

MAPPING DIGITAL MEDIA: CASE STUDY: GERMAN PUBLIC SERVICE BROADCASTING AND ONLINE ACTIVITY

By Johannes Weberling



Case Study: German Public Service Broadcasting and Online Activity

WRITTEN BY

Johannes Weberling¹

Few countries support public service broadcasting more enthusiastically than Germany, where the public service broadcasters (PSBs) are seen as more informal, modern and entertaining than before, without having lost their reputation for quality. The combined budgets of all the PSBs far exceed the combined advertising revenue of private broadcasters.

Yet the PSBs face a demographic threat. Around half of their viewers are over 65 years old, while only 5 percent are under 30. If the PSBs are to safeguard their future, they must attract younger audiences. This means developing services online.

At the same time, following private-sector complaints, the European Commission decided the license fee was distorting competition. The PSBs responded with a public value test to assess new services. Debate in this context has centred on two crucial questions: whether or not internet portals and online products fall within the remit of public service broadcasting, and whether PSBs should be allowed to compete for advertising with private media.

In this paper, Johannes Weberling explains the German search for an equitable balance between public and private media interests online, in the light of European Union concerns over state aid.

(This paper partners the Mapping Digital Media country report on Germany.)

1. Attorney-at-Law in Berlin and Head of the Study and Research Centre on Media Law at Europa-Universität Viadrina Frankfurt (Oder). The author thanks his assistants Eva-Maria Weberling and Malte Nieschalk for their useful support in preparing this article.

Mapping Digital Media

The values that underpin good journalism, the need of citizens for reliable and abundant information, and the importance of such information for a healthy society and a robust democracy: these are perennial, and provide compass-bearings for anyone trying to make sense of current changes across the media landscape.

The standards in the profession are in the process of being set. Most of the effects on journalism imposed by new technology are shaped in the most developed societies, but these changes are equally influencing the media in less developed societies.

The Media Program of the Open Society Foundations has seen how changes and continuity affect the media in different places, redefining the way they can operate sustainably while staying true to values of pluralism and diversity, transparency and accountability, editorial independence, freedom of expression and information, public service, and high professional standards.

The **Mapping Digital Media** project, which examines these changes in-depth, aims to build bridges between researchers and policy-makers, activists, academics and standard-setters across the world.

The project assesses, in the light of these values, the global opportunities and risks that are created for media by the following developments:

- the switchover from analog broadcasting to digital broadcasting
- growth of new media platforms as sources of news
- convergence of traditional broadcasting with telecommunications.

As part of this endeavor, the Open Society Media Program has commissioned introductory papers on a range of issues, topics, policies and technologies that are important for understanding these processes. Each paper in the **Reference Series** is authored by a recognised expert, academic or experienced activist, and is written with as little jargon as the subject permits.

The reference series accompanies reports into the impact of digitization in 60 countries across the world. Produced by local researchers and partner organizations in each country, these reports examine how these changes affect the core democratic service that any media system should provide – news about political, economic and social affairs. Cumulatively, these reports will provide a much-needed resource on the democratic role of digital media.

The **Mapping Digital Media** project builds policy capacity in countries where this is less developed, encouraging stakeholders to participate and influence change. At the same time, this research creates a knowledge base, laying foundations for advocacy work, building capacity and enhancing debate.

The **Mapping Digital Media** is a project of the Open Society Media Program, in collaboration with the Open Society Information Program.

MAPPING DIGITAL MEDIA EDITORS

Marius Dragomir and Mark Thompson (Open Society Media Program).

EDITORIAL COMMISSION

Yuen-Ying Chan, Christian S. Nissen, Dušan Reljić, Russell Southwood, Michael Starks, Damian Tambini.

The Editorial Commission is an advisory body. Its members are not responsible for the information or assessments contained in the Mapping Digital Media texts.

OPEN SOCIETY MEDIA PROGRAM TEAM

Meijinder Kaur, program assistant; Morris Lipson, senior legal advisor; Miguel Castro, special projects manager; and Gordana Jankovic, director

OPEN SOCIETY INFORMATION PROGRAM TEAM

Vera Franz, senior program manager; Darius Cuplinskas, director

The views expressed in this publication do not represent, or necessarily reflect, the views of the Open Society Foundations.

Contents

I. Newspapers Lose Readers, PSBs Seek Young Viewers	6
II. Who Pays for Online Expansion?	7
III. Background: the Dual Broadcasting System	8
IV. Federal Constitutional Court vs. European Commission.....	10
V. The European Dimension	12
VI. The 12th Interstate Treaty on Broadcasting and Telemedia	14
VII. Assessing Public Value	16
VIII. The “Three-Step Test”	18
IX. The Effects of the Interstate Treaty on Broadcasting and Telemedia	19

I. Newspapers Lose Readers, PSBs Seek Young Viewers

What are German public service broadcasters (PSBs) allowed to do on the internet? Over the last couple of years, this issue has been a focal point of discussion between the public and private broadcasters as well as among print media publishers. The debate reached a climax in 2008, leading to the adoption of the 12th Interstate Broadcasting Treaty (*Rundfunkstaatsvertrag*, RStV). The topic re-emerged in the middle of 2010 when the PSBs presented the results of the Public Value Test of their online offers, and it remains highly topical.

The German public service broadcasters (PSBs) are trying to attract young audiences, because surveys show that 50 percent of their viewers are over 65 years of age, and only 5 percent are younger than 30 years.² Newspaper publishers, meanwhile, face shrinking circulations and diminishing advertising revenues. In 2010, only 22.72 million copies of daily newspapers were sold, down from 28.53 million copies in 2000.³ Less than a half, or 45.1 percent of 14 to 19 year-olds read a daily newspaper in 2009, which marks a decrease of 11 percent compared to 2003 (56 percent).⁴ In just one decade, from 1998 to 2008, the number of daily newspapers declined from 398 to 375.⁵ The advertising revenues of the daily newspapers fell to 3.69 billion in 2009, a loss of 15.5 percent compared to 2008.⁶ In the hope of mitigating this development and preserving their market position, print media publishers have invested heavily in online products. But print media still have to compete with the public service broadcasters in the advertising market.

2. Volker Lilienthal, "Integration als Programmauftrag", *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, 9–10/2009, p. 12.

3. Horst Röper, "Zeitungen 2010: Rangverschiebung unter den größten Verlagen", *Media Perspektiven* 5/2010, statistic 1, p. 219.

4. "Schaubild 1", *Zeitungen* 2009, BDZV e.V (Editor), Berlin 2009, p. 129.

5. See http://www.kek-online.de/Inhalte/tazei_daten_zeitungsmarkt.pdf.

6. Horst Röper, "Zeitungen 2010: Rangverschiebung unter den größten Verlagen", *Media Perspektiven* 5/2010, p. 218.

II. Who Pays for Online Expansion?

The PSBs are financed independently, via license fees,⁷ so they do not depend only on advertising revenues and are less vulnerable to economic crises. The combined budget of all the PSBs in 2010 was €7.5 billion,⁸ financed via the fee, which is set at €17.98 a month (since 1 January 2009). Private print media companies and broadcasters have to fill their budgets themselves, from advertising revenue, without public funds. The combined advertising revenue for private broadcasters came to about €3.9 billion in 2007, and for the daily, weekly and Sunday newspapers to €4.63 billion in 2008.⁹

The private/commercial broadcasters believe this situation is unacceptable, as it puts them in a disadvantageous position. For the PSBs can use public money to experiment with new media, while the commercial broadcasters have to risk their own funds for this, even though the new media market is vital for their future and sustainability.

Two questions have arisen: whether or not internet portals and online products fall within the remit of public service broadcasting, and whether the PSBs should be allowed to compete with the private media groups for advertising revenues.

7. The license fee is levied monthly by the Fee Collection Center of Public Law Broadcasting Institutions in the Federal Republic of Germany (*Gebühreneinzugszentrale der öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunkanstalten in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, GEZ) from every household that declares electronic media receivers such as TV sets, computers and radio. It is compulsory to declare these electronic devices.

8. See http://www.gez.de/gebuehren/gebuehreneinzug/index_ger.html.

9. "Schaubild 1", *Zeitungen* 2009, BDZV e.V (Editor), Berlin 2009, p. 37.

III. Background: the Dual Broadcasting System

To explain the specific relationship between PSBs and private media groups in Germany, it is essential to take a closer look at the historical development of television in Germany. To avoid the abuse of broadcasting by government, as happened under the Nazi regime, this new medium had to be made independent from direct government interference and financed through license fees. This arrangement was reached by founding different public broadcasting stations for the different German federal states, such as Bavarian Broadcasting (*Bayerischer Rundfunk*, BR) . In 1950, the federal broadcasting stations decided to form a joint organization. The Consortium of Public Broadcasting Institutions of the Federal Republic of Germany (*Arbeitsgemeinschaft der öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunkanstalten der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, ARD) was founded on the model of the BBC.

The ARD started broadcasting its first regular nationwide television program, *Erstes Deutsches Fernsehen* ('*Das Erste*'), on 1 November 1954.¹⁰ Even then, the first allegations of unfair competition between the public broadcasters and the private media, which relied on sales and advertising revenue, was expressed by newspaper publishers and the private business sector, i.e. the Federation of German Industries (*Bundesverband der Deutschen Industrie*, BDI) and the advertising sector. Together, they founded the Research Association for Radio and TV Advertising (*Studiengesellschaft für Funk- und Fernsehwerbung*) and soon showed interest in a second nationwide television program.¹¹

In addition, the German government of the day tried to influence the PSBs, although this was prohibited by the federal public broadcasting system and also by the Constitution, which states that freedom of reporting by means of broadcasts shall be guaranteed and there shall be no censorship (Article 5 on Freedom of Expression, Arts and Sciences). The Constitution also stipulated that the states (*Länder*) of the Federal

10. See <http://web.ard.de/cgi-bin/chronik/start?lrafilter=gsea&cbg=gsea>.

11. Jürgen Wilke, "Die zweite Säule des 'Dualen Systems': Privater Rundfunk", in *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, 9–10/2009, p. 13.

Republic had legislative power over broadcasting. The *Länder* filed a lawsuit against the Federal Government over its constant attempts to gain influence over broadcasting policy. In 1961, the Federal Constitutional Court issued its first “broadcasting judgment” in favor of the states, which established the constitutional basis for public broadcasting, and ended the conflict between the states and the federal government over the authority for broadcasting issues, and prohibited private broadcasting.¹²

Instead of developing a private broadcasting sector, the *Länder* proceeded to establish a second nationwide public service broadcasting station. The Second German Television (*Zweites Deutsches Fernsehen*, ZDF) went on air in 1963.

However, further “broadcasting judgments” by the Constitutional Court limited the monopoly of the PSB. The birth of private broadcasting and the current dual broadcasting system occurred on 1 January 1984, when the first programs made by private production companies were broadcast.¹³ In its 1986 “broadcasting judgment”, the Court defined the public service broadcasting remit as requiring an unrestricted representation of the diversity of opinions and broadly varied program content.¹⁴

Against the background of diversification of the broadcasting system, thanks to the introduction of private broadcasters and new broadcasting technology such as satellite and cable TV, the Constitutional Court’s sixth “broadcasting judgment” of 1991 guaranteed the existence and development of the PSBs.¹⁵

These fundamental decisions are still valid today. The 1st Interstate Treaty on the New Organization of Broadcasting in the Federal States (1987) formalized the dual broadcasting system, where public and commercial broadcasting coexist. This treaty was replaced after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the reunification of Germany by the 1st Interstate Treaty on Broadcasting in the reunited Germany (RStV), adopted on 31 August 1991.

The provisions of the Treaty have been modified several times since then. Currently, the 13th Treaty is in force.

12. Bundesverfassungsgericht (hereafter BVerfGE) 12, p. 205. (The BVerfGE is the German Federal Constitutional Court.)

13. Jürgen Wilke, “Die zweite Säule des ‘Dualen Systems’: Privater Rundfunk”, in *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, 9–10/2009, p. 14.

14. BVerfGE 73, p. 118.

15. BVerfGE 83, p. 238.

IV. Federal Constitutional Court vs. European Commission

Further technological development, especially the internet, opened up new broadcasting platforms and renewed discussion of the contemporary remit of the public service broadcasters.

In 2005, the *Länder* prime ministers raised the monthly license fees by only €0.88 to €17.03 monthly, instead of €17.24 as had been recommended by the Commission to Identify the Financial Needs of Broadcasting (*Kommission zur Ermittlung des Finanzbedarfs der Rundfunkanstalten*, KEF).¹⁶ The KEF is a commission that assesses the funding needs of PSBs, at least once every two years. The KEF recommends if, when and by how much the monthly license fee should be changed by the *Länder* governments.¹⁷

ARD, ZDF and Deutschlandradio were unhappy about this decision and took the matter to the Federal Constitutional Court. In 2007, the Court ruled in favor of the broadcasters and affirmed the dual broadcasting system.¹⁸ The judges referred to the constitutional guarantee ensuring the existence and development of PSB, spelled out in the Court's sixth "broadcasting judgment" in 1991. This guarantee included the funding from the license fee, which should suffice to meet the financial needs of the PSBs.

The Court ruled that the program offer must be open to new content, formats and genres as well as to new ways of broadcasting; the PSBs must not be limited to the current stage of development in respect of programming, funding and technology; and funding must be open for development and tailored to meet the market needs. The Court ruled that the method of calculating the latest increase in the license fee had been unconstitutional.¹⁹

16. See <http://www.faz.net/s/RubE2C6E0BCC2F04DD787CDC274993E94C1/Doc-E90F8650DDB244861A3A7057E87C14FE3-ATpl-Eco mmon-Scontent.html>.

17. See <http://www.kef-online.de/inhalte/aufgaben.html>.

18. BVerfG, Urteil vom 11.9.2007—1 BvR 2270/05.

19. BVerfG, Urteil vom 11.9.2007—1 BvR 2270/05.

By the time the Constitutional Court judgment was announced, the prime ministers of the *Länder* had already drafted a new regulation on PSB funding for the license period starting in 2009. The judgment confronted them with a dilemma. According to the ruling, the remit of the public service broadcasters had to be interpreted in a broad sense, imposing no limit on their development of online offers. According to the European Commission, however, this was not in line with the state aid regulations in the EC Treaty.

V. The European Dimension

One of the fundamental aims of the European Union is a free internal market. This requires that no competitor has an advantage due to subsidy by a government. To prevent such distortion of competition, the European Commission ensures that everyone complies with Article 87 (1) of the EC Treaty. This article states that “any aid granted by a Member State or through State resources in any form whatsoever which distorts or threatens to distort competition by favoring certain undertakings or the production of certain goods shall, insofar as it affects trade between Member States, be incompatible with the common market”.

This state aid rule was a point of discussion between private and public broadcasters. The question was, if the license fee, which finances the PSB, has to be seen as a state aid in terms of Article 87 EC Treaty. In that case the fee would be incompatible with European Law.

In 2003, the Association of Private Broadcasters and Telemedia (VPRT) filed a complaint with the European Commission. This complaint obliged the Commission to clarify whether the license fee amounted to illegal state aid which distorted competition by giving the PSBs an advantage.

In March 2005, the Commission came to the preliminary conclusion that the license fee was subject to the state aid regulations and that it did distort competition. The Commission sent a questionnaire to the German government, asking for information about the financing of the PSBs’ online activities. In its answer, the government maintained that the license fee should not be regarded as state aid.

A crisis talk was held in summer 2006 between the European Commissioner for Competition, Neelie Kroes, and two of the prime ministers of the German *Länder*, Kurt Beck and Edmund Stoiber. In particular, the European Commission demanded stricter control of the further extension of the digital offers of the PSB. For instance, the European Commission pointed out that online games and dating services are not within the regular remit of public service broadcasters.

Beck, Stoiber and Kroes reached a compromise: the German government had to suggest concrete steps that would dispel the European Commission’s concerns about the funding of the PSBs. The broadcasting remit of the PSB had to be defined more clearly, and there had to be more transparency, conformity with the market

and financial control. These changes had to be reflected in a new Broadcasting Treaty, to be adopted within two years.

In April 2007, the European Commission accepted the compromise and decided to dismiss an action against the exceptional position of the German PSB.

The PSBs appreciated the European Commission's decision and signaled their constructive participation in working out a new Interstate Treaty on Broadcasting.²⁰ The VPRT, on the other hand, was not pleased with this outcome. The commercial broadcasters criticised the compromise as “creating facts” before the new Broadcasting Treaty had come into force. The compromise would not, they said, prevent the PSBs from expanding their online activities. This complaint was echoed by certain politicians, such as former Baden-Württemberg prime minister Günther Oettinger, who called for the excessive growth in the PSBs' online offers to be cut back.²¹

In response to the European Commission's decision, the prime ministers of the *Länder* had to strike a careful balance, protecting the PSBs' independence on the one hand, while, on the other, preventing them from exploiting their privileges by acting as publicly financed competitors to the private sector.

20. See <http://www.zdf-jahrbuch.de/2006/zdf-chronik/dezember.html>.

21. See http://www.welt.de/wirtschaft/article827154/Bruessel_zwingt_ARD_und_ZDF_zu_mehr_Transparenz.html.

VI. The 12th Interstate Treaty on Broadcasting and Telemedia

On 18 December 2008, the prime ministers of the *Länder* signed the 12th Interstate Treaty on Broadcasting and Telemedia, which came into force on 1 June 2009. The *Länder* specified the programming mandate of the public broadcasters, in line with the recommendation of the European Commission and the demands of private media groups.

The dual broadcasting system forms the basis of the Interstate Treaty, which guarantees the existence and development of public service broadcasting, as spelled out in the Constitutional Court ruling. However, this guarantee now includes the public broadcasters' "participation in all new technologies for the production and transmission as well as the provision of new forms of broadcasting".²²

The remit of the public broadcasters is also specified, as required by the European Commission. "Under their remit, the public service broadcasting corporations are to act as a medium and factor in the process of the formation of free individual and public opinion through the production and transmission of their offers, thereby serving the democratic, social and cultural needs of society."²³

While the traditional broadcasting remit is retained, the 2008 Treaty also states, for the first time, that the entertainment programs should comply with a certain standard. "Their offers shall serve the purpose of education, information, culture and entertainment. In particular, they must provide a contribution to culture. Entertainment should also be provided in line with the public service profile of offers."²⁴ In Section 2, the Treaty defines the terms "education", "information", "culture" and "entertainment" and what ARD and the ZDF have to deliver in line with these definitions. Entertainment output should be distinguished in terms of quality from the programs of other broadcasters. As such, the websites of the public broadcasters would no longer be able to feature dating agencies and tips on how to spend leisure time.

22. Preamble, 12th RStV.

23. Section 11, I RStV.

24. Section 11, I RStV.

Another new departure is the explicit inclusion of “telemidia” among the public broadcasters’ range of products (Section, 11a I RStV). While the term is not directly defined in the RStV, it encompasses, among other platforms, the online activities of ARD, ZDF and Deutschlandradio.

The PSBs are allowed to keep their programs online as television on-demand for seven days after broadcast, reduced to 24 hours for major events such as the Olympic Games or matches in the first and second football leagues (Section 11d, II Nr. 2 RStV). These limits seem very counterproductive for the user. License-fee payers should surely have the right to view the programs at any time. But the private publishers and broadcasters demanded strict limits on the availability of PSB products online.

Unrestricted access to the “archives including content of contemporary history and cultural history” (Section 11d, II Nr. 4 RStV) was, however, permitted. The 12th RStV leaves most of the terms it uses undefined; this is a task for the PSBs.

German publishing houses were worried that the PSBs wanted to become an “electronic press”. Responding to this concern, the Treaty allows the public broadcasters to publish only “programs and telemidia related to a specific program. (...); press-type offers unrelated to the program shall not be permitted” (Section 11d, II No. 3).

The 12th Treaty no longer caps investment in online services. Below the permitted funding ceiling, ARD and ZDF can earmark their expenses for online activities and have great freedom in allocating the given budget. In the former version of the 12th RStV, the investment in online products was limited to 0.75 percent of the whole budget.

VII. Assessing Public Value

At the heart of the 12th Interstate Treaty on Broadcasting and Telemedia is a further revision of the public service remit and the newly introduced Three-Step Test, which is also called the Public Value Test.

There is a tension between the Constitutional Court and the European Commission regarding the specification of the public broadcasters' remit. The Three-Step Test (based on the BBC's Public Value Test)²⁵ is a compromise between the two opinions. The terms in the Treaty are very general and not defined. The new Treaty stipulates that the Government is not responsible for defining the broadcasting remit: this task falls to the independent local media authority, the broadcasting council (*Rundfunkrat*).²⁶ Each of the *Länder* has one of these bodies, which are independent of the Federal Government. They represent a variety of different social groups, including churches, trades unions and artists' associations. The councils manage their own financial resources. This approach ensures that the remit does not reflect a political agenda. The councils have to approve the results of the Three-Step Tests and, thereby, the online offers of the public broadcasters.

Beyond the basic demands of Section 11, II No. 3, targets are established in Section 11d, III RStV, which the online products of the PSBs usually have to respect. "The telemedia concepts shall enable all groups in society to participate in the information society, offer orientation and foster technical and content media literacy for all generations and minorities."²⁷

The details of the Three-Step Test were spelled out in Section 11f RStV. It had to be applied to the existing telemedia products by 31 August 2010, if a product was to stay on the internet over that date and for new and modified telemedia products.

25. On the BBC's Public Value Test, see http://www.bbc.co.uk/bbctrust/our_work/new_services/.

26. At every German PSB, there are two authorities responsible for the supervision: the Broadcasting Council (*Rundfunkrat*) and the Administrative Council (*Verwaltungsrat*). The *Rundfunkrat* represents the interests of the public, ensures that programs meet the legal requirements, elects and supervises the Director General, and lays down program guidelines.

27. Section 11d, III RStV.

Telemedia concepts have to be made by the public broadcasters for one or more of their offers together. In these concepts the target audience, content, bias and duration of the planned offer have to be detailed (Section 11f I RStV). The concepts have to be more detailed than the law. In every case, the time limit for availability on the internet has to be stated.

All the important basic elements of the telemedia concepts have legal application to all the PSBs. The legal parameters are specified in the internal guidelines of the individual broadcasting stations.

VIII. The “Three-Step Test”

The Three-Step Test is named after the steps that a program offer must pass to be approved by the broadcasting councils. For example, the broadcasting councils of ARD have to examine the offers in the light of the following questions:

1. To what degree does the offer conform to the democratic, social and cultural needs of society?
2. To what degree does the offer contribute, in a qualitative manner, to media diversity?
3. What budget has been earmarked to deliver the offer?

The councils have to judge the quantity and quality of the existing public range of offers, as well as the economic impact of the planned offer, in the light of these considerations.²⁸

Before the broadcasting councils make their decision, they have to give others a chance to comment on the concepts. In order to reach a decision, the councils are allowed to consult independent experts.

The decision to accept a new or modified offer must be passed by a two-thirds majority of all votes cast by the members present (Section 11f VI RStV).

28. See <http://www.ard.de/intern/dreistufentest/dreistufentest/-/id=1086834/nid=1086834/did=1090670/10sdo4a/index.html>.

IX. The Effects of the Interstate Treaty on Broadcasting and Telemedia

The European Commission and the German Constitutional Court were satisfied with the phrasing and amendments in the 12th Interstate Treaty on Broadcasting and Telemedia. The part regarding telemedia in the 13th Interstate Treaty, which came into effect in April 2010, contained no changes.

The question remains whether it was a good idea to leave the assessment of the existing range of telemedia to the broadcasting councils of the *Länder*. Although these bodies do represent nearly all social groups, doubts about their independence still remain. In the current system, the public broadcasters have to supervise their own adherence to the broadcasting remit, also with regard to their internet presence. There is a risk that they may just rubber-stamp the online offers without proper prior assessment.

Recent decisions seem to confirm the reality of this risk. For instance, on 23 June 2010, the committee of the WDR, the biggest German regional PSB,²⁹ approved the range of online offers on the group's website, www.wdr.de. Just two days earlier, on 21 June, the committee of Bavarian Broadcasting had approved the volume and extent of online products and offers on their website, www.dasErste.de. Two further stations followed suit, approving of their own online products. The committees of the ARD approved their range of 37 online offers such as sportschau.de on 20 July 2010.³⁰ The remaining public broadcaster, ZDF, approved its online offers on 30 August 2010, just within the given deadline.³¹ All these decisions were very similar. Only a few minor changes were made in the range of the offer, for example, with regard to the time limit for the on-demand version.

29. See http://www.wdr.de/unternehmen/senderprofil/wdr_ard/.

30. See <http://www.heise.de/newsticker/meldung/ARD-sieht-Online-Angebote-regelkonform-ausgestaltet-Verleger-protestieren-1042200.html>.

31. See <http://www.heise.de/newsticker/meldung/Online-Angebot-des-ZDF-besteht-3-Stufen-Test-1069178.html>.

There has been a remarkable explosion of costs. Since the budget for online products is no longer capped, the numbers already show an online expansion. In 2010, ARD was allowed to spend €20 million on their joint online offers and announced in July 2010 an increase in their budget for online offers to €25 million.³² This is not what the private broadcasters, let alone the publishers, were expecting.

At the end of December 2010, ARD launched the iPhone app of the *Tagesschau*, the main news bulletin of the first channel.³³ ZDF followed suit by promising to launch an app for their main news bulletin, *heute*, in 2011.³⁴ On 21 June 2011, eight publishing houses filed a lawsuit against the *Tagesschau* app.³⁵ At the same time, the Federation of German Newspaper Publishers (*Bundesverband Deutscher Zeitungsverleger*, BDZV) intervened again at the EU Commission for Competition, alleging that the public broadcasters would lack an effective control, which is also not guaranteed by the Three-Step Test.³⁶

As the *Länder* politicians have legal authority over broadcasting, it is they who should call the public service broadcasters to order and take responsibility for rebalancing the system. This is unlikely to happen, however, because it was the *Länder* that enacted the Interstate Treaty which created this controversy in the first place. The results could have been anticipated.

Only the EU Commission and the Constitutional Court can help now. As a result of this development of the Interstate Treaty, and due to the legal action by the private media companies, it is very likely that there will be another broadcasting judgment in the coming years.

32. “Zwanzig Millionen”, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 24 June 2010, p. 39.

33. See <http://www.faz.net/artikel/C31013/tagesschau-app-das-falsche-versprechen-30322598.html>.

34. See <http://www.spiegel.de/netzwelt/netzpolitik/0,1518,769561,00.html>.

35. See <http://www.bdzv.de/pressemitteilungen+M5642bc4f1e4.html>.

36. See <http://www.bdzv.de/pressemitteilungen+M5642bc4f1e4.html>.

The MDM Reference Series papers published so far, and available on www.mediapolicy.org and www.soros.org, are:

1. *Online Media and Defamation*—Toby Mendel
2. *Digital Media and Investigative Reporting*—Mark Lee Hunter
3. *Mobile TV: Challenges and Opportunities Beyond 2011*—Ronan de Renesse
4. *Citizen Journalism and the Internet*—Nadine Jurrat
5. *Digitization and Media Business Models*—Robert Picard
6. *Freedom of Expression Rights in the Digital Age*—Andrew Puddephatt
7. *Net Neutrality and the Media*—Stefaan Verhulst
8. *Gatekeeping in the Digital Age*—Peter Looms
9. *Technical Standards in Terrestrial Television*—David Wood
10. *The Digital Dividend*—Gérard Pogorel
11. *How television went digital in the Netherlands*—Nico van Eijk and Bart van der Sloot
12. *The Media and Liability for Content on the Internet*—Cynthia Wong and James X. Dempsey

Mapping Digital Media is a project of the **Open Society Media Program** and the **Open Society Information Program**.

Open Society Media Program

The Media Program works globally to support independent and professional media as crucial players for informing citizens and allowing for their democratic participation in debate. The program provides operational and developmental support to independent media outlets and networks around the world, proposes engaging media policies, and engages in efforts towards improving media laws and creating an enabling legal environment for good, brave and enterprising journalism to flourish. In order to promote transparency and accountability, and tackle issues of organized crime and corruption the Program also fosters quality investigative journalism.

Open Society Information Program

The Open Society Information Program works to increase public access to knowledge, facilitate civil society communication, and protect civil liberties and the freedom to communicate in the digital environment. The Program pays particular attention to the information needs of disadvantaged groups and people in less developed parts of the world. The Program also uses new tools and techniques to empower civil society groups in their various international, national, and local efforts to promote open society.

Open Society Foundations

The Open Society Foundations work to build vibrant and tolerant democracies whose governments are accountable to their citizens. Working with local communities in more than 70 countries, the Open Society Foundations support justice and human rights, freedom of expression, and access to public health and education.

For more information:

Open Society Media Program
Open Society Foundation

4th Floor Cambridge House, 100 Cambridge Grove
London, W6 0LE, United Kingdom

mappingdigitalmedia@osf-eu.org
www.mappingdigitalmedia.org
www.soros.org/initiatives/media

Cover Design: Ahlgrim Design Group
Design and Layout: Judit Kovács | Createch Ltd.

