Review Article

BIOMEDICAL Journal of Scientific & Technical Research

ISSN: 2574 -1241

DOI: 10.26717/BJSTR.2026.65.010121

Regulatory Oversight of CROs in India: An Overview and Implications of the 2024 NDCT Amendment

Parvatha Raja Kumaran[1,2]* and Hemalatha Kanagarajan[2]

[1]*SRM Centre for clinical Trials and Research (CCTR), SRM Medical College Hospital & Research Centre (SRM MCH & RC), SRM Institute of Science and Technology (SRM IST), Chengalpattu, Tamil Nadu, India*

[2]*Saveetha College of Pharmacy (SCOP), Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences (SIMATS), Thandalam, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India*

***Corresponding author:** Parvatha Raja Kumaran, SRM Centre for clinical Trials and Research (CCTR), SRM Medical College Hospital & Research Centre (SRM MCH & RC), SRM Institute of Science and Technology (SRM IST), Chengalpattu, Tamil Nadu, India

ARTICLE INFO

Received: February 09, 2026

Published: March 03, 2026

Citation: Parvatha Raja Kumaran and Hemalatha Kanagarajan. Regulatory Oversight of CROs in India: An Overview and Implications of the 2024 NDCT Amendment. Biomed J Sci & Tech Res 65(1)-2026. BJSTR. MS.ID.010121.

ABSTRACT

The clinical trial ecosystem in India has evolved rapidly over the past decade, positioning the country as a major hub for clinical research. Clinical Research Organisations (CROs) play a pivotal role in managing and conducting clinical trials on behalf of sponsors, ensuring operational efficiency and adherence to regulatory requirements. However, the regulatory oversight of CROs in India remained ambiguous until the 2024 amendment to the New Drugs and Clinical Trials (NDCT) Rules, 2019. This amendment formally defines CROs, mandates their registration with the Central Licensing Authority, and prescribes a structured framework for their governance, inspection, and enforcement. This review provides an in-depth analysis of the 2024 amendment, highlighting its implications on clinical trial governance, quality assurance, and the future clinical research landscape in India. The article also compares India's regulatory approach with international standards and discusses challenges and opportunities for stakeholders.

Abbreviations: CROs: Clinical Research Organisations; NDCT: New Drugs and Clinical Trials; CDSCO: Central Drugs Standard Control Organization; BA/BE: Bioavailability/Bioequivalence; CLA: Licensing Authority; SOPs: Standard Operating Procedures; GCP: Good Clinical Practice; FDA: Food and Drug Administration; EMA: European Medicines Agency; BIMO: Bioresearch Monitoring Program

Introduction

Clinical trials are the cornerstone of medical innovation, generating evidence for the safety and efficacy of new drugs and therapies. The increasing complexity of clinical trials has necessitated the involvement of Clinical Research Organisations (CROs), entities that provide specialized services such as trial management, monitoring, data handling, and regulatory compliance support. [1] Globally, CROs act as critical intermediaries between sponsors and investigators, facilitating high-quality and timely execution of studies. In India, the clinical research sector witnessed exponential growth in the past decade due to a large patient pool, skilled professionals, and cost advantages. [2] The New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019 (NDCT Rules) provided a comprehensive regulatory framework to govern clinical trials. However, the absence of explicit regulation and registration requirements for CROs led to challenges in accountability and quality control. [3] The 2024 amendment addresses these gaps by defining CROs, mandating their registration, and prescribing regulatory oversight mechanisms, marking a significant step in strengthening clinical trial governance. [4]

Historical Regulatory Framework for CROs in India

Before the NDCT Rules of 2019, clinical research in India was regulated under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, and various guidelines issued by the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO). CROs operated with limited formal recognition, and their oversight was indirect, primarily through sponsor responsibilities. The NDCT Rules, 2019, represented a paradigm shift, incorporating detailed provisions for clinical trial conduct, ethics, and safety. Yet, they lacked clarity on the role and registration of CROs, creating ambiguity about who was accountable for trial conduct and quality assurance. This regulatory gap led to inconsistent practices and concerns over data integrity and participant safety, underscoring the need for formal CRO regulation.

Overview of the 2024 Amendment

Published as G.S.R. 581(E) on 19th September 2024, the amendment to the NDCT Rules introduces the first formal legal framework regulating Clinical Research Organisations (CROs) in India. It defines a Clinical Research Organisation as anybody, commercial or academic, with a legal entity status, to which a sponsor may delegate or transfer tasks related to clinical trials or bioavailability/bioequivalence (BA/BE) studies. The amendment mandates that no CRO shall conduct such studies unless registered with the Central Licensing Authority (CLA) as per Rule 38A. This provision eliminates regulatory ambiguity by establishing a mandatory registration regime, thereby ensuring that all CROs, regardless of their size or specialization, fall within the purview of centralized oversight. It establishes legal accountability and traceability, creating a closed and regulated network of authorized service providers. This rule aims to enhance transparency, accountability, and quality control within the clinical research ecosystem. The rules came into force on 1st April 2025, allowing CROs time to comply with the new registration and operational requirements. The amendment introduces Chapter VA (Rules 38A to 38F), which defines the roles and responsibilities of Clinical Research Organisations (CROs), along with the Ninth Schedule, which specifies the requirements for their registration.

Registration Process for CROs under the New Rules

The amendment establishes a formal registration procedure for CROs through the submission of Form CT-07B to the Central Licensing Authority. Applicants must provide requisite documentation, including infrastructure details, personnel qualifications, quality management systems, standard operating procedures (SOPs), and financial statements, as specified in the Ninth Schedule. A registration fee of INR 5,00,000 is prescribed, with a fee of INR 1,00,000 for reconsideration applications under Rule 38B. Importantly, CROs previously registered under Rule 44 for BA/BE studies are deemed registered under the amended provision, streamlining the transition and avoiding duplicative administrative burden. Under Rule 38C, the CLA is obligated to evaluate submitted applications within forty-five working days. The authority may approve the application, reject it with reasons, or communicate deficiencies within this period. Rectifications are allowed within a defined timeline, and a request for reconsideration must be made within sixty days of rejection, accompanied by the prescribed fee.

The final decision, including any re-evaluation following the correction of deficiencies, must be completed within ninety days from the date of initial submission. This structured and time-bound framework introduces predictability into the registration process and incorporates mechanisms to ensure due diligence and fairness. The registration is valid for five years as stated under Rule 38D, and must be renewed before expiry. Renewal applications are processed using Form CT-07B, and if a renewal application is pending, the existing registration remains valid until a decision is made. This ensures continuity of operations and mitigates disruptions from administrative delays. In cases of rejection or disputes, CROs may appeal to the Central Government within the stipulated timelines.

Roles and Responsibilities of CROs under the Amendment

By legally defining CROs and their registration, the amendment clarifies their role as entities authorized to conduct clinical trials or BA/BE studies on behalf of sponsors. CROs are responsible for compliance with applicable regulations, protection of trial subjects, data integrity, and timely reporting. Under Rule 38E, the rules empower regulatory authorities to inspect CRO premises with or without prior notice. Inspections may include verification of infrastructure, examination of trial-related documentation, investigational products, and interviews with organizational personnel. This ensures ongoing oversight and adherence to Good Clinical Practice (GCP) standards. CROs must maintain robust quality management systems and operate under approved protocols and SOPs. Any failure to comply may trigger regulatory action. Under Rule 38F, the CLA is authorized to issue written warnings, reject study outcomes if regulatory violations compromise data validity, or suspend/cancel registrations for specified durations. In severe cases, CROs may be debarred from future clinical trial activities. These measures are proportionate to the severity of non-compliance. Crucially, before any such action is enforced, the CRO is given an opportunity to be heard. Aggrieved parties may appeal to the Central Government within sixty days of the regulatory order, preserving procedural fairness and transparency.

Enforcement Provisions and Penalties

The amendment empowers the Central Licensing Authority to take stringent actions against CROs violating regulations or jeopardizing trial integrity. Possible measures include:

- Issuance of written warnings describing observed deficiencies affecting participant safety or study validity
- Rejection of clinical trial or study results conducted by non-compliant CROs
- Suspension or cancellation of CRO registration for a defined period
- Debarment from conducting any clinical trial or related studies in the future

Such enforcement mechanisms enhance accountability and protect public interest by ensuring that only qualified and compliant CROs operate within the Indian clinical research sector.

Aggrieved CROs have the right to appeal orders within 60 days, allowing for procedural fairness and regulatory transparency [5,6].

Implications for Clinical Research in India

The formal regulation and registration of CROs is expected to transform the clinical research landscape in India positively by:

- **Enhancing transparency and accountability:** CROs will be identifiable and regulated entities, reducing the risk of malpractice.
- **Improving study quality and participant safety:** Regulatory inspections and compliance requirements reinforce adherence to GCP standards.
- **Building public trust:** Transparent regulation may improve participant confidence in clinical trials.
- **Facilitating sponsor confidence:** Sponsors will have clarity on CRO qualifications and oversight, reducing risks related to trial conduct and data integrity.
- Aligning India with global best practices, potentially attracting more international trials and investments.

Challenges remain in ensuring smooth implementation, particularly for smaller CROs adapting to the new regulatory burden and for regulators managing increased oversight responsibilities [7,8].

Comparison with International Regulatory Practices

Globally, regulatory bodies such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) mandate the registration and oversight of CROs to ensure compliance with clinical trial standards. For instance, the FDA's Bioresearch Monitoring Program (BIMO) audits CROs and investigators to safeguard data quality. India's 2024 amendment aligns with this global trend, creating a formal registration system akin to international practices. However, India's regulatory framework still differs in some operational aspects, such as fee structures and appeal processes, reflecting local legal and administrative contexts. Further harmonization with global regulations, including incorporation of digital oversight tools and public registries, can enhance India's attractiveness as a clinical trial destination [8].

Future Directions and Recommendations

To maximize the benefits of the 2024 amendment, the following measures are recommended:

- Capacity building programs for CRO personnel on regulatory compliance and quality assurance
- Awareness campaigns to educate sponsors, investigators, and CROs about new requirements and timelines
- Development of digital portals for application, tracking, and inspection reporting to improve transparency and efficiency
- Regular review and update of CRO registration criteria to keep pace with scientific and regulatory advances
- Engagement with international bodies for harmonization and adoption of global best practices
- Strengthening penalties and enforcement mechanisms to deter violations and maintain high standards

Such proactive strategies will foster a robust clinical research ecosystem that benefits all stakeholders [9-15].

Conclusion

The 2024 amendment to the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019, represents a landmark regulatory development by formally recognizing and regulating Clinical Research Organisations in India. Through mandatory registration, defined responsibilities, inspection authority, and enforcement powers, the amendment aims to enhance the quality, transparency, and accountability of clinical trials conducted in the country. This regulatory clarity is poised to strengthen participant safety, data integrity, and public trust, while aligning India more closely with international standards. As the amendment comes into effect, stakeholders must collaborate to ensure effective implementation and realize the full potential of India's clinical research capabilities.

References

1. Kumar A, Singh P (2023) The Role and Regulation of CROs in India: A Legal and Ethical Perspective. J Clin Res Bioeth 14(2): 109-114.
2. Patel V, Reddy SK (2021) Contract Research Organizations in India: Growth, Regulation, and Compliance Issues. Clin Trials J 18(3): 45-53.
3. (2024) Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. New Drugs and Clinical Trials (Amendment) Rules, G.S.R. 581(E).
4. (2019) Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO). New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, G.S.R. 227(E).
5. Getz K, Campo R (2021) Global CRO Market Dynamics: Regulatory Frameworks and Operational Trends. Ther Innov Regul Sci 55(2): 239-248.
6. Kaur G, Jain A (2023) Ensuring Quality in Clinical Trials: Role of CROs and GCP Compliance. Int J Clin Trials 10(1): 34-40.
7. Rao S, Bansal M (2022) Risk Management and Monitoring of CROs: Regulatory Best Practices. J Drug Deliv Ther 12(6): 149-155.
8. Kapoor N, Thomas P (2022) Legal Implications of Clinical Research Outsourcing in India. Indian J Law Ethics Res 9(2): 56-64.
9. Chakrabarti A (2021) From Ethics to Enforcement: A Study on Indian CRO Compliance Practices. Asian Bioeth Rev 13(3): 221-230.
10. (2021) World Health Organization (WHO). Standards and Operational Guidance for Ethics Review of Health-Related Research with Human Participants. Geneva.
11. (2023) Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR). National Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical and Health Research Involving Human Participants. Revised.

12. Sharma R, Malhotra S (2020) India's Clinical Trial Landscape Post-NDCT Rules 2019: What's New for CROs. Regul Aff J Pharma 31(5): 12-18.

13. Bhatt A (2022) Ethics Committees and Regulatory Reforms in India: Impact on CROs. Perspect Clin Res 13(1): 25-30.

14. (2023) ICH-GCP E6(R3) Draft Guideline. International Council for Harmonisation.

15. (2020) European Medicines Agency (EMA). Reflection Paper on Risk Based Quality Management in Clinical Trials. EMA/269011/.

ISSN: 2574-1241

DOI: 10.26717/BJSTR.2026.65.010121

Parvatha Raja Kumaran. Biomed J Sci & Tech Res

Submission Link: https://biomedres.us/submit-manuscript.php