credit rationing in markets with imperfect information. American Economic Review, 71(3), 393–410.
Suddaby, R. (2006). From the editors: What grounded theory is not. Academy of Management Journal, 49(4), 633–642.
Suri, T., & Jack, W. (2016). The long-run poverty and gender impacts of mobile money. Science, 354(6317), 1288–1292.
Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319–1350.

Teece, D. J. (2018). Profiting from innovation in the digital economy: Enabling technologies, standards, and licensing models in the wireless world. Research Policy, 47(8), 1367–1387.
The Ken. (2023). Agritech valuations and operational restructuring in 2023. The Ken.
Tracxn. (2024). Agri-FinTech sector report: India. Tracxn Technologies.
Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. British Journal of Management, 14(3), 207–222.
Warehousing Development and Regulatory Authority. (2024). Annual report 2023–24. Government of India.
Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. Strategic Management Journal, 5(2), 171–180.
Williamson, O. E. (1975). Markets and hierarchies: Analysis and antitrust implications. Free Press.
Williamson, O. E. (1985). The economic institutions of capitalism. Free Press.
Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). Sage Publications.