

<b>การเงินธนาคาร</b> Money and Banking Circulation: 200,000 Ad Rate: 65,000	<b>Section:</b> -/-
	<b>วันที่:</b> พุธ 1 - พฤหัสบดี 30 เมษายน 2569 <b>ปีที่:</b> 44 <b>ฉบับที่:</b> 528 <b>หน้า:</b> 58(ล่างขวา) <b>จำนวนหน้า:</b> 0.25 <b>Ad Value:</b> 16,250 <b>PRValue (x3):</b> 48,750 <b>คลิป:</b> สีสี่ <b>คอลัมน์:</b> IN BRIEF: กสทช. เผยมูลค่าตลาดสื่อสารไทย 8 แสนล้านบาท

## IN BRIEF

► กสทช.

### เผยมูลค่าตลาดสื่อสารไทย 8 แสนล้านบาท

นายไตรรัตน์ วิริยะศิริกุล รองเลขาธิการ รักษาการแทนเลขาธิการคณะกรรมการกิจการกระจายเสียง กิจการโทรทัศน์ และกิจการโทรคมนาคมแห่งชาติ กสทช. เปิดเผยว่า จากผลการศึกษาแนวโน้มมูลค่าตลาดสื่อสารและทิศทางอุตสาหกรรมโทรคมนาคมของไทยปี 2569 พบว่า แนวโน้มมูลค่าตลาดสื่อสารไทยยังมีปัจจัยบวก รับแรงหนุนบริการดิจิทัล-AI ซึ่งประกอบด้วย 3 ตลาดย่อย ได้แก่ 1. ตลาดบริการสื่อสาร 2. ตลาดอุปกรณ์สื่อสาร และ 3. ตลาดอุปกรณ์โครงข่ายโทรคมนาคม มีแนวโน้มเติบโตจาก 711,900 ล้านบาท ในปี 2567 เป็น 805,200 ล้านบาทในปี 2569 คิดเป็นอัตราการเติบโตเฉลี่ย 4.19% ต่อปี สำหรับแรงขับเคลื่อนสำคัญจากการขยายตัวของบริการดิจิทัล และการลงทุนในโครงสร้างพื้นฐานที่เกี่ยวข้อง เช่น การขยายโครงข่ายอินเทอร์เน็ตของภาคเอกชน และการลงทุนในโครงสร้างพื้นฐานด้านข้อมูล (Data Center) ที่เพิ่มขึ้นอย่างต่อเนื่อง สะท้อนให้เห็นว่าอุตสาหกรรมสื่อสารไทยยังมีแนวโน้มขยายตัว และหากได้รับการสนับสนุนผ่านมาตรการที่เหมาะสม ก็จะช่วยเสริมการเติบโตได้อย่างมีประสิทธิภาพและยั่งยืน



## กสทช.ทำลายของกลางผิดกฎหมาย

นายไตรรัตน์ วิริยะศิริกุล รองเลขาธิการ รักษาการแทน เลขาธิการคณะกรรมการกิจการกระจายเสียง กิจการ โทรทัศน์ และกิจการโทรคมนาคมแห่งชาติ (กสทช.) กล่าวว่า สำนักงาน กสทช.ได้ทำลายของกลางที่คดีถึงที่สุดแล้ว เป็นเครื่อง Wi-Fi Router 750 รายการ จากความผิดต่อพระราชบัญญัติศุลกากรและความผิดต่อพระราชบัญญัติวิทยุคมนาคม โดยของกลางถูกกำจัดอย่าง ถูกวิธีด้วยการบดทำลาย เพื่อให้แน่ใจว่าจะไม่ถูกนำกลับมา ใช้ซ้ำ เพื่อความปลอดภัยของประชาชน และการใช้งาน คลื่นความถี่ที่ถูกต้อง

Established 1946

**Bangkok Post**

THE NEWSPAPER YOU CAN TRUST

# Unchartered territory

It's clear that Prime Minister Anutin Charnvirakul has deliberately omitted any mention of rewriting the charter from his policy statement. Such a decision, while not a surprise, is totally unacceptable. Lest we forget, the public referendum held on the same day as the Feb 8 general election showed that 21 million people voted in favour of rewriting the current junta-sponsored constitution, which has been in place since 2017.

When confronted by the media about this issue, Mr Anutin was evasive and walked away. Such a childish response is intolerable. As the prime minister, he must show more responsibility.

But it would be too naive to think that the Bhumjaithai Party (BJT) cares much about charter change. On the contrary, like most political parties, the BJT has never taken the charter amendment issue seriously.

In reality, the party appeared to treat it as a poll campaign issue out of the need to save its image ahead of the election, something close to just paying lip service, rather than seeing it as a commitment. It has tended to backtrack in the wake of the election.

But Mr Anutin and the ruling party must think again. To put it bluntly, they must honour the outcome of the Feb 8 referendum, when a minority of 11 million opposed the idea and three million did not express any

opinion. The Election Commission (EC) confirmed the figures when it published the referendum results recently in the *Royal Gazette*.

Nathawut Buapratoom, a list-MP of the People's Party (PP), is right in pointing out that any delay in rewriting the charter would mean Mr Anutin and the BJT have effectively ignored the public mandate.

Besides, Mr Anutin must bear in mind that it was his pledge to give charter writing a push that helped him earn legitimacy to run the country last October. Then, a disagreement between the Lower House and the BJT-controlled Senate over the number of senators who should be involved in a crucial charter vote led to the abrupt dissolution of the House.

Mr Anutin and the BJT may want to ignore public sentiment. But they must accept the painful fact that, while the party has decisive control over both Houses and strong ties with some independent agencies, such as the EC, it cannot fully boast of public support. Doubts over the party's poll victory linger on amid allegations of election fraud.

Despite coming first in the national election, the BJT's popularity is on the wane.

A popularity survey in February and March by the King Prachadhipok's Institute (KPI) shows the majority of respondents, or 75%, would welcome a new election in the event of a "political accident". Quite ironic for a party with full power!

Leaving popularity and politics aside, the crux of the argument is that the military-sponsored charter has more than enough flaws to justify a major overhaul.

Among those are the lack of checks and balances to curb the excessive power of independent agencies whose commissioners are appointed by the Senate, notably the EC, the Office of the National Anti-Corruption Commission (NACC), the Office of the National Broadcasting and Telecommunications Commission (NBTC), and the charter court.

Unchecked power can lead the country to greater stagnation and eventually induce political turmoil.

Mr Anutin and the BJT have no choice but to show respect to the will of the people and become an instrument of charter change.

# ABOUT Politics

Warong's push to cut MPs' perks steals momentum, forcing main opposition party into reactive bid to reclaim reformist ground ❖ With diesel prices topping 50 baht per litre, govt faces increasing scrutiny over crisis management, communication

## PP on back foot over reform

If there is one issue that should naturally belong to the People's Party (PP), it is the politics of institutional reform — especially when that reform touches on the privileges, perks and opaque benefits enjoyed by political and state elites.

Yet in recent days, the party has found itself in the uncomfortable position of appearing reactive rather than leading, after Dr Warong Dechgitvigrom, leader of the single-MP Thai Pakdee Party, unexpectedly seized the spotlight by proposing cuts to MPs' meal allowances and the number of parliamentary assistants. His demands were later granted by parliament.

These are not merely technical budget items. They are symbolic pressure points in a political climate shaped by public frustration over inequality, cost-of-living pressures and distrust of elite privilege.

That the issue was first forcefully raised by Dr Warong — rather than by the PP, which has long campaigned on political reform and ethical governance — has exposed a strategic vulnerability for the opposition's largest reformist bloc.

Now, the PP is attempting to reset the narrative.

On April 7, Bangkok MP Phanthil Nuamjerm shifted the conversation by calling on independent agencies to publicly disclose the salaries, allowances and welfare benefits of their executives. He argued that these agencies, funded by taxpayers but often shielded by institutional autonomy, should be subject to greater transparency and scrutiny by both the public and other state bodies.

On substance, the move is logical. Politically, however, it is defensive, according to one observer.

Mr Phanthil's intervention is clearly designed to reclaim reformist ground by broadening the debate beyond parliament itself.

Rather than remaining trapped in a politically awkward argument over whether the PP has done enough to cut its own perks, the party is now attempting to redirect attention towards the wider ecosystem of elite compensation — particularly within independent constitutional bodies, which have often

drawn criticism for generous pay structures and weak accountability.

This is a clever pivot, the observer said. It allows the party to argue that reform should not stop at MPs, and that if society is serious about cutting waste and restoring trust, scrutiny must extend to institutions such as the National Anti-Corruption Commission (NACC), the Ombudsman's Office and the National Broadcasting and Telecommunications Commission (NBTC).



**Warong: Seizes the spotlight**

By citing specific examples — advisers, secretaries, security staff, official cars and layered benefits — the PP is seeking to paint a broader picture: that public anger over “politician perks” should be matched by scrutiny of unelected centres of power, whose compensation is often higher and less visible.

But politically, the problem remains the same: the party is responding after the fact.

Dr Warong's intervention resonated because it struck at a weakness that is both symbolic and emotional.

The PP has built much of its brand on being an anti-establishment force willing to challenge entrenched political habits.

But such a brand carries a higher standard. When the issue turns to reducing benefits for MPs themselves — especially those the party has previously criticised or campaigned against — the public expects the PP not merely to support reform in principle, but to move first, visibly and decisively.

Instead, Dr Warong managed to occupy the

reform space with a simple and highly legible message: cut food budgets, cut assistants, trim the political fat, the observer noted.

It did not matter that Dr Warong is not the obvious standard-bearer for institutional reform in the eyes of younger or urban voters. What mattered was that he acted first, on a politically potent issue, and in doing so forced the PP into explanation mode.

For the PP, this is not just a one-off communications problem. It goes to the core of its political identity.

Reformist parties do not merely compete on ideology; they compete on credibility. Voters tolerate imperfection, but they punish hesitation when a party's central promise is moral or institutional renewal.

If the PP begins to look like a party that talks reform more fluently than it delivers it — especially on matters involving its own material interests — it risks ceding its strongest comparative advantage, the observer warned.

That is why the backlash has been sharper than it might appear on paper.

Critics are not simply asking whether MPs' meal allowances should be reduced. They are asking whether the PP is willing to impose costs on itself before demanding sacrifice from others. In politics, where distrust of self-serving behaviour runs deep, that distinction matters enormously.

This is why some critics have urged the party to take a more concrete and politically dramatic step: reduce the number of assistants employed by its own MPs first, and do so publicly as proof of sincerity.

Without such a move, calls for greater transparency among independent agencies risk being interpreted less as principled escalation and more as narrative diversion, the observer said.

That said, the PP's shift towards independent agencies is not without strategic merit.

These institutions occupy a politically sensitive space: they are powerful, unelected, constitutionally protected, and often accused by critics of lacking adequate accountability despite enjoying substantial budgets and privileges.

They are also central to the post-2017 constitutional order that reformist forces have repeatedly questioned.

By demanding disclosure of executive pay and benefits, the PP is effectively linking budget transparency to structural constitutional reform, according to the observer.

It allows the party to frame the issue not as an isolated controversy over parliamentary welfare, but as part of a broader question: who gets to spend public money with minimal scrutiny, and why?

It may also resonate if tied to current economic hardship. In a period of rising fuel

prices, household strain and public anger over the cost of living, arguments about high compensation for insulated officials can quickly gain traction.

The question now is whether the party can turn a reactive manoeuvre into a coherent reform offensive. To do so, it needs three things, the observer said.

First, it must act internally. If it wants to restore credibility, it should voluntarily announce a measurable reduction in certain parliamentary privileges or staffing practices within its own ranks. Symbolism matters.

Second, it must sustain institutional pressure. Calling for disclosure is useful, but proposing section-by-section amendments to the organic laws governing independent agencies would allow the party to move from rhetoric to legislative architecture.

Third, it must unify its message. This cannot appear as one issue concerning MPs' welfare and another concerning independent agencies. The party's strongest argument is that all taxpayer-funded power — elected or unelected — should be subject to the same standards of transparency, restraint and accountability.



**Anutin: Shouldn't rely on Facebook**

## Under oil price pressure

**T**he Bhumjaithai Party (BJT)-led government is moving to cushion the impact of rising oil prices triggered by the war in the Middle East, amid doubts over whether its measures will be sufficient.

Reallocating parts of the state budget to absorb energy costs, preparing to invoke special laws if necessary, and rolling out a new round of the co-payment scheme, "Khon La Khrueng Plus", are all in the pipeline.

As part of efforts to curb soaring retail diesel prices, the Energy Policy Administration Committee (Epac) earlier this week approved a cut in ex-refinery prices of 2 baht per litre, a move expected to lower domestic diesel prices by about 2.14 baht per litre.

Enabled by emergency powers under a 1973 decree on preventing fuel shortages, the move marked an unusual intervention following discussions between energy officials and six oil refinery operators.

However, with diesel prices having surged past 50 baht per litre — pushing up transport and living costs — public frustration is growing over how the government is handling the situation. Questions are also emerging over whether it can outlast the energy crisis.

Olarn Thinbangtieo, a political science lecturer at Burapha University, said Prime Minister Anutin Charnvirakul has had opportunities to manage crises but has often fallen short. He pointed to slow or misjudged responses in past crises, including the Covid-19 pandemic and flooding in Hat Yai, Songkhla. The BJT leader has been criticised for relying heavily on close advisers, which may have contributed to delayed or ineffective responses, he said.

However, Mr Olarn said he believes the government can still navigate the current energy crisis, although some quarters remain unhappy with Mr Anutin. A key factor, he said, is continued backing from influential groups.

Even if public pressure intensifies, a change in government through a coup, as some hard-line observers have feared, remains highly unlikely, he said.

“No matter how unhappy the public is, a military putsch is unlikely. A military-backed government would lack legitimacy and would not offer a solution to the current economic problems,” he said. Mr Olarn also said he does not expect political shifts that would allow the People’s Party (PP) to take power. Moreover, the party itself faces internal constraints and is not in a position to fully capitalise on the current crisis, he added. With limited alternatives, the focus returns to how the current government manages the situation.

“The prime minister is also aware that if the crisis continues without effective action, the government itself will not survive,” he said.

According to Mr Olarn, improving communication is one of the government’s most urgent tasks. He cited Singapore Prime Minister Lawrence Wong as an example of a more direct and transparent approach, saying Mr Anutin needs to clearly explain the situation, outline his plans, and help the public understand the scale of the problem.

“This is not a short-term issue. People need to know the crisis will last and that everyone has a role to play. Otherwise, the government risks losing the chance to address long-term problems,” he said. He added that Mr Anutin should communicate through official channels and make national addresses, rather than relying on Facebook. Moreover, the government should broaden cooperation, clearly setting out how the private sector and local authorities can contribute.

Government agencies, businesses and local administrations, including tambon administrative organisations, should all help ease the burden — whether through cost reductions, tax relief or more efficient use of public budgets, he said.

“Even if the figures aren’t big, a concerted effort can cushion the impact of the crisis,” he said. Mr Olarn also called for greater public participation, saying wider engagement could generate practical ideas that may not emerge from within official circles.

He added that the government could encourage businesses to share part of the burden by accepting lower profit margins during the crisis, although it cannot force private companies to absorb losses.

Local oil refineries have come under heavy criticism for benefiting from windfall gains on existing oil stocks as prices surge, while much of the public struggles with rising costs.

“If possible, Mr Anutin should ask businesses to accept lower profits. This would improve the image of the government and private sector, and help ease pressure on the public. But this is also where Mr Anutin is not so good,” Mr Olarn said.

**มติชน**  
กรอมน้ำ

Matichon (Mid-Day)  
Circulation: 950,000  
Ad Rate: 1,200

Section: First Section/กีฬา

วันที่: อาทิตย์ 12 เมษายน 2569

ปีที่: 49

ฉบับที่: 17563

หน้า: 15(บนขวา)

Col.Inch: 12.76

Ad Value: 15,312

PRValue (x3): 45,936

ศิลปิน: ชาว-ดำ

หัวข้อข่าว: เขมรซื้อแล้ว-ไทยยังลุ้น ลิขสิทธิ์ถ่ายทอดสดบอลโลก

## เขมรซื้อแล้ว-ไทยยังลุ้น ลิขสิทธิ์ถ่ายทอดสดบอลโลก

ศึกฟุตบอลโลก 2026 ที่จะจัดขึ้นระหว่างวันที่ 11 มิถุนายน-19 กรกฎาคม โดยมีเจ้าภาพ 3 ประเทศประกอบด้วย สหรัฐอเมริกา, เม็กซิโก และแคนาดา ซึ่งได้ 48 ทีมสุดท้ายเป็นที่เรียบร้อยแล้ว ในส่วนของการถ่ายทอดสดซึ่งสหพันธ์ฟุตบอลนานาชาติ (ฟีฟ่า) เป็นเจ้าของลิขสิทธิ์นั้น

ข้อมูลล่าสุดจากฟีฟ่า ระบุว่า มี 6 ชาติอาเซียนจากทั้งหมด 11 ชาติ ที่ซื้อลิขสิทธิ์ถ่ายทอดสดเรียบร้อยแล้ว พร้อมระบุชื่อผู้ถือลิขสิทธิ์อย่างเป็นทางการ ดังนี้ กัมพูชา - Hang Meas TV / อินโดนีเซีย - TVRI / ฟิลิปปินส์ - Aleph Group / สิงคโปร์ - Mediacorp / ตีมอร์ เลสเต - ETO / เวียดนาม - VTV ส่วนอีก 5 ชาติอาเซียนในอาเซียนที่ยังไม่ได้ควาลิขสิทธิ์ถ่ายทอดสดฟุตบอลโลก 2026 รอบสุดท้าย ประกอบด้วย ไทย, เมียนมา, มาเลเซีย, บรูไน และลาว รายงานล่าสุดระบุว่า ไทยและมาเลเซีย คือ 2 ชาติที่กำลังอยู่ในระหว่างการเจรจากับฟีฟ่าในการซื้อลิขสิทธิ์ ซึ่งในส่วนของประเทศไทยบริษัทเอกชนรายหนึ่งที่เกี่ยวข้องถือลิขสิทธิ์ฟุตบอลรายการดังกล่าวได้ร่วมมือกับพันธมิตรหลายเจ้าในการเจรจากับฟีฟ่า ซึ่งคาดว่าจะบรรลุข้อตกลงในเร็ว ๆ นี้

อนึ่งสำหรับฟุตบอลโลก 2026 ถือเป็นครั้งแรกหลังจากคณะกรรมการกิจการกระจายเสียง กิจการโทรทัศน์ และกิจการโทรคมนาคมแห่งชาติ (กสทช.) ได้ถอดฟุตบอลโลก รอบสุดท้าย ออกจากกฎ Must Have ทำให้คนไทยอาจไม่ได้ดูการถ่ายทอดสดฟุตบอลโลก 2026 ผ่านฟรีทีวี