IUJ Journal of Management
Volume 13, No.01, June 2025

Received: May
Accepted : June
Published : June
DOI: eoi.citefactor.org/13.11224/IUJ.13.01.04

Role of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, RBI, SEBI, and ESG Compliance in India

Dr. Pritha Chaturvedi
Associate Professor, ICFAI University Jharkhand
Email Id: prithachaturvedi@iujharkhand.edu.in
Prof. Sumit Kumar Sinha
Assistant Professor, ICFAI University Jharkhand
Email Id: sumitsinha@iujharkhand.edu.in

Abstract

This research examines the evolving regulatory landscape for Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) compliance in India, with a focus on the distinctive roles played by key regulatory bodies: the Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA), the Reserve Bank of India (RBI), and the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). Through quantitative analysis of compliance data from 500 listed Indian companies between 2018-2024, this study identifies significant trends in ESG adoption rates across different sectors and evaluates the effectiveness of regulatory frameworks. Findings reveal that while mandatory disclosure requirements have driven improved compliance rates (37% increase over the study period), considerable variation exists across sectors, with technology and pharmaceuticals demonstrating higher compliance levels than manufacturing and infrastructure. The research identifies critical challenges in the implementation of ESG frameworks, including standardization issues, monitoring limitations, and enforcement gaps. This paper contributes to understanding the developing regulatory ecosystem for sustainable business practices in India and offers recommendations for strengthening the collaborative approach between regulatory bodies to enhance ESG compliance and reporting standards. Ultimately, this research provides insights for policymakers, corporate entities, and stakeholders navigating India's evolving ESG landscape.

Keywords: ESG compliance, regulatory framework, SEBI, RBI, Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting, corporate governance, sustainable finance, India.

1. Introduction

Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) considerations have become increasingly central to corporate strategy and regulatory oversight globally. In India, the transition toward sustainable business practices has been accelerated by evolving regulatory frameworks established by key institutions: the Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA), the Reserve Bank of India (RBI), and the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). These regulatory bodies have progressively expanded their mandates beyond traditional regulatory functions to incorporate ESG principles, reflecting a growing recognition of sustainability's importance to India's economic development trajectory.

The integration of ESG compliance into India's corporate governance framework has been characterized by a notable shift from voluntary guidelines to mandatory reporting requirements. This transition is particularly significant given India's position as one of the world's fastest-growing major economies and its vulnerability to climate change impacts (Agarwal and Saini, 2023). As Indian corporations increasingly seek to attract global capital, ESG compliance has emerged as a critical factor influencing investment decisions and stakeholder trust.

Despite these developments, systematic research into the specific roles, overlaps, and effectiveness of India's regulatory institutions in promoting ESG compliance remains limited. This paper addresses this gap by examining how MCA, RBI, and SEBI have individually and collectively shaped India's ESG regulatory landscape, and by providing quantitative assessment of compliance trends across different industry sectors.

The research is particularly timely given recent regulatory developments, including SEBI's introduction of the Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting (BRSR) framework, the RBI's initiatives on climate risk management, and the MCA's evolving guidelines on corporate social responsibility (CSR). By analyzing these developments comprehensively, this study aims to provide stakeholders with insights into the complex interplay between regulation and sustainable business practices in the Indian context.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Evolution of ESG Regulatory Framework in India

The development of India's ESG regulatory framework has been documented across several studies. Rajput et al. (2021) trace the evolution from voluntary guidelines to increasingly mandatory requirements, highlighting significant milestones including the National Voluntary Guidelines on Social, Environmental and Economic Responsibilities of Business (NVGs) introduced by the MCA in 2011. These guidelines laid the groundwork for subsequent regulatory developments that have shaped India's approach to ESG compliance.

Kumar and Sharma (2022) examine the transformative role of the Companies Act, 2013, which introduced mandatory CSR spending requirements for qualifying companies. This legislation represented a significant shift in India's corporate governance approach, establishing one of the world's first mandatory CSR frameworks and positioning the MCA as a key architect of sustainability regulations. However, as Bhattacharyya (2023) notes, early regulatory approaches faced criticism for their narrow focus on philanthropic activities rather than comprehensive ESG integration.

2.2 SEBI's Evolving Role in ESG Regulation

SEBI's progression from a traditional financial market regulator to a proponent of sustainable investment practices has been well-documented. Goyal and Mishra (2021) analyze SEBI's introduction of Business Responsibility Reporting (BRR) requirements in 2012 and their subsequent evolution. Singh et al. (2023) examine SEBI's more recent transition from BRR to the more comprehensive Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting (BRSR) framework, identifying this as a watershed moment in India's ESG disclosure requirements.

Research by Kapoor and Dhamija (2023) highlights how SEBI's ESG mutual fund disclosure requirements have catalyzed growth in India's sustainable investment landscape, with assets under management in ESG-focused funds increasing from approximately ₹2,500 crores in 2019 to over ₹12,000 crores by 2023. However, Bansal (2022) identifies persistent challenges in comparability and verification of ESG disclosures, suggesting that SEBI's regulatory framework continues to evolve.

2.3 RBI's Approach to Climate Risk and Sustainable Finance

The RBI's engagement with ESG issues, particularly its focus on climate risk management within the financial sector, has received increasing scholarly attention. Chatterjee and Patel (2022) analyze the RBI's gradual incorporation of climate considerations into its supervisory framework, while Singh and Verma (2023) examine the central bank's sustainable finance initiatives and their impact on lending practices among Indian financial institutions.

Notably, Krishnan (2023) identifies a shift in the RBI's approach from viewing climate change primarily as a corporate social responsibility issue to recognizing it as a systemic financial risk requiring regulatory intervention. This transition aligns with global trends among central banks, though Mehta and Joshi (2023) note that the RBI has adopted a more measured approach compared to counterparts in Europe and North America.

2.4 Intersections and Coordination Among Regulatory Bodies

Limited research exists on the coordination mechanisms and potential overlaps between India's regulatory bodies concerning ESG compliance. Sharma et al. (2022) identify instances of both regulatory synergy and friction, particularly regarding reporting requirements that may impose duplicative compliance burdens on corporations. Patel and Gupta (2023) argue that incomplete coordination among regulators has created uncertainty for market participants navigating India's ESG landscape.

Research by Khanna (2023) suggests that while each regulatory body approaches ESG through its distinct mandate, the lack of a unified taxonomy for sustainable activities has contributed to implementation challenges. This finding aligns with international research by Davidson and Roberts (2022), who identify regulatory coordination as a critical factor in effective ESG frameworks globally.

2.5 Empirical Studies on ESG Compliance in India

Quantitative assessments of ESG compliance in India have yielded mixed findings regarding effectiveness and corporate adoption. Rao and Kumar (2022) analyze ESG disclosures among India's top 100 listed companies, finding significant improvements in reporting quality but persistent gaps in verifiability and comparability. Similarly, Mehta et al. (2023) document substantial variation in ESG performance across sectors, with technology and financial services companies generally outperforming manufacturing and infrastructure firms.

Research by Gupta and Singh (2022) examining the relationship between ESG performance and financial outcomes among Indian companies indicates positive but modest correlations, with stronger relationships emerging for governance factors than environmental considerations. These findings suggest that the business case for ESG compliance in India continues to evolve, with regulatory requirements often serving as the primary driver of adoption rather than perceived financial benefits.

2.6 Research Gaps and Contribution

The literature review reveals several gaps that this study aims to address. First, while individual regulatory bodies have received scholarly attention, a comprehensive analysis of their interconnected roles in shaping India's ESG landscape remains limited. Second, quantitative assessments of ESG compliance across different sectors and company sizes are relatively scarce, particularly regarding the impact of recent regulatory developments. Third, research on implementation challenges and effectiveness of enforcement mechanisms remains underdeveloped.

This study contributes to the literature by providing an integrated analysis of regulatory approaches to ESG in India, quantifying compliance trends across sectors, and evaluating factors that influence corporate ESG performance. Additionally, it assesses the effectiveness of current regulatory frameworks and identifies opportunities for enhanced coordination among key regulatory bodies.

3. Objectives

The primary objectives of this research are:

1. To examine the distinct and overlapping roles of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Reserve Bank of India, and Securities and Exchange Board of India in shaping India's ESG regulatory landscape.

2. To quantitatively analyze ESG compliance trends among Indian companies across different sectors and identify factors influencing compliance levels.

3. To evaluate the effectiveness of current regulatory frameworks in promoting meaningful ESG integration rather than superficial compliance.

4. To identify challenges in the implementation and enforcement of ESG regulations in India.

5. To develop recommendations for enhancing regulatory coordination and strengthening ESG compliance mechanisms in the Indian context.

4. Hypotheses

Based on the literature review and research objectives, this study tests the following hypotheses:

H1: There is a significant positive relationship between the introduction of mandatory ESG reporting requirements and the quality and comprehensiveness of ESG disclosures among Indian listed companies.

H2: ESG compliance levels vary significantly across industry sectors, with higher compliance in sectors with greater international exposure and consumer visibility.

H3: Companies subject to oversight from multiple regulatory bodies (MCA, SEBI, and RBI) demonstrate higher ESG compliance levels than those regulated primarily by a single authority.

H4: The alignment between Indian ESG regulatory requirements and international standards is positively associated with foreign institutional investment in Indian companies.

H5: The enforcement mechanisms employed by regulatory bodies significantly influence ESG compliance levels among regulated entities.

5. Methodology

5.1 Research Design

This study employs a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative analysis of ESG compliance data with qualitative assessment of regulatory frameworks. The research design incorporates three primary components: (1) longitudinal analysis of ESG disclosure trends, (2) comparative assessment of regulatory approaches, and (3) statistical analysis of factors influencing compliance levels.

5.2 Data Collection

5.2.1 Sample Selection

The quantitative analysis is based on a sample of 500 companies listed on the National Stock Exchange (NSE) of India. The sample includes the NIFTY 50 companies and additional firms selected using stratified random sampling to ensure representation across sectors and company sizes. The study period spans from fiscal year 2018-19 to 2023-24, capturing key regulatory developments including the transition from BRR to BRSR frameworks.

5.2.2 ESG Disclosure Data

ESG disclosure data was collected from multiple sources:

- Annual reports and sustainability reports published by sample companies
- Business Responsibility Reports and Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reports
- ESG ratings from established providers including CRISIL ESG scores, S&P Global ESG scores, and MSCI ESG ratings
- Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) submissions for environmental metrics

5.2.3 Regulatory Data

Information regarding regulatory frameworks was gathered from:

- Official notifications, circulars, and guidelines issued by MCA, SEBI, and RBI
- Policy documents and consultation papers
- Parliamentary committee reports on corporate governance and sustainability
- Expert interviews with 15 regulatory officials, compliance officers, and sustainability practitioners

5.3 Variables and Measurement

5.3.1 Dependent Variables

- **ESG Disclosure Score:** A composite measure (0-100) assessing the comprehensiveness of ESG disclosures based on predefined criteria aligned with international standards.
- **Environmental Compliance Index:** Measure of compliance with environmental disclosure requirements (0-100).

- **Social Responsibility Index:** Measure of compliance with social responsibility disclosure requirements (0-100).
- **Governance Quality Score:** Assessment of corporate governance practices and transparency (0-100).

5.3.2 Independent Variables

- **Regulatory Exposure:** Categorized as high, medium, or low based on the number of ESG-related regulatory bodies overseeing the company.
- **Sector Classification:** Companies categorized into 10 sectors based on NSE classification.
- **Company Size:** Based on market capitalization (large, mid, small).
- **International Presence:** Measured by percentage of international revenue.
- **Ownership Structure:** Categories including promoter-owned, institutional, government, and widely held.

5.3.3 Control Variables

- Financial performance indicators (ROA, ROE)
- Company age
- Board composition
- Presence of dedicated sustainability committee

5.4 Analytical Approach

The study employs several analytical techniques:

1. **Descriptive Statistics:** To identify trends in ESG disclosure and compliance across years, sectors, and company characteristics.
2. **Panel Data Regression:** To analyze the relationship between regulatory factors and ESG compliance while controlling for company-specific variables.
3. **Difference-in-Differences Analysis:** To assess the impact of specific regulatory interventions (e.g., introduction of BRSR) on ESG disclosure practices.
4. **Content Analysis:** Qualitative assessment of regulatory frameworks and their implementation.

5. **Structural Equation Modelling:** To examine the interrelationships between different aspects of ESG compliance and their determinants.

5.5 Reliability and Validity

To ensure reliability and validity of findings, the research incorporates several measures:

- Multiple data sources for triangulation
- Inter-rater reliability testing for content analysis
- Robustness checks using alternative model specifications
- Validity testing of constructed indices through expert review and statistical validation

6. Results and Analysis

6.1 Overview of India's ESG Regulatory Landscape

The analysis of India's ESG regulatory framework reveals a complex ecosystem characterized by distinct yet overlapping mandates among key regulatory bodies. Table 1 summarizes the primary ESG-related responsibilities of each entity.

Table 1: Primary ESG Regulatory Mandates in India

Regulatory Body	Primary ESG Focus Areas	Key Regulatory Instruments
Ministry of Corporate Affairs	Corporate governance, CSR compliance, Director responsibilities	Companies Act 2013, National Guidelines on Responsible Business Conduct
SEBI	ESG disclosure requirements, Sustainable investment regulations, Green bond standards	BRSR framework, ESG mutual fund disclosure requirements, Green debt securities framework
RBI	Climate risk management, Sustainable finance, Green lending guidelines	Priority sector lending guidelines, Climate risk disclosure framework, Sustainable finance taxonomy

The temporal analysis indicates an increasing convergence of regulatory approaches, with coordination mechanisms becoming more formalized over the study period. Notably, the establishment of inter-regulatory working groups on sustainable finance in 2022 marked a significant development in harmonizing approaches among the three bodies.

6.2 Trends in ESG Compliance among Indian Companies

Longitudinal analysis reveals a consistent upward trend in overall ESG compliance among sampled companies, with the mean ESG Disclosure Score increasing from 42.3 in FY2018-19 to 58.1 in FY2023-24, representing a 37.4% improvement (Figure 1).

The transition from voluntary to mandatory requirements appears to have driven significant improvements, particularly following the introduction of SEBI's BRSR framework. The difference-in-differences analysis indicates that companies subject to mandatory BRSR requirements demonstrated a 12.6 percentage point greater improvement in disclosure quality compared to those outside the regulatory threshold ($p < 0.01$).

Environmental and social disclosure components showed the most substantial improvements (41.2% and 39.7% respectively), while governance disclosure improvements were more modest (21.3%), likely reflecting the longer history of governance reporting requirements in India.

6.3 Sectoral Variation in ESG Compliance

Significant sectoral variation in ESG compliance was observed, supporting Hypothesis H2. Figure 2 illustrates the mean ESG Disclosure Scores by sector for FY2023-24.

The technology and pharmaceutical sectors demonstrated the highest compliance levels (mean scores of 72.4 and 68.9 respectively), while infrastructure and real estate reported the lowest (mean scores of 43.2 and 46.5 respectively). Statistical analysis confirms that these differences are significant (ANOVA, $F=18.72$, $p<0.001$).

Regression analysis controlling for company size and age indicates that sector-specific factors explain approximately 23% of the variation in ESG disclosure quality, suggesting that industry context significantly influences compliance approaches.

6.4 Impact of Regulatory Oversight on ESG Performance

Analysis supports Hypothesis H3, with companies subject to oversight from multiple regulatory bodies demonstrating significantly higher ESG compliance. Table 2 summarizes ESG performance based on regulatory exposure.

Table 2: ESG Disclosure Scores by Regulatory Exposure (FY2023-24)

Regulatory Exposure Level	Number of Companies	Mean ESG Disclosure Score	Standard Deviation
High (3 regulatory bodies)	87	73.6	9.2
Medium (2 regulatory bodies)	242	61.8	12.4
Low (1 regulatory body)	171	47.3	14.7

Multiple regression analysis indicates that regulatory exposure remains a significant predictor of ESG disclosure quality ($\beta=0.43$, $p<0.01$) even after controlling for company size, age, profitability, and international presence. This suggests that regulatory oversight is a key driver of ESG compliance in the Indian context.

6.5 Relationship Between Indian and International Standards

The analysis partially supports Hypothesis H4 regarding the relationship between alignment with international standards and foreign investment. Companies demonstrating greater alignment with international frameworks (e.g., GRI, SASB, TCFD) attracted higher foreign institutional investment, with a moderate positive correlation ($r=0.38$, $p<0.01$).

Structural equation modeling indicates that this relationship is mediated by improved ESG ratings from international providers, suggesting that alignment with global standards enhances the visibility and credibility of Indian companies among international investors.

However, the strength of this relationship varies across sectors, with technology and consumer goods companies showing stronger correlations than manufacturing and infrastructure firms. This suggests that the benefits of international alignment may be sector-dependent.

6.6 Effectiveness of Enforcement Mechanisms

Analysis of enforcement data from MCA, SEBI, and RBI reveals varying approaches and effectiveness, partially supporting Hypothesis H5. Table 3 summarizes enforcement actions related to ESG compliance during the study period.

Table 3: ESG-Related Enforcement Actions (FY2018-19 to FY2023-24)

Regulatory Body	**Number of Enforcement Actions**	**Average Penalty (₹ Lakhs)**	**Compliance Impact**
MCA	217	12.4	Moderate
SEBI	153	28.7	High
RBI	82	35.2	High

Regression analysis indicates that SEBI's enforcement actions had the strongest association with subsequent improvements in disclosure quality ($\beta=0.37$, $p<0.01$), followed by RBI ($\beta=0.29$, $p<0.01$) and MCA ($\beta=0.18$, $p<0.05$). This suggests variation in the effectiveness of enforcement approaches among regulatory bodies.

Qualitative analysis indicates that the visibility of enforcement actions and specificity of remediation requirements significantly influence their effectiveness in improving subsequent compliance.

6.7 Implementation Challenges

Content analysis of interviews and regulatory documents identifies several persistent challenges in India's ESG regulatory implementation:

1. **Standardization Issues:** Despite progress, inconsistencies in reporting requirements across regulatory bodies create compliance challenges, with 78% of interviewed compliance officers citing this as a significant concern.

2. **Verification Limitations:** Limited third-party verification requirements undermine the reliability of ESG disclosures, with only 34% of sampled companies obtaining external assurance for sustainability reports.

3. **Capacity Constraints:** Both regulators and regulated entities face resource limitations in implementing comprehensive ESG frameworks, particularly among smaller companies and those in resource-intensive sectors.

4. **Materiality Determination:** Absence of sector-specific materiality guidance leads to inconsistent approaches in determining which ESG factors warrant disclosure, limiting comparability across companies.

5. **Enforcement Gaps:** Uneven enforcement capacity across regulatory bodies results in varying compliance levels depending on primary regulator.

7. Discussion

7.1 Complementary Roles of Regulatory Bodies

The findings demonstrate both distinct and complementary roles played by India's key regulatory bodies in advancing ESG compliance. The MCA has established foundational governance requirements through the Companies Act, 2013, particularly regarding board responsibilities, CSR obligations, and fiduciary duties. This legislative framework provides the legal basis upon which other regulatory initiatives build.

SEBI has emerged as the primary driver of standardized ESG disclosure practices, leveraging its authority over listed entities to establish increasingly comprehensive reporting requirements. The evolution from BRR to BRSR frameworks represents a significant advancement in aligning Indian corporate disclosure with global standards while addressing India-specific priorities.

The RBI's approach emphasizes systemic risk management and sustainable finance, reflecting its mandate to ensure financial stability. By incorporating climate and broader ESG considerations into risk assessment frameworks, the RBI is gradually influencing capital allocation toward sustainable activities while remaining within its traditional regulatory purview.

This division of responsibilities enables a multi-faceted approach to ESG regulation, with each body addressing different aspects of the sustainability agenda. However, the findings also highlight coordination challenges that can create compliance burdens for regulated entities navigating overlapping requirements.

7.2 Drivers of Sectoral Variation

The significant sectoral differences in ESG compliance identified in this study warrant further examination. The superior performance of technology and pharmaceutical sectors likely reflects several factors: greater international exposure, higher proportion of knowledge workers with sustainability concerns, and business models with relatively lower direct environmental impacts.

Conversely, sectors with lower compliance levels (infrastructure, real estate, and manufacturing) face different challenges: capital-intensive operations with significant environmental footprints, complex supply chains with social risks, and in some cases, lower consumer visibility reducing reputational incentives for sustainability initiatives.

These findings suggest that regulatory approaches may need sectoral calibration to effectively drive meaningful improvement across India's diverse business landscape. The one-size-fits-all approach currently employed may inadvertently disadvantage certain sectors or fail to address their most material ESG issues.

7.3 Balancing Standardization and Flexibility

The tension between standardization and flexibility emerges as a recurring theme in India's ESG regulatory landscape. While standardized disclosure requirements enhance comparability and prevent selective reporting, they may also incentivize box-ticking compliance rather than meaningful integration of sustainability into business strategy.

The study findings suggest that the most effective approach combines standardized core metrics with sector-specific materiality guidance. SEBI's BRSR framework represents progress in this direction, though interviewees indicated that further refinement of sector-specific indicators would enhance relevance and reduce reporting burden.

Additionally, the progressive introduction of requirements based on company size appears to be effective in managing compliance capacity issues, with larger companies demonstrating leadership while smaller entities gain time to develop necessary systems and expertise.

7.4 International Alignment and Domestic Priorities

The relationship between alignment with international standards and enhanced foreign investment identified in this study highlights the potential benefits of regulatory harmonization.

However, this relationship must be balanced against the need to address India-specific sustainability priorities that may not be fully captured in globally developed frameworks.

The data suggests that Indian regulators have increasingly sought to incorporate internationally recognized elements (e.g., TCFD recommendations, SDG alignment) while maintaining focus on domestic priorities such as inclusive growth, water management, and biodiversity conservation. This hybridized approach appears to be gaining traction among both domestic and international stakeholders.

As global ESG standards continue to evolve (particularly the International Sustainability Standards Board frameworks), Indian regulators face important decisions regarding the degree of alignment to pursue and how to preserve space for addressing country-specific challenges.

7.5 From Compliance to Performance

A critical distinction emerges between compliance with disclosure requirements and actual sustainability performance. The analysis reveals that while disclosure quality has improved substantially, performance improvements are more modest and uneven across ESG dimensions.

Environmental performance metrics show the widest gap between disclosure and actual improvement, with many companies reporting targets and initiatives without demonstrating significant emissions reductions or resource efficiency gains. This suggests that current regulatory frameworks may be more effective at driving transparency than transformative change in business practices.

Governance improvements appear more substantive, likely due to the longer history of governance regulation and clearer connection to financial performance. Social performance presents mixed results, with formal policies widespread but implementation quality varying considerably.

8. Conclusion

This research provides a comprehensive analysis of the evolving roles of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Reserve Bank of India, and Securities and Exchange Board of India in shaping India's ESG compliance landscape. Through quantitative analysis of compliance trends and evaluation of regulatory frameworks, several key conclusions emerge.

First, India's approach to ESG regulation has matured significantly, transitioning from primarily voluntary guidelines to increasingly mandatory requirements with substantial improvements in disclosure quality across sectors. The distinct yet complementary roles played by key regulatory bodies have created a multi-dimensional framework addressing various aspects of corporate sustainability.

Second, regulatory interventions have been most effective when characterized by clear standards, phased implementation, and robust enforcement mechanisms. SEBI's BRSR framework exemplifies this approach, driving meaningful improvements in disclosure practices among listed entities. However, the translation of enhanced disclosure into improved sustainability performance remains uneven, suggesting limitations in current regulatory approaches.

Third, significant variation in compliance levels across sectors highlights the need for more calibrated regulatory approaches that account for industry-specific challenges while maintaining core standardized requirements. The superior performance of internationally exposed sectors suggests that global market forces complement domestic regulatory pressures in driving ESG adoption.

Fourth, while coordination among regulatory bodies has improved, further harmonization of requirements and enforcement approaches would enhance efficiency and effectiveness. The establishment of formal inter-regulatory working groups represents progress, but inconsistencies in terminology, materiality definitions, and compliance thresholds persist.

Fifth, verification and assurance mechanisms remain underdeveloped, limiting the reliability and comparability of ESG disclosures. Enhancing third-party verification requirements would strengthen the credibility of reported information and support more informed decision-making by investors and other stakeholders.

8.1 Implications

For policymakers, this research underscores the importance of regulatory coordination in creating a coherent ESG ecosystem. Establishing a unified taxonomy for sustainable activities and harmonizing reporting requirements would reduce compliance burdens while enhancing the utility of disclosed information.

For corporate entities, the findings highlight the value of moving beyond compliance-oriented approaches to strategic integration of ESG considerations. Companies demonstrating leadership in this transition not only manage regulatory expectations more effectively but also secure advantages in capital access and stakeholder trust.

For investors, the research provides insights into the reliability and comparability of ESG disclosures in the Indian market. Understanding the regulatory drivers and limitations of current reporting practices can inform more sophisticated approaches to ESG integration in investment analysis.

8.2 Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the reliance on disclosed information may not fully capture actual sustainability performance. Second, the six-year time frame, while substantial, may not be sufficient to evaluate longer-term trends in regulatory effectiveness. Third, the focus on listed companies limits insights regarding ESG practices among privately held entities.

Future research could address these limitations by incorporating direct measurement of sustainability performance beyond disclosed data, extending the temporal scope of analysis, and examining ESG practices among unlisted companies. Additionally, comparative studies between India and other emerging economies would provide valuable insights into the relative effectiveness of different regulatory approaches.

As India continues to navigate the complex intersection of economic development and sustainability imperatives, the regulatory framework for ESG will undoubtedly continue to evolve. Understanding the dynamics of this evolution and its impact on corporate behavior remains a rich area for ongoing research with significant implications for policy and practice.

References

- Agarwal, R., & Saini, N. (2023). Climate vulnerability and corporate disclosure: Evidence from India. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 18(2), 143-162.
- Bansal, S. (2022). Challenges in ESG reporting: An analysis of India's BRSR framework. *Corporate Governance Review*, 14(3), 278-296.
- Bhattacharyya, A. (2023). From philanthropy to responsibility: Evolution of CSR in India. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 184(1), 117-135.
- Chatterjee, B., & Patel, V. (2022). Central banking and climate risk: The RBI's emerging approach. *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*, 76(4), 67-82.
- Davidson, K., & Roberts, J. (2022). Regulatory coordination and sustainable finance: Comparative analysis across jurisdictions. *Journal of Financial Regulation*, 8(1), 32-54.
- Goyal, P., & Mishra, S. (2021). Business responsibility reporting to business responsibility and sustainability reporting: A critical analysis of SEBI's new framework. *Securities Law Journal*, 15(2), 112-131.
- Gupta, A., & Singh, R. (2022). ESG performance and financial outcomes: Evidence from Indian listed companies. *International Journal of Corporate Sustainability*, 13(4), 327-345.
- Kapoor, N., &Dhamija, S. (2023). Growth of ESG investing in India: Drivers and challenges. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, 20(1), 89-104.
- Khanna, M. (2023). Regulatory coordination in sustainable finance: India's experience. *Journal of Banking Regulation*, 24(3), 217-236.
- Krishnan, V. (2023). Climate risk and financial stability: The RBI's evolving approach. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 58(17), 42-49.
- Kumar, S., & Sharma, P. (2022). Mandatory CSR in India: Impact assessment after a decade. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 29(2), 476-491.
- Mehta, R., & Joshi, K. (2023). Comparing central bank approaches to climate risk: A case study of RBI and ECB. *Journal of Central Banking*, 14(2), 156-173.
- Mehta, S., Patel, R., & Singh, K. (2023). Sectoral analysis of ESG performance in India: Patterns and determinants. *Journal of Business Research*, 156, 113428.
- Patel, J., & Gupta, V. (2023). Regulatory overlaps in India's ESG landscape: Implications for compliance. *Journal of Financial Compliance*, 6(4), 312-328.
- Rajput, N., Arora, S., & Khanna, A. (2021). From voluntary to mandatory: The

evolution of sustainability reporting in India. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 319, 128654.

- Rao, K., & Kumar, S. (2022). Quality of ESG disclosures among Indian listed companies: An empirical assessment. *Asian Journal of Accounting Research*, 7(2), 184-201.
- Sharma, A., Gupta, R., & Mehta, S. (2022). Regulatory synergies and frictions in India's ESG landscape. *Journal of Regulatory Studies*, 10(3), 245-263.
- Singh, A., &Verma, P. (2023). Green finance initiatives of the Reserve Bank of India: Impact on lending practices. *International Journal of Green Banking*, 5(1), 78-96.
- Singh, R., Joshi, D., & Patel, K. (2023). Business responsibility and sustainability reporting: Initial evidence from India. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 14(1), 42-61.