

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
--------------	---

by Paolo Baldi

AUSTRIA

By Uwe Hasebrink and Anja Herzog

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTECIPATION IN AUSTRIA	3
1.1 National Institutions and Government bodies	3
1.2 Self-Regulation	3
1.3 Other Organisations	3
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	4
2.1 Sector (TV) specific regulation	4
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	4
2.3 Instruments established by law	4
2.4 Complaints procedures (established by law)	5
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	5
Case Study: ORF Audience Council	5
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	6
ANNEXES	7
Table	8

BELGIUM

By Simon Delaere

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN BELGIUM	9
1.1 Institutions and organisations in Flanders	9
1.1.1 Government bodies	9
1.1.2 Self-Regulation: Raad voor de Journalistiek	10
1.1.3 Other organisations	10
1.1.4 And the broadcasters?	11
1.2 Institutions and organisations in Wallonia	12
1.2.1 Government bodies	12
1.2.2 Other organisations	13
1.2.3 The RTBF	13
1.2.4 Feedback mechanisms at commercial broadcasters	14
1.3 National institutions and organisations	14
1.3.1 Government bodies	14
1.3.2 Self-regulation and consumer protection	15
1.3.3 The King Baudouin Foundation	16
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	16

2.1 Flanders	16
2.1.1 Content regulation: the Radio and Television Decrees	16
2.1.2 The Administrative Agreement with the VRT	17
2.1.3 Establishment of institutions	18
2.1.4 Complaint procedures	18
2.2 Wallonia	18
2.2.1 The Broadcasting Decree and License Agreements with private broadcasters	18
2.2.2 The RTBF: Decree and Administrative Agreement	19
2.2.3 CSA: establishment and complaint procedures	20
2.3 Federal regulations	21
2.3.1 Ministry of Economic Affairs - Department for Control and Conciliation	21
2.3.2 Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism	21
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	22
3.1 Official bodies	22
3.1.1 Flanders	22
3.1.2 Wallonia	23
3.1.3 Federal level: Ministry of Economic Affairs	24
3.2 Self-regulation	24
3.3 Other organisations	25
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTISES	26
ANNEXES	28
Table	35

BULGARIA

By Anja Herzog

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTECIPATION IN BULGARIA	37
1.1 National Institution and Government bodies	37
1.2 Self-Regulation	37
1.3 Other organisations	38
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	38
2.1 Sector specific regulation	38
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	39
2.3 Instruments established by law	39
2.4 Complaints procedures	39
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	40
3.1 Case study 1: Council for Electronic Media (CEM)	40
3.1.1 Complaint procedures	40
3.1.2 Innovative steps to the future – the PHARE project	41
3.2 Case Study 2: Bulgarian Media Coalition	41
3.3 Case study 3: Media with Human Face Association	42
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	42
ANNEXES	43

CYPRUS

By Elisabetta Santori and Kostas Gouliamos

Introduction	49
1. GOVERNMENTAL AND NON GOVERNMENTAL BODIES FOR THE PROTECTION OF VIEWERS' RIGHTS	49
1.1 Cyprus Radio-Television Authority	49
1.2 Center for the development of child and youth programs (PLIAS tv)	50
2. THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	50
3. SOCIAL IMPACT OF THE CYPRUS RADIO-TELEVISION AUTHORITY	51
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	51

CZECH REPUBLIC

By Anja Herzog

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC	53
1.1 Government and official bodies	53
1.2 Self-Regulation	53
1.3 Other organisations	54
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	54
2.1 Sector (TV) specific regulation	54
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	54
2.3 Instrument established by law	55
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	55
Case study: Council for Radio and TV Broadcasting (CBC)	55
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	56
Table	58

DENMARK

By Anja Herzog

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTECIPATION IN DENMARK	59
1.1 National Institutions and Government bodies	59
1.2 Self Regulation	60
1.3 Other Organisations	61
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS	61
2.1 Sector (TV) specific Regulation	61
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	62
2.3 Instruments established by law	62

2.4 Complaints procedures (established by law)	62
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	63
3.1 Case study 1 : Arbejdernes Radio og Fjernsynsforbund, Kirke og Medier, SLS	63
3.2 Case study 2: Press Council	64
3.3 Case study 3: Media Council for Children and Young People	64
3.4 Case study 4: DR research & complaints	65
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	65
ANNEXES	66
Table	70

ESTONIA

By Anja Herzog

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN ESTONIA	71
1.1 Government bodies	71
1.2 Self-Regulation	71
1.3 Other organisations	71
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	72
2.1 Sector specific regulation	72
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	72
2.3 Instrument established by law	72
2.4 Complaints procedures	73
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	73
3.1 Case study: Estonian Press Council and Newspaper Council	73
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	74

FINLAND

by Anja Herzog

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN FINLAND	75
1.1 Government bodies	75
1.2 Self-Regulation	75
1.3 Other organisations	76
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	76
2.1 Sector specific regulation	76
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	77
2.3 Instrument established by law	78
2.4 Complaints procedures	78
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	79
3.1 Case study 1: Kansan Radioliiton (kaRa) & Pro Ylesio	79
3.2 Case study 2: Council for Mass Media	79
3.3 Case study 3: Audience research by the public service broadcaster YLE	80

4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	81
ANNEX	81
Table	83

FRANCE

by Adeline HULIN

Introduction	85
1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN FRANCE	85
1.1. Procedures offered by TV Channels	86
1.2. The consumer associations	87
1.3. The TV viewers' associations	88
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	90
2.1. Regulation of the Television Industry	90
2.2. Regulation of the Audio-Visual Sector: main points	90
2.3. Regulation issued by the CSA	92
2.4. Procedures for Complaints	93
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	93
3.1. The Impact of the Mediators	93
3.2. The Impact of " Les Pieds dans le Paf "	94
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	94
ANNEXES	96
Table	102

GERMANY

By Bernd Holznagel and Christiane Jugfleisch

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTECIPATION IN GERMANY	103
1.1 The television landscape	103
1.2 Legal/Controlling Bodies	103
1.3 Self- Reregulation	104
1.4 Viewer' organisations	104
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	104
2.1 Sector specific regulation	104
2.2 Factual and Legal Viewer Rights	105
2.2.1 Possibilities to participation in official institutions	105
2.2.2 Possibilities to voice criticism	105
2.2.3 Background information	106
2.2.4 Forums of discussion for viewers of specific programmes	106
2.2.5 Guides for programme choice for particular needs	106
2.3 Instruments established by law: Television Broadcasters	106
2.3.1 Programme Complaint	106

2.3.2 Rights to counterstatements	107
2.3.3 Right to inspection	107
2.3.4 Person responsible for youth protection	107
2.4 Instruments established by law: Media Authority	108
2.4.1 Overview	108
2.4.2 Advising viewer on their rights	108
2.4.3 Possibilities for complaints and objections	108
2.4.4 Opportunities for criticism	109
2.4.5 Offer of background information	109
2.4.6 Possibility of discussion between the viewers	109
2.4.7 Advancing Media Competences	109
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	112
3.1 Legal/Controlling Bodies	112
3.1.1 Media meeting and quality control	112
3.1.2 www. Programmbeschwerde.de	113
3.1.3 Programme complaint to the public broadcaster	113
3.1.4 "Flimmo": Programme consultation for parents registered society	113
3.2 Self- Regulation: FSF	113
3.3 Other organisations	114
3.3.1 AFF	114
3.3.2 Consumer Advice Centre	114
3.3.3 Society for Media Education and Culture in Communications (GMK)	114
3.3.4 Bavarian Organisation of the Association of Catholic German Women (KDFB)	115
3.3.5 Working Group of Christian Publishers (ACP)	115
3.3.6 Red Card against violence in the media	115
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	116
ANNEX	117
Table	119

GREECE

By Sophia Kaitatzi-Whitlock

Introduction	121
1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN GREECE	121
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	122
3. VIEWERS' ACCESS TO CHANNELS AND RELEVANT AGENCIES	123
3.1 The independent regulatory authority (ESR)	123
3.2 Hellenic Audiovisual Institute (IOM)	125
3.3 EEHMME / NACEM: a body of the past	125
3.4 Association for protection of television viewers (APTV)	126
3.5 The consumers' federation of Greece, INKA	126
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	127
ANNEXES	129

HUNGARY

by Bernd Holznagel and Christiane Jungfleisch

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN HUNGARY	133
1.1 The television landscape	133
1.2 Legal/Controlling Bodies	133
1.3 Other organisations	134
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	134
2.1 Sector specific regulation	134
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	134
2.3 Factual and legal Viewer' Rights	134
2.3.1 Possibilities to participate in official institutions	134
2.3.2 Complaint/Express support	135
2.3.3 Background Information	135
2.3.4 Discuss TV with other viewers	135
2.3.5 Orientation in selection programmes for special interests	135
2.4 Instruments established by law	135
2.4.1 Television Broadcaster	135
2.4.2 Media Authority: National Radio and Television Commission (ORTT)	136
2.4.3 General Inspectorate for Consumer Protection (GICP)	136
2.4.4 Hungarian Competition Authority	136
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	137
3.1 Legal/Controlling Bodies: Complaints Committee	137
3.2 Other organisations	137
3.2.1 National Association for Consumer Protection (NACPH)	137
3.2.2 Press Freedom Centre	138
3.2.3 Center for Independent Journalism	138
3.2.4 Mediakutato	138
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	138
ANNEXES	139
Table	144

IRELAND

by Helen Shaw

Introduction	145
1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN IRELAND	145
1.1. TV viewers to public broadcasting	147
1.2. TV viewers' interests as consumers	147
1.3. TV viewers' interests as citizens	147
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK	148
2.1. Sector (TV) specific legislation	148
2.2. Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	149
2.3. Instruments established by law	149

3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	150
3.1. RTE Audience Council	150
3.2. Broadcasting Complaints Commission	150
3.3. Sports rights in Ireland	151
3.4. Children's Advertisement on TV	152
3.5. Children's programming on TV	152
3.6. Television subtitling	152
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	152
Table	156

ITALY

by Elisabetta Santori and Nicola Ferrigni

Introduction	157
1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN ITALY	157
1.1 The Communications Regulatory Authority (Agcom)	157
1.1.1 The National Council of Users (CNU)	160
1.2 Committee for the application of the "Self-regulation code for TV and minors"	161
1.3 The Public Broadcasting Service (RAI)	162
1.3.1 The Charter guaranteeing the users and operators (RAI's "Consulta Qualità")	162
1.3.2 The RAI social secretariat	162
1.4 Consumer and TV viewer associations	163
1.4.1 AIART (Viewers' Association)	163
1.4.2 ADOC (Association for the Defense of Consumers)	163
1.4.3 CODACONS (Coordination of the consumer associations)	164
1.4.4 MOIGE (Italian Parents' Movement)	165
1.4.5 Other associations (ACU, ADUSBEP, CONFCONSUMATORI)	166
1.4.6 National Council of Consumers and Users (CNCU)	166
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	166
2.1. Main Laws	166
2.2. Regulation of the radio and television system	167
2.2.1 The "Mammi" Law (1990)	167
2.2.2 The "Maccanico" Law (1997)	167
2.3 The Self-regulation code for TV and minors	168
2.4 The RAI Charter	169
2.5 The "Gasparri" Law (2004)	169
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	169
3.1 The interviews	170
3.1.1 The Agcom President	170
3.1.2 The CNU Vice-president	171
3.1.3 The president of the Committee on TV and minors	172
3.1.4 The AIART President	172
3.2 Case Histories	173
3.2.1 "Bisturi", the reality show (Italia 1)	173
3.2.2 An unsuccessful protest: move Beautiful to the late evening slot	173

4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	174
Table	177

LATVIA

by Anja Herzog

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN LATVIA	179
1.1 Government bodies	179
1.2 Self-Regulation	179
1.3 Other organisations	179
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	179
2.1 Sector specific regulation	180
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	180
2.3 Instrument established by law	180
2.4 Complaints procedures	180
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	181
3.1 Case study 1: National Council for Radio and TV (NRTP)	181
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	182
ANNEX	183
Table	184

LITHUANIA

By Anja Herzog

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN LITHUANIA	185
1.1 Government bodies	185
1.2 Self-Regulation	186
1.3 Other organisations	186
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	186
2.1 Sector (TV) specific regulation	186
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	187
2.3 Instrument established by law	187
2.4 Complaints procedures	188
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	188
3.1 Ethics Commission & Ombudsman	188
3.2 Radio and Television Commission of Lithuania (RTCL)	188
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	189
ANNEX	189
Table	190

LUXEMBOURG

By Bernd Holznagel and Christiane Jungfleisch

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN LUXEMBOURG	191
1.1 The television landscape	191
1.2 Legal/Controlling Bodies	191
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	191
2.1 Sector specific regulation	191
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	192
2.3 Factual Viewer Rights	192
2.3.1 Express Support	192
2.3.2 Service	192
2.4 Instruments established by law	192
2.4.1 Television Broadcaster: Programme Complaint	192
2.4.2 Institutions/Media Authority	192
2.4.2.1 Commission Indépendante de la Radiodiffusion	192
2.4.2.2 Conseil National des Programmes (CNP)	193
2.4.2.3 Commission Consultative des Médias	193
2.5 TV Viewer-organisations	193
ANNEXES	194
Table	196

MALTA

By Elisabetta Santori

Introduction	197
1. THE BROADCASTING AUTHORITY	197
2. THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	198
2.1 The National Broadcasting Act (1991)	198
2.2 Broadcasting Code For The Protection of Minors	198
2.3 The Broadcasting Guidelines	199
3. SOCIAL IMPACT OF THE BROADCASTING AUTHORITY	200
4. BEST PRACTICES	200

NORWAY

By Anja Herzog

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN NORWAY	201
1.1 Government and official bodies	201
1.2 Self-Regulation	201
1.3 Other organisations	202
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	202

2.1 Sector (TV) specific regulation	202
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	202
2.3 Instrument established by law	203
2.4 Complaints procedures (established by law)	204
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	204
3.1 Case study 1: Familie & Medier – Kristient medieforum KKL	204
3.2 Case Study 2: Press Council	205
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	205
ANNEX	206
Table	207

POLAND

By Anja Herrzog

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN POLAND	209
1.1 Government body	209
1.2 Self-Regulation	210
1.3 Other organisation	210
2. TV VIEWER' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	210
2.1 Sector specific regulation	210
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	210
2.3 Instruments established by law	211
2.4 Complaints procedures	211
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	211
3.1 Case study 1: National Radio and Television Council	211
3.2 Case study 2: Press Freedom Monitoring Centre	212
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	212
ANNEXES	213
Table	219

PORTUGAL

By Manuel Pinto

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN PORTUGAL	221
1.1. Television viewers' associations	221
1.1.1. ACMedia – Portuguese Association of Media Consumers	221
1.1.2. ATV – Television Viewers' Association	222
1.2. Indirect forms of participation	223
1.2.1. RTP Advisory Council	223
1.2.2. National Consumer Council	223
1.2.3. "A Dois" Support Council	223
1.3. Modalities of self-regulation	224

1.4. Regulatory bodies	225
1.4.1. High Authority for Social Communications	225
1.4.2. National Communications Authority (ANACOM)	226
1.4.3. Competitiveness Authority	226
2. REGULATORY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK	227
2.1. Regulations on broadcasting content	227
2.2. Radio and television public license agreement	229
2.3. Complaints procedure	229
3. IMPACT, EFFECTIVENESS AND ASSESSMENT	230
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	231

ROMANIA

By Elisabetta Santori and Radu Baltasiu

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTECIPATION IN ROMANIA	235
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK	236
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	237
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	238

SLOVAKIA

by Anja Herzog

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN SLOVAKIA	239
1.1 Government and official bodies	239
1.2 Self-Regulation	240
1.3 Other organisations	240
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	240
2.1 Sector specific regulation	240
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	241
2.3 Instrument established by law	241
2.4 Complaints procedures	241
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	242
3.1 Case study: Memo 98	242
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	242
ANNEXES	243
Table	245

SLOVENIA

By Elisabetta Santori and Iztok Skerlic

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTECIPATION IN SLOVENIA	247
---	------------

1.1 The Telecommunications, Broadcasting and Post Agency of the Republic of Slovenia (ATRP)	247
1.2 Broadcasting Council of the Republic of Slovenia	247
1.3 Telecommunications Council of the Republic of Slovenia	248
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	249
2.1 Slovenia turning points	249
2.2 Telecommunications Act (Ztel-1)	249
2.2.1 Mass Media Act	249
2.2.2 Supervision of the implementation of the Mass Media Act	251
2.3 Limits of the Mass Media Legislation	251
3. EFFICIENCY OF THE AGENCY (ATRP)	252
4. BEST PRACTICES	252

SPAIN

by Charo Lacalle

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN SPAIN	255
1.1 Audiovisual Councils	255
1.2 Television Viewers' Associations	258
1.2.1 All-inclusive Associations	258
1.2.2 Associations related to the influence of the media	259
1.2.3 Associations related to the rights of the viewers	260
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	260
3. VIEWERS' ORGANIZATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	262
3.1 Petitions and complaints for the Audiovisual Councils	262
3.2 Petitions and complaints for TV viewers' associations	263
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	265
ANNEXES	268
Table	274

SWEDEN

by Anja Herzog

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN SWEDEN	275
1.1 Government bodies	275
1.2 Self-Regulation	275
1.3 Other organisations	276
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	276
2.1 Sector (TV) specific regulation	276
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	277
2.3 Instruments established by law	277
2.4 Complaints procedures (established by law)	278

3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	278
3.1 Case study: Swedish Press Council and the Ombudsman	278
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	279
ANNEX	279
Table	281

SWITZERLAND

by Anja Herzog

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN SWITZERLAND	283
1.1 Government and official bodies	283
1.2 Self-Regulation	283
1.3 Viewer' Organisations	284
1.4 Other Organisations	284
1.5 Audience Research	284
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK	284
2.1 Sector (TV) specific regulation	284
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	285
2.3 Instruments established by law	285
2.4 Complaints procedures (established by law)	286
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	287
3.1 Case study 1: arbus	287
3.2 Case study 2: Medien-Forum	288
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	288
ANNEXES	289
Table	291

THE NETHERLANDS

By Bernd Holznagel and Christiane Jungfleisch

1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN THE NETHERLANDS	293
1.1 The television landscape	293
1.2 Legal/Controlling Bodies	293
1.3 Self-Regulation	294
1.4 Other organisations	294
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	294
2.1 Sector specific regulation	294
2.2 Regulatory practices for positive and negative content regulation	294
2.3 Factual and legal Viewer Rights	295
2.3.1 Boards of public service broadcasting	295
2.3.2 Representation of members and influence on programming	295
2.3.3 Complaint/Express support	295

2.3.4 Background Information	296
2.3.5 Discuss TV with other viewers	296
2.3.6 Orientation in selecting programmes for special interests	296
2.4 Instruments established by law	296
2.4.1 Television Broadcasters	296
2.4.2 Dutch Media Authority	296
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS SOCIAL IMPACT	297
3.1 Legal/Controlling Bodies: NICAM	297
3.2 Self-Regulation	298
3.2.1 Independent Journalism Council	298
3.2.2 The Advertising Code Commission	298
3.3 Other organisations	299
3.3.1 Consumer Advice Centre	299
3.3.2 NJV Migranten & Media	300
3.3.3 Mira Media	300
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	300
ANNEXES	302
Table	306

UNITED KINGDOM

by Richard Collins and Zoe Sujon

Introduction	307
1. TV VIEWERS' PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM	308
1.1 How the TV viewer can participate	308
1.2 BBC	308
1.3 BBC and New Media: iCan	309
1.4 Channel 4	310
1.5 ITV (Channel 3)	312
1.6 five (Channel 5)	312
1.7 Sky (BSkyB)	312
1.8. Summary	313
2. TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	314
2.1. The Communications Act 2003	314
2.2. Ofcom. How the interests of the TV consumer are protected	314
2.3. How the interests of the viewer as citizen are secured	315
2.4. Ofcom and TV content regulation	315
2.5. Positive and negative content regulation	316
2.6. Media Literacy	316
2.7 BBC Charter and Licence	316
2.8 BBC Advisory Councils	318
2.9 BBC Governors	318
3. VIEWERS' ORGANISATIONS AND CAMPAIGN GROUPS.	318
3.1. Voice of the Listener and Viewer (VLV)	318
3.2. General Campaign Groups with relevance to broadcasting.	319

3.2.1 The Consumers Association (CA)	319
3.2.2. National Consumer Council (NCC)	319
3.2.3 RNIB: Royal National Institute for the Blind	320
3.2.4 The Commission for Racial Equality	320
3.2.5 Clik2Complaints.	321
3.3. MEDIA CAMPAIGN GROUPS.	321
3.3.1 CPBF Campaign for Press and Broadcasting Freedom.	321
3.3.2 Mediawatch.	322
3.3.3 Open Democracy	322
3.3.4 Ofcomwatch	322
4. BEST AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES	322
ANNEX	324
Table	327

TV VIEWERS' RIGHTS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

By Paolo Celot and Fausto Gualtieri

Introduction	329
1. ACCESS TO THE INSTITUTIONS: INSTRUMENTS AND PROCEDURES	330
1.1 The European Parliament	330
1.1.1 Case Study – A successful Petition on Media Pluralism	331
1.2 The European Commission	332
1.2.1 Case study: municipal taxes on satellite dishes	334
1.3 The Court of Justice of the European Communities (ECJ)	335
1.3.1 Case study: Preliminary ruling for repayment of taxes on satellite dishes	337
1.3.2 Case study: Advertising in satellite television programmes	338
1.4 The European Ombudsman	339
1.4.1 Case study: Greek prohibition on television advertising of children's toys	340
1.5 The European Court of Human Rights	340
1.6 SOLVIT – An on-line problem solving network	341
1.7. The European Consumer Centres and the European Extra-Judicial Network (EEJ-Net)	342
1.7.1 Italy: the European Consumers Centre	343
1.7.2 Belgium: the European Consumer Centre	344
2. RELEVANT EU PRINCIPLES AND COMMUNITY POLICIES	345
2.1 Treaty of the European Community	345
2.2 Council of Europe Conventions: Human Rights and Transfrontier Television	347
2.3 EU Consumer affairs	348
2.3.1 The Consumer Consultative Group	348
2.4 Audiovisual policy	349
2.4.1 Contact Committee by the Directive Television without Frontiers	350
3. CONCLUDING REMARKS	350
ANNEX: EAVI - PRESENTATION PAPER	351
ABOUT THE AUTHORS	357