WG II: Programme Monitoring: Methods and Case Studies
Information paper by the EPRA Secretariat
Presentations from EPRA Members in Romania, France, Spain and Switzerland
22nd EPRA meeting, Budapest October 20-21 2005

Introduction
The issue of programme monitoring has been discussed on several occasions at EPRA meetings: in 1997 two working group addressed different monitoring practices; in 2000 the focus was on technical aspects of monitoring. This working group will serve as an update in the context of proliferation of channels and the development of new types of content.
The majority of EPRA members now have the remit to supervise the broadcasting output of both private and public broadcasters. Those who currently are responsible for private only are the authorities from Austria, Cyprus, Germany, Ireland, Israel (both authorities), Navarra and Turkey, while, on the other hand, the Broadcasting Council of Estonia supervises public service broadcasting organisations only.

From the information available regarding the remits for monitoring and the resources applied (see table 1 below), it is apparent that some authorities employ a larger system of programme monitoring, due to different remits and the size of the broadcasting landscapes. Overall three different techniques are usually employed: monitoring may exist on a continuous basis (mostly for national television), may be sampling, or may adopt a case by case approach (on complaints). Additionally the German authorities take part in spot surveys that are conducted by the DLM (Directors' Conference of the State Media Authorities) focused on the nationwide television channels (not licensed at regional level). In Bulgaria, an additional focused monitoring takes place wherein the programming of a particular broadcaster will be requested for a week in advance. As noted above, the majority of EPRA members are responsible for both private and public broadcasting. In almost all cases, a different approach is taken to different types of media. Frequently the total output of free to air (analogue) has been recorded (e.g. Italy, France, United Kingdom, Macedonia, Romania), while samples are taken of cable and satellite or regional channels (e.g. France). The BLM (Germany) additionally has the responsibility to monitor all Internet service providers located in Bavaria.

In some cases a higher emphasis is placed on the monitoring of certain types of broadcasters. For example in Ireland commercial services are monitored more than community services and stations with compliance issues are monitored more frequently. In Austria broadcasters are chosen according to their importance and their position in the broadcasting market in relation to their competitors, and therefore the Public Service ORF is monitored more frequently than other broadcasters. In support of the complaints process, broadcasters are generally required to retain copies of output in case they are requested by the authority concerned.

General remits
Almost all authorities carry out a random sampling of broadcasting periods of different broadcasters to check their compliance with legal obligations concerning advertising, sponsorship, teleshopping; concerning protection of minors and human dignity, quotas for national, European and independent productions etc. while most of them also respond to individual complaints. Of these, advertising and protection of minors are frequently cited by

members as being the most important focus for monitoring. Many authorities additionally also have a specific concern for political pluralism, balance and fairness, and the activity of broadcasters during elections, providing reports and research in this area.

Specific areas of interest
As mentioned above, many authorities play a particular role in monitoring media election coverage and the fair coverage of candidates and parties. The issue of programming compliance based on licensing agreements are also important aspects of monitoring: for example local programming and programming diversity, minority language broadcasting etc. Regarding complaints and issues of special focus, currently some of the main themes include: reality programmes (Turkey); programmes with sexual or with violent content, or use of inappropriate language (Navarra, Cyprus, Moldova, Israel); the representation of people with disabilities (Navarra); issues of gender equality (Malta); piracy and broadcasting rights (Albania); surreptitious advertising (Israel); sponsored programmes and product placement (Netherlands). In the working group we will also see several content examples and case studies: for example political pluralism (France); protection of minors (Romania); and the complaints process with examples (Switzerland).

Resources and staff
In many instances, the monitoring (and review of complaints) of programming is carried out by the staff as part of their overall duties in the authority i.e. there are no (or few) full time staff. In some instances the regulatory authority does not monitor programming in-house (although they deal with complaints in-house), where it is carried out by a separate agency (Slovakia, and in Estonia on behalf of the Ministry of Culture). Most members have a permanent monitoring staff size of between 3 and 10 people, while several are larger with between 10 and 20 staff members (Albania, the Netherlands, Serbia, Malta, Hungary, Greece and Poland). In Navarra the regulator established an *Office for the Defence of the Audience* to carry out this work. Many employ temporary or occasional staff, or outsource monitoring (due to limited resources) in order to carry out particular research, or during elections (Bosnia and Herzegovina), or to cover regional and cable operators (Macedonia). From table 1 we can see that there are several authorities who have very large and developed systems of programme monitoring: the BLM Bavaria (responsible also for Internet), Bulgaria, Catalonia, France, Hungary, Romania (where regional monitoring units have been established) and Turkey. Two of these (Catalonia, Romania) will describe the systems developed for this work.

Presentations
Cristina Trepcea of the National Audiovisual Council of Romania will describe the monitoring system developed with the support of the European Commission Phare programme: structure, personnel, technology. She will also address some particular case studies including protection of minors.

Maryse Brugière from the French CSA, where an extensive level of monitoring is carried out, will focus in her presentation on the approach to monitoring of political pluralism in the French media. She will outline the principles laid out in the law concerning the media in relation to politics, news, local news, and election periods. The methodology used by the CSA to monitor and check compliance will also be explained.

Monica Gasol of the CAC in Catalonia, Spain will provide an overview of the broadcasting monitoring system developed at the CAC. This will include a description of: the functions of the technological system used by the Broadcasting Council; the personnel structure of the monitoring department; and the key thematic areas that are a focus for the monitors**.**

Pierre Rieder of the Independent Complaints Commission, Switzerland will outline the Swiss system, based on complaints, and present audiovisual examples of case studies and the process of dealing with complaints.

Table 1: Overview monitoring remits, and monitoring extent, of EPRA members[1]

Country	Supervision		Monitoring				Staff
	private	public	Handling complaints	All output	Samples	Complaint based	
Private only							
Austria	X		X			X	2 full time
Cyprus	X		X				8 (as part of work)
Germany[2]	X		X				
LFM	X		X		X	X	3 full time (4 students)
BLM	X		X		X	X	50 (part time)
ULR	X		X		X	X	2 full time (2 students)
Ireland	X				X	X(1)	8 full time
Israel CCTSB	X		X				1.5 (full time)
Israel 2nd Auth	X		X		X	X	5 (full time)
Spain Navarra	X		X				2 (full time)
Turkey	X		X		X	X	70 full time
Public only							
Estonia		X	X (1)				external
Private and public							
Albania	X	X	X				15-20 (full time)
Belgium CSA	X	X	X		X	X	3
Belgium CvdM	X	X	X		X	X	3 (as part of work)
Bosnia Herzegovina	X	X	X				3
Bulgaria	X	X	X				23 Full time
Croatia	X	X	X		X	X	External (by tender)
Czech Republic	X	X	X		X	X	5 full time
Denmark	X	X (1)	X			X	0
Finland	X	X	X		X	X	2 (as part of work)
France	X	X	X	X FTA	X	X	50 full time
Greece	X	X	X		X	X	18 full time
Hungary	X	X	X		X	X	16 full time (40 freelance)
Isle of Man	X	X	X		X	X	1.5 (as part of work)
Italy	X	X	X	X			5 (full time) + external
Latvia	X	X	X		X(1)	X	1 (full time)
Lithuania	X	X	X		X	X	5 full time
Luxembourg	X	X	X		X	X	
Macedonia	X	X	No	national			7 full time (+external)
Malta	X	X	X		X	X	12 full time
Moldova	X	X	X		X	X	7 full time
Netherlands	X	X	X		X	X	11 full time
Norway	X	X	No		X		5 full time
Poland	X	X	X		X	X	18 full time
Portugal	X	X			X		
Romania	X	X	X	X	X	X	44* full time
Serbia	X	X	X		X	X	15 full time
-Montenegro	X	X	X				4 full time
-Kosovo	X	X	X		X(1)	x	6 full time
Spain -Catalonia	X	X	X	news	X	X	22 full time
Slovak Republic	X	X	X		X	X	10 full time
Slovenia	X	X	X		X	X	8 full time
Sweden SBC	X	X	X		X	X	8 (as part of work)
Switzerland UBI/ AIEP	X	X	X			X	9 (as part of work)
Ukraine	X	X	X	X		X	5 full time
UK	X	X	X		X	X	(as part of work)

(1) on a limited basis only
* including regional

---

[1] Compiled by EPRA Secretariat based on regulator profiles, member websites and question to members. Thanks to the EPRA members for the excellent response to these questions.
[2] examples from 3 of the Landesmedienanstalten