

## Q1

**For the purpose of granting authorisations under Section 3(1) of the Telecommunications Act, 2023, whether the Central Government should issue an authorisation to the applicant entity, as is the international practice in several countries, in place of the extant practice of the Central Government entering into a license agreement with the applicant entity? In such a case, whether any safeguards are required to protect the reasonable interests of authorized entities? Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

## Ans:

Since 1991 reforms, our country has seen the tremendous growth, as "License Raj" ended with open market competition. This has not only given choice to the Indian consumer, but has also given an impetus to the Indian Economy. The fruits of the reforms has reached to every Indian citizen in terms of effective competition, and has also benefited Indian business houses. Only few selected areas of business still requires License. Telecom sector is one of them. It is high time that we reduce the burden of licensing regime to the extent possible, especially where

1. Promoters of the company are all Indian, with total Indian management.
2. Companies not using any scarce resources like spectrum.
3. Companies only providing terrestrial services and not directly connecting any foreign nations.
4. Companies not providing any satellite based communications.

Except for all above mentioned conditions, there should be simple registration process, like GST or PAN Card, and there should be no License fee, which can act as an entry barrier.

The simplified registration, need to be considered as bilateral contract, and should have safety mechanism like TRAI law, to safeguard the interest of all stakeholders, which can prevent government to take any decision without consulting the stakeholders. (A detailed discussion can be held, and suitable mechanism can be worked out for the safeguard of all prospective service providers)

There can not be any amendment unilaterally, without consulting TRAI, along with all stakeholders, and TRAI recommendation. TRAI should have more teeth in changing of any rules and regulations.

**Q2. Whether it will be appropriate to grant authorisations under Section 3(1) of the Telecommunications Act, 2023 in the form of an authorisation document containing the essential aspects of the authorisation, such as service area, period of validity, scope of service, list of applicable rules, authorisation fee etc., and the terms and conditions to be included in the**

**form of rules to be made under the Telecommunications Act, 2023 with suitable safeguards to protect the reasonable interests of the authorised entities in case of any amendment in the rules? Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans:**

For simplification of the process, especially those companies who wanted to provide only terrestrial services within the country, and not utilising any scarce resources like spectrum, and having Indian promoters and Indian management, simplified application, ideally Online should be made available.

For further simplification, even the authorisation categories can be made only one . If service provider want to restrict his services to specific region , that is up to him, but there can be single registration for all terrestrial services at national level. Based on the business prospects , service provider can offer any terrestrial services in their preferred area.

For making rules, following things should be kept in mind.

1. No technological barriers need to be applied, like MPLS, VPN, VoIP or any other technological options can not be offered by so and so type of authorisation. Because It has been observed that whenever any technological barriers have been kept as rules, It has been challenged thru technologies and has become primary reason of litigation. ( For example In case of VoIP services, it was not allowed to ISPs without license fee, whereas same came thru backdoors of technology thru OTT like WhatsApp and level playing field for VoIP providers were hampered.)
2. Rather than restricting service providers for offering any innovative services, only selected black listed activities should be mentioned as prohibitive, Other than that all services must be allowed to a service provider for area for which he/she has been granted authorisation.
3. Cumbersome and repeated reporting requirements must be done away with. Technical reporting must have a centralised portal, which can be accessed by all wings of the department along with TRAI, and all concern agencies.
4. Limited set of applicable rules , which are pertaining to consumer privacy, quality of services, sovereignty of the nation and security of the network shall form the part of specified rules.
5. For all terrestrial authorisation, entry fee should be waived or should be kept minimal to allow effective competition in the sector. For license fee also, Income Tax like slabs must be proposed, for example,
  - 0 to Rs. 25 Cr. Turnover license fee is NIL
  - 25 Cr. To 50 Cr. Turnover license fee is 1% after first 25 Cr.
  - 50 Cr. To 100 Cr. Turnover license fee is 2%And above 100 Cr. It should be kept at 3%

All payment made to other service providers should be allowed as deduction in arriving license fee on Adjusted Gross revenue.

The above example is just an idea, but Slabs can be decided by competent authorities as per above example. MSME companies must be allowed exemption to the best possible extent.

**Q3. In case it is decided to implement the authorisation structure as proposed in the Q2 above, -**

**(a) Which essential aspects of authorisation should be included in authorisation documents?**

**(b) What should be the broad category of rules, under which, terms and conditions of various authorisations could be prescribed?**

**(c) Whether it would be appropriate to incorporate the information currently provided through the extant Guidelines for Grant of Unified License and Unified License for VNO, which included, inter-alia, the information on the application process for the license, eligibility conditions for obtaining the license, conditions for transfer/ Merger of the license etc., in the General Rules under the Telecommunications Act, 2023?**

**(d) What could be the broad topics for which the conditions may be required to be prescribed in the form of guidelines under the respective rules?**

**Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

- a) All authorisation must have a long term validity of at least 20 to 25 years, or even it can be linked with company, till company exists, or company decides to surrender the authorisation.
- b) Authorisation category shall be only two or three types,
  1. Terrestrial telecom services
  2. Services using spectrum or satellite bandwidth
  3. Services connecting international or satellite gateway

All authorisation must be for PAN India by default. Companies may decide their service area based on their business viability .

- c) As per my opinion VNO should be done away with ,as VNO category in most area has not served its purpose, and simplification of authorisation will make it irrelevant.
- d) Minimum conditions need to be prescribed which should broadly cover
  1. Customer privacy
  2. Network and National Security

3. Traceability
4. Quality of Services
5. Inter operability among service providers
6. Foreign equity holding or foreign management

Apart from broad guidelines, TRAI Act with regular reporting may be prescribed. Reporting should be made online with an access to all concern departments, and frequency should be kept minimal.

Detailed consultation is required for reporting and inter operability issue with all stake holders.

**Q4. In view of the provisions of the Telecommunications Act, 2023, what safeguards are required to be put in place to ensure the long-term regulatory stability and business continuity of the service providers, while at the same time making the authorisations and associated rules a live document dynamically aligned with the contemporary developments from time to time? Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

Some points must be considered :

1. Authorisation mechanism should not be restrictive to adopt new technological advancements.
2. It should be treated as bilateral agreement between government and authorisation seeker, where amendments are done with consultation and are not imposed in unilateral way.
3. Quality of services and consumer privacy should be prescribed as it is of prime importance.
4. Licenses which uses scarce resources, or connecting to international gateway or satellite services , detailed guidelines must be prescribed.
5. Overall all prescribed rules and regulations should not be restrictive for new entrant , should give fair treatment to all service providers and should no way promote monopolies in sector.
6. More like GST or Income tax type of online reporting mechanism need to be worked out where transparent and easy online filling of details need to be promoted.

**Q5. In addition to the service-specific authorisations at service area level, whether there is a need for introducing a unified service authorisation at National level for the provision of end-to-end telecommunication services with pan-India service area under the Telecommunications Act, 2023? Kindly justify your response.**

**Ans :** As answered in Q2 and Q3, Service specific authorisation should be abolished and need to be replaced with nation wide unified authorisation. Service providers should be allowed to offer services as per their business viability.

This mechanism will ensure ease of doing business. Once authorisation is taken , service provider shall be free to offer as many services as they wish and shall be able to decide which area or the whole nation where they need to provider their services, based on their business viability. This single authorisation will avoid repeated application to add more services or more area by same service providers.

**Q6. In case it is decided to introduce a unified service authorisation at National level for the provision of end-to-end telecommunication services-**

**(a) What should be the scope of service under such an authorisation?**

**(b) What terms and conditions (technical, operational, security related, etc.) should be made applicable to such an authorisation?**

**(c) Would there be a need to retain some of the conditions or obligations to be fulfilled at the telecom circle/ Metro area level for such an authorisation?**

**(d) Should assignment of terrestrial access and backhaul spectrum be continued at the telecom circle/ Metro area level for such an authorisation?**

**(e) Any other suggestion to protect the interest of other authorised entities/ smaller players upon the introduction of such an authorisation.**

**Kindly provide a detailed response with justification.**

**Ans :**

a) Already suggested in Q2 and Q3 answer. All terrestrial services which doesn't require spectrum or satellite bandwidth should be allows to be provided. Single authorisation taken for entire nation shall be allowed to provide services . For starting a services in specific geographic area, a simplified intimation forms can be made online, where service providers can intimate that they are adding services , or aree of operation .

b) Already responded earlier. A detailed discussion is required once authorisation mechanism is decided.

c)Minimal conditions need to be prescribed , as new regime should be more accommodative rather than restrictive.

d) For spectrum assignment No Comments.

e) Smaller players need to be well taken care of. Migration to new regime need to be promoted widely among existing service providers as well. Pro rata refund of entry fee can also be thought.

SMARTLINK SOLUTIONS PVT. LTD

CIN: U72300GJ2014PTC079758

Office: B-8, YOGIRAJ PARK, NEAR SWARGASHRAM TEMPLE, TITHAL ROAD, CROSS LANE, VALSAD-396001

Phone: 02632-248027

**Q7.**

**Within the scope of Internet Service authorisation under the Telecommunications Act, 2023, whether there is a need for including the provision of leased circuits/ Virtual Private Networks within its service area?**

**Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans:**

Although we suggest drastic changes in authorisation mechanism, where end to end telecom services without using any spectrum should be brought under single authorisation, and there should not be any restrictions on account of technology , If that is not accepted, at least such restriction must be done away with.

**Q8. In case it is decided to enhance the scope of Internet Service authorisation as indicated in the Q7 above, -**

**(a) What should be terms and conditions (technical, operational, security related, etc.) that should be made applicable on Internet Service authorisation?**

**(b) Any other suggestion to protect the reasonable interests of other authorised entities upon such an enhancement in the scope of service.**

**Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

In fact it is already proposed to have real unified authorisation which covers all types of terrestrial services under single authorisation and promote ease of doing business right at the entry point of business. For terms and conditions , have already provided inputs in earlier questions. We reiterate that all terms and conditions must not be restrictive and should not promote monopolies in sector. Detailed consultation is required for terms and conditions with all concerns .

**Q9. Whether there is need for merging the scopes of the extant National Long Distance (NLD) Service authorization and International Long Distance (ILD) Service authorization into a single authorisation namely Long Distance Service authorisation under the Telecommunications Act, 2023? Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

In fact we have proposed a different set of solutions , and having single national level authorisation should be allowed to provide all sorts of terrestrial services . For ILD a

[SMARTLINK SOLUTIONS PVT. LTD](#)

CIN: U72300GJ2014PTC079758

Office: B-8, YOGIRAJ PARK, NEAR SWARGASHRAM TEMPLE, TITHAL ROAD, CROSS LANE, VALSAD-396001

Phone: 02632-248027

separate authorisation is proposed where there are very few entities , and having security concerns for national security.

As ILD services requires, LIM and other security related measures, It is not advisable to merge it with NLD. In fact a single PAN India authorisation for terrestrial services should all telecom services which doesn't require scarce resources under one umbrella.

**Q10.**

**In case it is decided to merge the scopes of the extant NLD Service authorization and ILD Service authorization into a single authorisation namely Long Distance Service authorisation under the Telecommunications Act, 2023, -**

**(a) What should be the scope of service under the proposed Long Distance Service authorisation?**

**(b) What terms and conditions (technical, operational, security related, etc.) should be made applicable on the proposed Long Distance Service authorisation?**

**(c) Any other suggestions to protect the reasonable interests of other authorised entities upon the introduction of such an authorisation?**

**Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

It is not a good idea to have NLD and ILD services under single authorisation. This may increase cost burden to NLD providers in terms of mandatory security implementation. Instead single national level authorisation covering all end to end terrestrial services should be proposed. And for ILD or International gateway, separate authorisation is proposed.

**Q11.**

**Whether there is need for merging the scopes of the extant GMPCS authorization and Commercial VSAT CUG Service authorization into a single authorisation namely Satellite-based Telecommunication Service authorisation under the Telecommunications Act, 2023? Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans:**

Single unified authorisation need to be introduced for all satellite based communication instead of multiple licenses for different technology based.

**Q12. In case it is decided to merge the scopes of the extant GMPCS authorization and Commercial VSAT CUG Service authorization into a single authorisation namely Satellite-based Telecommunication Service authorisation under the Telecommunications Act, 2023, -**

- (a) What should be the scope of service under the proposed Satellite-based Telecommunication Service authorisation?**  
**(b) What should be terms and conditions (technical, operational, security related, etc.) that should be made applicable on the proposed Satellite-based Telecommunication Service authorisation?**  
**(c) Any other suggestion to protect the reasonable interests of other authorised entities upon the introduction of such an authorisation?**  
**Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans : No Comments**

**Q13. Whether there is a need for merging the scopes of the extant Infrastructure Provider-I (IP-I) and DCIP authorization (as recommended by TRAI) into a single authorisation under the Telecommunications Act, 2023? Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

In fact after simplification of authorisation as proposed above, IP1 may become irrelevant, but still if government wanted to promote infrastructure, separate authorisation can be proposed, which should have very light touch or no regulations, except to curb monopolies. DCIP category authorisation holders should be allowed to share all active as well as passive infrastructure with all telecom authorisation holders without any prejudice. This being infrastructure services, need to be exempted from entry and authorisation fee for as many years possible.

**Q14. In case it is decided to merge the scopes of the extant IP-I and DCIP (as recommended by TRAI) into a single authorisation under the Telecommunications Act, 2023, -**

- (a) What should be the scope under the proposed authorisation?**  
**(b) What terms and conditions should be made applicable to the proposed authorisation?**  
**Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans: Same as above answer of Q13**

**Q15. Whether there is a need for clubbing the scopes of some of the other authorisations into a single authorisation under the Telecommunications Act, 2023 for bringing more efficiency in the operations? If yes, in your opinion, the scopes of which authorisations should be clubbed together? For each of such proposed (resultant) authorisations, -**

- (a) What should be the scope of the service?**  
**(b) What should be the service area?**  
**(c) What terms and conditions (technical, operational, security, etc.) should be made applicable?**

SMARTLINK SOLUTIONS PVT. LTD

CIN: U72300GJ2014PTC079758

Office: B-8, YOGIRAJ PARK, NEAR SWARGASHRAM TEMPLE, TITHAL ROAD, CROSS LANE, VALSAD-396001

Phone: 02632-248027



**Kindly provide a detailed response with justification.**

**Ans :**

As answered earlier, a single authorisation with only two service areas should be allowed to provide all sorts of services under single umbrella.

- a) Scope of services should be any sort of terrestrial services including but not restricted to voice, data, video etc.
- b) There shall be one single uniform authorisation, and service providers shall be offered to intimate the types of services being offered and area of services being offered.

**Q16. Whether there a need for removing some of the existing authorizations, which may have become redundant? If yes, kindly provide the details with justification.**

**Ans : Already proposed in previous answers.**

**Q17. Whether there is a need for introducing certain new authorisations or sub-categories of authorisations under the Telecommunications Act, 2023? If yes, -**

- (a) For which type of services, new authorisations or sub-categories of authorisations should be introduced?
- (b) What should be the respective scopes of such authorisations?
- (c) What should be the respective service areas for such authorisations?
- (d) What terms and conditions (general, technical, operational, Security, etc.) should be made applicable for such authorisations?

**Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

In fact we are of the opinion to remove majority of authorisation and introduce single unified authorisation for terrestrial services which can cover PAN India . For services require scares resources like spectrum, or numbering plan shall have separate authorisation, and services requires international gateway or satellite gateway need to have separate category.

For new regime minimal conditions need to be proposed. New regime must promote more entrepreneurs to come forward and provide innovative services in the field of telecommunication and foster the innovation in the sector.

**Q18. In view of the provisions of the Telecommunications Act, 2023 and technological/ market developments, -**

**(a) What changes (additions, deletions, and modifications) are required to be incorporated in the respective scopes of service for each service authorisation with respect to the corresponding authorizations under the extant Unified License?**

**(b) What changes (additions, deletions, and modifications) are required to be incorporated in the terms and conditions (General, Technical, Operational, Security, etc.) associated with each service authorisation with respect to the corresponding authorizations under the extant Unified License?**

**Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans. :**

a) Different authorisation should be done away with and in new regime only few simplified authorisation need to be introduced.

If it is to be revisited , we propose following authorisations

1. Terrestrial telecom authorisation where end to end services can be provided without using any licensed spectrum or satellite connectivity
2. Authorisation using spectrum for providing services
3. Authorisation for using international connectivity using gateway
4. Authorisation for using satellite bandwidth.

**Q19. In view of the provisions of the Telecommunications Act, 2023 and technological/ market developments, -**

**(a) What changes (additions, deletions, and modifications) are required to be incorporated in the respective scopes of service for each service authorisation with respect to the corresponding authorizations under the extant Unified License for VNO?**

**(b) What changes (additions, deletions, and modifications) are required to be incorporated in the terms and conditions (General, Technical, Operational, Security, etc.) associated with each service authorisation with respect to the corresponding authorizations under the extant Unified License for VNO?**

**Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

In fact VNO categories has not served its purpose since its inception, and with simplification of authorisation , it may become irrelevant . We propose to end the VNO authorisation and promote them to new authorisation regime.

**Q20. Whether the Access Service VNOs should be permitted to parent with multiple NSOs holding Access Service authorisation for providing wireless access service? If yes, what conditions should be included in**

the authorisation framework to mitigate any possible adverse outcomes of such a provision? Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.

**Ans : No comments**

**Q21. Considering that there are certain overlaps in the set of services under various authorisations, would it be appropriate to permit service-specific parenting of VNOs with Network Service Operators (NSOs) in place of the extant authorisation-specific parenting?**

**Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans : No Comments.**

**Q22. In view of the provisions of the Telecommunications Act, 2023 and technological/ market developments, -**

**(a) What changes (additions, deletions, and modifications) are required to be incorporated in the respective scopes of service for each service authorisation with respect to the corresponding extant standalone licenses/ authorizations/ registrations/ NOC etc.?**

**(b) What changes (additions, deletions, and modifications) are required to be incorporated in the terms and conditions (General, Technical, Operational, Security, etc.) associated with each service authorisation with respect to the corresponding extant standalone licenses/ authorizations/ registrations/ NOC etc.?**

**Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

Detail Consultation and is required can be decided once clarity about authorisation is accepted as proposed.

**Q23. In view of the provisions of the Telecommunications Act, 2023 and market developments, whether there is a need to make some changes in the respective scopes and terms and conditions associated with the following service authorisations, recently recommended by TRAI:**

**(a) Digital Connectivity Infrastructure Provider (DCIP) Authorization (under Unified License)**

**(b) IXP Authorization (under Unified License)**

**(c) Content Delivery Network (CDN) Registration**

**(d) Satellite Earth Station Gateway (SESG) License**

**If yes, kindly provide a detailed response with justifications in respect of each of the above authorisations.**

**Ans :**

As proposed in earlier answers DCIP, and IXP authorisation can be made part of single national level or unified terrestrial authorisation. Or there can be separate category can be created ( If simplified authorisation is not accepted as proposed)

CDN shall also be covered in national level authorisation and should have strict monitoring mechanism, as majority of issues are pertaining to CDNs and service providers are asked the details be LEAs. So CDNs must be made more answerable.

A separate authorisation is proposed for satellite based services , under this SESG can be incorporated.

**Q24. In view of the provisions of the Telecommunications Act, 2023 and market developments, any further inputs on the following issues under consultation, may be provided with detailed justifications:**

- (a) Data Communication Services Between Aircraft and Ground Stations Provided by Organizations Other Than Airports Authority of India;**
- (b) Review of Terms and Conditions of PMRTS and CMRTS Licenses; and**
- (c) Connectivity to Access Service VNOs from more than one NSO.**

**Ans : No Comments**

**Q25. Whether there is a need for introducing any changes in the authorisation framework to improve the ease of doing business? If yes, kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

Already covered in previous answers. Even reporting must be simplified and there should be single report asked which can be shared among all agencies.

**Q26. In view of the provisions of the Telecommunications Act, 2023 and market technological developments, whether there is a need to make some changes in the extant terms and conditions, related to ownership of network and equipment, contained in the extant Unified License? If yes, please provide the details along with justifications.**

**Ans : No Comments**

**Q27. Whether any modifications are required to be made in the extant PM-WANI framework to encourage the proliferation of Wi-Fi hotspots in the country? If yes, kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

As proposed in above answers, if unified authorisation is promoted with simplification, all possible technological advancement will take place automatically. New regime should ensure that it is not restrictive in terms of any technological advancement.

**Q28. What should be the broad framework including the specific terms and conditions that should be made applicable for captive authorisations, which are issued on a case-to-case basis? Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

Any network where it is not used for public at large, and captive in nature should be permitted with simplified registration, or can be covered in unified terrestrial registration. While intimating about services, those companies should make it as private captive network, along with geographical coverage. More such network will come in place with advancement of technology like IoT. Especially in the field of automobile, health care, agriculture, utilities etc. may require captive networks, and should be allowed freely.

**Q29. What amendments are required to be incorporated in the terms and conditions of authorisations for providing telecommunications services using satellite-based resources in light of the policy/ Act in the Space Sector?**

**Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

As proposed earlier a separate category of authorisation is proposed to cover all satellite based communication under single authorisation, irrespective of technology being used.

**Q30. Whether the provisions of any other Policy/ Act in the related sectors need to be considered while framing terms and conditions for the new authorisation regime? If yes, kindly provide a detailed response with justification.**

**Ans : No Comments**

**Q31. What conditions should be made applicable for the migration of the existing licensees to the new authorisation regime under the Telecommunications Act, 2023? Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

All existing license holders or registration holders must be encouraged to migrate to new regime. A pro rata refund of entry fee may also be considered for avoiding confusions and litigations.

**Q32. What procedure should be followed for the migration of the existing licensees to the new authorisation regime under the Telecommunications Act, 2023?**

**Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans:**

A simple application to migrate in appropriate authorisation should be proposed. As all license holders are verified once , need not be asked for any entry fee or processing fee. Pro rata entry fee refund can also be proposed and can also be adjusted against current license fees.

**Q33. Do you agree that new guidelines for the transfer/ merger of authorisations under the Telecommunications Act, 2023 should be formulated after putting in place a framework for the authorisations to be granted under the Telecommunications Act, 2023? Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :** Yes merger and transfer must be defined with precise clarity after introduction of new regime.

**Q34. Whether there is a need to formulate guidelines for deciding on the types of violations of terms and conditions which would fall under each category as defined in the Second Schedule of the Telecommunications Act, 2023?**

**If yes, kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

Sector must be regulated with minimal rules and regulations, and there should be light touch approach for most unintentional errors or omissions. In last decade the sector has faced lots of regulatory and market based challenges, and need some careful approach and special attention.

**Q35. Are there any other inputs/ suggestions relevant to the subject? Kindly provide a detailed response with justifications.**

**Ans :**

Government should look telecommunication as an enabler of IT services , and as our country is a market leader in IT services, same shall be replicated in telecom sector with a clear long terms goals. This is the sector which can help addressing lot of issues and can put country on the world map. All rules and regulations formed must foster new entrepreneurs to come forward and should promote investment in sector.

[SMARTLINK SOLUTIONS PVT. LTD](#)

CIN: U72300GJ2014PTC079758

Office: B-8, YOGIRAJ PARK, NEAR SWARGASHRAM TEMPLE, TITHAL ROAD, CROSS LANE, VALSAD-396001

Phone: 02632-248027

Telecom sector should not be considered as cash cow, rather as an enabling sector, subsidised tax rates for at least 10 years should be considered, along with waiver of authorisation fee for all terrestrial services.

**Q36. In case it is decided to introduce a unified service authorisation for the provision of end-to-end telecommunication services with pan-India service area, what should be the: -**

**(i) Amount of application processing fees**

**(ii) Amount of entry fees**

**(iii) Provisions of bank guarantees**

**(iv) Definitions of GR, ApGR and AGR**

**(v) Rate of authorisation fee**

**(vi) Minimum equity and networth of the Authorised entity**

**Please support your response with proper justification.**

**Ans :**

For terrestrial services :

- 1) Amount of application fee might be kept zero or minimal to cover processing fee. As in case of GST or PAN CARD.
- 2) Entry fee for all sorts of authorisation should be done away with as it creates an artificial entry barrier.
- 3) Bank guarantee is also removed as it blocks a lot of money for service providers.
- 4) Definition of GR, ApGR and AGR must be simplified. All terrestrial services must be exempted from license fee for next 10 years, or till our country achieves a critical target mutually agreed by industry. For simplification of AGR, GST return based HSN codes can be taken, and any services which doesn't attract license fee can be identified based on HSN codes. Any amount paid to other services provider, and reflected shall be made available as credit, as in case of GST3A and 3B forms. Similar online mechanism can be developed which ensures transparency and simplicity.
- 5) Authorisation fee must be kept minimal, and sector should not be treated as cash cow. Maximum percentage of authorisation fee shall not exceed 3% of AGR. Slab based approach is more appropriate, for example

For AGR amount less than 25 Cr. Should be exempted,  
25 Cr. To 50 Cr. AGR shall attract 1% fee  
50 Cr. To 100 Cr. AGR shall attract 2% fee.  
AGR above 100 Cr. Shall attract 3%

So for a company having AGR of 125 Cr. First 25 Cr. Shall not attract any fee, remaining 25 Cr. Shall attract 1%, 50 Cr. Shall attract 2% and only 25 Cr. Above 100 Cr. Shall attract 3%

- 6) No minimum net worth should be proposed for terrestrial authorisations. Only a private limited or LLP companies should be allowed to apply . For companies having resource based authorisation , some minimum net worth can be proposed. As there is not entry barrier in any other business in case of GST registration or getting PAN Card.

**Q37. In case it is decided to enhance the scope of Internet Service authorization**

**as indicated in the Q7 above, what should be the:**

- (i) Amount of application processing fees**
- (ii) Amount of entry fees**
- (iii) Provisions of bank guarantees**
- (iv) Definitions of GR, ApGR and AGR**
- (v) Rate of authorisation fee**
- (vi) Minimum equity and networth of the Authorised entity**

**Please support your response with proper justification.**

**Ans :**

As covered in previous answers , there should be single authorisation for terrestrial services and no or minimal possible entry fee is proposed. Bank guarantee must be removed from all authorisations. For other aspects are already covered in previous answers.

No authorisation fee is proposed for next 10 years at least.

**Q38. In case it is decided to merge the scopes of the extant NLD Service**

**authorization and ILD Service authorization into a single authorization namely Long Distance Service authorization under the Telecommunications Act, 2023, what should be the: -**

- (i) Amount of application processing fees**
- (ii) Amount of entry fees**
- (iii) Provisions of bank guarantees**
- (iv) Definitions of GR, ApGR and AGR**
- (v) Rate of authorisation fee**
- (vi) Minimum equity and net worth of the Authorised entity**

**Please support your response with proper justification.**

**Ans : details are already covered in previous answers.**

**Q39. In case it is decided to merge the scopes of the extant GMPCS authorization and Commercial VSAT CUG Service authorization into a single authorization namely Satellite-based Telecommunication Service authorization under the Telecommunications Act, 2023, what should be the:**

**-**

- (i) Amount of application processing fees**

SMARTLINK SOLUTIONS PVT. LTD

CIN: U72300GJ2014PTC079758

Office: B-8, YOGIRAJ PARK, NEAR SWARGASHRAM TEMPLE, TITHAL ROAD, CROSS LANE, VALSAD-396001

Phone: 02632-248027



- (ii) Amount of entry fees**
  - (iii) Provisions of bank guarantees**
  - (iv) Definitions of GR, ApGR and AGR**
  - (v) Rate of authorisation fee**
  - (vi) Minimum equity and net worth of the Authorised entity**
- Please support your response with proper justification.**

**Ans : No comments.**

**Q40. In case you are of the opinion that there is a need for clubbing the scopes of some other authorisations into a single authorisation under the Telecommunications Act, 2023 for bringing more efficiency in the operations, what should be the:**

- (i) Amount of application processing fees**
  - (ii) Amount of entry fees**
  - (iii) Provisions of bank guarantees**
  - (iv) Definitions of GR, ApGR and AGR**
  - (v) Rate of authorisation fee**
  - (vi) Minimum equity and networth of the Authorised entity**
- Please support your response with proper justification.**

**Ans :Already covered earlier**

**Q41. In case you are of the opinion there is a need to introduce certain new authorisations or sub-categories of authorisations under the Telecommunications Act, 2023, what should be the: -**

- (i) Amount of application processing fees**
  - (ii) Amount of entry fees**
  - (iii) Provisions of bank guarantees**
  - (iv) Definitions of GR, ApGR and AGR**
  - (v) Rate of authorisation fee**
  - (vi) Minimum equity and networth of the Authorised entity**
- Please support your response with proper justification.**

**Ans : Already covered earlier**

**Q42. What should be the amount of application processing fees for the various service authorisations including VNOs, other than the merged/clubbed/new service authorisations? Please provide your response for each of the service authorisation separately.**

**Ans:**

Zero or bare minimum fee is to be proposed for processing authorisation.

**Q43. Whether the amount of entry fee and provisions for bank guarantee for various service authorisations including VNOs, other than the merged/clubbed/new service authorisations, should be:**

- i. kept the same as existing for the various service authorisations under the UL/UL(VNO) license**
- ii. kept the same as recommended by the Authority for the various service authorisations under the UL/UL(VNO) license, vide its Recommendations dated 19.09.2023**
- iii. or some other provisions may be made for the purpose of Entry Fee and Bank Guarantees**

**Please support your response with proper justification separately for each authorisation.**

**Ans : Already covered in earlier answers in detail.**

**Q44. Whether there is a need to review any of the other financial conditions for the various service authorisations including VNOs, other than the merged/clubbed/new service authorisations? Please provide your response for each service authorisation separately with detailed justification.**

**Ans: Already covered in earlier answers.**

**Q45. In case it is decided to merge the scopes of the extant IP-I Registration and the Digital Connectivity Infrastructure Provider (DCIP) authorization into a single authorization under the Telecommunications Act, 2023, what should be the: -**

- i. Amount of application processing fees**
- ii. Amount of entry fees**
- iii. Any other Fees/Charge**
- iv. Minimum equity and networth etc. of the Authorised entity.**

**Please support your response with proper justification.**

**Ans :**

For any terrestrial services no authorisation fee or application fee is proposed. And all such authorisations must be covered under single umbrella of Unified Terrestrial authorisation

**Q46. For MNP license and CMRTS authorisation, should the amount of entry fee and provisions of bank guarantees be:**

- i. kept same as existing for the respective license/authorisation.**
- ii. kept the same as recommended by the Authority vide its Recommendations dated 19.09.2023**

**iii. or some other provisions may be made for the purpose of Entry Fee and Bank Guarantees**

**Please support your response with proper justification separately for each authorisation.**

**Ans : No Comments**

**Q47. For other standalone licenses/ registrations/ authorisations/ permissions, should the existing framework for financial conditions be continued?**

**Please provide detailed justification.**

**Ans: Already answered in previous questions.**

**Q48. If answer to question above is no, what should be the new/revised financial requirement viz. bank guarantee/ entry fee/ processing fee/ authorisation fees/ registration fees or any other charge/ fees? Please provide detailed justification in support of your response for each other license/ registration/ authorisation/ permission separately.**

**Ans: Already covered in previous answers.**

**Q49. In case of the merged M2M-WPAN/WLAN service authorisation, what should be the processing fees or any other applicable fees/ charges. Please support your response with proper justification.**

**Ans :**

M2M being new advancement covering lot of upcoming technological advancements, need wider consultation for the same.

**Q50. In the interest of ease of doing business, is there a need to replace the Affidavit to be submitted with quarterly payment of license fee and spectrum usage charges with a Self-Certificate (with similar content)? Please justify your response.**

**Ans:**

All steps which makes the life easier for service providers must be taken at the earliest. Usage of online single page reporting must be promoted.

**Q51. Is there a need to revise/ modify/simplify any of the existing formats of Statement of Revenue Share and License Fee for each license/authorisation (as detailed at Annexure 3.2)? In case the answer to the question is yes, please provide the list of items to be included or to be deleted from the formats along with detailed justification for the inclusion/deletion.**

**Ans.**

As proposed, authorisation fee on all terrestrial services which doesn't require any scarce resources, must be exempted at least for 10 years as proposed by TRAI in case of wireline services. Even AGR and ApGR formats where authorisation fee are applicable than it should exempt all services , except those covered under authorisation . GSTR 3A and 3B type approach need to be encouraged, where any fee paid to other service providers must be exempted while calculating AGR to avoid the cascading effect to end consumer.

**Q52. In case of a unified service authorisation for the provision of end-to-end telecommunication services with pan-India service area, what should be the format of Statement of Revenue Share and License Fee for each of these authorisations? Please support your response with justification.**

**Ans: Already covered earlier.**

**Q53. In case the scope of Internet Service authorization is enhanced, what should be the format of Statement of Revenue Share and License Fee for each of these authorisations? Please support your response with justification.**

**Ans : Already covered earlier.**

**Q54. In case of merged extant NLD Service authorization and ILD Service authorization into a single authorization namely Long Distance Service authorization, what should be the format of Statement of Revenue Share and License Fee for each of these authorisations? Please support your response with justification.**

**Ans : Already covered in earlier answers.**

**Q55. In case of merged extant GMPCS authorization and Commercial VSAT CUG Service authorization into a single authorization namely Satellite-based Telecommunication Service authorization, what should be the format of Statement of Revenue Share and License Fee for each of these authorisations? Please support your response with justification.**

**Ans : No Comments.**

**Q56. In case you have proposed to club the scope of some of other authorizations OR introduce certain new authorisations/ sub-categories of authorisations, what should be the format of Statement of Revenue Share and License Fee for each of these authorisations? Please support your response with justification.**

SMARTLINK SOLUTIONS PVT. LTD

CIN: U72300GJ2014PTC079758

Office: B-8, YOGIRAJ PARK, NEAR SWARGASHRAM TEMPLE, TITHAL ROAD, CROSS LANE, VALSAD-396001

Phone: 02632-248027

**Ans: Already answered.**

**Q57. Whether there is a need to review/ simplify the norms for the preparation of annual financial statements (that is, the statements of Revenue and License Fee) of the various service authorizations under UL, UL(VNO) and MNP licenses? Please give detailed response with proper justification for each authorization/license separately.**

**Ans : No comments**

**Q58. In case of migration, how the entry fee already paid by the company be calculated/ prescribed for the relevant authorisation(s)? Please provide detailed justification in support of your response.**

**Ans : No comments.**

**Q59. Should the application processing fee be applicable in case of migration. In case the response is yes, what should be amount of application processing fee? Please give reason(s) in support of your answer.**

**Ans:**

There should be no application processing fee or it should be bare minimum to cover administrative cost only. For existing service providers , that also should be exempted. For terrestrial services TRAI recommendation for exemption of license fee for 10 years must be implemented ASAP.

**Q60. What should be terms and conditions of security interest which Government may prescribe? Please provide detailed response.**

**Ans :**

For terrestrial services, security requirements must be kept minimal, except allowing only trusted sources equipment. For ILD or gateway authorisation security requirements can be elaborated after having detailed consultation with all stake holders.

**Q61. Whether there are any other issues/ suggestions relevant to the fees and charges for the authorisations to provide telecommunication services? The same may be submitted with proper explanation and justification.**

**Ans :**

Government should treat this sector as an enabler in different sectors , and foster new innovations in field of M2M and IoT. Telecom sector off late has passed thru lot of challenges, and need good care. In new regime

[SMARTLINK SOLUTIONS PVT. LTD](#)

CIN: U72300GJ2014PTC079758

Office: B-8, YOGIRAJ PARK, NEAR SWARGASHRAM TEMPLE, TITHAL ROAD, CROSS LANE, VALSAD-396001

Phone: 02632-248027

1. Light touch regulation must be considered.
2. Sector should not be treated as cash cow and should be given maximum possible relief in taxation as well as authorisation fee.
3. To increase the penetration of wireline service , special exemption of authorisation fee for 10 years or till the desired target is achieved should be considered.
4. Even after the initial period of 10 years, authorisation fee must be considered in slab manner, and maximum authorisation fee shall not exceed 3% of AGR.
5. All reporting requirement , must be made online with minimum frequency , ideally once in a year , especially for MSME companies having turnover of less than 50 Cr..
6. Penalties should also be token for first couple of instances, after that only it should be imposed on serial offender companies.
7. Although authorisation is to be promoted, there should not be any unilateral amendments be allowed in rules or regulations, without having TRAI recommendations, post stake holders consultation.
8. Rules only to cover user privacy, restricting monopolies and sovereign security must be made with precise clarity without any ambiguity.
9. In authorisation frame work no restrictions based on technology should be made applicable, as it has become the issue of litigation in past.
10. Rules and regulation must be accommodative of new technological innovation rather than restrictive.
11. Fair treatment should be made available to every service providers without allowing any monopolistic practices. Even this should be made applicable in terms of PSUs as well.
12. Telecom sector shall be treated as an infrastructure sector and should be treated as priority sector for easy access to finances by banks and financial institutes