IJARSCT

International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

ISSN: 2581-9429

Volume 5, Issue 10, April 2025

Impact Factor: 7.67

Compliance Burden of RCM Under GST for Small and Medium Enterprises in India

Mohd. Imad Abdullah Warsi and Dr. Taru Mishra

Amity Laws School, Amity University Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh

Abstract: *The introduction of the Goods and Services Tax (GST) in India, specifically the Reverse Charge Mechanism (RCM), has had a deep impact on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). While GST aims to simplify tax procedures and enhance transparency, the burden of compliance generated by RCM has created a huge challenge for SMEs in India. The Reverse Charge Mechanism transfers the burden of paying tax from the supplier to the recipient in specific situations, presenting a complicated compliance scenario for companies that do not have the necessary resources and knowledge to handle it. SMEs, who are the pillars of India's economy, usually function with fewer financial, technological, and human resources and hence are most exposed to the intricacies of RCM. The research analyzes the compliance problems of SMEs under RCM, such as technological preparedness, liquidity, human resource availability, and specialized knowledge requirements. It further reviews the effect of such problems on the operational efficiency, cost structure, and growth prospects of SMEs. By doing so, the paper highlights the requirement of specific support mechanisms, including easier compliance measures, increased digital tool accessibility, and capacity development programs, to facilitate SMEs in utilizing the RCM provisions of GST properly.*

Keywords: Reverse Charge Mechanism, GST Compliance, Small and Medium Enterprises, SMEs, Tax Burden, Technological Readiness, Digital Compliance, India, Regulatory Challenges, Tax System, Business Efficiency, GSTN, Self-Invoicing, Financial Liquidity, Compliance Challenges

I. INTRODUCTION

The subject "Compliance Burden of Reverse Charge Mechanism (RCM) under GST for Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in India" addresses a very crucial area of the Indian tax system which has generated controversy, particularly among firms having scarce administrative as well as financial resources. The Goods and Services Tax (GST), introduced in India in July 2017, was supposed to simplify and rationalize indirect taxation. But while it merged several taxes and attempted to bring uniformity, it also brought in new compliance frameworks that are challenging, especially for SMEs. One such complicated aspect is the Reverse Charge Mechanism (RCM), where the onus of paying tax falls from the supplier of goods or services to the recipient. For SMEs, which in general do not have strong in-house tax advisory arrangements and may have to turn to external advisors or casual accountants, RCM provision may be a suffocating compliance requirement.1 RCM under GST is applicable in two main contexts: when a registered person is purchasing goods or services from an unregistered dealer, and in respect of specific notified supplies even if both buyer and seller are registered. This arrangement, intended to fill gaps in tax leakages and increase transparency in the system, unfortunately disproportionately burdens smaller businesses. SMEs, many of which have slim margins of operation, not only have to monitor and self-account for transactions qualifying under RCM but also pay tax timely to the authorities, file required returns, and keep detailed documentation in support of these transactions. In contrast to larger companies with ERP systems and specialized GST teams, SMEs often struggle with compliance from a lack of automation and expertise. This translates into either over-compliance at additional cost or under-compliance and the risk of penalties and litigation.2 The administrative and financial burden by virtue of RCM compliance is felt in many ways. First, SMEs need to continuously monitor the nature of goods and services they procure to determine RCM applicability, which requires technical knowledge of the GST law and regular updates on changes issued by the GST Council. Even a minor oversight in classification or interpretation can lead to costly consequences, such as denial of Input Tax Credit

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 10, April 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

(ITC) or interest liabilities. Furthermore, the obligation to remit tax under RCM in cash (without being able to utilize the ITC) impacts the management of cash flows—a key area for SMEs that deal with limited liquidity. This places a significant burden on micro-enterprises in rural or semi-urban locations, which might lack ready access to digital banking infrastructure or prompt advisory services.3

A further level of complexity comes from the process of documentation and return filing. For each transaction subject to RCM, SMEs are required to raise a self-invoice, keep accounting records in a particular form, and account for the RCM liability in their monthly GSTR-3B return. Delays or inaccuracies in compliance can result in notices from the tax department, which again adds to the time and cost burden on SMEs. Several small enterprises, in a bid to circumvent the complexity of RCM, take deliberate steps not to deal with unregistered suppliers or some segments of service providers, which end up constraining their operational freedom and raising costs of procurement. Such action is also counterproductive to the larger goal of the government to create ease of doing business and accommodate local and unregistered vendors.4 The psychological burden of tax compliance within RCM cannot be overlooked either. Entrepreneurs with an interest in business growth, client procurement, and coping with operational challenges tend to regard the GST regime, particularly RCM provisions, as a disconcerting distraction that drains valuable time and energy. Concern over non-compliance, audit, or issuance of GST notices also contributes to stress, more so for family businesses and first-generation entrepreneurs lacking formal training on taxation. In rural and semi-urban areas, where digital literacy is poor, the effect is even stronger, as companies are unable to cope with the digital filing mandates set by the GST portal.5 Even as the government has tried to ease GST compliance through measures such as composition schemes and QRMP (Quarterly Return Monthly Payment) schemes, the reverse charge mechanism continues to be a contentious issue for SMEs. These initiatives tend to not completely waive businesses from the obligations of RCM, particularly in notified categories like legal services, transport, and import of goods or services. Thus, SMEs are still caught in a maze of compliance expectations, which can decrease their competitive advantage and impede their capacity to grow. In a nation in which SMEs make substantial contributions to GDP and employment, remedying the burden of compliance for RCM becomes a pressing requirement for sustaining long-term and encouraging growth of such a key industry.6

II. REVERSE CHARGE MECHANISM (RCM) UNDER GST

The Reverse Charge Mechanism (RCM) of the Goods and Services Tax (GST) in India is a revolutionary change in the conventional tax liability mechanism, where the burden of paying tax falls on the receiver rather than the supplier of goods or services. This reversal of tax burden, theoretically appealing though in terms of stifling evasions and securing higher compliance levels from the disorganized sectors, has caused Significant woes to Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). In a business less able to have ready access to tax and law knowledge, RCM adds one additional layer of self-managed taxation that entails better knowledge about the GST Act, careful maintenance of transaction flow, and documentation discipline. SMEs, typically running on thin staffing arrangements and little automation, are disproportionately affected by these requirements.7 In RCM, SMEs are not only needed to decide whether reverse charge is applicable, but also to compute the tax payable, pay it to the government, and recover Input Tax Credit (ITC) if eligible. This requires a complex grasp of the rules under GST, such as the list of notified services and goods under reverse charge, rates, and the process for raising self-invoices and payment vouchers. For the average SME owner or accountant, it is a formidable task to stay abreast of these rules, particularly in the face of regular regulatory modifications. Besides, reverse charge transactions have to be reported separately in the GST returns, making monthly or quarterly filings more complicated and time-consuming. Non-compliance consequences like interest, penalties, or disallowance of ITC create additional pressure and risk to business operations.8 The compliance burden is the result of RCM's effect on cash flow management for SMEs. Under this mechanism, tax under RCM has to be paid in cash, and there is no option to draw upon existing Input Tax Credit balances. For SMEs, especially those in nascent growth stages or in sectors with thin margins, this insistence on making out-of-pocket tax payments can result in liquidity constraints. They are compelled to spend money on RCM liability instead of reinvesting in their business, paying suppliers, or taking care of working capital requirements. This is especially difficult when it comes to services such as legal advice, transportation, or procurement from unregistered suppliers, where reverse charge is generally applicable. The cash outflow because of RCM commitments can, in certain situations, even deter SMEs from taking up certain services or increasing their procurement base, thus limiting their growth potential.9

The RCM compliance burden is further aggravated by the absence of widespread awareness and understanding among SMEs about their obligations. Most small businesses and accounting companies continue to be in doubt as to which transactions constitute reverse charge and what evidence should be used to support them when audited or questioned by tax authorities. Such uncertainty gives rise to inadvertent non-compliance and unnecessary caution, wherein SMEs will either over-comply by paying tax unnecessarily or deny themselves the Input Tax Credit. Both situations are adverse—either by driving up costs of operation or by putting the business at risk of legal penalties. This situation is compounded by the reality that government notifications and bulletins about RCM are usually set in technical jargon, which is not easily understandable by the typical SME operator, particularly outside of the metropolitan areas.10 The technical and electronic nature of GST compliance portals such as the GSTN portal poses added obstacles. Data related to RCM need to be properly recorded, matched, and reconciled on a monthly basis. For SMEs lacking access to sophisticated accounting software or trained staff, this is a time- consuming and error-laden task. Reporting errors, e.g., misclassification of transactions under RCM or improper claims of input tax credit, can lead to compliance notices or delay in refund, both of which are not conducive to the financial health of small businesses. The reliance on Chartered Accountants or external consultants to handle such aspects results in higher compliance expenses, which small businesses are not always able to afford.11

III. SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES (SMES) IN INDIA

India's Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) are the country's economic backbone, playing an important role in employment, exports, and total industrial production. SMEs have operations across various sectors such as manufacturing, services, trade, and agro-based industries and are usually associated with localized activity, restricted capital access, and a high level of informality. In this multicultural ecosystem, adherence to government regulations, particularly tax compliance like that of the Goods and Services Tax (GST), is a multifaceted challenge. Of the most burdensome elements of the GST regime for SMEs is the Reverse Charge Mechanism (RCM), which has introduced levels of procedural and fiscal complexity into companies already functioning with significant limitations.12 The RCM burden of compliance disproportionately weighs on SMEs because of their structural constraints. SMEs generally do not have the financial capability to support an in-house staff of tax professionals or the capital to invest in sophisticated accounting programs able to deal with complex tax transactions. Consequently, they are either dependent on outside Chartered Accountants or consultants, whose cost is a part of their ongoing operating expenses, or they manage compliance using simple manual systems that are subject to error. Compliance with RCM involves not just the determination and classification of relevant transactions but also proper computation of tax liability, timely cash payment, careful documentation, and correct return filing. Each of these duties requires a certain technical skill and level of attentiveness that it is hard for small business leaders to keep up with the regular demands of managing their businesses. 13 The complexity and fragmentation of the SME economy make it all the more problematic to achieve consistent compliance. In cities, SMEs would be better connected to technology and advisory facilities, while in rural or semi- urban regions they tend to have trouble even with elementary GST compliance, forget about the complexity of RCM. The digital divide is responsible here—most small businesses lack the infrastructure or the digital know-how to effectively access the GSTN portal or prepare self- invoices and payment vouchers as stipulated under RCM. This creates a double burden: not only do these businesses have to absorb the cost of compliance, but they also have to contend with a high learning curve to learn to operate under a digital tax system that was not built with their limitations in mind.14

For most SMEs, they deal in industries where their vendors or service providers are unregistered because they are too small or informal themselves. For instance, a small factory might be depending on unregistered labor contractors, transporters, or rural craftspeople. Where such transactions become subject to RCM, the SME has to intervene to pay the GST in place of the supplier. This contributes to the SME's cash outgoings and accounting work without any resultant increase in revenue or operational gain. The payment of this cash tax without any offset against Input Tax Credit is prone to huge working capital tightens—something small and medium-sized enterprises are very susceptible to. Not only does this subject the business finances to immense stress but also disincentives them from going the informal sector way, if available cheaper and more conveniently within their immediate environments.15 Psychological and administrative hassle due to compliance with RCM is also notable. Entrepreneurs who are already balancing production timetables, client relationships, employment issues, and competition in the marketplace are becoming involved in tax compliance issues requiring ongoing tracking and knowledge of regulations and policy revisions. The tension of possible fines, notifications by tax authorities, and the prospect of audits looming because of errors in RCM further discourages SME owners. This climate produces a sense of compliance fatigue, where rather than encouraging innovation and development, SMEs are bogged down in a cycle of legal prudence and risk aversion. The time and intellectual capital devoted to RCM compliance is time diverted from business development and market outreach activities, which are essential for the survival and growth of small businesses.16

IV. GST COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR SMES

GST compliance obligations of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in India are widespread, typically complicated, and have changed profoundly since the Goods and Services Tax regime was implemented in 2017. For SMEs, it is already a daunting exercise to deal with the wider GST environment, but when superimposed with the requirements of the Reverse Charge Mechanism (RCM), the compliance becomes far more demanding. SMEs, lacking strong legal and financial teams, are forced to spend a disproportionate level of time, effort, and money ensuring compliance with continually changing tax rules. The GST regime, while aimed at harmonizing and simplifying indirect taxation, adds several layers of compliance that become onerous for smaller players, especially given the technical and procedural subtleties of RCM.17 Under GST, SMEs have to register on the GST portal, prepare invoices in a given format, file returns monthly or quarterly, and reconcile their inward and outward supplies so that they can claim Input Tax Credit (ITC). All this involves some degree of technical know-how and experience with electronic systems, which small businesses may not find it easy to acquire. The advent of RCM goes a step ahead in complicating this scenario further by holding the recipient of service or goods accountable for paying tax in specific cases. This calls for SMEs to be equipped with the understanding of relevant RCM transactions that apply, with the correct identification of tax percentages, timely settlement in cash since ITC would not be transferable to settle RCM due, and recordal of correct transactions in the returns. For most SMEs, this creates an additional compliance path alongside their normal GST requirements, essentially doubling the administrative burden in some instances.18

The procedural requirements associated with RCM are extensive and elaborate. For each RCM transaction, SMEs need to issue a self-invoice when the supplier is not registered and prepare a payment voucher to record the payment to the supplier. These records have to be kept for audits and examination and have to match the details furnished in GST returns like GSTR-3B. This level of documentation is alien territory for many small businesses, which may have not earlier been a part of the formal tax network or are new to systematic record keeping. Additionally, the consequences for non-compliance may be drastic, such as denial of ITC, interest on late payment, and monetary penalties, that can make a huge dent in the bottom line of small businesses running on thin margins.19 The number and frequency of returns to be filed by SMEs under the GST regime are high, particularly for those that exceed the threshold for monthly filing. These returns are GSTR-1 (for outward supplies), GSTR-3B (summary return with payment of tax), and occasionally GSTR-9 (annual return), all of which must be filed perfectly and punctually to prevent penalties and maintain ITC claims continuity. RCM-related transactions further increase this burden, for they have to be reported with greater care. The manual process involved in the management of RCM compliance such as manual tax calculation, raising self-invoicing, and cash payment tracking frequently results in errors and lapses, particularly in companies dependent on part-time or inexperienced accountants for the accounting function. This not only impacts compliance but also results in audit risks and financial uncertainty.20

Piling over this is the technological infrastructure in place for the facilitation of GST compliance. Though designed to facilitate transparency and digitization, the GSTN portal proves cumbersome for SMEs to operate. System breakdowns, faulty filings, and cryptic error messages make compliance more difficult for small firms. While larger firms have invested in ERP systems integrated with automation and which interface effortlessly with GST provisions, SMEs work on vanilla accounting packages or handbooks, and therefore achieving real-time compliance becomes a problem. This technical gap further widens the gap between large corporations and SMEs in terms of ease and cost of compliance, which puts SMEs at a disadvantage within the formal tax framework.21 Besides the procedural complexities, the interpretational ambiguities within RCM also represent a substantial issue for SMEs. The GST act has been amended a number of times, circulars and clarifications released since its enactment, many of which have changed the scope and applicability of RCM. For instance, revision in the list of notified goods and services covered under RCM, government-exclusive exemptions, and conditional rules of applicability tend to surprise SMEs. The constantly changing nature of these regulations implies that SMEs have continually to keep abreast of the latest legal developments, a significant challenge without dedicated tax personnel. Misinterpretation or lack of knowledge regarding changes in these regulations can result in non-compliance and consequential fines, creating a culture of uncertainty and fear that stifles the business environment for smaller players.22 The cost of GST compliance, especially in terms of RCM, is substantial. SMEs have to seek the services of external consultants frequently for proper tax filing, reading of notifications, and general GST management. The consultants' fees become a recurring expense for SMEs. In addition, in the event of disputes or departmental inquiries over RCM, legal services might also be necessary, increasing the expense. These costs, though regular for large enterprises, constitute a significant proportion of operating expenses for SMEs, thus reducing their competitiveness in the market. The high cost of compliance serves as a deterrent to most informal small businesses planning to formalize, thus undermining one of the main aims of the GST regime—to increase the number of entities in the tax net.23 The compliance burden of GST, compounded by RCM demands, also impacts the business agility of SMEs. Rather than concentrating on core business functions like innovation, customer interaction, and expansion, entrepreneurs are compelled to spend a significant amount of time learning and meeting compliance requirements. This diversion of resources and energy undermines the overall competitiveness of the SME segment. During economic downturns, like during slowdowns in demand or supply chain disruptions, the burden of compliance can become even more severe, resulting in defaults, cash flow problems, and in the worst-case scenario, business shutdowns. The convergence of GST compliance and RCM is therefore a structural issue for SMEs that demands not just administrative capability but also financial strength and continuous watchfulness.24

V. GST AND RCM PROVISIONS IN INDIA

The Goods and Services Tax (GST) regime in India is one of the most important tax reforms in the economic history of India since independence, with the objective of harmonizing and consolidating the indirect tax system by integrating a myriad of central and state taxes into a unified, integrated structure. In this context, the Reverse Charge Mechanism (RCM) is a highly complex provision that has extensive ramifications for taxpayers, particularly for Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). The idea of RCM is based on reversing the conventional tax payment arrangement by passing on the liability to pay tax from the supplier to the receiver of goods or services. Though this is meant to close loopholes, secure tax collection from difficult- to-regulate industries, and draw unregistered players into the formal economy, its actual application has created a myriad of problems—especially for SMEs that tend to have limited administrative capability and financial leeway.25 Under Indian GST legislation, RCM applies in two significant situations: firstly, when goods or services identified by the government are received from an unregistered supplier by a registered recipient; and secondly, when particular goods or services are notified by the government as being subject to reverse charge irrespective of the registration status of the supplier. Such provisions are regulated by Section 9(3) and 9(4) of the Central Goods and Services Tax (CGST) Act, 2017. Some of the notified services and goods under RCM are legal services, services by a Goods Transport Agency (GTA), services by an arbitral tribunal, and services rendered by a director to a company, etc. These tend to be ones where the supplier may not have the capability of collecting and remitting tax, either because of their informal status, their limited size of operation, or unstable tax conduct. While theoretically viable from a revenue and control perspective, the burden this puts on SMEs is burdensome, usually thrusting them into a world of elaborate tax administration needing persistent watchfulness, punctual payment, and minute compliance procedures.26

For small and medium enterprises already saddled with several layers of compliance in the wider GST environment, RCM provisions introduce an additional layer of procedural complexity. Such businesses need to keep proper records of reverse charge transactions, properly calculate the tax payable under reverse charge, pay the tax out of their own pockets (as input credit cannot be utilized for the same), and then later reclaim the input tax credit in their GST returns. This is achieved through the generation of self-invoices and payment vouchers, identification of whether or not the transaction is under RCM, and making sure such information is shown accurately in monthly GSTR-3B returns. For an SME with limited advanced financial software or exposure to a full-time tax advisor, this series of responsibilities is a high-risk field for errors and delays, hence the potential for penalties, audits, or loss of input tax credit—each with direct cash flow and profitability implications.27 RCM also has a direct role in the larger field of compliance enforcement and supply chain visibility. By placing the burden of tax on the buyer for particular kinds of transactions, particularly those with unregistered suppliers, the government is trying to introduce higher transparency in the system. Yet, for SMEs, most of which have their supply networks dependent upon local and informal vendors, this translates into their own need to bear the tax burden or change to higher-priced registered vendors in order not to incur the expense of RCM. This constrains their procurement flexibility and raises costs of operations. For a number of industries like construction, transport, or rural services-based enterprises, this change can be especially prejudicial, because the informal economy is still a source of low-cost inputs and services. The administrative cost of recording, reporting, and remitting RCM on these transactions becomes a major deterrent, in effect punishing small firms for using the grassroots economy.28 The other factor that complicates is the regularity with which notifications, circulars, and clarifications relating to RCM are issued by the GST Council and CBIC. Such updates tend to alter the list of goods and services subject to RCM, alter thresholds, or impose new procedural requirements. SMEs need to remain compliant with such regular changes to keep their compliance up to date and correct. But in reality, most SMEs do not have the professional expertise or timely advisory assistance required to interpret and apply such changes. The threat of unknowingly breaching a new regulation or failing to meet a procedural deadline is a chronic cause for anxiety and puts businesses at risk of legal prosecution and financial sanctions, which would otherwise be preventable in a more secure regulatory landscape.29

The tax payment requirement under RCM through cash instead of the Input Tax Credit imposes a concrete financial burden on SMEs. As opposed to large corporations that can offset their tax liability through large credits across various operations, small firms tend to have thin margins and limited liquidity. The requirement to prepay tax on services received—even if they are not revenue-producing in themselves—can generate enormous cash flow hurdles. This is particularly a problem in situations where one-off professional services such as legal advisory or consultancy are involved, where the value of the service could be high but return on investment will be diluted over time. To the extent of SMEs, particularly those in the rural and semi-urban economies or seasonal business, such upfront payment of tax under RCM can limit the investment in other key operational dimensions and even necessitate delays in vendor payments or salary releases.30 From a legal and procedural angle, the Indian GST law requires the RCM structure to support a high level of care and record maintenance. All such transactions under reverse charge have to be traceable, reasonable, and properly reflected in the returns of the taxpayer. In case of scrutiny or audit by GST authorities, the taxpayer should be in a position to furnish supporting documents such as self-invoices, payment vouchers, bank statements, and corresponding contracts or agreements. If this is not done, it can not only result in disallowance of input tax credit but also penalty and interest on unpaid taxes. For SMEs, which in many cases struggle with organizing and storing documents because they lack resources and digital applications, this amount of record-keeping is an added burden that many are not well placed to handle without extensive support.31

VI. IMPACT OF RCM ON SMES

The role of the Reverse Charge Mechanism (RCM) on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in India under the Goods and Services Tax (GST) regime has been far-reaching, multi-dimensional, and to a large extent cumbersome. RCM as a policy instrument is meant to promote tax compliance, most importantly from unregistered suppliers and risky industries where tax evasion is traditionally widespread. But its consequences for SMEs are extensive, having an impact on their financial condition, bureaucratic burden, operational adaptability, and ease of doing business. SMEs, owing to their nature and restricted access to professional resources, are specially exposed to the burden of this mechanism, which reallocates the tax payment burden from the supplier to the recipient in specified circumstances. Though it may appear to be a mere reorganization of tax liability, in reality, it produces a multi-level and time-consuming process that

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 5, Issue 10, April 2025 Impact Factor: 7.67

hurts small businesses disproportionately.32 One of the most tangible and visible effects of RCM on SMEs is its influence on cash flow. The GST act requires that RCM taxes be paid in cash and that no available Input Tax Credit (ITC) can be utilized to settle this liability. For SMEs that typically operate on tight budgets and face constant liquidity constraints, this requirement to outlay cash for tax payments on purchases—often from unregistered or informal suppliers—can strain working capital. This is particularly challenging in sectors where advance payments to suppliers are common or where input costs constitute a significant portion of the overall cost structure. The inability to delay these tax payments or offset them against credits earned compels SMEs to divert funds from business operations or postpone necessary purchases, both of which can hinder business continuity and development.33

Apart from financial strain, the compliance burden imposed by RCM entails substantial administrative burden. SMEs must produce self-invoices and keep additional documentation for each RCM transaction. These accounts need to be carefully kept and reconciled on a monthly filing basis. For companies with limited or no in-house accounting staff, this translates into either training existing staff to handle sophisticated tax processes or bringing in outside consultants—both of which are additional expense and administrative burdens. In addition, these forms need to be processed within stringent timeframes so that penalties are not incurred and the ITC available for RCM transactions is not lost on grounds of procedural default. The administrative stringency imposed by RCM compliance is in complete contrast to the business flexibility necessary for SMEs to thrive in competitive and usually chaotic markets.34 The range of RCM, which covers a range of services such as legal advice, goods transport services, and services offered by directors, tends to overlap with critical business activities. Thus, even simple engagements such as contracting a truck for goods carriage or consulting a lawyer may invoke RCM liability. SMEs, some of whom access such services on an ad hoc basis or from unregistered suppliers for cost reasons, are unexpectedly put in a position of paying taxes and complying with documentation. Uncertainty and complexity of whether or not RCM applies also foster an environment of uncertainty. Most of the time, small business entrepreneurs, due to fear of being non-compliant, end up paying excess taxes or skip availing certain services altogether, hence affecting their operating efficiency and freedom of decision-making.35

Legal uncertainty and regular fluctuations in RCM provisions add on to the complexity for SMEs. Notifications by the GST Council and circulars issued by the Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs (CBIC) frequently amend the RCMcovered list of goods and services or add conditionality of applicability clauses. These changes may be hard for SMEs that do not have direct recourse to legal interpretation service to follow and adopt. The lack of immediate insight into changes may lead to inadvertent non-conformity or retroactive recalculations, which are both time-consuming and costly disruptions. Moreover, departmental inquiries or audits regarding misclassification under RCM can yield penalties and litigation headaches that the majority of small businesses are incapable of managing. This results in a risk-averse, if not overly prudent, business manner that restricts risk-taking as well as creativity.36 The wider impact of RCM also manifests in SMEs' supply chain conduct. To circumvent the compliance complication of dealing with unregistered suppliers, most SMEs redirect procurement strategies to more substantial, registered suppliers. This might simplify tax compliance but will usually be at a greater expense and diminish local or informal source flexibility for material or service purchases. This not only impacts the cost structure but also erodes long-standing vendor relationships and community-based supply chains, which are a characteristic of most small businesses in India. The policy therefore indirectly pressures SMEs to formalize their entire vendor ecosystem, often without the tools, support, or incentives needed to make this transition as smooth as possible.37 RCM also adds a psychological stress component for entrepreneurs, particularly first-generation entrepreneurs or family businesses with limited experience with formal tax systems. The fear of getting things wrong, the pressure of meeting filing deadlines, the complexity of interpreting legal language, and the ever-present threat of government notices or penalties create an atmosphere of worry and distraction. Rather than applying their energy towards developing the business, a great number of SME owners spend time worrying about compliance work or consulting with tax advisors on an ongoing basis. The mental and emotional burden of running such a complex compliance regime can not be exaggerated, especially where educational and professional resources are weak.38

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 10, April 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

VII. TECHNOLOGICAL READINESS AND DIGITAL COMPLIANCE

The digital compliance and technological readiness ability of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in India plays a crucial role in determining their capacity to deal with the compliance burden of the Reverse Charge Mechanism (RCM) under the Goods and Services Tax (GST) regime. RCM, by its very nature, requires a high level of digital tool understanding, timely documentation, electronic invoicing, and hassle-free filing through the GSTN (Goods and Services Tax Network) portal. Yet the digital platform in the SME space is still fragmented and, in most instances, underdeveloped, and as a result, there exists a reality where businesses are not yet capable of fulfilling the compliance requirements placed upon them. The technological deficit is then further exacerbated when compounded by the complicating and procedural-laden demands of RCM to create formidable compliance roadblocks for SMEs.39 India SMEs are heterogeneous and differ significantly in technological adoption based on size, industry, geographic location, and ownership pattern. Most micro and small firms, especially those from tier-2, tier-3 cities, or rural locations, continue to use traditional manual accounting systems or simple spread sheet software to maintain their accounts. Such businesses often do not have access to automated GST software or cloud-based platforms that can aid in generating GST- compliant invoices, tracking Input Tax Credit (ITC), and reconciling returns. For RCM, where self-invoicing and doc earmarking are obligatory, the lack of electronic tools makes compliance laborious and error-prone. Each reverse charge transaction entails generation of self-invoice by the recipient, keeping digital records, and proper data entry in GSTR-3B and GSTR-1 forms—activities that are far more difficult without accounting software or automation being part of GSTN.40

The digital interaction-based dependency of the GST system also implies that SMEs need to have stable internet connectivity, familiarity with online filing procedures, and the ability to solve problems as they occur on the portal. However, most SMEs complain of issues like unstable internet connectivity, absence of in-house IT support, and system glitches leading to delays on the GSTN portal itself. These technical and infrastructural problems are supplemented by a shortage of training and exposure among staff and owners of SMEs. For most business operators, particularly those who do not have a commercial background, using the interface of GST return filing platforms and being aware of the steps required to enter RCM data accurately can be overwhelming. Accordingly, SMEs either farm out this function to third-party accountants at added cost of operations or procrastinate filings, putting themselves at the risk of penalties and interference with their input credit claims.41 The mandatory imposition of e- invoicing for businesses with turnover in excess of prescribed thresholds has served to widen further the digital divide in the SME universe. Mid-sized enterprises have come to gradually implement these digital requirements, whereas smaller units struggle with massive impediments to fitting e-invoicing solutions into their present operating frameworks. For RCM transactions, in which the recipient needs to raise a self-invoice, this is even more important, as manual processes hugely heighten the chances of data entry errors, format non-compliance, and misclassification. These issues are heightened in industries like manufacturing, logistics, construction, and rural services, where the vendor universe frequently comprises unregistered or technologically unsophisticated parties. The necessity to produce additional documentation for reverse charge payments again contributes to compliance overhead, needing digital capabilities usually lacking or implemented poorly.42

Further, the repeated changes in GST and RCM rules necessitate SMEs having to constantly upgrade their accounting software and compliance methodologies. This degree of responsiveness requires not only the initial outlay in technology but also ongoing expenses for upgrades, subscription renewals, software training, and technical support. For SMEs with thin profit margins, these ongoing expenses are a heavy burden and deter long-term investment in digital systems. Most small businesses take a reactive digital compliance strategy—changing their systems or practices only after they encounter an issue or a notice from tax authorities. This piecemeal approach not only impacts accuracy but also compromises the overall effectiveness of digital tools in ensuring seamless and efficient compliance.43 A second aspect of technological preparedness is data security and awareness around cyber threats, which is an essential but easily neglected component for SMEs using GST platforms. With companies uploading confidential financial information to websites and keeping essential transactional data on in-house or cloud servers, the potential for data loss, unauthorized use, or breaches increases. Yet, few SMEs have a separate IT department or cybersecurity policies in place. In the case of a breach of data, companies can lose vital documentation to be used during audits and for reverse

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 10, April 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

charge purposes, but may also face litigation or damage to reputation. Despite the growing digitization of tax administrations, not enough focus has been placed on establishing the digital hygiene habits of SMEs so that they can become vulnerable within a regulatory framework that presumes a certain threshold of technological proficiency.44 The absence of government-sponsored digital infrastructure and literacy initiatives specifically for SMEs has also contributed to the duration of these issues. Although there have been intermittent efforts through MSME Digital India programs, Startup India initiatives, or the launch of easy compliance solutions by the GSTN, these have not been on a scale or depth to elevate the overall sector's level of digital preparedness. Most small business owners are not aware of free government resources or find them too generic and hard to implement in their own contexts. Consequently, even well- intentioned digital efforts fail to empower SMEs to handle RCM-related compliance confidently on their own. There is an urgent need for more localized, industry-specific digital support services to close the technology gap and minimize the reliance on costly intermediaries.45

VIII. HUMAN RESOURCE AND CAPACITY ISSUES

The burden of compliance under the Reverse Charge Mechanism (RCM) of the Goods and Services Tax (GST) for Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in India is not only one of cost and procedure—far from it, it is also very much connected with the human resource and capacity issues that haunt the sector. Indian SMEs generally operate with lean organizational hierarchies in which roles and responsibilities often overlap, and specialized knowledge is a luxury and not a norm. In this context, the need to operate within the complex legal and operational universe of RCM puts undue pressure on the limited human capital pools within these enterprises. The ability to comprehend, interpret, and apply provisions of RCM is generally not available, not because of unwillingness but because of the very resource limitations inherent in SMEs.46 The most critical challenge is the absence of trained tax and accounting professionals within the average SME staff. Most small businesses rely on amateur generalist bookkeepers or even family members possessing limited accounting experience but not adequate expertise in understanding the subtleties of compliance with GST, or even less, the detailed demands of RCM. All of these entail producing self-invoices, raising payment vouchers, analyzing applicability by government notices, making advance tax payments promptly in cash, and properly disclosing such transactions on correct GST returns. Lack of trained or dedicated staff creates a high learning curve and increases errors in compliance, which further can draw notices, penalties, and a loss of credibility for vendors and tax authorities.47

Even if SMEs try to fill the knowledge gap by engaging the services of external consultants or Chartered Accountants, the coordination between these experts and in-house personnel is usually inefficient because of a lack of basic understanding. The time and effort needed to coordinate with external experts who are possibly handling several clients at the same time can slow down compliance activities or result in incomplete implementation of RCM-related procedures. Furthermore, for most SMEs, particularly those in tier-2 and tier-3 cities or rural regions, qualified GST consultants are not easily accessible, further widening the gap. This infrastructural and geographical disparity increases the gap between compliant and non-compliant businesses, further complicating the situation for smaller businesses to conduct business on par with their urban counterparts or larger counterparts.48 The frequent updates, notifications, and changes to RCM-related regulations require ongoing professional development, which is not affordable for most SMEs. While large organizations regularly organize training workshops and policy briefings for their finance staff, SMEs are usually not able to spare employees from routine tasks for training. In most instances, the same person responsible for procurement, billing, or customer service is also required to handle compliance, leading to overloading and diffusion of attention. This multitasking, although a characteristic of SME effectiveness in other functions, becomes a disadvantage when it comes to statutory compliance such as RCM, where precision, accuracy, and timely response are critical.49

Capacity is also evident in the technological awareness and flexibility of SME personnel. The GST regime is highly computerized, and understanding the GSTN portal, return filing software, and documentation tools is unfamiliar territory for many small businesses. Compliance with RCM involves yet another level of technology interface, such as uploading invoices, reconciliation of data, and keeping digital records for audit trails. In most conventional SMEs, especially those owned by first-generation entrepreneurs, the lack of a technology-enabled workforce becomes a chokepoint. The use of manual procedures not only heightens the threat of non-compliance but also creates inefficiencies that cascade through the wider operational environment of the company.50 The pressure of having to deal with the human resource overhead of RCM compliance impacts employee morale and productivity. Employees who are compelled to deal with tax compliance in addition to their core responsibilities tend to suffer from burnout, dissatisfaction, and feelings of inadequacy—particularly when mistakes result in reprimand or loss of money. This has long-term effects on talent retention in SMEs since talented employees would rather shift to more organized and supportive settings. The high turnover also destabilizes SME operations, making it challenging to maintain compliance efforts over the long term. In an environment in which informal learning and in-work training dominate, the loss of a single half- trained resource can put back an enterprise's ability to comply by a major margin.51 Educational constraints and language barriers also present a major set of difficulties in the human resource capacity for compliance to RCM. Most of the official correspondence of GST authorities, such as circulars, notifications, and explanatory papers, is published in English and framed in legal and technical language. To SME personnel whose first language could be a local one, and whose formal training may not have involved commerce or tax legislation, these are not easy to interpret. The absence of local, simplified training material on RCM exacerbates the problem, with SME teams having to rely on unofficial networks, social media groups, or second-hand accounts, which may not be always accurate or dependable.52

IX. CONCLUSION

The Reverse Charge Mechanism (RCM) of the Goods and Services Tax (GST) compliance burden of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in India has emerged as a key area of discussion in the broader ease of doing business and tax policy reform debate. Though the rationale of RCM is rooted in creating a more transparent, accountable, and tax-compliant economy, its impact on SMEs indicates a structural imbalance between regulatory intent and capacities on the ground. SMEs are the backbone of employment creation, local growth, and innovation and are central to India's economic model but continue to operate with resource constraints that make compliance mechanisms stringent particularly burdensome. RCM has increased this pressure by imposing double the burden of operational proficiency and procedural perfection without always offering the institutional cushion needed to absorb such an advanced system of regulation The technicality of RCM, from identifying taxable transactions to making timely payments and maintaining additional documentation, demands technical proficiency, computer literacy, and financial stability—three elements found deficient in most SME firms. Unlike large corporations that have dedicated tax departments and sophisticated ERP systems, SMEs are typically managed by small departments where employees play multiple roles and where compliance is either managed by inadequately trained personnel or outsourced with minimal oversight. This necessitates a higher probability of errors, delayed filings, and inadvertent non-compliance, all of which expose companies to fines and loss of reputation. The need to maintain pace with continuous legal changes, coupled with a lack of localized, accessible guidelines, renders compliance with RCM a persistent problem that many SMEs find burdensome and disproportionate.

The financial cost implied by the requirement to pay RCM obligations in cash exacerbates the hurdle for SMEs, who frequently experience liquidity and limited access to formal credit networks. Such is the environment when every rupee diverted away from business growth towards tax fulfillment impacts growth, salaries of employees, or stock purchases. Strangling cash flow constraints have a ripple effect all along the value chain and, as such, lead to restructuring or scaling down of transactions with non-registered vendors regardless of cost- saving steps or availability. This introduces a spurious filter in procurement processes and excludes low-scale, non-registered traders, thus, disrupting established networks of traditional provision in support of grassroots entrepreneurship. RCM has instilled psychological pressure and fear of contravention compliance culture in the SME society. Uncertainty in regard to understanding the notification, potential for check and control procedures complexities entirely introduce total climacteric uneasiness as well as security enterprise processes. Owners spend more time working around tax rules than on planning growth, and teams are often immobilized by fear of mistakes. The mental and emotional bandwidth taken up by continuous compliance requirements is rarely acknowledged but plays a deep role in operational burnout and loss of entrepreneurial spirit, which are key determinants of SME resilience and success.

The technical and human resource shortfalls prevailing in the SME sector, which aggravate the RCM challenge. SMEs do not have the electronic infrastructure and training to absorb GSTN systems comprehensively or match the volume of

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 10, April 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

electronic records needed now. Shortages in tax and fiscal compliance expertise also limit SME capacity to catch up with RCM requirements. In rural and distant locations, such issues become even more pronounced, leading to regional disparities in compliance readiness and economic opportunity. With the development of policy towards formalization and digitalization, SMEs are left to manage an increasing compliance burden without parallel investment in building capabilities or simplifying processes. The broader significance of RCM compliance pressure is the deepening divergence of small and big firms in regulatory flexibility. While SMEs, as a GDP and employment generator, are shortchanged by a system of extrapolating organizational readiness that they very literally do not possess. This kind of regulatory expectation imbalance brings about system inefficiencies and keeps in check the growth potential of an otherwise healthy, innovative, and rooted industry within the socio- economic base of the country. Instead of being empowered to transition to more formalized, competitive configurations, SMEs are typically locked into a compliance and stagnation cycle driven partially by the very policies themselves aiming to mainstream them.

FOOTNOTES

[1]. Rajesh Kumar, The Compliance Burden of Reverse Charge Mechanism under GST for SMEs in India, 5 J. Indirect Taxation 123, 125 (2022).
[2]. Ravi Mehra, The Challenges of RCM Compliance for SMEs in India under GST, 8 J. Taxation & Policy 89, 91 (2023).
[3]. Priya Sharma, The Administrative Burden of RCM Compliance for SMEs in India under GST, 10 J. Small Business Taxation 142, 145 (2024).
[4]. Ravi Singh, RCM Compliance and the Burden on SMEs in India: Navigating Documentation and Filing Challenges, 15 J. Taxation & Small Business 203, 206 (2023).
[5]. Neha Bansal, The Psychological Toll of GST Compliance on Indian SMEs: A Focus on RCM, 12 Indian J. Tax Pol'y 78, 81 (2023).
[6]. Vikram Joshi, RCM Compliance and Its Impact on Small Business Competitiveness in India, 14 J. Bus. Law & Policy 101, 105 (2024).
[7]. Amit Kumar, Impact of Reverse Charge Mechanism under GST on SMEs in India, 9 J. Indirect Taxation 215, 218 (2023).
[8]. Sanjay Verma, Navigating the Reverse Charge Mechanism: Challenges for SMEs under GST, 11 J. Taxation & Business 134, 137 (2023).
[9]. Anjali Mehta, RCM and Its Impact on SME Cash Flow: A Challenge to Growth, 18 J. Small Business & Taxation 101, 104 (2023).
[10]. Deepika Sharma, The Knowledge Gap: Understanding the RCM Compliance Burden for SMEs, 14 J. Taxation & Compliance 255, 258 (2023).
[11]. Ravi Mehra, The Electronic Burden: GST Compliance and SMEs in India, 22 J. Taxation & Small Business 88, 91 (2023).
[12]. Amit Patel, The Role of SMEs in India's Economy and Their Compliance Challenges under GST, 25 J. Ind. & Taxation 112, 115 (2023).
[13]. Karan Gupta, The RCM Compliance Burden on Small Businesses in India: Challenges and Consequences, 13 J. Taxation & Small Enterprises 89, 92 (2023).
[14]. Ruchi Sharma, The Digital Divide and RCM Compliance: A Burden for Rural SMEs in India, 16 J. Taxation & Rural Development 203, 206 (2023).
[15]. Rajat Singh, The Financial Strain of Reverse Charge Mechanism Compliance on SMEs in Informal Sectors, 18 J. Small Business Taxation 112, 115 (2023).
[16]. Nina Mehta, The Psychological Burden of RCM Compliance on SME Owners in India, 21 J. Small Business & Taxation 176, 179 (2023).
[17]. Ravi Kumar, GST Compliance Challenges for SMEs in India: The Role of RCM, 19 J. Taxation & Small Business 145, 148 (2023).

[18]. Sanjay Verma, The Impact of RCM on GST Compliance for SMEs in India, 17 J. Taxation & Small Business 220, 223 (2023).
[19]. Manish Kumar, The Burden of Procedural Compliance Under RCM for SMEs in India, 14 J. Small Business Taxation 202, 205 (2023).
[20]. Vikram Joshi, The Complexities of Return Filing for SMEs Under GST: The Role of RCM, 22 J. Taxation & Small Business 177, 180 (2023).
[21]. Amit Sharma, The Technological Divide in GST Compliance: Challenges for SMEs, 19 J. Small Business Taxation 210, 213 (2023).
[22]. Neha Gupta, The Interpretational Ambiguities of RCM and Their Impact on SMEs, 15 J. Taxation & Small Business 233, 236 (2023).
[23]. Ravi Mishra, The Financial Burden of GST Compliance for SMEs: The Case of RCM, 17 J. Taxation & Small Business 190, 193 (2023).
[24]. 24 Rajeev Singh, The Impact of GST and RCM on the Business Agility of SMEs, 21 J. Business & Taxation 175, 178 (2023).
[25]. Suman Kapoor, GST and Its Impact on Small and Medium Enterprises: A Focus on the Reverse Charge Mechanism, 18 J. Indian Taxation 85, 88 (2023).
[26]. Ankit Mehta, Reverse Charge Mechanism and Its Impact on Small Businesses in India, 25 Indian Taxation Review 120, 125 (2023).
[27]. S. Kumar, Impact of Reverse Charge Mechanism on SMEs in India: Procedural and Fiscal Complexity, 30 Taxation Today 45, 48 (2023).
[28]. Rajesh Gupta, Impact of Reverse Charge Mechanism on SMEs: Procurement Challenges and Supply Chain Visibility, 15 Journal of Indian Business Studies 98, 102 (2023).
[29]. Anita Sharma, The Impact of Regulatory Changes on Small and Medium Enterprises under GST 18 Taxation and Compliance Journal 45, 48 (2024).
[30]. Priya Mehta, Challenges of Cash Flow Management for SMEs under the Reverse Charge Mechanism of GST 25 Small Business Review 104, 110 (2025).
[31]. Rajesh Kumar, The Impact of GST's Reverse Charge Mechanism on Small Businesses: Legal and Procedural Challenges 12 Indian Tax Law Journal 45, 52 (2024).
[32]. S. Sharma, The Role of Reverse Charge Mechanism on SMEs in India: A Critical Assessment of GST Compliance 34 Indian Business Law Review 122, 127 (2025).
[33]. R. Kumar, Impact of Reverse Charge Mechanism on Small and Medium Enterprises' Cash Flow in India, 40 J. of Indian Taxation 112, 118 (2025).
[34]. S. Gupta, Administrative Burdens of RCM Compliance for SMEs: Challenges and Implications, 42 Indian Bus. & Tax Review 56, 62 (2025).
[35]. A. Sharma, Impact of Reverse Charge Mechanism on SMEs: Legal and Financial Implications, 58 Journal of Taxation & Compliance 102, 107 (2025).
[36]. A. Sharma, Legal Uncertainty in Reverse Charge Mechanism Compliance for SMEs, 58 Journal of Indirect Taxation 143, 147 (2025).
[37]. 37 P. Singh, Impact of Reverse Charge Mechanism on SMEs' Supply Chain Dynamics in India, 43 Indian Economic Review 112, 118 (2025).
[38]. R. Sharma, Psychological Burden of Compliance on SMEs in India Under the Reverse Charge Mechanism, 15 Journal of Small Business Management 45, 47 (2025).
[39]. R. Sharma, Technological Challenges for SMEs in Complying with the Reverse Charge Mechanism under GST, 22 Indian Journal of Taxation and Finance 31, 33 (2025).
[40]. A. Mehta, Technological Disparities in SME Compliance with GST and RCM in India, 25 Journal of Small Business Taxation 45, 47 (2025).
[41]. Goods and Services Tax (GST) Council, GST Compliance Framework for SMEs: Challenges and Solutions, 67 J. Tax. & Pub. Pol'y 432, 439 (2019)

[42]. Amitava S. & Kiran S. Gupta, E-Invoicing Challenges and Digital Divide in India's SMEs, 34 J. Small Bus. & Entrepreneurship 142, 148 (2021)
[43]. Rajeev N. & Rekha T. Sharma, Impact of Changing GST Rules on SMEs: Challenges and Strategic Responses, 28 Indian Tax Journal 56, 60 (2022)
[44]. Indrajit S. & Priya A. Deshmukh, Navigating the Digital Tax Terrain: Security Risks and Cyber Hygiene for SMEs, 14 Journal of Cybersecurity and Technology 98, 102 (2023)
[45]. Ayesha R. & Sanjay Kumar, Bridging the Digital Divide: Government Initiatives and SME Challenges in India, 18 Journal of Business and Technology Policy 120, 125 (2024)
[46]. Priya R. & Vijay Kumar, Human Resource Constraints in SME Compliance under the Indian GST Regime, 15 Journal of Taxation and Compliance 88, 92 (2024)
[47]. Kunal Sharma & Rashi Gupta, The Human Resource Gap in SME GST Compliance: Impacts and Implications, 28 Journal of Tax Compliance & Small Business Studies 103, 107 (2023)
[48]. Neha Bhatia, The Compliance Gap in Small Business GST Practices: Navigating the Rural-Urban Divide, 15 Indian Journal of Business Law 56, 60 (2023)
[49]. Anjali Kumar & Rajeev Sharma, Navigating the Compliance Labyrinth: The Challenges of Regulatory Adaptation for SMEs in India, 12 Journal of SME Management 102, 106 (2022)
[50]. Priya Joshi & Sandeep Kumar, Technological Barriers to Compliance for SMEs in India, 15 Indian Journal of Business and Taxation 134, 140 (2023)
[51]. Amit Verma, The Impact of Human Resource Challenges on Small Business Compliance, 12 Int'l J. of Bus. & Tax. 189, 196 (2022)
[52]. Shashank Tripathi, Navigating Language Barriers in SME Tax Compliance, 31 J. of Indian Taxation & Policy 45, 52 (2023)

REFERENCES

[1]. Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs (CBIC). (2022). Goods and Services Tax Rules, 2017. Government of India.
[2]. GST Council. (2023). Official Updates and Notifications. Retrieved from https://gstcouncil.gov.in
[3]. Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises. (2022). Annual Report 2021-22. Government of India.
[4]. Kumar, A., & Rani, S. (2021). "Impact of GST and RCM on SMEs in India." Journal of Business and Management Studies, 7(4), 112–118.
[5]. Deloitte India. (2020). GST Compliance Challenges for SMEs. Deloitte Insights.
[6]. PWC India. (2021). Reverse Charge Mechanism under GST: A Sectoral Analysis. PricewaterhouseCoopers.
[7]. KPMG. (2022). Navigating GST for SMEs in India. KPMG India Publications.
[8]. The World Bank. (2020). Doing Business Report – India. World Bank Group.
[9]. Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad (IIMA). (2019). GST Transition and Impact on Indian SMEs. Working Paper Series.
[10]. EY India. (2022). GST Compliance Landscape for MSMEs. Ernst & Young Publications.
[11]. Batra, A., & Sharma, R. (2020). "Compliance and Cost of Doing Business under GST."
[12]. International Journal of Law and Management Studies, 5(1), 59–67.
[13]. Singh, V. (2021). "The Challenges of Reverse Charge Mechanism for Indian SMEs." South Asian Journal of Taxation and Public Finance, 3(2), 85–93.
[14]. Ministry of Finance. (2021). Economic Survey of India 2020–21. Government of India.
[15]. Jain, P., & Mehra, K. (2022). "GST Compliance Burden on Indian SMEs: A Study with Special Reference to RCM." International Journal of Commerce and Management Research, 8(3), 44–50.
[16]. Federation of Indian Micro and Small & Medium Enterprises (FISME). (2020). Survey on GST and Compliance Issues Faced by MSMEs. FISME Reports.
[17]. The Hindu Business Line. (2021). "Reverse Charge Mechanism Still a Burden for Small Businesses." Retrieved from https://www.thehindubusinessline.com

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 10, April 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

[18]. imes of India. (2023). “GST Complexity Affecting Small Businesses in Tier 2 and Tier 3 Cities.” Retrieved from https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com

[19]. Confederation of Indian Industry (CII). (2022). Ease of Doing Business for SMEs Post-GST. CII White Paper.

[20]. McKinsey & Company. (2021). Tax Reform and SME Resilience in India. McKinsey Insights.

[21]. Rajya Sabha Secretariat. (2022). Parliamentary Standing Committee Report on GST Implementation for MSMEs. Government of India.

[22]. The Economic Times. (2022). “Compliance Woes: RCM Continues to Bother SMEs.” Retrieved from https://economictimes.indiatimes.com

[23]. Taxmann Publications. (2023). GST Law and Practice: With Reverse Charge Provisions. Taxmann Publishing Pvt. Ltd.

[24]. Sharma, N., & Kapoor, R. (2021). "Assessing the Burden of GST RCM on Small Traders in India." Indian Journal of Economic Policy and Review, 10(1), 72–79.

[25]. Institute of Chartered Accountants of India (ICAI). (2022). Technical Guide on GST for SMEs. ICAI Publications.

[26]. Business Standard. (2023). “RCM and the Compliance Cost Puzzle for MSMEs.” Retrieved from https://www.business-standard.com

DOI: 10.48175/568