Workshop on

WHAT ARE PEOPLE'S RIGHTS IN THE DIGITAL WORLD?

- Moving towards a digital social contract

4th and 5th December, Bengaluru

Organised by

Supported by

IT for Change

APC
ASSOCIATION FOR PROGRESSIVE COMMUNICATIONS

WORLD WIDE WEB FOUNDATION

What are People's Rights in the Digital World?
- Moving Towards a Digital Social Contract

A report of the workshop organised by IT for Change, with support from
Association for Progressive Communications and World Wide Web Foundation
December 4-5, 2015

Overview

On 4th and 5th December 2015, IT for Change organised a workshop on *What are People's Rights in the Digital World?- Moving towards a digital social contract.* The primary objective of the workshop was to evolve a shared vision of human rights with respect to the digital realm, through discussion and dialogue between individuals and organisations engaged in different domains of social change. Through the 30+ workshop participants, a range of civil society concerns were represented at the workshop: women's rights and gender equality, community development, rural livelihoods, water rights, environmental justice, local democracy and digital rights.

The starting point of the workshop was the recognition that the Internet's original promise for ushering in a more equal society can be realised only through challenging the control of 'dominant forces' over critical network nodes, platforms, and personal and social data. The first step in challenging this control is the articulation of a new imaginary of a just and equitable digital society and drawing up the new social contracts that are essential for the protection of digital rights and freedoms of all citizens.

At this juncture, the dominant discourse on digital rights is informed by a libertarian understanding of minimal governance of the digital realm. Freedoms have come to more or less mean freedom from clamp-downs by authoritarian regimes on individual civil-political rights. The violation of people's socio-economic rights resulting from the enclosure of key digital resources by Internet companies is not usually part of debates on digital rights and freedoms. Restoring the indivisibility of human rights in the digital rights discourse, and establishing linkages between digital rights and the rights agenda of 'traditional' development actors, were therefore the two main objectives of the workshop.

At IT for Change, we also felt that these debates were extremely pertinent for

strengthening the work we have undertaken as part of the Women's Rights Online project of the World Wide Web Foundation.

As the veteran scholar Nancy Fraser has highlighted, it is important for women's rights activists to challenge the ongoing displacement of the politics of redistribution by the identity politics of recognition, within feminism. Women's rights struggles must not become a hand-maiden of capitalism. For us, the workshop was a space to bring the spotlight onto emerging forms of structural exclusion in the debate on digital rights.

The workshop opened with 2 panel discussions on Day 1, that examined the following questions:
– What do traditional rights-struggles teach us about the evolution of the human rights discourse?
– What does it mean to live in a digital world?

The post-lunch session on Day 1 and the entirety of Day 2 were devoted to group work and plenary discussions to identify critical issues and challenges with respect to people's rights in the digital age.

Summary of Panel 1. Lessons from history on the evolution of rights-consciousness

Panelists

Babu Mathew, Visiting Professor, National Law School of India University
Kalyani Menon-Sen, Member, Women Against Sexual Violence and State Repression
Kshitj Urs, Head, Karnataka Office of ActionAid India and Co-founder, People's Campaign for Right to Water
Bishnu Mohapatra, Professor, Azim Premji University

Babu Mathew on the need to foreground the indivisibility of human rights in development discourse

Indian jurisprudence can offer lessons for the rest of the world, in terms of affirming the indivisibility between civil-political rights and socio-economic rights. For example, the landmark judgment in *Unnikrishnan vs State of Andhra Pradesh* that read the right to education into the right to life, paved the way for the Right to Education Act that makes it mandatory for the state to guarantee education to all children between the age of 0-14 years. However, the policies and programmes pushed by the executive as

part of the mainstream development model the country has adopted, have not taken forward the directions shown by judicial activism. As a result, the majority of the country's population – dalits, Muslims, women – find themselves alienated from the development model. Correcting this historical imbalance is one of the key tasks that activism, including ICT-based activism, must take on today.

Kalyani Menon-Sen on the lessons from the feminist movement, for struggles that seek to expand the rights-discourse

The experiences of women's rights struggles reveal how assertions of 'universality' and 'difference' are both vital strategies in efforts that seek to expand the rights discourse. To illustrate with examples from the feminist movement: while it is the argument of 'universality' that was used by the women's groups fighting for women's right to vote; it is the argument of 'difference' that has helped in furthering reproductive and sexual health struggles. In this latter strategy, it is the particularity of women's experiences of oppression and subordination which are ignored by the mainstream discourses on rights, that are foregrounded.

Another insight from the feminist movement is that it is ruptures and struggles within the movement that have led to the bulk of the advancement in sharpening the discourse of women's human rights, rather than the tussle with the dominant forces. Dalit women's rights, LGBTIQ rights, pornography regulation, sex selective abortion – there are numerous examples in this area.

Kshitij Urs on the 'social inequality' blind-spot in the mainstream rights-discourse

The Magna Carta signed by King John in 1215 AD is usually considered the foundational milestone in the evolution of human rights. However, what often goes unmentioned is that the Magna Carta was an agreement between the king and a small elite group of barons. The interests of the common people did not factor in.

Over 800 years later, we still find ourselves in a situation where the promise of political equality is not fully realised due to inadequate attention to the question of social inequality. People's struggles against water privatisation in India can be read as an exemplar of this. For example, water sector reforms proposed in the early 2000s in the city of Bengaluru, intended to allow privatisation of urban water supply as part of enhancing efficiencies of city governance. The proposed reforms (subsequently

challenged by people's movements), intended to recast 'water' from being a public good to a commodity that would be accessible only to those with the ability to pay. Most worryingly, there were no democratic dialogues or public consultations that were held as part of discussing these reforms. They were pushed through by the state executive in partnership with a local NGO – an elite-driven exercise that bypassed the need to consult the majority of Bengaluru citizens, especially the urban poor who would be most affected by this shift.

The lesson to take away from this experience is that there are limitations to the discourse of civic-political rights in capitalist democracies, and without addressing socio-economic rights, the promise of universal human rights cannot be realised.

Bishnu Mohapatra, on the distinction between rights as endowments and rights as an exercised concept

The experiences from different rights-struggles clearly demonstrates that there is a distinction between rights as endowments and rights as an exercised concept. There are many glaring instances where people notionally have rights but are not in a position to exercise them.

Today, there is an overwhelming impetus to make rights juridical – by reducing them to law. But the moral imaginary of rights is much broader and so, the question to ask is how can we make legally guaranteed rights real on the ground?

Summary of Panel 2. What does it mean to live in a digital world?

<u>Panelists</u>
Shemeer Babu, Azim Premji Philanthropic Initiatives
Anita Gurumurthy, Executive Director, IT for Change
Nisha Thompson, Data Rights Activist, DataMeet
Siddharthya Roy, Independent Journalist

Shemeer Babu on how policy frameworks and development practice in India aren't fully ready to deal with digital disruption

The first word that one associates with digital

technologies is 'disruption'. It is another matter though, that not all digital disruption has positive impacts. However, in the Indian context, the areas of data governance and ICTs in development reveal that policy and practice

hasn't evolved enough, to be able to cope with digital disruption.

a) Data governance: Digitalisation has led to a vast increase in the data traces that we leave, and there is a vast amount of personal data with corporations and with the state. There is no framework on effectively managing this.

b) ICTs in development: In the area of ICTD practice, the idea of solutionism prevails and the views of the communities for whom such initiatives are being developed are hardly factored in. This needs to change. Otherwise we will end up with techno-centric solutions instead of the incremental solutions that actually serve community needs.

Anita Gurumurthy on the marketisation of the social contract in the age of network power and ideological nomadism

The big question that rights activists have to tackle today is this: "*what do you do when the formal discourse of rights is captured by a moral imaginary that foregrounds capitalist interests?*" In the 'digital society' paradigm, the marketisation of development is being taken to the next level. There is a new class of intermediaries – large Internet platforms that corner network advantage and create monopolies on an unprecedented scale.

The companies that own these platforms are extremely powerful, and there is increasingly an oligarchic nexus between new-age Internet companies and governments. For development practice, one of the critical issues emerging out of this nexus is the shift in the terrain of global philanthropy. The Gates Foundation is a leading donor agency for African NGOs, and through its activities, is aggressively calling for US multinationals like Monsanto to gain a stronger foothold in these countries. (In other words, this is a backdoor strategy for shaping development choices of the people of these nations).

Another critical issue is the reduction of the social contract to market mechanisms – as is evidenced by paeans to the idea of the 'Facebook Republic' or 'Google United Nations'. When these companies start influencing civil society dialogue, a trend that we are increasingly witness to, it is necessary to remember the warning that feminists always urge us to take note of: "*who is standing up for your rights is as important as what rights they are standing up for*".

A third issue is the power of 'big data' to create new myths of development. An illustration of this is the current rage over creating big data based measurement systems for capturing progress towards SDGs, even whilst the issue of building the statistical capabilities of national systems continues to be ignored.

Finally, when it comes to enabling people's access to the digital realm, the lack of

benchmarking poses a serious challenge. Currently, about 19% of the Indian population and 3% of Indian households use the Internet. What does this mean for people's rights and digital citizenship? Are we investing enough in building collective digital capabilities and is it enough to talk about Free Basics? The hard questions about the nature of the digital architecture that we want to build, need to be addressed in these post-*Modern Times* of ideological nomadism.

Nisha Thompson on how the tensions between efficiency considerations and people's rights are amplified in the digital age

The idea of efficiency is one of the cornerstones of the digital age and has its roots in the 'assembly-line' mindset of the industrial age. But in the movement from the industrial revolution to the data revolution, the tension between efficiency considerations and rights only seems to have worsened. Currently, the idea that every individual is primarily a data-point predominates the imagination of those in power – the Smart Cities initiative of the Indian state being a typical example. In this urge to generate more and more data about everyone and everything, it is the question of privacy and security that is side-stepped. Also, as our lives become increasingly digital, what are the 'brains' that we are connecting to? And who has access to them?

Siddharthya Roy on why the Internet needs a Magna Carta, as well as a Paris Commune

Myth-making and fiction-making are the strategies through which power structures are maintained. This has been the case throughout history. For example, the king's divine right to rule was legitimised by myth in ancient times. And in the digital world, we see corporate power using the myth of digital utopia and the myth of corporate rights to assert itself. These myths allow Internet corporations to claim exceptions to common law – especially when it comes to making tax payments! Another powerful fiction that the IT sector utilises is that of being a 'pure meritocracy'. Yet the reality is that for every 100 rupees an Indian programmer is paid, the (average) IT company charges its client 100 dollars. That is wage theft, and not a meritocratic system! But this fiction allows IT sector companies to claim that labour rights are irrelevant to their manner of functioning.

These fictions are distractions that draw attention away from the attempts of corporates to curb the Internet as it exists and bring it under their dominion. That is what platforms such as Facebook are doing.

In the final analysis, it is time to bring down these myths and fictions. This requires the Internet to be subject to common principles of human rights. Tim Berners-Lee, the inventor

of the World Wide Web, once remarked that the Internet needs a Magna Carta. The Internet also needs a Paris commune. The principles of liberty, equality and fraternity are non-negotiable in the digital world.

Key highlights of the open discussion that followed the panels

- In the digital world, it is important to watch out for and challenge the new ways in which social hierarchies are replicated. This requires us to highlight the interests of the most marginalised and create accountability frameworks that can facilitate this. In the current context where governance is becoming increasingly digitalised, these issues are critical to avoid new exclusions from service delivery systems.

- The silences around platform regulation, data legislation and open source code need to be broken. The issue of creating a regulatory architecture for the digital age needs to be tackled head-on.

- The digital medium by its very nature complicates old rights-debates. On social media, the dividing line between public and private communication becomes extremely blurry. This poses new challenges to the old ways in which the question of the limits of the freedom of expression have been addressed.

- Data rights are an example of new concerns for rights-debates that emerge in the digital age. The emerging digitalised databases raise new critical questions about the need to draw distinctions between individual, personal and social data, in order to ensure that transparency and privacy are effectively balanced. In the case of India, the move to create a nation-wide citizen database that is inter-linkable across departments and agencies, without any data protection and data privacy legislation, is a clear instance of data rights violation.

- There is a nexus between corporate-controlled technology and militant aggressive nationalism that rights-activists must challenge and question.

The open discussion was followed by group work sessions to flag key issues and concerns on the following thematic areas, from a rights-based perspective:

1) Access and connectivity
2) Data and privacy
3) Freedom of expression and association
4) Internet platforms
5) Software-isation

These themes were discussed in break-out groups during the afternoon session of Day 1 and morning session of Day 2. Following

this, there was a presentation from each break-out group on the key insights emerging from their discussion, which is reproduced below.

Key insights from the break-out group exercise on critical rights-issues and challenges in the digital age

Group 1. Access and Connectivity

1. The right to universal and non-discriminatory Internet access is an enabler of other human rights in the digital age.

2. The principle of net neutrality is an integral component of the right to access. Zero services, except when provided by governments/public agencies in general public interest, are a violation of net neutrality. Considering that net neutrality should be understood as a political idea of an equal Internet rather than a technical idea about traffic management, net equality may be a more appropriate term.

3. Accessibility for marginalised groups such as remote and rural populations, and the disabled, is a critical concern in enforcing the right to access. Public access points with community-sensitive management and intermediation arrangements, and the universal adoption of accessibility standards (such as W3C standards for the visually impaired), are therefore important.

4. In the current context where governance services are increasingly becoming digitalised, the right to Internet access is essential for realising citizenship claims. States therefore have the responsibility to undertake affirmative action towards universalising meaningful Internet access.

Group 2. Data and Privacy

1. The government needs to invest in creating a public data commons. A data commons bank can be set up towards this purpose. It can be governed by a set of vigilance principles, to prevent misuse of its power. All private companies dealing in, generating, or using public data can be compulsorily required to share data with this agency. For example, groundwater maps developed by the Coca Cola company, oil field maps generated by an energy company etc.

2. All 'big data' exercises must be regulated by a Data Commission, which is a suitably empowered agency that supervises data collection, use, re-use, storage, deletion and interlinking of personal data.

3. Communities and local self governments must be empowered to create and manage

their own data systems, and the government must launch a Data Literacy Mission to build grassroots capacities in this area.

4. Ownership of data should be determined on the basis of its use rather than its source. This means that social data, even if privately generated, must be put out in the public domain.

5. In the age of cloud computing, legislation and jurisprudence on data ownership, especially in PPPs, needs to be more robust.

Group 3. Freedom of Expression and Association

1. The Internet must be maintained as a safe public space for free expression and association but subject to reasonable restrictions, including freedom from cyber-attacks, hate speech, and sexual harassment.

2. All individuals have the right to be free from algorithmic/mass filtering and blocking of content by platforms/intermediaries, and arbitrary censorship by the state.

3. The plurality and diversity of online media should be respected and protected.

4. Intra- and inter-country Internet shut-downs are violations of the right to freedom of expression and association.

Group 4. Internet Platforms

1. Platforms have to be recognised as quasi-public in nature, because of their monopolistic nature.

2. Non-discriminatory access to platforms, and transparency of algorithms underpinning platforms (enforced either through open source design or code audit systems) are important.

3. Socially relevant software should also be considered platforms.

4. In the case of platform closures (especially social media and social networking platforms) the question of what happens to existing user data needs to be sorted out.

5. Considering the immense transnational power wielded by Internet platforms today, setting up an international tribunal for platform governance (following the footsteps of CEDAW) becomes extremely important. The exact shape that this tribunal will assume needs further thought. The decisions around this should be guided by a commitment to the vision of people-friendly digital jurisprudence.

Group 5. Software-isation

1. In the current context where proprietary software solutions rule the roost, the right of individuals to know what they are using, and their right to configure what they are using, are jeopardized.

2. The right to be protected from vendor-based lock-ins, the right to opt out of embedded software solutions when purchasing hardware, and the right to digital mobility – freedom to switch across various tools, formats and platforms that are currently available, must be recognised.

3. In the software-isation paradigm, the discourse of rights becomes reduced entirely to that of user-rights. This is worrisome and there is an urgent need to reclaim the citizenship-based discourse on rights.

Where do we go from here?

Following the presentations from the break-out groups, there was a final session to chalk out strategies on taking forward the insights from the workshop.

1. Participants felt that the workshop had helped in building a loose civil society coalition on people's digital rights in the Indian context. They felt that it was important for all workshop participants to commit to expanding this conversation to their respective constituencies and groups, as part of sparking off a public policy debate on digital rights. From the discussions at the workshop, IT for Change has committed to creating a charter of people's digital rights that can provide a foundational document for this exercise.

2. Legal and policy research on digital constitutionalism, in partnership with leading academic centres was seen as another key priority.

3. IT for Change, along with other organisations, is convening an Internet Social Forum in late 2016 in India. Workshop participants expressed their interest in being a part of this event.

Annexure – I
List of Participants

Anita Gurumurthy

Anita Gurumurthy is a founding member and executive director of IT for Change. She serves on the Board of ISIS International- Manila, the International Advisory Group of BRIDGE at IDS Sussex, is advisor to SciDev.net, serves on the National Resource Group of the Mahila Samakhya women's empowerment programme of the Ministry of HRD - Government of India, and is on the Advisory Group of Ending VAW: Research on Legal Remedies and Corporate Policies – a global programme of APC, supported by the Dutch Government's FLOW Fund.

Babu Mathew

Babu Mathew is a Visiting Professor at the National Law School of India University (NLSIU), Bengaluru. He teaches courses on 'Constitutionalism, Rights and Institutions' and 'Development policies and Law' to 'Master of Public Policy'. Previously, he has served as Country Director of Action Aid India and held the post of Vice-President of Trade Union International for two terms. He was also one of the founding members of the New Trade Union Initiative (NTUI).

Bishnu Mohapatra

Bishnu Mohapatra is a professor at the Azim Premji University. He was earlier the Governance Program Officer at the Ford Foundation South Asia office at New Delhi. Previously, he has taught at the Centre for Political Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, University of Delhi and the University of Kyoto.

Cynthia Stephen

Cynthia Stephen is a President of TEDS Trust and Dalit Women's Network for Solidarity (DAWNS). Cynthia Stephen also works as a consultant, Government and Community

Relations at the International Justice Mission. She has previously worked with Mahila Samakhya Karnataka, New Entity for Social Action, Centre for Child and the Law and National Law School of India University, Bengaluru.

Dhruv Arora

Dhruv Arora is a gender rights activist, a social media activism practitioner, and the founder of the GotStared.At campaign against Sexual Harassment. He has worked with various organisations such as the Centre for Policy Research, Youth Ki Awaaz, CREA and the Must Bol Campaign.

Gangesh Varma

Gangesh Varma is a Senior Fellow at the Centre for Communication Governance at National Law University, Delhi. He is currently enrolled as a PhD candidate at the Centre for International Legal Studies at the School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University. He has previously worked with the Indian Council of World Affairs.

Jeevika Shiv

Jeevika Shiv is a Program Manager at ANANDI, Area Networking and Development Initiatives. She has earlier worked as a Policy Researcher with the Centre for Equity Studies and with the Commissioner of the Supreme Court on the Right to Food, New Delhi and worked with members of the National Advisory Council on drafting of land, food and other social policies and laws related to governance.

Kalyani Menon-Sen

Kalyani Menon-Sen is a feminist activist and researcher based in Delhi, India. She is a member of Women Against Sexual Violence and State Repression (WSS) and has a long association with Mahila Samakhya, a programme of women's education for empowerment. She is also one of the associates at Gender at Work.

Kshitij Urs

Kshitij Urs heads the Karnataka office of ActionAid India. He co-founded the People's Campaign for Right to Water, which strives for the protection of water bodies. He has worked on projects related to the democratisation of water sources, the empowerment of local communities on this issue, as well as advocacy efforts that were crucial for drafting the Karnataka Lake Conservation and Development Authority Act.

Meghana Rao

Meghana Rao is a marketing communications and corporate communications professional, who is currently working with Azim Premji Philanthropic Initiatives. She was previously the Deputy Director of Campaigns at Breakthrough, an international human rights organisation.

Neena Pandey

Neena Pandey is a doctoral fellow at the IIM, Bengaluru, specialising in the Information Systems area. Previous to this, after her M.Tech. in Computer Science, she has worked with core technology firms like Verizon, Sencore Electronics and Samsung India Software Operations. Her research interests are in the areas of ICT4D, Internet Governance and policy.

Nehmat Kaur

Nehmat Kaur is a counsel for SFLC.in (Software Freedom Law Centre, India) – a not-for-profit legal services organization that protects citizens' civil liberties in the digital world. Nehmat has worked extensively on the law and policy surrounding right to privacy, corporate surveillance of communications, on-line free speech and intermediary liability, among others.

Nisha Thompson

Nisha Thompson is a data rights activist, currently working full time with DataMeet. She has earlier worked as a Data Project Manager at Arghyam/ India Water Portal.

Parminder Jeet Singh

Parminder Jeet Singh leads IT for Change's work in the areas of governance reform and Internet Governance. He has been a Special Advisor to the Chair of the UN Internet Governance Forum (IGF) and an Advisor to UN Global Alliance on ICTs and Development. He was also the first elected co-coordinator of the Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus and the founding member of the global Internet Rights and Principles group. He has been a key figure in organising a new coalition of civil society organisations from across the world, called the Just Net Coalition, for promoting a just and equal Internet.

Pramathesh Ambasta

Pramathesh Ambasta is co-founder of Samaj Pragati Sahayog, a grassroots voluntary organization working in the tribal drylands of Madhya Pradesh for the last 25 years. He leads the SPS Training and Support Programme. Pramathesh is the Convenor of the National Consortium of Civil Society Organisations on MGNREGA, a network of civil society organizations working across 12 states of India to make MGNREGA effective, and advocate for changes in the structure and implementation of MGNREGA. Previously he has worked at the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

Praveen Arimbrathodiyil

Praveen Arimbrathodiyil is a digital rights campaigner and Debian Developer (member of Debian project which makes Debian GNU/Linux operating system). He is the founding member of Indian Pirates, a collective for social justice. He has also initiated campaigns like Pirate Cycling and Diaspora Yatra. He is a part of the team that runs diaspora services at poddery.com and diasp.in.

P.V.S. Giridhar

P.V.S. Giridhar is the Senior Partner at P.V.S. Giridhar and Sai Associates. His areas of expertise include Constitutional and Administrative Law, Intellectual Property Law,

Commercial Law, Family Law and Private International Law. He has handled briefs in U.S., Malaysia, and Singapore in association with lawyers in these countries, and has been involved in International Arbitration. He is a trained Mediator and is on the panel of Mediators of the Madras High Court, having received accreditation from the Chief Justice of India.

Shemeer Babu

Shemeer Babu works with Azim Premji Philanthropic Initiatives. He was previously the Director of Programmes at Amnesty International India, where he headed the research, campaigns, media, advocacy, digital, mobilization, innovation and technology teams. He also founded M for Change, a non-profit whose primary focus was to bridge the gap between technology and social change.

Siddharthya Roy

Siddharthya Roy started his work life as a professional programmer but left formal employment in 2008 to pursue writing and politics. He now splits his time between activism and writing reportages and features. He has been involved with digital civil rights movements, free/open source initiatives and hacktivist collectives for over a decade, and has been working with groups that try to increase computer internet usage among tribals, farmworkers, urban poor, sexual minorities and other neglected sections of society. Among other things, he has contested local elections in Pune and was arrested for leading protests against Sec 66A of the IT Act.

Sonali Srivastava

Sonali Srivastava is a consultant in the area of governance, with specific focus on Gram panchayats. Previously, she has worked as a management consultant with Eicher Consultancy Services Ltd, and as an HR professional in Asian Paints (I) ltd. Sonali has also worked in the Barefoot College, Tilonia, Rajasthan, leading their efforts in income generation. She was a part of Arghyam since 2009, where she helped conceptualise the Gram Panchayat Organisation Development framework and later transitioned it to Avantika Foundation in 2013, where she set up and headed their Centre for Decentralised Local Governance.

Srihari Srinivasan

Srihari Srinivasan is currently the Head of Technology for ThoughtWorks India. He's been a developer and architect for several enterprise applications with a focus on building large scale systems based on service oriented architectures, domain specific languages etc.

Thejesh GN

Thejesh GN is an Independent Technologist, developer, traveler, blogger, open data and open internet enthusiast from Bengaluru, India. He is the co-founder and chairman of [DataMeet](#)Trust. DataMeet is a community of Data Science and Open Data enthusiasts in India. Presently along with technology consulting, he runs [OpenBangalore](#), [AskYourGovt](#) and other [personal projects](#).

Vanya Rakesh

Vanya Rakesh works as a Programme Officer at Centre for Internet and Society for the Big Data Project. Her work area includes research on the implications of 'big data' in the global south, with special focus on projects like Smart cities and Digital India, along with the legal regime governing data security and Privacy Policy.

Vijay Sai Pratap

Vijay Sai Pratap, prior to co-founding OnionDev, was heading the Life Impacting Services and Mobile Governance business unit at OnMobile Global Ltd. as Director-Business Development. He has over 13 years of valuable cross functional experience in the telecom and VAS industry.

Annexure – II
Agenda and Discussion Plan

What are people's rights in the digital world?
- Moving towards a digital social contract

Venue: The Senate Hall, Pai Viceroy Hotel, Bengaluru

4th December: 09:00 am – 05:30 pm

5th December: 09:30 am – 02:30 pm

4th December

Session Duration	Description
09:30 am – 11:00 am	Registration and assembling
09:30 am - 11:00 am	Traditional human rights actors present how rights consciousness and articulation developed in different areas. **Speakers:** Babu Mathew, Visiting Professor, National Law School of India University Kalyani Menon-Sen, Member, WSS Kshitij Urs, ActionAid India Cynthia Stephen, President, TEDS Trust & DAWNS **Chair and discussant:** Bishnu Mohapatra, Professor, Azim Premji University
11:00 am – 11:30 am	Tea break
11:30 am – 01:00 pm	'What is the digital doing to our world?' **Speakers:** Shemeer Babu, Azim Premji Philanthropic Initiatives Anita Gurumurthy, Executive Director, IT for Change Nisha Thompson, Data Rights Activist, DataMeet Siddharthya Roy, Independent Journalist **Chair and discussant:** P.V.S. Giridhar, Senior Partner, P.V.S. Giridhar & Sai Associates
01:00 pm - 02:00 pm	Lunch break
02:00 pm - 03:15 pm	Round table on 'What are our rights in the digital world?'
03:15 pm – 03:45 pm	Tea break
03:45 pm - 05:00 pm	Break-out group exercise on critical rights-issues and challenges in the digital age
05:00 pm – 05:30 pm	Groups report back

5th December

Session Duration	Description
09:30 am – 10:30 am	Presentation of synthesis of the previous day, including group report backs, and discussion
10:30 am – 11:15 am	Break-out group exercise on the basis of thematic areas discussed the previous day (access and connectivity, data and privacy, freedom of expression/association, Internet platforms and software-isation), to identify key concerns and strategise for a way forward
11:15 am – 11:30 am	Tea break
11:30 am – 12:30 pm	Groups report back, and discussion on bringing together the digital rights agenda
12:30 pm – 01:30 pm	Lunch break
01:30 pm – 02:30 pm	Exploring the way ahead for a possible rights framework for Internet governance and policies in India (also, movement building and advocacy)
2:30 pm	Tea break, end of workshop