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**1. Short bio**

I currently serve as Executive Director of the Centre for Communication Governance at National Law University Delhi. I have ties with multiple global, regional and domestic organisations owing to my involvement in various facets of internet governance. For example, I am a Faculty Associate of the Berkman Centre for Internet & Society at Harvard University, on the Board of Directors of Digital Asia Hub and an Academic Expert with the Internet & Jurisdiction Observatory. I am also a Fellow of the Centre for Internet & Society, Bangalore and a member of the Government of India’s multi stakeholder advisory group for the India Internet Governance forum. I have been teaching and researching information policy since 2010. I was already working on questions relating to enhanced co-operation and multi-stakeholder governance by the time I started actively engaging with the global internet governance space in 2012, which is the year that I spoke at the Internet Governance Forum, and participated in the World Conference on International Telecommunications.  In the policy space, I have participated as a civil society representative at various Internet Governance fora.  These include the WICT 2012, the WSIS+10 Review negotiations and the UNESCO Connecting the Dots conference. I have been invited to speak on expert panels at the sidelines of the WSIS+10 High Level Meeting and the Connecting the Dots conference. As an Executive Director of CCG, I supervise a team of researchers dedicated to following global internet governance processes, and domestic internet processes. We engage equally with global institutions like ICANN (through the Non-Commercial Users Constituency) and with local institutions and processes like the Law Commission of India’s media law reforms and the Indian Net Neutrality consultations.

**2. My Motivation to be part of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation**

I have a keen interest in governance models as a result of my academic work. As an Indian woman who works in the internet governance space, I speak frequently with people who offer varied, even contentious, perspectives on the meaning of Enhanced Cooperation and multistakeholderism. It is very important to understand and engage with these different points of view, and to work out inclusive ideas and models around which consensus can be built. I can see the enormous impact that this group’s report might have and would like to do my part to help think through what ‘enhanced co-operation’ means and how our articulation of its meaning can reflect global public interest, and the concerns of my region especially those of marginalised vulnerable people.

The previous Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation did an excellent job of mapping all the internet governance institutions and identifying areas within internet governance that need closer attention. This is a good time (especially given the outcome of the WSIS+10 review) to take this work forward and work towards shared understanding of the meaning of this contested, yet crucial concept.

1. **3. Substantive proposals or a vision on “how to further implement enhanced cooperation as envisioned in the Tunis Agenda”**

I believe that there is more space for mutual understanding and consensus than most people realise. It is important to use the previous working group’s extensive research on different internet governance institutions, along with the work of scholars who have been writing about multi-stakeholder models around the world, to highlight the nuance within the enhanced co-operation debate. This will help stakeholders focus on the specific areas and details that are of particular concern to them.  I see the criticisms of multi-stakeholder models as valuable learning opportunities to work out ways in which internet governance can be made as inclusive, transparent and accountable as possible. Engaging with the WSIS+10 Review has shown us that despite the emerging consensus on multistakeholder models of governance, there can be significant barriers to civil society participation. To this end, establishing clear terms of civil society engagement in the various IG and IG related institutions will help facilitate the “full participation of all stakeholders” as per the Tunis Agenda (para 31).

**My experience or qualifications to represent civil society on the WG.**

I have previously represented civil society at many international institutions. Chief among these was WICT, 2012, IGF (2012, 2013 and 2015), WSIS+10 Review meetings and the WSIS forum. As an academic participating under the civil society umbrella, my expertise has been called upon at many of these fora. I was a panellist at the UNESCO Connecting the Dots Conference and at a UNESCO-organised side event at the WSIS High Level Meeting. I have collaborated with research centres at Harvard University and Oxford University, and am my organisation’s representative at several international networks including the Global Network of Internet and Society Centres, the Global Network Initiative and the Digital Asia hub. I do therefore have experience of translating priorities from the Asia Pacific region to a global level.

I have also been a part of multi-stakeholder governance domestically, as a member of the Indian MAG, as a consultant to the Law Commission and as a participant in open consultations held by the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India and the Department of Telecommunication. Our research agenda at the centre focuses on constructive ways to support inclusive, multi-stakeholder governance – my colleagues and I host public briefings and discussions before every major global internet governance event and circulate material to help other stakeholders engage more effectively.

Samples of my comments on internet governance are available [here](http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed/on-multistakeholder-governance-of-the-internet/article7440857.ece) and [here](http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/the-trouble-with-hurried-solutions/article4200604.ece). I do want to emphasise that as a researcher, I always approach these questions with an open mind and find that my position evolves as I read and discuss these issues with others.