The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management
Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026
Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896

THE REGULATORY VACUUM IN INDIAN BIOTECHNOLOGY LAW: MAKING THE CASE FOR A COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL BIOTECHNOLOGY REGULATORY AUTHORITY

Charul Pande

INTRODUCTION

India's biotechnology sector has emerged as a global powerhouse, contributing over $17 billion to the economy and generating millions of skilled jobs. However, this rapid growth occurs against a fragmented regulatory backdrop characterized by overlapping jurisdictions, inconsistent standards, and significant compliance gaps. Unlike developed nations with unified biotechnology regulatory frameworks, India relies on a patchwork of outdated rules administered by multiple agencies with competing mandates. This regulatory vacuum threatens innovation, investor confidence, and public safety. This article argues that India urgently requires a comprehensive National Biotechnology Regulatory Authority (NBRA) to consolidate oversight, establish uniform standards, and facilitate responsible biotechnology advancement.

THE CURRENT REGULATORY FRAMEWORK: A FRAGMENTED APPROACH

India's biotechnology regulation operates through dispersed authorities with overlapping responsibilities. The Department of Biotechnology (DBT) coordinates policy; the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change oversees genetic modification; the Drugs Controller General of India (DCGI) regulates pharmaceuticals; the Food Safety and Standards Authority (FSSA) manages food-related biotechnology products; and state governments maintain concurrent jurisdiction over agricultural matters. This fragmentation creates several critical problems.

- Jurisdictional Conflicts: When genetically modified (GM) crops require approval, applicants navigate multiple agencies with divergent criteria. The Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee (GEAC), established in 1990, lacks comprehensive legal authority. The Institutional Biosafety Committees (IBCs) operate with minimal standardization across institutions. This multiplicity causes delays—Bt brinjal's approval process spanned over a decade, discouraging investment in agri-biotechnology.

- Inconsistent Standards: Different agencies apply varying safety and efficacy benchmarks. Pharmaceutical biotechnology products undergo different scrutiny than agricultural biotech, despite similar underlying concerns. Gene therapy regulations remain undefined, creating uncertainty for researchers and companies. The absence of harmonized guidelines compounds compliance costs, particularly for small and medium enterprises (SMEs) that form India's biotechnology backbone.
- Inadequate Legal Architecture: Existing regulations predate contemporary biotechnology developments. The Rules for Manufacture, Use, Import, Export and Storage of Hazardous Microorganisms/Genetically Engineered Organisms or Cells (1989) and the Guidelines for Research in Genetically Modified Crops in India (1998) fail to address synthetic biology, gene editing beyond traditional transgenic methods, and emerging biotechnology applications. This legal lag creates ambiguity about regulatory obligations for novel technologies.

SPECIFIC REGULATORY GAPS

Gene Editing and Synthetic Biology: CRISPR-Cas9 and other gene-editing technologies occupy regulatory grey zones. Distinguishing between edited organisms, genetically modified organisms, and naturally occurring variants lacks clarity. The European Union explicitly addressed gene-edited crops; India's silence invites inconsistent treatment.

- Personalized Medicine and Companion Diagnostics: Companion diagnostic devices for precision oncology lack dedicated regulatory pathways. The DCGI's framework emphasizes traditional drugs, not biomarker-driven treatments requiring coordinated regulation of diagnostic and therapeutic components.
- Biomanufacturing and Advanced Therapies: Cell and gene therapies face undefined regulatory trajectories. While the DCGI issued preliminary guidance in 2021, inconsistencies persist. Regenerative medicine products, tissue engineering, and ex vivo therapies lack comprehensive oversight protocols.
- Bioinformatics and Data Governance: Biotechnology increasingly depends on data analytics and artificial intelligence. No specific regulatory framework addresses data privacy, intellectual property implications, or algorithmic transparency in biotechnology applications.
- Agricultural Biotechnology Stagnation: After Bt cotton's 2002 approval, no new GM crops have been commercialized. Regulatory delays and public opposition, partly attributable to unclear risk assessment standards, have effectively halted innovation in crop improvement, a domain where India possesses significant competitive advantage.

INTERNATIONAL COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Developed nations demonstrate superior frameworks:

- United States: The FDA, EPA, and USDA coordinate through defined memoranda of understanding. Clear submission pathways and timelines expedite approvals. The framework evolved with biotechnology, addressing gene therapy, personalized medicine, and agricultural biotech through specialized pathways.
- European Union: Unified regulations ensure harmonization across member states. The European Medicines Agency (EMA) oversees advanced therapy medicinal products (ATMPs) through dedicated committees. Clear labeling and traceability requirements exist for GM foods.
- Singapore and Australia: These nations established single-window biotechnology regulatory authorities, reducing compliance timelines and costs while maintaining safety standards.
- China: Despite regulatory concerns, China consolidated biotechnology oversight under the Center for Drug Evaluation (CDE), achieving faster approvals and significant market share in biologics.

India's regulatory fragmentation disadvantages domestic companies competing globally. Foreign investors hesitate when approval timelines remain unpredictable and standards undefined.

ECONOMIC AND INNOVATION IMPLICATIONS

The regulatory vacuum imposes substantial costs:

- Direct Compliance Costs: Companies navigate multiple applications, assessments, and committees. SMEs, lacking dedicated regulatory affairs departments, face disproportionate burdens. Estimated compliance costs increase 40-60% compared to unified systems, disadvantaging Indian companies against international competitors.
- Innovation Chilling Effect: Regulatory uncertainty discourages investment in biotechnology sectors where India possesses natural advantages. Agricultural biotechnology investment has virtually ceased. Domestic biopharmaceutical companies increasingly relocate research operations to jurisdictions with clearer regulatory frameworks.
- Time-to-Market Delays: Average approval timelines in India exceed global standards by 2-3 years. For time-sensitive innovations like cancer therapeutics, such delays significantly impact competitive position and commercial viability.
- Talent Migration: Young scientists and entrepreneurs migrate to countries offering regulatory clarity and stable innovation ecosystems. India's "brain drain" in biotechnology partly reflects regulatory uncertainty.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS

Regulatory fragmentation also creates public health vulnerabilities:

- Inconsistent Risk Assessment: Without standardized safety evaluation protocols, public health protection becomes inconsistent. Gene-edited crops, for instance, might receive divergent scrutiny depending on which committee reviews them.
- Traceability Deficiencies: No unified system exists for tracking biotechnology products post-approval. Contamination incidents, adverse events, or product recalls lack coordinated response mechanisms.
- Biosafety and Biosecurity Concerns: In an era of increasing biosecurity threats, fragmented oversight creates vulnerabilities. A unified authority could implement comprehensive biosafety protocols and maintain better surveillance over research involving potentially dangerous pathogens.
- Environmental Impact Assessment Gaps: Different agencies apply varying environmental standards. This inconsistency undermines the coherence of environmental protection in biotechnology oversight.

THE CASE FOR A NATIONAL BIOTECHNOLOGY REGULATORY AUTHORITY

A unified NBRA would address these deficiencies:

- Single-Window Approval System: Consolidating applications reduces redundancy and timelines. Applicants would submit once to the NBRA, which would coordinate internal assessments, eliminating inter-agency conflicts.
- Harmonized Standards: A single authority develops and implements consistent safety, efficacy, and labeling requirements across all biotechnology sectors. These standards would align with international best practices while addressing India-specific contexts.
- Specialized Expertise: The NBRA would establish dedicated divisions for agricultural biotech, pharmaceutical biotech, environmental biotech, and emerging technologies (gene therapy, synthetic biology). Specialized committees ensure informed decision-making in technically complex areas.
- Adaptive Regulatory Framework: As biotechnology evolves, a centralized authority can more agilely update regulations. Current fragmentation makes regulatory modernization slow and incomplete.
- Improved Transparency and Predictability: Published timelines, clear criteria, and consistent procedural rules increase investor confidence. Predictable regulation attracts capital and talent.
- Enhanced Public Trust: Unified oversight, transparent communication, and evidence-based decision-making strengthen public confidence in biotechnology regulation. Clear traceability and adverse event reporting systems would be coordinated centrally.

- International Competitiveness: Harmonizing with international standards facilitates reciprocal recognition, benefiting Indian companies in export markets and foreign companies investing in India.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

Establishing an effective NBRA requires careful design:

- Institutional Structure: The NBRA should be an autonomous statutory authority reporting to the Department of Biotechnology, with sufficient independence to resist political pressure while remaining accountable to elected representatives. A board combining government representatives, scientific experts, industry representatives, and public health/environmental advocates would ensure balanced decision-making.
- Regulatory Transition: Rather than replacing all existing bodies immediately, the NBRA could gradually consolidate functions. Transitional periods would allow knowledge transfer and minimize disruption.
- Stakeholder Engagement: Effective implementation requires consultation with scientists, industry, civil society, and international regulatory counterparts. Public participation mechanisms would ensure legitimacy and social acceptance.
- Financial and Human Resources: Adequate funding and recruitment of world-class scientific talent are essential. This investment would be offset by efficiency gains and economic benefits.
- International Coordination: The NBRA should establish relationships with international regulatory agencies (FDA, EMA, WHO) for harmonization and mutual recognition, facilitating technology transfer and trade.

ADDRESSING CONCERNS

Critics might argue that consolidation risks regulatory capture or reduced regional autonomy. However:

- Safeguards Against Capture: Multi-stakeholder governance structures, transparency requirements, and professional civil service protections mitigate capture risks. Independent scientific committees provide insulation from political pressure.
- Federalism Considerations: Agricultural biotechnology could maintain state consultation mechanisms while central oversight ensures uniform minimum standards. Federal structures in other countries successfully balance central and regional interests.
- Precautionary Principle: Centralization need not compromise caution. Clear, science-based standards can accommodate precaution without regulatory paralysis.

CONCLUSION

India's biotechnology sector stands at a crossroads. The current regulatory framework, designed for 1990s biotechnology, fails to serve 21st-century innovation. Fragmented oversight creates inefficiencies, discourages investment, and leaves public health and environmental concerns inadequately addressed. Establishing a comprehensive National Biotechnology Regulatory Authority represents not regulatory overreach, but rational modernization. The NBRA would consolidate expertise, harmonize standards, accelerate approvals, and enhance India's global competitiveness. It would facilitate responsible innovation in sectors where India possesses natural advantage agricultural biotechnology, tropical disease therapeutics, and affordable biologics while maintaining rigorous safety standards.

Developed nations recognized that biotechnology's complexity demands specialized, unified oversight. India, possessing both biotechnology capability and need, cannot afford continued regulatory fragmentation. A well-designed NBRA would unlock India's biotechnology potential while protecting public health and environment. The time for regulatory modernization is now.