



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed Edition :

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume 2 Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

IJLRA

EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITORS



Megha Middha

Megha Middha, Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar

Megha Middha, is working as an Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar (Rajasthan). She has an experience in the teaching of almost 3 years. She has completed her graduation in BBA LL.B (H) from Amity University, Rajasthan (Gold Medalist) and did her post-graduation (LL.M in Business Laws) from NLSIU, Bengaluru. Currently, she is enrolled in a Ph.D. course in the Department of Law at Mohanlal Sukhadia University, Udaipur (Rajasthan). She wishes to excel in academics and research and contribute as much as she can to society. Through her interactions with the students, she tries to inculcate a sense of deep thinking power in her students and enlighten and guide them to the fact how they can bring a change to the society

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain



Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi.(2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr. Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8 Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1 Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC - NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR - Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

"TRANSFORMING ANTITRUST IN THE DIGITAL AGE: TOWARDS A FRESH REGULATORY APPROACH"

AUTHORED BY - MISBAH KHAN
Amity Law School, Amity University, Noida

INTRODUCTION

Competition forms the bedrock of a thriving market economy. Antitrust laws, meticulously crafted by legal scholars and economists, act as the guardians of fair competition. These regulations, aim to prevent the formation of monopolies and curb anti-competitive practices that stifle innovation. By ensuring a level playing field, antitrust laws empower consumers through lower prices, a wider variety of choices, and the constant drive for innovation fueled by competitive pressures. A thriving market economy relies heavily on the foundation of vigorous competition. Antitrust laws, meticulously designed to uphold this fundamental principle, serve as guardians against the emergence of monopolies and the proliferation of anti-competitive behaviors that can impede innovation.¹ These regulations are crafted with precision to maintain a fair and open marketplace, thereby empowering consumers with lower prices, diverse options, and the continuous advancement fostered by competitive dynamics. At the heart of these laws lies the commitment to ensuring a level playing field where businesses compete based on the merits of their offerings rather than through manipulative tactics or unfair advantages. This environment not only cultivates economic growth but also enhances societal well-being by nurturing an ecosystem where innovation flourishes, benefiting both businesses and consumers alike.

However, the digital age has presented a unique conundrum for antitrust enforcement. The rise of complex online networks known as digital ecosystems has blurred traditional market boundaries. Companies within these ecosystems leverage their dominance in one area to unfairly disadvantage competitors in others for instance, if a dominant e-commerce platform prioritizes its own delivery services while hindering access for competing delivery companies then the platform's dominance in online shopping spills over, stifling competition in the logistics sector.

¹ OECD, OECD Handbook on Competition in Digital Age, (2022)

Traditional antitrust frameworks, which were primarily designed to address more tangible forms of market dominance, now face the challenge of grappling with the intricacies of digital ecosystems. The interconnected nature of these platforms poses unique challenges for regulators seeking to preserve competition and prevent anti-competitive behavior.²

The rapidly evolving digital landscape demands a thorough reassessment of existing antitrust frameworks. In India, a country witnessing exponential growth in its digital economy, this imperative for change is particularly pronounced. The prevailing legal framework, which was primarily crafted with traditional markets in mind, finds itself ill-equipped to effectively regulate the complex interactions within digital ecosystems. As such, India stands at a crucial juncture, necessitating the formulation of a new regulatory paradigm that not only encourages innovation and fosters healthy competition but also prioritizes the protection of consumer welfare.

THE LANDSCAPE OF DIGITAL ECOSYSTEMS IN INDIA

India's digital ecosystem thrives on a vibrant tapestry of players. E-commerce giants like Flipkart, and Amazon India, dominate the online shopping landscape, raising concerns about potential mergers and acquisitions stifling competition.³ While social media titans like Facebook (Meta), WhatsApp, and Twitter hold immense sway. Ride-hailing services such as Ola and Uber have revolutionized transportation, but face scrutiny for potential price manipulation.⁴

These platforms have experienced phenomenal growth, with some achieving dominance in their respective spheres. This dominance raises concerns about fair competition. It is argued that these platforms can leverage their position in one area to unfairly disadvantage competitors in others, potentially violating the Competition Act, 2002.⁵

The impact of these ecosystems on traditional competition and consumer welfare is a double-edged sword. While these platforms foster innovation and convenience, their dominance can lead to reduced consumer choice due to limited competition and potentially higher prices. Predatory pricing practices, where dominant platforms drive competitors out of the market by offering

² Ezrachi, A. and Stucke, M. 2016. *Virtual Competition: The Promise and Perils of the Algorithm-Driven Economy*. (Harvard University Press, London, 2016).

³ Competition Commission of India, "Market Study on E-Commerce In India- Key Findings and Observations" (2020).

⁴ Chandola Basu, "Supreme Court of India Upholds Investigation Against Uber" Kluwer Competition Law Blog (2019).

⁵ Competition Act 2002 (Act 12 of 2003), s. 4

unsustainable low prices, are a growing concern. Additionally, the vast amount of data collected by these platforms raises significant privacy concerns, necessitating robust legal frameworks to protect consumer data.

The legal system needs to adapt to this evolving landscape. The Competition Commission of India (CCI) has taken some steps, such as issuing guidelines on e-commerce platforms and investigating potential anti-competitive practices. However, ongoing legal debates highlight the need for a comprehensive framework that balances innovation within digital ecosystems with fair competition and consumer welfare.

LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT FRAMEWORK IN INDIA'S DIGITAL AGE

India's antitrust landscape is governed by the Competition Act, 2002, a framework designed for a pre-digital era. This section will analyze how this framework struggles to address the unique challenges posed by digital platforms, using legal arguments and case studies.

India's digital revolution has outpaced its legal framework for regulating competition. The Competition Act, 2002, serves as the cornerstone of antitrust enforcement, prohibiting anti-competitive agreements, abuse of dominant positions, and mergers that could harm competition.⁶ The Competition Commission of India (CCI) enforces these provisions, investigating potential violations and imposing corrective measures. However, the Act's design, built for a pre-digital era, struggles to address the unique features of digital platforms.

A critical limitation lies in the Act's definition of relevant markets. Traditionally, markets are defined based on product substitutability. This concept falls short in the digital world, where platforms often operate across interrelated areas. For instance, a dominant social media platform might leverage user data to stifle competition in online advertising, even though the products seem distinct. This interconnectedness challenges the effectiveness of the Act's market definition, potentially allowing established players to exploit loopholes and maintain dominance across seemingly separate sectors.

Further limitations arise from the Act's focus on ex-post enforcement. It primarily addresses anti-

⁶ Competition Act 2002 (Act 12 of 2003), s. 3,4,5

competitive conduct after it occurs.⁷ However, digital platforms often achieve dominance through their inherent structure and network effects. Network effects occur when a platform's value increases as more users join, creating a self-reinforcing cycle that makes it difficult for new entrants to compete. The Act's focus on conduct fails to adequately address these structural features and their potential for stifling competition at its nascent stages.

Established companies have capitalized on these limitations in various ways. Predatory acquisitions, where a dominant player buys out a potential future competitor, pose a significant threat. The Act's merger control provisions might not effectively address such concerns. The threshold for triggering scrutiny might be too high for early-stage acquisitions, allowing established companies to eliminate potential rivals before they can gain a foothold.

Another tactic involves self-preferencing, where a dominant platform prioritizes its own services or products within its ecosystem. However, proving such practices can be challenging due to the complex algorithms driving platform behavior. The case of All India Online Sellers Association vs. Flipkart exemplifies this challenge⁸. The opaque nature of platform algorithms makes it difficult to establish intentional manipulation, allowing established companies to potentially exploit this grey area.

These limitations highlight the urgent need for a revamped legal framework that can effectively regulate digital platforms in India. By addressing the shortcomings discussed above, India can create a more robust and competitive digital ecosystem that fosters innovation, protects consumers, and ensures fair play for all participants.

RESHAPING THE DIGITAL LANDSCAPE: NEW PARADIGMS FOR REGULATING INDIA'S PLATFORMS

The limitations of the existing Competition Act in India necessitate a paradigm shift towards regulating digital ecosystems. Learning from international developments and exploring new approaches can foster a more balanced digital economy.

⁷ Government of India, "Report of the Committee on Digital Competition Law" (Ministry of Corporate Affairs, 2024).

⁸ All India Online Vendors Association v. Flipkart India Private Limited, Case 20 of 2018.

International Precedents

Globally, various jurisdictions are grappling with regulating digital platforms.

- **EU Digital Markets Act (DMA):** The DMA from the European Union aims to create fair competition in the digital market. This is done by focusing on major online platforms that have considerable market dominance, identified as "gatekeepers" based on factors such as their economic, intermediation or if it has is about to have an entrenched and durable position in the market.⁹ The gatekeepers are confronted with new regulations, which require them to guarantee fair and equal entry to app stores, enable users to delete pre-installed apps, and encourage compatibility between messaging services offered by various providers. Moreover, the DMA also bans self-preferencing, which occurs when a gatekeeper gives preference to its own services instead of those of its competitors.¹⁰ This all-encompassing strategy seeks to promote a more competitive digital environment, spur innovation, and empower users to have more options and control over their digital usage.

India, possessing a quickly expanding digital market, has the opportunity to gain valuable insights from the DMA. Similar regulations in India could target the issue of potential domination by large tech companies, leading to a more equitable and competitive atmosphere. First and foremost, it is crucial to establish a regulatory framework that promotes competition. By observing the DMA's labeling of "gatekeepers," India can recognize key digital platforms through their popularity among users, market presence, and control over data. These platforms may be regulated to encourage fair competition and open access. This might involve guaranteeing compatibility among various service providers, such as messaging apps, enabling users to select their preferred app store, and banning gatekeepers from promoting their own products.

In addition, India can focus on empowering users and protecting data. The focus on user choice in app selection and data control by the DMA strikes a chord with India's expanding digital user population. It is essential to have strong regulations for protecting data. India's current initiatives regarding the Data Protection Bill are a good start, but it is crucial to prioritize user control when it comes to data collection, usage, and portability.

Additionally, it is essential to guarantee transparency in algorithmic decision-making on

⁹ "The Digital Markets Act: Ensuring Fair and Open Digital Markets" European Commission (2022).

¹⁰ Guillaume Duquesne, Thibaut De Bernard, et.al., "What Constitutes Self-Preferencing and its Proliferation in Digital Markets" Global Competition Review (2023).

digital platforms in order to combat possible biases and enhance user confidence.

Another important aspect for a successful digital market is promoting innovation. The emphasis on interoperability by the DMA could serve as a model for Indian policies that promote open standards and APIs. This enables smaller enterprises to connect with bigger platforms, nurturing a diverse and innovative environment. Furthermore, enhancing innovation and advancement in fields such as artificial intelligence and cybersecurity can strengthen India's capabilities in the digital realm.

- **Germany's Act Against Restraint of Competition (ARC):** ARC (German Competition Act, GWB)¹¹ has been evolving to address anti-competitive practices in digital markets. The ARC prohibits abuse of dominance and considers a company's relative market power. Recent amendments, the 9th (2017)¹² and 10th (2021)¹³, introduced new rules specific to digital markets. These amendments take into account factors like a company's access to data and how network effects influence competition. A key change is the introduction of an "ex-ante" framework under the 10th Amendment. This framework specifically targets large digital companies designated as "undertakings of paramount significance for competition across markets (PSCAM)". PSCAM companies face stricter rules, including a prohibition on self-preferencing and hindering competitors, as well as requirements for interoperability, data portability, and fair terms.¹⁴ The most recent amendment, the 11th Amendment which came into effect on November 7, 2023, further strengthens enforcement. It allows authorities to address competition issues even in the absence of legal violations by a company, and empowers them to seize profits gained through infringements. This amendment also expands the reach of the Digital Markets Act (DMA) in Germany by allowing the Federal Cartel Office (FCO) to investigate and enforce DMA violations.¹⁵

India can glean valuable insights from Germany's evolving Act Against Restraint of Competition (ARC) to tackle anti-competitive practices in its own digital market. Germany's approach focuses on both preventing and punishing harmful behaviors. The

¹¹ ARC 2013, Germany *available at*: https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/englisch_gwb/englisch_gwb.html#p0026 (Last Modified 25 October 2023)

¹² Supra Note 5 at 72

¹³ Supra Note 5 at 73

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Supra Note 5 at 75

"ex-ante" framework, introduced in the 10th Amendment, proactively identifies dominant digital players and imposes stricter rules like fair access to data and interoperability. This can be a model for India to regulate large platforms without stifling innovation entirely. Additionally, the 11th Amendment empowers authorities to address competition concerns even without a legal violation and seize ill-gotten gains.¹⁶ This focus on strong enforcement can deter anti-competitive practices in India's digital market. By incorporating these elements from Germany's ARC, India can craft a competition act that fosters a fair and competitive digital landscape.

- **USA:** The US enforces antitrust laws in digital markets through the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and FTCA. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the Antitrust Division of the US Department of Justice (DOJ) enforce these laws and have been investigating anti-competitive practices by large tech companies like Google, Meta, and Amazon.¹⁷

To address these concerns, new bills have been proposed. The American Innovation and Choice Online Act (AICO) of 2023 prohibits discriminatory practices by large platforms and restricts their data use. The Ending Platform Monopolies Act (EPM) of 2023 limits a platform's ability to own businesses competing on its platform. The Open App Markets Act (OAMA) of 2023 regulates app stores by preventing them from forcing app developers to use their own payment systems.¹⁸

India can learn a multitude of strategies from the US approach to address anti-competitive practices in digital markets. Firstly, the US actively investigates and proposes new legislation to tackle emerging issues. India can emulate this by establishing a proactive investigative body and consider similar legislative measures. The proposed US bills offer a rich source of inspiration. Bills like the AICO and OAMA provide a blueprint for regulating dominant platforms by prohibiting discriminatory practices and preventing app store monopolies.¹⁹ Additionally, the US focus on strengthening merger review processes (e.g., Competition and Antitrust Law Enforcement Reform Bill)²⁰ can be instrumental in preventing large players from acquiring and stifling potential competitors in India's developing digital market. Finally, the US emphasis on enforcement through executive

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Supra Note 5 at 76

¹⁸ Supra Note 5 at 77-78

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Supra Note 5 at 80

orders and empowering authorities is a valuable lesson.²¹ By incorporating these elements, India can craft a robust legal framework that fosters a competitive digital landscape where innovation can thrive.

NAVIGATING THE TIGHTROPE: BALANCING INNOVATION AND CONTROL

One approach to handle this is the concept of "ex-ante" regulation. This proactive strategy identifies companies with significant market power in advance, allowing authorities to set clear rules of the game before harmful practices take root. Germany's 10th Amendment to the Act Against Restraint of Competition (ARC) exemplifies this. It establishes a framework for designating "paramount companies" and imposing specific obligations on them. These obligations might include prohibitions on self-preferencing, ensuring fair access to data for competitors, and maintaining interoperability between platforms.

However, a purely rule-based approach might stifle innovation. Exempting smaller players from certain regulations, as seen in Germany's framework, can be a way to strike a balance. Similarly, competition acts can be designed to consider factors beyond market share, such as a company's access to data and its potential to influence the development of entire ecosystems. This ensures regulations adapt to the unique characteristics of digital markets.

Another crucial aspect is addressing mergers and acquisitions. Large digital players often acquire nascent competitors to eliminate future threats. The US, for example, is proposing stricter merger review standards to prevent such dominance-enhancing acquisitions. India, or any country crafting a competition act, can learn from this by incorporating stricter merger review processes to ensure a healthy competitive landscape.

Finally, effective enforcement is paramount. The ability to investigate and penalize anti-competitive behavior, as seen in the US and EU's empowerments to seize profits from infringements, sends a strong deterrent message. Competition authorities also need to be well-equipped to handle the complexities of digital investigations, requiring a focus on building expertise in areas like data analysis and algorithmic bias.

²¹ Ibid.

THE ROLE OF THE COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA (CCI)

The Competition Commission of India (CCI) plays a pivotal role in enforcing antitrust laws and fostering healthy competition in the Indian market. Established under the Competition Act, 2002, the CCI investigates anti-competitive agreements, abuse of dominance by large players, and mergers and acquisitions that could harm competition.²²

However, the current framework presents challenges for the CCI in regulating digital platforms. The Act's focus on traditional market structures and "ex-post" enforcement (addressing violations after they occur) may not be sufficient to address the dynamic nature of digital ecosystems. The complexity of network effects, data dominance, and opaque algorithms pose significant hurdles for the CCI.

To strengthen the CCI for effective regulation in the digital age the CCI can be equipped with a dedicated team of experts in digital technologies, economics, and data analysis to effectively scrutinize platform behavior.²³

ANTICIPATING HURDLES IN IMPLEMENTING DIGITAL COMPETITION LAW

Implementing the Digital Competition Law (DCL) in India could pose several challenges. Firstly, the law might inadvertently stifle the very growth it aims to regulate. By placing stricter regulations on designated "gatekeepers," the act could discourage investment and innovation in the digital sector. This could be particularly harmful to India's vibrant startup scene, where young companies rely on attracting investment to scale up.²⁴

Additionally, the enforcement process itself might be counterproductive as India's court system already struggles with lengthy delays. DCL could exacerbate this problem, leading to "sledgehammer antitrust" tactics where overly broad regulations are used due to the difficulty of enforcing more nuanced rules. Furthermore, the law might create an unfair playing field. Large companies designated as gatekeepers would face stricter scrutiny compared to smaller

²² Competition Act 2002 (Act 12 of 2003), s. 18

²³ Supra Note 5 at 18

²⁴ Nisha Kaur Oberoi, "Don't fix it if it's not broken", Financial Express, 11 March 2024

competitors. This could stifle competition and potentially penalize efficient Indian companies that have achieved economies of scale through legitimate means.

Finally, the effectiveness of a Digital Markets Act-style law is entirely untested. There's no guarantee it would achieve its intended goals, and it might not be suitable for India's specific economic situation. Overall, the potential drawbacks of the Digital Competition Law in India raise concerns that it could hinder innovation, create an uneven playing field, and lead to drawn-out legal battles that ultimately harm all stakeholders.

CONCLUSION

India's digital landscape is flourishing, driven by a dynamic interplay between established players and aspiring startups. However, the current legal framework, designed for a bygone era, struggles to keep pace with the complexities of digital ecosystems. The limitations of the Competition Act, 2002, necessitate a paradigm shift towards a robust Digital Competition Law (DCL) that fosters fair competition, protects consumers, and encourages innovation.

Learning from international precedents offers valuable insights. The European Union's Digital Markets Act (DMA) provides a blueprint for identifying dominant platforms ("gatekeepers") and imposing regulations that promote interoperability, user choice, and fair access to data. Germany's evolving Act Against Restraint of Competition (ARC) demonstrates the effectiveness of an "ex-ante" framework in proactively addressing anti-competitive practices. The United States' proactive approach to investigations and proposed legislations offer further guidance.

A well-crafted Digital Competition Law must prioritize balancing innovation and control, addressing mergers and acquisitions, and most importantly ensuring effective enforcement of law so that it does not hinder the growing of digital businesses in India.

While implementing the Digital Competition Law the authorities must take into consideration the challenges that this act may bring with itself and ensure that they make a law that fulfills the needs of the growing economy of India and ensures a level playing field for all the players in the market. To ensure that we overcome these challenges a collaborative approach can be adopted by actively engaging with stakeholders – industry leaders, startups, regulatory bodies, and civil society, India can craft a law that fosters a vibrant digital ecosystem. This ecosystem will be

characterized by fair competition, empowered users, and a thriving culture of innovation, propelling India's digital economy to even greater heights. The Digital Competition Law should not be viewed as a restrictive measure, but rather as an instrument to cultivate a responsible and sustainable digital future for India.

