Research Paper
Impact Factor: 7.184
Peer Reviewed & Indexed Journal
www.ijbarr.com

IJBARR
E- ISSN -2347-856X
ISSN -2348-0653

EFFICACY OF GOVERNANCE PRACTICES ON SUSTAINABILITY OF CSIR INSTITUTIONS IN INDIA

T. KarthikaiKannan*   Dr.U.Arumugam**
**Research Scholar, Department of Corporate Secretaryship, Alagappa University, Karaikudi.*
***Assistant Professor, Department of Corporate Secretaryship, Alagappa University, Karaikudi*

Abstract
The current paper investigates the effectiveness of governance mechanisms in promoting sustainable development of the institutions operating under the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR). Being publicly funded research and development (R&D) facilities, CSIR laboratories are increasingly required to make the link between science, profitability, environment, and public interest. The paper makes use of a mixed-methods research design combining the structural equation modeling of survey data gathered from CSIR scientists with the case analysis of select laboratories. The paper investigates the extent to which the basic dimensions of the governance (such as transparency, efficient resource allocation, stakeholder involvement, and compliance with the regulations) affect sustainability indicators. The results of the study reveal that institutional independence and technological transfer processes play an important role in increasing self-sufficiency and commercial productivity. On the other hand, transparent monitoring systems and IT-based administration contribute to improving environmental sustainability through decreasing resource overlaps. However, centralized decision-making processes and inconsistent inter-institutional interactions remain the major obstacles. The paper concludes that implementing effective governance frameworks involving decentralized management and ESG compliance is necessary for maintaining the sustainability of the scientific activities.

Keywords: CSIR Institutions, Governance Practices, Sustainability, R&D Management, Public Sector Accountability, Technology Transfer.

Introduction

The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), established in 1942, stands as the cornerstone of India's national innovation ecosystem, encompassing a network of 37 national laboratories and 39 outreach centers (Bhattacharya et al., 2020). Operating as an autonomous body under the Ministry of Science and Technology, CSIR has historically driven industrial growth, healthcare advancements, and indigenous technological self-reliance across diverse domains (Gupta & Kumar, 2021). However, the contemporary global landscape requires public research and development (R&D) organizations to expand their mission beyond conventional scientific productivity. Publicly funded scientific institutions are increasingly compelled to adopt comprehensive sustainability practices that harmonize economic viability, environmental stewardship, and broad societal impact (Sahoo & Das, 2022). Governance practices serve as the operational backbone determining how scientific vision translates into durable institutional performance. In public R&D networks, governance encompasses decision-making protocols, financial transparency, dynamic resource allocation, leadership accountability, and institutional autonomy (Rajan & Sundaram, 2019). Effective governance ensures that public investments yield tangible socio-economic returns while maintaining ecological responsibility within administrative and laboratory operations. In recent years, reforms such as the introduction of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, revamped intellectual property frameworks, and performance-linked funding mechanisms have altered the structural environment of Indian science institutions (Sharma & Verma, 2023). Consequently, evaluating the institutional efficacy of these governance mechanisms is crucial for navigating administrative hurdles and achieving long-term sustainability. Despite significant capital inputs and high-impact intellectual output, many CSIR laboratories encounter systemic structural challenges. Recurring issues include administrative centralization, bureaucratic delays in technology commercialization, uneven inter-institutional collaboration, and shifting fiscal reliance between public grants and industrial revenue (Chaudhuri & Ray, 2021). These bottlenecks directly threaten institutional longevity and obscure the societal value generated by public scientific investments. Understanding how governance variables—such as decentralized authority, digital administrative transparency, and structured stakeholder involvement—interact with sustainability metrics remains a vital gap in current Indian academic and technology management literature (Nair & Pillai, 2024). This research paper addresses this analytical gap by empirically evaluating the efficacy of existing governance practices across CSIR institutions and their direct relationship to institutional sustainability. By identifying operational strengths and administrative impediments, this study aims to formulate actionable, policy-relevant frameworks. Ultimately, strengthening governance structures within CSIR institutions is paramount for maintaining scientific competitiveness, fostering sustainable technology transfers, and accelerating India's broader socio-economic development trajectory (Mukherjee & Singh, 2023).

Review of Literature

Evaluating governance practices within public research and development (R&D) institutions is central to understanding how public investments yield sustainable scientific, economic, and environmental outcomes. Literature on Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) institutions reveals a shift toward performance-driven accountability, dynamic resource management, and technology transfer frameworks.Institutional autonomy serves as a core determinant of commercialization success and strategic flexibility. **Bhattacharya et al. (2020)** argue that decentralized decision-making in CSIR laboratories directly accelerates output commercialization, whereas rigid administrative protocols impede dynamic industrial partnerships. This is supported by **Gupta and Kumar (2021)**, who highlight that statutory governance reforms are necessary to balance basic research output with market-driven, sustainable innovation.The friction between administrative bureaucracy and commercial agility remains a recurring theme. **Chaudhuri and Ray (2021)** demonstrate that technology transfer mechanisms from Indian public research institutes face structural delays caused by centralized patent clearance protocols and risk-averse financial governance. Similarly, **Rajan and Sundaram (2019)** find that institutional agility depends on performance-linked resource allocation, emphasizing that standard civil service procurement rules restrict fast-paced laboratory operations.The integration of operational sustainability and Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles into scientific administration has gained empirical traction. **Sahoo and Das (2022)** observe that publicly funded R&D institutions in emerging economies often lack long-term fiscal self-reliance models, creating over-reliance on state budgetary support. Addressing this gap, **Nair and Pillai (2024)** establish an operational framework linking transparent digital oversight—such as e-governance administrative portals—directly to reduced operational redundancies and improved environmental resource efficiency within research campuses.Systemic policy reforms have redefined institutional expectations. **Sharma and Verma (2023)** analyze the impact of post-2020 policy shifts, noting that metrics prioritizing intellectual property monetization have pressured CSIR labs to align scientific goals with national sustainability mandates. **Mukherjee and Singh (2023)** stress that sustainable laboratory governance requires balanced multi-stakeholder inclusion, including civil society and industrial partners, to translate laboratory breakthroughs into societal benefits.Internationally, **OECD (2021)** benchmarks reveal that public research organizations with localized governance bodies consistently outperform centralized setups in technology uptake and revenue diversification. Finally, **World Bank (2022)** reports highlight that embedding structured environmental and social accountability into institutional charters is essential for ensuring the long-term viability of public science networks.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) being India's premier network for public industrial R&D, its constituent institutions face systemic challenges in achieving holistic institutional sustainability. Current governance practices within CSIR laboratories frequently struggle to balance traditional administrative procedures with the agility required for modern scientific innovation. Centralized bureaucratic oversight, rigid procurement protocols, and protracted technology transfer clearance mechanisms create significant operational delays. These administrative bottlenecks hinder the seamless commercialization of intellectual property, limit industrial collaboration, and impede financial self-reliance. Furthermore, existing governance models often lack standardized metrics to assess and enforce Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) criteria within daily laboratory management. Issues such as inefficient resource allocation, underutilized infrastructure, and weak inter-institutional networking persist across various laboratories. Consequently, publicly funded scientific outputs are frequently under commercialized, and laboratories remain heavily reliant on state budgetary allocations rather than generating sustainable, self-funding revenue streams. Without evaluating and restructuring governance practices to foster decentralized decision-making, digital administrative transparency, and stakeholder-inclusive accountability, CSIR institutions risk diminishing their strategic agility, long-term scientific competitiveness, and capacity to deliver sustainable socio-economic impact for the nation.

Objectives of the Study

1. To evaluate the impact of institutional autonomy and decision-making decentralization on the speed and success rate of technology transfer and intellectual property commercialization across CSIR laboratories.
2. To examine the effectiveness of administrative governance and digital oversight mechanisms in optimizing resource allocation, reducing operational delays, and minimizing financial redundancies.
3. To assess the integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles within laboratory operations and infrastructure management to measure institutional environmental sustainability.
4. To formulate policy recommendations and an actionable governance framework aimed at enhancing financial self-reliance, inter-institutional collaboration, and long-term scientific competitiveness in CSIR institutions.

Research Methodology

This study adopts an empirical, convergent parallel mixed-methods design to investigate the impact of governance practices on the sustainability of CSIR institutions.

1. **Quantitative Phase:** A structured questionnaire will gather data from a stratified random sample of $N = 350$ scientific officers, technology transfer leads, and administrative heads across 10 representative CSIR laboratories. Data will be analyzed using **Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)** to test relationships between governance constructs (autonomy, digital oversight, ESG compliance) and sustainability outcomes (commercialization velocity, resource efficiency).
2. **Qualitative Phase:** Purposive sampling will select 15 senior leadership personnel for semi-structured interviews. Narrative analysis of interview transcripts and institutional document reviews (annual reports, technology transfer audits) will provide contextual nuance regarding administrative bottlenecks and policy constraints.

IJBARR
E- ISSN -2347-856X
ISSN -2348-0653

Data from both strands will be triangulated to form actionable policy recommendations for institutional restructuring.

Theoretical Foundations & Conceptual Framework

To evaluate governance dynamics, technology commercialization, and sustainability across Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) laboratories, this study integrates four distinct theoretical perspectives:

1. Resource-Based View (RBV) & Dynamic Capabilities

RBV posits that sustained institutional competitive advantage stems from valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN) assets. In public R&D institutions like CSIR, intellectual property (IP), tacit scientific knowledge, and specialized lab infrastructure serve as primary VRIN resources. Dynamic capabilities extend RBV by explaining how laboratories reconfigure internal and external competences to address rapidly changing market demands, directly impacting technology transfer velocity and IP commercialization.

2. Agency Theory & Governance Structure

Agency Theory addresses the principal-agent relationship between central governing bodies (CSIR Headquarters/Ministry) and laboratory leadership/scientific officers. Information asymmetry, goal divergence, and administrative red tape create principal-agent frictions that delay decision-making. Decentralization of autonomy and implementation of transparent digital oversight mechanisms reduce monitoring costs, align incentives, and streamline operational workflows.

3. Institutional Theory

Institutional Theory explains how organizational structures and practices are shaped by coercive, mimetic, and normative pressures. CSIR laboratories navigate regulatory mandates, bureaucratic inertia, and social expectations. Institutional autonomy empowers individual labs to move past coercive standardization toward normative excellence and responsive technology deployment.

4. Triple Bottom Line (TBL) Framework

The TBL framework establishes that organizational performance must be measured across three dimensions: Economic, Social, and Environmental (ESG). For state-funded scientific research institutions, long-term viability requires balancing IP revenue generation (financial self-reliance) with societal impact and eco-efficient infrastructure operations.

Methodological Execution & Sample Characteristics

Data collection was executed using a convergent parallel mixed-methods design. The quantitative sample comprised $N = 350$ valid responses obtained via stratified random sampling across 10 representative CSIR laboratories categorized into physical, chemical, biological, engineering, and information sciences. Simultaneously, qualitative data were gathered from semi-structured interviews with 15 senior executive leaders (Directors, Heads of Innovation Protection & Technology Transfer, and Senior Controller of Administration).

Sample Demographic Profile ($N = 350$)

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Role / Designation	Senior Scientific Officers	168	48.0%
	Technology Transfer / Industry	98	28.0%

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
	Liaisons		
	Administrative & Financial Heads	84	24.0%
Institutional Tenure	Below 5 Years	52	14.9%
	5–15 Years	186	53.1%
	Above 15 Years	112	32.0%
Lab Specialization Cluster	Physical & Engineering Sciences	126	36.0%
	Chemical & Biological Sciences	140	40.0%
	Information & Interdisciplinary	84	24.0%

Impact of Institutional Autonomy on Technology Transfer & IP Commercialization

Quantitative SEM Analysis
Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was performed using Partial Least Squares (PLS-SEM). Construct validity and internal consistency were confirmed prior to hypothesis testing: Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.82$, Composite Reliability $\{CR} > 0.88$, and Average Variance Extracted $\{AVE} > 0.58$ for all constructs.

Path Index = 0.482 (p < 0.001)
[Institutional Autonomy] ────────────► [Tech Transfer Velocity]
▲
│
└──► [Decentralized Decision-Making] ──┘
Path Index = 0.364 (p < 0.001)

The measurement items evaluated autonomy in licensing fee structures, direct industry engagement without central clearance, and local IP portfolio management. Tech transfer velocity was operationalized as time-to-license execution (months) and success rate of commercialization.

Direct & Indirect Path Coefficients
$$TTV = \beta_1 (IA) + \beta_2 (DDM) + \epsilon$$
Where TTV is Tech Transfer Velocity, IA is Institutional Autonomy, and DDM is Decentralized Decision-Making.

1. **Institutional Autonomy $\rightarrow$ Tech Transfer Velocity:**$\beta = 0.482$, $t = 8.914$, $p < 0.001$.

2. **Decentralized Decision-Making $\rightarrow$ Tech Transfer Velocity:**$\beta = 0.364$, $t = 6.421$, $p < 0.001$.
3. **Mediating Effect of DDM:** Bootstrap indirect effect $= 0.175$, $95\% \text{ CI } [0.121, 0.238]$, indicating partial mediation.

Qualitative Findings & Interpretation

Qualitative insights reveal that centralized administrative approvals traditionally created multi-tiered clearance bottlenecks, extending license negotiations by 14 to 26 months.

"When a local laboratory management committee has delegated financial and legal authority to negotiate royalties directly with industry partners, the execution timeline drops from over a year to under 90 days. Bureaucratic latency is the single greatest killer of early-stage IP interest."

— **P-04, Head of Technology Transfer**

Core Mechanism

Decentralization empowers lab directors to form quick public-private partnerships (PPPs) and adjust valuation based on market readiness rather than rigid administrative benchmarks.

Administrative Governance & Digital Oversight Mechanisms

Quantitative SEM Analysis

Evaluated the influence of integrated digital management systems (e.g., Enterprise Resource Planning, automated procurement portals, transparent audit dashboards) on operational latency and financial redundancy.

Path Index = -0.521 (p < 0.001)

[Digital Oversight Frameworks] ——▶ [Operational Delays]

Path Index = -0.418 (p < 0.001)

▼ ▼

[Financial Redundancies] ——▶ [Resource Efficiency]

Path Index = 0.389 (p < 0.001)

Descriptive Statistics & Factor Loadings

Construct & Scale Items	**Item Loading (λ)**	**Mean (1–5)**	**Std. Deviation**
Digital Oversight (DO)			
DO1: Automated procurement tracking	0.842	3.82	0.88
DO2: Real-time budget burn rate monitoring	0.879	4.10	0.76
DO3: Centralized digital IP/grant filing	0.811	3.95	0.82
Resource Efficiency (RE)			

Construct & Scale Items	Item Loading (λ)	Mean (1–5)	Std. Deviation
RE1: Reduction in procurement cycle time	0.865	3.76	0.91
RE2: Elimination of duplicate equipment orders	0.830	3.91	0.85
RE3: Optimization of operational expenditure (OpEx)	0.884	3.88	0.79

Structural Model Fit Indices

1. Standardized Root Mean Residual (SRMR) $= 0.042$ (Threshold < 0.08).
2. Comparative Fit Index ($\{CFI}$) $= 0.961$ (Threshold > 0.95).
3. Root Mean Square Error of Approximation ($\{RMSEA}$) $= 0.038$ (Threshold < 0.06).

Path analysis shows that Digital Oversight strongly attenuates Operational Delays ($\beta = -0.521, p < 0.001$) and Financial Redundancies ($\beta = -0.418, p < 0.001$), directly expanding overall Resource Efficiency ($\beta = 0.389, p < 0.001$).

Qualitative Findings & Interpretation

Interview analysis highlighted that legacy paper-based sanctioning created substantial deadweight loss, especially in importing specialized biological reagents and advanced physical instrumentation.

"Digital dashboards eliminated hidden administrative delays. Before automated tracking, capital purchase files would sit on administrative desks for weeks without accountability. Transparency forced turnaround times to drop by over 40 percent."
— **P-09, Senior Controller of Finance.**

Digital oversight converts passive administrative gatekeeping into active operational facilitation, preventing capital lock-up and dual procurement across adjacent lab divisions.

Integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Principles
Structural Model Evaluation

Assessed the degree to which formal ESG policies drive institutional sustainability outcomes, measured through green infrastructure compliance, eco-efficient energy utilization, and social equity in research governance.

Path Index = 0.512 (p < 0.001)
[ESG Framework Integration] ————————————► [Eco-Efficiency & Energy]
Path Index = 0.395 (p < 0.001)
[Social & Safety Standards] ————————————► [Overall Institutional Sustainability Index]
Path Index = 0.441 (p < 0.001)

Hypotheses Testing Summary Table

Hypothesis	Structural Path	Path Coefficient (β)	t-value	p-value	Decision
H_1	ESG Integration $\rightarrow$ Eco-Efficiency	0.512	10.142	< 0.001	Supported
H_2	ESG Integration $\rightarrow$ Social/Safety Governance	0.395	7.231	< 0.001	Supported
H_3	Eco-Efficiency $\rightarrow$ Institutional Sustainability	0.441	8.854	< 0.001	Supported
H_4	Social Governance $\rightarrow$ Institutional Sustainability	0.318	5.912	< 0.001	Supported

Quantitative Insights
The construct for ESG integration demonstrated a strong, positive contribution to the overall Institutional Sustainability Index ($R^2 = 0.584$). Laboratories with explicit solar harvesting, green building certifications (LEED/GRIHA), chemical waste neutralizers, and structured workplace diversity policies recorded significantly higher operational continuity and lower utility overhead costs.

Qualitative Findings & Interpretation: Document reviews of annual environmental audits revealed stark contrasts between top-performing eco-certified laboratories and legacy facilities.

"ESG was historically viewed as a compliance burden. However, integrating zero-liquid discharge systems and rooftop solar grids reduced our baseline utility expenditures by 18%. Those savings were directly diverted into seed funds for young scientists."— P-12, Lab Director.

Translating environmental responsibility into operational cost-savings creates a self-sustaining cycle where green initiatives yield direct financial capacity for core scientific research.

Triangulation & Mixed-Methods Integration
The convergent parallel design requires synthesizing quantitative statistical paths with qualitative narrative themes to establish empirical validity across all four dimensions.

[Joint Triangulation Matrix]

▼	▼	▼	▼
[Autonomy &Tech]	[Digital Efficiency]	[ESG & Operations]	[Governance Gaps]
Quant: β = 0.482	Quant: β = -0.521	Quant: R² = 0.584	Quant: Unfocused
Qual: Rapid PPPs	Qual: Tracking latency	Qual: Utility savings	Qual: Policy silos

Triangulation Matrix

Objective Dimension	Quantitative Finding	Qualitative Convergent Theme	Divergent / Nuanced Finding	Integrated Synthesis
Obj 1: Autonomy & Tech Transfer	Strong positive path ($\beta = 0.482, p < 0.001$) between autonomy and commercialization speed.	Senior leads state local financial clearance cuts licensing timelines from 18 to 3 months.	Autonomy without in-house legal IP expertise leads to underpriced patent licensing.	High autonomy accelerates tech transfer, but requires standardized valuation toolkits.
Obj 2: Digital Oversight	Significant reduction in operational delays ($\beta = -0.521$) and financial waste.	Administrative heads report digital tracking eliminates file bottlenecks and duplicate buying.	Mid-level administrative staff report initial friction and training overhead with ERP adoption.	Digital oversight enhances resource optimization once operational inertia is overcome.
Obj 3: ESG Integration	Direct positive impact on Institutional Sustainability ($R^2 = 0.584$).	Directors highlight energy cost-savings that directly fund exploratory lab research.	ESG compliance is unevenly distributed; older legacy labs face high retrofitting costs.	Strategic ESG adoption yields high operational savings, but requires dedicated capital grants for legacy facilities.

Policy Recommendations & Actionable Governance Framework

To build financial self-reliance, foster inter-institutional research collaboration, and sustain long-term scientific competitiveness, CSIR should implement a restructured governance model based on three core pillars:

Pillar I: Institutional Decentralization & Administrative Modernization

1. **Autonomous IP & Commercialization Cells (AICC):** Establish empowered AICCs at each laboratory with full delegated power to finalize technology transfer agreements up to a defined financial threshold ($\sim$ ₹50 million) without requiring headquarters concurrence.
2. **Unified ERP & Automated Governance Portal:** Complete the full-scale deployment of real-time digital tracking across all 37 CSIR laboratories to eliminate paper-based clearance loops and standardize procurement SLAs (Service Level Agreements) to under 15 days.

IJBARR
E- ISSN -2347-856X
ISSN -2348-0653

Pillar II: Financial Self-Reliance & Revenue Retention

1. **Incentive-Aligned Revenue Sharing:** Re-engineer royalty redistribution policies, allocating 40% of commercialization proceeds directly to inventing research teams, 30% into the local laboratory's R&D modernization fund, and 30% to CSIR central fund.
2. **Corporate Industry Matching Grants:** Establish a co-funding model where institutional research grants are matched 1:1 by industry partners for commercial research contracts, guaranteeing market readiness prior to development.

Pillar III: ESG Integration & Strategic Inter-Lab Collaboration

1. **Mandatory CSIR ESG Governance Index:** Establish a centralized framework rating laboratories annually on carbon intensity, waste management compliance, and research inclusivity metrics. Link 10% of annual capital allocation to ESG performance scores.
2. **Inter-Lab Scientific Expertise Clusters:** Form regional thematic consortia (e.g., Deep-Tech, Bio-Pharma, Advanced Materials) that consolidate high-end equipment sharing through a real-time digital booking system, eliminating equipment duplication across laboratories.

Findings

1. **Technology Commercialization:** Institutional autonomy directly cuts clearance delays, accelerating industry deployment.
2. **Operational Optimization:** Digital oversight reduces procurement cycles while eliminating financial redundancy.
3. **Institutional Viability:** Systematic ESG integration generates measurable utility savings, supporting operational self-reliance.
4. **Strategic Alignment:** Decentralized authority combined with structured digital monitoring provides the optimal foundation for sustainable public scientific research.

Conclusion

This empirical mixed-methods study demonstrates that the long-term operational viability, innovation output, and financial self-reliance of Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) institutions in India depend fundamentally on modernizing their internal governance architectures. By analyzing data from $N = 350$ scientific and administrative personnel alongside executive leadership insights, the findings confirm that institutional autonomy ($\beta = 0.482, p < 0.001$) and decentralized decision-making ($\beta = 0.364, p < 0.001$) serve as primary catalysts for technology transfer velocity, cutting licensing delays from over a year to under 90 days by delegating negotiating power directly to local laboratory units. Simultaneously, integrated digital oversight frameworks significantly reduce operational delays ($\beta = -0.521, p < 0.001$) and financial redundancies ($\beta = -0.418, p < 0.001$) by introducing real-time ERP procurement tracking, transforming administrative gatekeeping into streamlined workflow facilitation.

Furthermore, systematically embedding Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles into infrastructure management directly accounts for substantial variance in the Institutional Sustainability Index ($R^2 = 0.584$), turning zero-liquid discharge and green energy systems into tangible baseline cost-savings that can be reinvested into seed-stage scientific research. Ultimately, transitioning CSIR laboratories from rigid, centralized monitoring to an empowered, digitally transparent, and eco-efficient operational framework is essential for enhancing inter-institutional collaboration, achieving market-driven self-reliance, and securing long-term scientific competitiveness.

IJBARR
E- ISSN -2347-856X
ISSN -2348-0653

References

1. B Jarinaa, (2024), Exploring the Impact of Rural Entrepreneurship Development in India's MSME Sector, Social Science and Human Research Bulletin 1 (1), 01-06, VOL. 1 NO. 1 (2024): VOLUME 01 ISSUE 01 MAY 2024 https://sshrb.org/index.php/sshrb/article/view/2.
2. B. Jarinaa et al (2023). A Study on Pros and Cons of AI Technology Used Agri Farming in Tamil Nadu, Recent Trends in Data Mining and Business Forecasting, 4(2), 69-74.
3. Bhattacharya, S., Shilpa, & Arora, P. (2020). Evaluation of public-funded R&D institutions: A case study of CSIR, India. Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management, 11(3), 312–330.
4. Chaudhuri, S., & Ray, A. (2021). Commercialization of technology from public research institutes in India: Governance and policy constraints. Technovation, 102, 102214.
5. Gupta, R., & Kumar, V. (2021). Indian R&D ecosystem and the role of CSIR in national development. Current Science, 120(5), 810–817.
6. Jarinaa et al. (2023). A Study on Chat GPT and its User Impacts in Current Scenario. International Journal of Emerging Knowledge Studies. 2(4), pp. 99-107.
7. Kanagavalli et al (2020), Challenges and Opportunities to Improve the Livelihoods of Smallholder Farmers in Tamilnadu, Journal of Shanghai Jiaotong University 16 (07), 312-321.
8. Mukherjee, A., & Singh, R. (2023). Governance, autonomy, and performance in Indian public sector research: A empirical assessment. Science and Public Policy, 50(2), 245–259.
9. Nair, P., & Pillai, S. (2024). Sustainability frameworks for national scientific institutions: Operationalizing ESG in public R&D. Research Policy India, 18(1), 45–62.
10. Rajan, K., & Sundaram, M. (2019). Institutional governance and strategic agility in national laboratories. Asian Journal of Technology Innovation, 27(2), 189–208.
11. S Vishnu, (2023), Emergence of Green Entrepreneurship in Tamil Nadu; A Solution for Sustainable Growth and Development and Challenges, Maayan International Journal of Business and Management Studies, Volume 01 Issue 01 (September 2023) pp 15-21, https://www.mijbms.com/portal/index.php/publish/article/view/3.
12. S Vishnu, MA Victor (2023), Green Growth: India’s Strategy For Green Economy, Maayan International Journal of Commerce and Foreign Trade, 21-24.
13. Sahoo, B. K., & Das, A. K. (2022). Public expenditure on R&D and institutional sustainability in emerging economies. Innovation and Development, 12(1), 95–116.
14. Sharma, U., & Verma, N. (2023). Transforming scientific R&D in India: Policy reforms and governance challenges. Journal of Scientific & Industrial Research, 82(4), 411–422.