

**ISPAI Response to the Consultation paper**  
**on**  
**“Review of Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services License”**

**Q1. In view of the discussion in Para 2.13, is it necessary to have a separate standalone license for Voice Mail Service? If so, why? Please provide detailed justification?**

**&**

**Q2. If the answer to the Q1 is in the affirmative, whether the existing technical specifications need to be revised or redefined? What should be the revised technical specifications?**

**Q3. In view of Para 2.17 and present technological developments, is it necessary to have a separate standalone license for only Audiotex Service? If so, why? Please provide detailed justification?**

**&**

**Q4. If the answer to the Q3 is in the affirmative, whether the existing technical specifications need to be revised or redefined? What should be the revised technical specifications?**

**Q5. Whether there is a need for standalone license for providing Audio Conferencing Service? If yes, whether the technical specifications need to be explicitly defined? Please provide detailed justification?**

**&**

**Q6. If the answer to the Q5 is in the affirmative, what should be the technical specifications for providing Audio Conferencing Service?**

**Q7. Is it necessary to have a separate license for Unified Messaging Service when holding an ISP license is mandatory to provide the Unified Messaging Service and standalone ISP licensee is also allowed to provide Unified Messaging Service? If so, why? Please provide detailed justification?**

**&**

**Q8. If the answer to the Q7 is in the affirmative, whether the existing technical specifications need to be revised or redefined? What should be the revised technical specifications?**

**Response:**

The Government has introduced the Unified Licence Regime under which various service authorization is being given for various telecom services. Since the Government has stopped issuing the standalone licence for all other telecom services, there is no requirement for a separate standalone license for Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging services.

**Q9. In case Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Service requires a licence should they be made a part of the Unified Licence as one of the services requiring authorisation? Please provide detailed justification?**

**Response:**

We suggest that there is no need for a separate authorization under UL and these services may be provided under a Unified Licence (Access Service Authorization) only. However, measures are needed to be taken to create a level playing field in the market and prevent any kind of regulatory arbitrage.

**Q10. If the answer to the Q9 is in the affirmative, what should be Service Area? Whether Service Area may be similar to the Service Area of ISP (National Area, Telecom Circle/Metro Area, and Secondary Switching Area) to bring in uniformity among the Service Areas of different services? Please provide detailed justification?**

**Response:**

Presently the service area for Voicemail/Audiotex/UMS licenses is an SDCA i.e. (Short distance charging area). Currently, there are more than 2000 SDCAs across India and it is not feasible for the licensor to grant such a large number of licences in case any operator intends to provide the services across the country. Thus, it is recommended that in order to bring uniformity and transparency, the UL (Access Service Authorization) should be granted, with minimum authorization for **at least one LSA**.

**Q11. If Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services is made a part of the Unified Licence as one of the services requiring authorisation, then what should be the Entry Fee?**

**&**

**Q12. Whether there should be any requirement for Minimum Net worth and Minimum Equity for Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorisation under Unified Licence?**

**Response:**

As explained above, Voice mail/ Audiotex / Unified Messaging Services should be provided under Unified License (*with Access Authorisation*). The Entry Fee, Minimum Net worth and Minimum Equity should be the same as that applicable under UL (Access Service Authorisation).

**Q13. The annual licence fee for all the services under UL as well as for existing UASL/CMTS/Basic Service/NLD/ILD/ISP licensees have been uniformly fixed at 8% of AGR since 1st April 2013. Whether it should be made same for Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorisation under Unified Licence? If not, why?**

**Response:**

Presently, DoT is levying a uniform licence fee of 8% across all telecom licences. We strongly recommend that the same licence fee rate may be made applicable for telecom licences/services including Voice mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Service.

**Q14. In case the answer to the Q13 is in the affirmative then what should be the definition of AGR for Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorisation under Unified Licence?**

**Response:**

The existing definition of AGR as prescribed under UL (Access Service Authorization) [Clause 2.1 (a) (vi)] related to Voice Mail / Audiotex / Unified Messaging Services is as under:

*(vi)The Licensee may also provide Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging services, Video Conferencing over its network to the subscribers falling within its SERVICE AREA on non-discriminatory basis. All the revenue earned by the Licensee through these services shall be counted towards the revenue for the purpose of paying License Fee under the LICENSE AGREEMENT.*

In our view, the above definition may be continued. All the revenues earned from subscribers through these services should be included for the purpose of levy of LF of 8%.

**Q15. What should be Performance Bank Guarantee, Financial Bank Guarantee and Application Processing Fee for Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorisation under Unified Licence?**

**Response:**

The terms of PBG, FBG and Application Processing Fee as prescribed under UL (Access Service Authorisation) should be followed.

**Q16. Whether the duration of the licence with Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorisation be made 20 years as in the other licence authorisations under Unified Licence? If not, why?**

**Response:**

Yes, the duration of the license should be 20 years.

**Q17. What should be the terms and conditions for the migration of the existing Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services licensees to Unified Licence?**

**Response:**

Under the UL, DoT has already defined the process of migration of existing telecom operators to the UL Regime. We recommend that all existing Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services should be migrated to a UL (Access Service Authorization).

**Q18. Whether the existing Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services licensees may be allowed to continue or it would be mandatory to migrate to the Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorisation under Unified Licence?**

**Response:**

We recommend that all existing Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services licensees should be mandatorily migrated to a Unified Licence (Access Service Authorization) within a prescribed timelines say 3 to 6 months.

In case Authority does not implement mandatory migration, then it must create a level playing field wherein all clauses of Unified Licence should also be made applicable to the existing standalone Voice Mail / Audiotex / Unified Messaging Service Licensees.

**Q19. What should be the annual licence fee for existing Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services licensees who do not migrate to the Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services authorization under Unified Licence?**

**Response:**

The existing Voice Mail/Audiotex/Unified Messaging Services licensees should be subjected to LF of 8% as has been prescribed in UL. This will also help in creating a level playing field amongst the operators offering similar services.

**Q20. Please give your comments on any related matter, not covered above.**

**Response:**

Not applicable