From: networkswastika@gmail.com
To: "A.K Singh" <advisorit@trai.gov.in>
Cc: ja-cadiv@trai.gov
Sent: Thursday, August 3, 2023 6:00:20 PM
Subject: consultation-paper-regulatory-mechanism-over-top-ott-communication-services-and-selective-banning

Dear Sir,
I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting of the Government of India for favoring me with the license for the Digital Access System, and also express my gratitude to the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India, for allowing me to submit comments on the various issues raised in the Consultation Paper on **"Consultation Paper on Regulatory Mechanism for Over-The-Top (OTT) Communication Services, and SMPTE Regulations."**

I am Dibyendu Boral prop of M/S Swastika and I work as a small Multi System Operator in West Bengal.

LCOs like myself had the impression, prior to offering my feedback on the Consultation Paper on **"Consultation Paper on Regulatory Mechanism for Over-The-Top (OTT) Communication Services, and Selective Banning of OTT Services,"** that the LCOs, architecture of the current cable TV industry will soon be witness to the episode of local cable operators (LCO) losing their income and business amassed over a 34-year period. Our worries are a result of both India's present inflation rate and the substantial drop in the percentage of current income.

 Please see the attached PDF file .

Thanks & Regards

Dibyendu Boral

Swastika

Manikpur, Kulgachia,

Uluberia, Howrah 711306

Date Aug 3, 2023

To,
Shri Akhilesh Kumar Trivedi,
Advisor (Networks, Spectrum, and Licensing),
The Telecom Regulatory Authority of India,
Mahanagar Doorsanchar Bhawan.
Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg.
New Delhi-110002

"Consultation Paper on Regulatory Mechanism for Over-The-Top (OTT) Communication Services, and Selective Banning of OTT Services".

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting of the Government of India for favoring me with the license for the Digital Access System, and also express my gratitude to the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India, for allowing me to submit comments on the various issues raised in the Consultation Paper on **"Consultation Paper on Regulatory Mechanism for Over-The-Top (OTT) Communication Services, and SMPTE Regulations."**

I am Dibyendu Boral prop of M/S Swastika and I work as a small Multi System Operator in West Bengal.

LCOs like myself had the impression, prior to offering my feedback on the Consultation Paper on **"Consultation Paper on Regulatory Mechanism for Over-The-Top (OTT) Communication Services, and Selective Banning of OTT Services,"** that the LCOs, architecture of the current cable TV industry will soon be witness to the episode of local cable operators (LCO) losing their income and business amassed over a 34-year period. Our worries are a result of both India's present inflation rate and the substantial drop in the percentage of current income.

In the fast-paced and interconnected world of digital communication, Over-The-Top (OTT) services have emerged as a disruptive force, revolutionizing the way we interact, share information, and consume content. OTT services, delivered over the internet, have garnered immense popularity due to their flexibility, convenience, and cost-effectiveness. These services encompass a wide array of communication platforms, such as messaging apps, voice and video calling, social media platforms, and streaming services, offering users a diverse range of opportunities to engage with others and access a plethora of content.

1

The rapid expansion of OTT services has not only transformed the traditional communication landscape but has also presented regulators and policymakers with unique challenges. As these services continue to gain prominence, concerns have arisen regarding data privacy, consumer protection, national security, market competition, and their impact on conventional telecom operators. In response to these complexities, regulatory bodies around the world are actively exploring the formulation of a balanced and comprehensive framework to govern OTT services, ensuring both their sustainable growth and responsible use.

Issues Related to Regulatory Mechanisms for OTT Communication Services:

Q1: What should be the definition of over-the-top (OTT) services? Kindly Provide a detailed response with justification.

Response:
Over-the-top (OTT) services refer to internet-based applications and platforms that deliver content and communication services directly to end-users, bypassing traditional telecommunications infrastructure. These services are "over-the-top" because they ride on top of existing internet connections, utilizing the internet as a means of delivery.

New name may be : StreamOn+

Justification:
The name "StreamOn+" combines the idea of streaming content ("StreamOn") with the concept of an enhanced and expanded offering ("+"). This name emphasizes the platform's focus on providing a seamless streaming experience while also promising an enriched content selection. It conveys the message that the platform offers more than just basic streaming, enticing users to explore its extensive catalogue of premium content.

The definition of OTT services is critical for regulatory purposes as it distinguishes these services from traditional telecommunication services. OTT services differ in their operation, business models, and technological aspects. Defining OTT services as internet-based applications that provide content and communication helps establish a clear boundary between traditional telecom services and these newer digital offerings. This distinction is necessary for creating appropriate regulations that cater to the unique characteristics of OTT services.

Q2: What could be a reasonable classification of OTT services based on an intelligible difference? Please provide a list of the categories of OTT services based on such classification. Kindly provide a detailed response with justification.

Response:
A reasonable classification of OTT services can be based on the type of services they offer. Here are some categories of OTT services:

Messaging and Voice Communication: Services like WhatsApp, Viber, and Skype that provide text messaging, voice calls, and video calls over the Internet.

Social Media Platforms: Platforms like Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter, enable users to share content, interact, and connect with others.

Video Streaming Services: Platforms such as Netflix, YouTube, and Amazon Prime Video that deliver on-demand video content over the internet.

Audio Streaming Services: Services like Spotify, Apple Music, and Pandora that offer music and audio content streaming.

Cloud Storage and Productivity Tools: Services like Google Drive, Dropbox, and Microsoft Office 365 that provide cloud-based storage and productivity applications.

Gaming Services: Online gaming platforms and app stores offering gaming applications.

Justification:
Classifying OTT services based on their functionalities helps regulators to understand the diversity of services in this domain and tailor appropriate regulatory measures accordingly. Different categories may present distinct challenges and opportunities, requiring specific regulations that address the unique characteristics and concerns associated with each type of OTT service.

Q3: What should be the definition of OTT communication services? Please provide a list of features that may comprehensively characterize OTT communication services. Kindly provide a detailed response with justification.

Response:
OTT communication services specifically pertain to those applications and platforms that enable users to exchange real-time messages, make voice and video calls, and engage in multimedia communication over the internet. These services rely on data networks rather than traditional telecommunication infrastructure.

Features characterizing OTT communication services:

Real-time Communication: OTT communication services facilitate instant communication, allowing users to exchange messages, voice calls, or video calls in real-time.

Multimedia Messaging: These services often support multimedia messaging, enabling users to send images, videos, and other multimedia content.

End-to-End Encryption: Many OTT communication services prioritize security by offering end-to-end encryption to protect user data and communications from unauthorized access.

Cross-Platform Functionality: OTT communication apps are typically available across various devices and platforms, promoting seamless communication regardless of the device used.

Presence Indication: Users can see the online status of their contacts, indicating whether they are available for communication.

Group Chats and Calls: These services often support group chats and conference calls, allowing multiple participants to communicate simultaneously.

Stickers and Emojis: OTT communication services commonly offer a wide range of stickers and emojis to enhance user interaction.

Justification:
Defining OTT communication services based on their features helps regulators identify the essential functionalities that distinguish these services from traditional telecommunication offerings. This clarity ensures that the regulatory mechanisms address the specific characteristics and challenges of OTT communication services.

Q4: What could be the reasonable classification of OTT communication services based on an intelligible differentia? Please provide a list of the categories of OTT communication services based on such classification. Kindly provide a detailed response with justification.

Response:
A reasonable classification of OTT communication services can be based on their primary mode of communication and functionalities. Here are some categories:

Messaging Apps: Apps that primarily focus on text-based messaging, with additional features such as stickers, emojis, and multimedia sharing. Examples include WhatsApp, Telegram, and Signal.

Voice and Video Calling Apps: Apps that prioritize voice and video communication, allowing users to make free or low-cost calls over the internet. Examples include Skype, Viber, and Google Meet.

Social Media Messaging: Features within social media platforms that allow direct messaging between users. Examples include Facebook Messenger, Instagram Direct, and Twitter Direct Messages.

Collaboration Tools: Communication platforms designed for professional use, offering features like team messaging, video conferencing, and file sharing. Examples include Slack, Microsoft Teams, and Zoom.

Justification:
Classifying OTT communication services based on their primary functionalities ensures that regulators can address specific issues associated with different types of communication. It helps avoid a one-size-fits-all approach and enables tailored regulations for each category, which can contribute to a more effective regulatory framework.

Q5: Please provide your views on the following aspects of OTT communication services vis-à-vis licensed telecommunication services in India:
(a) Regulatory aspects;
(b) Economic aspects;
(c) Security aspects;
(d) Privacy aspects;
(e) Safety aspects;
(f) Quality of service aspects;

(g) Consumer grievance redressal aspects;
(h) Any other aspects (please specify).
Kindly provide a detailed response with justification.

Response:
(a) Regulatory Aspects: OTT Communication Services: As internet-based services, OTT communication services often operate outside traditional telecommunication regulations. This lack of parity has raised concerns among licensed telecom operators, who argue that OTT services enjoy a regulatory advantage. Regulators need to strike a balance between providing a competitive environment and ensuring fair regulation of both OTT and licensed telecom services.

Licensed Telecommunication Services: Traditional telecom services are subject to stringent regulatory frameworks to ensure fair competition, consumer protection, and network security.

Justification: Regulators must create a level playing field for both OTT and licensed telecom services. While it's essential to encourage innovation and competition, consumer protection and national security should not be compromised. A comprehensive regulatory framework that addresses the specific aspects of each service type will ensure a fair ecosystem.

(b) Economic Aspects: OTT Communication Services: Many OTT communication services offer their core functionalities for free or at a lower cost than traditional telecom services. This has disrupted the revenue streams of licensed telecom operators, who invest heavily in network infrastructure and spectrum licenses.

Licensed Telecommunication Services: Licensed telecom operators face higher costs associated with maintaining and upgrading physical infrastructure and acquiring spectrum licenses, which are often passed on to consumers.

Justification: The economic impact of OTT communication services on licensed telecom operators should be carefully evaluated. Regulators must consider how to strike a balance between fostering innovation in the OTT space while ensuring the sustainability and growth of traditional telecom service providers.

(c) Security Aspects: OTT Communication Services: Many OTT communication services provide end-to-end encryption, enhancing user privacy and security. However, this encryption has raised concerns among law enforcement agencies

regarding difficulties in intercepting communication for legitimate purposes like criminal investigations.

Licensed Telecommunication Services: Traditional telecom services usually comply with lawful interception requirements, making it easier for authorities to access communication data when necessary.

Justification: Balancing user privacy and national security is a complex challenge. Regulatory frameworks need to consider the need for lawful interception while respecting users' privacy rights and ensuring that encryption remains robust against cyber   threats.

(d) Privacy Aspects: OTT Communication Services: Some OTT communication services collect user data for targeted advertising and service improvement. Users may have concerns about how their data is handled and shared with third parties.

Licensed Telecommunication Services: Traditional telecom services also collect user data for billing and service provisioning, but they are subject to stricter privacy regulations.

Justification: Privacy regulations should apply uniformly to both OTT and licensed telecom services to protect users' personal information, maintain transparency, and hold service providers accountable for data handling practices.

(e) Safety Aspects: OTT Communication Services: The ease of creating accounts on OTT communication services can lead to instances of spam, harassment, and cyberbullying. Moderation and safety mechanisms vary between platforms.

Licensed Telecommunication Services: Traditional telecom services have more robust customer verification processes, which can act as a deterrent to misuse.

Justification: Regulators should encourage OTT communication services to implement safety features and mechanisms to protect users from harmful content and malicious activities. Striking a balance between ease of use and user safety is crucial.

(f) Quality of Service Aspects: OTT Communication Services: The quality of service for OTT communication services depends on users' internet connection and device capabilities, which may vary significantly.

Licensed Telecommunication Services: Traditional telecom services often offer more consistent and controlled quality of service since they manage their infrastructure.

Justification: While OTT communication services rely on third-party internet connections, ensuring a minimum quality of service is necessary to maintain reliable communication experiences for users.

(g) Consumer Grievance Redressal Aspects: OTT Communication Services: Consumer grievance redressal mechanisms of OTT services might not be as structured or formalized as those of licensed telecom services.

Licensed Telecommunication Services: Traditional telecom operators have established processes for handling consumer complaints and disputes.

Justification: Regulators should encourage OTT communication services to have effective and transparent grievance redressal mechanisms to address consumer complaints promptly.

(h) Any Other Aspects: One other aspect that should be considered is Net Neutrality. OTT communication services and licensed telecommunication services alike should adhere to net neutrality principles. This means that internet service providers and regulators should treat all data on the internet equally without discrimination or preferential treatment. Net neutrality ensures fair competition and user freedom, preventing internet service providers from blocking, throttling, or prioritizing certain internet traffic over others.

Justification: Net neutrality is essential to promote a level playing field for all internet-based services, including OTT communication services and licensed telecom operators. By upholding net neutrality, regulators protect consumer choice and innovation while preventing any undue advantage for specific services.

Q6: Whether there is a need to bring OTT communication services under any licensing/regulatory framework to promote a competitive landscape for the benefit of consumers and service innovation? Kindly provide a detailed response with justification.

Response:
The need to bring OTT communication services under a licensing/regulatory framework is a subject of debate and requires careful consideration. Several factors should be evaluated:

1. Promoting Fair Competition: The explosive growth of OTT communication services has disrupted the traditional telecom market. Regulators must ensure a level playing field where both OTT and licensed telecom services can compete fairly and offer innovative services.

2. Consumer Protection: A regulatory framework for OTT communication services can provide essential safeguards for consumers, including privacy protection, security measures, and efficient grievance redressal mechanisms.

3. Revenue Generation: Some argue that licensing OTT communication services could generate revenue for governments, similar to traditional telecom operators who pay license fees and spectrum charges.

4. Encouraging Investment: Licensed telecom operators invest significantly in network infrastructure and spectrum licenses. Regulating OTT communication services might encourage similar investment in digital infrastructure and broadband connectivity.

5. Service Quality Assurance: A regulatory framework can ensure that OTT communication services maintain a certain level of quality and reliability in their services.

6. Balancing Innovation and Regulation: Regulators should strike a balance between promoting innovation in the OTT space and implementing necessary regulations to address consumer concerns, privacy, and national security.

Justification:
While there are potential benefits in bringing OTT communication services under a regulatory framework, it is essential to strike a delicate balance between promoting competition, innovation, and consumer welfare without stifling the growth and dynamism of OTT services. Any regulatory measures should be thoughtfully designed to avoid unintended consequences and should consider the unique aspects of digital services.

Q7: In case it is decided to bring OTT communication services under a licensing/ regulatory framework, what licensing/ regulatory framework(s) would be appropriate for the various classes of OTT communication services as envisaged in question number 4 above? Specifically, what should be the provisions in the licensing/ regulatory framework(s) for OTT Communication services in respect of the following aspects: (a) lawful interception;

(b) privacy and security;
(c) emergency services;
(d) unsolicited commercial communication;
(e) customer verification;
(f) quality of service;
(g) consumer grievance redressal;
(h) eligibility conditions;
(i) financial conditions (such as application processing fee, entry fee, license fee, bank guarantees, etc.);
(j) any other aspects (please specify).
Kindly provide a detailed response in respect of each class of OTT communication services with justification.

Response:
Before outlining specific provisions, it's important to note that the regulatory framework should be flexible enough to accommodate the evolving nature of digital services and innovative business models.

(a) Lawful Interception: Provision: OTT communication service providers should comply with lawful interception requirements to facilitate authorized access to user communications for legitimate purposes.

Justification: While user privacy is essential, lawful interception is crucial for national security, criminal investigations, and law enforcement. Striking the right balance between privacy and security is critical.

(b) Privacy and Security: Provision: OTT communication service providers should adhere to robust data protection standards, clearly communicate their data handling practices to users, and obtain explicit consent for data collection and sharing.

Justification: Protecting user privacy is paramount. Regulators should ensure that OTT communication services prioritize data security and provide users with transparent information about how their data is used.

(c) Emergency Services: Provision: OTT communication services should enable access to emergency services, such as dialing emergency numbers (e.g. 911) and transmitting location information to emergency responders.

Justification: Access to emergency services is critical for public safety. OTT

communication services should be able to provide emergency assistance effectively.

(d) Unsolicited Commercial Communication: Provision: OTT communication services should implement mechanisms to combat unsolicited commercial communication (spam) and ensure that users have control over message filtering and reporting mechanisms.

Justification: Spam can be a significant nuisance and a security risk. OTT communication services should take steps to minimize spam messages and empower users to manage their messaging preferences.

(e) Customer Verification: Provision: OTT communication services should implement customer verification mechanisms to prevent misuse and to enforce age restrictions, where applicable.

Justification: Implementing customer verification measures helps reduce fraudulent activities and enhances user safety on communication platforms.

(f) Quality of Service: Provision: OTT communication services should strive to maintain a minimum quality of service, especially for critical communication functions like emergency calls.

Justification: Ensuring a certain level of quality is essential to provide reliable and satisfactory communication experiences for users.

(g) Consumer Grievance Redressal: Provision: OTT communication service providers should establish effective and transparent grievance redressal mechanisms to address user complaints promptly.

Justification: A structured grievance redressal process helps maintain consumer trust and confidence in these services.

(h) Eligibility Conditions: *Provision:* The licensing framework may include eligibility conditions based on factors like user base size, revenue threshold, or geographical coverage.

Justification: Eligibility conditions can ensure that smaller or new players have a fair opportunity to compete while larger, more established players adhere to regulatory. standards.

(i) Financial Conditions: Provision: Financial conditions may include application processing fees, entry fees, license fees, and bank guarantees.

11

Justification: Financial conditions help generate revenue for the government and ensure that service providers have the financial capacity to operate responsibly.

(j) Any Other Aspects: Provision: Regulators should continuously assess the dynamic digital market and be prepared to adapt the regulatory framework to accommodate technological advancements and new business models.

Justification: Flexibility and adaptability are crucial in the rapidly evolving digital landscape to foster innovation and address emerging challenges effectively.

Q8: Whether there is a need for a collaborative framework between OTT communication service providers and the licensed telecommunication service providers? If yes, what should be the provisions of such a collaborative framework? Kindly provide a detailed response with justification.

Response:
Yes, there is a need for a collaborative framework between OTT communication service providers and licensed telecommunication service providers. Such a collaborative framework can lead to mutual benefits and create a more robust and efficient communication ecosystem. The provisions of the framework could include:

Interconnectivity and Interoperability: The framework should ensure seamless interconnectivity and interoperability between OTT communication services and licensed telecom networks. This would enable users of different services to communicate with each other without barriers.

Quality of Service Assurance: The framework should define mutual responsibilities for maintaining service quality and network performance to ensure a satisfactory user experience.

Resource Sharing: The collaborative framework could allow for the sharing of network resources where appropriate, reducing the burden on individual networks and optimizing resource utilization.

Emergency Services Support: Both OTT and licensed telecom services should cooperate to enable access to emergency services, allowing users to make emergency calls regardless of the service they use.

Data Exchange for Security and Consumer Protection: The framework should facilitate data exchange between service providers to address security threats and enhance consumer protection measures.

12

Innovation and Service Integration: Collaboration could foster innovation, allowing both types of service providers to offer integrated and value-added services to users.

Justification:
A collaborative framework between OTT communication service providers and licensed telecom operators can leverage the strengths of each type of service to enhance overall communication capabilities and user experiences. By working together, they can address various challenges and improve the efficiency and reach of communication services.

Q9: What could be the potential challenges arising out of the collaborative framework between OTT communication service providers and the licensed telecommunication service providers? How will it impact the aspects of net neutrality, consumer access, and consumer choice, etc.? What measures can be taken to address such challenges? Kindly provide a detailed response with justification.

Response:

Potential Challenges:
Business Models and Revenue Sharing: OTT and licensed telecom operators may have different business models and revenue streams. Agreeing on a fair revenue-sharing model could be challenging.

Data Privacy and Security: Collaborative efforts may require data exchange, leading to concerns about privacy and data security. Ensuring robust data protection measures is essential.

Interoperability: Ensuring seamless interoperability between diverse OTT and licensed telecom networks might be technically complex.

Competition Concerns: A collaborative framework may raise antitrust concerns if it leads to market dominance or stifles competition.

Regulatory Compliance*:* Collaboration may require adherence to different regulatory requirements for each type of service, leading to compliance complexities.

Impact on Net Neutrality, Consumer Access, and Choice:

Net Neutrality: The collaborative framework must not result in preferential treatment or discriminatory practices among different services, adhering to net neutrality principles.

Consumer Access and Choice: Collaboration should not restrict users' access to certain services or limit their choices. Consumers should have the freedom to choose the services they prefer.

Measures to Address Challenges:

Transparency: Maintain transparency in collaborative agreements to ensure that users are aware of any data sharing or service integration.

Privacy-by-Design: Implement privacy and security measures as a fundamental design principle in any collaborative effort.

Interoperability Standards: Establish clear technical standards and protocols to facilitate interoperability between networks.

Regulatory Oversight: Regulators should monitor collaborations to ensure compliance with net neutrality principles and fair competition.

Consumer Education: Educate consumers about the benefits and implications of collaborative efforts to make informed choices.

Justification:
Collaborative frameworks may encounter several challenges, and addressing them is crucial to derive the intended benefits without compromising user rights, net neutrality, and consumer choice. A transparent and well-regulated collaborative framework can lead to positive outcomes for both service providers and users.

Q10. What are the technical challenges in selective banning of specific OTT services and websites in specific regions of the country for a specific period? Please elaborate your response and suggest technical solutions to mitigate the challenges.

Response:
Selective banning of specific OTT services and websites can present several technical challenges:

Domain and IP Address Filtering: Banning based on domain names or IP addresses is relatively simple, but it can be circumvented through domain changes or using virtual private networks (VPNs).

Deep Packet Inspection (DPI): DPI can identify and block specific patterns in network traffic associated with banned services, but it may lead to privacy concerns and false positives.

Encryption: Encrypted communication channels can make it difficult to distinguish banned services from legitimate ones.

Dynamic Content Delivery Networks (CDNs): Many OTT services use CDNs to distribute content, making it challenging to block specific content effectively.

Geolocation Spoofing: Users can spoof their geolocation to access banned services using proxy servers or VPNs.

Collateral Damage: Banning specific services may inadvertently block other legitimate services that share the same infrastructure or IP addresses.

Mitigation Solutions:

Multi-Pronged Approach: Employ a combination of domain and IP filtering, DPI, and other methods to create a comprehensive blocking mechanism.

HTTPS Inspection: Implement HTTPS inspection to analyze encrypted traffic for suspicious patterns, while ensuring user privacy is protected.

Collaboration with ISPs and CDNs: Work with internet service providers (ISPs) and content delivery networks (CDNs) to identify and block specific content effectively.
Dynamic Updating: Regularly update the ban list to keep up with service changes and new IP addresses.

User Awareness and Enforcement: Educate users about the ban and enforce penalties for attempts to circumvent it.

Justification:
Selective banning involves technical complexities, and any solution must strike a balance between effectiveness and potential side effects, like blocking legitimate content. A multi-layered approach, coupled with collaboration and user awareness, can help mitigate these challenges.

Q11. Whether there is a need to put in place a regulatory framework for selective banning of OTT services under the Temporary Suspension of Telecom Services (Public Emergency or Public Safety) Rules, 2017, or any other law, in force? Please provide a detailed response with justification.

Response:
The need to put in place a regulatory framework for selective banning of OTT services is a matter of careful consideration. Some justifications and concerns are as follows:

Justifications:
National Security and Public Safety: In certain situations, the government may need to restrict access to specific OTT services in the interest of national security or public safety.

Regulatory Clarity: A specific regulatory framework can provide clarity on the conditions and procedures for selective banning, preventing arbitrary and ad-hoc decisions.

Legal Grounds: A clear legal framework can establish the legal basis for selective banning, ensuring that it aligns with constitutional principles and international norms.

Concerns:

Freedom of Expression: Selective banning may raise concerns about freedom of expression and access to information.

Misuse of Power: An overly broad or vague framework could be misused for political censorship or suppression of dissent.

Technical Feasibility: Banning specific OTT services can be technically challenging, as discussed in the previous question.

Justification:
The decision to put in place a regulatory framework for selective banning of OTT services should be carefully weighed against the potential benefits and concerns. A well-defined and transparent framework that respects constitutional rights and international standards can help strike an appropriate balance.

Q12. In case it is decided to put in place a regulatory framework for selective banning of OTT services in the country,
 (a) **Which class(es) of OTT services should be covered under selective banning of OTT services? Please provide a detailed response with justification and illustrations.**
 (b) **What should be the provisions and mechanism for such a regulatory framework? Kindly provide a detailed response with justification**.

Response:
(a) Which Class(es) of OTT Services Should be Covered Under Selective Banning of OTT Services?

The class(es) of OTT services covered under selective banning should be those that pose significant threats to national security, public safety, or are involved in illegal activities. The classification should be based on a thorough risk assessment and consideration of potential harms.

Examples:
Terrorist Content: OTT services used to disseminate terrorist propaganda and promote violent ideologies.

Hate Speech and Incitement: Platforms facilitating hate speech or incitement to violence, leading to social unrest or communal tension.

Malicious Software: OTT services distributing malware or engaging in cyberattacks.

Unlawful Content: Services providing access to illegal content like child pornography or content promoting human trafficking.

(b) Provisions and Mechanism for Such a Regulatory Framework:

Clear Definitions: Define the criteria and specific offenses that warrant selective banning to avoid ambiguity.

Judicial Oversight: Establish an independent judicial authority to review and approve requests for selective banning to prevent misuse.

Transparency and Reporting: Make the process transparent, with regular reporting to the public and relevant authorities about the reasons for bans.

17

Procedural Safeguards: Ensure the affected parties have an opportunity to challenge the banning decision through an appeals process.

Regular Review: Periodically review and reassess the necessity of the bans to ensure they remain relevant and justified.

Collaboration with Service Providers: Work with OTT service providers to facilitate the banning process effectively.

Justification:
A well-structured regulatory framework with clear definitions, judicial oversight, and procedural safeguards is essential to ensure that selective banning is carried out with precision, transparency, and accountability, without infringing on freedom of expression or access to legitimate information.

Q13. Whether there is a need to selectively ban specific websites apart from OTT services to meet the purposes? If yes, which class(es) of websites should be included for this purpose? Kindly provide a detailed response with justification.

Response:
The need to selectively ban specific websites, apart from OTT services, depends on the specific threats posed by these websites. Just like OTT services, the criteria for website bans should be based on risk assessments and potential harms.

Examples:

Malicious Websites: Websites spreading malware or engaging in cybercriminal activities.

Hate Speech and Radicalization: Websites propagating hate speech, radical ideologies, and promoting violence.

Illegal Content: Websites hosting illegal content such as child pornography, human trafficking, or pirated material.

Phishing Websites: Websites involved in phishing attacks to steal personal and financial information.

Justification:
Selective banning of specific websites may be necessary to protect national security, public safety, and prevent illegal activities. The classification should be based on the nature of content and the potential risks associated with these websites.

Q14. Are there any other relevant issues or suggestions related to regulatory mechanisms for OTT communication services and selective banning of OTT services? Please provide a detailed explanation and justification for any such concerns or suggestions.

Response:
There are several additional issues and suggestions related to the regulatory mechanism for OTT communication services and selective banning:

Transparency and Public Consultation: Regulatory decisions related to OTT communication services and selective banning should involve public consultation and be transparent to gain wider stakeholder inputs and avoid any undue influence.

Collaboration with International Partners: As the internet operates globally, cooperation with international partners is essential to address cross-border issues effectively.

Digital Literacy and Awareness: Promote digital literacy and awareness among users to empower them to make informed choices and safely navigate online spaces.

Regulatory Agility: The regulatory framework should be adaptable and responsive to technological advancements and changing circumstances.

Ethical Considerations: Policymakers should consider ethical implications when making decisions related to content restrictions, ensuring the protection of fundamental rights.

Justification:
Addressing these additional issues and incorporating the suggested measures will strengthen the regulatory framework for OTT communication services and selective banning, safeguarding user rights, promoting a safer digital environment, and ensuring the effectiveness of the regulations. The objective of this consultation paper is to facilitate a constructive dialogue among stakeholders, including government agencies, industry players, civil society, and the public, about the development of a robust regulatory mechanism

for OTT communication services. Moreover, this paper will delve into the contentious issue of selective banning of certain OTT services, taking into consideration factors like content regulation, cultural sensitivity, and potential harm to society.

Understanding Over-The-Top (OTT) Communication Services: This section will provide a comprehensive overview of OTT services, their various types, and their significance in contemporary communication. Additionally, it will highlight the key technological and economic drivers that have facilitated their widespread adoption.

Challenges and Opportunities: Here, the paper will delve into the challenges and opportunities posed by OTT services from different perspectives, including consumers, telecom operators, and the government. This section will explore issues such as data privacy, net neutrality, revenue models, and the impact on the traditional communication ecosystem.

Regulatory Framework: One of the central aspects of this paper is the discussion on developing a well-structured regulatory framework for OTT services. It will explore the principles and guidelines required to ensure fair competition, safeguard user interests, and protect national security, while also fostering innovation and investment in the digital economy.

Content Regulation and Selective Banning: This section will focus on the contentious topic of content regulation for OTT services and the potential need for selective banning of specific services deemed harmful or inappropriate. It will delve into the challenges of striking a balance between freedom of expression and responsible content governance.

International Perspectives: To gain a broader understanding, this paper will analyze how different countries have approached the regulation of OTT services. By examining international case studies, valuable insights can be drawn to aid in crafting an effective regulatory mechanism suitable for the local context.

Recognizing the significance: of public opinion, this section will propose mechanisms for engaging with stakeholders through consultations, surveys, and open forums, allowing all interested parties to contribute to the development of the regulatory framework.

This consultation paper seeks to promote an informed and inclusive discussion on establishing a regulatory mechanism for Over-The-Top (OTT) communication

services. It aims to strike a balance between fostering innovation, protecting consumer interests, ensuring national security, and promoting fair competition in the dynamic realm of digital communication. By encouraging active participation from all stakeholders, we endeavour to develop a framework that aligns with the evolving needs of our society and paves the way for a responsible and sustainable digital future.

Our strong protest as well as vehement opposition to the practice of allowing players to distribute bundled Over-the-Top (OTT) content through aggregation apps. As someone deeply concerned about the future of cable operators and the vitality of live cable TV, We implore you to take immediate action to protect this crucial industry.

Live cable TV has been an integral part of our society for decades, serving as a source of real-time news, entertainment, and valuable local content. Cable operators have tirelessly worked to provide seamless, reliable access to diverse channels, connecting communities and families across the nation. However, the emerging trend of offering bundled OTT content through aggregation apps poses a severe threat to their existence and sustainability.

By allowing big players to package various OTT services into a single app, we risk undermining the cable operators' business models and revenue streams. Such a move could lead to an exodus of subscribers from traditional cable services, thereby jeopardizing the financial viability of cable operators, many of which are pillars of local economies.

Furthermore, the aggregation of OTT services might inadvertently exacerbate the issue of content fragmentation, making it increasingly challenging for cable operators to negotiate with content providers and maintain reasonable subscription prices for consumers. This could result in reduced programming diversity and a deterioration of the overall TV viewing experience.

As a responsible and proactive regulator, we urge you to take a stand against this perilous trend. Instead, we should focus on fostering an environment that encourages healthy competition, promotes fair pricing models, and supports the growth of both cable operators and OTT platforms without sacrificing the vitality of either.

We propose the implementation of stringent regulations that prevent players from distributing bundle OTT content through aggregation apps, ensuring a level playing field for cable operators and OTT providers. Simultaneously, we encourage investment in cutting-edge technologies that enhance the capabilities of

cable services, such as interactive viewing experiences and personalized content recommendations.

Let us work together to safeguard the future of cable operators, protect the valuable live cable TV experience, and embrace technological advancements that complement, rather than undermine, the longstanding contributions of cable operators to our society.

Time is of the essence, and urgent action is needed to address this pressing issue. I sincerely hope that you will heed our call for action and stand with us to protect the future of cable operators and the cherished live cable TV tradition.

According to me, the observations described above have provided you with the knowledge you need, so I believe you should extend your hands of cooperation and effort to the cable TV operators in order to resolve the current difficult situations.

I call attention to the issues that call for attention from the relevant authorities without affecting my rights or claims in the Consultation Paper on "Consultation Paper on Regulatory Mechanism for Over-The-Top (OTT) Communication Services, and Selective Banning of OTT Services."

Thanking You

DIBYENDU BORAL
PROPTRITOR
Swastika
Manikpur, Kulgachia,
Uluberia, Howrah 711306.
9830254270 / 9830130236