

BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS

For BIS use only

MINUTES

First meeting of Panel for review of Indian Standards, LITD 11

दिनांक /Date: 12 अक्टूबर/Oct 2023 दिन/Day: गुरुवार/Thursday समय/Time : 1400 बजे /H	स्थान/VENUE मीमांसा रूम/White Room, मानक भवन/Manak Bhavan, 9 बहादुरशाह जफर मार्ग/ Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, नई दिल्ली/ New Delhi— 110002
---	---

Members Present:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| 1. Shri Sandeep Aggarwal | Convener |
| 2. Smt Kamla Pargai | Ex ADG TEC & Member in personnel Capacity\ |
| 3. Prof N. K. Goyal | TEMA/CMAI |
| 4. Ms. Manisha Kumari | TEMA/CMAI |
| 5. Shri Roshan Kumar | Sterlite Technologies Limited |

Invitee

- | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 6. Shri Vijay Nain | UM Cables Ltd |
| 7. Shri Devendra Singh | West Coast Optilinks |
| 8. Shri Manoj Kumar Singh | Paramount Cables |
| 9. Shri Rajveer Singh Tanwar | Paramount Communications Ltd |

BIS DG

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 10. Smt Reena Garg | Head LITD |
| 11. Shri Bipin Jambholkar | Member Secretary, LITD 11 |

Regrets

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| 12. Shri Rakesh Desai | Chairman LITD 11 |
| 13. Ms Mudita | TEC |

ITEM 0 WELCOME

0.1 Member Secretary of LITD 11 welcomed Convener, all members of Panel and invitee to the first meeting of Panel of LITD 11.

He informed that Shri Sandeep Aggarwal has been appointed as Convener of the Panel for review of Indian Standards.

In the last meeting of LITD 11, it was pointed out that IS 16939: 2018 ‘Optical Fibre Cables for Inside Premises FTTX Application’ and IS 17046: 2018 ‘Fibre Optic Cable for Cable TV Application were based on TEC GR No. GR/OFC-019/01/ FEB 2009 “Optical fibre cable for fibre to home (FTTH) Application” (Superseded by TEC GR No. 85160:2021) and TEC GR No. TEC/GR/TX/OFC-024/01/MAR-15 ‘Aerial drop optical fibre cable’ (Superseded by TEC 85200:2022) respectively.

In view of above, TEC has requested to withdraw above mentioned Indian Standards.

In that meeting, some Committee members noted that there are different purposes of the TEC and BIS specifications and some of the specifications of IS 17046: 2018 may be different due to requirements of Cable TV application when compared to telecommunication applications, hence there is the need to study this issue before deciding the matter.

In view of above, the Committee decided to form a Panel of experts for examining the matter & comparison of IS 17046: 2018 Fibre Optic Cable for Cable TV Application'' with TEC GR 85200:2022, who will then give their recommendations to the LITD 11, whether the IS 17046: 2018 needed to be kept as it is or needs some revision or need to be withdrawn.

He briefly informed the Panel members about the history of IS 16939: 2018 'Optical Fibre Cables for Inside Premises FTTX Application' and IS 17046: 2018 'Fibre Optic Cable for Cable TV Application'. Both these were formulated after taking comments of all stakeholders which includes Optical fibre manufacturer, Cable TV Industry as well TEC. The relevant comments of Stakeholders were incorporated in the Standards.

He also tabled the letter No F.No. 9-12/2023-Tx/TEC dated 12th Oct 2023 issued by Shri Vijay Dixit, Director (Transmission-II) requesting DDG (Standardization), BIS to avoid duplication on Optical Fibre and Optical Fibre Cable related to telecom Standardization activities.

0.2 Smt Reena Garg, Head (LITD) also welcomed Convener and all members & invitees to the meeting.

She also supported the idea that we should avoid duplicity of work, hence often Indigenous Indian Standards in its National Foreword mentions that help has been derived from Standards Development Bodies (Like RDSO/FSSAI/TEC/ARAI etc.).

In present day, there is very thin line differentiating in products of IT and Communications. So the organization responsible for taking up Standardization in the Country should collaborate with each other. LITD 11 has already been liaising and is mirror Indian committee with IEC TC 86 Fibre Optics and its SCs. LITD 11 have also adopted nearly 65 IEC Standards as Indian Standards based on Indian requirements. The said standards when adopted with or without modification are given Indians number as IS (Indian Standard).

She said that Both Indian Standards and TEC Standards can coexist. Both BIS and TEC need to work together facilitating implementation of Standard.

She also informed that BIS being member of ISO and IEC has provision to adopt ISO/IEC Standards as Indian Standard and can nominate Indian experts as well give comments on IEC/ISO Standards.

She requested the Panel to carefully examine the contents of both the Standards and make suitable recommendations.

0.3 Convener of the Panel thanked the Committee for nominating him for such important work. He said that he had gone through both IS 17046: 2018 and TEC GR 85200:2022 as well as IS 16939: 2018 and TEC GR No. 85160:2021.

He said that TEC GR 85200:2022 extensively covers different requirements (like high altitude/ coastal region /high wind load areas) hence increasing the cost of final product, thus making it difficult to use by local cable operators whose requirements may not be so extensive.

He informed that different Govt. Bodies like RDSO/Defence Organizations have their own Standards, which are different from both TEC/BIS Standards.

As per him, Indian Standards should be formulated for optimum requirements and few things can be made optional

He said that, Committee formulating Standards should ensure that Standards are usable by industry in general.

He said that TEC GR 85200:2022 covers cable requirements primarily focused on telecom sector requirements whereas IS 17046: 2018 is specially for Cable TV Requirements.

He was of the opinion IS 17046: 2018 should stay and need to be revised taking latest technology and material requirements into consideration. He gave example of aramid yarn, which need to be replaced by more cost effective raw material but also cover all the requirements.

4 Prof. N.K.Goyal, Chairman Emeritus TEMA informed in brief about various TEC Standards such as GR, IR ER , COA etc. He also informed that TEC specifications are also made after industry consultations at various levels and TEMA supports the TEC Standards.

He said that TEMA fully supports TEC as the body of DOT to make specifications and Standards for telecom sector. The TEC GRs are often used with or without modifications for procurement by BSNL, USOF like Government Agencies and relied by other private users. There is no mandate to follow TEC GRs for any Government or private bodies. The TEC ER are made specifically for mandatory testing also called MTCTE. By the very nature and policies/procedures of MTCTE/ER, these do not include quality and reliability parameters. The MTCTE can be mandated and is implemented in phases for certain products. The IR on the other hand is used by all for interface between products and telecom network. The COA are for specific products based on individual Company's specifications.

According to TEMA, the issues is why do we need BIS standards, even though when there are several sectoral bodies including telecom, Meity making specifications/standards. The prime reason is that BIS standards, which include quality parameters, draw their strength from BIS Act, 2016 and can be mandated across India on users, consumers, manufacturers, traders, importers etc. Coming to telecom, the TEC GR which includes quality parameters are not mandated across all users. On the other hand, the MTCTE vide Rule 529 as introduced by Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Rules, 2017, is applicable only on telegraph which is used or capable of being used with any telegraph established, maintained or worked under the licence granted by the Central Government in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885. Thus, any body not licensed in Telegraph Act is not covered under MTCTE. The MTCTE process itself says it is not meant for quality and reliability. It is for national security parameters as also to ensure that telecom network (licensed under Section 4 of Indian Telegraph Act, 1885) does not degrade when connected to products.

The Cable TV Operators & Broadcaster are covered under Cable Television Networks (Regulation) Act, 1995. There are over 1400 Multi-system Operators registered with the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. There are more than 60000 cable operators, giving cable TV services to about 100 million households. They use optical fibre cable manufactured from Optical fibre and there is strong need to ensure quality of fibre and cable for this sector.

Hence, Cable TV does not come under the purview of Telecom, hence TEC MTCTE by ER will not be applicable for Cable TV and its products. The TEC GR, as it is are not even mandated for telecom users. The TEC ER also can not be implemented on Cable TV users due to limitation provided in the Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Rules, 2017, as quoted above. But if needed, I&B Ministry can adopt the TEC GR (and not TEC ER, as they do not cover quality and reliability parameters) and mandated by (i) introducing appropriate provisions in Cable TV Networks Regulations Act, 1995, or (ii) QCO Quality Control Order (QCO) based on BIS standard. The QCO under BIS Act can be issued only on the basis of BIS standard, not on standard made by any other body local or global.

There are also issues connected to ensure implementation for the quality in any product. The BIS derives its strength from BIS Act, and has powers vide Section 9 to enter into and search places, premises or vehicles, and inspect and seize goods or articles and documents to enforce the provisions of BIS Act. The MTCTE is implemented by surveillance by DOT LSA offices without any powers for search and seizure. MTCTE provides penalties as per licence conditions under the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885. The Details attached separately with the minutes.

Only BIS is authorised to issue Indian Standard (IS) corresponding to ISO/IEC standard. This is needed globally. No other sectoral department including telecom is authorized to do so.

The duplicity in making standard by BIS and TEC is properly ensured by having the concerned Officer Incharge of TEC as Chairman for the BIS relevant Sectional Committee entrusted to make BIS specifications.

As regards IS 16939: 2018, he said that in modern times due to convergence of technologies, internet is provided by cable TV operators also.

Hence, there is need for both BIS standard to stay on record.

He also supported the Convener view that IS 17046: 2018 need to be revised.

0.5 Mrs. Kamla Pargai, Ex-TEC official and member in personnel capacity informed that she has drafted and finalized most of Optical Fibre and Optical Fibre Cables Standards for TEC. She was also alternate member of LITD 11 on behalf of TEC.

She informed that TEC has initiated formulation of IS 16939: 2018 Optical Fibre Cables for Inside Premises FTTX Application and IS 17046: 2018 on the request of industry.

She was of the opinion that both IS 16939: 2018 and IS 17046: 2018 does not cover all the quality requirements of the end user and needs revision, as suggested by Convenor. She informed the members that TEC follows rigorous process for formulating all Standard and try to cover all the requirements and so that GRs/ERs ensures the quality products.

0.6 Shri Roshan Kumar from Sterlite Technology Limited, said that TEC GR 85200:2022 was more specific to Users (Government Agencies) who has takes Pan India view, whereas IS 17046: 2018 was formulated focusing more for unorganized sectors and Cable TV as the name itself says, so that same can deploy the good quality cable for local use. As per him, MSO's find IS 17046: 2018 more applicable for use in Cable TV industry.

As per him, both the IS don't have design parameters, whereas TEC Standards specifies both design parameters and raw material requirement leading to restricted manufacturing practice. He said that consistent good quality end product can be made only if raw materials are good.

0.7 Member Secretary during the Panel discussion shown the comparison statement between IS 17046: 2018 and TEC GR 85200:2022, wherein it was observed by members that both the IS 17046 and TEC 850200 have different scope and usage requirements.

ITEM 1 IS 17046: 2018 “Fibre Optic Cable For Cable TV Application”

1.1 After deliberating on comparison Statement and comments of Convener and all members of the Panel, it was decided that IS 17046: 2018 “Fibre Optic Cable For Cable TV Application” need not be withdrawn and decided to revise the Standard taking into latest technology and raw materials into consideration and wider stakeholders consultations including Cable TV industry members

1.2 It was decided that all members of LITD 11 would give their comments on IS 17046: 2018 and based on their comments, a Working Draft will be prepared and circulated to all members for period of 15 days. It will be then discussed in next meeting of LITD 11 or Panel.

ITEM 2 IS 16939: 2018 Optical Fibre Cables For Inside Premises FTTX Application

2.1 Members of Committee namely Shri Sandeep Aggarwal (Convener), Prof. N.K.Goyal and Shri Roshan Kumar was of the opinion that IS 16939: 2018 need to be retained and revised as per latest technology.

2.2 Smt Kamla Pargai, was of the opinion though IS 16939: 2018 Standard is similar to TEC GR No. 85160:2021, but it has fewer requirements or lenient requirements and hence creating confusion to industry, therefore it should be withdrawn.

2.3. Other members were of the opinion that though both IS 16939: 2018 and TEC GR No. 85160:2021 scope and requirements are different, as IS 16939: 2018 caters to base users. The issue may be discussed in the next meeting of Panel after taking comments from other members of Committees also.

2.4 It was decided that withdrawal of IS 16939: 2018 ‘Optical Fibre Cables For Inside Premises FTTX Application/ may be deferred till comments of other members of LITD 11 and from industry also received.

ITEM 3 DATE AND PLACE FOR THE NEXT MEETING

3.1 It was decided to next meeting will be held after issue of working draft of IS 17046. The meeting date and place for the next meeting will be decided in consultation with the convener.