

Views and comments on Consultation Paper on Review of Scope of Infrastructure Providers Category-I (IP-I)

Registration by upobhokta sanrakshan samiti Kanpur CAG member

1) Should the scope of Infrastructure Providers Category –I (IP-I) registration be enhanced to include provisioning of common sharable active infrastructure also? The permission to IP-I for owning and establishing active infrastructure elements such as antenna, feeder cable, BTS (eNodeB/gNodeB), Radio Access Network, transmission system for backend end-to-end bandwidth (on Microwave or OFC), wired access (FTTX) network, and IBS systems; and provide the same to telecommunication service providers on lease/rent out/sale basis, it may lead to substantial cost reductions for telecommunication service providers also.

2) In case the answer to the preceding question is in the affirmative, then i) What should be common sharable active infrastructure elements which can be permitted to be owned, established, and maintained by IP-I for provisioning on rent/lease/sale basis to service providers licensed/ permitted/ registered with DoT/ MIB? Please provide details of common sharable active infrastructure elements as well as the category of telecommunication service providers with whom such active infrastructure elements can be shared by IP-I, with justification. ii) Should IP-I be allowed to provide end-to-end bandwidth through leased lines to service providers licensed/ permitted/ registered with DoT/ MIB also? If yes, please provide details of category of service providers to it may be permitted with justification. iii) Whether the existing registration conditions applicable for IP-I are appropriate for enhanced scope or some change is required? If change is suggested, then please provide details with reasoning and justification. iv) Should IP-I be made eligible to obtain Wireless Telegraphy Licenses from Wireless Planning and Coordination (WPC) wing of the DoT for possessing and importing wireless equipment? What methodology should be adopted for this purpose?

) Should Micro The permission to IP-I for owning and establishing active infrastructure elements such as antenna, feeder cable, BTS

(eNodeB/gNodeB), Radio Access Network, transmission system for backend end-to-end bandwidth (on Microwave or OFC), wired access (FTTX) network, and IBS systems; and provide the same telecommunication service providers on lease/rent out/sale basis, it may lead to substantial cost reductions for telecommunication service providers also. Microwave Backbone (MWB) spectrum allocation be permitted to IP-I for establishing point to point backbone connectivity using wireless transmission systems?

3) In case the answer to the preceding question in part (1) is in the negative, then suggest alternative means to facilitate faster rollout of active infrastructure elements at competitive prices

While increasing the scope of IP-I registration, it is also important to consider here that should the registration mechanism as existing be continued for IP-I or it require some changes. Is there a need to impose additional regulatory obligations on Infrastructure Providers, when they would be allowed to provide active infrastructure and end-to-end bandwidth

.4) Any other issue relevant to this subject.

no