



One Nation, One Electoral Roll: Enhancing Accessibility and Political Participation

Mohd Uvais

Former Research Associate, Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA), New Delhi

Article Info: (Received- 09/03/2026, Accept- 12/04/2026, Published- 10/05/2026)

DOI- [10.70650/rvimj.2026v3i5009](https://doi.org/10.70650/rvimj.2026v3i5009)

Introduction

Electoral democracy functions efficiently because of the two main principles of universal adult suffrage and easy access to participate in voting. In the case of the Indian federal electoral system, which has been able to successfully conduct the world's largest democratic experiments (Yadav, 2019), there existed two parallel registration processes where the rolls maintained by the ECI are for national and state-level elections, while the State Election Commissions have their own register for local body elections. This divide in the electoral system, although justified by the distribution of powers provided for by the constitution of India, has increasingly revealed inefficiency in recent times (Brass, 2020). The idea of "One Nation, One Electoral Roll" thus becomes an innovative concept that would make use of the infrastructure of the Indian electoral system for better democratic practices, removing all barriers to easy access to the electoral process of over 950 million voters (Election Commission of India, 2024).

Conceptual Framework and Constitutional Context

One Nation, One Electoral Roll is the idea of a single, comprehensive digital voter registration system that would consolidate the electoral rolls maintained by different bodies into one, updated database that could be used for different levels of elections. It is important to note that this would not lead to the centralized conducting of elections but only to the integration of voter registration systems (Singh, 2021). According to the current system envisaged by the Constitution (Seventy-Third and Seventy-Fourth Amendments) enacted in 1992, ECI is supposed to conduct elections to Parliament and state assemblies under Article 324 whereas SECs are supposed to conduct elections to the panchayats and municipalities under Article 243K and 243ZA (Basu, 2018).

In practice, this institutional separation has led to parallel registration drives, duplicate verification processes and divergence between electoral rolls at different levels.

As per the unified roll plan, the core electoral roll could be shared, managed collectively and synchronized through technology whereas the SECs would retain their constitutional independence to carry out the election process at the local level (Palshikar, 2022). The plan retains the federal principles and eliminates the absurdity of citizens being registered separately for parliamentary and municipal elections in

the same constituency.

The Role of Electoral Institutions in a Unified System

Given its established technical capabilities, nationwide network of district electoral officers and expertise in implementing large-scale database management initiatives such as the EPIC scheme and the Electoral Search and Services Portal (Chhibber & Verma, 2018), the ECI would be given custodianship of the central database under a centralized electoral roll framework. However, this does not diminish the significance of SECs in their daily operations. It changes their status from independent entities to complementary organizations in a common ecosystem. The SECs will remain responsible for all electoral processes including nomination of candidates, polling and announcement of results.

Such a structure is comparable to that of cooperative federalism systems that have been adopted in other sectors. The Goods and Services Tax Network shows how different constitutional bodies can share technological infrastructure without affecting their sovereignty (Rao & Singh, 2019). In the same way, the Aadhaar framework benefits various government departments while ensuring their operational sovereignty.

Enhancing Voter Accessibility and Inclusion

The advantage of accessibility that comes along with a single electoral list is more pronounced for the Indian mobile population. The internal migration figures for the year 2011 were above 450 million individuals according to the census report by the Office of the Registrar General and Census Commissioner, 2011. For instance, a domestic worker moving from his/her rural location in Bihar to urban Delhi experiences difficulties registering as an electoral citizen due to various bureaucratic processes (Deshingkar & Akter, 2009). A centralized, digitally integrated system with real-time streamlining would enable efficient constituency transfers, allowing migrants to update their registration online without navigating multiple bureaucratic channels.

Women's participation in voting is yet another area where unification can bring about some concrete advantages. Even in the presence of legal equality between men and women, there are states wherein the number of women voters is lower than that of men owing to difficulties in document processing as well as patriarchal family settings that prevent them from going for voter registration (Rai, 2017). A one-time registration process coupled with Aadhaar authentication and mobile-based updates removes these hurdles. In Karnataka, the BLO (Booth Level Officer) system shows that simplified, technology-enabled registration considerably improves women's enrollment when combined with targeted outreach (Tillin & Pereira, 2017).

Youth participation in election-related activities is another area that is set to see immense advantages. First-time voters, such as students at college who are studying far from their constituencies, are subjected to various problems with regard to voter registration, which hinders their involvement in politics (Kumar & Rai, 2012). This can be solved by having one common database that allows registration online with simple verification of addresses. In the same way, various minority groups like those of the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes, and disabled individuals also have many problems related to documentation and mobility barriers that a streamlined, accessible registration system could reduce through mobile registration camps linked to a central database rather than multiple parallel processes (Jayal, 2013).

Democratic Participation and Voter Turnout Dynamics

Political participation through voting depends not only upon political mobilization but also upon institutional accessibility. Voter turnout studies always show that the more the barriers of registration, the lower will be voter turnout, especially in the

case of economically disadvantaged individuals who find it very costly to register each time for their vote (Banerjee & Pande, 2007). The voter turnout for the Lok Sabha elections in 2019 ranged differently depending upon which state the election took place in, ranging from 77.68 percent in Kerala and 57.09 percent in Bihar (Election Commission of India, 2019). Meanwhile, political factors contribute to these disparities, and administrative accessibility remains a continuous variable.

With a Centralized electoral roll, such barriers can be overcome as it turns the practice of periodic registration linked to elections into a continuous one, based on the individual's life cycle stage. Linking electoral rolls with civil registry systems recording births, deaths, and migration would make it easy for people to be automatically registered when they reach voting age, something which has been tried out in many countries already (McDonald & Popkin, 2001). This transformation from opt-in to opt-out participation essentially modifies the accessibility landscape, potentially adding millions of eligible but unregistered citizens to electoral rolls.

Administrative Efficiency and Technological Advantages

In terms of governance, it is possible to expect considerable rationalization of administration from the unified roll. At present, two similar registration operations drain large amounts of public funds since each entity, ECI and SECs, performs its own independent exercise involving summary revisions, field verifications, and delivery of voters' identity cards (Mittra & Singh, 2014). According to conservative estimates, suggest that integration could reduce duplicated administrative costs by 30-40 percent, redirecting these resources toward voter education and facilitation.

There are further advantages to consider with the integration of technology. A central database using Blockchain Technology would guarantee data integrity and facilitate real-time data updates across all levels of elections (Kshetri & Voas, 2018). The ECI's present program, known as the Electors Verification Program, in which artificial intelligence is used to detect duplicate and suspicious records, can operate far more effectively if performed on a centrally located database rather than on several individual databases. Predictive analytics can work more efficiently if performed on a centralized database instead of multiple segregated databases.

Digital governance systems today tend to focus on data sharing and interoperability within government systems (Janssen et al., 2012). The use of an integrated electoral list would be instrumental in ensuring smooth authentication processes that can underpin other public service systems without necessitating additional authentication mechanisms by governments. Estonia is one such country where the electoral database can form the basis for e-governance infrastructure development (Vassil et al., 2016).

Challenges: Federalism, Privacy, and Implementation Concerns

Despite its promise, the unified roll idea faces numerous legal, practical, and political impediments. First is the issue of federal equilibrium. Since the SECs get their powers from the constitution itself, any suggestion that the unified roll infringes on their independence may spark political and legal opposition. In 2015, the Supreme Court of India ruling in the case of Election Commission of India vs. State of Haryana confirmed the SECs' independence, noting that any attempt to intervene in state election machinery by the central government is unconstitutional (Supreme Court of India, 2015). A unified roll, must therefore be structured through cooperative legislation rather than unilateral central imposition.

Data privacy and security issues take on great significance in this age of vulnerability in the digital domain. A consolidated electoral database that stores the personal details of nearly one billion citizens is an appealing target for hackers, espionage, and other

malicious activity (Narayanan & Shmatikov, 2008). Until now, the absence of a comprehensive data protection legislation in India has rendered existing mechanisms for governance of electoral data lacking. A consolidated system must include strong encryption, access controls, auditing, and limited use policy (Purtoy, 2018).

The digital divide emerges as yet another significant obstacle. Although cities and semi-urban India have seen high levels of penetration by the internet, there are regions in rural and far-flung areas that lack digital connectivity (Srinivasan & Burrell, 2015). Any system that relies on digital integration might end up putting voters living in regions with weak digital connectivity at a disadvantage. Hybrid models include integration with an offline verification mechanism may be necessary during transition phases.

Legal and procedure complexities cannot be comprehended. Adopting a unified roll would need changes to the Representation of the People Act, 1950 and 1951, and state panchayat and municipal laws, among other constitutional provisions (Austin, 1999). Convincing parties in politics and the states and central government of the same politics in this respect is a huge challenge considering the politically volatile nature of election management.

Global Perspectives on Integrated Voter Registration

The international perspective provides useful information on the possibilities and problems associated with a unified electoral system. Even though America is a federal country, it has taken steps towards integration by adopting the National Voter Registration Act and the Electronic Registration Information Center that facilitates inter-state information exchange in order to ensure up-to-date voter registration without duplication (Fortier, 2006). Although the process is still state-specific, the shared database architecture demonstrates federalism-compatible integration.

The National Register of Electors in Canada is an example of the continuous registry system, introduced in 1997, which maintains an accurate register that is used by both the federal and provincial electoral agencies. Such a register ensures a level of about 96% accuracy and eliminates many registration barriers (Massicotte, 2003). Significantly, Canada's model recognizes provincial autonomy while enabling collaborative management of a shared resource.

The electoral roll in Australia is managed by the Australian Electoral Commission, though it is made available to the state electoral commissions via arrangements for data sharing. The system uses linkages with other government databases, such as taxation and motor vehicles records, which keeps the information up-to-date without the need for people to enroll individually at various levels (Orr, 2015). This has ensured very high rates of registration exceeding 96% while reducing administrative redundancy.

These international cases, there is one basic rule for effective integration: investments in technology, good data protection laws, but most importantly, institutional trust and cooperation, rather than central imposition.

Recommendations and the Way Forward

The one nation, one electoral roll process requires a gradual and consultative approach to address technical and legal issues. Firstly, there should be an expert committee consisting of ECI, SECs, lawyers, and the civil society members to develop a comprehensive plan to ensure the independence of the SEC and encourage information technology integration (Saez & Sinha, 2010). The committee should examine international models and adapt them to India's constitutional framework. Second, pilot schemes in willing states could test the feasibility of such initiatives and

reveal potential hurdles to successful implementation on a nationwide scale. Ideal pilot states could have strong digital capabilities and an enabling political environment.

Third, any new policy initiative would require legal reforms ahead of time with established standards on data ownership, access, privacy concerns and dispute resolution measures. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 could be used to provide some protection to electoral data. Fourth, technology should be designed with awareness of the issues of security, accessibility and interoperability. Open-source technologies, distributed databases and multiple tiers of authentication can help to secure and increase transparency in these systems (Preibusch, 2013). Finally, massive voter education must go hand in hand with the execution so that public confidence is built and citizens are able to traverse the new system efficiently.

Conclusion

More than merely excellent administration, One Nation, One Electoral Roll represents a commitment to ensuring that democracy is accessible to all individuals, regardless of their geography or socioeconomic status. A single electoral roll is crucial in a nation where migration patterns are continually changing, citizenship is increasingly defined and affirmed through technology, and nearly half of voters are women and young people who desire simple access to the political process. The difficulties are substantial, requiring careful management of technological weaknesses, government sensitivities, and implementation obstacles. But the benefits, millions more votes, improved information accuracy, administrative efficiencies, and, last but not least, democracy itself, make the institution's effort worthwhile. Every qualified voter must have easy access to India's election process, particularly voter registration, since the country aspires to set an example for other countries in terms of democratic governance. A well-thought-out and performed comprehensive electoral roll might, in fact, revolutionize voter access and fulfill the democratic bargain with its constituents.

Author's Declaration:

I/We, the author(s)/co-author(s), declare that the entire content, views, analysis, and conclusions of this article are solely my/our own. I/We take full responsibility, individually and collectively, for any errors, omissions, ethical misconduct, copyright violations, plagiarism, defamation, misrepresentation, or any legal consequences arising now or in the future. The publisher, editors, and reviewers shall not be held responsible or liable in any way for any legal, ethical, financial, or reputational claims related to this article. All responsibility rests solely with the author(s)/co-author(s), jointly and severally. I/We further affirm that there is no conflict of interest financial, personal, academic, or professional regarding the subject, findings, or publication of this article.

References-

1. Austin, G. (1999). Working a democratic constitution: The Indian experience. Oxford University Press.
2. Banerjee, A., & Pande, R. (2007). Parochial politics: Ethnic preferences and politician corruption. Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government.
3. Basu, D. D. (2018). Introduction to the Constitution of India (23rd ed.). LexisNexis.
4. Brass, P. R. (2020). The politics of India since independence (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
5. Chhibber, P., & Verma, R. (2018). Ideology and identity: The changing party systems of India. Oxford University Press.
6. Deshingkar, P., & Akter, S. (2009). Migration and human development in India. Human Development Research Paper, 2009(13). UNDP.
7. Election Commission of India. (2019). Statistical report on general elections, 2019 to the Lok Sabha.

8. Election Commission of India. (2024). National voters' day 2024 report. <https://eci.gov.in/>
9. Fortier, J. C. (2006). Absentee and early voting: Trends, promises, and perils. American Enterprise Institute.
10. Janssen, M., Charalabidis, Y., & Zuiderwijk, A. (2012). Benefits, adoption barriers and myths of open data and open government. *Information Systems Management*, 29(4), 258-268.
11. Jayal, N. G. (2013). *Citizenship and its discontents: An Indian history*. Harvard University Press.
12. Kshetri, N., & Voas, J. (2018). Blockchain-enabled e-voting. *IEEE Software*, 35(4), 95-99.
13. Kumar, S., & Rai, P. (2012). Measuring voting behavior in India. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 47(43), 39-42.
14. Massicotte, L. (2003). Election law in democracies: A framework for comparative analysis. In R. Lopez-Pintor & M. Gratschew (Eds.), *Voter turnout since 1945: A global report* (pp. 31-42). International IDEA.
15. McDonald, M. P., & Popkin, S. L. (2001). The myth of the vanishing voter. *American Political Science Review*, 95(4), 963-974.
16. Mitra, S. K., & Singh, V. B. (2014). *When rebels become stakeholders: Democracy, agency and social change in India*. Sage Publications.
17. Narayanan, A., & Shmatikov, V. (2008). Robust de-anonymization of large sparse datasets. In 2008 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (pp. 111-125). IEEE.
18. Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner. (2011). *Census of India 2011: Migration tables*. Government of India.
19. Orr, G. (2015). *The law of politics: Elections, parties and money in Australia*. Federation Press.
20. Palshikar, S. (2022). Electoral reforms and democratic deepening in India. *Studies in Indian Politics*, 10(1), 45-58.
21. Preibusch, S. (2013). Guide to measuring privacy concern: Review of survey and observational instruments. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 71(12), 1133-1143.
22. Purtova, N. (2018). The law of everything: Broad concept of personal data and future of EU data protection law. *Law, Innovation and Technology*, 10(1), 40-81.
23. Rai, S. M. (2017). *Gender and the political economy of development*. Polity Press.
24. Rao, M. G., & Singh, N. (2019). *Indian fiscal federalism*. Oxford University Press.
25. Saez, L., & Sinha, A. (2010). Political cycles, political institutions and public expenditure in India, 1980-2000. *British Journal of Political Science*, 40(1), 91-113.
26. Singh, M. P. (2021). *Indian political system* (4th ed.). Pearson Education India.
27. Srinivasan, J., & Burrell, J. (2015). On the importance of price information to fishers and to economists: Revisiting mobile phone use among fishers in Kerala. *Information Technologies & International Development*, 11(1), 57-70.
28. Supreme Court of India. (2015). *Election Commission of India v. State of Haryana*. AIR 2015 SC 1540.
29. Tillin, L., & Pereira, A. (2017). Indian federalism. In A. Ayres & P. R. Brass (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of South Asian politics* (pp. 145-158). Routledge.
30. Vassil, K., Solvak, M., Vinkel, P., Trechsel, A. H., & Alvarez, R. M. (2016). The diffusion of internet voting: Usage patterns of internet voting in Estonia between 2005 and 2015. *Government Information Quarterly*, 33(3), 453-459.
31. Yadav, Y. (2019). India's third electoral system, 1989-2014. In F. Frankel, Z. Hasan, R. Bhargava, & B. Arora (Eds.), *Transforming India: Social and political dynamics of democracy* (pp. 101-136). Oxford University Press.

Cite this Article

'Mohd Uvais', "One Nation, One Electoral Roll: Enhancing Accessibility and Political Participation", Research Vidyapith International Multidisciplinary Journal, ISSN: 3048-7331 (Online), Volume:3, Issue:5, May 2026.

"Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC-BY), allowing others to use, share, modify, and distribute it with proper credit to the author."