TELECOM REGULATORY AUTHORITY OF INDIA
NOTIFICATION

New Delhi, the 9th November, 2000

No.306-1/99-TRAI (Econ.). – In exercise of the powers conferred upon it under sub-section (2) of section 11 of the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India Act, 1997 to notify, by an Order in the Official Gazette, tariffs at which Telecommunication Services within India and outside India shall be provided, the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India hereby makes the following Order.

The Telecommunication Tariff (Tenth Amendment) Order 2000
(4 of 2000)

Section I
Title, Extent and Commencement

1. Short title, extent and commencement :

(i) This Order shall be called “Telecommunication Tariff (Tenth Amendment) Order 2000.”

(ii) The Order shall come into force with effect from 1st December, 2000.

Section II
Tariff

2. The tariff for Franchised Group PBX, or PABX and EPABX with DID facility (for Multistorey Buildings, other Buildings, Co-operative Housing Societies) is changed as detailed below.

3. For item (16.b.ii) in Schedule I of the Telecommunication Tariff Order (TTO), 1999 prescribing Monthly Rental, the changes are as under:

Read In place of
“Rs.100 per month” “Rs.125 per month”

4. In (16.b.iv) in Schedule I of the Telecommunication Tariff Order (TTO), 1999 prescribing call charges, the existing entry is replaced as under:-

(a) Call charge per metered call unit
up to 500 metered call units per month Rs.0.90

(b) For calls above 500 metered call units
per month, call charge per metered call unit Rs.1.10
Section III

Explanatory Memorandum

5. This Order contains at Annex A, an Explanatory Memorandum to provide clarity and transparency to the tariffs specified in this Order.

By Order,
HARSHA VARDHANA SINGH,
Advisor (Economic)

Annex A
Explanatory Memorandum

1. The Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (hereinafter the “Authority”) noted that DID Franchisees provide a cheaper alternative to the low user group, particularly after the increase in rentals was ordered by the TRAI last year as part of its tariff rebalancing exercise.

2. The tariff for extension users of DID Franchisees was fixed in TTO, 1999, keeping the standard tariff package in view. The Authority noted that with the tariffs remaining unchanged for urban low callers (i.e. those making up to 200 metered calls per month), tariffs for extension users of DID franchisees had become much less attractive than was envisaged in TTO, 1999. The viability of the service had also been adversely affected.

3. The Authority recalled the emphasis given in TTO, 1999 to DID franchisees as a means of expanding tele-density in the context of enhanced rentals. The Authority further noted that the extension user of DID has an easier access to a DID Franchisee, than does a corresponding user of DEL to his service provider. Thus, the service is likely to be more user-friendly than a DEL. The Authority also noted that DID provides an option that requires less investment per user in comparison to a DEL. The Authority further noted that at the prevailing tariffs needed to change for the extension users of DID to find the service attractive in comparison to a DEL. Accordingly, the tariffs for end-users of DID have been amended.