

Fwd: Re: Consultation paper on 'Audit related provisions of Telecommunication (Broadcasting and Cable) Services Interconnection (Addressable Systems) Regulations, 2017 and the Telecommunication (Broadcasting and Cable) Services Digital Addressable Systems Audit Manual

RK rajesh kumar <rk.vatsa73@traf.gov.in>
Mon, 09 Sep 2024 10:15:58 AM +0530

To "Sapna Sharma" <jtadv-bcs@traf.gov.in>, "Arvind Kumar" <interconnect-bcs@traf.gov.in>

Reply... "advbcs-2" <advbcs-2@traf.gov.in>

Rajesh Kumar Vatsa,
PPS to Advisor (B&CS)
TRAI

==== Forwarded message =====

From: <ankurgoyal@spchopra.in>
To: "Deepak Sharma" <advbcs-2@traf.gov.in>
Cc: "Sapna Sharma" <jtadv-bcs@traf.gov.in>
Date: Mon, 09 Sep 2024 06:29:23 +0530
Subject: Re: Consultation paper on 'Audit related provisions of Telecommunication (Broadcasting and Cable) Services Interconnection (Addressable Systems) Regulations, 2017 and the Telecommunication (Broadcasting and Cable) Services Digital Addressable Systems Audit Manual

==== Forwarded message =====

Dear Sh. Deepak Sharma Ji,

Pls. find attached herewith the written comments to the consultation paper issued by Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI) on 'Audit related provisions of Telecommunication (Broadcasting and Cable) Services Interconnection (Addressable Systems) Regulations, 2017 and the Telecommunication (Broadcasting and Cable) Services Digital Addressable Systems Audit Manual' for your kind consideration.

On Wed, Aug 21, 2024 at 3:00 PM Sapna Sharma <jtadv-bcs@traf.gov.in> wrote:

--
Warm regards,

Ankur Goyal | Partner

S. P. CHOPRA & Co.
Assurance | Tax | Advisory

F-31 Connaught Place
New Delhi - 110001

Mobile +91 9810664230 | Office +91 11 23313495/ 96 | Fax +91 11 23713516

Questions in the Consultation Paper & their answers		
Q. No.	Questions	Answers
1	<p>Q1. Should provision of Regulation 15(1) be retained or should it be removed in the Interconnection Regulation 2017?</p> <p>i). In case you are of the opinion that provisions of Regulation 15(1) should be retained then</p> <p>a). b. Should it continue in its present form or do they need any modifications?</p> <p>b). In case you are of the opinion that modifications are required in Regulation 15(1) of the Interconnection Regulation 2017, then please suggest amended regulations along with detailed justification for the same.</p> <p>ii). In case it is decided that provisions of Regulation 15(1) should be removed then what mechanism should be adopted to ensure that the monthly subscription reports made available by the distributors to the broadcasters are complete, true and correct?</p>	<p>Regulation 15(1) of Interconnection Regulation 2017 should be retained in present form.</p>
2	<p>Q2. Should small DPOs be exempted from causing audit of their systems every calendar year, under Regulation 15(1) of Interconnection Regulation?</p> <p>A. If yes, then,</p> <p>1. Should 'subscriber base' of DPO be adopted as a criterion for defining small DPOs for this purpose?</p> <p>i. If yes,</p> <p>a) what limit of the subscriber base should be adopted to define small DPOs for the purpose of exempting them from causing audit of their systems under Regulation 15(1)?</p> <p>b) on which date of the year should the DPOs' subscriber base be taken into consideration for categorising whether or not the DPO falls in exempted category?</p> <p>c) In case any distributor is offering services through more than one distribution platforms e.g. distribution network of MSO, IPTV, etc. then should the combined subscriber base of such distributor be taken into consideration for categorising whether or not the distributor falls in exempted category?</p> <p>ii. If 'subscriber base' criterion is not to be adopted, then what criteria should be selected for defining small DPOs?</p> <p>2. In case it is decided that small DPOs may be exempted from causing audit of their systems under Regulation 15(1), then should broadcasters be explicitly permitted to cause subscription audit and/or compliance audit of systems of such DPOs, to verify that the monthly subscription reports made available by the distributor to them are complete, true and correct?</p> <p>i. If yes, what should be the mechanism to reduce burden on small DPOs that may result due to multiple audits by various broadcasters?</p> <p>ii. If no, what should be the mechanism to verify that the monthly subscription reports made available by the small DPOs to the broadcasters are complete, true and correct?</p> <p>B. If you are of the view that the small DPOs should not be exempted from the mandatory audit, then</p> <p>i. how should the compliance burden of small DPOs be reduced?</p> <p>ii. should the frequency of causing mandatory audit by such small DPOs be decreased from once in every calendar year to say once in every three calendar years?</p> <p>iii. alternatively, should small DPOs be permitted to do self-audit under Regulation 15(1), instead of audit by DECIL or any TRAI appointed auditor?</p>	<p>Each and every DPOs (including small DPOs) shall be subjected to audit every year under Regulation 15(1) of Interconnection Regulation, 2017.</p>
3	<p>Q3. As per the existing Interconnection Regulation, all the distributors of television channels have been mandated to cause audit of their system once in a calendar year. Should the existing provision of "calendar year" be continued or "financial year" may be specified in place of calendar year? Please justify your answer with proper reasoning.</p>	<p>The current practice of calendar year should be continued. Further, the differentiation based on 'Calendar year' or 'Financial year' does not make any difference.</p>
4	<p>Q4. As per the existing Interconnection Regulation, the annual audit caused by DPO under regulation 15 (1), shall be scheduled in such a manner that there is a gap of at-least six months between the audits of two consecutive calendar years and there should not be a gap of more than 18 months between audits of two consecutive calendar years. Instead of above, should the following schedule be prescribed for annual audit?</p> <p>i) The DPOs may be mandated to complete annual audit of their systems by 30th September every year.</p> <p>ii) In cases, where a broadcaster is not satisfied with the audit report received under regulation 15(1), broadcaster may cause audit of the DPO under Regulation 15(2) and such audit shall be completed latest by 31st December.</p> <p>iii) In case DPO does not complete the mandatory annual audit of their systems by 30th September in a year, broadcaster may cause audit of the DPO under Regulation 15(2) from 1st October to 31st December year. This shall not absolve DPO from causing mandatory audit of that year by 30th September and render the non-complaint DPO liable for action by TRAI as per the provisions of Interconnection Regulation 2017? Justify your answer with proper reasoning.</p>	<p>The report for a calendar year should be stipulated for submission during next year, by categorizing the DPOs in four categories as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Less than 5,000 - by 31st March 2. 5,000 - 20,000 - by 30th June 3. 20,000 - 5,00,000 - by 30th September 4. Above 5,00,000 - by 31st December

5	<p>Q5. In case you do not agree with schedule mentioned in Q4, then you are requested to provide your views on the following issues for consultation:</p> <p>i. As per the existing Interconnection Regulation, the annual audit caused by DPO under regulation 15(1), shall be scheduled in such a manner that there is a gap of at-least six months between the audits of two consecutive calendar years and there should not be a gap of more than 18 months between audits of two consecutive calendar years. Does the above specified scheduling of audit need any modification? If yes, please specify the modifications proposed in scheduling of audit. Please justify your answer with proper reasoning.</p> <p>ii. For the audit report received by the broadcaster from the DPO (under regulation 15(1)), should the broadcasters be permitted to cause audit under regulation 15(2) within a fixed time period (say 3 months) from the date of receipt of that report for that calendar year, including spilling over of such period to the next year?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If yes, what should be the fixed time period within which a broadcaster can cause such audit. Please support your answer with proper justification and reasoning. • If no, then also please support your answer with proper justification and reasoning? <p>iii. In case a DPO does not cause audit of its systems in a calendar year as specified in Regulation 15(1) then should broadcasters be permitted to cause both subscription audit and/or compliance audit for that calendar year within a fixed period (say 3 months) after the end of that calendar year?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If yes, what should be the fixed time period (after the end of a calendar year) within which a broadcaster should be allowed to get the subscription audit and/or compliance audit conducted for that calendar year? Please support your answer with proper justification and reasoning. • If no, then also please support your answer with proper justification and reasoning? 	<p>The report for a calendar year should be stipulated for submission during next year, by categorizing the DPOs in four categories as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Less than 5,000 - by 31st March 2. 5,000 - 20,000 - by 30th June 3. 20,000 - 5,00,000 - by 30th September 4. Above 5,00,000 - by 31st December
6	<p>Q6. What measures may be adopted to ensure time bound completion of audits by the DPOs? Justify your answer with proper reasoning.</p>	<p>The penalty of late submission of audit report after the due date should be levied to ensure strict compliance.</p>
7	<p>Q7. Stakeholders are requested to offer their feedback on the amendments proposed in the Audit manual in this consultation paper (CP) in the format as given in Table 2.</p>	<p>Please refer sheet ' New Amendments' and ' Amendments Sheet' for clause wise feedback.</p>
8	<p>Q8. Please provide your comments/any other suggested amendment with reasons thereof in the Audit Manual that the stakeholder considers necessary (other than those proposed in this consultation paper). The stakeholders must provide their comments in the format specified in Table 3 explicitly indicating the existing clause number, suggested amendment and the reason/full justification for the amendment in Audit Manual.</p>	<p>No Suggestion</p>
9	<p>Q9. In light of the infrastructure sharing guidelines issued by MIB, should clause D-14 (CAS & SMS) of Schedule-III of Interconnection Regulation 2017, be amended as follows: "The watermarking network logo for all pay channels shall be inserted at encoder end only. Provided that only the encoders deployed after coming into effect of Telecommunication (Broadcasting and Cable) Services Interconnection (Addressable Systems) (Amendment) Regulations, 2019 (7 of 2019) shall support watermarking network logo for all pay channels at the encoder end. In case of infrastructure sharing, the infrastructure sharing provider shall insert its watermarking network logo for all pay channels at encoder end while each DPO taking services from infrastructure provider distributor shall insert its own watermarking network logo for all pay channels at STB end." Please support your answer with proper justification and reasoning. If you do not agree then suggest an alternative amendment, with proper justification?</p>	<p>No Suggestion</p>
10	<p>Q10. In case of infrastructure sharing, if it is decided that the infrastructure sharing provider shall insert its watermarking network logo for all pay channels at encoder end while each DPO taking services from infrastructure provider distributor shall insert its own watermarking network logo for all pay channels at STB end,</p> <p>i) does the specification of the logos (transparency level, size, etc), of both Infrastructure provider and infrastructure seeker distributors, need to be regulated? If yes, please provide detailed specification (transparency level, size, etc) of the logos of both Infrastructure provider and infrastructure seeker distributor.</p> <p>ii) Since appearance of the logos of more than one DPO on the TV screen may compromise the quality of the video signal at the subscriber's end, what measures such as overlapping logos of the DPOs or any other solution, should be adopted to ensure that while logo of the DPO (infrastructure seeker) is prominently visible on the subscriber's TV screen, the objective of tracing piracy is also met through watermarking the network logo of the infrastructure provider DPO suitably? Please provide details of measure proposed. Please support your answer with proper justification and reasoning.</p>	<p>No Suggestion</p>

11	<p>Q11. In light of the infrastructure sharing guidelines issued by MIB, should clause C-14 (CAS & SMS) of Schedule-III of Interconnection Regulation 2017), be amended as follows: "The CAS shall be independently capable of generating, recording, and maintaining logs, for a period of at least immediate preceding two consecutive years, corresponding to each command executed in the CAS including but not limited to activation and deactivation commands issued by the SMS. In case Infrastructure is shared between one or more distributors, the CAS shall be capable of generating, recording, and maintaining logs for each distributor separately for the period of at least immediate preceding two consecutive years, corresponding to each command executed in the CAS including but not limited to activation and deactivation commands issued by the SMS."</p> <p>Please support your answer with proper justification and reasoning. If you do not agree then suggest an alternative amendment, with proper justification?</p>	No Suggestion
12	<p>Q12. For those cases of infrastructure sharing where the CAS and SMS are not shared by the infrastructure provider with the infrastructure seeker,</p> <p>i. do you agree that in such cases, the audit of the infrastructure seeker so far as the shared infrastructure is concerned, should extend to only those elements of the infrastructure of the provider which are being shared between the DPOs?</p> <p>ii. should a broadcaster be permitted to cause the complete technical audit of all the DPOs, including the audit of the shared infrastructure, as a precondition for the broadcaster to provide the signals of television channels, if the broadcaster so decides?</p> <p>Please support your answers with proper justification and reasoning.</p>	No Suggestion
13	<p>Q13. In case CAS and SMS are shared amongst service providers,</p> <p>i. what provisions for conducting audit should be introduced to ensure that the monthly subscription reports made available by the distributors (sharing the infrastructure) to the broadcasters are complete, true, and correct, and there are no manipulations due to sharing of CAS/DRM/SMS?</p> <p>ii. should a broadcaster be allowed to simultaneously audit (broadcaster-caused audit) all the DPOs sharing the CAS/DRM/SMS, to ensure that monthly subscription reports are complete, true, and correct in respect of all such DPOs, and there are no manipulations due to sharing of CAS/DRM/SMS? Support your answer with proper justification and reasoning.</p>	No Suggestion
14	<p>Q14. Do you agree that in case of infrastructure sharing between DPOs, suitable amendments are required in the Schedule III of the Interconnection Regulation and the audit manual for assessment of multiplexer's logs during audit procedure? If yes, please suggest the proposed amendment(s), keeping in mind that no broadcaster should be able to see the data of another broadcaster. Please support your answer with proper justification and reasoning. If you do not agree, then also please support your answer with proper justification and reasoning?</p>	No Suggestion
15	<p>Q15. In light of infrastructure sharing, does clause 4.5 of the existing Audit Manual require any amendment? If yes, please suggest the amended clause. Please provide proper justification for your response. If no, then also please support your answer with proper justification and reasoning?</p>	No Suggestion
16	<p>Q16. In light of the infrastructure sharing guidelines issued by MIB, should clause 5.3 and clause 5.4 of Audit Manual be amended to read as follows: "5.3 Certificate from all the CAS vendors (Format as in Annexure 1). 5.4 Certificate from SMS vendors (Format as in Annexure 2). Note: In case of Infrastructure sharing, all the certificates/ documents related to CAS and SMS, should be given by the infrastructure provider distributor on the basis of certificate issued to it by CAS and SMS vendor."</p>	No Suggestion
17	<p>Q17. In light of the infrastructure sharing guidelines issued by MIB for sharing of infrastructure amongst MSOs, amongst DTH operators and between MSO and HITS operator, do you think that there is a need to amend any other existing provisions of Interconnection Regulations 2017 or introduce any additional regulation(s) to facilitate infrastructure sharing amongst MSOs, amongst DTH operators and between MSOs and HITS operators? If yes, please provide your comments with reasons thereof on amendments (including any addition(s)) required in the Interconnection Regulation 2017, that the stakeholder considers necessary in view of Infrastructure guidelines issued by MIB. The stakeholders must provide their comments in the format specified in Table 4 explicitly indicating the existing Regulation number/New Regulation number, suggested amendment and the reason/ full justification for the amendment in the Interconnection Regulation 2017.</p>	No Suggestion
18	<p>Q18. In light of the infrastructure sharing guidelines issued by MIB for sharing of infrastructure amongst MSOs, amongst DTH operators and between MSO and HITS operator, do you think that there is a need to amend any other existing provisions of Audit Manual or introduce any additional clause(s) to facilitate infrastructure sharing amongst MSOs, amongst DTH operators and between MSOs and HITS operators? If yes, please provide your comments with reasons thereof on amendments (including any addition(s)) required in Audit Manual, that the stakeholder considers necessary in view of Infrastructure guidelines issued by MIB. The stakeholders must provide their comments in the format specified in Table 5 explicitly indicating the existing clause number/New Clause Number, suggested amendment and the reason/ full justification for the amendment in Audit Manual.</p>	No Suggestion

19	Q19. Stakeholders may also provide their comments on any other issue relevant to the present consultation.	No Suggestion
----	--	---------------

New Amendments

Sr. no.	Clause	New Amendments	Old Clauses	SPC Suggestions
1	4.4	Take the declaration of DPOs regarding the IRDs deployed in the headend including serial/VC numbers. The Auditor shall check all the IRDs +VCs deployed by the DPO during the audit. The checking may be done during lean hours. The auditor shall ensure that there is no disruption of the live service of DPO.	Take inventory of IRDs + VCs issued by broadcaster including their serial numbers. Make note of broadcasters IRDs + VCs available but not installed.	No Suggestion
2	5.7	It may be noted that the STB Vendor declarations would need to be provided only from those STB Vendors whose STBs have been deployed and activated by the DPO post March 2017 i.e. post coming into effect of the Interconnection Regulations 2017 and who are still providing the support to DPOs. If DPO does not have a current business relationship with a STB vendor, then certificate issued from such STB vendor at the time of procurement may be acceptable.	Certificate from STB vendor (Format as in Annexure 4).	No Suggestion
3	5.8	List of all the decoder along with VC serial numbers to DPO deployed in the Headend by the DPO.	List of all the decoder along with VC serial numbers issued by broadcasters to DPO.	No Suggestion
4	5.9	It may be noted that in case system generated reports captures all the field specified in the above declaration format, then the auditor may accept such system generated reports.	New Clause	No Suggestion
5	7	It may be noted that all simulations tests on STBs should be carried out on those STB models that have been deployed and activated by the DPO post 2017 (i.e., post coming into effect of the Interconnection Regulations 2017). For this purpose, DPO must ensure that at least 2 STBs of each STB model, that have been deployed and activated by the DPO post 2017, are available in the stock for the simulation tests.	New Clause	No Suggestion
6	C1 (iii)	Auditor to perform TS recording: i) At the Headend; ii) In the field at appropriate place. Auditor to analyze the TS streams to ascertain actual number(s) of CAS running in the network and compare with the declaration of CAS systems made as part of agreement with the broadcaster. Auditor to record discrepancy, if any. DPO should sign the record wherein Auditor has noted the discrepancy, if any. In case DPO refuses to sign, the Auditor should record the same.	Auditor to perform TS recording: i) At the Headend; ii) In the field at appropriate place. Auditor to analyze the TS streams to ascertain actual number(s) of CAS running in the network and compare with the declaration made as part of agreement with the broadcaster. Auditor to record discrepancy, if any.	It is not practical to obtain the signature of DPO since, the proof in the form of TS recordings are available, which in itself will serve the required purpose.
7	C12	In case the Auditor has reason to doubt the output from the SMS/CAS reporting modules, he may verify the output of the frontend with that of the backend of SMS/CAS. For this purpose, the Auditor may choose to run any query/code of the SMS/CAS vendor for the extraction of data as needed post verification of the query/code in terms of the filters being used and in terms of the entire database being referenced or not".	The screen shots and explanations of the queries shall be provided after masking customer confidential data of the DPO before handing over to the auditor and such screen shots and explanation should be included in the report.	No Suggestion
8	C14	In case the Auditor has reason to doubt the output from the SMS/CAS reporting modules, he may verify the output of the frontend with that of the backend of SMS/CAS. For this purpose, the Auditor may choose to run any query/code of the SMS/CAS vendor for the extraction of data as needed post verification of the query/code in terms of the filters being used and in terms of the entire database being referenced or not".	The screen shots and explanations of the queries that are run shall be provided after masking customer confidential data of DPO before handing over to the auditor and such screen shots and explanations should be included in the report.	No Suggestion
9	D1 (b)	Auditor to take a screenshot of the fingerprint. For multiple fingerprinting tests on multiple STBs, the screenshots may be enclosed on sample basis.	Auditor to take a screenshot of the fingerprint.	Please define sample size to avoid dispute as broadcasters may challenge the sample size selected. (Sample size of 30% to 50% may be specified)

10	D11 (a)	Auditor should obtain fingerprint Schedules from some (minimum 2 broadcasters) broadcaster channels distributed by the DPO.	Auditor should obtain fingerprint Schedules from some broadcaster channels distributed by the DPO.	It is not practical to obtain the fingerprint schedule from the broadcaster since under the current provision also, broadcasters are not providing the same. However, it should be made mandatory for the broadcasters to provide/ waive off the same in writing if the advance notice of audit has been given.
11	D14	The above requirement of schedule III can be checked and verified by auditor only if the DPO has deployed encoders with watermarking network logo capability. If the DPO encoders are old (procured before 30th October 2019) and do not have this capability the same observation is captured in the audit report along with declaration of DPO mentioning the deployment of encoders before 30th October 2019.	Only the encoders deployed after coming into effect of the Amendment regulations shall support watermarking network logo for all pay channels at the encoder end.	No Suggestion
12	E8	Auditor should trigger Forced message (If available) and Fingerprinting from SMS or CAS to testing STBs to confirm availability of Forced messaging and fingerprinting commands. It means, when a forced messaging/FP is run on the STB, no buttons on the remote should function which can disable the force message or Fingerprinting. Further, the FP command should appear as per parameters given through SMS/CAS. Screenshots may accordingly be enclosed.	Auditor should trigger scroll messaging from SMS or CAS to all STB in the network which should display the fingerprint as the message. Auditor should take screenshot of the display	No Suggestion
13	E9 (a)	a) Auditor should take copies of BIS certificates from the DPO for each make & model of STB procured after 2012. The BIS certificate of a STB may be of the year when the STB was purchased. Alternately, Auditor may also verify the validity of the BIS Certificates online (by inputting the Registration Number of the first BIS Certification of the respective STB Models). Screenshots of the online verification of such BIS validity should be provided in the Audit Report.	Auditor should take copies of BIS certificates from the DPO for each make & model of STB procured after 2012. The BIS certificate of a STB may be of the year when the STB was purchased. Alternately, Auditor may also verify the validity of the BIS Certificates online (by inputting the Registration Number of the first BIS Certification of the respective STB Models). Screenshots of the online verification of such BIS validity should be provided in the Audit Report.	No Suggestion
14	E9 (c)	As of the audit date, the certificates should be valid for the STB models which are available in the physical stock and the current inventory of DPO for deployment. For this purpose, DPO must ensure that at least 2 STBs of each STB model, that have been deployed and activated by the DPO post 2017, are available in the stock. For old STB models deployed before the 2017 the DPO need to have at least one BIS Certification (whether valid/expired) to prove BIS Compliance at the time of seeding the STBs.	As of the audit date, the certificates should be valid.	No Suggestion
15	8.1	Every audit should be ideally completed within four weeks and the proposed suggested timelines under compliance audit are mentioned below. Additional one week time may be taken for each headend in case of more than one headend.	Every audit should be ideally completed within three weeks and the proposed suggested timelines under compliance audit are mentioned below.	Time period of 8 weeks is required to conduct the audit, obtaining the data, data validation, data analysis, preparation of report, discussion of draft report etc.
16	8.3	2 to 3 weeks maximum for the analysis of the data and finalization of the audit report.	1 to 2 weeks maximum for the analysis of the data and finalization of the audit report.	It is better if the due date for submission of report should be fixed instead of stage wise time period being fixed and then penalty should be levied for delays, if any, as per the practise being followed by all the regulators.
17	8.5	Two weeks time will also be given to DPO to respond and provide explanation on these issues flagged by auditor.	One week time will also be given to DPO to respond and provide explanation on these issues flagged by auditor.	
18	8.7	In case whether verification and analysis of TS recording and ground VC are also required the auditor may take additional one week for sample verification of the recordings and ground VC samples. Provided that in case of broadcaster caused audit, the auditor may take additional time (depending upon the location and no of samples to be tested) as mutually agreed between the Broadcaster, DPO and Auditor.	In case whether verification and analysis of TS recording and ground VC are also required the auditor may take additional one week for sample verification of the recordings and ground VC samples.	No Suggestion
19	8.8	In case the broadcaster has any issues/ doubt/ clarifications with the audit report shared by the DPO the same needs to be communicated by broadcaster within four weeks after the receipt of audit report	New Clause	No Suggestion

20	10.3 (iv)	Analysis on data dump to report the active STB count on 5 random dates from the audit period other than 7th, 14th, 21st and 28th . As on date DPO package wise, a-la-carte and broadcaster bouquet wise STB/VC details (both from SMS & CAS system). In case of variance of more than 15% of the "as on date" data and the audit period data, the auditor shall bring the variance to the notice of concerned broadcaster.	As on date DPO package wise, a-la-carte and broadcaster bouquet wise STB/VC details (both from SMS & CAS system).	No Suggestion
21	10.3 (v)	Verification and reporting of Channel to package mapping along with service ID (with creation, modification and discontinue date) from SMS & CAS on the minimum 20% random selected dates of the audit period (as per point ii above).	Verification and reporting of Channel to package mapping along with service ID (with creation, modification and discontinue date) from SMS & CAS of the audit period.	No Suggestion
22	15a	The auditors are required to complete the subscription audit and submission of report within six weeks from the date of first visit of DPO with subscriber base above 5 lakhs. Additional one week time may be taken for each headend in case of more than one headend.	The auditors are required to complete the subscription audit and submission of report within 4 weeks from the date of first visit of DPO with subscriber base above 5 lakhs.	Please refer suggestion at serial number 15.
23	15b	The auditors are required to complete the subscription audit and submit report within four weeks from the date of first audit visit of DPO with subscriber base below 5 lakhs.	The auditors are required to complete the subscription audit and submit report within 3 weeks from the date of first audit visit of DPO with subscriber base below 5 lakhs.	Please refer suggestion at serial number 15.
24	15c	In case where verification and analysis of TS recording and ground VC are also required the auditor may take additional one week for sample verification of the recordings and ground VC samples. Provided that in case of broadcaster caused audit, the auditor may take additional time (depending upon the location and no of samples to be tested) as mutually agreed between the Broadcaster, DPO and Auditor.	In case where verification and analysis of TS recording and ground VC are also required the auditor may take additional one week for sample verification of the recordings and ground VC samples.	No Suggestion
25	15d	In case the broadcaster has any issues/doubt/clarifications with the audit report shared by the DPO the same needs to be communicated by broadcaster within eight weeks after the receipt of audit report	New Clause	No Suggestion
26	18 (2)	The DPO should ensure all the compliance of the Digital Addressable System (CAS, SMS and STB) as per Schedule III of Interconnection Regulation 2017 and cause the compliance audit and the subscription audit of its system every calendar year. Audit being conducted in the year should be completed within that calendar year including issue of final report.	The DPO should ensure all the compliance of the Digital Addressable System (CAS, SMS and STB) as per Schedule III of Interconnection Regulation 2017 and cause the compliance audit and the subscription audit of its system every calendar year.	The report for a calendar year should be stipulated for submission during next year, by categorizing the DPOs in four categories as under: 1. Less than 5,000 - by 31st March 2. 5,000 - 20,000 - by 30th June 3. 20,000 - 5,00,000 - by 30th September 4. Above 5,00,000 - by 31st December
27	18a (17)	In case DPO has provided its own laptop (in this audit manual 'laptop' includes 'computer/PC/laptop') to the auditor for an audit, then DPO shall preserve that laptop along with entire data used by the auditor till at least one year after that audit.	New Clause	No Suggestion
28	18c (35)	In case Auditor has used its own laptop for an audit, then Auditor shall preserve that laptop along with entire data of the DPO till at least one year after that audit. This is in case DPO had no objection to auditor using its own laptop and DPO permits auditor to take data outside its premises. Besides, in such cases, DPO shall also preserve entire data given to auditor and/or extracted by auditor, till at least one year after that audit.	New Clause	No Suggestion

29	It may be noted that in case system generated reports captures all the field specified in the format, then the auditor may accept such system generated reports . In case of shared CAS architecture, where the same is shared by JVs of DPO or in case a DPO has multiple CAS, the MSR verification can be done in nonlinear manner where the total package/channel count of SMS needs to be reconciled with the total package/channel count of CAS i.e. In case of JVs sharing common CAS(s) or in case a DPO has multiple CAS, the data can be reconciled in totality or by summing up the HC wise count from CAS and reconciling the same with SMS count. This is a non-linear way of reconciliation	New Clause	No Suggestion
----	--	------------	---------------

Table 2

Sr. No.	Page no. of the existing Audit Manual	Clause no. of the existing Audit Manual	Do you agree with the amendments proposed in this CP (Yes/ No)	If you do not agree with the amendment proposed in this CP, then provide amended Clause proposed by you	Reasons with full justification of your response
1	8	4.4	Yes	-	-
2	9	5.7	Yes	-	-
3	9	5.8	Yes	-	-
4	9	5.9	Yes	-	-
5	11	7	Yes	-	-
6	11	C1 (iii)	No		It is not practical to obtain the signature of DPO since, the proof in the form of TS recordings are available, which in itself will serve the required purpose.
7	16	C12	Yes	-	-
8	17	C14	Yes	-	-
9	21	D1 (b)	No		Please define sample size to avoid dispute as broadcasters may challenge the sample size selected. (Sample size of 30% to 50% may be specified)
10	23	D11 (a)	No		It is not practical to obtain the fingerprint schedule from the broadcaster since under the current provision also, broadcasters are not providing the same. However, it should be made mandatory for the broadcasters to provide/ waive off the same in writing if the advance notice of audit has been given.
11	24	D14	Yes	-	-
12	26	E8	Yes	-	-
13	26	E9 (a)	Yes	-	-
14	26	E9 (c)	Yes	-	-
15	27	8.1	No		Time period of 8 weeks is required to conduct the audit, obtaining the data, data validation, data analysis, preparation of report, discussion of draft report etc. It is better if the due date for submission of report should be fixed instead of stage wise time period being fixed and then penalty should be levied for delays, if any, as per the practise being followed by all the regulators.
16	27	8.3			
17	27	8.5			
18	27	8.7	Yes	-	-
19	27	8.8	Yes	-	-
20	30	10.3 (iv)	Yes	-	-
21	30	10.3 (v)	Yes	-	-
22	34	15a	No		Please refer suggestion at serial number 15.
23	34	15b	No		Please refer suggestion at serial number 15.
24	34	15c	Yes	-	-
25	34	15d	Yes	-	-
26	37	18 (2)	No		The report for a calendar year should be stipulated for submission during next year, by categorizing the DPOs in four categories as under: 1. Less than 5,000 - by 31st March 2. 5,000 - 20,000 - by 30th June 3. 20,000 - 5,00,000 - by 30th September 4. Above 5,00,000 - by 31st December
27	39	18a (17)	Yes	-	-
28	45	18c (35)	Yes	-	-