



SOS / R2K COMMUNITY BROADCASTING WORKSHOP REPORT

Date 22 and 23 September 2011
Venue Elijah Barayi Memorial Training Centre
Yeoville
Johannesburg

DAY ONE: 22 SEPTEMBER 2011

ACTIVITY

Welcome and Purpose

Jayshree Pather (R2K), the facilitator, welcomed participants, and covered logistical arrangements.

Jayshree clarified the purpose of the workshop as to present an opportunity for community media broadcasters to be informed on public and community broadcasting issues being taken up by the SOS: Support Public Broadcasting Coalition (SOS) and the Right 2 Know Campaign (R2K) – particularly with a view to community broadcasters participating in the campaigns and strengthening their voice(s) within the broadcasting policy review process.

Delegate introductions

Jayshree asked delegates to introduce themselves by name and organisation, and their interest in public and community broadcasting. (See [Appendix One: Attendance Register](#) for a full list of delegates and contact details.)

Interest in broadcasting across the delegates contained a strong emphasis on broadcasting as a mechanism for empowerment and, through encouraging dialogue and debate, a tool for changing people's mindsets and deepening democracy. It was seen as a conduit for information and engagement between role players (particularly government and communities); and as a platform to "tell the truth" i.e. a vehicle for transformation and justice.

It was seen as a powerful tool for creating access to knowledge and resources, and supporting community development i.e. making positive differences in communities.

It was seen to have a role in educating, informing and entertaining. Here it was seen to have a role in creating cohesion in society, and highlighting heritage and histories of communities. In this respect community broadcasters are reflections of communities, and were seen to provide a "pulse" of the community or nation.

Community broadcasting was seen to provide a space to share experiences, and to give a profile and voice to local and untold stories (particularly those of the less empowered), heroes, musicians, poets, etc.

Introducing SOS: Support Public Broadcasting Coalition

Kate Skinner (SOS) introduced the SOS Coalition and its work. The Coalition began in 2008 when the SABC was going through a series of crises emanating from, among other things, the 2007 political interference in the appointment of the SABC Board, and the on/off suspension of the Chief Executive Officer.

ACTIVITY

SOS was formed by a group of interested and affected civil society organisations and individuals who had an interest in ensuring the SABC became an accountable public broadcaster. It was committed to supporting the SABC out of its crisis. It very soon became engaged in public broadcasting policy and legislation good practice in its attempt to influence government and the SABC. It has also done a lot of work in identifying people for the new SABC Board.

SOS is comprised of large unions – the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) and the Federation of South African Unions (FEDUSA) – and the smaller, sector-specific unions, independent producers, Freedom of Expression Institute (FXI), Media Monitoring Africa (MMA), and community media groupings. SOS would like the National Community Radio Forum (NCRF) – of which some delegates are members – to play larger role in SOS, ensuring the community broadcasting sector is well represented in its work.

Introducing the Right to Know Campaign (R2K)

Raashied Galant (R2K and FXI) introduced the R2K Campaign and its work. He stated that R2K is a coalition of organisations and individuals interested in the right of access to information. It was launched in August 2010. In February 2011 it had its first national summit. It has provincial branches in the Western Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and Gauteng. It is not a constituted organisation, but a coalition. The summit developed mission and vision statements and a campaign focus.

It was constituted in response to the information bill at the time, but has also looked at issues such as media diversity and media freedom since they also impact on a free flow of information at all levels of society.

Yesterday the Eastern Cape branch was launched. R2K will be looking to start up “collectives” of interested people in other provinces. He asked delegates to make contact with him if they were interested.

Raashied noted important summit issues and resolutions regarding media freedom and diversity – see pages 7 and 8 of [Appendix Two: Right2Know National Summit, 2 – 3 February 2011: Summit Report](#). The Summit resolved the following:

1. To campaign to strengthen ICASA to ensure that it functions and regulates courageously in the interest of the public, and not government and commercial interests;
2. Campaign for the adequate and sustainable funding of community media. Community media should not be overly reliant on market sources of funding;
3. Campaign for the adequate funding of the MDDA and to ensure that it is independent, more effective, and that it is more transparent and accountable in its processes, so that it fulfils its mandate of growing and diversifying the media;
4. Ensure that community stations are democratically owned and controlled by the community, and to support communities in claiming their ownership and participation in their stations,
5. Explore possible anti-trust measures to limit the concentration of media ownership;
6. Reject the Media Appeals Tribunal or any statutory regulation that impacts on editorial freedom in the print sector;
7. Campaign for redressing infrastructural impediments to the exchange of information including accessible and affordable broadband for internet access;
8. Engage in the policy review process on the far reaching Public Service Broadcast Bill that is to be conducted by the Department of Communications to ensure that these resolutions and principles are applied and upheld in any legislation.

Garth Damerell (Radio Teemenang) made the point that he did not support all the R2K positions, in particular, the recommendation around strengthening the MDDA as he did not believe it was ideal to have one institution involved in all tiers of broadcasting – making it an immensely powerful structure.

The point was made that it is important that these issues be debated honestly and openly, and that the campaigns are about building consensus where possible, and engaging key stakeholders to ensure the widest possible civil society engagement in the campaigns.

Principles of public broadcasting, and the Broadcasting Policy Process – SOS’s vision

Kate Skinner presented the SOS vision for public broadcasting, and highlighted a major success of the SOS: that on 2 September the Minister of Communication met with SOS where SOS presented its “Vision” document. The Minister agreed to a comprehensive policy review process. He undertook to review policy across all aspects of broadcasting and repeal, amend or create new legislation, as required. He undertook to begin the process now and to finalise it in 2013. He agreed to a public process with an expert committee (which will include international experts). (In November 2010 the Minister had withdrawn the Draft Public Service Broadcasting Bill and had agreed to a review of the Broadcasting White Paper, 1998).

SOS recognises the importance of working with organised and individual community media to ensure policy and legislation adequately covers their interests – hence this workshop.

Kate called participants’ attention to the SOS “Vision” document (attached as [Appendix Three: Vision of the “SOS: Support Public Broadcasting” Coalition: Document to support the broadcasting policy review process, September 2011](#)).

This Vision document brings together the work of the SOS Coalition since 2008 – providing all consensus positions on all aspects of public (including community) broadcasting, although it still has a strong focus on the SABC as the public broadcaster. The document is a work in progress, and some areas are better developed than others. So, for example, the input on community broadcasting requires significant debate and strengthening. This workshop is seen as one important vehicle to begin getting community broadcasting input from those involved in the sector. It is also important in encouraging and empowering SOS members and others to make their own submissions to the policy review process.

Kate highlighted sections 2.1 and 2.2 (page 6) – international principles of public and community broadcasting. These principles included the importance of clearly-defined public service mandates for independence, quality, impartiality, universal accessibility, local programme production, editorial independence and adequate funding; and community broadcasting which is for, by and about the community, whose ownership and management is representative of the community, which pursues a social development agenda, and which is non-profit.

Painting the future perfect: What my community station will look like when our vision and mission is realised?

Jayshree asked people to work individually to depict, using cardboard and crayons, what delegate community stations would look like when their vision and mission / purpose are realised (5-10 year time frame). Individuals met in groups to share pictures, and then groups fed back to plenary. Feedback was in the form of a “gallery walk” where participants engaged with the pictures and feedback.

FEEDBACK COMMONALITIES

- Building a station is a journey - hiccups and problems are to be expected, but “in five years we will be at the top of the mountain and know where we are going”.
- There is a strong foundation based on financial, personnel and technical sustainability; community input and ownership (“It should represent the pulse of the community”) and editorial independence – enabled by government.
- The station is a community watchdog regarding governance issues.
- The station “assists in terms of moving the wheels of justice a bit faster towards government-community relations”, and enables positive change in the community; it “serves as tool to improve service delivery”.
- It brings diverse communities together (particularly in cities) and builds social fabric. It is about facilitating understanding within communities and among inhabitants of neighborhoods.
- Programming is varied (different issues, genres, cultures, religions, beliefs, stories) and “captivating”.
- Broadcasting is trustworthy, honest and resourceful – it stands for social justice and freedoms of expression and association. It must educate on issues such as recycling and sustaining the earth.
- The station is a communication hub – it empowers, amuses, informs and develops knowledge, and invites the community to participate in fulfilling its vision and mission. It is the “eyes and ears of the community”

ACTIVITY

– it “makes people happy”.

- People tell their own stories and are empowered to effect change.
- Training (in-house and other) and development of both personal and community members is prioritised and resourced.
- Monitoring, review and research are undertaken – so that continuous programming improvement is enabled.
- The station has high tech and up-to-date equipment.
- Migration to digital technology presents challenges.

FEEDBACK LIMITED TO A SMALLER NUMBER OF STATIONS

- There is 100% signal coverage for the station’s audience.
- The station is professionally run.
- Listenership is substantially increased (“up from 2.5 million listeners”).

PLENARY DISCUSSION

Jayshree made the point that purpose is crucial. There was a lot of input around buildings and communities, but not necessarily a lot on the vision and mission i.e. what defines you as a community broadcaster.

In terms of values – a key point was balancing income generation with access to listeners. However, it is important to remember that relevance does not depend so much on numbers of listeners as the value and difference the broadcaster makes – linked to purpose and mission.

The issue that community broadcasters have to pay the same fees as commercial broadcasters to the South African Music Rights Organisation (SAMRO) was raised as a serious concern.

Two issues highlighted for discussion the following day were a funding model for community broadcasters, and the role of the NCRF in the sector. It was hoped that the role of the South African Advertising Research Foundation (SAARF) and its relationship with community radio stations could also be discussed.

Jayshree noted that perhaps the key questions are: How do we as community stations organise ourselves? How do we build our voice? What kind of coordination do we need?

She stated that there is a need to focus on common problems, and to examine carefully how SOS and R2K might be useful in facilitating certain debates in the sector and / or offer lessons in how to facilitate debates and work towards building consensus, where possible.

Jayshree concluded by stating that tomorrow’s agenda would include an examination of common problems, and the search for solutions.

DAY TWO: 23 SEPTEMBER 2011

ACTIVITY

Recap of day one

New delegates introduced themselves, and Jayshree gave a brief overview of the previous day’s activities and discussion.

Broadcasting policy review process: building on input from Day One

Kate referred back to the previous day’s input on the policy review process. She stated that in mid-2009 the Department of Communication (DoC) disseminated a public broadcasting discussion document (with a view to changes in legislation) that asked 70 questions relating to public broadcasting. The questions included issues of vision, funding and governance. It proposed that public broadcasting should be linked to the goals of the “developmental state” (without defining the term), rather than to the Constitution.

ACTIVITY

SOS and others sent copious responses in an effort to influence DoC's thinking. The DoC issued a Draft Public Service Broadcasting Bill at the end of October 2009. It contained some good principles (e.g. it recognised that more public money was required for SABC and the community broadcasting sector to fulfill their public mandates). However, it put forward a flawed and controversial new funding model that did not appear to have been well researched. It suggested doing away with license fees in favour of a broadcasting tax (up to 1% of person's income). It also called for money from the proposed broadcasting tax to be put into a central broadcasting fund to be managed by the MDDA – to fund a plethora of media needs including the SABC, community media, signal distribution, and the commercial media if they undertook public programming.

SOS expressed many concerns about the Bill, including

- That the central fund would be too bureaucratic, that the MDDA would not have the capacity to manage the millions of rands in the fund, and that it felt that community media would be at the bottom of the pile.
- The Bill was silent on governance and independence of the central broadcasting fund.
- The Bill intended to give the Minister significantly more powers so that s/he could intervene in any aspect of the SABC.
- The Bill wanted municipal officials on the boards of community broadcasting stations, and for community stations to be housed within municipal offices.

SOS called for a policy review process that included a review of the Broadcasting White Paper, 1998. Nothing more was heard from the DoC until November 2010 when the new Minister (Roy Padayachie) was appointed. He withdrew the Draft Bill towards the end of 2010, and undertook to engage in a comprehensive policy review process.

He requested a meeting with SOS on 2 September 2011 where he undertook to set up a panel of national and international experts to assist the DoC to engage with the entire broadcasting landscape, including public (the SABC), commercial and community, and to comprehensively review existing policy and legislation. He said the process would be completed in 2013 – with some laws or aspects of laws repealed, some amended, and some completely new legislation, as appropriate. SOS requested a major stakeholder forum of all civil society groupings, stakeholders and role players (i.e. to ensure maximum inclusivity), and asked the Minister to resource and run the stakeholder forum (along the precedent set by previous Minister Jay Naidoo in developing the 1999 Broadcasting Act).

DISCUSSION

Gaseitsiwe Segame (Mosopatsela Community Radio) mentioned that their station had been instructed by DoC to move out of its new premises within six months and to move to the municipal offices, or it would not receive infrastructure support from the DoC. There was general agreement that there is no role for government to get involved in the management of stations; that the DoC was acting outside of its mandate; and that it is important to empower ourselves in terms of our rights, and to be guided by our communities. Garth Damerell (Radio Teemaneng) asked that this matter be placed on the agenda of the DoC meeting to be held with all community broadcasters in Johannesburg in October. There was agreement that the NCRF, SOS and others would support this unhappiness with DoC conduct.

Seemingly the DoC prioritises geographical stations above communities of interest. This needs further unpacking and understanding.

SOS and other civil society organisations need to define for the Minister and the DoC what they mean by "substantive consultation".

NCRF submission on the Draft Public Service Broadcasting Bill

Jayshree presented the NCRF submission on the Draft Public Service Broadcasting Bill – supported by SOS.

One of the key things highlighted in the submission was the concept that community broadcasting is a public good, and should be funded on that basis – acknowledging that the MDDA was set up to fund community broadcasters, but was significantly underfunded.

ACTIVITY

The NCRF supported the call for a comprehensive policy review process – noting conflicting policy and legislation in the sector. It looked at the role of community broadcasting in a participatory democracy – how best to engage with and serve communities, separate from political, economic and other vested interests. It also called for clarity on what was meant by a “developmental state”.

It acknowledged that community broadcasters play very important developmental role. What are the principles? Do we create platforms for dialogue and debate? The NCRF wanted clarity on strengthening the role of broadcasters in development – based on freedom of expression, independence, impartiality, to promote human rights and democracy and the Constitution, and to create platforms for dialogue and debate. It said that the role of community media should be more robust.

It welcomed the intention of the Bill to ensure greater sustainability through ensuring that community broadcasters were well resourced. It called for research and economic modeling, and to ring-fence money for community broadcasting. It offered the model of an annual subsidy from the state on proof of meeting of obligations. It also called for self-regulation of the sector based on international good practice, and the need for governance models that suited community broadcasters. It called for the role of ICASA to be strengthened to ensure compliance with license conditions. It also stated that local government should not be isolated from other stakeholders in their role and influence, and that community broadcasters should be free to choose their own locations and partners. It recognised that government-funded public infrastructure needs to be safeguarded, but the mechanisms proposed by the Bill were problematic. It called for the safeguarding of independence of community broadcasters, and no additional powers for the Minister to intervene in broadcasting matters.

DISCUSSION

The point was raised that it might be preferable to give community broadcasting money to the MDDA rather than a universal fund because it would be easier to keep track of. Another point was made that ICASA is incorrectly asking community broadcasters to contribute to a levy that commercial broadcasters must pay (in terms of the Electronic Communications Act) either to the MDDA or to the Universal Service and Access Agency of South Africa (USAASA).

A question was asked about whether the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) (commercial broadcasters) had been consulted. They have a community radio committee. There was agreement that NAB should be sought as an ally in the process.

As stated previously, the Minister has agreed to wide consultation. We need to be mindful of the technical processes and legal consequences of consultation. What do we mean by consultation? What type of public consultation are we calling for? There was agreement that the specifics of the call by SOS for a major stakeholder forum need to be developed for the Minister.

See [Appendix Four: NCRF January 2010 submission to the DoC](#) and [Appendix Five: NCRF 2009 Policy Conference Report](#) for more information.

As community broadcasters, what do we want the Minister and DoC to know?

Delegates broke into four groups to look at key issues and causes of problems / challenges for community broadcasters, and to look at possible solutions to the problems. Each group focused on one of the following areas:

1. Purpose and mission
2. Sustainability
3. Accountability
4. Programming / content

Group reports back in plenary followed – with time for clarification and further discussion.

1. Purpose and mission for community broadcasters

The group report back included the following key issues:

- 1.1. Each community broadcaster must **develop and own a vision and mission**, and these should change

ACTIVITY

when context(s) shift.

- 1.2. Community broadcasters must be distinct from commercial media in that they are **rooted in their community** and its idiom, and seek out alternative voices.
- 1.3. Stations must develop **hyper-local content** to ensure the profiling of their communities and local artists (i.e. a talk station can still do recording for local musicians). This would require local content quotas.
- 1.4. Stations should look beyond their airtime (programming time) to ensure they are engaged in **development outreach**.
- 1.5. Stations must **build and deepen local democracy**, encouraging informed decision making by presenting and interrogating different perspectives. Deepening democracy is about giving a voice to people.
- 1.6. Stations must **build community cohesion** with real respect (i.e. not just tolerance) but real understanding. It should promote and enhance local businesses and LED.
- 1.7. Stations must provide a platform and be a **conduit for community voices**.
- 1.8. The vision should include a **network function** with other stations.
- 1.9. The need to **generate income** often leads to a losing of focus and forgetting of niche.
- 1.10. **Roles and responsibilities of government structures** must be clear, and their purpose must be kept intact.

DISCUSSION / CHALLENGES / QUESTIONS

It is worrying that we don't always know our mission and vision – and very important that they be clarified.

How do we define the notion of “community”? We need to give space to countervailing voices.

We need to clarify notions of plurality, diversity and social cohesion.

How does a broadcaster ensure community engagement in the development of its vision? Community of interest stations have, by their nature, a common interest and purpose. But they may find it more difficult to develop a “development” vision; whereas geographical stations have large disparities in their listenerships, but can more easily identify a development vision and agenda for their communities.

How do we peg our values more clearly since values inform our actions.

Community broadcasters are competing with other voices (e.g. government “propaganda”).

2. Sustainability

The group looked at challenges more broadly than just financial sustainability. The report back included the following key issues:

- 2.1. **Meeting one's purpose** is the basis of sustainability.
- 2.2. There is a need for a multi-faceted process and approach to setting up and operating a community station. There is **no one size fits all** approach.
- 2.3. **Purchase and maintenance of equipment** – Much of the equipment is imported. Perhaps stations can negotiate a tariff deduction with DTI and / or organise local and cheaper options. Also, if each station had its own sound engineer then DJs would not have to multi-task (and maybe the equipment would last longer with better care i.e. skilled technical people operating the equipment).
- 2.4. **Disbursement of funds** – Perhaps SARS(or National Treasury) should become the agency that disburses funds to community stations – with no strings attached. i.e. MDDA has too much power. SARS is seen as more efficient and neutral. Or perhaps a community institution should disburse the funds. The message to the DoC is to find efficient ways to disperse public funding, and money for community broadcasters must be ring-fenced.
- 2.5. **Training / education** is required on how to operate a community broadcaster as a Section 21 company – but still with a surplus to plow back into station.

ACTIVITY

- 2.6. The **NCRF should change its focus** and speak on behalf of the sector (for example, like COSATU). The sector must be organised and have a credible voice.
- 2.7. **Non-core functions** could be undertaken with partners – possibly government.
- 2.8. In terms of **advertising**, perhaps higher rates (in line with commercial stations) should be charged. And government departments should have quotas for “ad spend” in community broadcasting.
- 2.9. Community broadcasting should be seen to provide opportunities **for job creation**. Why not call for a percentage of the Extended Public Works Programme (EPWP) money to be allocated to this sector (R2billion has been set aside for job creation)?

DISCUSSION / CHALLENGES / QUESTIONS

It is important to focus on **principles** of sustainability.

A key issue is where is the “home” of community broadcasting media – and how to raise its profile. The NCRF, SOS and others have key roles, as does government, in terms of oversight and funding; who takes responsibility for sustainable community broadcasters?

Clarity is required on the core responsibilities of state and parastatal structures (including GCIS, DoC and the MDDA), and what they focus on. So, for example, GCIS spends a lot of money on Caxton – only one form of community media.

Accountability is closely linked to human resources. If personnel support the vision and mission, then they will have a shared and common goal.

Community radio is not taken seriously by many stakeholders, including advertisers and government.

A number of issues were raised in terms of a funding model. Community stations don't want to be competing for and chasing advertising. Some delegates supported the idea of stations being run solely on public funding; others supported a mixed funding model .. It was noted that the advertising agencies depend on where the ad spend goes. Which is why, if we are tied to advertising, we need to go after national clients through a body such as the NCRF. Since government has already said it will spend more money on community broadcasting it was felt that ways must be found to hold government accountable through measurable quotas. Another idea was that perhaps government needs to run the SAARF since right now the SAARF is funded by the advertisers, and is not seen as impartial It was also suggested that an in-depth analysis of the impact and workings of the MDDA is required.

Funding of signal distribution was flagged as an important issue.

A question was asked regarding whether some community stations should become commercial stations.

Finally, the question was asked about how our communities could contribute to financial viability. If communities own and control the station, then perhaps they should make a contribution, however small.

3. Accountability

The group looked at accountability challenges in terms of governance and the many forms of accountability. The report back included the following key issues:

- 3.1. Accountability should be seen in terms of **shared responsibility** – you can't be held accountable to each other where one party dictates to the other.
- 3.2. Looking at the **role players** should define areas of accountability:
 - 3.2.1. To the **community**. Who is this community? Are there pockets within our community that we are not recognising or creating platforms for them to have a voice? When we do this we can say we are accountable to our communities?
 - 3.2.2. To our **license conditions**. Since our license conditions are based on what we decide (i.e. ICASA does not impose license conditions on stations), we need to be accountable to our own license conditions.
 - 3.2.3. To our **funders / donors / advertisers**. There must be a partnership between us and our funders,

ACTIVITY

donors and advertisers. They must buy in to what we are doing. Their product must be in line with what we are doing. (Perhaps GCIS could become an advertising agency for community broadcasters – for government departments and parastatals?)

- 3.3. **Informed partners and relationships** are critical. A good example of an unformed partner is the DoC telling Mosopatsela Community Radio that it must move when DoC has no authority to do so. We have to know about each other and how we operate.
- 3.4. What is the **DoC mandate**? Should it be an implementing body? Can it call itself accountable to community broadcasting in terms of its current rolling out of equipment and programmes?

DISCUSSION / CHALLENGES / QUESTIONS

Community stations are accountable to their communities. How are communities accountable to their stations, and what contributions are they making in terms of funding, informing programming, etc.?

It would be useful to hold a seminar on community broadcasters' access to funds. Government is proposing to centralise access to funding. It is important for DoC to legislate ring-fenced money for community broadcasting.

It would also be useful to hold a stakeholder seminar on advertising.

Community broadcasters, through an accountable NCRF, need to inform themselves in order to have better access to funding. Perhaps the NCRF should be working on behalf of government to distribute the funds. (The point was made that the NCRF seemingly became a broker of revenue on behalf of stations, and is now in crisis and struggling to find its purpose.)

4. Programming / content

The report back included the following key issues:

- 4.1. Programming begins with the **license application**.
- 4.2. Content should be **owned by the community**. There should be content hubs in communities that are not filtered by the station i.e. if there is a religious group or cult in the community, let people speak for themselves, and enable all interest groups to engage on all issues.
- 4.3. The **DoC must understand the communication sectors** in the community. It has a technical / implementation department. Does it understand what goes into the technical, administrative, management issues? DoC should also provide training in the use of the equipment. It is not cost effective if it just comes back to maintain the equipment. (There is a major gap in technical skills required to operate and maintain stations.)
- 4.4. The sector should be **governed by one document** – radio, print media, etc. – a DoC document inclusive of community broadcasting, along with all other issues.
- 4.5. Programming must be **value driven**. We need to be protected by those whose values we promote. This must keep us relevant to our communities.
- 4.6. Programming should be run like a **business**, and training may be required in content presentation.

DISCUSSION / CHALLENGES / QUESTIONS

Jayshree asked stations how much is spent on production and programming, There was agreement that 40-60% of money is spent on this by delegates at their stations. Using programming to bring in money (e.g. a sponsor who wants to be associated with a particular education programme) has been successfully implemented by some stations. Other forms of using community stations' intellectual property to bring in money should be sought.

Garth from Teemaneng reported that it has a Listeners' Forum comprising nine sub-groups (such as the aged, youth, economic, religious, etc.). The sub-groups meet monthly to discuss programming. Every three months the entire Listeners' Forum meets and defends its air time. The AGM is easy to run since there is a very involved core group who understands the issues. This model (of one or more programme advisory committees empowers and informs the community, and enables people to understand the parameters under which the station works (e.g. ICASA regulations). It also enables the station to be more responsive to community needs.

ACTIVITY

It was felt that perhaps Chapter 9 institutions could assist with support around this such as human rights and gender issues.

The Policy Review Process and community broadcasters: SOS input

Kate reminded delegates of the SOS call for a **national stakeholder forum** to guide the policy review process, and asked delegates to give thought to how SOS should be defining the call for the stakeholder forum, and how community broadcasters could make a contribution to the process.

There was general agreement that consultation should be as broad as possible; that those on the Forum should be the “right” people who would add value to the process. Chairpersons and station managers of community broadcasters should be involved (and not junior representatives) i.e. people with mandates to take decisions at the Forum following prior consultation within constituencies (including communities). Public representation was also seen as important, as was the NCRF provincial structures, civil society, government (e.g. DTI and Department of Health), and parastatal stakeholders (such as ICASA and the MDDA).

There was agreement that all forms of media (public, community and commercial broadcasters, twitter, etc.) should be employed to advertise the process and educate people on the importance of making a contribution, and that the DoC should put resources behind it. One idea was for live feeds to be sponsored by GCIS.

Awareness campaigns should include public service announcements, talk shows and debates in community broadcasting stations in different languages.

It was seen as a good idea for SOS to develop a brief and simple questionnaire for the public and organisations to fill it as one form of feedback into the policy review process.

The national stakeholder forum should be linked to provincial (and district?) stakeholder forums. This would require greater resources from the DoC, but would also ensure a far more participatory and representative process. It could be that community broadcasters get together at provincial level, and mandate two or three people per province to go to the national forum.

SOS undertook to update its Policy Review Process Document to include inputs from this workshop. The updated document is attached as Appendix Six.

Kate also reminded delegates that community stations should make inputs and suggestions to the SOS Vision document (attached as Appendix Four.)

The Policy Review Process and community broadcasters: R2K input

R2K has a media diversity sub-committee. It's campaign focuses on four issues:

1. Media appeals tribunal
2. SABC
3. Community media
4. Ownership and control issues

R2K is commissioning research, for example, on the MDDA and ICASA.

The Policy Review Process and community broadcasters: Talk shows and other materials

SOS and R2K want to support community broadcasters in terms of producing content on MP3 files (and translated into selected local languages) that can be used to publicise policy review process. The content might cover issues such as what kind of legislation would you like to see that will determine how you want your community station to be run; what role you want the SABC to play, etc. It should speak to how the policy review process affects ordinary people, and it should focus on practicalities (and not be an academic document).

SOS and R2K have a team of resource people who can speak on behalf of the process, and the Alternative Information Development Centre (AIDC) is developing a directory of resource people (media and culture / water / environment / etc.).

ACTIVITY

RESPONSES FROM DELEGATES

1. Community broadcasters would like to have information on the process, and to run panel discussions and phone in programmes that highlight what the policy review process means for our democracy, and the need for regulation that ensures accountability. Stations can also use their websites and Facebook pages to provide information and elicit responses.
2. Stations want backup in the form of resource people, as well as materials which include additional background information for their websites. (Where background information is academic, perhaps FES money could be used to rewrite them in more accessible language?)
3. Stations would like materials in English only as stations generally have the in-house capacity to do their own translations. Some undertook to do translations on MP3 files and share with other stations, so long as they receive a script with clarity on how to use it. The air time will be free. The following undertakings to translate and distribute materials were made:
 - 3.1. Zulu – Radio Khwezi (Peter Rice).
 - 3.2. Xhosa, Tswana and Afrikaans – Radio Teemaneng (Garth Damerell). Garth undertook to send to all stations in the Northern Cape.
4. Provision of feedback to SOS / R2K should be optional, and take the form of MP3 files or a (simple) questionnaire stations and communities fill in and return. Peter Rice (Radio Khwezi) undertook to send a straw dog for a schedule / questionnaire to assist SOS / R2K get feedback (including what people have said). (Note that, by law, stations need to keep recordings for 30 days, so it will be very easy to send MP3 files).
5. Different ideas put on the table for additional activities: Some stations could do road shows – hopefully with DoC resources – where DJs and speakers use open areas to get people to congregate; invite stakeholders and community members; inform through fun. Film festivals might work. The important thing is that stations share good ideas and experiences.
6. The campaigns must be based in communities. It may be necessary to train local people. (If anyone wants to set up a group of interested people in a province, R2K would be very happy to speak / train / etc.)
7. There was total commitment from stations to being partners in the campaign. Different stations will address their engagement around the policy review process in different ways. For example, some may dedicate 10 minutes a day or half an hour per week. They will inform their Boards and hold staff meetings to spread the message. “Come 2013 we need to know we were part of the process!”

Way forward

In order to develop a comprehensive list of community broadcasters and other stakeholders (i.e. those not represented at the workshop), participants are asked to send names to Jayshree. Victoria Cawood (Fine Music Radio) has a list of all NCRF affiliates in the Western Cape. Garth Damerell (Radio Teemaneng) has a list of all community broadcasters in the Northern Cape. Gontse Maele (Motheo FM) has a list of all Free State community broadcasters. Sonnyboy Masinga (Chairperson of the NCRF, phone 082 468 6855) may also assist. Jayshree will also speak to Media Connection for a comprehensive list of community stations (contact Shaida Ngobeni: phone 082 441 2359 / 011 791 3107; email shaida@themediacconnection.co.za). Jayshree to send her list of community broadcasters to all delegates so that they can assist with updating the list.

The workshop report will be sent to all by Friday 30 September 2011. The report will contain the following appendices:

- Appendix One: Attendance Register (including contact details of all delegates)
- Appendix Two: Right2Know National Summit Report (2- 3 February 2011)
- Appendix Three: Vision of the “SOS: Support Public Broadcasting” Coalition: Document to support the Broadcasting Policy Review Process (September 2011)

ACTIVITY

- Appendix Four: NCRF submission on the Draft Public Service Broadcasting Bill to the DoC (January 2010)
- Appendix Five: NCRF Policy Conference Report (2009)
- Appendix Six: Updated SOS Policy Review Process document (reflecting workshop inputs)

The report and appendices will also be sent to those who could not attend and those to be identified through the updating of the community broadcaster stakeholders' list.

Delegates were encouraged to use the SOS and R2K documents as opportunities to provide input into the policy review process. People should use anything they want to – it is all in the public domain.

A package of materials will be sent to all community broadcasters by mid-October (or earlier, if possible, as feedback to SOS is required by the end of October 2011).

Conclusion

Kate and Jayshree both expressed heartfelt appreciation to delegates for fruitful engagement and participation, and for their commitment to partnering SOS and R2K in this very important campaign.

The financial and other support provided by the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES) was also gratefully acknowledged.

It was agreed that SOS / R2K and delegates should chase each other in ensuring deadlines and undertakings were met.

Although no formal evaluation was conducted, several delegates thanked SOS and R2K for holding this workshop. In the words of Peter Rice (Radio Khwezi), "This came at the right time, and was just what we needed."

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix One	Attendance Register
Appendix Two	Right2Know National Summit Report (2- 3 February 2011)
Appendix Three	Vision of the "SOS: Support Public Broadcasting" Coalition: Document to support the Broadcasting Policy Review Process (September 2011)
Appendix Four	NCRF submission on the Public Service Broadcasting Bill to the DoC (January 2010)
Appendix Five	NCRF Policy Conference Report (2009)
Appendix Six	Updated SOS Policy Review Process document (reflecting workshop inputs)