

Exploring Sustainability in Electronics: A Comparative Study of Industry Practices in India and South Korea

¹Dr. Shyam Shukla, ²Dr. KK Eun, ³Suyesha Shukla

¹NSB Academy Bangalore

²Hanshin Machinery Co. Ltd. & Adjunct Professor, Tong Myong University, Busan

³Independent Researcher, Bangalore

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2025.1408000184>

Abstract. In today's rapidly evolving industrial landscape, sustainability is no longer optional, it's a core driver of innovation and competitiveness. This study examines how India and South Korea, two prominent players in the global electronics industry, are addressing environmental challenges through differing yet complementary strategies. India leans on policy-driven mechanisms such as Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) to promote inclusive and localized sustainability efforts (MeitY, 2021). In contrast, South Korea advances its agenda through cutting-edge technologies, ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) compliance, and smart manufacturing systems (KITA, 2020; KICTI, 2021).

Using Bangalore and Busan as regional case hubs, the research explores three key dimensions: energy efficiency, e-waste management, and sustainable sourcing. A structured comparative model is applied to assess policy effectiveness, industry engagement, and measurable environmental outcomes. The findings highlight strengths and challenges unique to each country and propose a hybrid approach that blends India's socially focused strategies with South Korea's innovation-driven model. Ultimately, the study offers practical insights for policymakers, business leaders, and researchers working toward a more sustainable and resilient electronics sector (Elkington, 1997; UNEP, 2021; Plepys et al., 2019).this nature, given in the addresses, will be deleted by our typesetters.

Keywords: Sustainability, Electronics Industry, India, South Korea, CSR, ESG, Circular Economy, E-Waste Management, Energy Efficiency

I. Introduction

As we know the sustainability is a pressing requirement for the global businesses. While comparing Indian and South Korea let's have a look on the differences in key parameters.

Key Area	India	South Korea
Sustainability Approach	Policy-driven, focused on local manufacturing and regulatory compliance	Tech-driven, emphasizes ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance) integration
Green Practices	Growing adoption of energy-efficient methods and responsible sourcing, still evolving	Advanced implementation of eco-friendly production, circular economy, and green R&D
Environmental Challenges	High e-waste generation, inconsistent recycling infrastructure	High energy use but better-managed e-waste and recycling systems
Regulatory Framework	Several national initiatives (e.g., E-Waste Management Rules), but weak enforcement	Strong governance through legal mandates and industry standards
Innovation Focus	Focus on frugal innovation and low-cost solutions	Investment in advanced green technologies and smart manufacturing
Stakeholder Engagement	Increasing awareness among consumers and companies	Strong collaboration between government, industry, and academia
Social Responsibility	Emphasis on job creation, ethical labor practices still developing	Mature CSR culture, high labor standards, better worker safety
Market Positioning	Emerging player with sustainability gaining momentum	Global leader leveraging sustainability for competitive advantage

South Korean electronics industry led by global players like Samsung and LG, driving the country's economic growth (Lee, 2019). India's electronics industry is still in a developing stage with more focus on assembly and manufacturing (Saxenian, 2006). Indian Government is actively pushing through the drives like Make in India (Government of India, 2014). Taking a look on sustainability measures becomes imperative and important learning for the industry practitioners and researchers at this stage.

This study aims to explore how each country approaches sustainability in its electronics sector. By looking at their policies, corporate practices measurable outcomes, can be identified. What is working, where are the gaps, and how lessons from one can benefit the other. The goal is to build a roadmap that is both effective and adaptable for companies and policy-makers alike,

Dimension	India	South Korea
Economic Position	Emerging global manufacturing hub	Established high-tech export powerhouse
Strategic Focus	Local manufacturing, employment generation	Smart, automated, and high-value manufacturing
Policy Framework	“Make in India”, PLI Scheme, E-waste Management Rules (MeitY, 2021)	Green New Deal, Circular Economy Roadmap, ESG mandates (KITA, 2020)
Sustainability Emphasis	Social inclusion, employment, environmental awareness	Technology-driven sustainability, innovation, carbon neutrality
Key Programs/Initiatives	PLI for electronics, National E-Governance Plan, Swachh Bharat Abhiyan	Green Growth Strategy, Smart Factory Initiative, K-Circular Economy Plan
Corporate Practices	CSR-led sustainability, responsible sourcing, energy efficiency	ESG compliance, zero-carbon factories, green R&D investments
Recycling Infrastructure	Developing; reliant on informal sector; limited formal systems	Advanced and tech-integrated recycling systems (KICTI, 2021)
Innovation & R&D	Growing but limited; policy-supported	Strong public-private R&D ecosystem; global leader in green tech

II. Literature Review: Sustainability in Electronics

Sustainable supply chain management (SSCM) is about embedding sustainability at every link of the supply chain from sourcing raw materials to the final product. It is not just about minimizing costs anymore, it is about ensuring that every partner in the chain meets ethical, environmental, and social standards (Seuring & Muller, 2008). Key components of SSCM include green procurement, eco-efficient production and recycling infrastructure. Sourcing from vendors that use fair labor and eco-friendly materials supports broader sustainability goals. Similarly, responsible production and recycling reduce waste and help close the loop in manufacturing.

However, implementing SSCM is not without its challenges. Monitoring sustainability compliance across international suppliers can be difficult. Coordination between manufacturers, suppliers, and consumers is essential. And without transparency, it's hard to build trust and track progress. Addressing these issues head-on enables companies to build supply chains that are not only efficient but also ethical and future-proof (Pagell & Wu, 2009).

Research Gap Analysis: Sustainability in Electronics Sector – India vs. South Korea			
Dimension	India – Existing Research	South Korea – Existing Research	Identified Research Gaps
Policy Framework	Focus on “Make in India”, PLI, and E-waste policies (MeitY, 2021)	Emphasis on Green New Deal and smart manufacturing (KITA, 2020)	Lack of comparative policy impact analysis; need to assess long-term sustainability outcomes
Implementation Effectiveness	Studies on challenges in enforcement and informal sector (CPCB reports)	Evaluations of compliance and ESG adoption (KICTI, 2021)	Limited cross-country comparative effectiveness analysis; need for real-world case studies
Corporate Sustainability Practices	CSR and environmental disclosures covered, but uneven across firms	ESG reporting is well-documented; linked to performance and governance	Absence of comparative metrics on corporate performance and actual sustainability impact
Technological Innovation	Discussed in terms of adoption barriers and policy in-	Strong literature on smart factories and green tech	Gap in evaluating transferability of green technologies and innovation from Korea

	centives	ecosystems	to India
Recycling & E-Waste Management	Focus on informal sector, collection inefficiencies, and awareness	Well-documented processes in formal recycling systems	Comparative study on system integration and replicability of Korean models in India
Social Sustainability	Discussed in terms of employment, awareness, and local engagement	Less explored; more focus on environmental and economic outcomes	Need for studies evaluating social impacts of sustainability initiatives in Korea
Carbon Reduction & Net-Zero Targets	India's long-term goals under NDCs studied, but limited on electronics-specific targets	Korea's net-zero by 2050 extensively covered	Gap in sector-specific decarbonization pathways; lack of detailed roadmaps for electronics sector
Public Awareness & Behavior	Urban studies on consumer awareness of e-waste and sustainable use	Higher awareness documented, often supported by tech and digital campaigns	Missing behavioral comparison; role of education, media, and regulation in shaping consumer behavior
Circular Economy Models	Concept gaining traction in policy; academic adoption growing	Embedded in national planning and industrial practice	Few comparative analyses on effectiveness of circular models; scope for adapting Korean practices in India
Industry–Academia Collaboration	Present but fragmented; few innovation-driven joint efforts	Strong R&D linkages; government–industry–university synergy	Gap in joint India-Korea research or capacity-building programs focused on sustainability in electronics
Dimension	India – Existing Research	South Korea – Existing Research	Identified Research Gaps

III. Methodology: Comparative Analysis Model

To fully understand how sustainability is approached in the electronics sector, this study uses a mixed-methods approach blending both qualitative and quantitative research techniques. Why both? Because numbers can show us trends and performance, but stories and policies reveal the "why" and "how" behind them.

Component	India (Bangalore Region)	South Korea (Busan Region)	Comparative Focus / Purpose
Research Design	Case study approach focused on regional sustainability policies and firm-level practices	Case study approach within the industrial hub of Busan	Structured comparative model using mixed-methods
Geographic Focus	Bangalore metropolitan area (India's leading IT & electronics manufacturing cluster)	Busan metropolitan area (South Korea's industrial and port city with strong electronics presence)	Region-level comparison enhances context relevance and allows for operational benchmarking
Universe (Population)	All registered mid-to-large electronics manufacturing firms in the Bangalore metropolitan region	All registered mid-to-large electronics manufacturing firms in the Busan region	Defined universe allows population-based sampling strategy
Sample Size	20 firms (including MSMEs and large manufacturers) + 5 policy experts	20 firms (including exporters and smart manufacturers) + 5 policy experts	Equal sample size supports balanced insights across geographies
Data Type	Quantitative: Emissions, energy use, policy compliance		
Qualitative: CSR reports, local interviews	Quantitative: ESG scores, GHG reductions		
Qualitative: Innovation initiatives, policy alignment	Mixed-methods enable rich contextualization and measurable outcome analysis		

Policy Evaluation	Make in India, PLI Scheme, PAT, EPR Rules	Green New Deal, K-Circular Economy Roadmap, Net-Zero Strategy	Compare regulatory intent vs. actual impact
Corporate Engagement	CSR-driven programs, adoption of SSCM, local sourcing, informal e-waste partnerships	ESG-led practices, automation, green certifications, circular product design	Evaluate extent of corporate sustainability integration
Secondary Data Sources	MeitY, CPCB, BEE, NSDC reports, company CSR disclosures, academic journals	KITA, MOTIE, KICTI, corporate ESG reports, Korean Sustainability Index data	Common academic and institutional repositories for validation
Primary Data Sources	5 expert interviews (policy makers, CSR heads)		
Surveys and/or field visits to 20 firms	5 expert interviews (government, ESG officers)		
Surveys and site reports from 20 firms	Cross-regional triangulation for reliability and validity		
Quantitative Methods	Descriptive stats, emissions index, energy benchmarking, policy outcome scoring	ESG performance index, carbon target tracking, smart tech adoption rates	Create a unified Sustainability Index Score (SIS) for comparison
Qualitative Methods	SWOT analysis, thematic policy coding, supply chain mapping, gap analysis	SWOT analysis, green innovation narratives, stakeholder interviews	Identify contextual gaps and scalable models

IV. Discussions

Sustainability Measures in the Indian Electronics Industry

Energy Efficiency Initiatives

Indian electronics manufacturers are stepping up their game by adopting energy efficient technologies, such as LED, high efficiency motors and variable frequency drives. These technologies help reducing electricity usage and operational costs while eliminating greenhouse gas emissions.

Indian firms are now embracing sustainable supply chain management (SSCM) evaluating suppliers based not only on cost and quality but also on their environmental and labor practices. This helps the industry align with global standards and enter raw markets where sustainability is a prerequisite.

Evaluation Dimension	India	South Korea	Model Insights / Applications
Policy Effectiveness	- Strong initiatives like PAT scheme and EPR rules (MeitY, BEE) - Challenges in enforcement, informal sector integration	- Highly regulated with targets under Green New Deal and Net-Zero 2050 roadmap - High compliance and monitoring standards	Benchmark success of enforcement models; replicate scalable monitoring systems from South Korea to India
Energy Efficiency Initiatives	- PAT scheme with market-based incentives (ESCerts) - Adoption of energy-efficient equipment and behavioral campaigns	- Smart factory automation, AI-driven energy optimization - Industry-wide ISO 50001 compliance	India can adopt AI-based industrial automation models; Korea can learn from India's behavioral energy campaigns
E-Waste Management	- EPR policy framework with gaps in enforcement - Informal sector dominates; lacking safety standards	- Centralized, tech-enabled recycling systems - Government-certified recycling firms with traceability mechanisms	Integrate India's informal sector via formal training programs; Korea can export modular e-waste tech
Corporate Practices	- CSR mandates drive sustainability programs - Gradual shift to Sustainable Supply Chain Management (SSCM)	- Strong ESG governance - High investor and regulatory pressure for sustainability metrics	India can benefit from ESG reporting frameworks used in Korea; Korea can adopt India's localized CSR models

Sustainable Sourcing	- Emphasis on local procurement through “Make in India” - Ethical labor practices and resource sourcing gaining ground	- Integrated green supply chains - Supplier ESG audits and certification mandatory for large exporters	Potential for joint SSCM benchmarking programs ; Korea can help design green certification systems for Indian SMEs
Social & Environmental Impact	- Employment generation, rural electrification via CSR - Need for improvement in emissions tracking, labor standards enforcement	- Lower job creation but high-tech, low-carbon production - Clear GHG emission tracking and reporting	Combine India’s inclusive growth models with Korea’s tech-driven sustainability metrics
Industry Engagement	- Growing interest in green branding and sustainability-driven competitiveness - Need for deeper SME engagement	- Industry-wide ESG commitments and automation investments - Government–industry–university collaboration well established	Create cross-country industry forums ; incentivize green supply chain partnerships
Innovation Ecosystem	- Policy-supported innovation (e.g., PLI schemes) - R&D spending lower than global average	- High R&D-to-GDP ratio - Government-led innovation hubs and corporate R&D tax incentives	Establish India–Korea innovation exchange in green electronics technology

Sustainability Measures in the South Korean Electronics Industry

South Korea giving thrust on sustainability, the focus area, key strategies and impact is shown below: -

Focus Area	Key Strategies and Practices	Impact/Outcome
High-Tech Sustainability Solutions	Use of AI-powered energy optimization tools for real-time monitoring and adjustment of energy usage	Improved energy efficiency, cost savings, and reduced carbon emissions across production lines
Circular Economy Initiatives	Government-led push for designing durable, repairable, and recyclable electronic products	Enhanced product lifecycle, reduced e-waste, and promotion of resource efficiency
Corporate Sustainability & ESG	Integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles into business operations	Lower emissions, fair labor practices, and long-term value creation through sustainable and ethical business

Corporate sustainability is a major focus in South Korea. South Korea’s corporate sustainability and policy framework emphasize Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) principles. It also includes K-ESG guidelines and Environmental Disclosure Obligations mandatory.

Comparative Analysis of Sustainability Measures

Now let us have a look how South Korean and Indian electronic industries are trying to improve their energy efficiency and ESG in totality.

Dimension	India	South Korea	Comparative Insights / Gaps
6.1 Energy Efficiency	- Policy-led initiatives (PAT Scheme) - Focus on awareness and incremental improvements - Growing adoption of renewables	- Tech-driven optimization (AI, IoT, real-time monitoring) - Precision energy management - Smart factories, grid integration	Korea leads in technological sophistication ; India needs to scale up digital tools alongside policy reforms
Performance Benchmarking	- Energy reductions tied to certificate trading (ESCs) - Measurable but gradual change	- Real-time reduction in energy use and emissions - Smart factory frameworks	India’s model is compliance-based ; Korea uses continuous real-time feedback systems

		with KPIs on energy performance	
6.2 E-Waste Management	- EPR policies mandate producer responsibility - Dominance of informal sector - Weak enforcement and low public awareness	- Centralized recycling systems - Formalized take-back programs - Strong enforcement of design-forrecyclability laws	India needs to formalize informal networks ; Korea needs to increase access and outreach in rural/small areas
6.3 System Structure	- Dual ecosystem (formal + informal) - High volume, low safety processing in unregulated sectors	- Integrated national recycling infrastructure - Use of automation and data tracking in ewaste logistics	Korea demonstrates institutional integration ; India shows communitylevel resource dependence
6.4 CSR and ESG Practices	- Mandatory CSR spending under Companies Act 2013 - Focus on community, local environment, and renewable energy adoption	- ESG practices driven by global compliance and investor pressure - Emphasis on traceability, ethics, and environmental performance	India emphasizes social responsibility ; Korea prioritizes global ESG alignment and corporate governance
6.5 Sustainable Sourcing	- Supported by 'Make in India' campaign - Focus on local value chains and reducing carbon from logistics	- Ethical global sourcing standards - ESG-compliant procurement and supplier audits	India is domesticmarket driven ; Korea aligns with international value chain sustainability norms
6.6 Corporate Accountability	- CSR reporting guided by statutory requirements	- ESG reporting embedded in investor relations - Transparent and	Korea has structured ESG indices ; India's CSR is evolving toward strategic alignment
	- Often reactive or philanthropy-oriented	metric-driven sustainability disclosures	
6.7 Common Ground	- Shared commitment to renewable energy, sustainable supply chains, and improved social/environmental outcomes	- Both countries value long-term competitiveness through sustainability	Opportunity to cocreate a hybrid model combining India's social depth with Korea's tech and governance rigor

Challenges and Opportunities for India

Indian ESG policies like w-waste management are well designed, However, it is found that there is a gap in implementation the policies effectively.

Improving this landscape involves:- Stronger compliances systems including inspections and reporting can improve this landscape. Further integration of Informal recyclers through training, safety upgrades and financial incentrives may also be considered. Public education campaigns can be applied to raise awareness and encourage responsible disposal.

Opportunities include:

Strategic Initiative	Implementation Focus in India	Expected Outcome
Financial Incentives	Expansion of subsidies, tax breaks, and Production-Linked Incentive (PLI)	Stimulates investment in green manufacturing and energy-efficient technol-

	schemes	ogies
Public-Private R&D Collaboration	Strengthening partnerships for development of locally adapted, cost-effective technologies	Drives innovation tailored to Indian industrial needs and environmental challenges
Technology Adoption in Industry	Promotion of automation, energy-efficient motors, and smart monitoring systems via government schemes	Enhances energy efficiency, reduces emissions, and modernizes manufacturing processes

Advancing Sustainable Supply Chain Practices

Some of the sustainable supply chain practices which can strengthen traceability, transparency and ethical practices are as follows :-

Challenge/Focus Area	Strategy	Expected Impact
Lack of Transparency and Ethical Standards	Build traceability systems and enforce ethical procurement and labor standards	Improved accountability, reduced exploitation, and better brand trust
High Emissions in Procurement	Encourage local sourcing of components and raw materials	Lower carbon footprint and stronger local economic integration
Fragmented Sustainability Efforts	Facilitate collaboration among government, industry, and consumers for unified action	Alignment of sustainability goals, shared responsibility, and policy effectiveness

Challenges and Opportunities for South Korea

Managing Green Technology Costs

There is a challenge and huge cost involve for South Korean electronic industry in this respect.

Challenge/Focus Area	Strategy	Expected Outcome
High Cost of Green Technologies for SMEs	Provide financial aid such as tax relief, low-interest loans, and green innovation grants	Eases financial burden, boosts SME participation in sustainable practices
Limited Accessibility of Scalable Solutions	Increase public investment in R&D to make green technologies more affordable and adaptable	Wider adoption across industries; enhanced innovation and cost-effectiveness

Expanding Circular Economy Practices

South Korean electronic industry circular economy practices expansion is important in present context.

Challenge/Focus Area	Strategy	Expected Outcome
Limited Circularity Beyond Electronics	Encourage design of repairable and recyclable products in other sectors	Extended product life cycles and reduced waste generation
Lack of Cross-Sectoral Material Recovery Systems	Develop nationwide systems for collection, reuse, and recycling beyond electronics	Improved resource efficiency and reduced landfill dependency
Siloed Industry Practices	Promote inter-sectoral collaboration for material exchange and circular innovations	Reduced industrial waste, cost savings, and stronger circular economy networks

Balancing Economic and Environmental Goals

South Korean electronic industries economic and environmental goals are to be aligned and need to be balanced.

Challenge/Focus Area	Strategy	Expected Outcome
----------------------	----------	------------------

Tension Between Growth and Sustainability	Implement carbon pricing mechanisms	Encourages industries to account for environmental impact and reduce emissions
Limited Green Influence in Public Spending	Mandate green procurement in government contracts	Drives demand for eco-friendly products and sets industry standards
Need for Sustainable Innovation	Support entrepreneurship in green tech and sustainable business models	Promotes innovation, creates green jobs, and aligns growth with sustainability goals

Policy Recommendations for Greater Sustainability

Enhancing Legal and Regulatory Mechanisms

For the both countries considering Basel convention and e-waste, legal and regulatory mechanism can be strengthened.

Area of concern	India	South Korea
Global Alignment with Treaties	Working towards full compliance with the Basel Convention; enforcement and monitoring still evolving	Already aligned with Basel Convention; strong in transboundary e-waste controls and reporting
E-Waste Management Framework	National E-Waste Management Rules exist, but implementation is inconsistent	Advanced, centralized e-waste collection and recycling systems integrated with industry practices
Trade in Green Goods	Requires harmonization of standards and certifications to boost export potential	Actively engages in international green trade; supports global standards and eco-labeling
Regulatory Mechanism Strength	Legal frameworks exist but suffer from gaps in enforcement and coordination	Strong regulatory infrastructure supported by digital tracking and industry compliance mechanisms

Promoting Technological Advancement

Electronic Industry of Indian and Republic of South Korea can promote technological advancement in following focus area to benefit each other.

Area of improvement	India	South Korea
Public R&D in Sustainable Tech	Increasing R&D funding in clean energy and recycling, but still limited compared to global leaders	Strong investment in R&D for clean tech, smart manufacturing, and green innovation
Cross-Sector Collaboration	Growing collaboration between academia, startups, and government via schemes like Atal Innovation Mission	Well-established networks connecting universities, chaebols (conglomerates), and government agencies
Innovation Ecosystem Development	Developing green innovation hubs and incubators, but scale and reach are still emerging	Advanced innovation hubs and accelerators with global partnerships in sustainability tech

Conclusion

Indian and South Korean Electronic industry can be immensely benefitted by mutual cooperation in advancing sustainability measures. They can regulate the market through incentives and strict compliance of sustainability measures & embedded ESG principles into policy implementation. Both the countries can leverage circular economy for both environmental and economic gains.

References:

- Balde, C. P., Forti, V., Gray, V., Kuehr, R., & Stegmann, P. (2017). The global e-waste monitor 2017: Quantities, flows, and resources. United Nations University (UNU), International Telecommunication Union (ITU) & International Solid Waste Association (ISWA). <https://ewastemonitor.info/>
- Elkington, J. (1997). Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business. Capstone Publishing.
- Hilty, L. M., & Aebischer, B. (2015). ICT for sustainability: An emerging research field. In L. M. Hilty & B. Aebischer (Eds.), ICT Innovations for Sustainability (pp. 3–36). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-09228-7_1

4. Plepys, A., Heiskanen, E., & Mont, O. (2019). European policies on sustainable consumption and production. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 218, 294–303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.01.025>
5. Eccles, R. G., & Klimenko, S. (2019). The investor revolution. *Harvard Business Review*, 97(3), 106–116.
6. Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Capstone.
7. European Commission. (2019). The European Green Deal. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52019DC0640>
8. European Union. (2015). Directive 2011/65/EU on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances in electrical and electronic equipment (RoHS). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2011/65/oj>
9. Geissdoerfer, M., Savaget, P., Bocken, N. M. P., & Hultink, E. J. (2017). The circular economy—A new sustainability paradigm? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 143, 757–768. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.048>
10. IEA (International Energy Agency). (2021). Net Zero by 2050: A roadmap for the global energy sector. <https://www.iea.org/reports/net-zero-by-2050>
11. KICTI (Korea Information Society Development Institute). (2021). Sustainable ICT in South Korea. <https://eng.kisdi.re.kr>
12. Kiron, D., Unruh, G., Kruschwitz, N., Reeves, M., Rubel, H., & Meyer Zum Felde, A. (2015). Corporate sustainability at a crossroads. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 56(4), 1–25.
13. KITA (Korea International Trade Association). (2020). Electronics export report. <https://www.kita.org>
14. MeitY (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, India). (2021). PLI Scheme for IT hardware and electronics manufacturing. <https://www.meity.gov.in>
15. OECD. (2016). Extended Producer Responsibility: Updated Guidance for Efficient Waste Management. <https://www.oecd.org/environment/waste/extended-producer-responsibility.htm>
16. Pagell, M., & Wu, Z. (2009). Building a more complete theory of sustainable supply chain management. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 45(2), 37–56.
17. Seuring, S., & Müller, M. (2008). From a literature review to a conceptual framework for sustainable supply chain management. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 16(15), 1699–1710.
18. UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). (2021). Global E-waste Monitor. <https://ewastemonitor.info>
19. UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change). (2015). The Paris Agreement. <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement>
20. WEF (World Economic Forum). (2019). A New Circular Vision for Electronics: Time for a Global Reboot. <https://www.weforum.org/reports/a-new-circular-vision-for-electronics>
21. Bureau of Energy Efficiency. (2023). Perform, Achieve and Trade (PAT) scheme. Ministry of Power, Government of India. <https://beeindia.gov.in/>
22. Korea Energy Agency. (2022). Annual report on energy efficiency and AI integration in industrial sectors. <https://www.energy.or.kr>
23. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. (2021). E-waste (Management) Rules, 2016 (as amended). Government of India. <https://moef.gov.in/>
24. Yoon, J., & Kim, H. (2021). Circular economy and e-waste management in South Korea: A case study. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 294, 126334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126334>
25. Ministry of Corporate Affairs. (2020). Corporate Social Responsibility: Policy framework and implementation. Government of India. <https://www.mca.gov.in/>
26. Kim, J., & Lee, S. (2022). ESG strategy in South Korea: Impact on corporate transparency and investment decisions. *Sustainability*, 14(2), 829. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14020829>
27. PwC India. (2023). Supply chain sustainability in India: Pathways to a resilient future. <https://www.pwc.in>
28. OECD. (2022). Sustainable supply chains in Asia: Policies and industry trends. <https://www.oecd.org>
29. Ministry of Environment Korea. (2022). Resource Circulation Policy and Circular Economy Roadmap. <https://eng.me.go.kr/>
30. Park, S., & Kim, D. (2023). Innovation challenges in green technology diffusion among SMEs in Korea. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 186, 122182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.122182>
31. United Nations Environment Programme. (2022). Global environmental outlook 6: Healthy planet, healthy people. <https://www.unep.org>
32. International Energy Agency. (2021). Energy efficiency 2021. <https://www.iea.org/reports/energy-efficiency-2021>
33. Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st-century business*. Capstone Publishing
34. KICTI. (2021). Korea ICT Industry Outlook. Korea Information Society Development Institute.
35. Lee, K. (2019). The Innovative System in Korea. In the *Oxford handbook of Innovation* (pp. 453-470). Oxford University Press.
36. Saxenian, A. (2006). *The New Argonauts : Regional advantage in Global economy*. Harvard University Press.
37. Government of India. (2014) Make in India. Retrieved from <https://www.mea.gov.in/Images/attach/Make in India Initiative.pdf>