

Question 2.

The current definition relating to “nondiscrimination” is adequate

Question 3.

Any offer which is substantially different from any companies ongoing offer (in terms of lower tariff, more data, waiver of any charges, or cross selling etc.) should be a promotional offer.

No, there should be not be any limit in numbers of promotional offer that can be launched by a TSP, in a calendar year one after another, as it is beneficial from consumer point of view. But special check need to be kept in place that promotional offer need to differ substantially otherwise it could disrupt market in a negative manner.

Question 4.

Currently telecom service license stipulates the geographical area in which the licensee is authorized to provide designated telecom services. This is not an appropriate way to distinguish. It should be based on boundary lines of region or state, as it might create discrimination between one state which is very large (example Uttar Pradesh divided into two parts UP EAST and UP west).

Question 8.

Implementation of policy regarding non-discrimination need to addressed.

Also, issues relating to price charged by companies for providing data services on different technology (especially 3G and 4G LTE) does not reflect on the speed. I mean to say that price discrimination is higher but consumer does not receive the speed promised.

Earlier trend was seen new tech was costlier than the old but it is opposite in the case with 3G and 4G, with 4G being better.

Udbhav Aggarwal