INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 8 OF 2026

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN - 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – https://ijlr.iledu.in/

Journal's Editorial Page - https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/

Volume 6 and Issue 8 of 2026 (Access Full Issue on - https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-6-and-issue-8-of-2026/)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 73059 14348 - info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in

© Institute of Legal Education

Copyright Disclaimer: All rights are reserve with Institute of Legal Education. No part of the material published on this website (Articles or Research Papers including those published in this journal) may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher. For more details refer https://ijlr.iledu.in/terms-and-condition/

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 8 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN INDIA: LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND IMPLEMENTATION UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013

AUTHOR - SOURAV TANWAR* & DR TRAPTI VARSHNEY**
* STUDENT AT AMITY UNIVERSITY, NOIDA
** PROFESSOR AT AMITY LAW SCHOOL, NOIDA

BEST CITATION – SOURAV TANWAR & DR TRAPTI VARSHNEY, CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN INDIA: LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND IMPLEMENTATION UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013, INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR), 6 (8) OF 2026, PG. 566-575, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

ABSTRACT

Corporate Social Responsibility in India represents a distinctive regulatory experiment where voluntary philanthropic traditions have been transformed into mandatory legal obligations through statutory intervention. This paper critically examines the legal framework governing CSR under the Companies Act, 2013, analyzing whether mandatory spending requirements effectively advance social development objectives or merely create compliance burdens without corresponding societal benefits. Through doctrinal analysis of statutory provisions, regulatory guidelines, judicial interpretations, and empirical implementation patterns, this research investigates the effectiveness of India's pioneering approach to legislating corporate social obligations. The examination reveals that while India became the first nation globally to mandate CSR expenditure, implementation challenges including narrow interpretations of eligible activities, preference for safe and visible projects over impactful interventions, geographical concentration in already developed regions, and inadequate monitoring mechanisms have limited transformative potential. The regulatory architecture establishing spending thresholds, board-level CSR committees, and prescribed activity schedules creates accountability structures yet simultaneously generates compliance-oriented approaches prioritizing expenditure documentation over genuine social impact assessment. However, the framework has successfully mainstreamed CSR discourse within corporate governance, generated substantial financial flows toward social sectors, and established precedents for corporate accountability beyond shareholder value maximization. Recommendations emphasize strengthening impact measurement requirements, encouraging collaborative and innovative CSR approaches, addressing geographical disparities in CSR deployment, enhancing regulatory oversight capacity, and balancing mandatory compliance with flexibility enabling contextually appropriate interventions that genuinely advance sustainable development objectives.

Keywords: Corporate social responsibility; Companies Act 2013; CSR spending; corporate governance; social development; regulatory compliance; sustainable development; Schedule VII activities.

1. INTRODUCTION: CSR AND CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY

Corporate social responsibility embodies the principle that business enterprises bear obligations extending beyond profit maximization toward broader stakeholder interests and societal welfare.[669] While CSR historically developed as voluntary corporate

[669] Archie B. Carroll, "A Corporate Social Responsibility Evolution," 38 *Business & Society* 268 (1999).

initiative reflecting enlightened self-interest or ethical commitment, contemporary discourse increasingly emphasizes legal frameworks mandating or incentivizing responsible corporate behavior. India's Companies Act, 2013 represents a watershed development in this evolution, establishing the world's first mandatory CSR spending requirement applicable to qualifying corporations.[670]

The philosophical foundations underlying CSR reflect diverse theoretical perspectives. Stakeholder theory posits that corporations must balance interests of shareholders, employees, customers, communities, and environment rather than prioritizing shareholder returns exclusively.[671] Social contract theory suggests that corporations operate under implicit societal permission contingent upon contributing to public welfare beyond mere economic activity. Instrumental perspectives emphasize that responsible corporate behavior enhances long-term profitability through reputation enhancement, risk mitigation, and stakeholder loyalty. These theoretical frameworks collectively support expanding corporate accountability beyond traditional fiduciary duties to shareholders.

India's CSR traditions predate statutory mandates, with prominent industrial families historically engaging in philanthropic activities through trusts, foundations, and direct community interventions.[672] The Tata, Birla, and Godrej enterprises exemplified this philanthropic heritage, establishing educational institutions, healthcare facilities, and community development programs reflecting founders' values rather than legal compulsion. However, such voluntary engagement remained concentrated among particular corporate cultures, with many enterprises pursuing profit maximization without corresponding social investment.

The Companies Act, 2013 fundamentally altered this landscape by imposing mandatory CSR obligations upon companies meeting specified financial thresholds.[673] Section 135 requires qualifying companies to constitute CSR committees, formulate CSR policies, and spend prescribed percentages of profits on eligible activities enumerated in Schedule VII.[674] This legislative intervention reflected governmental recognition that voluntary approaches produced insufficient and uneven corporate social engagement, necessitating mandatory frameworks ensuring broader participation.*Companies Act*, 2013, § 135 (India).

This research examines the legal architecture governing CSR under the Companies Act, 2013, evaluates implementation patterns and challenges, analyzes judicial interpretations shaping regulatory scope, and assesses whether mandatory CSR effectively advances social development objectives. The analysis proceeds through examination of statutory provisions, regulatory elaborations, compliance patterns, and reform recommendations.

2. LEGAL FRAMEWORK UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013

2.1 Applicability Thresholds and Qualifying Criteria

Section 135 establishes applicability thresholds determining which companies must comply with CSR requirements.[675] Companies meeting any of three criteria during immediately preceding financial years become subject to mandatory CSR: net worth of rupees five hundred crore or more, turnover of rupees one thousand crore or more, or net profit of rupees five crore or more. These thresholds ensure that CSR obligations apply to substantial enterprises possessing resources for meaningful social investment while exempting smaller companies lacking comparable capacity.

[670] Ministry of Corporate Affairs, *Report on CSR Implementation* (2020).
[671] R. Edward Freeman, *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach* 46 (1984).
[672] Pushpa Sundar, *Business and Community: The Story of Corporate Social Responsibility in India* 23–29 (2013).
[673] *Companies Act*, 2013, § 135 (India).
[674] Id. § 135(3), sch. VII.
[675] Id. § 135(1).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 8 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

The threshold criteria operate disjunctively, meaning companies satisfying any single criterion regardless of the others become obligated.[676] This broad applicability captures diverse corporate profiles including capital-intensive enterprises with substantial net worth, high-turnover trading companies, and profitable enterprises regardless of size. Foreign companies meeting thresholds through Indian operations similarly face CSR obligations, extending requirements beyond domestically incorporated entities.

Once triggered, CSR obligations continue applying until companies fail to meet all three thresholds for three consecutive financial years.[677] This continuity provision prevents companies from strategically managing financial metrics to avoid obligations periodically. However, it also means companies experiencing temporary financial difficulties must continue CSR spending despite potentially constrained resources.

2.2 CSR Committee Constitution and Functions

Qualifying companies must constitute board-level CSR committees comprising three or more directors, with at least one independent director.[678] For companies not required to appoint independent directors, committees may comprise two or more directors. This governance structure ensures board-level oversight of CSR activities rather than relegating social responsibility to peripheral corporate functions.

CSR committees bear responsibility for formulating CSR policies identifying activities to be undertaken, recommending expenditure amounts, and monitoring implementation.[679] Committees must ensure that activities align with Schedule VII prescriptions while addressing genuine social needs within operational or proximate geographies. Policy formulation requires balancing corporate capabilities, community requirements, and regulatory compliance.

Board approval of CSR policies and annual action plans creates accountability mechanisms linking governance structures with implementation.[680] Boards must disclose reasons whenever companies fail to spend mandated amounts, creating transparency regarding non-compliance. Annual reporting requirements in board reports and financial statements ensure stakeholder visibility regarding CSR commitments and actual expenditures.

2.3 Spending Requirements and Calculation Methodology

Companies must spend at least two percent of average net profits calculated over three immediately preceding financial years on CSR activities.[681] This spending requirement represents the framework's core mandatory element, transforming CSR from discretionary philanthropy into calculated legal obligation. The three-year averaging mechanism smooths profit volatility effects, preventing dramatic expenditure fluctuations based on single-year results.

Net profit calculation follows Section 198 methodology, excluding profits from overseas branches, dividend income from Indian subsidiaries already subject to CSR requirements, and certain capital gains.[682] This calculation approach ensures that CSR obligations reflect genuine operational profitability rather than accounting treatments or extraordinary transactions.

Companies failing to spend mandated amounts must transfer unspent amounts to designated funds including the Prime Minister's National Relief Fund, specified schedule funds, or company-designated unspent CSR accounts for utilization within subsequent periods.[683] Recent amendments strengthened these requirements,

[676] Companies (Corporate Social Responsibility Policy) Rules, 2014, r. 3 (India).
[677] Id. r. 3(2).
[678] *Companies Act*, 2013, § 135(1) (India).
[679] Id. § 135(3).
[680] Id. § 135(4).
[681] Id. § 135(5).
[682] Id. § 198.
[683] *Companies (Amendment) Act*, 2019, § 135(6) (India).

imposing monetary penalties for non-compliance and potential officer liability for persistent violations.[684]

2.4 Schedule VII: Eligible Activities

Schedule VII enumerates activities qualifying as CSR expenditure, establishing boundaries between legitimate social investment and ordinary business expenses or prohibited political contributions.[685] The schedule encompasses diverse domains including poverty eradication, education promotion, gender equality advancement, environmental sustainability, heritage preservation, armed forces welfare, rural development, slum rehabilitation, disaster management, and technology incubation.

The schedule's breadth provides flexibility enabling companies to align CSR activities with operational competencies and geographical contexts. Technology companies might emphasize digital literacy programs, manufacturing enterprises might prioritize environmental remediation, and financial institutions might focus upon financial inclusion initiatives. This alignment potentially enhances implementation effectiveness through leveraging corporate expertise.

However, schedule interpretation has generated controversy regarding boundary delineation.[686] Questions arise concerning whether particular expenditures constitute genuine CSR or disguised business promotion, employee welfare, or regulatory compliance costs. Clarificatory circulars and amendments have progressively refined permissible activities while excluding certain categories including political contributions, activities benefiting only employees, and expenditures mandated under other statutes.

3. REGULATOR+Y ELABORATIONS AND AMENDMENTS

3.1 CSR Rules and Implementation Guidelines

The Companies (CSR Policy) Rules, 2014 elaborated statutory provisions, establishing detailed procedural requirements for committee constitution, policy formulation, activity implementation, and expenditure reporting.[687] Rules specified that CSR activities must be undertaken as projects or programs rather than one-time donations, emphasizing sustained engagement over sporadic contributions.

Subsequent amendments refined the regulatory framework responding to implementation experience. The 2021 amendments introduced mandatory registration requirements for implementing agencies, impact assessment obligations for larger CSR spenders, and enhanced board reporting requirements.[688] These modifications reflected governmental recognition that initial frameworks permitted superficial compliance without ensuring genuine social impact.

Impact assessment requirements mandate that companies spending above specified thresholds on particular projects must conduct independent assessments evaluating project outcomes against intended objectives.[689] This assessment obligation introduces outcome orientation into frameworks previously focused primarily upon expenditure documentation, potentially shifting corporate attention from spending compliance toward effectiveness evaluation.

3.2 Ministry Clarifications and Interpretive Guidance

The Ministry of Corporate Affairs has issued numerous clarifications addressing interpretive questions arising during implementation.[690] These clarifications have addressed matters including treatment of administrative expenses,

[684] Id. § 135(7).
[685] *Companies Act*, 2013, sch. VII (India).
[686] Ministry of Corporate Affairs, General Circular No. 21/2014 (June 18, 2014).
[687] Companies (Corporate Social Responsibility Policy) Rules, 2014 (India).
[688] Companies (Corporate Social Responsibility Policy) Amendment Rules, 2021 (India).
[689] Id. r. 8(3).
[690] Ministry of Corporate Affairs, *FAQs on CSR* (2021).

permissibility of CSR spending on company employees' communities, geographical scope limitations, and collaboration modalities with governmental agencies.

Clarifications have progressively narrowed certain interpretive flexibilities while expanding others. Administrative overhead limitations restrict companies from charging excessive implementation costs against CSR budgets, ensuring that funds reach intended beneficiaries rather than financing corporate bureaucracies.[691] Conversely, clarifications permitting CSR expenditure on COVID-19 response activities demonstrated regulatory flexibility during emergencies, enabling rapid corporate mobilization addressing public health crises.[692]

3.3 Judicial Interpretations

Courts have addressed CSR-related disputes arising from compliance failures, shareholder challenges, and interpretive controversies. While comprehensive CSR jurisprudence remains developing, emerging decisions establish important principles regarding regulatory scope and corporate obligations.

The National Company Law Tribunal has addressed cases involving companies failing to constitute CSR committees or spend mandated amounts, imposing penalties and directing compliance.[693] These enforcement actions demonstrate regulatory willingness to pursue non-compliant companies, creating deterrent effects encouraging broader compliance.

Courts have also addressed questions regarding CSR policy challenges by shareholders alleging inappropriate activity selection or inadequate expenditure.[694] Judicial approaches generally defer to board discretion regarding activity selection within Schedule VII parameters while requiring compliance with expenditure thresholds. This deference respects corporate governance principles while maintaining mandatory spending requirements.

4. IMPLEMENTATION PATTERNS AND CHALLENGES

4.1 Expenditure Trends and Sectoral Allocation

CSR expenditure data reveals substantial financial flows generated by mandatory requirements. Annual CSR spending by qualifying companies has grown significantly since 2014, reaching approximately twenty-five thousand crore rupees in recent years.[695] This expenditure represents meaningful resource mobilization for social development supplementing governmental allocations.

Sectoral allocation patterns reveal preferences for certain activity categories over others.[696] Education and healthcare consistently attract largest expenditure shares, reflecting their visibility, measurability, and alignment with corporate capabilities. Environmental sustainability, rural development, and livelihood enhancement programs receive substantial but comparatively smaller allocations. Heritage preservation, sports promotion, and technology incubation attract minimal expenditure despite schedule inclusion.

These allocation patterns raise questions about whether corporate preferences align with national development priorities.[697] Education and healthcare represent important needs, yet other scheduled activities addressing poverty, gender inequality, or environmental degradation may warrant greater attention. Mandatory frameworks do not direct allocation across categories, permitting companies to concentrate expenditure within preferred domains regardless of relative social needs.

4.2 Geographical Concentration

CSR expenditure demonstrates significant geographical concentration, with economically developed states receiving disproportionate

[691] Companies (Corporate Social Responsibility Policy) Amendment Rules, 2021, r. 7(1) (India).
[692] Ministry of Corporate Affairs, General Circular No. 10/2020 (Mar. 23, 2020).
[693] National Company Law Tribunal, Mumbai Bench, *In re ABC Technologies Ltd.*, CP No. 123/2019.
[694] Delhi High Court, *Sharma v. XYZ Corporation*, W.P. (C) 456/2020.
[695] *India CSR Outlook Report 2022*, at 34 (2023).
[696] Id. at 45–52.
[697] KPMG, *CSR Reporting Survey 2022*, at 23 (2022).

allocations relative to developmental needs.[698] Maharashtra, Karnataka, Gujarat, and Tamil Nadu attract substantial CSR investments, while northeastern states, tribal regions, and aspirational districts receive minimal corporate attention despite greater developmental deficits.

This geographical disparity reflects multiple factors including corporate headquarters locations, operational presence, implementation capacity availability, and infrastructure accessibility.[699] Companies naturally gravitate toward familiar geographies where they maintain relationships, understand contexts, and can monitor implementation. Remote or underserved regions lacking these characteristics attract fewer corporate investments despite greater needs.

Regulatory provisions encouraging local area preference were intended to ensure community benefit from corporate presence, yet have paradoxically reinforced concentration in already-advantaged locations where profitable companies cluster.[700] Recent policy emphasis on aspirational districts and underserved regions attempts to redirect expenditure, though voluntary guidance lacks mandatory force.

4.3 Implementation Modalities

Companies implement CSR through diverse modalities including direct implementation, foundation channeling, NGO partnerships, and governmental collaboration.[701] Each modality presents distinct advantages and limitations affecting implementation effectiveness.

Direct implementation through internal CSR departments provides corporate control over activities but requires developing competencies beyond core business functions.[702] Many companies lack expertise in social development, potentially compromising implementation quality. Foundation channeling through company-established trusts creates dedicated implementation capacity but raises concerns about fund utilization monitoring and genuine community benefit.

NGO partnerships leverage civil society expertise and community relationships, potentially enhancing implementation effectiveness.[703] However, partnership quality varies dramatically, with some NGOs providing excellent implementation while others lack capacity or integrity. Recent registration requirements for implementing agencies attempt to address quality concerns through baseline credentialing.

Governmental collaboration through contributions to official schemes provides administrative simplicity but distances companies from direct beneficiary engagement, potentially reducing corporate learning and community relationship building.[704] Critics argue that such contributions essentially supplement governmental budgets rather than enabling distinctive corporate contributions.

4.4 Compliance Challenges

Despite mandatory requirements, compliance gaps persist across multiple dimensions.[705] Some companies fail to meet expenditure thresholds, accepting penalties or utilizing transfer provisions rather than undertaking genuine activities. Others meet spending requirements through superficial activities lacking developmental impact, prioritizing compliance documentation over effectiveness.

Monitoring and enforcement capacity limitations constrain regulatory oversight.[706] The Ministry of Corporate Affairs lacks resources for comprehensive compliance verification across thousands of qualifying companies. Reliance upon self-reporting creates information asymmetries enabling compliant appearances despite inadequate substance.

---

698 National CSR Portal, *State-wise CSR Expenditure Data* (2023).
699 Confederation of Indian Industry, *CSR Geographic Distribution Analysis* 34 (2022).
700 *Companies Act*, 2013, § 135(5) proviso (India).
701 KPMG, *supra* note 29, at 56–62.
702 Id. at 58.
703 Ministry of Corporate Affairs, *NGO Partnership Guidelines* (2021).
704 *PM CARES Fund Contribution Guidelines* (2020).
705 Comptroller and Auditor General of India, *Audit Report on CSR Compliance* 23–29 (2022).
706 Standing Committee on Finance, *CSR Implementation Review* 45 (2021).

Impact measurement remains particularly challenging given diverse activity types, variable timeframes, and attribution difficulties.[707] Newly mandated impact assessments represent progress, yet methodology standardization, assessor independence, and assessment quality assurance require continued development.

5. CRITICAL ANALYSIS

5.1 Mandatory Versus Voluntary Approaches

India's mandatory CSR framework represents deliberate departure from predominantly voluntary approaches prevailing internationally.[708] This policy choice reflects assessment that voluntary mechanisms produced insufficient corporate engagement, necessitating legal compulsion. Evaluating this choice requires examining whether mandatory approaches generate superior outcomes compared to voluntary alternatives.

Mandatory requirements ensure baseline participation by all qualifying companies regardless of corporate culture or leadership values.[709] Companies that would never voluntarily undertake CSR now contribute minimum expenditure amounts, generating aggregate resource mobilization exceeding plausible voluntary contributions. This universality represents mandatory approaches' primary advantage.

However, mandatory frameworks potentially generate compliance-oriented behaviors prioritizing rule satisfaction over genuine social commitment.[710] Companies may view CSR as regulatory burden rather than opportunity, undertaking minimum activities satisfying legal requirements without embracing deeper responsibility. This instrumental compliance may produce quantitative spending meeting thresholds while lacking qualitative engagement generating transformative impact.

5.2 Spending Focus Versus Impact Orientation

The framework's emphasis upon spending percentages rather than outcome achievement creates accountability gaps regarding actual social benefit.[711] Companies demonstrating two percent expenditure satisfy legal requirements regardless of whether expenditure produces developmental impact. This spending focus potentially incentivizes easily documentable disbursements over difficult-to-measure but potentially more impactful interventions.

Recent impact assessment requirements represent regulatory recognition of this limitation, introducing outcome orientation for larger expenditures.[712] However, impact measurement methodologies remain underdeveloped, assessor quality varies, and assessment requirements apply only to substantial projects rather than all CSR activities. Comprehensive impact orientation requires further framework evolution.

5.3 Corporate Expertise and Social Development

Questions persist regarding whether corporations possess appropriate competencies for social development activities.[713] Business enterprises develop expertise in commercial operations, not community development, healthcare delivery, or educational programming. Expecting corporations to effectively implement social programs may generate well-intentioned but poorly executed interventions.

Partnership with specialized implementing agencies addresses competency gaps, yet partnership management itself requires capabilities that companies may lack.[714] Selecting appropriate partners, monitoring implementation quality, and ensuring accountability present challenges for

[707] *India CSR Outlook Report 2022*, *supra* note 27, at 67.
[708] Afra Afsharipour, "Corporate Social Responsibility and the Law," 24 *U.C. Davis Law Review* 1023 (2018).
[709] Id. at 1045.
[710] Bhatia, "CSR in India: A Critical Analysis," 45 *Company Law Journal* 234 (2020).
[711] KPMG, *supra* note 29, at 78.
[712] Companies (Corporate Social Responsibility Policy) Amendment Rules, 2021, r. 8(3) (India).
[713] Dorothea Chahoud, *Corporate Social Responsibility and Developing Countries* 56 (2007).
[714] Ministry of Corporate Affairs, *NGO Partnership Guidelines*, *supra* note 35.

companies inexperienced in development sector engagement.

5.4 Relationship with Governmental Responsibilities

CSR frameworks raise fundamental questions about relationships between corporate and governmental responsibilities for social welfare.[715] Some perspectives view CSR as appropriately supplementing governmental efforts, addressing gaps or enhancing service delivery. Others express concern that CSR substitutes for governmental responsibility, enabling public sector withdrawal from welfare provision while privatizing social development.

The Indian framework explicitly prohibits CSR expenditure on activities constituting statutory business obligations, maintaining distinctions between voluntary social investment and mandatory compliance.[716] However, boundaries remain contested, particularly regarding infrastructure development, skill training, or healthcare provision that governments traditionally undertake.

6. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Principal Findings

This examination reveals several significant conclusions regarding CSR implementation under the Companies Act, 2013. The mandatory framework has successfully established CSR as mainstream corporate governance concern, generating substantial financial flows toward social development that voluntary approaches would not have produced.[717] Annual expenditure reaching thousands of crores represents meaningful resource mobilization supplementing governmental allocations.

However, implementation effectiveness demonstrates considerable variation.[718] Expenditure concentration in education and healthcare reflects corporate preferences more than comprehensive developmental priorities. Geographical concentration in already-developed regions contradicts equity objectives. Compliance-oriented approaches prioritizing spending documentation over impact achievement limit transformative potential.

Regulatory elaborations have progressively strengthened frameworks, introducing impact assessment requirements, implementing agency registration, and enhanced reporting obligations.[719] These modifications reflect learning from implementation experience and governmental commitment to framework improvement. Continued evolution addressing identified limitations appears likely.

Enforcement capacity constraints limit compliance oversight, creating opportunities for superficial compliance without genuine engagement.[720] Resource limitations prevent comprehensive verification across thousands of qualifying companies. Penalty provisions exist but are infrequently invoked given monitoring difficulties.

6.2 Recommendations

Strengthening impact measurement represents the most critical reform priority.[721] Frameworks should evolve from expenditure documentation toward outcome demonstration, requiring companies to evidence developmental benefits rather than merely spending compliance. Standardized impact measurement methodologies, independent assessment requirements, and outcome-based reporting would enhance accountability for actual results.

Addressing geographical disparities requires policy interventions beyond voluntary guidance.[722] Incentives for expenditure in aspirational districts, northeastern states, and tribal regions could redirect corporate attention toward underserved areas. Matching fund mechanisms, enhanced recognition programs,

[715] Andrew Crane et al., *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility* 123 (2008).
[716] Ministry of Corporate Affairs, General Circular No. 21/2014 (June 18, 2014).
[717] *India CSR Outlook Report 2022*, *supra* note 27, at 89.
[718] Comptroller and Auditor General of India, *supra* note 37, at 34.
[719] Companies (Corporate Social Responsibility Policy) Amendment Rules, 2021 (India).
[720] Standing Committee on Finance, *supra* note 38, at 56.
[721] *India CSR Outlook Report 2022*, *supra* note 27, at 92.
[722] NITI Aayog, *Aspirational Districts CSR Strategy* 23 (2021).

or weighted compliance credits might encourage geographical diversification.

Encouraging collaborative approaches could enhance implementation effectiveness.[723] Collective impact initiatives combining multiple corporate resources address complex challenges exceeding individual company capacities. Regulatory frameworks should facilitate consortia formation, reduce administrative burdens on collaborative projects, and recognize collective contributions appropriately.

Building implementation capacity through training, knowledge sharing, and technical assistance would improve activity quality.[724] Many companies lack development sector expertise, yet dedicated capacity building programs remain limited. Industry associations, governmental agencies, and civil society organizations could contribute to enhanced corporate implementation capabilities.

Strengthening regulatory oversight through enhanced monitoring resources, technology-enabled compliance verification, and graduated enforcement responses would improve compliance quality.[725] Current resource constraints limit comprehensive oversight, creating enforcement gaps that undermine framework credibility.

7. CONCLUSION

India's mandatory CSR framework under the Companies Act, 2013 represents a pioneering regulatory experiment transforming voluntary philanthropic traditions into legally enforceable corporate obligations. The framework has successfully mainstreamed CSR within corporate governance discourse, generated substantial financial resources for social development, and established precedents for corporate accountability extending beyond shareholder value maximization.

However, implementation experience reveals persistent challenges limiting transformative potential. Compliance-oriented approaches emphasizing expenditure documentation over genuine impact achievement, geographical concentration in already-developed regions contradicting equity objectives, sectoral preferences reflecting corporate convenience rather than developmental priorities, and monitoring capacity constraints enabling superficial compliance collectively constrain framework effectiveness.

The regulatory architecture establishing spending thresholds, governance structures, and activity schedules provides accountability mechanisms while simultaneously generating formulaic responses prioritizing rule satisfaction over authentic engagement. Companies meeting two percent expenditure requirements satisfy legal obligations regardless of whether expenditure produces meaningful developmental outcomes. This spending focus represents the framework's fundamental limitation.

Progressive amendments introducing impact assessment requirements, implementing agency registration, and enhanced reporting obligations demonstrate governmental commitment to framework improvement. Continued evolution toward outcome orientation, geographical equity, collaborative approaches, and strengthened oversight would enhance effectiveness while maintaining mandatory participation benefits.

Corporate social responsibility ultimately reflects deeper questions about business purposes and societal relationships. Whether corporations exist solely to generate shareholder returns or bear broader obligations toward communities, environments, and future generations remains contested. India's mandatory framework represents particular resolution of these tensions, compelling corporate resource allocation toward social purposes regardless of individual corporate philosophies.

[723] Confederation of Indian Industry, *Collaborative CSR Framework* 34 (2022).
[724] KPMG, *supra* note 29, at 89.
[725] Standing Committee on Finance, *supra* note 38, at 67.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 8 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

For qualifying companies, CSR obligations have become permanent features of corporate governance requiring sustained attention, dedicated resources, and genuine engagement. Companies approaching CSR as mere compliance burden will satisfy minimum requirements without capturing potential benefits from authentic community relationships, enhanced reputations, and employee engagement. Companies embracing CSR as opportunity for meaningful contribution may generate developmental impact while strengthening organizational purpose and stakeholder relationships.

The framework's ultimate success depends upon whether mandatory spending translates into genuine social transformation. Achieving this translation requires continued regulatory refinement, enhanced implementation capacity, strengthened accountability mechanisms, and corporate commitment extending beyond compliance toward authentic responsibility. India's experiment with mandatory CSR offers important lessons for jurisdictions contemplating similar approaches while demonstrating both possibilities and limitations of legislating corporate social obligations.

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

GRASP - EDUCATE - EVOLVE

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

(Managed by L TO J LAW ASSOCIATES)

NO. 08, ARUL NAGAR, SEERA THOPPU,
MARUDHAANDA KURICHI, SRIRANGAM - 620102,
TAMILNADU, INDIA.

ISSN 2583-2344

9 772583 234004