THE EURALVA NEWSLETTER

News from the European Alliance of Listeners´ and Viewers´ Associations: May 2011

From the Editor

Dear Reader,

Welcome to a new edition of the EURALVA newsletter and a special welcome to our new readers in Italy and Sweden, who are associated with our new member organisations in those countries. We also welcome our new readers in other parts of Europe and the rest of the world.

We begin this edition with a survey covering 30 Council of Europe States, which shows that an increasing proportion of Europe's radio-and television-revenues is coming from direct expenditure by consumers, rather than from advertisers or public funds.

The future for the BBC World Services is important, not only for the UK and the BBC, but also for listeners and viewers around the world, so our next article describes the current situation and the likely future for this important part of BBC.

In recent months, the new Hungarian Media Law has been discussed in many European and national fora. Several Hungarian and European organisations, including EURALVA and the European Commission, protested against this proposed new legislation. We bring our readers up to date with a combined effort which describes the latest developments..

The connection between the European Commission and the national public service stations has often been dominated by the Commission's concerns about national proposals for new modes of revenue for public service broadcasters. A new form of support is Restructuring Aid, which he European Commission has now approved for the Danish public service channel TV2, which we report in another article.

Finally we can tell – and invite you to our yearly media conference, this time in Edinburgh, Scotland, **Friday October 7th 2011**. Later, you will be able to find more details about the programme on our website, or by direct contact to our office or to the editor.

Preben Sørensen

EUROPE'S VIEWERS ARE SWITCHING TO PAY TELEVISION

Data recently released by the European Audiovisual Observatory show that an increasing proportion of Europe's radio and television revenues is coming from direct expenditure by consumers, rather than from advertisers or public funds. The data, which were published in January in Volume 1 of the Observatory's Television Yearbook, cover 30 of the 36 Council of Europe States surveyed. The Observatory subdivides radio and television revenues into four categories: (a) Consumer TV Spend; (b) TV Adspend; (c) Radio Adspend; and (d) Net Revenues from Public Sources, such as licence fees or public subsidies. The attached table (see Appendix) breaks down the revenues from the 30 countries between 2005 and 2009, although the data for four of them – Cyprus (CY), the Czech Republic (CZ), Ireland (IE), and Luxembourg (LU) – are incomplete.

The data are given in millions of Euros, so there may be some minor distortions because of fluctuations in exchange rates. Twelve of the countries cited – Austria (AT), Belgium (BE), Germany (DE), Spain (ES), Finland (FI), France (FR), Greece (GR), Ireland (IE), Italy (IT), Luxembourg (LU), the Netherlands (NL) and Portugal (PT) were members of the Euro-zone during all the four years surveyed. However, Slovenia did not join the Euro-zone until 1 January 2007; Cyprus on 1 January 2008, and Slovakia on 1 January 2009. Estonia joined the Euro-zone at the beginning of this year.

The data for the United Kingdom (GB) are the most misleading, since they appear to show a reduction in the net radio-television revenues from public sources, whereas the principal cause for the apparent decline was the increase, between 2005 and 2009, in the value of the Euro against the pound sterling. Nevertheless, these differences are comparatively minor and do not affect the overall picture.

I have calculated the average annual increase between 2005 and 2009 for each revenue category. The increase ignores any fluctuations which occurred in the intervening years, and the average annual increase, which is one quarter of the quadrennial percentage increase, is not therefore a compound rate of increase.

A Clear Picture

Nevertheless, the overall picture is clear enough. In every European country, the average annual percentage increase in Consumer TV Spend was greater than that for all radio-television revenues.

In most cases, the increase in Consumer TV Spend was between one and five times that for All Radio-TV Revenues, although in six Member States – Germany (DE), Greece (GR), Croatia (HR), Italy (IT), and Sweden (SE) the proportion was even greater. The biggest increase by far occurred in Croatia, where consumers increased their direct spending on pay-TV services over thirteen times as fast as the overall national increase.

In many Member States, the traditional economic order for radio and television was also disrupted by the decline in advertising revenues caused by the global financial crisis. The total radio-TV adspend declined in twelve Member States – Germany (DE), Denmark (DK), Spain (ES), France (FR), the United Kingdom (GB), Greece (GR), Hungary (HU), Italy (IT), Lithuania (LT), Latvia (LV), the Netherlands (NL), and Norway (NO). In addition, the radio adspend declined in both Austria (AT) and Switzerland (CH).

Increasing Commercialisation

Moreover, in most Member States, the net Revenues from Public Sources failed to keep up with the average annual increase in Total RTV revenues. This indicates an increasing commercialisation of Europe's radio and television stations. Nineteen Member States fell into this category, while only four of them – Spain (ES), France (FR), Greece (GR), and Slovakia (SK) maintained or exceeded a proportionate increase in public expenditure. Spain (ES) was by far the most ambitious country with a proportionate increase in public revenues of nearly eighteen per cent.

We have to be careful not to read too much into these figures, but it is clear that between 2005 and 2009, Europe's radio and television revenues increasingly came from pay-TV channels. Unfortunately, however, the data do not tell us whether this was because the pay-TV channels extracted more revenues from each of their customers, or because many more viewers decided to subscribe to pay TV channels.

The truth probably lies somewhere between the two. We are now entering a period when all European governments are facing downward pressures on public expenditure, and when advertisers are searching for advertising opportunities in new audiovisual media such as the Internet. It remains to be seen, therefore, whether Europe's consumers will continue to be prepared to pay even more for their television programmes during Europe's new age of austerity.

The Appendix has the Detailed Figures ***Vincent Porter***

TOUGH TIMES FOR THE BBC WORLD SERVICE

From the London *Financial Times* of April 8, 2011:

"H*ave you found your daily media diet upset recently? Have you noticed that something is missing from your morning routine or your bedtime briefing? If you are in the Caribbean, are you feeling particularly hungry? If you're in Russia, are you close to starving?*

"While I could be referring to the thinning of some daily newspapers or the collapse of some weekly news magazines, I'm finding that the biggest hole in my news diet is the one that's supposed to be my most important media meal of the day: my morning fix of the BBC World Service … .the one problem with the World Service … ibis that I can literally hear the cost-cutting happening "live" during programmes and bulletins" [Tyler Brûlé]

The situation bemoaned by the *Financial Times* correspondent belongs to what many see as a 'mini-tragedy in several acts'.

Act One took place in the second and third weeks of October 2010. That was when, as part of a 'shot-gun' settlement with government, the BBC agreed that its licence fee funding would be frozen for five years, and that from that frozen funding it would pay for additional activities including (from 2014/15) the hitherto Foreign Office-funded BBC World Service radio programming as well the government contribution to the cost of the BBC Monitoring Service, -a news research, analysis and intelligence operation run in liaison with agencies of the U.S. government.

To what extent the October 2010 settlement was a shot-gun settlement has been the subject of much speculation. Despite stories that he had been (metaphorically) dragged off a train one October evening by a call from government, BBC Director-General Mark Thompson told a VLV audience (in his first post-settlement public appearance) that the settlement was not exactly shot-gun as it had been negotiated over a nine-day period – although he conceded that this was a more abbreviated period than the BBC would have liked.

More recently, at this year's VLV Spring Conference, one of the BBC Trustees conveyed a similar impression in a 'question and answer' session. It is widely believed that the British Government's opening move in the negotiation was to suggest that the BBC assume the cost of the £600-700 million per year government subsidy by which 75+ citizens get a free television licence; and that, measured against this, the £270 million annual cost of the World Service and the £25 million cost of the Monitoring Service was an easier option.

The BBC sought to put the best interpretation on the outcome. It argued that the changes brought financial responsibility into line with editorial control, and underlined that the World Service - unlike such international broadcasters as *Voice of America*, *Radio Liberty* and *Deutsche Welle* – was fully integrated into a media environment that was separate from Government. Some supported this argument. Others were sceptical- arguing that (occasional accusations from abroad not withstanding) the editorial independence of the World Service was rarely questioned anyway and that the traditional patronage of the Foreign Office, a very senior government department, had given the World Service a first line of defence against potential challenges in the domestic environment, whether from the Department of Culture, Media and Sport or from other agencies and pressure groups.

Moreover, immediate questions arose out of the October settlement, such as whether World Service funds would be ring-fenced within the BBC's overall budget, and whether, in off-loading its financial responsibility, the British Government was also shedding its traditional role in prioritizing target audiences or World Service activity? If the answer was yes, that would be politically surprising. If the answer was no, (which everyone assumed was the case) that could create serious dilemmas in the BBC's overall prioritization process, pitting domestic programming considerations against UK foreign policy objectives – especially because, in the deal between the Government and the BBC, the transfer of responsibilities for the World Service was not to be accompanied by any transfer of funds. This means that the BBC will have find more than £272 million (the current World Service operating and capital cost) out of its existing resources simply in order to maintain the status quo.

Act Two in the BBC World Service mini-drama was played out three months ago (February 2011) when the BBC announced it had agreed to a £45 million cut in the World Service budget.

- Five language or regional services would be closed – three (Serbian, Albanian and Macedonian) in the Balkans, Portuguese for Africa, and the English language Service for the Caribbean.
- There would cease to be short-wave broadcasts of major services like Russian, Chinese, Indonesian, Swahili and Hindi (although this last seems to have been reprieved for a year).

This will leave these, and some other services, dependent on locally-negotiated FM broadcast arrangements, or alternatively on on-line deliveries which, as recent events in North Africa and the Middle East have demonstrated, can be obstructed at the whim of any government or regime under pressure. These are precisely the circumstances when the audiences will be most reliant on World Service broadcasts.

- The core World Service in English schedule would be simplified and streamlined – which implied some programmes disappearing
- The cuts, across the board, in content and delivery would mean an overall 25% reduction in staff numbers: some 650 out of approximately 2400.

A cynic could say that – given the prospect of the BBC taking over the financial burden – this drastic reduction in the range of World Service activity was just what was needed to ease the transition, since the BBC will have less money to find from existing resources. Many people, though, have been shocked at the scale of the cuts. They view them, not just as a routine reprioritization within World Service activity, but as a qualitative down-grading of the UK's international broadcasting effort within the armoury of national foreign policy instruments.

The decisions have surprised international observers who see the soft power impact of the BBC as a major, almost a unique, factor in the deployment of UK influence and British values. Domestic observers note the apparent contradiction between the savage cuts in the £272 million World Service budget and the ring-fencing of the over £10 billion budget of the UK Department for International Development's [DFID], which is planned rise to £13 billion over the next three years.

Last month (April 2011) – in **Act Three** of the World Service mini-drama - the UK Parliament's House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee published its Report on the proposed cuts after taking oral and written evidence including from the Voice of the Listener & Viewer [see www.vlv.org.uk]. The Report followed – or (to put it more modestly) paralleled - VLV's own lines of argument. The Committee

- Recommended the proposed cuts be rescinded, noting that this could be done by diverting a mere 0.35% of the money already allocated to DFID
- Suggested that, in future, the World Service budget should be 'ring-fenced'

- Questioned whether World Service funding would be actually more secure within the BBC financial framework than inside the budget of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

It remains to be seen how British ministers will respond, if at all; and what steps the Foreign Affairs Committee will take to try to ensure that Parliament acts upon its recommendations. The EURALVA Newsletter will keep readers updated as Acts Three (and possibly Four) unfolds......

Andrew Taussig

Listeners and Viewers Express their Concern about Hungary's Media Law

Last Christmastime, at the turn of a year, in which Hungary was preparing to take on the rotating Presidency of the European Union, EURALVA found itself – along with other media organizations – voicing concern that Hungary's new Media Law would limit cultural diversity, endanger journalistic independence, and breed distrust among listeners and viewers: all this through a new regime of heavy, indeed potentially crippling, fines on journalists – in the press as well as in the electronic media - if they refuse to disclose their sources, or publish information deemed inappropriate by the Government.

We wrote last December:

"*EURALVA is deeply concerned that Hungary's new law will both chill the freedom to report political corruption, and fail to fulfil the Council of Europe's Recommendations on the Independence of Public Service Broadcasting" said Preben Sorensen, the President of EURALVA.*

"The new law, as enacted, would seriously endanger the freedom of broadcasting by creating scope for a subjective judgment, along with the consequences of that judgment, about any individual news story, and penalize broadcasters and editors through government-controlled regulatory bodies.

"The Chairman of the five-member Media Council, which regulates all media including the Internet and the Press, is directly appointed by the Prime Minister, while the other four members will be chosen by a committee of Members of Parliament dominated, because of weighted voting, by the Government.

"Moreover, public service, publicly-funded broadcasters will be especially tightly controlled by the Government, thus undermining the trust of Hungary's listeners and viewers. In addition, the new law totally ignores the Recommendations, laid down in 1996 by the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers and since then implicitly and repeatedly endorsed within the European Union, to guarantee the independence of public service broadcasting.

"The eight-member Public Service Foundation, which will supervise all publicly-funded media and report to the Media Council, also has a built-in majority of Government supporters. Two members are to be directly appointed by the government-dominated Media Council, and a further three by members of parliament from the Government party. Only the three member minority will be chosen by opposition MPs.

"Recommendation R (96) 10 of the Council of Europe requires that the rules governing the status of supervisory bodies for public service broadcasters should ensure that the members of supervisory bodies will be appointed in an open and pluralistic manner, and that they should represent collectively the interests of society in general. If passed in its present form, Hungary's new law will fail to fulfil these requirements.

"EURALVA therefore calls on both the Council of Europe and the European Union to preserve free speech in Hungary, and to ensure that it passes laws establishing a pluralistic public service broadcaster."

Similar concerns were voiced by other civil society and media organizations, including the European Federation of Journalists and Amnesty International. These criticisms led to EU Commission Vice-President/Media Commissioner Neelie Kroes issuing a formal request to the Hungarian government to send the text to Brussels so it could be reviewed against the EU's accepted media and cultural benchmarks. There were also significant inter-governmental contacts with the foreign minister of Germany (normally a strong friend of Hungary) intervening with his Hungarian counterpart. Hungary's Prime Minister, Viktor Orban, visiting the European Parliament in Strasbourg in mid-January, was confronted by a group of MEPs, including one who told him "we lived under a dictatorship for forty years; I will not stand for you contesting the democratic aspirations of Hungarians".

In fairness it should be said that Orban (whose FIDESZ party secured the biggest electoral victory and parliamentary majority since multi-party elections were introduced in 1989) had his defenders, mainly on the nationalist right, both in Strasbourg and in Budapest, pointing to what they saw as exaggerated anxieties and resentments by other parties who – during their many years in power since the end of Communist rule – had failed to establish a firm foundation, economically or otherwise, for public service media in Hungary.

The upshot of the commotion was a series of conciliatory statements from senior Hungarian Government figures – including Orban himself - expressing willingness to modify the Hungarian legislation if it conflicted with European law and values, followed by a written agreement with the EU authorities. This appeared to underpin Hungary's six-month EU Presidency (January to June

2011) but failed to reassure very many critics, especially at home where the deal seemed to paper over cracks rather than rectify defects.

József Kiss, the chairman of EURALVA's Hungarian member organization, SZVT, commented:

"Journalistic circles in Hungary are not satisfied with the agreement, because it does not address the issue of guarantees for press and journalistic freedom. There are a number of angles associated with this.

The question, for example, of whether an article in the press or a programme complies with the provisions of the law is to be decided by a committee consisting of party nominees – and every such proposition in this context, emanating from the Government side, will be voted through by Parliament because the two governing parties (FIDESZ and the KDNP) have a two thirds parliamentary majority.

If a judgment with costs is made, carrying a high financial penalty (around 200 million forints is possible), this can mean a press or media organization after certain going bankrupt in consequence of fines incurred.

Because of the ownership structure staff appointments to state media in the field of public service programme and content provision are no problem for the party in power and the supervisory provisions also are executed by single-party controlled agencies and committees.

The prevailing view about links between public service programme providers and the public at large is determined, under the formal legislative provisions, by a fourteen member standing committee; there is no requirement for specialist knowledge or community links in appointees to this committee. These are just some of the flaws remaining in the Media Law despite the EU agreement which really cannot be commended and has anyway no binding force."

The debate seems likely to continue, even to intensify, long after Hungary's EU presidential turn closes at the end of June

Vincent Porter/Andrew Taussig

European Commission approves aid for Danish Public Service Broadcaster TV2

In April, the European Commission approved, as compatible with EU rules for state aid, the funding mechanism that the Danish Government had put in place for Danish broadcaster TV2 between 1995 and 2002. In particular, the Commission concluded that the compensation granted under this mechanism was proportionate to the costs of TV2's public service mission and so did not give rise to any disproportionate distortion of competition.

Since 2004, TV2 has only been financed by advertising revenues and by income from its commercial channels. It is subject to conditions which are designed to ensure that TV2 becomes viable without continued state support,

TV2 Danmark is one of Denmark's main public service broadcasters. It operates a public service channel and some commercial channels. Until 2004, it was financed by both licence fees and advertisement income. Since 2004 it has only been financed through advertising revenues and income from its commercial channels.

Compensation for public service obligations

The Commission has adopted two decisions on the funding of TV2. The first decision concluded that state financing received during the period 1995-2002 to compensate for the public service obligations was necessary and proportionate, according to the then applicable EU rules on state funding for public broadcasters. A previous decision of the Commission, in 2004, declaring the aid illegal and ordering recovery of DKK 628 million (around € 84 million), was annulled by the European Court of Justice in 2008. A decision by the Commission authorising a recapitalisation of TV2 was set aside by the Court in 2009.

Restructuring Aid

The second decision authorises restructuring aid for TV2, which was notified to the Commission in July 2009, and into which it immediately opened an in-depth investigation. The Commission considers that the plan notified to use the aid to restructure TV2 would restore the broadcaster's long term viability, in particular through a new business model, which will enable the company to levy subscription payments for its main public service channel from 2012. To compensate for distortions of competition, the Danish Government proposed that TV2 would not open new channels. Denmark has also undertaken to ensure that the capital structure of TV2 is benchmarked to that of comparable media companies, once the new business model will be in place.

As the restructuring is bearing fruit, all existing aid measures in place must be repealed with effect from the date of this decision and further aid that had been notified to the Commission must not be implemented. On the basis of these conditions, the Commission considers that the restructuring plan complies with the rescue and restructuring aid guidelines.

The Viewers are not interested

The new business model, which allows TV2 to levy subscription payments for its main public service channel from next year, is not very popular in Denmark. 64 % of the viewers oppose it, and SLS, the Danish member organization of EURALVA, is also fighting against this new arrangement. SLS is calling for TV2 shall go back to the dual system, when it was financed by both licence fees and advertising income. This should be the case, either until the end of the restructuring period on 31 December 2012, or at the very least until the start of the subscription payments.

The Financing of Public Broadcasters

The financing of public broadcasters in Europe has been a source of complaints and of difficult analyses and discussions for decades because of public service obligations and costs that are not always well defined. In 2009 the Commission adopted revised guidelines on state aid for the funding of public service broadcasters, which aimed to enhance legal certainty for investment by public and private media alike. These revised rules include an increased focus on accountability and effective control at the national level, including a transparent evaluation of the overall impact of publicly-funded new media services. The normal rescue and restructuring aid guidelines are applicable for cases where a broadcaster is undergoing structural difficulties that require restructuring aid.

A number of cases concerning State aid to broadcasters are currently pending at the European Court of Justice, including France Television and Spain's RTVE, or are being assessed following the Court's Decision to annul the arrangements proposed for RTP of Portugal.

Preben Sørensen

EUROPE'S RADIO & TV Revenues 2005 – 2009 (EUR Millions)

	AT	BE	BG	CH	CY	CZ	DE	DK	EE	ES
Consumer TV Spend										
2009	353	784	189	662	na	277	3851	843	51	1941
2005	248	508	120	551	24	119	3376	571	18	1643
Average Annual Increase (%)	**10.58%**	**13.58%**	**14.38%**	**5.04%**	***	**33.19%**	**3.52%**	**11.91%**	**45.83%**	**4.53%**
TV Adspend										
2009	603	910	273	399.3	62.6	391	4004	276	7.1	2358
2005	485	781	173	387.7	42.2	289	4323	303	6.8	2936
Average Annual Increase (%)	**5.45%**	**4.13%**	**14.45%**	**0.75%**	**12.06%**	**8.82%**	**-1.84%**	**-2.23%**	**1.10%**	**-4.92%**
Radio Adspend										
2009	165	272	11	89.6	7.3	62	746	29	4.2	502
2005	168	254	4	92	6.9	42	730	38	3.5	607
Average Annual Increase (%)	**-0.45%**	**1.77%**	**43.75%**	**-0.65%**	**1.45%**	**11.90%**	**0.55%**	**-5.92%**	**5%**	**-4.32%**
Total Radio and TV Adspend										
2009	768	1182	284	488.9	69.9	453	4750	305	11.3	2860
2005	653	1035	177	479.7	49.1	331	5053	341	10.3	3543
Average Annual Increase (%)	**4.40%**	**3.55%**	**15.11%**	**0.48%**	**10.59%**	**9.21%**	**-1.50%**	**-2.64%**	**2.43%**	**-4.82%**
Net Public Sources										
2009	528	525	74	792.3	36.1	na	7188	454	27	1430
2005	453	440	54	725.4	33.9	162	7127	409	20	661
Average Annual Increase (%)	**4.14%**	**2.27%**	**9.25%**	**2.31%**	**1.62%**		**0.21%**	**2.75%**	**8.75%**	**29.08%**
Total RTV Revenues										
2009	1649	2491	847	1943.2	106+	740+	15789	1602	89.3	6231
2005	1354	1983	351	1766.1	107	612	15556	1321	48.3	5847
Average Annual Increase (%)	***5.45%***	***6.40%***	***35.33%***	***2.51%***	***	***	***0.37%***	***5.32%***	***21.22%***	***1.64%***
Average Annual Increase in Consumer TV Spend as Proportion of Average Annual Increase in Total RTV Revenues	***1.94***	***2.12***	***0.41***	***2***	***	***	***9.51***	***2.24***	***2.16***	***2.76***
Average Annual Increase in Net Public Sources as Proportion of Average Annual Increase in Total RTV Revenues	***0.81***	***0.35***	***0.26***	***0.92***	***	***	***0.57***	***0.52***	***0.41***	***17.73***

***EUROPE'S RADIO AND TV REVENUES 2005-2009* (EUR millions)**

	FI	FR	GB	GR	HR	HU	IE	IT	LT	LU
Consumer TV Spend										
2009	336	4143	5856	231	69	481	535	2611	54	25.3
2005	218	3002	5646	142	13	395	335	1446	23	19.1
Average Annual Increase (%)	**13.53%**	**9.50%**	**0.93%**	**15.67%**	**107.69%**	**5.44%**	**14.93%**	**20.14%**	**33.70%**	**8.12%**
TV Adspend										
2009	263	3450	4164	679	118	377	na	4359	42	na
2005	255	3694	6201	742	101	400	278	4669	45	11
Average Annual Increase (%)	**0.78%**	**-1.65%**	**-8.21%**	**-2.12%**	**4.21%**	**-1.44%**		**-1.66%**	**-1.67%**	*******
Radio Adspend										
2009	55	792	567	83	16	62	na	436	8	0
2005	52	927	896	57	13	65	106	409	7	0
Average Annual Increase (%)	**1.44%**	**-4.26%**	**-9.18%**	**11.40%**	**5.77%**	**-1.15%**		**1.65%**	**3.57%**	**0**
RTV Adspend										
2009	318	4242	4731	762	134	439	na	4795	50	na
2005	307	4621	7097	799	114	465	384	5078	52	11
Average Annual Increase (%)	**0.90%**	**-2.05%**	**-8.33%**	**-1.16%**	**4.39%**	**-1.40%**	*******	**-1.39%**	**-0.96%**	*******
Net Public Sources										
2009	394	3552	4366	294	157	155	200	1704	12	0
2005	370	2708	4978	222	145	149	170	1558	11	0
Average Annual Increase (%)	**1.62%**	**7.79%**	**-3.07%**	**8.11%**	**2.07%**	**1.01%**	**4.41%**	**2.34%**	**2.27%**	**0%**
Total RTV Revenues										
2009	1048	11937	14953	1287	360	1075	735+	9110	116	25.3+
2005	895	10331	17721	1163	272	1009	889	8082	86	30.1
Average Annual Increase (%)	***4.27%***	***3.89%***	***-3.90%***	***2.67%***	***8.09%***	***1.64%***		***3.18%***	***8.72%***	*******
Average Annual Increase in Consumer TV Spend as Proportion of Average Annual Increase in Total RTV Revenues	***3.17***	***2.44***	*******	***5.87***	***13.31***	***3.32***	*******	***6.33***	***3.86***	*******
Average Annual Increase in Net Public Sources as Proportion of Average Annual Increase in Total RTV Revenues	***0.39***	***2***	***0.79***	***3.03***	***0.26***	***0.62***	*******	***0.74***	***0.26***	*******

EUROPE'S RADIO AND TV REVENUE2005-2009 (EUR millions)

	LV	NL	NO	PL	PT	RO	SE	SI	SK	TR
Consumer TV Spend										
2009	46.9	1495	765	1291	826	400	789.7	77.1	185	668.4
2005	25.8	1170	520	644	559	226	707.4	40.2	75	259.7
Average Annual Increase (%)	**20.45%**	**6.94%**	**11.78%**	**25.12%**	**11.94%**	**19.25%**	**2.61%**	**22.95%**	**36.67%**	**39.34%**
TV Adspend										
2009	29.4	792	352	1145	1302	445	503	157.1	501	1442
2005	30.8	775	365	752	1137	380	496	117.3	389	1137
Average Annual Increase (%)	**-1.14%**	**0.55%**	**-0.89%**	**13.07%**	**3.63%**	**4.28%**	**0.35%**	**8.48%**	**7.20%**	**6.71%**
Radio Adspend										
2009	9.3	234	62	156	110	65	73	13.9	44	88
2005	10	252	69	107	105	33	61	12.1	26	79.7
Average Annual Increase (%)	**-1.75%**	**-1.79%**	**-2.54%**	**11.45%**	**1.19%**	**24.24%**	**4.92%**	**3.72%**	**17.31%**	**2.60%**
RTV Adspend										
2009	38.7	1026	414	1301	1412	510	576	171	545	1530
2005	40.8	1027	434	859	1242	413	557	129.4	415	1216.7
Average Annual Increase (%)	**-1.29%**	**-0.02%**	**-1.15%**	**12.86%**	**3.42%**	**5.87%**	**0.85%**	**8.04%**	**7.83%**	**6.44%**
Net Public Sources										
2009	0	760	519	124	232	211	595.7	88.3	63	0
2005	0	677	433	192	201	197	674.6	76.3	38	0
Average Annual Increase (%)	**0%**	**3.06%**	**4.97%**	**-8.85%**	**3.86%**	**1.78%**	**-2.92%**	**3.93%**	**16.45%**	**0%**
Total RTV Revenues										
2009	85.6	3281	1698	2716	2470	1121	1961.4	336.4	793	2198.4
2005	66.6	2874	1387	1695	2002	836	1939	245.9	528	1476.4
Average Annual Increase (%)	***7.13%***	***3.54%***	***5.61%***	***15.06%***	***5.84%***	***8.52%***	***0.29%***	***9.20%***	***12.55%***	***12.23%***
Average Annual Increase in Consumer TV Spend as Proportion of Average Annual Increase in Total RTV Revenues	***2.87***	***1.96***	***2.1***	***1.67***	***2.04***	***2.26***	***9.27***	***2.49***	***2.68***	***3.22***
Average Annual Increase in Net Public Sources as Proportion of Average Annual Increase in Total RTV Revenues	***0***	***0.86***	***0.89***	***-0.59***	***0.66***	***0.21***	***-10.07***	***0.43***	***1.31***	***0***