



**INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION (IPU)
UNION INTERPARLEMENTAIRE (UIP)**

Geneva, 20 November 2006

**21 November 2006 - World Television Day
Success of parliamentary TV channels proves interest in parliamentary activities
(see press release attached)**

**B-Roll - Dope-sheet
(see also French version attached)**

01.05 Visit of EBU Headquarters in Geneva by participants of the Conference on Parliaments, Parliamentary TV Channels and Public Broadcasters, organized by the IPU, the EBU and the ASGP on 19 October 2003 in Geneva.

01.19 **Mr. Jean Réveillon, EBU Secretary General**
It was very important to have an exchange among ourselves about how the different countries cover parliamentary business. It's an excellent idea and I think that our day will be very fruitful.



01.53 **Views of the Centre international de conférences de Genève (CICG).**

02.01 **Mr. Anders B. Johnsson, Secretary General, Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU)**
When the EBU came to the IPU and the ASGP - these are acronyms and you know what they stand for - and suggested we should explore cooperation in this area, both the IPU, and (I know my friend Anders Forsberg will say in a while) the ASGP too, embraced the idea with a lot of enthusiasm.



02.34 **Mr. Anders Forsberg, President, Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments (ASGP)**

The basic idea of outline or transmission via the Internet is to give the public free and full access to debates and other activities in parliament. In working towards this, we show our respect for the citizens' right to see for themselves what is going on inside parliament.



03.04 **Mr. Fritz Pleitgen, EBU President, WRD Director General and founder of Phoenix**

Given the omnipresence of media and its insatiable hunger for instantaneous, short-lived information, virtually every thought, idea or statement emanating from parliament or any other given political forum is subject to immediate publication. In fact, it has become virtually impossible for parliamentarians to liberate themselves from this "law of nature", assuming of course that they wish to do so in the first place.



03.45 **Mr. Dan Landau (left), former Head of the Knesset Network (2 parts)**

The fact is that parliaments find it difficult to convey any parliamentary message, because, frankly, it is considered plain boring by the media, especially the commercial media. It just doesn't sell. Parliament suffers from a poor image of its members. But forget it. Politicians will never miss a chance to get some free TV time. So count them in to begin with. But be aware of the need to limit their control over content. Oh, and if you happen to have a second Chamber in your parliament, or Senate, be advised, they are going to want a piece of the action too. They might come along with completely different interests of their own. Politicians will tend to see things politically: left versus right, minority versus majority, coalition versus opposition, this is what parliament is all about. So before you know it, you might find that your nice little new television channel is becoming a pawn in the political game.



04.43 **Mr. Carlos Hoffmann (middle), Secretary General of the Chilean Parliament**

I think that the core issue before us is how to effectively ensure the right and aspirations of citizens to get in contact with and interact with the authorities or their legislators. The socio-historical context of this debate is particularly delicate, for it is characterized by an obvious crisis of political legitimacy at a global level. The attitude of citizens to politics is - more or less - one of dissatisfaction, disenchantment and apathy, according to numerous studies and theoretical and quantitative research throughout the world.



05.46 **Mr. Boris Bergant (right), EBU Vice-President (3 parts)**

We wanted to consult among ourselves, across the borders, and we are actually having this consultation for the first time in the existence of public service broadcasting. We look forward to finding solutions, by way of best practices, that will be useful for everybody. There are at least four main characteristics of what is truly public service broadcasting. The first prerequisite is independence. It should be independent of politics, economic interests, all sorts of lobbies, but at the same time open to all of them. The second is of course pluralism, pluralism not only in the political sense. We should be plural in presenting our cultures: modern culture, classical culture, mass culture, and elite culture. We should be open to all minorities, one of the main tasks of public service broadcasting is broadcasting for ethnical minorities; no other commercial station would ever dare to do something like that. So we need pluralism in the broader sense of the word. The third prerequisite is, I would say, credibility. But credibility can be established only if we are also making quality programmes. And I would say that the fourth prerequisite of public broadcasters, is, because it is a public service, accountability. This also means transparency. In every sense of the word, including the financial sense. Because we are financed by public, we are accountable to this public.



07.33 **Mr. Joe Phaweni (left), Head of Policy Management Unit, South African Parliament (two parts)**

The majority of South Africans live in rural areas. They are poor and unemployed. Electricity and its benefits are new developments to many of those people in rural areas. So owning a television set is a luxury that most people in rural areas cannot afford. Therefore, at this stage of our development, as a new democracy, we cannot talk of a parliamentary television broadcasting channel if the intention is also to reach the people in those far-flung areas. Parliamentary activities affect the lives of citizens; the public should therefore engage and actively participate in parliamentary processes. The nature of the function of the South African Parliament impacts on the work of reporters and the media. As such, there is a need for parliament and the media to work together to increase coverage of what is taking place in parliament.



08.53 **Mr. Peter Knowles (middle), BBC Parliament Controller (two parts)**

Offering parliamentary debate and journalism closely related to that activity consistently is extremely important. In terms of scheduling, let me just tell you about something which we call "stripping". Just to help out the superb translators in their glass boxes, they are doing a fantastic job, stripping means two things in the English language. One thing is taking all your clothes off, the other thing is a TV term in scheduling which means running programmes in strips. You've perhaps seen bits on the desk outside. But wherever we can, we run programmes in strips across the week, four days, five days or seven days a week, in the same place, at the same time. That is extremely important in terms of helping digital viewers who are moving between hundreds of different channels to find what they are looking for. It is very important. I would urge all of you concerned with running parliamentary



channels to think very hard about what cooperation agreement you could strike with your networks in your country, to actually get that kind of trailing. Because the impact it has in audiences is absolutely dramatic. You get larger audiences switching to parliamentary debates, through cross trailing from news programmes.

10.16 **Mr. Terry Murphy (left), C-SPAN Vice President of Programming and Executive Producer** (two parts)

We are unique in the parliamentary channels set-up, because we are a private, not-for-profit, non-commercial, non-governmental network. All of our money comes from the communication companies that carry us. They pay us about 4.5 cents per subscriber and - I am sorry to say that - our budget is between US\$ 35 and 40 million a year, and we have approximately 260 employees - but it took us a long time to get there. All our employees are based in [Washington,] D.C. and we now have three television channels, a radio station that can be heard throughout the United States and we have up to twelve Internet sites that we produce on a daily basis. Our coverage of the parliament or Congress only accounts for about twenty per cent of our programming. The other part of our programming is devoted to congressional meetings. On any given day, there are about forty congressional meetings out of Washington, D.C., and we can only cover about four or five of them. We make a decision on which four or five to cover. Again, since we are a private company, it is our decision.



11.24 **Mr. Dawood Kuttab, Director of the Institute of Modern Media, Al Qods University, Ramallah** (two parts).

Sometimes, being small can be very useful. Most Palestinians didn't even know what their members of parliament looked like. So, actually, putting them on television - unlike what we had heard all along, that parliament is very boring - for us it was very exciting to actually know what people looked like and who they were. People had never heard about them in the past, they had never seen them, so we did that. When I wanted to broadcast the Palestinian Parliament, I had three arguments with the Speaker of Parliament. First, he wanted to control the broadcasting. And I knew that if he controlled it, it would become a kind of propaganda: he was meeting such and such a group and he went there and was cutting the ribbon in such a place. It would not be what the public wanted. He wanted it to be broadcast at night - although sessions are usually held in the day - and I said that it had to be live. The third problem was that he wanted it edited and I said that it had to be gavel-to-gavel unedited. These are the three principles I stuck to, because I felt that unless we got that, it would not provide the public service that was required.



12.44 **Mr. Peter Vickers (right), EBU Head of Marketing and Business Management Eurovision Operations.**

We would like to suggest that we create a forum where you can exchange, freely between you, the content that you have on your channels, with other similar parliamentary channels. For example, if there is a vote of confidence in France, I would guess that it is of interest to other parliamentary channels around the world. And therefore we are talking about a forum, a market place, where we exchange this kind of content. It is our suggestion that this is



done on a reciprocal, free copyright basis so that there is no transaction at that stage. We, Eurovision, would be the platform that delivers this content, either live or in edited form and we would also take care of providing background information to help journalists and producers create their finished report.

13.45 **Mr. Eric Fichtelius, Executive Producer and Editor of SVT 24 Direct (Sweden), Rapporteur of the Geneva Conference (five parts)**

Is parliamentary broadcasting of public interest? The answer is yes and a definite yes. Should it be controlled by parliament or should it be controlled by independent media? I would advise all officials from parliament here, to really listen to the experience of all these broadcasters present here. Our unanimous feeling is that we believe in independent editorial decisions, and that this is good for everybody. There are one billion Internet users today and that number is growing every day. Ten years ago, we couldn't have any frequencies, and now we have so many frequencies to use. Internet gives us fantastic opportunities, and digital distribution, both on terrestrial emetteurs and satellite, give us many more frequencies, which is opening up the whole market for political or parliamentary broadcasting.



If you combine webcasting with documentaries on your home page - like the Swedish Parliament and many other parliaments are doing - you will have a fantastic political tool for citizens, with protocols from parliaments, documents from the opposition and the government, background documents, and MP voting records - which were mentioned here today - could be of great interest. These are my conclusions. I am proud to be a part of this new development in broadcasting and in political life, where citizens are becoming much more integrated in the political process. I came across a very interesting German study on why people hate politicians. They tested those attitudes against how politicians were presented on television. It turned out that if a leading politician was allowed to speak for himself, in his own voice, showing his own face, people would respect him much more than if he didn't. And I think that the political system we have whereby we elect representatives, is one where they can deserve some respect. If we can be a part of this, as independent broadcasters, I think it could be something good. Thank you.

16.36 End of B-Roll.

Moderators of the panels:

Mr. Luis Rivas, Director of News and Programmes - Euronews

Mrs. Esther Mamarbachi, Télévision suisse romande - TSR

Photos © Georges Cabrera, Geneva

Cameraman: François Glatz