India AI Impact Summit 2026: Law, Leadership, and India's AI Moment

News & Updates • March 10, 2026

'First published on BW Legal World'

By: Pravin Anand and Dr. Ajai Garg

The Summit underscored a broader reality: artificial intelligence is no longer an emerging policy topic. It is part of operational infrastructure. The task now is to ensure that governance frameworks develop with sufficient clarity, consistency, and institutional depth to sustain trust over time. India's trajectory suggests an effort to align innovation with regulatory coherence say Pravin Anand, Managing Partner & Head of Litigation, Anand and Anand and Ajai Garg, Head Digital Tech & Law, Anand and Anand.



Artificial intelligence is no longer discussed only in technology forums. It is being deployed in credit scoring models, diagnostic tools, logistics platforms, and administrative systems. In each of these spaces, AI is not simply assisting decision-making, it is influencing it. That shift changes the nature of regulatory responsibility and, more broadly, the relationship between technology and governance The India AI Impact Summit 2026 took place at a moment when these systems are already operational. The conversations were therefore grounded in implementation rather than projection. How should oversight function when automated systems are embedded in financial services? How

should accountability be assessed when outputs are shaped by probabilistic modelling rather than human discretion? These questions reflect the realities of present deployment, not distant possibility.

India's approach is developing alongside adoption. Infrastructure initiatives are underway. Industry engagement is increasing. Policy frameworks are being shaped while systems are scaling. This parallel movement presents opportunity, but it also demands coherence. Governance cannot lag significantly behind implementation, nor can it be designed in abstraction from operational realities.

Legal predictability emerged as a consistent concern. Enterprises investing in AI systems require clarity around liability exposure, compliance obligations, and permissible data use. Uncertainty in these areas affects capital allocation and long-term planning. At the same time, regulators must grapple with questions that earlier regulatory models did not anticipate — algorithmic opacity, explainability, automated risk scoring, and systemic bias. Crafting standards that are both principled and workable will require sustained engagement.

Institutional capability will therefore be central. Courts and regulatory bodies are increasingly confronted with disputes involving training datasets, model architecture, and automated outputs. These cases do not merely raise technical questions; they test the adaptability of legal reasoning itself. Building institutional literacy — through expertise, collaboration, and structured learning — will influence how consistently governance is applied across sectors.

Infrastructure remains foundational. AI systems require computational capacity, secure cloud environments, and reliable datasets. Expanding access to compute resources broadens participation in innovation and reduces dependence on external technological ecosystems. In this sense, infrastructure policy intersects directly with economic strategy and domestic capability-building.

Data governance presents one of the more intricate challenges. Concerns regarding bias and representativeness are legitimate, particularly where AI systems affect financial or medical outcomes. At the same time, data constitutes a valuable commercial asset. It is frequently protected by intellectual property rights, contractual arrangements, and confidentiality frameworks. Regulatory design must therefore reconcile two imperatives: enabling responsible data utilisation while preserving economic incentives for creation, curation, and investment. Neither objective can be pursued in isolation.

Artificial intelligence also resists sectoral containment. It operates across banking, healthcare, logistics, consumer platforms, and public administration. Regulatory coordination will inevitably become more significant as these systems proliferate. Fragmentation may create compliance uncertainty; excessive centralisation may constrain adaptive oversight. A degree of harmonisation in principles, coupled with flexibility in application, may offer a more sustainable path The international context adds further complexity. AI research, infrastructure, and deployment frequently extend across jurisdictions. Domestic regulatory choices will intersect with global standards, trade

considerations, and cross-border data flows. Continued dialogue between governments and institutions will influence whether governance frameworks remain compatible, even where they are not identical. Interoperability may ultimately prove more important than uniformity.

The Summit underscored a broader reality: artificial intelligence is no longer an emerging policy topic. It is part of operational infrastructure. The task now is to ensure that governance frameworks develop with sufficient clarity, consistency, and institutional depth to sustain trust over time. India's trajectory suggests an effort to align innovation with regulatory coherence. Whether that alignment can be maintained as systems scale will shape the next phase of AI integration. In the coming decade, leadership in artificial intelligence will be measured not only by technical capability or deployment metrics, but by the credibility and stability of the legal and institutional structures within which that technology operates.

KEY CONTACT



Pravin Anand

Managing Partner

View Bio of Pravin Anand

RELATED INDUSTRIES

ADVERTISING AND PRODUCT LIABILITY

RELATED PRACTICES

COPYRIGHT