

Policy Issues relating to Uplinking/Downlinking Television Channels in India, Dated March 15, 2010

Chapter 4. Issues for Consultation

The Views of Orissa Television Ltd for consideration are as follows:

4.1 In the present scenario how to determine the maximum number of satellite TV channels possible? Please elaborate with appropriate reasoning.

The maximum number of Satellite can be permitted keeping in view the spectrum availability and its optimum use and allocation. The new channels may only be permitted on MPEG-4 technology for effective utilisation of bandwidth.

4.2 Is it desirable to cap the number of channels? Please justify your response with detailed rationale.

There should not be cap for total number of channels unless there is spectrum constraint. All serious players to be permitted to bring new channels. At present the available spectrum and transponder capacities permits for more new channels.

4.3 If it is desirable to cap the number, what according to you should be the number in each category?

NA

4.4 Whether there is a case for putting a cap on the number of teleports/DSNG and uplinking facilities in other satellite based distribution networks such as DTH and HITS. If yes, please specify the number alongwith justification.

At present not required.

4.5 Should it be mandated for the broadcasters to switch from MPEG-2 to MPEG-4 encoding w.e.f. a particular date? If, so then what should be that date and if, not then why?

It should not be mandatory for existing channels since it involves sizable additional investments, should be for new entrants.

4.6 Should net worth requirement of Applicant Company for permission of TV channels under uplinking and downlinking guidelines be enhanced? If yes, how much it should be? Please elaborate with appropriate reasoning.

The present net worth requirement is adequate considering the investment requirement for setting up new channels and additional channels under both the category.

4.7 Should experience of the applicant company be introduced in eligibility criteria? If yes, what do you suggest?

This may put as preferred criteria but should not be a mandatory criteria in granting permission

4.8 Should experience and expertise of the promoters of Applicant Company be introduced in eligibility criteria? If yes, what do you suggest?

Yes experience and expertise of the promoter may be assessed, may not be in same/similar field.

4.9 Should the permission fee be enhanced to ensure participation of serious players?

No it should not be enhanced. Participation of serious player can not be assessed by mere increase of permission fee. Moreover the applicant should not assessed as serious or not linked to permission fee. Any applicant applying for permission should be considered as serious considering his past experience and expertise either in same/similar or other fields.

4.10 Should one time permission fee be converted into annual permission fee? If yes what should be the quantum?

Not required.

4.11 Should a commitment from the applicant company to stay in business for certain period be prescribed?

Any minimum period continuance commitment can not solve the objective. To run the business or not is totally at the discretion of the promoter. Better way to address this issue to revoke the license and blacklist those for certain period.

4.12 If yes, what should be that period? Please elaborate with appropriate reasoning.

NA

4.13 Whether permission of a channel should be revoked in case the channel is closed down for certain fixed period. If so, what should be the period? Should this period be same or different if the non operation is continuous or intermittent?

Yes it should be, but the minimum period may be six months with an opportunity of being heard.

4.14 What should be the policy for renewal of permission of channels under uplinking/downlinking guidelines? Please elaborate with appropriate reasoning.

Any channel operational and running during the permission period, renewal should be a routine matter subject to renewal fees if any.

4.15 Whether transfer of permission to a TV channel under uplinking/downlinking guidelines should be permitted. If so, under what terms and conditions.

Yes transfer of permission should be permitted. It should be allowed within same group companies, subsidiary or new company formed by same promoter and the majority of the directors of the transferee company be same as the licensee company.

At present there is a practice of indirect transfer of permission like the content part is being transferred to other party on hire basis. This should be restricted.

4.16 Whether India should be developed as a Teleport/hub centre for channels uplinking, which are not meant for viewing in India. In such case, should the channels be covered under uplinking and downlinking guidelines?

No comment.

4.17 If India is to be developed as a Teleport/hub centre for channels uplinking, then what facilities should be provided to the companies to make India a Teleport/hub centre for uplinking of channels? Whether this will in any way adversely affect the transponder availability for uplinking of TV channels to be viewed in India.

No comment

4.18 Any other related issue, you would like to comment upon or suggest.

At present many companies are holding license without any operation. All inoperative permitted channels may be reviewed and steps may be taken to make it operational/revoke the permission for effective utilization/release of available bandwidth.

Manoranjan Sarangi
Orissa Television Limited
Cell 09937288002