



Strasbourg, 25 November 2005

MC-S-MD(2005)09

[PDF](#)

**GROUP OF SPECIALISTS ON MEDIA DIVERSITY
(MC-S-MD)**

**2nd meeting
14 and 15 November 2005
Strasbourg, Human Rights Building**

REPORT

Item 1 and 2 of the agenda:**Opening of the meeting and Adoption of the agenda**

1. The Group of Specialists on media diversity (MC-S-MD) held its second meeting on 14 and 15 November 2005 in the Human Rights Building in Strasbourg. The meeting was chaired by Mr Sigve GRAMSTAD (Norway).

The agenda was adopted without changes (see Appendix II).

2. The list of participants appears in Appendix I.

Item 3 of the agenda:**Information on the decisions taken by the Steering Committee on the Media and New Communication Services (CDMC) of interest to the MC-S-MD**

3. The Group took note of the decisions by the CDMC of interest to the MC-S-MD, including the change to the Group's name.

4. One expert drew the Group's attention to the issue of the visibility of the CDMC's work, pointing out that this principle also applied to the activities of the MC-S-MD.

Item 4 of the agenda:**Study of the impact of media concentration on freedom of expression and information with a view to suggesting initiatives to preserve media pluralism**

- **National concentrations: consideration of the first results of the study on “the effects of media concentration on freedom of expression and information, media pluralism and cultural diversity”**

5. Mr David Ward, of the London Centre for Media Policy and Development, outlined the methodology used for the study on “the effects of media concentration on freedom of expression and information, media pluralism and cultural diversity” which the Group had commissioned from him (see MC-S-MD (2005) 005). He presented the initial results of the study.

He specified that the study had its limits because, on the one hand, it had only been conducted for two weeks in four Council of Europe member States (Croatia, Italy, Norway and the United Kingdom), and on the other, no other studies had ever been conducted using the same methodology, so that the analysis could not be compared against any similar previous survey.

6. In reply to a number of questions, Mr Ward pointed out that:

- there had been insufficient resources to include an analysis of on-line newspapers in the study, although such an analysis would undoubtedly have been very useful;
- the study had dealt with the national media, as this had seemed the most relevant level for inter-State comparisons;
- each article had been recorded in one category only, and all the encoders had been trained so as to apply identical criteria;
- the cm² criterion had been adopted for the press, because it was the method that had always been used in this field and also because the word-counting method would have been too time-consuming.

7. Mr Ward said that it could not yet be concluded from this study alone that there was a link between media concentration and content diversity. Nor could it be concluded from this study taken in isolation that an impact on one variable would inevitably have any specific effect.

8. The expert of Norway, whose country had taken part in the study thanks to the co-operation of its national media regulating body, pointed out that the experience had given this body the benefit not only of an innovative methodology but also of a novel way of looking at the media. His country would probably be conducting other similar experiments to analyse in particular whether the ownership of production companies by certain media-owning enterprises had any influence on the content of the media in question.

9. Many experts welcomed the completion of the study, especially in view of the low level of resources available. Several of them mentioned other questions to be studied/observed in order to complete the picture in terms of media diversity: one expert stressed that content quality was important for the quality of pluralism; another observed that it was difficult to know what had not been published and why.

10. In conclusion, many of the experts agreed that one study was insufficient on its own, and that the study that had been submitted was a starting point for considering content diversity.

11. However, the group noted that at a time when the possibility of setting up a media diversity observatory was often being mentioned in international colloquies or other events it was important to note that media ownership was not the only parameter to be observed.

- **Transnational concentrations: examination of the update carried out by the European Audiovisual Observatory (EAO), of the Advisory Panel on Media Diversity (AP-MD) study on transnational concentrations**

12. The Group took note of the update of some of the data set out in the AP-MD report on transnational media concentrations in Europe (see document MC-S-MD (2005) 006).

The question of co-operation with the European Audiovisual Observatory (EAO) was broached once again. It was recalled that with its current level of resources the EAO could not intensify its co-operation beyond the input it had made into the present meeting.

While noting the importance of the data passed on by the EAO, several experts regretted that there was no general overview of media concentrations in Europe, as this would be extremely useful to decision-makers by enabling them to react effectively.

One expert said that the European Union was prepared to finance an observatory in this field, the precise role of which remain to be defined. When the mandate has been determined, the EAO might conceivably be entrusted with executing it.

Item 5 of the agenda:

**Impact of media concentration on cultural diversity and media pluralism in the digital environment:
possible update of Recommendations No. R (94) 13 on measures to promote media transparency and No. R (99) 1 on measures to promote media pluralism**

13. The Group resumed discussions on the expediency of updating Recommendations Nos. R (94) 13 and R (99) 1. Some of the experts wondered whether each of the two recommendations should be updated separately or whether it might not be better to prepare a new combined text, which could be either a recommendation or some other kind of instrument, to cover both fields addressed by Recommendations Nos. R (94) 13 and R (99) 1.

The MC-S-MD decided that a select working group comprising the experts of Bulgaria, France and Poland would produce a draft text for the subsequent meeting, in consultation with the observers from the European Union, ACT, EBU and the European Federation of Journalists.

**Item 6 of the agenda:
the
expressions:
development of a joint**

UNESCO International Convention on protection of diversity of cultural contents and artistic effect on the media and possible pan-European approach

14. The expert of France presented his memorandum on the 33rd UNESCO General Conference held in Paris from 3 to 21 October 2005, which had adopted the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.

He stressed the historic nature of this text, which affirmed the freedom to define and conduct cultural policies. He drew the Group's attention to the fact that media diversity and the public broadcasting service were singled out as factors that could help cultural expressions to flourish and that might be the subject of governmental measures to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions.

15. In connection with types of follow-up to this Convention, he proposed adding a positive-law principle of the contribution of the new services/electronic media to content diversity.

16. All the experts welcomed the fact that the Convention had acknowledged the media's specific contribution to cultural diversity and the vital role of the broadcasting service. One expert also stressed the importance of independent producers in promoting cultural diversity.

17. The group noted that the Convention would be coming into force three months after the date of deposit of the thirtieth instrument of ratification, and the expert of France suggested that the Group prepare a draft recommendation of the Committee of Ministers urging Council of Europe member States to ratify the Convention.

The Group decided to prepare a draft recommendation for submission to the CDMC at its subsequent meeting, and then to the Committee of Ministers as soon thereafter as possible. The draft recommendation should take account of any initiatives that had been or were being adopted in other Council of Europe Directorates.

Item 7 of the agenda:

Follow-up of implementation of Recommendation (2003) 9 of the Committee of Ministers on measures to promote the democratic and social contribution of digital broadcasting: Examination of a draft questionnaire

18. The Chairperson presented the draft questionnaire reproduced in document MC-S-MD (205) 007 and pointed out that as this questionnaire concerned the implementation of a Recommendation, the questions had both to be concrete and to refer to the actual text of the Recommendation.

19. Having examined the questionnaire in depth and made a several amendments (see amended draft questionnaire in Appendix III), the Group decided that the questionnaire should be transmitted by CDMC members to the public authorities responsible for the changeover to digital technology in the member States, but that anyone interested in these questions should be allowed to reply to them. It was consequently decided that the questionnaire should be put on line on the Website of the Media Division and that the members of the Group would inform the general public that they could answer it if they so wished.

These measures must be taken as quickly as possible, and the replies should be made available to the Group and the CDMC for their subsequent meetings.

Item 8 of the agenda:**Other business**

20. The members of the MC-S-MD were informed of the Action Plan adopted by the Heads of State and Government of Council of Europe member States at their Third Summit in Warsaw on 16 and 17 May 2005 as well as the Action Plan adopted by the Ministers of States participating in the 7th European Ministerial Conference on Mass Media Policy (Kyiv, 10-11 March 2005).

21. The MC-S-MD held an initial exchange of views on one of the items in the Action Plan of the Kyiv Conference which had not yet been included in the terms of reference of the CDMC's subordinate groups and on which the MC-S-MD might be invited to work: "examine in particular how different types of media can play a part in promoting social cohesion and integrating all communities and generations".

Many of the experts considered this a very important subject which was worth examining in depth. One expert suggested that non-governmental organisations, including the Human Rights Grouping of INGOs enjoying participatory status with the Council of Europe, should be consulted on the topic. Several experts pointed out that the Group would need additional resources if it was to work on this subject.

Item 9 of the agenda:
for**Election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson
2006**

22. The current Chairperson of the MC-S-MD, Mr Sigve Gramstad, informed the Group that he was standing down from the Norwegian regulating authority to take up a post which was not directly connected with the media, and so he had decided not to stand for re-election to the Chair of the MC-S-MD.

The Group proceeded to elect its Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for 2006.

The Group unanimously elected Ms Zrinjka PERUŠKO (Croatia) Chairperson, and re-elected Mr Frédéric Deroin (France) Vice-Chairperson.

Item 10 of the agenda:**Date of next meetings**

23. The Secretariat informed the members of the Group that the timetable of meetings of Groups of Specialists in 2006 would be finally approved at the CDMC's next meeting (29 November – 2 December 2005). The scheduled meeting dates for the MC-S-MD were 20 and 21 March 2006 and 21 and 22 September 2006.

APPENDIX I**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****I. MEMBER STATES/ETATS MEMBRES****Albania/Albanie****Andorra/Andorre****Armenia/Arménie****Austria/Autriche****Azerbaijan/Azerbaïdjan****Belgium/Belgique**

Mme Muriel COLOT, Attaché, Service général de l'audiovisuel et des multimédias, Communauté française, BRUXELLES

Bosnia and Herzegovina/Bosnie-Herzégovine**Bulgaria/Bulgarie**

Mme Nina VENOVA, Bulgarian Telegraph Agency, Editor of LIK magazine, SOFIA

M. Svetlozar Kirilov IVANOV, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Journalism and Mass Communication, SOFIA

Croatia/Croatie

Ms Zrinjka PERUŠKO, Head of the Department for Culture and Communication, Institute for International Relations, ZAGREB

Cyprus/Chypre**Czech Republic/République tchèque****Denmark/Danemark****Estonia/Estonie****Finland/Finlande****France**

M. Frédéric DEROIN, Adjoint au Chef du bureau des affaires européennes et internationales, Services du Premier Ministre, Direction du développement des médias, PARIS

Georgia/Géorgie**Germany/Allemagne**

Greece/Grèce

Mme Maria GIANNAKAKI, Attachée de Presse, Représentation Permanente de la Grèce auprès du Conseil de l'Europe, Bureau de Presse et de Communication, STRASBOURG

Hungary/Hongrie**Iceland/Islande****Ireland/Irlande****Italy/Italie****Latvia/Lettonie**

Mr Ilmārs ŠLĀPINS, Advisor on Culture and Humanities to the President of Ministers, State Chancellery, RĪGA

Liechtenstein**Lithuania/Lituanie**

Ms Audrone NUGARAITE, Director, Institute of Journalism, Vilnius University, VILNIUS

Luxembourg**Malta/Malte****Monaco****Moldova****Netherlands/Pays-Bas****Norway/Norvège**

Mr Lars BRUSTAD, Assistant Director General, Department of Media and Copyright, Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs, OSLO

Mr Sigve GRAMSTAD, Director, The Norwegian Media Authority, OSLO

Poland/Pologne

Mr Pawel STEPKA, Senior Inspector, National Broadcasting Council, WARSAW

Portugal

M. Agostinho PISSARREIRA, Instituto da Comunicação Social, LISBOA

Mr Sebastiao LIMA REGO, Regulation des Media, LISBOA

Romania/Roumanie

Ms Elly-Ana TARNACOP-MOGA, Conseillère d'intégration européenne, Ministère de la Culture et des Cultes, BUCAREST

Russian Federation/Fédération de Russie

Mrs Elena VARTANOVA, Deputy Dean For Research, Professor, Faculty Of Journalism, Moscow State University, MOSCOW

San Marino/Saint-Marin

Serbia and Montenegro/Serbie-Monténégro

Slovak Republic/République slovaque

Slovenia/Slovénie

Spain/Espagne

Mme Maria Luisa GIL FERRER, Chef de Section de la Sous-direction générale des moyens audiovisuels, Ministère de l'Industrie, du Tourisme et du Commerce, MADRID

Sweden/Suède

Suisse

M. Jacques FAVRE, Chargé de cours à l'Université de Fribourg, VALLORBE

“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”/ « L'ex-République yougoslave de Macédoine »

Mr Janko NIKOLOVSKI, Head of Media Sector of the Agency of Information, Agency of Information SKOPJE

Turkey/Turquie

Ms Zeynep Arzu DEMIREL, Expert, International Relations Department, Radio and Television Supreme Council, ANKARA

Ukraine

United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni

Mr Mark FERRERO, Head of Creative Industries, Department for Culture, LONDON

OTHER PARTICIPANTS/AUTRES PARTICIPANTS

Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe/Assemblée Parlementaire du Conseil de l'Europe

Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe/Congrès des Pouvoirs Locaux et Régionaux du Conseil de l'Europe

European Audiovisual Observatory/Observatoire européen de l'Audiovisuel

European Commission/Commission européenne

Mr Adam WATSON BROWN, Principal Administrator, Unit A1: Audiovisual & Media Policies;
Digital Rights, Task Force for Co-ordination of Media Affairs, DG Information Society Media,
European Commission, BRUSSELS

II. OSERVERS WITH THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE/OBSERVATEURS AUPRES DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Canada

Holy See/Saint-Siège

M. Louis Ter STEEG, UTRECHT

Japan/Japon

Mexico/Mexique

United States of America/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

III. OSERVERS WITH THE MC-S-MD/OBSERVATEURS AU SEIN DU MC-S-MD

UNESCO

[Apologised/excusé(e)]

OSCE

European Broadcasting Union/Union Européenne de Radio-Télévision

Mr Jacques BRIQUEMONT, Responsable des affaires publiques,
Union Européenne de Radio-Télévision, BRUXELLES

Association of Commercial Television in Europe/Association des Télévisions commerciales européennes

Ms Monika Magyar, Chargée d'Affaires Européennes, Association of Commercial Television in Europe
BRUXELLES

European Federation of Journalists/Fédération européenne des Journalistes

Philippe LERUTH, Journaliste, Vice-président FEJ, Membre du comité de direction de l'AJP-AGJPB,
BRUSSELS

European Newspaper Publishers' Association/Association européenne des Editeurs de Journaux

Ms Hannah McCausland, European Affairs Advisor, European Newspaper Publishers' Association,
BRUSSELS

European Internet Service Providers' Association/Association européenne des Fournisseurs de Services Internet

European Internet Services Providers Association (EuroISPA)

[Apologised/excusé(e)]

M. Richard NASH, Secretary General, EuroISPA, BRUSSELS

IV. CONSULTANTS

Dr David WARD, Director, Centre for media policy and development, LONDON

V. SECRETARIAT

Mr Jan MALINOWSKI, Head of the Media Division, Directorate General of Human Rights - DG II/
Chef de la Division Media, Direction Générale des Droits de l'Homme - DG II

Ms Charlotte de BROUELLES, Secretary to the MM-S-MD, Administrative Officer, Media
Division, Directorate General of Human Rights - DG II/ Secrétaire du MM-S-MD, Administratrice,
Division Media, Direction Générale des Droits de l'Homme - DG II

VI. INTERPRETERS/INTERPRETES

Mme Sally BAILEY

Mme Martine CARALY

Mme Anne CHENAIS

APPENDIX II**AGENDA**

- 1. Opening of the meeting**
- 2. Adoption of the agenda**
- 3. Information on the decisions taken by the Steering Committee on the Media and New Communication Services (CDMC) of interest to the MC-S-MD**
- 4. Study of the impact of media concentration on freedom of expression and information with a view to suggesting initiatives to preserve media pluralism:**
 - National concentrations: Examination of the first results of the study on “Effects of media concentration on freedom of expression and information, media pluralism and cultural diversity”**
 - Transnational concentrations: Examination of the update carried out by the European Audiovisual Observatory (EAO), of the Advisory Panel on Media Diversity (AP-MD) study on transnational concentrations, and definition of future work**
- 5. Impact of media concentration on cultural diversity and media pluralism in the digital environment: possible update of Recommendations No. R (94) 13 on measures to promote media transparency and No. R (99) 1 on measures to promote media pluralism**
- 6. UNESCO International Convention on protection of the diversity of cultural contents and artistic expressions: effect on the media and possible development of a joint pan-European approach**
- 7. Follow-up of implementation of Recommendation (2003) 9 of the Committee of Ministers on measures to promote the democratic and social contribution of digital broadcasting: Examination of a draft questionnaire**
- 8. Other business**
- 9. Election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for 2006**
- 10. Date of next meeting**

APPENDIX III

AMENDED DRAFT QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is based on the seven recommendations (a-g) listed in the document, taking account of the principles set out in the appendix.

Abbreviations:

DBS Digital Broadcasting Service
 EPG Electronic Programme Guide
 PSB Public Service Broadcasting
 DTB Digital Terrestrial Broadcasting.

a. create adequate legal and economic conditions for the development of digital broadcasting that guarantee the pluralism of broadcasting services and public access to an enlarged choice and variety of quality programmes, including the maintenance and, where possible, extension of the availability of transfrontier services;

	Questions	Yes	No
1	Has a strategy for the transition to digital broadcasting been drawn up?		
1.2	If yes:		
1.2.1	Have relevant industries and the public been consulted?		
1.2.2	What does the strategy seek to promote:		
1.2.3	Co-operation between operators?		
1.2.4	Complementarity between platforms (terrestrial, satellite, cable)?		
1.2.5	Interoperability of decoders?		
1.2.6	Availability of a wide variety of content?		
2	If no:		
2.1	Have you organised activities to elaborate a strategy?		
2.2	What is the public/governmental authority responsible for the elaboration of the strategy?		
3	Has a date for digital switch-over nationally been set?		
3.1	If yes, please indicate the date:		
4	Will digital switch-over be done regionally in stages?		
4.1	If yes, please indicate the start and the stages below		
5	Has the work towards digital switch-over also included:		
5.1	Taking into account the interests of the public?		
5.2	Taking into account the interests of the various broadcasters?		
5.3	Providing an appropriate legal framework?		
5.4	Providing favourable economic and technical conditions?		
5.5	Providing favourable technical conditions?		
6	Has legislation to regulate digital broadcasting been adopted?		
7	Is legislation to regulate digital broadcasting in process?		
8	Is adopted or planned legislation to regulate digital broadcasting:		
8.1	A revision of existing broadcasting legislation?		
8.2	An entirely new legislation relating specifically to the digital environment?		

2.2 Name of the authority responsible for the elaboration of the strategy of digital switch-over:

.....

4.1 Start/stages regional switch-over:

.....

b. protect and, if necessary, take positive measures to safeguard and promote media pluralism, in order to counterbalance the increasing concentration in this sector;

	Questions	Yes	No
1	When awarding licences to Digital Broadcasting Services , do the authorities ensure that:		
1.2	The services on offer are many and varied?		
1.3	The establishment of regional/local services is encouraged?		
1.4	There will be a high degree of interoperability and compatibility:		
1.4.1	- of reception?		
1.4.2	- of decoding and decrypting equipment?		
1.4.3	- of systems granting access to Digital Broadcasting Services and related interactive services?		
2	Will the availability of free-to-air services be maintained?		
3	Will national Digital Broadcasting Services be available abroad?		
4	Will regional Digital Broadcasting Services be available abroad?		
5	Is there regulation limiting the concentration of media ownership?		
5.1	If yes, does media ownership regulation apply to Digital Broadcasting Services ?		
5.1.1	If yes, will it be maintained?		
5.1.2	If no, will it be extended to include Digital Broadcasting Services ?		
6.	Is there another type of regulation which contributes to diversity, notably to the diversity of content?		
6.1	If no, do you intend to adopt such regulation?		

c. be particularly vigilant to ensure respect for the protection of minors and human dignity and the non-incitement to violence and hatred in the digital environment, which provides access to a wide variety of content;

	Questions	Yes	No
1	The protection of minors against harmful content: Is there regulatory measures protecting minors against harmful content?		
1.1	Has legislation been adopted? If yes:		
1.1.1	Were/will these regulatory measures /be/adapted/modified during the switch-over to the digital environment?		

1.1.2	Is a monitoring system established?		
1.1.3	Are other measures taken (e.g. information, self-regulation)?		
1.1.4	Are there self-regulation measures on this subject?		
1.2	If no:		
1.2.1	Is the adoption of such regulatory measures envisaged?		
2.	Does the protection of the human dignity form the subject of particular regulation?		
2.1	Has legislation been adopted? If yes:		
2.1.1	Were/will this regulatory measures /be/adapted/modified at the switch-over to the digital environment?		
2.1.2	Is a monitoring system established?		
2.1.3	Are other measures taken (e.g. information, self-regulation)?		
2.1.4	Are there self-regulation measures on this subject?		
2.2	If no:		
2.2.1	Is the adoption of such regulatory measures envisaged?		
3	Do measures exist which aim to taken avoiding content which is an incitement to hatred, violence, xenophobia or religious intolerance?		
3.1	If yes, which kind of measures:		
3.1.1	Legislation?		
3.1.2	A monitoring system?		
3.1.3	Other measures (information, self-regulation)?		
3.1.4	Were/will these measures /be/adapted/modified at the switch-over to the digital environment?		
3.2	If no, is the adoption of such measures envisaged?		
4	Are measures taken regarding the protection of consumers?		

d. prepare the public for the new digital environment, notably by encouraging the setting-up of a scheme for adequate information on and training in the use of digital equipment and new services;

	Questions	Yes	No
1	Is the public being provided with wide-ranging information about Digital Broadcasting Services?		
2	Is the industry encouraged to make available a variety of decoding devices?		
3	Are training courses in the use of digital equipment and new services initiated or envisaged to facilitate the access to these services by people with specific needs?		
4	Are measures taken to reduce the cost of decoding and decrypting equipment?		
5	Are the broadcasters encouraged to enable the viewers to make informed programme choices?		
6	Is there any regulation regarding EPGs?		
6.1	If yes, does regulation (or other measures) include:		
6.1.1	Ensuring a position for service providers on the EPGs where they operate, under fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory terms?		
6.1.2	Securing a prominent display of and easy access to public service channels?		

6.1.3	Paying particular attention to the specific needs of people with disabilities?		
6.1.4	Avoiding that advertising prejudices the functionalities and integrity of programmes?		

e. guarantee that public service broadcasting, as an essential factor for the cohesion of democratic societies, is maintained in the new digital environment by ensuring universal access by individuals to the programmes of public service broadcasters and giving it inter alia a central role in the transition to terrestrial digital broadcasting;

	Questions	Yes	No
1	Have the legal, economic and technical conditions been created to enable PSB to be present on the different digital platforms?		
1.1	Legal conditions?		
1.2	Economic conditions?		
1.3	Technical conditions?		
2	Has regulation for Public Service Broadcasting concerning must-carry/ must-offers on these platforms been adopted?		

f. reaffirm the remit of public service broadcasting, adapting if necessary its means to the new digital environment, with respect for the relevant basic principles set out in previous Council of Europe texts, while establishing the financial, technical and other conditions that will enable it to fulfil that remit as well as possible;

	Questions	Yes	No
1	Has the remit of Public Service Broadcasting been adapted to the digital environment?		
1.1	If no:		
1.1.1	Is it identical to the existing Public Service Broadcasting remit?		
1.1.2	Has any Public Service Broadcasting remit for Digital Broadcasting Services been defined?		
1.2	If yes:		
1.2.1	Is the basic general service (news, educational, cultural and entertainment programmes aimed at different categories of the public) included in the remit?		
1.2.2	Is the possibility to create new specialised channels included?		
1.2.3	Is the possibility to create new interactive services included (e.g. EPG and associated on-line services)?		
2	Are the financial and other conditions created to enable the Public Service Broadcasting to fulfil its remit in the new digital environment?		
3	Does/will Public Service Broadcasting play a central role in the transition process to DTB?		

g. bring the basic principles contained in the appendix to this recommendation to the attention of the public authorities and the professional and industrial circles concerned, and to evaluate on a regular basis the effectiveness of the implementation of these principles.

	Questions	Yes	No
1	Has the basic principles contained in the appendix to the recommendation been brought to the attention of the public authorities and the professional and industrial circles concerned?		
1.1	If yes, how have they been communicated:		
1.1.1	On government web pages?		
1.1.2	In official gazettes?		
1.1.3	In conferences, or similar meetings?		
1.1.4	By special delivery or similar targeted communication?		
1.1.5	By other means?		
2	Have the basic principles contained in the appendix to the recommendation been brought to the attention of the public authorities and the professional and industrial circles concerned?		
2.1	If yes, how have they been communicated:		
2.1.1	On government web pages?		
2.1.2	In official gazettes?		
2.1.3	In conferences, or similar meetings?		
2.1.4	By special delivery or similar targeted communication?		
2.1.5	By other means?		
3	Will the effectiveness of the implementation of these principles be evaluated on a regular basis?		
3.1	If yes:		
3.1.1	Is a monitoring system established or planned?		
3.1.2	Will the results of the monitoring be made public?		
4	Has the development of Internet influenced your legislation on digital broadcasting?		