

ACTO1

local public service television directory

Excuse me - whose spectrum is it?

Before the Digital Dividend Review Consultation gets under way ACTO explores spectrum ownership, public service broadcasting and where this leaves the devolved nations.

NEW ... LOCAL television REPORT Volume Two out now with DVD

interview on why *independent* Local TV? see page 15 for further details

ALSOSpectrum has been covered in earlier ACTO - still available free from <http://www.maccess.org.uk/members/ilt.html>

ACTO is an advisory committee of local television organisations working alongside the Institute of Local Television. **ACTO**'s initial objective is to share information supporting the introduction of local digital terrestrial television as an independent form of local public service broadcasting.

ACTO was established in 2003 by local television members of the Community Media Association to focus on the introduction of local digital terrestrial television services - or 'local DTT'.

Through the Institute of Local Television **ACTO** is represented on **Open Channels for Europe!** the organisation representing European local and open channels in exchanging information on European practice and in negotiation with the European parliament on small-scale TV provision.

Personal and institutional affiliation to **ACTO** is by a small annual subscription (see page 15) entitling subscribers to copies of Institute of Local Television research and reports as well as to **ACTO** directories. Subscribers also receive early announcement of local TV conferences, forums, workshops and are offered networking and support with submissions to regulators and government as well as encouragement with local-tv related activities.

ACTO - local public service television directory - encourages local lines of research and documentation and promotes publications which support a wide public engagement with small-scale local TV.

This is the twenty first edition of the **ACTO - local public service television directory**.

ACTO back issues can be downloaded from www.maccess.org.uk/members/ilt.html

WEBSITES

For information:

on local and community TV in Europe: www.obs.int/db/persky/eu.html

on community TV channels worldwide: www.openchannel.se/

UK's Community Media Association: www.commedia.org.uk/

UK examples of local and community TV programmes:

www.showcase.commedia.org.uk/

website of NvTv Belfast's Local TV Channel: www.nvttv.co.uk

Public Voice is the leading voluntary sector coalition campaigning for citizens' interests in communications policy and regulation:

[www.politics.co.uk/campaignsite/public-voice-\\$3436683.htm](http://www.politics.co.uk/campaignsite/public-voice-$3436683.htm)

Ofcom - the UK's independent regulator and competition authority - site includes sections on codes, guidelines and consultations: www.ofcom.org.uk/

..... provides an extensive catalogue of consultations and reports - for background to local TV look out the public service broadcasting consultations Phase 1-3 and you can join the Ofcom email list for updates on future consultations and publications

inter-ACT!#5 media activism in South Korea. You can subscribe to this regular

English language newsletter at <http://lists.riseup.net/www/info/inter-act>

Institute of Local Television www.localtvonline.com/ shared with The Broadcasting Trust, website lists publications, provides background papers, illustrates local TV DVDs, 2.4 Ghz TV studies

Ofcom's spectrum dividend review consultation

http://www.ofcom.org.uk/media/news/2005/11/nr_20051117

Excuse me - whose spectrum is it?

From notes of presentations to the Cross Party Culture and Media Committee of the Scottish Parliament, Wednesday, 25th October and from Digital Switchover: Ready for the Revolution? The Hilton Grosvenor Hotel, Edinburgh Friday 27th October 2006.

Speaking during the January 2006 House of Lords Select Committee meeting on the BBC Charter Review Lord Armstrong of Ilminster said:

"As I understand ... the [electromagnetic] spectrum is the property of the Government. I believe our access to it is controlled by international agreement. I would be grateful if you could confirm that."

Professor Martin Cave replied: "I think there still may be some residual uncertainty about precisely to whom the spectrum belongs." (1)

Martin Cave has been the principle advocate of spectrum trading, a proposal subsequently adopted by the Westminster Government as the favoured means to regulate spectrum access in future - including the highly-prized spectrum in the broadcast bands which will be released for other uses after analogue switch-off.

Professor Cave has been responsible for two reports:

"one in 2002 was a general review of spectrum strategy for the UK, which covered the whole range of spectrum use, the second report, ... was specifically to address the question of what could be done to improve the *efficiency of spectrum employed for public purposes.*" (op cit, my italics)

If spectrum is wanted for 'public purpose' - as it is for Local Television and may be for new public channels and wireless communications in the nations and regions - should the Westminster government be contemplating trading spectrum in order to exclude it from future localised public access?

As Cave suggests, '*there still may be some residual uncertainty about precisely to whom the spectrum belongs*' - so surely until that 'residual uncertainty' is cleared up the spectrum cannot be central government's to relinquish?

There seems to be some confusion that the regulation of communications - of wireless and broadcasting - is the same as the regulation of spectrum as an asset. Communications and broadcasting policy describe licences of use, in particular assignments and restrictions on others not to interfere - in the 'public interest'.

Following Cave, through the mechanism of spectrum auctions and market trading the Government is seeking to encourage commercial companies to improve the efficiency of spectrum use by trading surplus or unwanted spectrum among themselves. The proposal presumes there is no further requirement for spectrum in the public interest or indeed that the public interest is or should remain entirely defined by Westminster. Citizenship is local as well as national in character. So to limit public broadcasting to a UK scale seems contrary to its public purpose - which is to enable and encourage democratic discussion.

In addition, if spectrum is to be traded under communications legislation which are free of use limitations it has to be assumed by the Government that the electromagnetic spectrum will always be used for services falling under the communications legislation. But I expect even Ofcom would not be so bold as to suggest that the electromagnetic spectrum will always be used for services that fall within the scope of this legislation.

The uncertainties as to who owns and who might assign spectrum and to what future

purposes it might be put goes well beyond the momentary doubts of the Government's otherwise self-confident spectrum advisor - it reaches to the heart of the government's auditing of assets. In a paper setting out to inform the Treasury's view of spectrum on the basis of international agreements Martin Kellaway, of the National Statistics Office writes "By international convention the spectrum is owned by the central government of each country, *and that ownership can not be transferred.*" (3)

These international conventions encourage governments to engage in a negotiated settlement of cross border spectrum conflicts but they resolutely do not establish a government's ownership, sovereignty or exclusive title to spectrum use or regulation throughout each state, over regions or (devolved) nations. (4)

When pressed on spectrum 'ownership' and entitlement to its use Peter Bury of the Spectrum Team and Mark Bunting of the Digital Dividend Review Team - both at Ofcom - have suggested that spectrum is a 'constitutional issue'. For example, Mark Bunting writes:

"Our national offices [eg Ofcom Scotland, etc] do carry out valuable work in licensing the use of spectrum, *however devolving spectrum policy regulation would raise constitutional issues which are really for Government to consider*". (5)

But Government(s) are not considering this. If central Government has already decided it has no further use for spectrum to serve a public purpose then surely the more local tiers of Government in the UK should assert responsibility for spectrum released after switchover for their own uses?

In the nations this question can be addressed without interfering with Westminster's retained responsibility for broadcasting.

Spectrum is a 'tangible non-produced asset' as distinct from an 'intangible non-produced asset' - which is how a broadcasting licence is described by international agreement. There's no need for ownership of spectrum to be addressed in broadcasting legislation. We can accept readily enough that for the purpose of international spectrum agreement it has been the UK government that has been best placed to act: but for local, regional, and each nation's use of spectrum the responsibility must surely lie with these lower tiers of government and their political accountability in order to ensure that the public sphere and its interests are appropriately represented.

The convention that a state Government should exercise monopoly over spectrum use has arisen for two distinct reasons.

Firstly, the states negotiate among themselves to resolve cross-border issues involving spectrum. To avoid interference spectrum has become a part of international negotiations and agreements in Europe and bilaterally between neighbouring countries. The need to resolve potential and real international disputes invites the central governments to act on behalf of their perceived interests - and in particular to do so for the spectrum that crosses borders.

As far as I have been able to establish part of the rationale for the UK Government's assumption of the stewardship, monopoly or 'ownership' of spectrum in the UK has been in order to address this international demand that a suitable stakeholder is in place to resolve spectrum's overlapping uses.

But secondly, the history of bringing together spectrum in the broadcast bands in the UK was very deliberately to avoid commercial inefficiencies and inequalities of ser-

vice and specifically to serve a unifying and socially inclusive purpose. The universal element of public service broadcasting is significantly attached to the all embracing reach of the signal and to preserve clarity of reception so that all households should be able to share in debate and discussion. Crucially this compact with the listener and viewer to combine spectrum helps shape our perception of the democratic representation of the UK. To provide spectrum for UK wide channels it is necessary to use local and regional spectrum, for this spectrum to (in effect) be annexed or appropriated and then combined in a plan that will achieve the public purpose of universal reach - to deliver radio and later television to all. This approach relies absolutely on the willingness of us all to share access to 'local' spectrum in the common cause of providing a mutual and available space for democratic debate, representation and access to information.

Because there is no transmitter site offering a single frequency which can transmit a signal to a UK wide audience the solution has been to construct a practical map of multiple frequency uses shared to a great extent over time in the original ambition of central regulatory thinking. But this plan - built up now over many decades - shows too that it is possible to imagine spectrum being used to deliver local and region and nation TV in addition to the UK-wide public broadcasting services. (6)

The plan for digital broadcasting follows the distribution of the analogue network and uses the same transmitter masts. Significantly the commercial digital channels - those on the commercial multiplexes - will be limited to 212 transmitters. This decision in itself negates public purpose of acquiring for common good the spectrum assets because the commercial approach is to 'cherry-pick' these assets to identify and isolate an audience for commercial services: the maxim being to reach a majority of households from a minimum of transmitter sites. In taking this commercial decision to use 'public' spectrum for shareholder rather than common benefit the Government has reneged on its compact with the public to bring spectrum together on the public's behalf. To counter the impact of the commercial services' poor availability part of the local, regional and nation governments' remit must now be to manage spectrum to recover lost services and inequalities in opportunity thrust onto their own areas.

There is no public reason why the management of spectrum should not be represented in a delegated way appropriate to the location of transmitters and reach of (broadcast) spectrum. Spectrum would be better represented 'locally' in the light of devolution as well as central plans to offer greater local authority autonomy. Westminster might retain sovereignty over UK-wide public service spectrum and international coordination - after consultation with the nations and regions. But the more localised democratic authorities should be concerned to address the efficient and - equally important - the 'effective use' of spectrum to deliver regional and local public services as well as commercial uses that will benefit the economies of their areas.

Devolution tests the monopoly of central government on spectrum entitlement just as it questions the exclusive rights of the present public service channels to cover with equality and appropriate accountability devolved political matters. The new democratic authorities were not present when spectrum was first annexed to serve the once monolithic and exclusive 'public purpose'.

So the 'universe' of public service broadcasting is no longer the 'universe of the UK' but is multilayered and in each area semi-autonomous: there are now legitimate public broadcasting *universes* not being addressed or not being addressed appro-

propriately by the branches of the broadcasting and regulatory centres. Both BBC Scotland and Ofcom Scotland remain dependent and answerable in a command and control way to their respective head offices in London and they are not answerable to the governments of the nations they ostensibly 'serve' with (respectively) public broadcasting and licences to use spectrum.

It is devolved government and the further 'double-devolution' to local authorities on the political horizon that demands this monopoly of public service broadcasting and spectrum accountability be broken up. These layers of governance are the new arenas of political discourse and a more complex decentralized multi-layered public sphere is overlooked to the detriment of their authority, of public interest, debate and purpose.

If Cave's plans are to be adopted before there is an opportunity to reconstruct public service broadcasting and to examine and realign spectrum 'ownership' or 'stewardship' downwards then this Labour government will have acted to against its responsibility and the public interest to manage spectrum in the public interest. It will have abused the common good of spectrum combination in favour of commercial purpose. It is certainly not in the public interest of those living in the nations and regions to see the electromagnetic spectrum auctioned, to have access to the spectrum removed from 'over their heads'.

In Wales there has been some discussion of these issues. Citing various authors looking at both the Welsh and Scottish experience before and after devolution Leighton Andrews of Cardiff University and a Labour Welsh Assembly Member – writes recently in *Media, Culture and Society* ...

“Issues of media policy are central to debates on national identities and national cultures, and questions of culture and identity drove the demands for devolution in both Scotland and Wales” (7)

The geographical features in Wales and Scotland lend themselves to arguments supporting devolution of broadcasting and, as Andrews' suggests, “it is certainly feasible to envisage a system in which some aspects of broadcasting are devolved.” (op cit)

The debates on broadcast devolution may well have fallen in the past to discussion between unionist and nationalist camps, but as Andrews' suggests this ignores important issues raised by multiple levels of regulation at the European, the state, and - I'd suggest, in many of those European states at a 'regional' as well as 'local' scale of organization and de facto accountability. Broadcasting need not become an entirely devolved matter but it must fall now to Scotland and Wales (and Northern Ireland) to determine the best and appropriate use of spectrum in their territories - that is, all spectrum in their area that has not been commandeered to serve a genuine UK-wide public broadcasting purpose.

What adds some urgency to Andrew's contribution from Wales is that the Scottish Parliament and the Scottish Executive have not made known to Ofcom during the Digital Dividend Review that they are stakeholders in Scotland's future requirements for spectrum. To date no claim has been made formerly for released spectrum to be reserved for public as well as possibly commercial services to be run in and for Scotland.(8)

In the way the proposals for spectrum trading are currently being framed it will fall to successive 'commercial owners' – not to future Government's at Westminster or Holyrood of Cardiff to transfer those rights of access to third parties. Spectrum trad-

ing will serve to regulate spectrum use by alienating future access for public purpose and common good – a good which the Scottish Parliament has a duty to safeguard in the democratic as well as economic interests of Scotland. The spectrum issue is therefore of some major political significance and - I suggest - it cannot be allowed to slip through an MSP's fingers because they feel constrained to think of 'broadcasting' as a retained (ie Westminster) responsibility. Spectrum is not the same as communications - a current use to which it is put, and who knows what uses will arise in future and how regulated if ceded to commercial operators to trade without restriction?

From what I can see spectrum trading will transgress the international agreements upon which the state's claims to 'ownership' of spectrum rest. In the international framework – licences and ownership cannot be transferred.

So it seems that there is a constitutional and legal issue to be explored here by the Scottish Parliament, the Welsh Assembly and by Westminster.

Unless the Scottish Parliament and Scottish Executive do act as 'broadcasting stakeholders' and represent to Ofcom broadcasting needs in Scotland - as identified and for the future, then media jobs will continue to flow southwards to the present broadcasting centres where the centralized UK channels will continue to produce and distribute (largely) from the South East of England.

From Ofcom's review of the television production sector		
TV production spend by area		
Northern Ireland	£43m	1.75% of UK production spend with 2.9% of UK population, runs 2% of broadcast journalism courses
Scotland	£138m	6% of UK production spend with 8.5% of UK population, runs 5% of broadcast journalism courses
Wales	£73m	3% of UK production spend with 4.9% of UK population, 10% of broadcast journalism courses
London	£1476m	60% of UK production spend with 12% of UK population, runs 22% of broadcast journalism courses
England ex London	£768m	32% of UK production spend with 65% of UK population, runs 61% of broadcast journalism courses

On 19th September Alex Neil MSP and Chair of the Culture and Enterprise Committee of the Scottish Parliament wrote to Lord Currie Chairman of Ofcom:

I am writing to you to request that no decisions are made on the use of broadcast spectrum that exclude the introduction of Local TV channels with DTT roll out to reach all households in Scotland. Furthermore, spectrum should not be allocated or regulated so as to restrict or inhibit the introduction in future of new

independent public channels from and for Scotland.

It is not surprising that the Scottish and Westminster perspectives might be different. The public and voluntary sector in Scotland occupy a far more central and bigger part of the economic as well as social fabric than in England. How are broadcasting proposals being framed by Ofcom to recognise these different emphases of 'citizen-consumer'?

A review of 'citizen-consumer' from Ofcom's publications shows overwhelmingly that it is the 'consumer' and not the citizen that is reflected, represented and championed.

Ofcom has also argued that the purpose of spectrum markets is to free spectrum use from the 'command and control' inefficiencies of earlier forms of centralized regulation. Yet Ofcom Scotland has not been freed from a 'command and control' role - the office in Scotland is fettered to prevent it interpreting and implementing broadcasting on Scotland's behalf, to picture the needs of the devolved nation so that it can respond and reflect upon itself.

There was scant attention paid to the Communications Bill by the Scottish Executive or Scottish Parliament. With responsible oversight the anomaly of broadcasting licences being offered to local authorities bound by the terms of the Local Government (England) Act 1972 would have been spotted.

The House of Lords Select Committee on the BBC's Charter Renewal also invited Dr David Cleevely to contribute evidence on the proposals for a spectrum market.

[Spectrum] is a significantly under-exploited resource, both for broadcasters and for other potential users of spectrum. It is very important that over the next 10 or 20 years, in a world where we are talking about broadcasting we get the economic incentives correct so that then people can take the right kinds of decisions and innovation can take place. [Spectrum] is where we are going to create the greatest amount of economic growth and the greatest benefit for the people of the United Kingdom. (9)

Economic growth and benefit for the people of Scotland are within the Scottish Parliament's remit.

The Campaign for Local TV conducted a series of paper and web based surveys earlier this year, asking contributors the simple question – Would you be willing to drop a current digital channel in favour of a Local TV channel in your area? All respondents would forego one (or more) of these channels in favour of space for a Local TV channel.

The preferences of respondents for dropping an existing digital service in favour of Local TV is shown below as a

PERCENTAGE of returns received up to 01.04.06

Gambling	64%
Shopping	15%
Quiz Shows	4%
Auction	1.5%
Community	15%
Education	4%
History	1.5

In spite of spectrum issues not being the subject of popular debate – here is circumstantial evidence that viewers do want to make a choice that is not dictated to them entirely by what the UK and near UK-wide channels have decided to offer their largely metropolitan audiences.

The universal social cohesion that has hitherto been represented in combining spectrum is going to be cherry-picked - offering channels which use part of the network to reach a selected or maximalist rather than universal audience. Ofcom has limited the number of transmitters that commercial channels might use to 212 – of the 1152 required to provide services throughout the UK. The commercial logic is that 25% of the population can be forgotten for the benefit of only using 20% of the transmitters to reach 75%. You can guess where those 212 transmitters and relays will be located.

Those already able to receive cable or high-bandwidth broadband – upon which TV will run in future - are located in the same place that the commercial channels will choose to reach. Left to their own deregulated devices companies' cost-benefit analysis and not universal service criteria will apply in the business plan.

From an economic point of view, the number of local jobs in TV and their value to each local economy as well as their tax value to the exchequer would provide a greater contribution than the same spectrum in a channel delivering a single quiz, shopping or repeats channel.

Local terrestrial TV in Scotland - the RSL services

In Scotland Local TV licences were held for short-term analogue channels covering Ayr, Dumbarton, Glasgow, Lanarkshire, Stirling, Edinburgh, Perth, Dundee, Aberdeen and Inverness – however, all were offered with poor or very poor coverage characteristics. Many did not go on air.

Of those that provided services for up to four years Lanarkshire TV employed over twenty staff, Edinburgh Television twelve and Channel Six Dundee eight.

If the frequencies offered had been comparable with those available to BBC Scotland or SMG Local TV in Scotland would reach over two thirds of the population.

Unless the Scottish Parliament and Welsh Assembly intervene now the spectrum to be released from switchover will continue to be used to misrepresent public service, to introduce greater inequality in the circulation and distribution of media goods and to further concentrate media employment in the South East of England.

NOTES & REFERENCES

1 Select Committee House of Lords BBC Charter Review Minutes of Evidence 11 January 2006 Examination of Witnesses, Question 1725

And further on:

Q1740 Lord Peston: I am right that you said in reply to Lord Armstrong that the spectrum in some general sense is within the Government's domain. which might also then be interpreted as belonging to the citizens of this country. The Government then would use it for optimum public purposes. Would that be a fair way of putting it? That is what we mean by things being in the public domain.

Professor Cave: I hesitate to describe it legally in those terms. In effect, it is at the Government's disposal.

Q1741 Lord Peston: That is right. Normally, what is at the Government's disposal, subject to some distinction, is meant to be allocated for the benefit of the people of this country. That is normal. I used to teach the subject and it is certainly what I used to say.

Professor Cave: It would certainly be a very respectable objective.

Q1742 Lord Peston: Therefore, to take an obvious example, if one of the objectives of the general views of what the people of this country wanted would be virtually universal coverage of television, then that would be a perfectly acceptable thing that they would want and they may like spectrum to be allocated to achieve that. I would be right on that, would I not, if that is what they want and if that is what is regarded as in the public interest?

Professor Cave: The public interest would be in the capacity of the population to receive broadcast programmes, which may or may not be spectrum based.

Q1743 Lord Peston: But if it were to be spectrum based, that would be one way of doing it. The notion of universal coverage does not imply the notion of universal watching. In other words, if I look at my Radio Times, I want access to everything in the Radio Times, but that does not mean I am going to watch everything. I certainly do not regard the system where most of us do not watch as inefficient, and that is why I regard your use of the word efficient as quite erroneous. In other words, it is nothing to do with the idea that if only a few people listen to Radio 3, that is not allocating the resources properly. Surely that is a complete mistake as far as economics is concerned.

2 In several discussions with senior staff at Ofcom claims have been made that the Treasury has put pressure on Ofcom to favour the sale of released spectrum over the introduction of new services – as an explanation for the difficulties faced by Local TV at Ofcom. A senior civil servant at the DCMS Catherine Smadje made the same point to Marilyn Hyndman and myself at a meeting - if more forcefully – that DCMS were following the Government's commitment to seek to maximise revenues by selling the spectrum released after digital switchover.

There are questions here concerning Ofcom's independence from Government as communications regulator and its willingness to accept as given that spectrum is Government's to sell. Discussions with Daniel Dyball at the Treasury confirmed that in Summer 2005 the Treasury had visited Ofcom to remind them of the Government's view on spectrum sale - but that Ofcom was free to make up its own mind as an independent regulator.

3 CLASSIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT RECEIPTS FROM ALLOWING USE OF SPECTRUM, Martin Kellaway – National Statistics www.statistics.gov.uk/.../Public_sector_accounts/downloads/GOVERNMENT_RECEIPTS_from_SPECTRUM.pdf

4 In a phone conversation, Martin Kellaway advised he had been 'told' it was Government who owned spectrum, there was no paper trail he could provide – he had no idea where the idea had originated and made 'the assumption this was the case' for the purposes of writing his advisory paper.

5 email correspondence

6 See *The Pocket Local Channel Atlas (Scotland)* and *The 2nd Pocket Local Channel Atlas*, School Press/Institute of Local Television, (ISBN: 1 899405 06 2, 2005 and ISBN: 1 899405 05 4, 2006)

7 Andrews, Leighton 'The National Assembly for Wales and broadcasting policy, 1999–2003' *Media, Culture & Society* © 2006 SAGE Publications (London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi), Vol. 28(2): 191–210

[ISSN: 0163-4437 DOI: 10.1177/0163443706061681]

8

The Digital Dividend Review was recently discussed by the Scottish Parliament Cross Party Group on Culture and Media.

While recognising the reserved powers applying to broadcasting, the outcome of this review of future spectrum use will have a direct impact on many devolved issues, including culture and enterprise. Scotland and its regions have distinctive cultures that are inadequately served through UK-wide media. This is of course not surprising, but it does need to be addressed. The current situation for Scottish output has some positive aspects, but there is certainly scope for improvement at a Scottish level, and the addition of local output would provide a very significant boost to our cultural opportunities. There would of course also be many potential economic benefits arising from more devolved broadcasting.

At the CPG meeting, we noted that on 19th September Alex Neil MSP, who is the Convener of the Enterprise and Culture committee, wrote to Lord Currie Chairman of Ofcom, to request that “no decisions are made on the use of broadcast spectrum that exclude the introduction of Local TV channels with DTT roll out to reach all households in Scotland. Furthermore, spectrum should not be allocated or regulated so as to restrict or inhibit the introduction in future of new independent public channels from and for Scotland.” There was general agreement with this sentiment, and it was agreed to write to you stressing the importance of retaining flexibility in the allocation of spectrum to allow a variety of local television companies to be set up to serve the cultural needs of our communities.

I understand that similar concerns have been expressed in Wales, and that additionally attention has been drawn to the role of television within the democratic processes of the devolved nations and regions. Clearly this is a matter that is also of great concern to us. The health of our democracy is in no small way dependent upon the health of the Scottish media, and we want to maximise any opportunity presented by new technology to enhance the democratic process.

In addition to requesting that technical measures be undertaken to ensure the flexibility of use of the system, the CPG was concerned about the issue of ownership of the digital spectrum. If the objective is to maximise income from the sale of the spectrum, if it is sold to the highest bidder and in perpetuity has its use determined by successive owners, then this clearly creates difficulties for the growth of local and community based alternatives which, especially in their early stages, are likely to be weaker commercial players than the big networks. We believe that a significant part of the spectrum should therefore be reserved to allow for the growth of local stations.

Cathy Peattie MSP (Convener CPG Culture and Media)

Staff at the Scottish Executive have not yet (24th October) provided information on spectrum use or requirements in Scotland to Ofcom's Digital Dividend Review but expect to offer views on consultation. Anne Dagg writing from the Scottish Executive: writing on 24th October

Ewa Hibbert has passed me your email of 18 October regarding the Analysis of the Digital Dividend that Ofcom is undertaking. I can confirm that Zahid Deen in the Telecoms Team and Ewa Hibbert and myself who deal with broadcasting are the appropriate contacts within the Executive. Our teams will be working closely together and discussing the DDR in depth with OFCOM, as well as responding fully to their forthcoming consultation.

9 Select Committee House of Lords BBC Charter Review Minutes of Evidence 11 January 2006 Examination of Witnesses

LOCAL TELEVISION PUBLICATIONS and DVDs from the Institute of Local Television

NEW NEW NEW NEW NEW NEW NEW NEW NEW NEW NEW NEW NEW NEW NEW

LOCAL television REPORT - ACTO local public service television papers, VOLUME TWO ISBN: 1 899405 08 9, published by School Press/ACTO/Institute of Local Television, (September 2006). Softback. CONTENTS Introduction, ONE Review & Analysis: Ofcom's *Digital Local: Options for the future of local video content and interactive services*, Ofcom's *Digital Local: Response and Further Review*. TWO Local Public Service Television Broadcasting: What is *not* clear about Public Service?, European Local Public Service Television, Delivering Ofcom's Digital Local with Public Purpose. THREE European Background: Assessing Opportunities for Local TV Across Europe, John Glover, Ofcom. FOUR: MORI's Local TV Study for Ofcom, Speed Reading MORI's 'Programmes in the Nations'. FIVE: Local TV: Who's interested? *Scottish Local TV Forum* Peter Williams, Kent; Eva Dekanovska, Slovakia; Nic Millington, Herefordshire; Brendan Murphy, Perthshire. *Borders Local TV Briefing* Scottish Borders Council, John Askew; Fife, MiMAC, Fife, Graeme Campbell; *Belfast NvTv*, Northern Visions. SIX Digital Frontline: Technical Overview, Programming Introduction, Grant & Production Funded Local TV. SEVEN Switchover and the Consumer: Trisha McAuley, Scottish Consumer Council. SEVEN Local DTT Engineering: Achilles' Heel or Fall Guy?, Add/Drop, Serge Francois, Terayon. £28.50 inc p&p 200pgs with DVD.

Two Volumes of DVDs each bound with a written introduction outlining the development of Community Television from the 1970s to the present day.

VOLUME ONE looks at European traditions which influenced the development of

labour movement filmmaking, later community cinema and community cable TV in the UK - £25.00 inc p&p

COMMUNITY TELEVISION 'KEY TEXTS' VOLUME ONE: *DEADMEN ECHO* (1982) Montage from the (mostly silent) workers' films of the 1930s incorporating clips from various archives with a spoken analysis. *EUROPEAN MEETING OF LOCAL TELEVISIONS* (1991) Council of Europe meeting on local and community TV. Examples from Germany, UK and Netherlands with a valuable analysis of community television by Nick Jankowski. *OPEN CHANNELS FOR EUROPE* (1999) A compilation of short Hi-8 videos on some of the different approaches to community and access TV to be found in Germany, Sweden and Israel.

VOLUME TWO explores recent local terrestrial TV examples and the emergence of a local public service after the introduction of the UK's restricted services licences in 1997 - £25.00 inc p&p

COMMUNITY TELEVISION 'KEY TEXTS' VOLUME TWO: *CAPITAL NEWS* (1995) Supported by The Scotsman, Capital News was a broadcasting project involving students from local universities and colleges in setting up and running a local TV news studio. Held to coincide with the Edinburgh International Television Festival, the Government's Department of National Heritage stopped the broadcast just moments before it was due on air. The project continued - 'broadcasting to tape' - providing evidence to help convince regulators that local television offered a real alternative to regional television news. *TOUBIE JACK'S CHANNEL SIX SHOWREEL* (2001-2002) On small budgets the local TV services, Edinburgh Television and Channel Six Dundee differentiated themselves very clearly in their short-form programming, commercials, TV graphics and logos. Toubie Jack's showreel demonstrates that high production values can be achieved from basic desktop computers and software. *e-tv ABERFELDY* (2002-3) A field trial of a low-cost licence-exempt neighbourhood TV technology which ran from September 2002-October 2003. Here, King Alfreds College filmed interviews and presentations from the Community TV Forum held in Aberfeldy in September 2002.

The Pocket LOCAL CHANNEL ATLAS (Scotland) ISBN: 1 899405 05 4. The 'add/drop solution' explained. The terrestrial Local TV option proposed by ACTO and described in Ofcom's Digital Local as "the most consistent and convenient solution and potentially offers the widest reach for Local TV of all the terrestrial options." Add/drop explained and applied to delivering Local TV throughout Scotland (2005), £9.00 inc p&p 40gs.

The 2nd Pocket LOCAL CHANNEL ATLAS (Scottish Borders, Cumbria, Kent, Northern Ireland, North West) ISBN: 1 899405 06 2 £8.00 inc p&p 32 pgs.

ACTO - local public service television directories. Is the pdf directory circulated as an information resource and discussion forum on Local TV. FOC and distributed by email to over 800 readers. To 'subscribe' forward you email address. Papers from the first ten editions of ACTO have been compiled into LOCAL television REPORT.

LOCAL television REPORT - ACTO local public service television papers, ISBN: 1 899405

04 6, published by School Press/ACTO/Institute of Local Television, (December 2005), £13.50 inc p&p 144 pgs. Softback. CONTENTS I Preamble. ii Introduction. ONE Questions & Answers: Natalie White's: Questions on the Future of Local Television; Ofcom's: Assessing the Future of Local Television and Interactive Services: A Survey for Stakeholders. TWO European Background: Assessing Opportunities for Local TV Across Europe; THREE Case Histories: Triangle TV Auckland; Open Channels Germany; Open Channel Berlin; Teveline: Reality Show vs Real People; Channel Six Dundee plus Audience Research; 'e-tv' in Aberfeldy. FOUR Local Spectrum & Costs: The Add/drop Solution and Local Network Channel; How Big or Small is Local TV?; A Stab at Local TV Costs. FIVE Shifting Policies: Media Literacy, Local Licences and Local Government; God's Own Spectrum: Local TV and the Public Good; Regional Variations in Production Spend; Bigger Picture on the Smaller Screen; Valuing Local Public Service Television. SIX Nutshell: ACTO Checklist to Ofcom, April 2005.

LOCAL TELEVISION RENEWED: essays on local television 1994-2005 published by School Press for the Institute of Local Television, (August 2005). £13.50 inc p&p 112 pgs, Softback *LOCAL TELEVISION RENEWED* provides a vigorous critique of the political impact of public service broadcasting since 1990 and argues for two hundred plus independent local, community and municipal television channels in line with developments underway across Europe. *LOCAL TELEVISION RENEWED* outlines how these proposals for local TV channels can be introduced as part of digital switchover from 2008 and expanded via broadband.

LOCAL TELEVISION RENEWED is the fifth volume on local television to be published by the Institute of Local Television - published either with John Libbey, the Community Radio Association (CRA, now the Community Media Association) or on the ILT imprint: School Press.

LOCAL TELEVISION RENEWED: essays on local television 1994-2005, ISBN:1 899405 03 8, Dave Rushton, published by School Press (2005) £13.50 inc p&p 112 pgs Softback CONTENTS Preamble; Introduction; Technical Background; Virtual Reality; Vicarious and Experiential TV News; A General Theory of Spectrum; Defining the Social Geography of Local News Identity; Assessing opportunities for local digital TV across Europe; Add/Drop and the Local Network Channel. APPENDICES: A Local Television Reader; Scottish Local TV Forum Report; Some pointers for filming local TV news and short documentaries

CITIZEN TELEVISION: a local dimension to Public Service Broadcasting, ISBN: 0 86196 433 0 edited by Dave Rushton, published by John Libbey & Institute of Local Television (1993) £19.50 inc p&p 232 pgs Hardback CONTENTS PART ONE - Research & Analysis: Citizens and the Local Choice. Edinburgh Television Study, Peter Kitchenman; Cable Company Franchise Commitments, Adrian Friedli; Highways Authority Experience of UK Cable Build, Inken Schindler; Local Authority Cable Briefing, Lyndsey Bowditch; Reading the ITC's Mapping Regional Views, Dave Rushton; Survey of Local Channels on UK Cable, 1992, Julie White; A Local Future on Cable?, Dave Rushton PART TWO - Commentary & Critique, Local Public Service Television. Making Local Work, Dave Rushton; Amendments to the ITC's Draft Invitation to Apply for Channel 5, Amanda Gibbs & Dave Rushton; Channel 5 and Local Television, Dave Rushton; 'Star Rating' Channel 5 Transmitters, Dave Rushton; The European Meeting of Local Television, Dave Rushton. APPENDICES, Section 7 Cable and Broadcasting Act, 1984;

Local Channel Survey, 1989, Peter Kitchenman; Tables 9-14, 16, 19 & 21, Peter Kitchenman; Cable Growth, 1983-1992; Pilot Local C5 Survey Edinburgh, 1990, Lyndsey Bowditch; C3 Regional Populations and C5 Transmitter Populations

LOCAL TELEVISION REVIEWED: essays on local television 1982-1993, ISBN: 1 899405 003 Dave Rushton, published by John Libbey & Institute of Local Television (1994) £9.50 inc p&p 48 pgs Softback CONTENTS Introduction; Cable, Cable TV and Video; Work! Work!!; Cultural, Racial, Economic, Political, Social & Class Bias (etc) ... on TV; Swindon Viewpoint, Aberdeen Cable, Cable Authority and the Grapevine Channel; Origins of UK Cable; Cable, Channel 4 and Tape Distribution.

CREATING LOCAL TELEVISION: local and community television under the Restricted Services Licence, 1 899405 01 1 Dave Rushton, published by John Libbey, Institute of Local Television & CMA (1997) £10.50 inc p&p 78 pgs Softback CONTENTS PART ONE - Policy and Intervention. Policy and intervention; PART TWO - Preparing a TV RSL; Locating frequency channels for TV RSLs; Blueprint for a TV RSL; Organising a TV RSL; APPENDICES.

DON QUIXOTE'S ART & TELEVISION: seeing things in art and television, ISBN: 1 899405 02 X Dave Rushton with an introduction by Terry Atkinson, published by School Press (1998) £8.50 inc p&p 48 pgs Softback. CONTENTS Introduction, Terry Atkinson; Noisy Channel; Art & Artifice: or designs on the past; Open Channels and Media Literacy.

Orders or further enquiries can be addressed to **Institute of Local Television 13 Bellevue Place Edinburgh EH7 4BS** or by email to **local.tv@virgin.net**.

Sale of books/DVDs and your voluntary subscriptions of £30.00 per year help keep ACTO afloat. To support send cheques made out to Institute of Local Television marked ACTO on the back.

Wih thanks.



To be removed from the **ACTO** electronic mailing list please advise **local.tv@virgin.net**