AI Operating System Adoption in Indian MSMEs: Organisational Readiness, Informal Knowledge, and Operational Constraints

November 2026

Abstract

An AI operating system requires usable records, explicit authority, and the capacity to manage exceptions after deployment. These conditions can differ substantially across Indian micro, small, and medium enterprises, even within one industry. This paper develops a workflow-specific readiness framework that connects operational records, informal knowledge, language, approval capacity, and continuing support. It draws on published research concerning small business digitalisation and Indian MSME surveys, then applies the framework to constructed manufacturing, distribution, and service scenarios. Its contribution is a set of evidence-based readiness gates rather than a single numerical adoption score. The proposed research design examines whether those gates predict valid completion, support burden, and sustained use. MatruOS provides an implementation context without implying observed customer results. The paper concludes that adoption should begin with a bounded business process whose records and responsibilities can be maintained by the enterprise after the initial implementation team leaves.

Keywords: Indian MSMEs, AI adoption, operational readiness, informal knowledge, multilingual workflows, deployment capacity.

1. Readiness belongs to a workflow

A business can be prepared to use AI for drafting customer messages while remaining unprepared to delegate purchase commitments. The same company may maintain reliable sales records but incomplete stock balances. Describing the whole enterprise as “AI ready” can conceal these differences.

For an AI operating system, readiness concerns whether a particular workflow has the information, authority, and support needed for dependable execution. A short approval chain can help identify a decision maker, but it does not establish that the underlying rules are documented or that the person has time to review exceptions.

The research question is how adoption readiness should be assessed for Indian micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs) when operating knowledge is distributed across software, documents, and people. The scope includes manufacturing, trading, and service workflows. It does not assume that firms within these categories share one process or level of digital capability.

This paper proposes readiness gates linked to evidence. A gate identifies a condition that must be established before a defined responsibility is delegated. The purpose is to make deployment decisions explainable and reversible as the business and its records change.

2. Research context and method

The OECD's work on small business digital transformation identifies constraints involving skills, finance, interoperability, and organisational capabilities. These findings provide a useful analytical foundation, while their application to an Indian enterprise requires local evidence about its actual processes and resources. [1]

SIDBI's reporting describes research covering manufacturing, services, and trading, including technology adoption, access to finance, infrastructure, and skilled labour. This breadth supports examining several dimensions of implementation capacity rather than treating software access as the sole adoption condition. [2]

SIDBI's first MSME Outlook Survey covers approximately 1,200 participating enterprises across urban and rural locations and distinguishes current conditions from future expectations. Its design illustrates the importance of sector and location in interpreting business conditions. It does not measure readiness to delegate AI execution, which remains the subject of the proposed framework. [3]

The method is a focused conceptual synthesis with constructed sector scenarios. The scenarios identify requirements that should be investigated during deployment discovery; they are not claims about all Indian MSMEs. The proposed contribution is a workflow-level assessment and research protocol. No field interviews or pilot outcomes are reported.

3. The first gate is a defined business process

A deployment should begin with a process that has a recognisable trigger and completion condition. "Manage my business" is not a sufficiently bounded instruction. "Prepare a quotation from approved prices and verified stock, then submit it for owner approval" provides a process that can be examined.

Discovery should identify who performs each step, which records are used, and where exceptions occur. The description should include actual operating variations, such as partial deliveries, customer-specific terms, or changes after a telephone discussion. A process map that records only the standard case can omit the work that determines implementation difficulty.

The evidence for this gate is a reviewed workflow description and a small set of representative completed cases. The responsible people should agree on what counts as correct completion. If they disagree, the disagreement is an implementation issue to resolve before execution is delegated.

The gate does not require every business process to be standardised. It requires sufficient clarity for the selected scope. A firm can begin with one bounded workflow while other activities continue through existing arrangements.

4. The second gate is usable operational data

4.1 Identity and opening records

Products, customers, suppliers, and locations need identifiers that remain stable across records. Similar names can refer to different entities, while one entity can appear under several names. An agent that selects the wrong account may produce a coherent document with an incorrect business meaning.

Opening records require validation appropriate to the process. A stock workflow needs a defined starting quantity and treatment of reserved or damaged goods. A receivables workflow needs agreed balances and a procedure for disputed entries. Uploading a spreadsheet does not establish that the contents are correct.

The evidence for this gate is a reconciled set of records for the selected workflow, with unresolved discrepancies identified and assigned. A business does not need to clean every historical record before beginning a narrow pilot. It does need to know which records can safely support the pilot's actions.

4.2 Ongoing record maintenance

Readiness depends on how records remain current. If stock movements are entered only at the end of the day, an agent cannot assume that a morning balance represents current availability. The deployment should either change the recording process or limit what the agent may promise.

Maintenance responsibilities should be explicit. Someone must correct duplicate customer records, update price terms, and resolve disputed balances. A system that relies on the implementation team for every correction is not yet operationally self-sustaining.

The evidence should include a demonstrated update and correction process. During the pilot, introduce a realistic change and observe whether the business can record it, review it, and see its effect in the workflow. This tests maintenance capacity directly.

5. The third gate is explicit operating knowledge

A business owner may know which customers receive special terms or which suppliers require advance confirmation. That knowledge can be useful but difficult to translate into reusable rules. The implementation process should capture examples and ask which conditions justify the exception.

Historical practice should remain distinguishable from current policy. An employee may describe what usually happens without having authority to make it mandatory. The owner or responsible manager should review the proposed rule and identify its scope, limits, and expiry conditions where relevant.

The evidence for this gate is a set of approved rules and a process for resolving cases those rules do not cover. The goal is not to encode every judgement. It is to define where automation is permitted and where a person remains responsible.

Knowledge capture should also preserve disagreement. Sales and accounts may interpret a credit arrangement differently. A model-generated summary that blends their accounts can conceal the conflict. The implementation should identify the difference and obtain a decision from the appropriate owner.

6. Language and interaction requirements

6.1 Interpretation of business language

A user may describe an order in Gujarati, Hindi, English, or a mixture of languages, while product names and quantities follow local conventions. The relevant readiness question is whether the system can resolve that input into the business fields needed for action.

The deployment should test actual vocabulary used by the business, including units, abbreviations, and product aliases. A term that is clear to staff may be ambiguous outside the firm. The system should ask targeted questions where that ambiguity affects quantity, price, or commitment.

The user should see the interpreted fields before consequential execution where review is required. A fluent response in the user's language does not establish that the order was understood correctly. Validation should inspect the structured transaction as well as the conversational quality.

6.2 Voice, documents, and shared devices

Voice input can introduce transcription ambiguity around numbers, names, and units. Scanned documents can omit or misread important fields. The workflow should identify uncertain values and route them for confirmation. It should not silently fill a missing amount from an unrelated record.

Device use also affects authority. If several employees share a phone or workstation, the application needs a practical way to identify who is authorising an action. Convenience should be considered alongside the consequences of an action being attributed to the wrong person.

The evidence for these interaction requirements is successful interpretation and review of representative inputs under the business's ordinary conditions. A polished demonstration using carefully prepared English text does not establish that a multilingual daily workflow will function as intended.

7. The fourth gate is review and recovery capacity

A business needs someone who can review exceptions, investigate uncertain outcomes, and correct records. This may be the owner, an accounts employee, an external adviser, or a support provider. The allocation should be agreed before the pilot creates real obligations.

Review capacity should be measured in practical terms. How many requests require attention, how long do they take, and what happens when the owner is unavailable? A system that generates more pending approvals than the business can process may obstruct work despite completing individual tasks promptly.

Recovery arrangements should cover connectivity loss, unavailable services, and duplicate submissions. If the business continues taking orders while disconnected, it needs a reconciliation process before synchronised records support new commitments. Offline convenience creates consistency requirements that must be examined.

The evidence for this gate is a rehearsed exception and recovery procedure. An implementation team should observe the business resolving a realistic failed or ambiguous operation, including how the final state is verified. A written support number alone does not demonstrate that the procedure works.

8. Three constructed sector scenarios

8.1 A manufacturer of plastic kitchenware

Assume a manufacturer produces several colours and sizes, uses raw material batches, and accepts orders subject to production capacity. The first useful workflow might prepare a production enquiry from customer requirements rather than promise a delivery date automatically.

Readiness requires product variants, units, material requirements, and the relationship between finished stock and planned production to be understood. A quantity described as "boxes" must map to the correct packing size. The owner's estimate of capacity should remain distinguishable from confirmed machine and material availability.

The pilot can begin with structured enquiry preparation and human review of production commitments. Expansion to scheduling should depend on the accuracy and timeliness of production records. The industry label alone does not determine that scope.

8.2 A regional distributor

Assume a distributor receives orders through messages and telephone calls, offers customer-specific prices, and makes partial deliveries. A quotation workflow needs verified customer identity, applicable price terms, and a clear definition of available stock.

Credit checks should reflect the business's agreed treatment of unpaid invoices, open orders, and unallocated receipts. Partial delivery should be an explicit customer decision where required. An agent should not change the order simply because some stock is available.

The pilot can evaluate whether the system prepares valid proposals and identifies exceptions that staff can resolve. The business should record the time spent maintaining prices and reconciling stock as part of adoption cost.

8.3 A service business

Assume a maintenance firm schedules technicians for customer visits. The scarce resource is a combination of time, location, skills, and required parts. A booking assistant needs more than an empty calendar slot to make a valid commitment.

Readiness requires service definitions, technician qualifications, travel assumptions, and procedures for changes or emergencies. The pilot may begin by proposing appointments for review. Automatic confirmation can be considered only when the necessary constraints are represented and maintained.

These scenarios demonstrate why a common platform needs configurable business meaning. They are analytical examples rather than evidence that one deployment approach fits every firm in a sector.

9. Applying the gates to MatruOS onboarding

MatruOS onboarding can use a business description to propose modules, terminology, and initial workflows. Those proposals should remain reviewable. A free text description can identify a starting point, but financial rules, product units, and permissions require confirmation from responsible people.

A readiness view should show evidence and unresolved conditions for each selected workflow. It should avoid presenting one aggregate score that allows strong performance in an unrelated area to conceal a missing prerequisite. Reliable customer records cannot compensate for absent authority to approve expenditure.

The implementation should identify the next concrete action, such as reconciling opening stock or confirming the meaning of a product unit. This makes readiness useful to the business owner. Abstract maturity labels provide limited guidance if they do not explain what must be established before deployment proceeds.

Progress should be based on demonstrated capability. A workflow can move from draft assistance to reviewed execution and then to bounded delegation as evidence accumulates. The system should also allow scope to be reduced when records deteriorate, staff change, or support capacity becomes insufficient.

10. Proposed field research design

A field study should recruit firms across defined sectors, sizes, and locations, with the sampling method stated clearly. Participation by digitally confident volunteers can bias the result. The report should identify who was approached, who participated, and which firms declined or withdrew.

For each firm, select a bounded workflow and document its readiness evidence before deployment. Record baseline completion, error correction, review effort, and unresolved work. During the pilot, record the same measures and changes to data, policy, staffing, or demand that may affect interpretation.

The primary research question is whether the proposed gates predict dependable operation and manageable support effort. A secondary question is which missing conditions cause delay or repeated intervention. The study should test the framework's usefulness rather than assume that every gate has equal predictive value.

Qualitative interviews can explain why a workflow was accepted, changed, or abandoned. They should be conducted with appropriate consent and distinguish owner views from employee experience. A business may continue paying for software while staff avoid the intended workflow, so subscription status alone is an inadequate adoption measure.

The evaluation should include firms that do not proceed beyond preparation. Their reasons may reveal important constraints. Excluding them would produce a selective account of adoption. Findings should be reported within the sampled population rather than generalised to all Indian MSMEs.

11. Limitations and conclusion

The proposed gates are a conceptual framework, not a validated diagnostic instrument. They require empirical assessment and adaptation to sector-specific obligations. The framework also depends on honest reporting of informal practices and access to representative records.

Some firms may need foundational process or record work before an AI operating system is appropriate for execution. That preparation can still be useful, but its effort should be visible. A deployment should not conceal unresolved operating questions behind automated configuration.

Readiness is the ability to maintain a particular workflow with usable data, explicit authority, and manageable exceptions. The proposed approach connects those conditions to observable evidence and practical deployment decisions.

For Indian MSMEs, an AI operating system should be introduced at a scope the business can operate and support. Subsequent responsibility should follow demonstrated performance and continuing maintenance capacity. This provides a researchable basis for adoption without assuming that company size, language, or industry label determines the outcome.

Author affiliation and disclosure

The author is affiliated with Code Colonies Private Limited, Ahmedabad, and leads the MatruOS team. Sector scenarios are constructed examples. No field study or independent product evaluation is reported.

References

[1] OECD (2021). The Digital Transformation of SMEs. OECD Studies on SMEs and Entrepreneurship.

https://doi.org/10.1787/bdb9256a-en

[2] Small Industries Development Bank of India (2025). Annual Report for financial year 2024-25. Business Performance, Publications and Outreach.

https://www.sidbi.in/annualreport/AnnualReport202425/business-performance.php

[3] Small Industries Development Bank of India. MSME Outlook Survey, Round 1, October to December 2024. Introduction and Sampling and Estimation sections.

https://www.sidbi.in/uploads/msme_outlook_survey.pdf