

THE INNOVATION-TO-ENTERPRISE GAP

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap: An Analytical Study of Why Technology Students in India Struggle to Convert Innovation into Start-ups

A Study of the Conversion Pipeline from Idea to Scalable Enterprise

Arun Kumar Chaudhary¹, and Maleeta Angelina Goddard²

¹Chairman, IDC India- Innovation Development Council; Chairman & Co-Founder, GRASA Millets & Foods Pvt. Ltd.

²IDC India — Innovation Development Council, New Delhi, India

Author Note

Arun Kumar Chaudhary <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-0032-4981>

Maleeta Angelina Goddard <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-8540-9498>

We have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

The authors are affiliated with IDC India Innovation Development Council and GRASA Millets & Foods Pvt. Ltd., the organisations that operate the screening instrument examined in

THE INNOVATION-TO-ENTERPRISE GAP

this study; this is a material conflict of interest. See the Conflict of Interest Statement for full disclosure.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to IDC India- Innovation Development Council, 5th Floor, Wing A, Statesman House, Barakhamba Road, Connaught Place, New Delhi – 110001, India. Email: editorial@idcijist.com

This manuscript is prepared for submission to IDCIJST — Innovation Development Council's International Journal of Science and Technology, ISSN (Online): 3139-7395, published by IDC India Innovation Development Council, New Delhi

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Abstract

India has, over the past decade, built one of the largest formal innovation-support infrastructures in the world for its student population. Institutions' Innovation Councils, incubation centres, hackathons, patent-awareness drives, and a fast-growing venture-capital market. Despite this, the proportion of technology students who convert a working prototype or academic project into a sustainable, revenue-generating enterprise remains disproportionately small relative to the scale of ideation activity. This research journal examines that gap termed here the innovation-to-commercialisation gap not as a shortage of ideas, but as a systemic failure across a multi-stage conversion pipeline: Idea → Problem Validation → Prototype → Testing → IP → Business Model → Customer → Funding → Company → Scale. Drawing on institutional data (principally NITI Aayog, the Ministry of Education, the Press Information Bureau, and Startup India), the study maps twenty-six distinct structural, educational, financial, cultural and institutional barriers, synthesises them into five core capability gaps, and proposes a fifteen-point strategic framework together with a five-year institutional roadmap and an illustrative KPI funnel. The central argument is that India's challenge is one of conversion rather than creation — and that closing it requires universities, industry, government and students to jointly build a connected innovation-to-enterprise pipeline rather than isolated, event-based innovation activity.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Keywords

Student entrepreneurship, technology commercialisation, innovation ecosystem, start-up India, incubation, NITI Aayog, deep-tech funding, technology transfer, higher education policy, conversion pipeline.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

1. Introduction

India produces one of the largest annual cohorts of engineering, computer science and applied-science graduates in the world. These students are trained in and increasingly build projects around artificial intelligence, robotics, the Internet of Things, semiconductor technology, cybersecurity, biotechnology, drones, renewable energy and software engineering.

Around this technical training, Indian higher-education institutions now run an extensive calendar of innovation-adjacent activity:

- Hackathons and coding competitions
- Innovation and start-up competitions
- Project exhibitions and technology clubs
- Entrepreneurship-cell and incubation programmes
- Institution's Innovation Council (IIC) activities
- Patent-awareness programmes
- Industry-sponsored student projects

These are supported by national policy instruments such as the National Innovation and Startup Policy and the IIC framework, which are intended to formalise entrepreneurship education within higher-education institutions.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Yet a persistent gap remains between the volume of student innovation activity and the number of durable technology businesses that result from it. The distinction matters because each of these activities carries a very different probability of ultimately producing a company:

Activity	Does it necessarily create a start-up?
Hackathon participation	No
College project	No
Working prototype	No
Patent filing	No
Competition prize	No
Incubation	No
Customer validation	Much closer
Paying customer	Strong commercial signal
Repeatable business model	Start-up foundation
Scalable product / company	Commercial innovation

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

The problem, in other words, is not a shortage of activity. It is a shortage of conversion — the systematic translation of activity into validated, revenue-generating, scalable enterprises.

2. Literature and Policy Review

This study draws primarily on recent Indian government and quasi-government assessments of the innovation ecosystem, rather than academic literature alone, because policy evaluations document the phenomenon under study more directly than peer-reviewed research.

2.1 NITI Aayog

NITI Aayog's assessments frame India's broader innovation problem as a gap between knowledge creation and commercially viable products, attributing it to ineffective technology-transfer mechanisms, unclear IP management, inadequate prototyping and validation infrastructure, and limited translational funding.

As of September 2024, NITI Aayog reported 14,269 Institutions' Innovation Councils across 707 universities, 9,533 colleges and 2,901 standalone institutions, alongside 2,849 incubation centres and 4,969 start-ups or ventures established or supported through this network, evidence of substantial infrastructure, even as the same assessment flags continuing weaknesses in industry mentorship, institutional capacity and commercialisation.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

2.2 Ministry of Education

The Ministry of Education's higher-education innovation framework identifies entrepreneurship education, hands-on learning, incubators and accelerators, industry partnerships, funding mechanisms, mentoring, and legal/business support as the necessary pillars of a functioning student-innovation system.

2.3 Press Information Bureau / Government of India

Government communications describe a proposed ₹1 lakh crore Research, Development and Innovation (RDI) Scheme over six years, intended to address financing gaps for high-risk, high-impact R&D and deep-tech ventures implicitly acknowledging that early-stage risk capital for technology-intensive student and faculty ventures remains scarce under conventional funding models.

2.4 Startup India

Startup India's academia-incubator guidance frames incubators as the connective layer that gives students access to business fundamentals, validation support, networking, marketing, finance, research support, mentors, investors and market connections functions that individual academic departments are rarely equipped to provide.

2.5 Synthesis

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Read together, these sources converge on a shared diagnosis: India's constraint is not the volume of ideas or the number of technically trained students, but the depth, consistency and reach of the support available at each downstream stage of the innovation pipeline, particularly outside the country's strongest institutions.

3. Methodology and Analytical Framework

This journal adopts a structural-diagnostic approach rather than a statistical one. It (a) defines the innovation-to-enterprise conversion pipeline as a nine-stage funnel; (b) maps the principal points of leakage at each stage using institutional and policy evidence; (c) groups the identified barriers into eight challenge categories and five core capability gaps; and (d) proposes a corresponding set of institutional strategies, mapped against a five-year implementation roadmap and an illustrative KPI framework.

The purpose is not to attribute precise statistical weight to each barrier; reliable India-wide conversion-rate data at this granularity does not yet exist in the public domain, but to provide a structured model that institutions, policymakers and student founders can use to diagnose where, specifically, a given venture or programme is likely to fail, and to prioritise intervention accordingly.

4. Defining the Innovation-to-Start-up Gap

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

The gap can be visualised as a narrowing funnel, in which each downstream stage retains a smaller proportion of the student population than the stage before it:

Large student population → Large number of ideas → Academic projects → Some prototypes → Fewer validated products → Even fewer commercially viable products → Still fewer student-founded companies → A very small proportion reaching scale.

4.1 The Nine-Stage Conversion Funnel

Stage	Typical student activity	Major leakage
1. Idea	Problem identification	Ideas may not address genuine customer problems
2. Concept	Academic / project proposal	Overweighted toward technical feasibility
3. Prototype	MVP / model	Prototype not production-ready
4. Validation	User testing	Insufficient real-world testing
5. Commercialisation	Business model	Students lack business knowledge
6. Funding	Grants / investors	Early-stage risk capital remains difficult

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Stage	Typical student activity	Major leakage
7. Incorporation	Company formation	Legal / compliance complexity
8. Market entry	First customers	Lack of sales and industry access
9. Scale	Expansion	Management, capital and talent constraints

5. The Current Indian Innovation Ecosystem

India is not starting from zero. NITI Aayog's September 2024 assessment records a substantial base of institutional infrastructure:

- 14,269 Institution's Innovation Councils
- 707 universities with IICs
- 9,533 colleges with IICs
- 2,901 standalone institutions with IICs
- 2,849 incubation centres
- 4,969 start-ups/ventures established or supported

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

The Ministry of Education's approach layers onto this base a broader agenda of innovation and entrepreneurship education, hands-on learning, incubators and accelerators, industry partnerships, funding mechanisms, mentoring, and legal and business support.

India is therefore already moving toward a functioning innovation ecosystem in structural terms. The open challenge is depth, quality and conversion particularly outside the strongest and best-resourced institutions.

6. Why Technology Students Struggle to Convert Concepts into Enterprises

The causes are multi-dimensional. They span educational design, commercial capability, institutional incentives, cultural pressure, capital availability, and regulatory complexity. Each is examined below.

6.1 An Examination-Oriented Rather Than Entrepreneurship-Oriented Education

Indian technical education is structured around a fundamentally different loop than entrepreneurship requires:

Education trains for: learn → pass examination → obtain degree → get job.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Entrepreneurship requires: identify problem → research → experiment → fail → iterate → build → sell → scale.

Technical curricula are typically strong in theoretical depth but inconsistent in customer discovery, product management, sales, negotiation, business modelling, financial planning, IP strategy, regulatory literacy and commercialisation. The result is a student who knows how to build technology but not necessarily what to build, for whom, why they will pay, and how to distribute it. NITI Aayog similarly emphasises the need for stronger practical industry exposure and industry mentorship for student ventures.

6.2 The "Technology First, Problem Later" Pattern

A large share of student projects begin with a technical capability rather than a validated problem "we can build an AI application" is a capability statement, not a business opportunity. The questions that actually determine commercial viability are rarely asked at the outset: Which problem? For whom? How serious is it? How is it solved today? What does the current solution cost? Who decides to purchase? Will the customer pay? Why is the new technology better?

A technologically excellent solution can still fail commercially. An advanced agricultural AI system, for example, may be technically outstanding yet commercially unviable if

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

farmers lack the required hardware, connectivity is unreliable, the service is unaffordable, the recommendation is hard to interpret, or no distribution partner exists.

6.3 Weak Customer Validation

Students frequently validate ideas by asking "do you like this idea?" rather than "would you use it?" and, ultimately, "would you pay for it?" The distinction between academic and commercial validation is substantial:

Academic validation	Commercial validation
Professor likes it	Customer has a problem
Competition judges like it	Customer uses the solution
Students find it interesting	Customer returns to use it
Prototype works	Customer pays, and recommends it

A project can therefore receive an excellent academic evaluation while carrying zero commercial potential.

6.4 Missing Business and Entrepreneurial Skills

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Technical capability frequently coexists with limited knowledge of market research, pricing, sales, marketing, accounting, taxation, company law, contracts, employment, fundraising, cap tables, valuation, investor relations, procurement and regulatory compliance producing what this journal terms a technical-founder gap: a founder able to build the product but not necessarily to sell it, finance it, structure it legally, market it, hire, or scale it. This is why interdisciplinary founding teams outperform single-discipline ones.

Function	Capability
Technology	Product engineering
Business	Market strategy
Product	Customer / problem understanding
Finance	Budgeting / fundraising
Sales	Customer acquisition
Legal / IP	Contracts and IP
Operations	Execution

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

6.5 Lack of Industry Mentorship

Many student founders have never negotiated with a corporate buyer, sold a product, manufactured hardware, obtained regulatory approval, negotiated an enterprise contract, raised venture capital, protected commercial IP, or managed a technology supply chain. NITI Aayog explicitly identifies the shortage of industry mentorship for high-potential student and faculty entrepreneurship as a barrier and recommends strengthening it.

6.6 Weak Academia–Industry Linkages

Universities and industry optimise for different outcomes: research, examinations, publications and academic projects on one side; customers, costs, deadlines, productivity, commercial viability and scalability on the other. Where the two systems operate in isolation, students risk solving problems industry does not consider important. NITI Aayog has separately highlighted an imbalance between research output and demand for quality research, and the need for stronger collaboration among academia, research professionals and industry.

6.7 The Prototype-to-Product Gap

A working prototype under controlled conditions is not a commercial product. A product must additionally survive repeated usage, varied users, varied environments, supply-chain constraints, cybersecurity threats, maintenance and warranty obligations, regulatory requirements, cost pressure and customer support. For hardware and deep-tech ventures this gap

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

is especially wide. The Government has identified deep-tech-specific constraints including high capital requirements, specialised infrastructure, long gestation periods, technology and market risk, a shortage of patient capital, extensive testing and validation requirements, and scarce specialised talent.

6.8 The Funding Gap

Student founders typically have limited personal capital, collateral, income, credit history, investor networks and fundraising experience, and conventional investors may treat student founders as higher-risk given limited operating experience. The gap is most acute for deep-tech innovation in semiconductor technology, robotics, quantum computing, medical devices, biotechnology, advanced materials, space technology and climate technology, where years of R&D may be required before revenue. The Government's proposed ₹1 lakh crore RDI Scheme over six years is intended, in part, to address financing for such high-risk, high-impact and deep-tech ventures.

6.9 Family and Social Pressure

Entrepreneurship competes directly, in many households, with the perceived security of campus placements, government jobs and established professional careers. The underlying calculation "why take the risk when you have a good engineering degree?" is not irrational; the

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

financial opportunity cost of entrepreneurship can be substantial. But it means many promising ideas lose momentum immediately after graduation.

6.10 Placement Culture

Final-year students frequently redirect effort toward coding interviews, aptitude tests, placement preparation, internships and competitive exams. Entrepreneurship risks becoming an extracurricular activity rather than a legitimate career pathway a student spends four years learning technology and the final year preparing to become an employee rather than a technology entrepreneur. The appropriate response is not to devalue employment, but to make both pathways institutionally legitimate.

6.11 Time Constraints

Building a technology venture requires sustained, often multi-year, commitment, while students simultaneously manage classes, examinations, assignments, attendance requirements, internships, placements and extracurricular obligations. A student with five to ten hours a week available cannot easily compete with a founder working full-time.

6.12 Faculty Incentive Misalignment

Faculty are frequently excellent technical mentors, but institutional incentives are centred on teaching, examinations, publications and academic administration. Commercialisation

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

can take years and may go insufficiently rewarded, discouraging faculty from investing significant time in student ventures. NITI Aayog has identified governance, funding and industry-linkage problems in state universities and recommends stronger incentives and institutional mechanisms.

6.13 Intellectual Property Confusion

Students often lack clarity on who owns an invention, when to file a patent, patentability, prior-art searches, confidentiality, licensing, technology transfer and university IP policy. This produces two opposite risks: public disclosure before IP implications are understood, and an over-belief that "patent filed = innovation completed" when a patent does not by itself generate customers, revenue, manufacturing, distribution or investment. NITI Aayog identifies unclear IP management and weak technology-transfer mechanisms as direct barriers to commercialisation.

6.14 The Technology-Transfer Gap

Much university output still follows the sequence research → patent → paper, when the necessary continuation is research → prototype → validation → IP → licensing/start-up → market → scale. The missing bridge technology-transfer and commercialisation capability is one of India's more structural innovation problems.

6.15 Infrastructure Inequality

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Access to advanced laboratories, fabrication facilities, research equipment, experienced faculty, incubators, alumni networks, investors and industry partnerships is concentrated in a small number of leading research institutions. Students at smaller institutions more commonly have only basic laboratory facilities, limited funding, limited industry exposure, limited mentorship and weaker incubation infrastructure a geographical and institutional innovation divide that NITI Aayog explicitly notes is constrained outside top-tier institutions.

6.16 Tier-1 versus Tier-2/Tier-3 Institutions

Innovation institutions and start-up activity are already distributed nationally, but institutional capacity remains uneven. This represents a significant untapped opportunity in state universities, engineering colleges, polytechnic institutions, and Tier-2/Tier-3 regional innovation clusters.

6.17 Lack of Manufacturing and Testing Access

This constraint is especially acute for hardware ventures. Moving from one prototype to 100, then 1,000, then 10,000 units requires component suppliers, manufacturing partners, quality testing, certification, tooling, logistics, quality control and working capital — infrastructure that universities rarely provide in full.

6.18 Regulatory Complexity

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Several technology categories carry substantial regulatory burden that student founders are seldom trained to navigate:

Technology	Possible regulatory complexity
Medical device	Clinical / testing / regulatory requirements
Drone	Aviation requirements
Fintech	Financial regulation
Health AI	Data / privacy and medical considerations
Food technology	Food safety
Biotechnology	Biosafety and other approvals
EV technology	Automotive standards
Cybersecurity	Data / security requirements

6.19 Limited Market Access

Students commonly lack direct access to corporate buyers, government procurement, hospitals, schools, manufacturers, distributors, retailers and international markets. Incubators are positioned to bridge this gap Startup India describes them as mechanisms supporting students

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

with business basics, validation, networking, marketing, finance, research support, mentors, investors and market connections.

6.20 "Competition Culture" Instead of "Company Culture"

Hackathons and competitions are valuable entry points but can unintentionally close a short loop — idea → presentation → prize → certificate → project ends — rather than continuing toward idea → prototype → user → pilot → customer → company. Competitions should be judged by what has happened six or twelve months later, not by the event itself.

6.21 Absence of Long-Term Mentorship

A 48-hour hackathon and a three-year venture require fundamentally different mentorship models. A realistic long-term support arc looks like: Year 1 — idea and validation; Year 2 — MVP and pilot; Year 3 — revenue and investment; Year 4 — scale. Most current mentorship structures are built for the event, not the arc.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

6.22 Summary: Eight Challenge Categories

Category	Major challenges
Education	Examination-oriented curriculum, limited entrepreneurship education
Technical	Prototype development, testing, reliability, scalability
Commercial	Customer discovery, pricing, sales, product-market fit
Financial	Seed capital, grants, working capital, patient capital
Institutional	Bureaucracy, university rules, limited incubation quality
Human	Mentors, co-founders, leadership, business talent
Legal / IP	Patents, contracts, incorporation, regulation
Market	Customer access, procurement, distribution, competition

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

7. The Core Five Gaps

Gap 1 — Knowledge → Application

Students know technology but cannot always apply it to real, validated problems.

Gap 2 — Application → Prototype

Students lack equipment, time and mentorship to convert application into a working prototype.

Gap 3 — Prototype → Product

Students lack testing, product-development and manufacturing capability to convert a prototype into a reliable product.

Gap 4 — Product → Business

Students lack customers, sales capability, pricing knowledge and business fundamentals to convert a product into a business.

Gap 5 — Business → Scale

Students lack capital, management capability and market access to convert a business into a scaled enterprise.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

8. Opportunities for India

8.1 Artificial Intelligence

India's population scale and market diversity create large, under-served problem spaces in healthcare, agriculture, education, governance, financial services, logistics, manufacturing and language technology. The Government has explicitly identified AI applications in agriculture, healthcare and education as priority areas for RDI support.

8.2 Deep Tech

Quantum computing, robotics, semiconductor technology, space technology, drones, advanced materials, biotechnology, medical devices and climate technology are all areas prioritised under India's RDI initiatives, and represent long-horizon but potentially high-value opportunities for student ventures with appropriate patient capital.

8.3 Bharat-Focused Technology

Multilingual AI, rural healthcare, agricultural technology, affordable diagnostics, low-cost automation, clean energy, water management, waste management, public transportation and financial inclusion represent problems specific to India's context where India's own scale and diversity can function as a large, realistic testing environment.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

8.4 Tier-2 and Tier-3 City Innovation

Considerable potential exists beyond Bengaluru, Hyderabad, Mumbai and Delhi-NCR. Students in smaller cities often have direct, first-hand exposure to agriculture, logistics, manufacturing, education, healthcare, rural markets and local-language problems proximity that can produce highly relevant innovation. Government reporting indicates that nearly half of recognised start-ups now originate from Tier-2 and Tier-3 cities, evidence that entrepreneurship is already spreading beyond traditional hubs.

9. Proposed Solution: The Student Innovation-to-Enterprise Pipeline

India should shift from a competition-based innovation model toward an enterprise-conversion model, structured as a defined pipeline with metrics at every stage:

Problem Identification → Student Research → Customer Discovery → Design Thinking → Prototype → Technical Validation → Market Validation → IP Protection → Pre-incubation → Incubation → Pilot Customer → Seed Funding → Company Formation → Revenue → Scale.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

10. Fifteen-Point Strategic Framework

Strategy 1 — Make Problem Discovery Mandatory

Universities should ask "which real problem are you solving?" rather than "what product can you build?" Teams should complete 20–50 customer interviews, competitor analysis, market research, problem validation and willingness-to-pay testing before receiving significant incubation support.

Strategy 2 — Introduce Entrepreneurship as a Technical Skill

Engineering curricula should embed practical, credit-bearing modules in design thinking, product management, market research, financial literacy, entrepreneurship, IP, business modelling, sales, negotiation and regulatory compliance assessed through building, testing, learning and improving, not through theoretical examination alone.

Strategy 3 — Create Student Venture Fellowships

A Student Founder Fellowship could provide monthly financial support, laboratory access, a faculty mentor, an industry mentor, incubator access, prototype funding, legal/IP support and customer introductions enabling 6–12 months of focused venture development.

Strategy 4 — Create University Prototype Grants

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Stage	Suggested support
Idea validation	₹25,000–₹50,000
Prototype	₹1–5 lakh
MVP	₹5–15 lakh
Pilot	₹10–50 lakh
Commercialisation	₹50 lakh+

The principle underlying this ladder is that funding should follow milestones, not merely ideas.

Strategy 5 — Industry-Sponsored Problem Statements

Companies should supply universities with real operating problems, for example, "reduce manufacturing inspection time by 30%" creating a direct chain from industry problem to student team to prototype to pilot to customer, considerably stronger than product development in isolation.

Strategy 6 — Create Industry Mentor Banks

Every incubator should maintain a mentor network spanning engineering, product, sales, marketing, finance, legal, IP, manufacturing, regulation and fundraising, matched to the specific problem a student team is facing.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Strategy 7 — Alumni Entrepreneur Network

Successful alumni are an underused resource capable of providing mentorship, seed capital, customer introductions, internships, technical expertise, hiring and international connections. NITI Aayog specifically recommends attracting alumni entrepreneurs to support high-potential student and faculty ventures.

Strategy 8 — University Venture Funds

Major universities could establish milestone-based internal venture funds — for example, ₹2 lakh toward an MVP, ₹5 lakh toward a pilot, ₹15 lakh toward first customers, ₹50 lakh toward scale — building institutional capability in identifying and supporting student ventures over time.

Strategy 9 — Create Shared Infrastructure

Rather than every institution purchasing expensive equipment independently, regional innovation hubs could provide shared Hardware, AI, Robotics and Biotechnology facilities — reducing the infrastructure gap between well-funded and under-resourced institutions.

Strategy 10 — Simplify University Rules

Clear, simplified policy is needed on student company formation, attendance flexibility, academic credits, faculty participation, IP ownership, university equity, laboratory use,

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

incubation and external funding, so that testing a business idea does not require navigating a complex administrative process.

Strategy 11 — Change Faculty Incentives

Academic promotion and recognition systems should credit patents, technology transfer, start-ups, industry projects, student ventures and licensing revenue alongside publications, rewarding real-world impact directly.

Strategy 12 — Create Prototype-to-Product Centres

Dedicated centres focused specifically on productisation — industrial design, reliability, manufacturing, testing, certification, packaging, cybersecurity, user experience and scalability — would address the layer that pure ideation-and-incubation infrastructure typically does not cover.

Strategy 13 — Government as First Customer

Structured government pilots in education technology, healthcare technology, agricultural technology, environmental technology, civic technology, cybersecurity and public infrastructure could create a direct chain from government problem to student innovation to controlled pilot to procurement opportunity.

Strategy 14 — Increase Patient Capital for Deep Tech

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Deep-tech ventures cannot always follow a conventional SaaS-style revenue timeline; semiconductor, medical-device and robotics companies in particular may require years of R&D. India needs differentiated funding instruments for early R&D, validation, testing, pilot manufacturing and commercialisation — a need the Government's RDI framework explicitly targets through long-term, high-risk, high-impact R&D financing.

Strategy 15 — Measure Outcomes, Not Activities

This is arguably the single most important institutional reform. Universities should move away from measuring innovation through counts of hackathons, workshops, certificates, participants or ideas, and toward outcome metrics such as:

Metric	Importance
Problems validated	High
Prototypes developed	High
Customer pilots	Very high
Paying customers	Very high
Revenue generated	Very high
Patents commercialised	Very high

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Metric	Importance
Start-ups incorporated	High
External funding raised	High
Jobs created	High
Start-ups surviving 3+ years	Very high

The Ministry of Education's own higher-education start-up framework already includes indicators such as industry-academia collaborations, start-ups incubated and patents commercialised — illustrating the direction of travel toward outcome-based measurement.

11. Recommended Institutional Model

Level	Purpose	Core activities
1. Innovation Cell	Awareness	Innovation clubs, hackathons, lectures, design thinking
2. Pre-Incubation	Validation	Problem discovery, customer interviews, prototype, business model

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Level	Purpose	Core activities
3. Incubation	Product	MVP, testing, IP, pilot customers
4. Venture Acceleration	Business	Sales, funding, hiring, company formation
5. Scale-Up	Growth	Venture capital, manufacturing, national expansion, internationalisation

12. Roles of Key Stakeholders

12.1 Students

Students need to reframe how they evaluate their own progress:

Common framing	Better framing
"I have an idea."	"I have identified a problem."
"My prototype works."	"Does a customer want it?"
"I have filed a patent."	"Can this technology be commercialised?"
"I won a hackathon."	"Can I get my first 10 customers?"

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

12.2 Universities

Universities should evolve from degree-producing institutions toward Knowledge + Innovation + Enterprise institutions, taking responsibility for the full journey from education and research through innovation, prototyping, commercialisation and entrepreneurship.

12.3 Industry

Industry should move from being merely recruiters of graduates to becoming partners in university innovation — contributing problem statements, mentors, laboratories, internships, datasets, pilot projects, funding and procurement opportunities.

12.4 Government

Government's comparative advantage lies in building infrastructure that markets alone will not readily provide:

1. R&D funding
2. Patient capital
3. Shared infrastructure
4. Research-commercialisation mechanisms
5. Industry-academia collaboration

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

6. IP support
7. Deep-tech funding
8. Regulatory sandboxes
9. Government procurement
10. Regional innovation ecosystems

India's current RDI initiatives and adjacent innovation programmes indicate movement in this direction.

13. Overall Assessment

India does not have a shortage of technically educated students, ideas or innovation programmes. The larger weakness lies in the middle and downstream stages of the pipeline: idea → validation → prototype → product → customer → funding → scale. Considerable institutional infrastructure already exists; the challenge is ensuring it actually produces commercially relevant outcomes.

NITI Aayog's recent work captures the broader issue succinctly: India has real strengths in knowledge creation but still struggles to translate research outputs into commercially viable products, owing to gaps in technology transfer, IP management, prototyping, validation and translational funding. At the same time, the policy environment is becoming more supportive —

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

the RDI Scheme's proposed ₹1 lakh crore corpus over six years specifically targets deep technology, AI, robotics, quantum computing, biotechnology, medical devices, climate technology and digital technologies.

The next phase of policy and institutional effort should therefore not be about creating more student innovators, but about creating more student entrepreneurs capable of converting innovation into products, businesses and measurable societal impact.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

14. Implications & Outlook

The gap in student-led technology innovation in India is fundamentally a conversion gap rather than an idea gap. Indian technology students already have access to large domestic markets, strong technical talent, growing digital infrastructure, government programmes, incubators, innovation councils, increasing availability of capital, and emerging deep-tech opportunities. Yet many struggle because they lack the complete combination of technical capability, problem understanding, business knowledge, mentorship, funding, infrastructure, market access and long-term support, operating together rather than in isolation.

The solution is therefore not one additional hackathon, competition or incubation centre. India needs a connected student innovation-to-enterprise ecosystem, in which the ideal student journey runs continuously from Problem → Research → Idea → Prototype → Validation → IP → Incubation → Pilot → Customer → Funding → Revenue → Scale.

If universities, industry, investors, government and students collectively build this pipeline, India's enormous technical student population can become not only a source of skilled employees but also a significant source of new technologies, products, companies, employment and solutions to Indian and global problems.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

From "Project India" to "Product India"; from "Hackathon India" to "Start-up India"; and ultimately from student innovation to globally competitive technology enterprises.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

References

- Department of Atomic Energy. (2013, March 13). Permission to export monazite. Government of India, Press Information Bureau.
- Department of Atomic Energy. (2026, January 29). Parliament question: Rare earth minerals. Government of India, Press Information Bureau.
- Geological Survey of India. (2015). Indian Minerals Yearbook 2015: Rare earths. Indian Bureau of Mines.
- International Energy Agency. (2025). Renewables 2025: Analysis and forecasts to 2030. International Energy Agency.
- Ministry of Mines, Government of India. (2025, July 23). Written reply in Lok Sabha on rare earth reserves, resources, imports and exports.
- Press Information Bureau. (2025a, January 29). Cabinet approves National Critical Mineral Mission to build a resilient value chain for critical mineral resources vital to green technologies. Government of India.
- Press Information Bureau. (2025b, November 26). Cabinet approves ₹7,280 crore scheme to promote manufacturing of sintered rare earth permanent magnets (REPM). Government of India.
- Press Information Bureau. (2025c, March 26). Extraction of critical minerals from tailings. Government of India.

The Innovation-to-Enterprise Gap

Press Information Bureau. (2026a, February 3). India steps up exploration, mining and value addition of rare-earth minerals. Government of India.

Press Information Bureau. (2026b, April 2). Rare-earth resources and domestic beneficiation capability. Government of India.

Press Information Bureau. (2026c, July 21). Assessment of rare earth permanent magnet demand in India. Ministry of Heavy Industries, Government of India.

Press Information Bureau. (2026d, July 29). Ministry of Heavy Industries extends bid submission timeline for global tender under the REPM scheme. Government of India.

Press Information Bureau. (2026e, April 2026). Rare-earth corridors and permanent-magnet manufacturing ecosystem. Government of India.

United States Geological Survey. (2025). Mineral commodity summaries 2025: Rare earths. U.S. Department of the Interior.