

Q10. Which of the following methodology should be followed to regulate the wholesale tariff in the non –CAS areas and why?

i) Revenue Share.

Revenue Share should be opted

ii) Retail minus.

iii) Cost plus.

iv) Any other method approach you would like to suggest.

Q.11 If the revenue share model is used to regulate the wholesale tariff, what should be the prescribed share of each stakeholder? Please provide supporting data?

We propose 45:55 ratios between the Broadcaster & declared subscriber

Q.12 If the cost plus model is used to regulate the wholesale tariff, should it be genre wise or channel wise?

Channel wise

Q.13 Can forbearance be an option to regulate wholesale tariff? If yes, how to ensure that (i) broadcasters do not increase the price of popular channels arbitrarily and (ii) the consumers do not have to pay a higher price.

Yes

Q14. What is your view on the proposal that the broadcasters recover the content cost from the advertisement revenue and carriage cost from subscription revenue? If the broadcaster is to receive both, advertisement and subscription revenue, what according to you should be the ratio between the two? Please indicate this ratio at the genre levels?

Broadcasters are generating revenue from both the streams; Subscription & Advertisement, 65:35 ratios should be the ratio.

Q.15 What is your view on continuing with the existing system of tariff regulation based on freezing of a-la-carte and bouquet rates as on 1.12.2007; and the rate of new channels based on the similarity principle at wholesale level? You may also suggest modifications, if any, including the periodicity and basis of increase in tariff ceilings.

The existing arrangement should not be continue because every time BC asks for increase in subscriber base, hence A-la-carte is highly recommended.

Q.16 Which of the following methodologies should be followed to regulate the retail tariff in non-CAS areas and why?

- i) Cost Plus
- ii) Consultative approach
- iii) Affordability linked

Affordability linked approach is the best way

- iv) Any other method/approach you would like to suggest

Q.17 In case the affordability linked approach is to be used for retail tariff then should the tariff ceilings be prescribed (i) single at national level or (ii) different ceilings at State level or (iii) A tiered ceiling (3 tiers) as discussed in paragraph 5.3.23 or (iv) Any other.

Different ceilings at State level

Q.18 In case of retail tariff ceiling, should a ratio between pay and FTA channels or a minimum number of FTA/pay channels be prescribed? If so, what should be the ratio/number?

We propose 50:50 ratio

Q.19 Should the broadcasters be mandated to offer their channels on a-la-carte basis to MSOs/LCOs? If yes, should the existing system continue or should there be any modification to the existing condition associated with it?

Yes, with a maximum ceiling between Rs. 5-10/- depends upon the GRP rating.

Q20. How can it be ensured that the benefit of a-la-carte provisioning is passed on to the subscribers?

The benefit of a-la-carte provisioning should be passed on to the subscribers when addressability implemented.

Q21. Are the MSOs opting for a-la-carte after it was mandated for the broadcasters to offer their channels on a-la-carte basis by the 8th tariff amendment order dated 4.10.2007. If not, why?

BC wants more no. of subscribers as compare to earlier.

Q22. Should the carriage and placement fee be regulated? If yes, how should it be regulated?

No

Q23 Should the quantum of carriage and placement fee be linked to some parameters? If so, what are these parameters and how can they be linked?

If TAM market be made nation-wide, it could be linked with some parameters till then it is not possible because it is area specific.

Q24. Can a cap be placed on the quantum of carriage and placement fee? If so, how should the cap be fixed?

No, because it is linked to demand and supply.

Q25. Is there a need for a separate definition of commercial subscriber in the tariff order?

Yes – but it should be Category-wise & Class of City (Metro / Non-Metro / Urban) wise.

Q26. If the commercial subscriber is to be defined in the tariff order, then does the existing definition of “Commercial subscriber” need to be revised? If yes, then what should be the new definition for the commercial subscriber?

**Yes – Hotels / Hospitals / Restaurant / Railway Station / Airport / Bus Stand / Café / Cyber-café / Guest house / Rest house / all other than Residence.
Even the Rented House should be treated as Commercial Subscriber.**

Q27 In case the commercial subscriber is defined separately, then does the present categorization of identified commercial subscribers, who are not treated at par with the ordinary subscriber for tariff dispensation, need to be revised? If yes, how should it be revised?

Yes it should be revised

Q28. Should the cable television tariff for these identified commercial subscribers be regulated? If yes, then what is your suggestion for fixing the tariff?

Should be double the Residential subscriber for each TV connection.

Q29 Do you agree that complete digitalization with addressability (a box in every household) is the way forward?

Yes – Certainly.

Q30 What according to you would be an appropriate date for analog switch off? Please also give the key milestones with time lines.

Between 2012 to 2014, but should be phase-wise.

Q31 What is the order of investment required for achieving digitization with addressability, at various stakeholder levels (MSOs, LCOs, and Customers)?

Investment of Rs. 4,000/- per subscriber

Q32 Is there a need to prescribe the technology/standards for digitization, if so, what should be the standard and why?

BIS

Q33 What could be the possible incentives that can be offered to various stakeholders to implement digitization with addressability in the shortest possible time or make a sustainable transition?

- **Relaxation in Tax should be provided immediately**
- **Free ROW permission for laying underground fiber**
- **Cheaper finance to be made available**
- **Subsidized STBs**
- **Relaxation / Discount on Entry Tax**
- **Technology Import Duty Relaxation**

Q34 What is your view on the structure of license where MSOs are licensed and LCOs are franchises or agents of MSOs?

- **LCOs are already operating under the MSO license**
- **As far as Digitization is concern, New LCOs entry should become more easier**
- **Only existing & Nationwide MSO should be licensed, no New MSO License be given**

Q35 What would be the best disclosure scheme that can ensure transparency at all levels?

IPO of each nation-wise MSO & MIS.

Q36 Should there be a 'basic service' (group of channels) available to all subscribers? What should constitute the 'basic service' that is available to all subscribers?

One channel of each Category from FTA channels + DD + Regional Channel

Q37 Do you think there is a need for a communication programme to educate LCOs and customers on digitization and addressability to ensure effective participation? If so, what do you suggest?

Yes – but BCs should also take part in educating the Mass + Exhibition for Technology, STBs etc.

Q38. Stakeholders are free to raise any other issue that they feel is relevant to the consultation and give their comments thereon.