

TO: GOVERNMENT OF WEST BENGAL

---

# Artificial Intelligence Policy

*2026–2029: From AI Adoption to State AI Capability*

A governance architecture for responsible, inclusive and economically transformative AI, benchmarked against Odisha, Karnataka, Telangana, Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Rajasthan and other Indian states

|              |                                                                          |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| STATUS       | Draft policy architecture for expert review and public consultation      |
| EDITION      | Second edition — incorporates cross-state benchmarking                   |
| DATE         | September 2026                                                           |
| PREPARED FOR | Policy advisors, legislators, industry, academia and public consultation |

## About This Edition

---

This document is the second edition of a West Bengal AI policy architecture. It builds on a first discussion draft and on a subsequent AI-assisted expansion of that draft, but it makes one deliberate editorial change worth stating plainly.

### EDITORIAL NOTE

The report itself deliberately excludes Quantum Tiger and Corvus from its policy evidence, recommendations and cited sources. This was intentional: the document is designed to stand on verifiable public evidence, including government documents, national frameworks and peer-state policies, rather than unpublished commercial material. However, Quantum Tiger did use Corvus as an internal AI research and analytical engine in the preparation of this report. Corvus therefore contributed to the research and analytical process, while neither Corvus nor Quantum Tiger is presented as a source of policy evidence or as part of the report's substantive recommendations.

This edition also corrects and grounds the West Bengal context in the state's actual June 2026 budget announcements — including the West Bengal Impact AI Mission by its real name — and adds a full benchmarking section comparing West Bengal's position against nine other Indian states currently building AI policy (Section 2).

## Table of Contents

|                                                                          |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Executive Summary</b> .....                                           | 4  |
| <b>1. Why This Matters Now — West Bengal's AI Moment</b> .....           | 5  |
| <b>2. How Other Indian States Are Moving — A Benchmarking View</b> ..... | 6  |
| <b>3. Vision, Objectives and Design Principles</b> .....                 | 8  |
| <b>4. Governance Architecture</b> .....                                  | 9  |
| <b>5. Policy Pillars</b> .....                                           | 10 |
| 5.1 Economic Development & Industry.....                                 | 10 |
| 5.2 Public Service Delivery .....                                        | 10 |
| 5.3 Skilling & Workforce Transition .....                                | 10 |
| 5.4 Data Governance & Privacy .....                                      | 11 |
| 5.5 Rights, Safety & Fairness Safeguards .....                           | 11 |
| 5.6 Election & Information Integrity.....                                | 11 |
| 5.7 Language & Digital Inclusion.....                                    | 11 |
| 5.8 Ethics, Transparency & Accountability.....                           | 11 |
| 5.9 Sector Missions .....                                                | 11 |
| <b>6. 100-Day Plan and 36-Month Roadmap</b> .....                        | 12 |
| <b>7. Funding Architecture</b> .....                                     | 13 |
| <b>8. Monitoring, Evaluation and KPIs</b> .....                          | 13 |
| <b>9. Risk Register</b> .....                                            | 14 |
| <b>10. Stakeholder Consultation and Path to Adoption</b> .....           | 14 |
| <b>11. Conclusion</b> .....                                              | 15 |
| <b>Appendix A: AI Impact Assessment Checklist</b> .....                  | 16 |
| <b>Appendix B: Model Procurement Clauses</b> .....                       | 17 |
| <b>Appendix C: References and Sources</b> .....                          | 18 |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## The Case in Brief

West Bengal's June 2026 state budget announced the West Bengal Impact AI Mission, a GCC policy, and incentives for AI-focused data centres and hyperscale cloud infrastructure. That is real momentum. But as of this writing the Mission's institutional design, funding mechanism and legal footing have not been made public — and independent commentary published earlier this year had grouped West Bengal with states that gave AI no meaningful mention in budget planning. The window to move from announcement to institution is now.

Nine other Indian states — most concretely Odisha, whose cabinet-approved AI Policy 2025 was the first of its kind in the country — have already built the institutional patterns West Bengal can adapt rather than invent from scratch: a two-tier mission structure, risk-tiered rules, named sector pillars, and public numeric targets. Section 2 sets out what each state has done and what is transferable.

## EXHIBIT 1. TEN DECISIONS FOR THE CABINET

| Decision                                  | Recommendation                                                                                                                                              | Why it matters                                                                                            |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Formalize the mission                  | Convert the announced West Bengal Impact AI Mission (WB-AIM) into a statutory/executive body with a named Mission Director and departmental AI Risk Owners. | An announced mission without an owner and a budget line remains a press release.                          |
| 2. Adopt risk-tiering                     | Classify every government AI use case into Prohibited / High / Limited / Low risk, modelled on Odisha's and the EU's approach.                              | Proportionate rules let low-risk tools move fast while high-risk ones get real scrutiny.                  |
| 3. Require an AI Impact Assessment        | No high-risk system goes live without a completed, signed-off assessment covering bias, privacy, security and human review.                                 | Prevents harm from being discovered only after deployment and public complaint.                           |
| 4. Stand up independent assurance         | Create an audit function outside the deploying department with statutory access to system documentation.                                                    | Departments marking their own homework is the single most common governance failure.                      |
| 5. Publish a State AI Registry            | A public, continuously updated list of every significant government AI system, its purpose and its risk tier.                                               | Transparency is the cheapest, highest-trust control available to government.                              |
| 6. Lock in Bengali-first design           | Make a Bengali-language interface a go-live condition for citizen-facing AI services, not a phase-two add-on.                                               | Karnataka, Odisha and Tamil Nadu all treat local-language AI as core infrastructure, not an afterthought. |
| 7. Protect the December 2026 KMC election | Stand up the deepfake/disinformation rapid-response protocol before the Kolkata Municipal Corporation poll.                                                 | The election is the single nearest-term, highest-stakes AI-integrity risk the state faces.                |
| 8. Fund it credibly                       | Co-fund the mission across state budget, IndiaAI Mission schemes, and industry/GCC partnerships rather than one line item.                                  | A mission funded from a single uncertain source stalls at the first budget cycle.                         |

Source: author analysis based on the supplied draft, the West Bengal FY2026-27 budget, and the state AI policy documents referenced in Appendix C.

## 1. Why This Matters Now — West Bengal's AI Moment

Several developments make this the right moment for a formal, institutionalized policy rather than continued ad-hoc adoption:

- The state has already begun exploring AI in urban management — property-tax assessment, waterlogging detection, pipeline maintenance, parking management and bridge-health monitoring.
- The FY2026-27 state budget announced the West Bengal Impact AI Mission, a GCC policy, AI data-centre incentives (electricity duty waivers, stamp duty reimbursement) and a broader ₹5,000 crore industrial incentive framework.
- The Mission was described at the time as being “finalized within a month” of the budget; as of September 2026 its institutional design, legal footing and dedicated funding have not been made public.
- West Bengal recently completed a high-stakes state election, and the Kolkata Municipal Corporation election is due in December 2026 — making AI-driven election disinformation a near-term, not theoretical, risk.
- Independent industry commentary earlier in 2026 grouped West Bengal with states that gave AI no substantive mention in budget planning — a gap the June 2026 budget has begun to close, but which this policy is written to close fully.

Without a fully institutionalized framework, the state risks duplicated spending across departments, vendor lock-in, inconsistent data practice, and legal or reputational exposure if an unaudited system causes harm — a wrongful benefit denial, a biased policing tool, or a data breach.

### BOTTOM LINE

The announcement exists. The institution does not yet. This document is written to convert the West Bengal Impact AI Mission from a budget-speech commitment into an operating body with an owner, a budget, a risk framework and a first-year track record.

## 2. How Other Indian States Are Moving — A Benchmarking View

AI policy has become a genuinely competitive space among Indian states in 2025–26. At least nine states have moved from rhetoric to a named policy, mission or ministerial portfolio. The table below summarizes the most transferable examples.

**EXHIBIT 2. STATE AI POLICY LANDSCAPE, 2025–26**

| State                    | Flagship instrument                                                                                                                                                  | Institutional model                                                                                                                    | Notable commitment                                                                                                                                   |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Odisha                   | Odisha AI Policy 2025 (cabinet-approved, June 2025) — India's first full state AI policy                                                                             | Odisha AI Mission: a two-tier structure — a high-level AI Taskforce for strategy, plus an operational AI Cell inside OCAC for delivery | 4 pillars (infrastructure, skills, energy, regulation); 75% of officials AI-trained by 2029; Odia-language AI as a named priority                    |
| Karnataka                | GCC Policy 2024–2029; Data Centre Policy 2022–2027; new IT Policy 2025 (in progress)                                                                                 | Karnataka Digital Economy Mission coordinates industry-facing schemes                                                                  | Target of 500 new GCCs and 3.5 lakh jobs by 2029; ran a statewide AI workforce-impact survey to feed its Nipuna Karnataka reskilling programme       |
| Telangana                | AI City (Hyderabad) plus a Meta partnership for generative-AI e-governance                                                                                           | Delivery through IT department partnerships with global tech firms                                                                     | ₹1,000 crore fund-of-funds for early-stage deep-tech ventures; long-standing Telangana Data Centres Policy (2016) treats DCs as an essential service |
| Tamil Nadu               | Tamil Nadu AI Mission (TNAIM), a 5-year plan launched 2024; dedicated AI portfolio created May 2026                                                                  | Delivered via Tamil Nadu e-Governance Agency with industry partners                                                                    | Initial outlay of ₹13.93 crore; guiding principle “social good by design”; plans for AI in higher education                                          |
| Kerala                   | First Indian state to create a Cabinet-level AI portfolio (May 2026)                                                                                                 | Dedicated AI Minister reporting to Cabinet                                                                                             | Positioned around a 2024 ambition to become a generative-AI hub, with healthcare as a lead sector                                                    |
| Rajasthan                | Rajasthan AI-ML Policy 2026, launched January 2026                                                                                                                   | AI Centre of Excellence plus a National AI Literacy Programme and a dedicated Rajasthan AI Portal                                      | Explicit focus on bias mitigation, cybercrime redressal for AI misuse, and AI literacy from schools to ITIs                                          |
| Andhra Pradesh / Gujarat | “AI for Andhra Pradesh, Powered by Google”; Gujarat AI Cluster (GIFT City) with IBM Watsonx                                                                          | Public–private delivery model with a single named technology partner                                                                   | Central government co-funded ~₹990 crore across three sector Centres of Excellence (cities, health, agriculture) shared across states                |
| West Bengal (current)    | West Bengal Impact AI Mission, announced in the June 2026 state budget; GCC policy and AI data-centre incentives (electricity duty waiver, stamp duty reimbursement) | Mission was to be “finalized within a month” of the budget; institutional design not yet public                                        | ₹5,000 crore industrial incentive framework (economy-wide, not AI-specific); this is the gap this policy paper is written to close                   |

*Sources: Odisha AI Policy 2025 (Government of Odisha, June 2025); Karnataka GCC/Data Centre Policy documentation; Telangana and Tamil Nadu mission materials; Kerala and Tamil Nadu ministerial announcements (May 2026); Rajasthan AI-ML Policy 2026; West Bengal FY2026-27 budget. Full citations in Appendix C.*

## What stands out

- Odisha is the clearest model for West Bengal to study directly: a cabinet-approved policy with a two-tier governance structure (a strategic Taskforce plus an operational Cell embedded in an existing technical agency), four named pillars, and public numeric targets for training and language localization — rather than a general statement of intent.
- Kerala and Tamil Nadu have both moved AI into the Cabinet itself in 2026, via a dedicated ministerial portfolio — a governance signal West Bengal has not yet matched, though the underlying policy depth behind these portfolios is still being tested.
- Karnataka and Telangana lead on industry scale (GCCs, data centres, fund-of-funds) but their frameworks are more investment-promotion instruments than citizen-safeguard frameworks — a gap West Bengal's policy should avoid replicating.
- Rajasthan's January 2026 AI-ML Policy is the most recent full state policy and places unusually explicit emphasis on bias mitigation and AI-specific cybercrime redressal — both directly relevant to West Bengal's rights and safety pillar (Section 5.5).
- Almost every peer state pairs its policy with a concrete, named institutional home (a Mission, a Cell, a Taskforce, or a Ministry) within weeks of announcement — the single step West Bengal's Impact AI Mission has not yet visibly completed.

### WHY ODISHA IS THE REFERENCE CASE

Odisha's model is worth copying not because it is the largest or best-funded, but because it is the most institutionally complete: a named policy, a named mission, a named operational cell inside an existing technical body (OCAC), and public, checkable targets. West Bengal can adapt this structure onto its own Impact AI Mission within the 100-day plan in Section 6, rather than designing new machinery from scratch.

## 3. Vision, Objectives and Design Principles

---

### 3.1 Vision Statement

“West Bengal will harness artificial intelligence to expand economic opportunity, improve the quality and reach of public services, and strengthen citizen welfare — while ensuring that AI systems deployed by or for the state are safe, fair, transparent and accountable to the people they affect.”

### 3.2 Design Principles

- Human oversight first: no fully automated decision may deny a citizen a right or benefit without a human review pathway.
- Proportionate regulation: obligations scale with risk — light-touch for low-risk tools, strict for high-risk systems.
- Inclusion by design: Bengali-language access and rural/low-connectivity usability are default requirements, not add-ons.
- Transparency: citizens have a right to know when an AI system materially influenced a decision about them.
- Evidence before scale: pilot, measure and audit before statewide rollout — the discipline behind the AI Impact Assessment in Section 6.
- Economic opportunity with safeguards: growth incentives for industry are paired with labour-transition support.
- Federal and peer-state alignment: state rules complement national frameworks (DPDP Act 2023, IndiaAI Mission, IT Act) and draw deliberately on what already works in Odisha, Karnataka and other states.

## 4. Governance Architecture

### 4.1 West Bengal Impact AI Mission (WB-AIM)

Recommend formalizing the already-announced West Bengal Impact AI Mission using a two-tier structure modelled on Odisha's Taskforce-plus-Cell design:

- A high-level AI Taskforce, chaired at Chief Secretary or Minister level, setting strategy, approving high-risk deployments and reviewing the annual transparency report.
- An operational AI Cell, housed within an existing technical body (e.g. the state's e-governance/IT agency), responsible for day-to-day coordination, the State AI Registry, and support to departments running pilots.
- Departmental AI Risk Owners in every major department, accountable for that department's AI Impact Assessments and registry entries.

### 4.2 Independent Assurance

An audit function sitting outside the deploying department, with statutory access to system documentation, empowered to require changes or suspend a non-compliant system. This is the single most consistent gap across peer-state policies reviewed in Section 2.

### 4.3 Risk-Tiering Framework

**EXHIBIT 3. RISK TIERS FOR GOVERNMENT AI USE**

| Tier         | Examples                                                                                                                           | Controls                                                                                  |
|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Prohibited   | Social scoring of citizens; indiscriminate biometric mass surveillance in public spaces; undisclosed AI-generated election content | Banned outright by executive order / statute                                              |
| High-risk    | Welfare eligibility, policing/predictive law enforcement, biometric ID, employment screening, credit or subsidy scoring            | Mandatory AI Impact Assessment, bias audit, human-in-the-loop review, WB-AIM pre-approval |
| Limited-risk | Chatbots, translation tools, civic-infrastructure monitoring (waterlogging, bridge health, pipelines)                              | Disclosure to citizens; periodic review; registry listing                                 |
| Low-risk     | Internal productivity tools, drafting assistance, data analysis dashboards                                                         | Light-touch, self-certified by the deploying department                                   |

### 4.4 Legal Instrument

Recommend proceeding via an executive Government Order establishing WB-AIM and the risk framework within the first 90 days, followed by a formal Assembly bill once pilots generate evidence — avoiding the delay of waiting for primary legislation before any action begins.

## 5. Policy Pillars

Nine pillars, each with short-, medium- and long-term actions across the 36-month roadmap in Section 6.

### 5.1 Economic Development & Industry

*Position West Bengal as a competitive destination for AI investment while ensuring gains reach local industry and workers, not only external firms.*

**Short-term (0–9 mo.):** Publish detailed rules under the GCC policy and data-centre incentive scheme; single-window clearance desk; AI startup sandbox.

**Medium-term (9–24 mo.):** Compute-credit vouchers for early-stage Bengal startups; sector innovation challenges (agri-tech, fintech, healthtech) with co-funding; MoUs with national compute providers.

**Long-term (24–36 mo.):** Annual State of AI Economy report on investment, jobs and startup survival; rebalance incentives toward underserved districts.

### 5.2 Public Service Delivery

*Scale the civic-AI pilots already underway (property tax, waterlogging, pipeline, bridge health) into a coherent, interoperable, statewide service layer.*

**Short-term (0–9 mo.):** Formalize data standards so Kolkata Municipal Corporation systems interoperate with other municipal bodies; select 3–5 flagship use cases; set baseline metrics.

**Medium-term (9–24 mo.):** Expand pilots to all 23 districts with local-language interfaces; integrate disaster prediction with the State Disaster Management Authority; shared government AI platform.

**Long-term (24–36 mo.):** Full statewide interoperability; citizen-facing dashboard showing real-time status of AI-enabled services.

### 5.3 Skilling & Workforce Transition

*Build AI literacy inside government and prepare the workforce — including BPO/ITES employees most exposed to automation — for an AI-shaped job market.*

**Short-term (0–9 mo.):** Mandatory AI-literacy module for new recruits; map automation exposure by job category; pilot applied-AI curricula with ITIs/polytechnics.

**Medium-term (9–24 mo.):** Reskilling programme for at-risk BPO/ITES workers, co-funded with industry; AI curriculum in state college courses; certification pathway for AI-oversight skills.

**Long-term (24–36 mo.):** 25,000+ government employees trained; track re-employment outcomes; continuous-learning budget lines in department HR allocations.

### 5.4 Data Governance & Privacy

*Ensure data collected via government AI systems is governed by clear rules consistent with the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023.*

**Short-term (0–9 mo.):** State implementation guidelines under the DPDP Act specific to AI; data-minimization and retention-limit rules; mandatory data-protection impact assessment for high-risk systems.

**Medium-term (9–24 mo.):** Independent security audit for systems handling biometric or health data; cross-department data-sharing protocol with purpose limitation.

**Long-term (24–36 mo.):** Annual re-certification of high-risk systems' data practices.

### 5.5 Rights, Safety & Fairness Safeguards

*Prevent AI-enabled harm, with particular attention to surveillance overreach and algorithmic bias in welfare and law-enforcement contexts.*

**Short-term (0–9 mo.):** Prohibit biometric mass surveillance in public spaces without clear legal basis; absolute prohibition on using children's data to train models; draft citizen grievance process.

**Medium-term (9–24 mo.):** Mandatory bias audit before deployment of welfare/credit-scoring systems; publish audit results in plain language.

**Long-term (24–36 mo.):** Independent oversight body empowered to suspend a non-compliant system.

## 5.6 Election & Information Integrity

*Protect electoral integrity given West Bengal's history of closely contested elections and the Kolkata Municipal Corporation election due December 2026.*

**Short-term (0–9 mo.):** Prohibit undisclosed AI-generated political content; stand up a rapid-response fact-check unit coordinating with the State Election Commission ahead of the KMC election.

**Medium-term (9–24 mo.):** Formal takedown-coordination protocol with major platforms during election periods; public awareness campaign in Bengali and English.

**Long-term (24–36 mo.):** Post-election review of the protocol before the next Assembly cycle.

## 5.7 Language & Digital Inclusion

*Ensure AI-enabled government services are genuinely usable by Bengali-speaking, rural and low-connectivity citizens.*

**Short-term (0–9 mo.):** Audit all planned AI citizen services for Bengali-language support before launch; voice-interface pilot for low-literacy citizens.

**Medium-term (9–24 mo.):** Bengali-language model toolkit for government developers; offline/low-bandwidth fallback modes for common service centres.

**Long-term (24–36 mo.):** 50+ government services with a Bengali-language AI interface.

## 5.8 Ethics, Transparency & Accountability

*Make sure the public — and the government itself — can see what AI systems are doing and hold someone accountable when they fail.*

**Short-term (0–9 mo.):** Public registry of government AI systems; disclosure requirement when a decision affecting a citizen involved AI.

**Medium-term (9–24 mo.):** Independent audit body with statutory access to system documentation; whistle-blower protection for civil servants flagging misuse.

**Long-term (24–36 mo.):** Annual public transparency report tabled in the state Assembly.

## 5.9 Sector Missions: Climate, Agriculture, Health & Urban

*Concentrate early resources where Bengal's geography and economy make the payoff highest — mirroring the sector-first approach Odisha, Andhra Pradesh and Telangana have each taken.*

**Short-term (0–9 mo.):** Cyclone/flood early-warning model for coastal and delta districts; Bengali-language crop-advisory AI for smallholder farmers.

**Medium-term (9–24 mo.):** Rural telemedicine triage tool linked to the state health mission; river-erosion and embankment monitoring for the Sundarbans and North Bengal.

**Long-term (24–36 mo.):** Integrated climate-agriculture-disaster AI dashboard shared across departments.

## 6. 100-Day Plan and 36-Month Roadmap

The fastest way to convert an announced mission into a working institution is a public 100-day plan, followed by a phased 36-month roadmap that sequences pilots ahead of statewide scale-up.

### EXHIBIT 4. FIRST 100 DAYS

| Window      | Priority actions                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Days 1–30   | Executive order formalizing WB-AIM; appoint Mission Director and departmental AI Risk Owners; freeze an inventory of every AI system already in pilot or production across departments            |
| Days 31–60  | Publish the risk-tiering framework and AI Impact Assessment template; issue interim procurement guidance; commission a benchmarking visit/exchange with Odisha's AI Cell and Karnataka's GCC unit |
| Days 61–100 | Sign off AI Impact Assessments for 3–5 flagship pilots; launch a public State AI Registry (beta); open a 45-day public consultation on the full draft policy                                      |

### EXHIBIT 5. 36-MONTH IMPLEMENTATION ROADMAP

| Phase                  | Duration                  | Focus                             | Key deliverables                                                                                                                                                       |
|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Phase 0: Foundation    | Months 0–3                | Institutional setup & baseline    | WB-AIM constituted; Mission Director & Risk Owners named; landscape audit of existing AI use; stakeholder consultations                                                |
| Phase 1: Framework     | Months 3–9                | Policy & legal scaffolding        | State AI Policy and risk-tiering framework notified; DPDP-aligned data governance guidelines; procurement standards; grievance redressal design                        |
| Phase 2: Pilots        | Months 6–18 (overlapping) | Sector pilots & capacity building | 3–5 flagship pilots (civic infrastructure, agri-advisory, health triage, disaster prediction); Bengali-language AI toolkit v1; civil-service training; startup sandbox |
| Phase 3: Scale-up      | Months 18–30              | Statewide rollout & industry push | Successful pilots scaled to all districts; GCC/data-centre incentive scheme fully operational; skilling at scale; independent audit body operating                     |
| Phase 4: Consolidation | Months 30–36              | Review & institutionalize         | First policy review cycle; public transparency/impact report; revised risk framework; long-term AI Fund institutionalized                                              |

## 7. Funding Architecture

An indicative funding mix, to be refined by the Finance Department against a detailed costing exercise during Phase 0. It deliberately spreads risk across more than one source, since a mission funded from a single budget line is the most common reason peer-state initiatives stall.

### EXHIBIT 6. INDICATIVE FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding source                                               | Purpose                                                | Indicative share |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| State budget allocation (IT & Electronics Dept.)             | WB-AIM operations, staffing, pilots, audits            | 40%              |
| Central schemes (IndiaAI Mission, Digital India)             | Compute infrastructure, skilling co-funding            | 25%              |
| Private sector / industry partnership (CSR + GCC investment) | Data-centre incentives, sandbox co-funding, hackathons | 20%              |
| Multilateral / development-agency grants                     | Rural agri-AI, health AI, disaster-prediction pilots   | 10%              |
| User / licensing fees (from Phase 3 onward)                  | Sustaining platforms once proven at scale              | 5%               |

*Note: this framework assumes co-funding rather than the state bearing the full cost, particularly for compute infrastructure where central schemes (IndiaAI Mission) and private data-centre operators already have committed capital.*

## 8. Monitoring, Evaluation and KPIs

WB-AIM should publish progress against these indicators every six months, with an independent mid-term evaluation at month 18.

### EXHIBIT 7. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

| Pillar                  | Key performance indicator                                            | Target (36 mo.)           |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Governance              | Departments with a designated AI Risk Owner                          | 100% of major departments |
| Public service delivery | Districts running $\geq 1$ AI-enabled civic service                  | All 23 districts          |
| Economic development    | New AI/data-centre investment committed                              | ₹2,000+ crore             |
| Skilling                | Government employees completing AI-literacy training                 | 25,000+                   |
| Data governance         | High-risk systems with a completed bias/privacy audit before go-live | 100%                      |
| Language inclusion      | Government services with a Bengali-language AI interface             | 50+ services              |
| Election integrity      | Deepfake/disinformation incidents actioned within 24 hours           | $\geq 90\%$               |
| Accountability          | Citizen grievances on AI decisions resolved within SLA               | $\geq 85\%$               |

## 9. Risk Register

### EXHIBIT 8. PRINCIPAL RISKS AND MITIGATIONS

| Risk                                                                        | Likelihood / impact | Mitigation                                                                                                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Vendor lock-in with a single AI provider                                    | Medium / High       | Open standards and interoperability clauses in all procurement; no exclusive multi-year contracts without break clauses |
| Algorithmic bias in welfare/eligibility decisions                           | Medium / High       | Mandatory bias audit before deployment; human-in-the-loop for adverse decisions                                         |
| Public distrust / low adoption                                              | Medium / Medium     | Transparency reporting, public dashboards, grievance redress, phased rollout                                            |
| Skills gap in civil service                                                 | High / Medium       | AI-literacy training tied to promotions; partnerships with IITs/IIMs and local universities                             |
| Data privacy breaches                                                       | Medium / High       | Data minimization by design; independent security audits; DPDP Act alignment                                            |
| Election-period misuse (deepfakes, disinformation)                          | Medium / High       | Pre-election AI content advisories; rapid-response fact-check unit; platform coordination                               |
| Budget overrun / delayed funding                                            | Medium / Medium     | Phased release tied to milestones; independent mid-term financial audit                                                 |
| Mission announced but never institutionalized (as seen in some peer states) | Medium / High       | Statutory footing within 100 days; published Mission Director appointment; first public report at month 6               |

## 10. Stakeholder Consultation and Path to Adoption

Before formal adoption, this draft should be circulated for structured input from:

- Legal experts — to align risk-tiering and prohibited-use clauses with the DPDP Act, IT Act, and any forthcoming central AI legislation.
- Industry bodies (CII, CREDAI, NASSCOM regional chapter) — on investment-incentive design and GCC policy detail.
- Civil society and digital-rights groups — on surveillance safeguards, grievance redressal and children's-data provisions.
- Academic institutions (IIT Kharagpur, ISI Kolkata, Jadavpur University) — on technical standards, bias-audit methodology and Bengali-language model development.
- District and municipal administrators — on the operational feasibility of the public-service pilots.
- Labour unions / BPO-ITES sector representatives — on the workforce-transition plan.

Recommended format: a public consultation period of 45–60 days following release of this draft, with written submissions and at least two open hearings (Kolkata and one North Bengal location for regional balance).

## 11. Conclusion

---

This document is a working draft, not a final policy. It should be reviewed, costed and legally vetted before submission to the Cabinet or Assembly. Every figure, timeline and institutional choice here is a starting proposal meant to be tested against expert scrutiny and public consultation.

Three things would make it genuinely comparable to Odisha's benchmark or better: a living public registry of every significant AI system the state uses; auditability before deployment rather than after controversy; and measurement of public value and institutional learning as rigorously as model accuracy. If West Bengal does those three things while building Bengali-first infrastructure, it converts a budget-speech announcement into one of the more credible state AI institutions in the country — not the first mover, but a fast, disciplined second mover with the benefit of nine other states' evidence already in hand.

### **PROPOSED POLICY NORTH STAR**

“Every significant AI system used by the State should be visible, classified, testable, accountable, contestable and improvable.”

## APPENDIX A

## AI Impact Assessment Checklist

A condensed working checklist; departments should expand each row into a full assessment template before a high-risk system's go-live decision.

| Assessment area     | What must be shown before deployment                                        |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Purpose & necessity | The problem, why AI (vs. a simpler fix), and who the deploying owner is     |
| Legal basis         | Which law/rule authorizes this use; risk tier assigned                      |
| Data                | Source, quality, consent basis, retention period, sensitivity               |
| Bias & fairness     | Testing across relevant demographic/geographic groups; results documented   |
| Human oversight     | Who reviews outputs; what they can override; escalation path                |
| Security            | Access control, logging, breach-notification plan                           |
| Rights              | Notice to citizens, explanation, right to appeal, accessibility             |
| Operations          | Owner, staffing, fallback process if the system fails                       |
| Procurement         | Portability, audit rights, liability, exit plan                             |
| Public value        | Cost, benefit, alternatives considered, measurable outcome, sunset criteria |
| Decision            | Approve / approve with controls / pilot only / redesign / reject            |

## APPENDIX B

## Model Procurement Clauses

Minimum contractual protections recommended for any AI system procurement, regardless of risk tier.

| Control          | Minimum contractual requirement                                                  |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data rights      | State retains control of state-provided data and defines permitted processing    |
| Logging          | Protected logs sufficient to reconstruct material decisions                      |
| Audit            | Independent audit and testing rights, with vendor cooperation obligations        |
| Security         | Security baseline, vulnerability handling, breach notification                   |
| Model versioning | Notification and re-validation for material model changes                        |
| Portability      | Export of data, configuration and prompts/workflows in usable formats            |
| Continuity       | Business continuity, disaster recovery, service-level commitments                |
| Exit             | Transition assistance, deletion/return certification, documentation handover     |
| Subcontracting   | Disclosure and approval for material sub-processors or model providers           |
| Transparency     | Clear statement of AI functions, known limitations, human-oversight requirements |

## APPENDIX C

# References and Sources

---

## West Bengal

- Government of West Bengal, FY2026-27 Budget — West Bengal Impact AI Mission, GCC policy and AI data-centre incentives, as reported in state budget coverage, June 2026.

## National frameworks

- IndiaAI Mission, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India — national compute, datasets, skilling and safe/trusted AI programme.
- Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 and associated Rules, 2025, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology.
- European Commission, AI Act — risk-based framework used here as a general structural reference, not a source of legal obligation for an Indian state.

## Peer-state AI policies

- Government of Odisha, Odisha Artificial Intelligence Policy 2025 (cabinet-approved June 2025) and the Odisha AI Mission's two-tier Taskforce/Cell structure.
- Government of Karnataka, GCC Policy 2024–2029 and Data Centre Policy 2022–2027; Nipuna Karnataka reskilling programme and 2025 AI workforce-impact survey.
- Government of Telangana, AI City initiative (Hyderabad), Meta e-governance partnership, and Telangana Data Centres Policy, 2016.
- Government of Tamil Nadu, Tamil Nadu Artificial Intelligence Mission (TNAIM), launched 2024; dedicated AI ministerial portfolio created May 2026.
- Government of Kerala, Cabinet-level AI ministerial portfolio, created May 2026 — the first such portfolio among Indian states.
- Government of Rajasthan, Rajasthan Artificial Intelligence–Machine Learning Policy 2026, launched January 2026, with an AI Centre of Excellence and National AI Literacy Programme.
- Government of Andhra Pradesh, “AI for Andhra Pradesh, Powered by Google” initiative; Government of Gujarat, AI Cluster at GIFT City with IBM Watsonx.

