BioSpectrum
the business of Bi
24 years of leveraging the business of Bio
www.biospectrumindia.co

Building Indiaâ??s Bio-AI Workforce Requires a Three-Way Compact

23 September 2026 | Views | By Chintan Dave, Chief of Staff, Indian AI Research Organisation (IAIRO)

Companies should publish skill requirements, provide anonymised or synthetic datasets, supply mentors and offer paid project placements

Artificial intelligence (AI) is changing life sciences from drug discovery and clinical development to manufacturing, diagnostics and drug-safety monitoring. Yet the sector's workforce challenge will not be solved simply by adding a generic AI course to a science degree. Life-sciences professionals need dual fluency: enough biology and regulatory understanding to frame the right problem, and enough data and AI literacy to evaluate whether a system is reliable, safe and useful. This matters because life-sciences AI operates in regulated settings, where errors can affect patients, product quality, scientific integrity, commercial decisions and public confidence at scale.

India already has building blocks. The IndiaAI Mission's FutureSkills programme is expanding AI education, fellowships and training infrastructure beyond metropolitan centres. The BioE3 policy proposes Bio-AI hubs across academia and industry, while government skilling programmes now include AI-enabled roles in life sciences. The missing element is an operating model that connects these initiatives to real scientific and industrial work.

The government should provide the common rails. This means financing compute, secure data environments and teaching laboratories; defining portable competency standards; and supporting paid apprenticeships rather than measuring success only through enrolments or certificates. A national skills map, refreshed with employers and universities, should identify demand across roles such as bioinformatics, computational chemistry, digital pathology, bioprocess optimisation and regulatory analytics. Public funding should reward programmes for demonstrated competence, placement, progression and regional inclusion.

Academia should redesign learning around problems, not departments. A biotechnology student need not become a software engineer, but should be able to work with data, question model outputs and understand validation. A computer-science student entering healthcare must learn experimental design, biological variability, privacy, research ethics and regulation. Universities can create shared modules taught jointly by life-science, engineering, statistics and ethics faculty. Faculty also need industry residencies so curricula follow changing practice rather than yesterday's tools.

Industry's contribution must go beyond guest lectures. Companies should publish skill requirements, provide anonymised or synthetic datasets, supply mentors and offer paid project placements. They can help universities build realistic assignments: predicting process deviations, improving trial recruitment, analysing microscopy images or monitoring drug safety. In return, firms gain a talent pipeline whose capabilities have been tested in relevant settings. Smaller biotechnology companies should participate through consortia, since few can build training programmes alone.

The partnership should be organised through regional Bio-AI skills hubs linked to universities, hospitals, research institutes, manufacturers and startups. Each hub could run short, stackable credentials for students and working professionals; shared capstone projects; faculty immersion; and apprenticeships. Credentials should record what a learner can do, the datasets and tools used, and the level of supervision required—not merely hours completed.

Responsible use must be part of competence, not a separate compliance lecture. Learners should practise recording where data came from, testing performance across populations, protecting confidential information, detecting when performance deteriorates and knowing when human review is essential. In life sciences, an impressive model can still fail because the data are unrepresentative or the biological question is poorly framed.

Finally, the three partners need shared accountability. The government should publish outcomes; academia should track whether training improves employability and research quality; industry should report apprenticeship conversion and emerging skill needs. An independent advisory group could review curricula annually and retire credentials that no longer match practice.

The aim is not to produce a generation of scientists who merely use AI tools. It is to build teams capable of combining biological judgment, computational skill and public responsibility.

The government can create access and standards, academia can build durable understanding, and industry can supply real problems and pathways into work. Their strongest contribution will come from designing the system together.

Chintan Dave, Chief of Staff, Indian AI Research Organisation (IAIRO)