FinTech Innovations and Their Impact on Traditional Banking

Rimjhim Shukla[1], Banothu Mounika[2], Enugurthi Akshay[3], Dupati Sai Kiran Raju[4], Mamidipally Sravani[5], A. Jyothsna[6]

[1–5] MBA (Finance), Aurora's PG College Hyderabad, Telangana
[6] Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Aurora's PG College Hyderabad, Telangana
Email: joshanajoo37846@gmail.com

Abstract—The rapid proliferation of financial technology (FinTech) innovations is fundamentally reshaping the structure, competitive dynamics, and customer engagement models of the global banking industry. Digital payments, peer-to-peer lending, robo-advisory, blockchain-based settlements, artificial intelligence-driven credit scoring, and embedded finance are dismantling traditional banking value chains and compelling incumbent institutions to accelerate digital transformation or risk structural displacement. This paper examines the nature and scope of FinTech innovations, their measurable impact on traditional bank performance metrics, customer acquisition patterns, and revenue model sustainability. A mixed secondary-primary methodology is employed: secondary data is drawn from RBI annual reports, World Bank FinTech publications, KPMG Global FinTech Pulse surveys, and industry databases for the period 2019–24; primary data is collected through a structured questionnaire administered to 100 respondents comprising bank customers and banking professionals in Hyderabad, Telangana. Findings reveal that digital payment FinTechs have eroded traditional bank payment fee revenues by an estimated 18–22%, while open banking APIs and embedded finance are enabling new revenue streams. Net Interest Margins at major Indian private banks have remained resilient, partly through FinTech co-lending partnerships. Customer satisfaction with FinTech-integrated banking services is significantly higher (mean = 4.21) than with traditional branch-only services (mean = 3.04). The study recommends strategic FinTech collaboration, regulatory sandbox participation, and AI-driven personalization as the optimal response framework for incumbent banks navigating the FinTech disruption cycle.

Keywords: FinTech, digital banking, traditional banking, financial innovation, digital payments, blockchain, AI in banking, robo-advisory, open banking, financial disruption, India.

1. INTRODUCTION

The global financial services industry is experiencing its most significant structural transformation since the introduction of credit cards in the 1950s. Financial technology—encompassing digital solutions that automate, enhance, or disrupt conventional financial service delivery—has emerged as a formidable competitive force challenging the century-old business models of traditional banks. The convergence of mobile internet penetration, cloud computing scalability, artificial intelligence capabilities, and evolving regulatory openness has enabled FinTech startups and Big Tech companies to penetrate financial services markets at unprecedented speed and scale.

Global FinTech investment reached USD 113.7 billion across 4,969 deals in 2023 (KPMG Pulse of FinTech 2024), reflecting sustained investor confidence despite rising interest rates and tighter liquidity conditions.

In India, the FinTech ecosystem has grown particularly rapidly, driven by the India Stack infrastructure—comprising Aadhaar biometric authentication, UPI payment rails, DigiLocker document verification, and Account Aggregator data-sharing frameworks—which collectively created the world's most sophisticated public digital financial infrastructure.

Traditional banks—institutions offering deposit-taking, lending, payment, and advisory services through branch-based and digital channels—face a dual challenge: protecting existing revenue streams from FinTech-driven disintermediation while simultaneously identifying collaborative opportunities to leverage FinTech capabilities for service enhancement and cost efficiency. The response strategies of incumbent banks range from internal digital transformation initiatives to strategic FinTech acquisitions, co-lending partnerships, and API-based open banking ecosystems.

India's banking sector, comprising 12 public sector banks, 21 private sector banks, and 44 foreign banks, is navigating this FinTech disruption against a backdrop of strong economic growth, a young digitally-native population, and supportive regulatory frameworks from the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) and the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). The RBI's regulatory sandbox framework, launched in 2019, and the Account Aggregator ecosystem, operationalized in 2021, exemplify India's proactive regulatory approach to structured FinTech innovation.

This paper systematically examines the nature of FinTech innovations disrupting traditional banking, quantifies their impact on bank performance and customer behavior, and recommends strategic frameworks for incumbent banks to navigate the FinTech disruption cycle sustainably.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To identify and categorize the major FinTech innovations currently disrupting traditional banking service delivery across payment, lending, investment, and insurance domains.
- To analyze the quantitative impact of FinTech adoption on key traditional bank performance metrics including net interest margin, fee income, customer acquisition cost, and branch network utilization.
- To assess customer perceptions of FinTech services versus traditional banking services across dimensions of convenience, trust, cost, and service quality.
- To examine the strategic responses adopted by leading Indian private sector banks to FinTech disruption, including partnerships, acquisitions, and internal digital transformation initiatives.
- To recommend a strategic framework for traditional banks to leverage FinTech innovations for competitive resilience and sustainable growth.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

[1] Arner, Barberis, and Buckley (2015) provided the foundational taxonomy of FinTech evolution across three phases: FinTech 1.0 (telegraph and transatlantic cable, 1866–1987), FinTech 2.0 (internet-based financial services, 1987–2008), and FinTech 3.0 (smartphone-enabled, democratized, platform-based FinTech, 2008–present)—a framework widely adopted in subsequent academic literature and regulatory policy documents.

[2] Philippon (2016) demonstrated through historical analysis that financial intermediation costs in the United States remained stubbornly high at 1.5–2.0% of total assets despite decades of technological investment, arguing that FinTech's fundamental contribution is finally reducing the unit cost of financial intermediation through automation, data democratization, and platform economics.

[3] Vives (2017) analyzed the competitive threat FinTech poses to incumbent banks, concluding that payment services and SME lending face the greatest disintermediation

risk, while complex financial advisory and large corporate banking relationships retain significant trust-based barriers to entry—a differentiation that guides strategic response prioritization for traditional banks.

[4] Buchak et al. (2018) empirically analyzed the growth of FinTech lenders in the U.S. mortgage market, finding that regulatory arbitrage explained 60% of FinTech lending growth, while technology-driven convenience explained 40%—suggesting that regulatory framework evolution will significantly determine the long-term competitive equilibrium between FinTech and traditional bank lending.

[5] RBI (2019) launched India's Regulatory Sandbox framework, enabling live testing of innovative financial products in a controlled environment with regulatory relaxations. This framework has facilitated testing of account aggregation, retail payments, digital KYC, and cross-border remittance innovations, directly accelerating FinTech deployment in the Indian banking ecosystem.

[6] Sheng (2021) examined how Big Tech platforms (Amazon, Google, Alibaba, Jio) leveraging massive customer data assets are entering financial services through embedded finance, arguing that data-driven credit scoring and behavioral finance personalization give Big Tech structural advantages over both traditional banks and pure-play FinTechs in consumer lending.

[7] Navaretti et al. (2022) studied the impact of digital banking on financial inclusion in emerging markets, documenting that mobile money platforms in Sub-Saharan Africa and digital banks in India increased formal financial service access by 34–42% in underserved populations—demonstrating FinTech's capacity to expand the overall banking market rather than merely redistributing existing customers.

[8] Chakraborty and Bhatt (2023) analyzed the co-lending partnership model between Indian banks and FinTechs post-RBI Co-Lending Model guidelines (2020), finding that bank-FinTech co-lending arrangements reduced credit delivery costs by 22–28%, expanded credit access to MSME segments with 35–40% lower NPA rates compared to unassisted bank MSME lending, and improved bank fee income without proportionate capital commitment.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a mixed-methods research design, integrating quantitative secondary data analysis with primary survey-based perception assessment. The combined approach enables both macro-level analysis of FinTech's financial impact on traditional banking metrics and micro-level understanding of individual customer and professional perceptions of FinTech disruption.

4.1 Research Design

Descriptive and analytical research design is adopted. Descriptive design documents FinTech innovation categories, adoption trends, and bank performance metric evolution over FY 2019–24. Analytical design applies statistical tests and correlation analysis to examine relationships between FinTech adoption indicators and bank performance variables. Cross-sectional primary data captures stakeholder perceptions at a single point in time (October–November 2024) in Hyderabad, Telangana, providing contemporaneous attitudinal evidence to complement longitudinal secondary data analysis.

4.2 Data Sources

Primary Data: Structured questionnaire administered to 100 respondents comprising 70 bank customers and 30 banking professionals (branch managers, digital banking officers, credit analysts) across five bank branches in Hyderabad. The questionnaire comprised 35 items covering FinTech awareness (8 items), service utilization patterns (10 items), satisfaction comparison (9 items), trust and security perceptions (5 items), and future adoption intentions (3 items). A 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) measured attitudinal variables.

Secondary Data: KPMG Global FinTech Pulse Survey Reports (2020–24); RBI Annual Reports and Financial Stability Reports (2020–24); World Bank Global Findex Database 2021; NPCI UPI transaction volume data (2019–24); EY Global FinTech Adoption Index; Reserve Bank of India Payment System Reports; Indian banking sector financial performance data from CMIE Prowess database; and peer-reviewed journals including Journal of Banking & Finance and Review of Financial Studies.

4.3 Sample Size

A sample of 100 respondents was selected using stratified purposive sampling: 70 bank customers (representing digital banking users across age groups 18–55+) and 30 banking professionals with direct experience in digital transformation or FinTech partnership management. Customer respondents were selected to ensure representation across FinTech adoption levels (heavy users, moderate users, non-users) and income brackets. The 100-respondent sample provides adequate statistical power for descriptive and comparative analysis given the study's primary objective of perception assessment.

4.4 Tools for Analysis

- Frequency distribution and percentage analysis for demographic profiling and FinTech adoption pattern mapping.
- Mean score and weighted average analysis for Likert-scale items comparing FinTech versus traditional banking satisfaction.
- Trend analysis and CAGR computation for secondary data variables (UPI volumes, mobile banking transactions, bank fee income trends).
- Comparative analysis benchmarking Indian bank performance metrics against global FinTech disruption impact studies.
- Chi-square test for independence to examine association between demographic variables and FinTech adoption levels.

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.1 FinTech Innovation Landscape and Adoption Trends

FinTech innovations disrupting traditional banking span six primary domains: digital payments (UPI, wallets, BNPL), digital lending (P2P, MSME credit platforms, co-lending), WealthTech (robo-advisory, discount broking), InsurTech (embedded insurance, usage-based products), RegTech (automated compliance, digital KYC), and Blockchain/DLT (cross-border settlements, CBDC pilots). In India, digital payments represent the most mature disruption vector, with UPI processing 131 billion transactions worth ₹199.9 trillion in FY 2023–24.

Table I: FinTech Domain-wise Adoption and Disruption Intensity in India (FY 2023–24)

FinTech Domain	Key Players	Transaction Volume	Disruption Intensity
Digital Payments	PhonePe, GPay, Paytm	131 Bn txns/yr	Very High
Digital Lending	Lendingkart, Faircent	₹4.2 Lakh Cr AUM	High
WealthTech	Zerodha, Groww	85 Mn active users	High
InsurTech	Acko, PolicyBazaar	₹58,000 Cr premium	Moderate
RegTech	Signzy, IDfy	480 Mn KYCs/yr	Moderate
Blockchain / DLT	RBI CBDC pilot	1 Mn wallets	Emerging

5.2 Impact on Traditional Bank Performance Metrics

Analysis of Indian private sector bank performance data over FY 2019–24 reveals differentiated FinTech impacts across metrics. Payment fee income (NEFT, RTGS, DD, cash handling charges) declined as a proportion of total non-interest income from 18.4% to 11.2%, reflecting UPI's zero-MDR policy displacing fee-generating payment instruments. However, digital banking adoption reduced customer acquisition cost

from ₹1,842 per account (FY 2019–20) to ₹892 (FY 2023–24), while cross-sell revenue per digital customer improved by 34%.

Table II: FinTech Impact on Traditional Bank Performance Metrics (FY 2019–24)

Performance Metric	FY 2019-20	FY 2021-22	FY 2023-24	Trend
Payment Fee Income / NII (%)	18.4	15.1	11.2	↓ Negative
Digital Txn Share of Total (%)	61.3	78.4	94.2	↑ Positive
Customer Acquisition Cost (₹)	1,842	1,312	892	↓ Positive
Branch Cost / Total OpEx (%)	38.4	32.1	26.7	↓ Positive
NIM – Private Banks (%)	3.48	3.72	4.21	↑ Positive
Co-lending Portfolio (₹ Lakh Cr)	0.38	1.12	3.84	↑ Positive

5.3 Customer Satisfaction: FinTech vs Traditional Banking

Primary survey data reveals a statistically significant satisfaction differential between FinTech-integrated services and traditional branch-based banking. FinTech services score highest on convenience (mean = 4.48) and transaction speed (mean = 4.52), while traditional banking retains superiority in trust for complex transactions (mean = 4.18) and relationship-based service (mean = 4.02). The overall FinTech service satisfaction mean (4.21) significantly exceeds traditional banking satisfaction mean (3.04), confirming the experiential superiority of digital-native financial service delivery.

Table III: Customer Satisfaction Comparison – FinTech vs Traditional Banking (n=70)

Service Dimension	FinTech Mean	Trad. Banking Mean	Difference
Convenience & Accessibility	4.48	3.12	+1.36
Transaction Speed	4.52	2.94	+1.58
Cost / Fee Transparency	4.21	2.87	+1.34
Security & Fraud Protection	3.62	4.02	-0.40
Complex Transaction Support	3.18	4.18	-1.00
Relationship & Personalization	3.44	4.02	-0.58
Overall Satisfaction	4.21	3.04	+1.17

5.4 UPI and Digital Payment Growth Trend

Unified Payments Interface (UPI) represents the most consequential FinTech-enabled disruption of traditional banking payment revenue in India. Launched in April 2016, UPI processed 131 billion transactions worth ₹199.9 trillion in FY 2023–24, a 10-year CAGR of approximately 140% in transaction volume. The zero-MDR policy for peer-to-peer and person-to-merchant UPI transactions has eliminated an estimated ₹12,000–15,000 crore in annual payment fee revenue that traditional banks and card networks previously earned, while simultaneously driving unprecedented financial inclusion.

Table IV: UPI Transaction Volume and Value Growth (FY 2019–24)

Financial Year	Volume (Bn)	Value (₹ Trillion)	YoY Growth (Vol %)
FY 2019-20	12.5	21.3	—
FY 2020-21	22.3	41.0	+78.4%
FY 2021-22	45.9	84.2	+105.8 %
FY 2022-23	83.7	139.1	+82.4%
FY 2023-24	131.0	199.9	+56.5%

5.5 Banking Professional Perceptions of FinTech Disruption

Survey data from 30 banking professionals reveals nuanced institutional perspectives on FinTech disruption. A majority (73.3%) perceive FinTechs as 'collaborative partners' rather than 'pure competitors'—a significant shift from the adversarial framing prevalent five years ago. Co-lending partnerships (cited by 83.3% as strategically important), API-based embedded finance (66.7%), and AI-driven credit scoring integration (76.7%) are identified as the highest-priority FinTech collaboration opportunities. Cybersecurity risk (86.7%) and regulatory compliance complexity (73.3%) are the two most frequently cited FinTech integration challenges.

Table V: Banking Professional Perceptions of FinTech (n=30)

Perception Dimension	Agree / Strongly Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)
FinTechs are partners, not threats	73.3	16.7	10.0
Co-lending is strategically important	83.3	10.0	6.7
AI credit scoring improves decisions	76.7	13.3	10.0
Cybersecurity is the top FinTech risk	86.7	6.7	6.6
Digital-only banks threaten market share	46.7	30.0	23.3
Open banking will expand revenues	60.0	23.3	16.7

5.6 Strategic Response Typology of Indian Banks

Indian banks' strategic responses to FinTech disruption can be classified into four typologies based on investment intensity and collaboration orientation. Tier-1 private banks (HDFC Bank, ICICI Bank, Axis Bank) pursue hybrid strategies combining deep internal digital investment with selective FinTech acquisitions and API partnerships. Public sector banks, guided by the Digital India initiative and IBA frameworks, are executing centralized digital transformation programs (e.g., YONO at SBI). Small finance banks increasingly rely on FinTech co-lending and BaaS (Banking-as-a-Service) models.

Table VI: Strategic Response Typology of Indian Banks to FinTech

Strategy Type	Description	Example Banks
Build (Internal)	In-house digital platform development	HDFC Bank, SBI
Buy (Acquire)	Strategic FinTech acquisitions	Axis Bank, Kotak
Partner (Co-create)	API partnerships & co-lending models	ICICI, IndusInd
BaaS (Platform)	Banking-as-a-Service for FinTech embedding	Small Finance Banks

6. FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1 Key Findings

- Digital payments represent the most mature and highest-intensity FinTech disruption vector in Indian banking, with UPI processing 131 billion transactions in FY 2023–24—eliminating an estimated ₹12,000–15,000 crore in traditional bank payment fee revenues through zero-MDR policy, while simultaneously driving mass financial inclusion.
- Traditional bank payment fee income declined as a proportion of non-interest income from 18.4% (FY 2019–20) to 11.2% (FY 2023–24), confirming significant FinTech-driven payment revenue disintermediation. However, digital banking adoption reduced customer acquisition costs by 51.6% (₹1,842 to ₹892) over the same period.
- Customer satisfaction with FinTech-integrated services (overall mean = 4.21) substantially exceeds satisfaction with traditional branch-based banking (mean = 3.04). FinTech services are significantly superior on convenience (+1.36), transaction speed (+1.58), and cost transparency (+1.34), while traditional banking retains advantages in complex transaction support and relationship-based personalization.
- A decisive shift in banking professional perception is confirmed: 73.3% of surveyed professionals view FinTechs as collaborative partners rather than purely competitive threats—reflecting the maturation of the bank-FinTech relationship from adversarial competition to structured co-evolution through co-lending, API integration, and embedded finance models.
- Co-lending partnerships between banks and FinTechs have grown from ₹38,000 crore (FY 2019–20) to ₹3.84 lakh crore (FY 2023–24)—a 10x increase—demonstrating that collaborative models successfully extend credit access while preserving bank capital efficiency and regulatory compliance.
- Net Interest Margins of Indian private sector banks improved from 3.48% (FY 2019–20) to 4.21% (FY 2023–24) despite FinTech competition, suggesting that technology-enabled efficiency gains, improved credit quality through AI-driven origination, and rate cycle tailwinds have more than offset FinTech-driven revenue erosion in lending.
- Cybersecurity risk (cited by 86.7% of banking professionals) and regulatory compliance complexity (73.3%) are the dominant FinTech integration challenges, reflecting the need for robust digital risk management frameworks as bank-FinTech integration deepens across payment, lending, and data-sharing dimensions.
- AI-based credit scoring adoption is viewed as strategically critical by 76.7% of banking professionals, consistent with industry evidence that AI models incorporating alternative data (GST filing, utility payments, behavioral transaction data) improve credit access for thin-file borrowers while reducing default rates in MSME and retail segments.

6.2 Suggestions

- Adopt a structured 'Build-Buy-Partner' FinTech strategy framework calibrated to each bank's digital maturity, capital availability, and customer segment profile. Tier-1 private banks should continue hybrid build-partner models; public sector banks should accelerate strategic FinTech partnerships under RBI co-lending guidelines to overcome internal digital capability gaps.
- Actively participate in the RBI Regulatory Sandbox framework to test innovative products—particularly in MSME credit, cross-border remittances, and green finance—in a controlled regulatory environment before full-scale deployment, reducing compliance risk while accelerating FinTech innovation integration.
- Invest in Account Aggregator (AA) ecosystem capabilities to leverage customer-consented financial data for hyper-personalized product recommendations, real-time credit decisioning, and proactive financial wellness interventions—positioning banks as trusted financial health partners rather than transaction processors.
- Establish dedicated Digital Risk Management Units (DRMUs) with cybersecurity expertise, AI model governance frameworks, and regulatory compliance monitoring capabilities to manage the exponentially growing digital attack surface as bank-FinTech integration deepens across payment APIs, co-lending platforms, and open banking interfaces.
- Develop FinTech literacy programs for branch-level banking professionals to equip them with knowledge of digital product equivalents, FinTech partner capabilities, and customer migration pathways—transforming branch staff from transaction processors to digital banking advisors who guide customers across omnichannel service journeys.
- Leverage embedded finance opportunities by offering Banking-as-a-Service (BaaS) APIs to non-banking platforms (e-commerce, healthcare, education, logistics) to embed financial products (credit, insurance, savings) into customer journeys outside traditional banking touchpoints—creating new revenue streams without proportionate branch infrastructure investment.

7. CONCLUSION

This study has comprehensively examined the nature, scope, and impact of FinTech innovations on traditional banking, with particular focus on the Indian banking ecosystem over FY 2019–24. The evidence unambiguously confirms that FinTech disruption is real, multidimensional, and accelerating—reshaping payment economics, credit delivery models, customer expectations, and the fundamental competitive structure of financial services.

The most striking finding is the co-existence of disruption and opportunity: while FinTech-enabled digital payments have eroded traditional bank payment fee revenues by 7.2 percentage points of non-interest income, the same digital transformation has reduced customer acquisition costs by 51.6%, expanded co-lending portfolios tenfold, and supported NIM improvement to 4.21%. This paradox—disruption in one value chain segment, expansion in another—reflects the complexity of FinTech's impact and the inadequacy of purely defensive or purely accommodating strategic responses.

The data also confirms a fundamental shift in bank-FinTech competitive dynamics: from zero-sum competition to structured co-evolution. The 73.3% of banking professionals who now view FinTechs as collaborative partners—against the adversarial framing prevalent a decade ago—reflects an emerging industry consensus that optimal outcomes for banks, FinTechs, customers, and the broader economy are achieved through co-lending partnerships, API ecosystems, and

regulatory sandbox collaboration rather than through winner-take-all competition.

The path forward for traditional banks is neither digital transformation at any cost nor passive resistance to FinTech disruption, but rather strategic co-evolution: leveraging FinTech partners' agility, data capabilities, and customer experience design while contributing institutional scale, regulatory capital, trust infrastructure, and complex financial advisory capabilities that FinTechs cannot replicate. Banks that master this collaborative strategy—supported by robust digital risk management, customer data monetization frameworks, and embedded finance capabilities—will emerge as the dominant institutions in the next phase of Indian financial services evolution.

8. REFERENCE

[1] D. W. Arner, J. Barberis, and R. P. Buckley, "The Evolution of FinTech: A New Post-Crisis Paradigm?," Georgetown Journal of International Law, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 1271–1319, 2015.

[2] T. Philippon, "The FinTech Opportunity," NBER Working Paper No. 22476, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA, 2016.

[3] X. Vives, "The Impact of FinTech on Banking," European Economy: Banks, Regulation, and the Real Sector, no. 2, pp. 97–105, 2017.

[4] G. Buchak, G. Matvos, T. Piskorski, and A. Seru, "FinTech, Regulatory Arbitrage, and the Rise of Shadow Banks," Journal of Financial Economics, vol. 130, no. 3, pp. 453–483, 2018.

[5] Reserve Bank of India, "Report of the Working Group on FinTech and Digital Banking," RBI, Mumbai, 2018.

[6] Reserve Bank of India, "Framework for Regulatory Sandbox," RBI Circular, RBI/2019–20/33, 2019.

[7] T. Sheng, "The Impact of FinTech on Corporate Cash Holdings," Cambridge Centre for Alternative Finance Working Paper, 2021.

[8] G. M. Navaretti, G. Calzolari, A. F. Pozzolo, and M. Ria, "FinTech and Banking: Friends or Foes?," European Economy: Banks, Regulation, and the Real Sector, vol. 1, pp. 9–30, 2022.

[9] S. Chakraborty and R. Bhatt, "Co-Lending Models in India: Impact on MSME Credit Delivery and Bank NPA Management," Indian Journal of Finance, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 42–58, 2023.

[10] KPMG International, "Pulse of FinTech H2 2023," KPMG, Toronto, 2024.

[11] National Payments Corporation of India, "Annual Report and UPI Product Statistics 2023–24," NPCI, Mumbai, 2024.

[12] Reserve Bank of India, "Annual Report 2023–24," RBI, Mumbai, 2024.

[13] World Bank, "Global Findex Database 2021: Financial Inclusion, Digital Payments, and Resilience in the Age of COVID-19," World Bank Group, Washington D.C., 2022.

[14] EY, "Global FinTech Adoption Index 2023," Ernst & Young Global Limited, London, 2023.

[15] Ministry of Finance, Government of India, "India's Digital Payment Revolution: Annual Progress Report 2023–24," MoF, New Delhi, 2024.