

Comments on TRAI Consultation Paper dt.14.06.2016
on Voice Mail/Audiotex/UMS licence

BY

P.S.Narula ITS(Retd.)

Mob: 9810509988

1.General Principles on which the comments herein under are based:

a) The present arrangement of treating Voice Mail/Audiotex/UMS and Audio conferencing as licensed services is aberration of the National Telecom Policy (NTP). NTP provides that the IT enabled Services (called OSP Sector), which use Telecom Resources provided by Authorised Telecom Service Providers needs no licence. These services are also IT enabled service and use the network of the licensed operators falls in the OSP sector and hence should have not need a license. It was an error in the implementation of the NTP 99 that these continued as licensed services.)These need to be regulated on same lines as OSP and thus may be registered as OSPs

b) VM, Audiotex, including audio conferencing, and UMS depend on services that are already licenced and therefore cannot be provided in isolation---. There can not be a licence for services which are using licensed and well regulated services as their input. There is no need for separate licences and/or fees/revenue considerations for these services.

c), Treating Services such as VM/Audiotex content/UMS non real time services. Treating Audio conferencing, which is a real-time service in the category of audio conferencing, , is not justifiable

d) Conferencing services are national, even global--Limiting to SDCA-based licencing/regulations serve very limited service. In fact licensing these services to SDCA is the main reason why these services have not picked up to their optimum use. and have denied the advantage of their use in ease of doing business particularly the SMEs and social network. in consumption of time and cost of travel. since these sectors can not financially afford to have their own inter/intra corporate conferencing networks.

e) From the viewpoint of regulating conference services with respect to compliance with telecom regulations since these services use telecom networks that already comply with regulations, there is no additional regulation needed. Bypassing licensed services can be monitored by licensed operators whose services are being bypassed or the service provider whose incoming/terminating traffic network is used by/ from an unlicensed network. DOT monitoring can continue by keeping these services as registered services. I will go to the extent that bypassing of licensed networks can be considered to be treated as a theft of their licensed operators' revenue and termed as a criminal offence.

2. Question wise answers are submitted hereunder

Q1. In view of the discussion in Para 2.13, is it necessary to have a separate standalone licence for Voice Mail Service? If so, why? Please provide detailed justification?

A1 There is no need to licence voice mail services. As clearly pointed out in Para 2.13 of the consultation paper, such services are already available on modern CPEs(customer premises equipments) and are being extensively used all over the world without any license. .

Q2. If the answer to the Q1 is in the affirmative, whether the existing technical specifications need to be revised or redefined? What should be the revised technical specifications?

A2 <N/A>

Q3. In view of Para 2.17 and present technological developments, is it necessary to have a separate standalone licence for only Audiotex Service? If so, why? Please provide detailed justification?

A3 There is no need to licence Audiotex services. These are provided over licensed, and regulated, telecom services. This will also be In line with the policy of keeping Content services out of licence regime, as explained in Para 2.4. of the consultation paper

Q4. If the answer to the Q3 is in the affirmative, whether the existing technical specifications need to be revised or redefined? What should be the revised technical specifications?

A4 <N/A>

Q5. *Whether there is a need for standalone licence for providing Audio Conferencing Service? If yes, whether the technical specifications need to be explicitly defined? Please provide detailed justification?*

A5 There is no need to licence Audio Conferencing services. The service is provided over licensed, and regulated, telecom services. There can not be a license for services using services of licensed operators. Bypassing licensed services can be monitored by licensed operators whose services are being bypassed. or the service provider whose network is used for incoming traffic from an unlicensed network. Bypassing of licensed networks can be considered to be treated as a theft of the telecom service provider's revenue and termed as a criminal act.

Q6. *If the answer to the Q5 is in the affirmative, what should be the technical specifications for providing Audio Conferencing Service?*

A6. No tech specs are needed, this rides on existing telecom services--specs governing regular telecom services would cover ACS adequately

Q7. *Is it necessary to have a separate licence for Unified Messaging Service when holding an ISP licence is mandatory to provide the Unified Messaging Service and standalone ISP licensee is also allowed to provide Unified Messaging Service? If so, why? Please provide detailed justification?*

A7 Comments against Q 5 apply here also

Q8. *If the answer to the Q7 is in the affirmative, whether the existing technical specifications need to be revised or redefined? What should be the revised technical specifications?*

A8 <No need to respond>

Q9. *In case Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Service requires a licence should they be made a part of the Unified Licence as one of the services requiring authorisation? Please provide detailed justification?*

A9 Voice Mail/Audiotex/UMS services need not be licenced, and service authorisation on UL may be provided for clarity.

Q10. *If the answer to the Q9 is in the affirmative, what should be Service Area? Whether Service Area may be similar to the Service Area of ISP (National Area, Telecom Circle/Metro Area, Secondary Switching Area) to bring in uniformity among the Service Areas of different services? Please provide detailed justification?*

A10<N/A>

Q11. *If Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services is made a part of the Unified Licence as one of the services requiring authorisation, then what should be the Entry Fee?*

A11 Service authorisation on UL is not needed and entry-fee is not applicable

Q12. *Whether there should be any requirement for Minimum Net worth and Minimum Equity for Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorisation under Unified Licence?*

A12 <N/A>

Q13. *The annual licence fee for all the services under UL as well as for existing UASL/CMTS/Basic Service/NLD/ILD/ISP licensees have been uniformly fixed at 8% of AGR since 1st April 2013. Whether it should be made same for Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorisation under Unified Licence? If not, why?*

A13 VM/AT/UMS services are supplementary, content-delivery services, and these should be excluded from AGR calculations. Their inclusion would lead to double-charges, as the underlying telecom services are already considered for AGR calculations.

Q14. *In case the answer to the Q13 is in the affirmative then what should be the definition of AGR for Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorisation under Unified Licence?*

A14 <N/A>

Q15. *What should be Performance Bank Guarantee, Financial Bank Guarantee and Application Processing Fee for Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorisation under Unified Licence?*

A15 There is no need for additional PBG/FBG/Processing fee, as UL holders have already provided adequate guarantees and fees

Q16. *Whether the duration of the licence with Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorisation be made 20 years as in the other licence authorisations under Unified Licence? If not, why?*

A16 Since no authorisation is needed, UL holders can provide services as long as their licence is valid.

Q17. *What should be the terms and conditions for the migration of the existing Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services licensees to Unified Licence?*

A17 Since no licence is needed for VM/AT/UMS, no migration to UL is required.

Q18. *Whether the existing Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services licensees may be allowed to continue or it would be mandatory to migrate to the Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorisation under Unified Licence?*

A8 Existing VM/AT/UMS licence may be allowed to continue since no licence is required .

Q19. *What should be the annual licence fee for existing Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services licensees who do not migrate to the Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorisation under Unified Licence?*

A19 No licence required, thus no licence fees are chargeable.

Q20. *Please give your comments on any related matter, not covered above.*

A20 Points covered under para 1 :General principles
