

emap radio

James Harris
Head of Industry Support
ICSTIS
Clove Building
4 Maguire Street
London SE1 2NQ

12 June 2007

Dear Mr Harris,

I attach Emap's response to the ICSTIS consultation on Introducing Prior Permission for Premium Rate Services in Television and Radio Services.

Emap operates 7 digital television music channels, 40 local and eight national radio stations. Whilst none of our services have generated complaints or concern from our viewers and listeners, we have no objection to the introduction of a Prior Permission scheme and look forward to working with service providers in the future to ensure the confidence of our audiences is maintained.

Yours sincerely

Mike Phillips
Head of Regulatory and Public Affairs
Emap Radio



MOJO



heat



ICSTIS Questions For Stakeholders: Emap response.

Q1. Do you agree with this definition of Broadcast Premium Rate Services? If not, why not and what would you propose instead.

Emap agrees with the proposal.

Connectivity and capacity:

Q2. What evidence do you have as to how serious and widespread a problem there is in respect of calls received either before lines are announced as open or after lines are ostensibly closed, and what steps could be taken to manage this problem in a way that limits callers from incurring costs without the benefits of receiving the service?

Neither Emap radio nor TV services have experienced any problems or received any complaints relating to the opening or closing of interactive phone or text lines.

Our radio and television solicits to interact are not promoted on air prior to the service being live, operational and tested. Moreover, on air solicits cease prior to lines closing in order prevent entry or other interaction after the lines close.

Q3. Do you agree with our proposed conditions for prior permission in relation to connectivity and capacity? Have we omitted anything that is critical to considering risk?

Radio interactivity generates lower response volumes than that associated with other media and is therefore much less likely to be affected by network congestion. Prior arrangements with service providers ensure that they have sufficient capacity available when such features are broadcast. Additionally, the flexible nature of radio programming is such that if any such problem arose, we can liaise with our service providers to ensure that it can be quickly and easily resolved by delaying any outcome until the problem is completely resolved. For example, a result or winner will not be decided until all calls have been processed.

Similarly, the scale of audience for Emap's TV channels and the subsequent levels of interaction are such that capacity and connectivity have not been an issue.



Conduct:

Q4. Do you agree with our proposed conditions for prior permission in relation to conduct as set out above? Have we omitted anything that is critical to considering risk?

Emap TV and radio services adhere to the conditions as set out above as a matter of course. We are also currently undergoing an independent third party audit to ascertain whether there are ways in which we can further enhance our current exacting standards.

Cost and conditions:

Q5. Do you agree with our proposed conditions for prior permission in relation to cost and conditions as set out above? Have we omitted anything that is critical to considering risk?

Emap TV and radio services adhere to and exceed the conditions as set out above. All costs are clearly represented within on screen graphics as well as being fully voiced where appropriate and are contained in live read and pre-recorded presenter announcements on radio. As mentioned above, we are currently undergoing an independent third party audit to ascertain whether there are ways in which we can further enhance our current exacting standards.

Coherence:

Q6. Do you agree with our proposed conditions for prior permission in relation to coherence as set out above? Have we omitted anything that is critical to considering risk?

Emap agrees with this.

Radio.

Q7. Do you agree with our analysis that the same inherent risks for premium rate use in programmes on television also exist in radio?

Emap radio does not disagree that the risks that exist in television can extend to radio but in radio the value chain is much shorter and is far easier to manage. Radio features are much shorter than some of those in television which can rely upon tightly scheduled programmes or the output of entire channels. Additionally the flexible nature of radio programme schedules allow for changes to be made, such as delaying or extending deadlines, should the need arise.



Q8. Do you agree with our judgement that the definition of Broadcast PRS should specifically extend to radio for the reasons set out above? If not, why not?

Whilst we do not have any objection to this, we would like to remind ICSTIS that the nature of some interactivity on radio is intended solely to engage listeners with their local station, such as music requests or dedications, and add value to the listening experience.

Call TV Quiz Services:

Q9. Do you agree with our proposal to require providers of Call TV Quiz Services to continue to obtain prior permission specific to Call TV Quiz Services but that we include in the existing permission certificates for providers of such services the above conditions? If not, why not?

Emap does not currently broadcast any Call TV output and if we were to do so, we would have no objection to this proposal.

Auction services:

Q10. Do you agree with our assessment that Broadcast PRS involving auctions should be included with the need to obtain prior permission? If not, why not?

Emap has no objection to this proposal.

Music channel playlist selections:

Q11. Do you agree that music channels using premium rate votes to determine playlists from participants should be included with the need to obtain prior permission? If not, why not?

We agree with this proposal for voting mechanisms.

Inclusion of PRS services *involving* charitable donations.

Q12. Do you agree with our analysis that premium rate services involving charitable giving and donations should be included with the need to obtain prior permission? If not, why not?

Emap has no objection to this proposal.

Q13. Do you agree with our assessment as to why we suggest that chat services should be excluded from the prior permission regime proposed in this paper? If not, why not?

Emap has no objection to this proposal.



emap radio

Q14. Do you consider that there are other categories of service which fall within the definition of Broadcast PRS but which should not be required to obtain prior permission?

None.

The prior permission process.

Q15. Do you agree with our proposals to introduce prior permission for Broadcast PRS where the primary focus of the need to obtain prior permission will be on service providers alone? If not, why not?

Emap has no objection to this proposal and looks forward to working in partnership with our service providers in the future.

Q16. Do you have any suggestions about how the effectiveness of the proposed prior permission regime might be improved?

Merely an indication of likely timelines between seeking and the granting of permission

Q17. What thoughts or suggestions do you have as to whether or not it would be sensible to engage broadcasters and/or production companies (when information providers) directly within the prior permission regime by causing them to accept, in effect, a position where they are directly answerable to ICSTIS for Code and condition breaches?

Emap has no objection to this proposal and support the intent. Our feeling is that including the production community with the process could be extremely beneficial and a large step towards delivering a more compliant and robust service to viewers.

