



Trial of the Community Media Centre Proposal

**Response by
Canadian Association of Community Television Users and Stations (CACTUS)
to Undertaking Given in
Broadcasting Notice of Consultation CRTC 2015-421, *Review of Local and Community TV***

February 9, 2015 (Rev)

Table of Contents

1.0 Community Media Centre

2.0 Community Media Centre Trial Purpose

3.0 Outline of Community Media Centre Trial Elements

4.0 Community Media Centre Test Sites

5.0 Funding/Budgetary Requirements

6.0 Trial Roll-Out, Reporting and Metrics

7.0 Regulatory Conditions

Appendix A: Trial Test Site Budgets

Appendix B: Proposed Board Structure for Community Media Centres

Appendix C: Information/Criteria to Assess Proposed Applicants

Appendix D: Regulatory Policy to Govern Community Media Centres

1.0 Community Media Centre

A Community Media Centre for the purposes of this trial is a not-for-profit organization (non-share capital corporation) located within a radio and television broadcast area authorized by the Commission that will own and operate multimedia broadcasting facilities for the purpose of generating community media on a multiplatform basis. The Community Media Centre model is proposed as a replacement to the community channels currently operated by Canadian BDUs.

Governance

The membership and board structure of the Community Media Centres should reflect and be representative of the institutional, cultural, linguistic, and ethnic composition of the community to be served. The board of the Community Media Centre will be responsible for the overall operation of the Community Media Centre as well as ensuring that all Commission policies are met or exceeded. Details regarding the board and governance structure recommended for Community Media Centres are set out in Appendix B.

Services

The Community Media Centre will, through paid staff in cooperation with community volunteers, deliver:

- Community TV services in accordance with the policy set out in Appendix D attached hereto, including volunteer training, equipment access, production support, and distribution on multiple platforms
- Community radio services in accordance with Commission policy
- Training, production support and distribution of video games in the community via its web site
- Web training and design, production support and distribution of online text and still visuals reflective of events, organizations, news, and culture of the community

Physical Plant

The training, equipment access and production support may be delivered at one central facility owned or leased by each Community Media Centre, including the following physical plant:

- one or more television studios and control rooms
- one or more radio studios and control rooms
- edit suites for both
- a computer lab for generating web content and games
- offices for administration and facilitators

In addition, some of the services may be distributed. For example, many communities install permanent robotic cameras and/or switchers and mini-control rooms at locations where the community routinely congregates for events; for example, municipal council chambers, performance spaces, sporting arenas, colleges, universities, and schools. These satellite locations maintain a feed to the central playback and broadcasting facility so that broadcasting from these locations can occur live.

In a large urban area, there may be multiple fully equipped studio or lab locations, each of which can upload content to a common playback or transmission facility.

The particular configuration needs to be planned by each Community Media Centre with community usage and demographics in mind.

Typically, the design of Community Media Centres as well as their equipment differ from conventional broadcasting facilities. For example:

- Studio locations and access points are planned for maximum public visibility and access, with consideration for free parking, access by bus, and co-location with high-traffic areas and institutions with similar mandates such as public libraries.
- 'Self-serve' features to maximize access, such as cypher locks for after-hours access, equipment checkout and check-in, mini-radio and TV studios that can be operated by a single host/producer using robotic cameras, meeting spaces for staff, volunteers, and community groups that enable their collaboration, and so on.
- Equipment that is robust and easy to use.

Rationale for Community Media Centres

With the ease of sharing and creating content digitally, it has become increasingly common among mainstream, community and alternative media for multiple media types to be produced by a single organization. Given the simultaneous globalization of media content over the Internet, it is important for local media organizations and communities to be able to:

- i) create local content by the most cost-effective methods so that there is *enough* local reflection to build community identity and support community life
- ii) *find* locally reflective media content

Since smaller communities in particular may have no local commercial newspaper, radio or television, it's increasingly important for community-based organizations that can leverage local synergies and resident participation to fill the gap. Community media are increasingly being delivered in Canada and in other jurisdictions from multimedia production centres, or "community media centres" whose purpose is to:

- i. train local residents in multimedia creation
- ii. generate multimedia content that is locally reflective
- iii. distribute the content on all platforms by which residents can access it, so that it is shared and can build a common platform for community dialogue and identity-building
- iv. facilitate a process of empowerment and local development through enabling all members of the community to participate in the cultural, political, social and economic life of the community.

2.0 Purpose and Length of Community Media Centre Trial

Purpose

- i. The primary purpose of the Community Media Centre trial is to demonstrate that local Community Media Centres that are adequately resourced can achieve the goals stipulated for the community element under the *Broadcasting Act* and in the Commission community television policy as set out in Broadcasting Regulatory Policy CRTC 2010-622 as amended and/or updated as a result of the Broadcasting Notice of Consultation CRTC 2015-421 proceeding. These goals include the production and dissemination of diverse community-reflective content in a technological neutral fashion and the enabling of Canadians to access television broadcasting to express their own views and concerns with the support of appropriate training programs, equipment access, and distribution of their content to their communities.
- ii. An additional purpose of the trial is to prove that Community Media Centres can efficiently deliver community media training, production support and content distribution of different media through a single local not-for-profit entity.
- iii. A further goal of the trial is to prove that these services can be delivered with a budget no greater than what BDUs currently spend on community TV; that is, that for no additional cost, Canadians can enjoy local reflection as well as local access to the system to express their views on several different media platforms, including radio, television, gaming, and online (text/still pictures) with the particular mix depending on the needs of the communities selected as test sites, but including at a minimum television.¹

Length

CACTUS proposes that the length of the trial be three (3) years. The first year will enable site selection, the hiring of staff and the acquisition of necessary infrastructure, with production occurring by the end the year. The Community Media Centres will be fully operational in all media in year two. Year three will afford the opportunity to establish best practices for leveraging synergies among the production of different media. Three years has been chosen to give the Commission sufficient data to judge the effectiveness of the Community Media Centre model.

¹ The capital infrastructure and multiple skillsets required for TV production are greater than for the other media.. Once the physical plant is in place to facilitate TV production, to a large extent, it can also be used to create radio, online, and gaming content. It is the staff skillset that enables the production of additional media to TV.

3.0 Summary of Trial Elements

Below is a summary of the components of the Community Media Centre trial. Details for each component are described elsewhere in this document:

| | | |
|--|---|---------------|
| <i>Number of Trial Community Media Centres:</i> | 5-7 (minimum number that meet site characteristics below) | See Section 4 |
| <i>Location of Community: Media Centres (to be determined by Commission from pre-vetted list of applicants)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one small, medium, large community • At least one that is predominantly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - anglophone - francophone - bilingual - Aboriginal - with significant multicultural composition • At least one growing out of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a licensed community TV broadcaster or unlicensed TVC - a licensed community radio station - a video co-operative (e.g. IMAA) - a public library | See Section 4 |
| <i>Trial Period:</i> | 3 Years | See Section 6 |
| <i>Funding Requirements: (Minimum to maximum cost depending on presence of existing facilities and operational capacity, staffing levels needed depending on trial community sizes, and whether captioning is included in the trial)</i> | <p>Year 1: Community Media Centres: \$5,491,586 - \$8,284,500 Administration: \$824,000</p> <p>Total: \$6,315,586 - \$9,108,500</p> <p>Year 2: Community Media Centres: \$2,038,172 - \$7,624,000 Administration: \$128,000</p> <p>Total: \$2,166,172 - \$7,734,000</p> | See Section 5 |

Year 3: Community Media Centres:
 \$2,038,172 - \$7,624,000
 Administration:
 \$148,000

Total: \$2,186,172 - \$7,754,000

3 Year Trial Total:
\$10,667,930 - \$24,596,500

Funding Source:

Funding will be made available by the Commission directing that BDUs pay a portion of their gross revenues from broadcasting operations (0.1%) based on 2014 data). See Section 5

4.0 Community Media Centre Test Sites

CACTUS proposes that the trial consist of five to seven (5-7) Community Media Centres to test the model:

- in different sizes of communities (small, medium, large)
- to meet the needs of different linguistic and ethnic populations (anglophone, francophone, Aboriginal, bilingual, multicultural)
- growing out of four existing types of organizations (licensed community TV channels or unlicensed TVCs, licensed radio stations, video co-operatives, and public libraries)

The rationale for the above-referenced Community Media Centre site location is set out below.

We propose that interested organizations apply to participate in the trial. The number of sites to be chosen should be the minimum qualified applicants necessary to fulfill these parameters. In the Section 5.0 “Budgetary Considerations”, we provide an example in which 6 actual communities fulfill all these parameters.

Parameters for Selecting Test Sites

a) *Demonstrated Will and Existing Infrastructure*

A key component of the Community Media Centre proposal set out in our full January 5th 2016 submission to this proceeding (*The Community Element in the Broadcasting System: Vision for a Digital Canada*) is that while some communities may currently have very little infrastructure to offer community media services (except perhaps a public library), other communities have some or most of the requisite infrastructure already in place, possibly including:

- an independent not-for-profit licensed community TV station or incorporated TVC
- a campus or community radio station
- a college or university media training program
- a video co-operative (such as members of the Independent Media Arts Alliance)

A successful trial of the Community Media Centres will depend on:

- i) the community's will to succeed; and
- ii) leveraging rather than duplicating existing infrastructure

In order to demonstrate proof of concept in as short a period as possible and to minimize the costs for the trial, we propose selecting sites where some or most of the infrastructure is already in place and the community has demonstrated interest and commitment to improving community media access and services via a multimedia model of service delivery.

This strategy will maximize the chances for a successful trial because existing facilities have clientele and a relationship with the community that can be leveraged and enhanced within the trial period, rather than starting from scratch.

We therefore recommend developing at least one full-blown Community Media Centre from each of the following types of existing organizations:

- one not-for-profit licensed community TV station or TVC
- one community radio station that is already streaming video or has indicated such an interest
- one video co-operative (for example, a member of IMAA) with a demonstrated interest in licensing and in fulfilling a broader community service mandate
- one public library in a community where none of the above are available

b) *Different Market Size*

Since the needs of very small markets are different from the needs of mid-size and large markets, we suggest at least one test site in each of a small, medium and large market.

Based on current practices and the existence of current community media organizations and networks, the large-market example will likely constitute a multiple hub model, in which the Community Media Centre will become the umbrella or license-holding 'community media network' to which other existing unlicensed organizations will contribute content.

An example with which the Commission is familiar includes several different

organizations in the GTA (Regent Park Focus, the Handeye Society, The Media Coop).² All three already facilitate the production of community content, but have no broadcast outlet. Dahne Jobson with the fledgling Toronto Community Media Network proposed a 'network' of existing community organizations that could provide content to a licensed common platform. Vancouver is another example of a large market with many existing community media organizations that lack a community-controlled and integrated multimedia approach that could serve as a large-market test.

Therefore, the organizational model for small, medium, and large communities will be different. It is important to have at least one of each to test in order for the trial to be both relevant and useful as a proof of concept.

c) *Diversity of Ethnic and Linguistic Composition*

Given the mandate of community media to serve linguistic and ethnic minorities as well as specifically Aboriginal and official-language minorities, it is important to include in the trial:

- at least one Aboriginal community
- one predominantly francophone community, in order to confirm that the Community Media Centre model can serve its needs
- one multiracial and/or bilingual community, such as in a large urban market

The point of the not-for-profit community-based ownership model is that each community can tailor the content creation and delivery model to its own needs.

d) *Putting these parameters together to determine the trial size.*

These test community parameters do not necessarily imply 4 + 3 + 3 distinct trial communities, as several parameters can be met within a single community. For example, the Aboriginal community might also serve as the small-community example. Or the francophone community might serve as the medium-size example.

In Section V, "Budgeting Considerations", we provide a list of 6 possible test sites that would fulfill the 10 test parameters among them. We propose a consultation process to allow sufficient time to communicate the goals and parameters of the trial with

² Others attended the Community Media Convergence, including Jane-Finch.com and Dames Making Games. Still others have helped the TCMN develop this multi-hub model, including the Toronto Public Library, EqualiTV, the Ontario Public Service Employees Union, Centennial College, students from Ryerson and York radio stations, and so on.

interested groups, and for interested groups to conduct the necessary stakeholder consultations. The strongest applicants that fulfill these parameters would be chosen by the Commission for the trial; we anticipate that that number would be between 5 and 7. In Appendix C, we set out information/criteria that we recommend be used to assess potential applicants during the consultation process.

We propose that CACTUS assess the potential applicants with input from an advisory group consisting of community radio, gaming, and online media specialists, before the final applications are submitted to the CRTC for authorization to operate a Community Media Center during the trial period. The purpose of this assessment is to ensure that no erroneous and/or incomplete application is filed with the Commission.

5.0 Funding/Budgetary Considerations

We estimate the total capital, operational and administration costs to complete the three-year trial will be between \$10,667,930 and \$24,596,500. The rationale for this range is set out below:

Capital and Operational Costs

We proposed capital and operational budgets for Community Media Centres for small, media and large communities in our Jan. 5th 2016 submission. We reattach them as Appendix A. We defined:

- 'small' as a community with fewer than 30,000 people
- medium as having between 30,000 and 100,000, and
- large as having greater than 100,000.³

In communities having 500,000 or more people, we recommended at least one additional fully functional Community Media Centre for each additional 500,000 people.

Whether the full budget for a Community Media Centre is fully expended at one physical facility where all types of media are made, or whether a Community Media Centre elects to leverage satellite locations (for example, installing cameras and a live link in council chambers, sporting arenas, or performance halls with a full training facility elsewhere) would be up to each Community Media Centre. The strength of the model is to leverage existing infrastructure and to adapt the model to each community's needs.

The main difference among the small, medium and large budgets is the staffing levels, and the greater volume of content that would have to be captioned or described if the current expectations for BDU community channels are maintained. Within the operational budgets for small, medium and large communities, a budget range has been provided to reflect differing staff levels (fewer staff at the relatively small communities within a size category, or more staff at a larger community within the same category).

The capital costs to set up a Community Media Centre are similar, with proportionately more studio, editing, and office space for Community Media Centres in larger centres in order to satisfied the increased population and resulting larger capacity requirements.

³ Community size pertinent to planning community media facilities are smaller than the 'markets' defined for commercial television. (e.g. Applicants for the Small Market Local Programming Fund must serve a 'market' of 300,000 or fewer.)

The capital and operational budgets offered in Appendix A assume that a Community Media Centre is starting from scratch, which will ultimately be applicable in some Canadian communities that have no existing community media facilities. For the purposes of the trial however, since we recommend selecting communities that have some or all of the infrastructure necessary to serve as a full multimedia Community Media Centre, a proportion only of these costs will be necessary during the trial period.

Captioning and Described Video

The budgets we offered in our January 5, 2016 submission assumed that content would be fully captioned and respect the proportion of described video that BDUs are currently required to provide under Broadcasting Regulatory Policy CRTC 2010-622. However, we included a discussion of the fact that captioning everything on the Community Media Centre channel could consume as much of 1/3rd of the operational budget per year due to the expected high volume of output. We discussed intermediary options such as captioning only the same news and information content as are described, or using automated systems.

In general, full captioning is problematic under a community-access model, in which there aren't 'programming' budgets per se. There are facilities and staff to enable community residents to make content on a voluntary basis. Community members generate content in the manner that best suits them (including captioning by and for the deaf and hard-of-hearing community should they wish). Furthermore, for live content to be captioned (live event coverage is a staple for community media), it may be a challenge in smaller communities if no simultaneous translators are available, or if bandwidth speeds are too slow to enable a translator working at a distance to transmit a translation to a live stream in real time.

Summary:

Year 1 Cost per Trial Site⁴:

Actual capital budget required for trial =
Capital budget in Appendix A according to community size
minus (-) value of existing infrastructure

Actual operational budget required for trial =
Operational budget in Appendix A according to community size
(minus) - existing operational budget

⁴ Training and consultancy provided by CACTUS and others are included as part of Administrative costs below, not as part of trial site start-up costs.

divided by two (/2)⁵

Years 2 & 3 Cost per Trial Site:

Actual operational budget required for trial =
Operational budget in Appendix A for community size
minus (-) existing operational budget

Example

For example, the capital and operational costs for the following combination of trial sites would be as follows:

| Community/Site | Characteristics for Trial | Maximum Cost Range⁶ |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| Toronto | Large community, predominantly English-language with large multicultural subgroups, gaming leader; network to be built from existing TVC, gaming, radio, and online media organizations | Capital (Year 1): \$1,906,500⁷ Operational over 3 years: \$5,910,000 - 9,847,500 |
| Vaudreuil-Soulanges, QC | Medium-size, bilingual, TVC | Capital (Year 1): \$536,000 Operational over 3 years: \$1,420,000 - \$2,195,000 |
| Innisfil, ON | Medium-size, anglophone, | Capital (Year 1): \$536,000 |

5 Since additional staff and equipment will not be hired and acquired until the second half of the year, the operational budget for Year 1 is estimated as half that of Years 2 and 3.

6 In order to generate a trial cost range, the minimum and maximum operational budgets offered in appendix A have been used for each community size; the actual budget for a trial site will depend on community size and need. (For example, the staffing needs for a 'large community' consisting of 100,000 people are different than for a community of 500,000, although both are considered 'large' in this proposal for budgeting purposes.)

7 As a large market, an additional budget to provide community access services for Toronto should be provided for each additional 500,000 people. Considering the population of downtown Toronto only (2.8 million) rather than the GTA (nearly 7 million) would imply at least six Community Media Centres. For the purposes of the trial, we propose distributing a capital and operational budget equivalent to three large Community Media centres among existing organizations that are already fulfilling part of a community multimedia access mandate, to demonstrate a multihub model that is scalable, but not unmanageable for the purposes of the trial.

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| | public library that teaches audio-visual production and gaming | Operational over 3 years: \$1,420,000 - \$2,195,000 |
| Wiky TV5, Manitoulin | Small, Aboriginal, unlicensed TV and radio broadcaster | Capital (Year 1): \$498,000 Operational over 3 years: \$982,500-\$1,607,500 |
| Kelowna, BC | Small, anglophone, video co-operative | Capital (Year 1): \$498,000 Operational over 3 years: \$982,500-\$1,607,500 |
| Iles-de-la-Madeleine | Small, francophone radio broadcaster, has TV license but has not launched (funding withdrawn after exemption order no longer required BDU contribution) | Capital (Year 1): \$498,000 Operational over 3 years: \$982,500-\$1,607,500 |

If we assume no existing infrastructure or operational capacity on the part of these communities, and that all content should be captioned and described as per the current BDU regulations, the maximum budget ranges for years 1, 2 and 3 would be:

Year 1: **\$6,812,000 - \$8,284,500** (capital and 1/2-year operational costs)

Year 2: **\$4,679,000 - \$7,624,000** (operational, depending on staffing and community sizes)

Year 3: **\$4,679,000 - \$7,624,000** (operational, depending on staffing and community sizes)

Total: **\$16,170,000 - \$23,532,500**

We estimate the actual trial site costs (given that there are existing infrastructure and operational budgets) would actually be 1/4 to 1/3 less than this total or between \$10,672,000 and \$17,649,375.

An estimated 1/4 to 1/3 of the operational budget would be consumed by closed-captioning and described video. If the Commission decides a different approach is more workable for community-access content in the long term or during the trial period, the actual total cost could be reduced still further, to between \$9,282,030 and \$15,350,639 (if captioning and described video are not included as part of the trial).

A final budget can be developed once the test sites are chosen, with input from the Community Media Centres involved.

Administrative Costs

In order to administer the trial, a budget of \$1,384,900 is required, for the tasks set out below, in addition to the budgets per Community Media Centre:

| Task | Cost |
|--|---|
| Year 1 | |
| Project Management and liaison with CRTC to refine trial parameters and manage trial, including trial assessment and reporting. | \$40,000 (CACTUS per year for 3 years) |
| Advertise trial and solicit applications | \$10,000 (E-mail and phone campaign with community and alternative media and public library associations) |
| Initial evaluation of written applications | \$20,000 (CACTUS with advisory group composed of radio, gaming, and online media representatives) |
| On-site stakeholder interviews and site assessment | \$132,000 (CACTUS with broadcast engineer or other consultants as necessary) |
| Consulting services to design facilities and distribution infrastructure within communities | \$132,000 (community TV, radio, gaming, and web design specialists, and broadcast engineers) |
| Consulting services to help sites prepare applications to Industry Canada and the CRTC | \$120,000 (community TV, radio, gaming, and web design specialists,) |
| Consulting services to help sites recruit personnel with appropriate skillsets | \$60,000 (community TV, radio, gaming, and web design specialists,) |
| Consulting services to help sites train personnel and volunteers in new media skills and best practices | \$180,000 (community TV, radio, gaming, and web design specialists,) |
| Consulting service to design Community Media Centre individual web sites, common program logging system and online database so trial output can be monitored by project administrator (CACTUS), CRTC, industry stakeholders, and the general public. | \$80,000.00 |
| Years 1, 2, 3 | |
| Phone support and liaison for Community | \$60,000 (CACTUS over three years with input |

| | |
|--|--|
| Media Centres | from online media, radio, gaming specialists) to compile Community Media Centre Best Practices guide |
| Audit of CACTUS administrative budget. | \$3000 per year |
| CACTUS administrative overheads (communications, insurance, servers) | \$15,000 per year |
| End Year 1, 2 and 3 | |
| Liaison with trial sites to prepare reports and assessments, including Community Media Centre Best Practices guide | \$90,000 (\$30,000 per year) CACTUS with input from online media, radio, gaming specialists |
| End Year 2 | |
| Independent audience/user survey | \$50,000.00 |
| Year 3 | |
| Liaison with Community Media Centres to co-ordinate and implement archiving best practices, in consultation with public libraries. | \$20,000 library and archival consultant working with CACTUS |
| End Year 3 | |
| Independent audience/user survey | \$50,000 |
| Subtotal | \$1,259,000 |
| Contingency for unforeseen administrative tasks (10%) | \$125,900 |
| TOTAL | \$1,384,900 |

Summary Trial Administrative Budget:

Year 1: **\$843,000**

Year 2: **\$198,000**

Year 3: **\$218,000**

Contingency:**\$125,900**

Total: **\$1,384,900**

Funding Sources

CACTUS proposes that the cost of the trial be funded by the Commission directing BDUs to contribute a portion of their gross revenues from broadcasting operations to a fund administered by the Commission out of the 5% BDUs are required to contribute to local expression. Based on an estimated annual budget of between \$5.5 million and \$9.1 million in Year 1 and \$5.2 million and \$7.7 million in Years 2 and 3, CACTUS proposes that the percentage annual contribution be set at 0.1% of BDU gross revenues and that this amount be paid by all BDUs (exempt and licensed, terrestrial and satellite). The percentage amount could be adjusted annually by the commission to take into account any funding surplus or deficit that may result.

6.0 Trial Roll-out, Reporting and Metrics

We propose that CACTUS report on the progress of the trial of all Community Media Centres at the end of each year of the three-year trial. CACTUS' report to the Commission would include and be based on reports provided by each trial site.

Targets:

Year 1

Month 1:

- Year 1 Administrative budget made available to trial co-ordinator (CACTUS)
- Advertise application process for trial.

Month 1, Month 2 and Month 3: Phone support for interested groups.

End Month 3: Application deadline.

End Month 4: Preliminary trial site selection; subject to:

- site review by CACTUS and/or other community media specialists and broadcast engineering consultant to confirm feasibility
- interview with stakeholder groups and proposed board
- preparation of applications for CRTC authorization of the proposed Community Media Centres, including additional licensing as necessary.

End Month 5: Trial site selection and broadcasting applications submitted to CRTC for approval and granting.

End Month 6: CRTC Decisions rendered. Formal trial starts; funds made available to Community Media Centres.

Months 1 through 6: Community Media Centre preliminary web design, logging procedures, and online trial database designed to facilitate administrative oversight and transparency during trial.

Months 7 through 12: Community Media Centres build additional infrastructure, purchase equipment, and hire and train additional staff as necessary.

End month 12:

- Community Media Centres programming services launch with some regular scheduling in incremental media types.

- Community Media Centre web sites are operational; logging procedures in place, output automatically being captured and archived by online trial database and web site.
- Community Media Centres submit progress report to CACTUS.
- CACTUS submits progress reports from individual centres to CRTC with analysis of trial success to date.

Year 2:

Volunteer training programs fully developed.

Program schedules reach full capacity.

End year 2:

- Community Media Centre Reports submitted to CACTUS
- Individual reports submitted to CRTC with overall analysis by CACTUS, including preliminary *Community Media Centres Best Practices Guide*.

Year 3:

Full synergies among media explored and best practices in multimedia approaches to offering community news and information fully articulated.

End year 3:

- Reports from Community Media Centres submitted to CACTUS
- Individual reports submitted to CRTC with overall analysis by CACTUS for all three years, including final copy of *Community Media Centres Best Practices Guide*.

Report format for individual Community Media Centres:

At the end of each year of the trial, each Community Media Centre will report progress toward the following targets, and commit to them as a condition of receiving the budgetary allocation for the upcoming year. Given the focus of the current hearing, included in their reports will be the amount and types of local news and event coverage they produce in all media, as well as coverage of municipal and civic events that contribute to open governance (such as but not limited to municipal council meetings).

End-of-year reports from Community Media Centres will also include a copy of an audit by professional auditors.

Recommended Targets:

| Target | Small | Medium | Large |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| Output: | | | |
| TV | Meets or exceeds regulatory minima. (In the new policy we proposed in Appendix F of our January 5 th full submission, we suggest raising local and access minima to 80% and 75% respectively.) | | |
| | 10 hours original content ⁸ per week | 20 hours original content per week. | 40 hours original content per week. |
| | Centres shall report amount and types of local news and event coverage as a percentage of overall content distributed. | | |
| Radio | Meets or exceeds regulatory minima. | | |
| Locally reflective games | 2 per month | 3 per month | 1 per week |
| # web pages | 5 | 10 | 20 |
| Training: | (averaging 6 participants per workshop; target of 1/3 held outside production facility in community; e.g. schools, seniors and community centres) | | |
| TV | 10 (one full cycle of topics) per year | 20 (two full cycles of topics per year) | 30 (three full cycles of topics per year) |
| Radio | 1 per month | 2 per month | 2 per month |
| Gaming | 2 per month | 3 per month | 1 per week |
| Web skills | 1 per month | 2 per month | 2 per month |

8 Too much focus on volume can compromise quality or discourage staff from undertaking more labour-intensive projects with multi-stakeholder groups. These figures should be regarded as a guidelines, to be considered in combination with other performance factors. They're useful to ensure that local and access percentages (which include replays) are not achieved by replaying a few programs repeatedly.

| Community Engagement | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| # regular volunteer contributors | 40 | 80 | 150 |
| Average # organizations profiled or involved | 2 per week | 4 per week | 8 per week |
| Open Governance programming | Coverage of municipal council or equivalent body (at least once per month) and election coverage | Coverage of municipal council or equivalent body at least bi-weekly and election coverage | Coverage of municipal council or equivalent bodies weekly, election coverage, and coverage at least one other town-hall, school board trustee meeting or equivalent |
| Development Target | Each Community Media Centre should meet its own self-defined community developed target by year end, whether a training target, a target to include previously marginalized groups, to stimulate dialogue about particular social or economic challenges, or to showcase or capture particular events or history. | | |
| Interactive programming | Community Media Centres shall document their efforts to involve community members directly in programming via interactive technologies and methodologies (e.g. phone-ins, text messaging, live uploads, studio audiences) | | |
| Archiving | An archiving strategy must be established in partnership with the public library over the course of the trial; consultancy and co-ordinator to be provided through trial administrator working with archiving and library consultant. | | |
| Audience (to be established by independent survey methodology) | 50% weekly reach | 25% weekly reach | 10% weekly reach ⁹ |

9 The weekly reach (larger percentage in smaller communities versus smaller percentage in large communities) reflects the different mandate of community media in small communities where there may be few other sources of local information, and the focus tends to be generalist. In urban areas, by contrast, community media tends to serve niche groups; while generalist news is provided by public and private sector broadcasters. CACTUS members (which are currently under resourced) nonetheless have an average weekly reach of 45%. BDU community channels in large cities have an average weekly reach as a group nationally of 1.5%. While well-resourced, we believe they are underachieving; they are producing a fraction of the volume of content of a true access model. Additional volume and variety of original content brings in additional audiences.

7.0 Regulatory Conditions

Regulatory Policies

The Community Media Centres will be required to operate in accordance with the following policies:

- Television - The policy set out in Appendix D¹⁰ attached hereto.
- Radio - Broadcasting Regulatory Policy CRTC 2010 – 499, *Campus and community radio policy*
- Online/Internet - Broadcasting Order CRTC 2009 – 660

Distribution Requirements

Terrestrial BDUs (licensed and exempt) will be required to distribute the linear service of any Community Media Centre as part of their basic service at a minimum throughout the area reached by the over-the-air signals or the service area for the Community Media Centre authorized by the Commission, whichever is greater.

In addition, BDUs that offer VOD services are required to distribute the programming of any Community Media Centre at a minimum throughout the area reached by the over-the-air signal or the service area for the Community Media Centre authorized by the Commission, whichever is greater.

DTH BDUs are required to distribute any Community Media Centre as part of their basic service, throughout the service area for the Community Media Centre authorized by the Commission.

¹⁰ The policy set out in Appendix D attached hereto is based on the draft policy submitted by CACTUS as Appendix F of CACTUS' January 5, 2016 submission in Broadcasting Regulatory Policy CRTC 2015-421.

Appendix A

Sample Budgets

Small Community: Under 30,000

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Start-up Costs | |
| Television | |
| Studio | \$60,000 |
| Control room | \$160,000 |
| Online edit suite | \$6,000 |
| ENG kits (3) | \$18,000 |
| Laptop editing consoles for loan (3) | \$1,500 |
| Mobile (van with portable cameras) | \$50,000 |
| Headend/servers/web hosting | \$30,000 |
| Radio | |
| Studio and control room | \$30,000 |
| Voiceover booth | \$2,000 |
| On-location recording equipment | \$500 |
| Computer-hacklab (offline audio and video editing, Internet, game design: 5 computers) | \$10,000.00 |
| Office equipment and furniture | \$2,000.00 |
| Transmission equipment | \$100,000 ¹¹ |
| Engineering consultancy | \$20,000 |
| | \$498,000.00 |
| | |
| Yearly Operational Costs | |
| 4-6 staff (manager, community outreach co- | |

11 This is possibly a low average. Two of the existing low-power OTA licence holders report that their transmission equipment cost them less than \$20,000, by buying second-hand, lesser known brands designed for community use, and by mounting the transmitter on existing buildings. Others report costs estimate \$100,000, while industry estimates (for example, the Canadian Media Guild) are between \$150,000 and \$200,000 (for a more powerful transmitter, longer range).

| | |
|---|----------------------------|
| ordinators/trainers with different media specialties, technician) | \$250,000-\$500,000 |
| Repairs (parts) | \$10,000 |
| Materials (e.g. Recording materials, office supplies) | \$30,000 |
| Rent or mortgage, building maintenance | \$25,000 |
| Professional fees | \$3,000 |
| Captioning and described video (assuming 10 hours/week original production) | \$75,000* |
| Total | \$393,000-\$643,000 |

* See Captioning Discussion, following "Large Communities" in the body of the proposal.

Medium-Sized Communities: 30,000 to 100,000

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Start-up Costs | |
| Television | |
| Studio | \$60,000 |
| Control room | \$160,000 |
| Online edit suites (2) | \$12,000 |
| ENG kits (5) | \$30,000 |
| Laptop editing consoles for loan (5) | \$2,500 |
| Mobile (van with ENG cameras) | \$50,000 |
| Headend/servers | \$30,000 |
| Radio | |
| Studio and control room | \$30,000 |
| Voiceover booth | \$2,000 |
| On-location recording equipment | \$500 |
| Computer-hacklab (offline audio and video editing, Internet, game design: 8 computers) | \$16,000.00 |
| Office equipment and furniture | \$3,000.00 |
| Transmission equipment | \$100,000 ¹² |

12 This is possibly a low average. Two of the existing low-power OTA licence holders report that their

| | |
|---|----------------------------|
| Engineering consultancy | \$20,000 |
| Total | \$536,000.00 |
| Yearly Operational Costs | |
| 6-8 staff (manager, community outreach co-ordinators/trainers with different media specialties, technician) | \$350,000-\$660,000 |
| Repairs (parts) | \$10,000 |
| Materials (e.g. Recording materials, office supplies) | \$30,000 |
| Rent or mortgage, building maintenance | \$25,000 |
| Professional fees | \$3,000 |
| Captioning and described video (assuming 20 hours new production per week) | \$150,000.00* |
| Total | \$568,000-\$878,000 |

* See Captioning Discussion, following "Large Communities" in the body of the proposal.

Large Communities(Serving up to 500,000; Multiple Facilities in Communities with Populations >500,000)

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Start-up Costs | |
| Television | |
| Studio(s) | \$100,000 |
| Control room(s) | \$200,000 |
| Online edit suites (3) | \$18,000 |
| ENG kits (6) | \$36,000 |
| Laptop editing consoles for loan (6) | \$3,000 |
| Mobile (specialized vehicle, committed equipment) | \$75,000 |

transmission equipment cost them less than \$20,000, by buying second-hand, lesser known brands designed for community use, and by mounting the transmitter on existing buildings. Others report costs estimate \$100,000, while industry estimates (for example, the Canadian Media Guild) are between \$150,000 and \$200,000 (typically for a more powerful transmitter, longer range).

| | |
|---|----------------------------|
| Headend/servers | \$25,000 |
| Radio | |
| Control room and studio | \$30,000 |
| Voiceover booth | \$2,000 |
| On-location recording equipment | \$500 |
| Computer/Hacklab (10 computers, modem, network) | \$20,000.00 |
| Office equipment and furniture | \$6,000 |
| Transmission equipment | \$100,000 ¹³ |
| Engineering Consultancy | \$20,000 |
| Total | \$635,500.00 |
| | |
| Yearly Operational Costs | |
| 8-11 staff (manager, community outreach coordinator/trainer(s), technician) | \$450,000-900,000 |
| Repairs (not including labour) | \$20,000 |
| Materials (e.g. Recording materials, office supplies) | \$40,000 |
| Rent or mortgage, building maintenance | \$50,000 |
| Professional fees | \$3,000 |
| Captioning and described video (assuming 30-40 hours new production per week) | \$225,000-300,000 |
| Total | \$788,000-1,313,000 |

¹³ As per the previous footnote, this may be a low average, but CACTUS research suggests that community television channels in other countries are getting on air (and converting to digital) for less than a third the cost estimated by the Canadian private and public sectors.

Appendix B

Proposed Board Structure for Trial Participants

CACTUS suggests that trial participants have boards that reflect a broad cross-section of and balance among community needs and interests. Given that we recommend the trial build on existing organizations, the applicants for the trial might need to identify additional board positions or changes to board structures if existing boards do not reflect the recommended structure.

The following structure reflects best practices in Canada and the US, and has had input from The Buske Group, the foremost consultant to more than 3000 US public-, educational- and government access cable TV channels. CACTUS recognizes, however, that every community is different; if an applicant's board's makeup differs significantly from this structure, they would have the opportunity of providing a rationale.

The intent is that the number of stable organizational seats representing key community institutions (the first part of the list) should have rough parity with the number of community member-elected seats.

REQUIRED DESIGNATED SEATS

- 1 seat for the municipality, appointed by the municipality
- 1 seat to represent public libraries in the license area, to be appointed by them.
- 1-2 seats to represent local educational institutions, including primary, secondary, and tertiary institutions (1 seat to represent primary and secondary if no tertiary institutions exist in the community, and a second seat to represent tertiary institutions, if they exist), preferably appointed by the local school board (s) or tertiary institutions themselves.
- 1 seat to represent non-profit community service organizations, appointed by a body that represents such organizations, if such a body exists. If no such body exists, the seat shall be selected according to a process determined by a community-service organization subcommittee consisting of any and all community service organizations that wish to be members and participate in election or nomination of this seat.
- 1 seat to represent other media in the license area, which could be other community media or professional media. The intent should be to foster partnerships among local media but also to draw on journalistic expertise that other local organizations can provide. Appointed by a body that represents local media if such a body exists. If no such body exists, the seat shall be selected according to a process determined by a local

media subcommittee consisting of any and all local media that wish to be members and participate in election or nomination of this seat..

- 1-3 seats to represent cultural groups in the license area; in particular specialists in audio-visual media creation that can offer leadership and expertise to the centre. To be appointed by a body that represents such group(s) if such a body exists. If no such body exists, the seat shall be selected according to a process determined by a subcommittee consisting of any and all artistic or cultural groups that wish to be members and participate in election or nomination of this seat..
- 1 seat for the Chamber of Commerce.
- 1 seat for the Chief Executive Officer (Manager of the station). This seat should be a voting seat only insofar as the appointment of other board positions is concerned. It should be a non-voting seat for all other issues, to prevent a conflict of interest.

OPTIONAL DESIGNATED SEATS

Small communities may not need these additional seats, but whether they will be designated or not should be stipulated in the applicant's by-laws

- 1 seat to represent community centre(s), appointed by a body representative of such centres if such a body exists, or by the municipality if it does not.
- 1 or more seats to represent minority language or ethnic groups that exist in the community, to ensure that the channel's access policies welcome users of the channel that wish to produce in a minority language. To be appointed by a body that represents such group(s) if such a body exists. If no such body exists, the seat shall be selected according to a process determined by subcommittee of minority-language or ethnic organizations consisting of any such organizations that wish to be members and participate in election or nomination of this seat..
- Other designated seats for important sectors that may exist in a given community, not represented in the list above, to be added to the by-laws.

BOARD APPOINTMENTS

- 1 seat for a lawyer, to provide legal advice to the board;
- 1 seat for an accountant;

- Up to 3 additional seats that may be added from time to time to add particular expertise and skill sets to the board.

BY ELECTION OF THE MEMBERSHIP

- 3-6 seats for producing members, depending on community size, elected by producing members, to represent their needs with respect to the usability and accessibility of the centre and its day-to-day policies and practices.
- 1-3 other seats for producing OR non-producing members, elected by both producing and non-producing members. (Non-producing members may include interested viewers and community leaders, who are not currently producing).

The number of seats to be voted by the membership (the total voted by producing and non-producing members) should be stipulated in the by-laws and scaled to community size.

Appendix C

Information/Criteria to Assess Proposed Applicants

1. Please describe your existing organization:
 - a) its mandate
 - b) board structure and current members
 - c) clientele (numbers of individual and organizational users in your community)
 - d) current media output or capacity (i.e. radio, TV, online media, gaming) in terms of hours of broadcast or streamed original production per week, web pages per week, or games in each medium.

If you are applying in partnership with another community media organization in order to work together to offer multimedia services to your community, each organization should answer this question separately, but all answer should be included in a single application.

2. Please describe any modifications to your board that you believe would be appropriate to fulfill a broad community access mandate, with reference to the recommended board structure in the application guidelines. Confirm whether such adjustments are possible given your current by-laws, and the names of any new board members that would be added via this process. For each board seats in the recommended structure in appendix D that are for key community institutions such as the municipality or the public library, please provide proof that you have spoken to these institutions and that they support your application.

If you believe that a different board structure is more appropriate to accomplish this mandate in your community, please provide details.

3. Please describe the other sources of local media in your community, including print or online sources, as well as traditional TV or radio broadcasters.
4. Describe why you would like to participate in this trial. Please substantiate your interest and ability (with additional funding) in offering media services (radio, TV, online media or gaming) that would be new for your organization. For example, if you currently broadcast radio but you would like to add television broadcasting, describe your goal or the anticipated impact on the community and audiences in adding the additional medium or media.
 - a) The Commission has indicated its concern that Canadians have access to adequate local reflection, information and events coverage. Please comment on how different

media services that you would provide would meet that need in your community, considering the differing strengths of online information, live and pre-recorded radio and TV content, and games.

- b) Comment on how the news, information, and local event coverage that you would provide would be complementary or different to other sources of local information in your community and whether you would be collaborating with those sources. If you plan to collaborate with other sources, please provide a letter supporting the planned partnership.
 - c) Please comment on the availability of media training in your community, and how your organization will be filling a need that is complementary or different to other local media training opportunities.
4. What is your current average annual operation budget? What additional infrastructure (capital expenditures), staffing, and operational budget would be necessary in addition to current revenue sources to offer TV, radio, online media and game development? Provide details regarding the additional space, equipment, and personnel that you would need, including their skillsets. Feel free to refer to the recommended budget suggested in the application guidelines.
 5. Describe what you see as the possible synergies for your organization and for your community in co-ordinating multiple media services?
 6. Please describe whether you would offer production support in these multiple media from a single or multiple locations within your community, and your rationale. For example, if you are located in a medium to large community you may wish to offer equipment loan or editing capacity from public library branches in addition to a central studio facility, or you may wish to install permanent Robocams at public locations such as sporting facilities, municipal council offices, or performance spaces... wherever the public currently congregates for current events. Note that the Commission's policies for community TV since the 1970s have included a concern that community media should enhance open governance, with the capacity of televising municipal council meetings, at a minimum.
 7. Is there anything else that we should consider in assessing your community's readiness to participate in this trial and its likelihood for success?
 - Please share any historic, social, economic or other factors that make your community different or which highlight a special need or role for community media in your community at this time.

- Given these unique factors, what should be the Commission's measurement for success of the trial in your community?

APPENDIX D

COMMUNITY TELEVISION POLICY TO GOVERN COMMUNITY MEDIA CENTRES

Objectives

The Policy has been created to satisfy the following objectives for community media policy:

- *Equitable and more transparent funding for community media*
- *Greater community ownership and involvement in community television production specifically*
- *Offer training and equipment to produce radio, TV, Internet, and new media/digital content from multimedia facilities maximally accessible to Canadians*
- *Distribute that content*
 - *over the air, free of charge*
 - *on the cable basic tier,*
 - *on satellite to the extent that there is available bandwidth for the carriage of local channels*
 - *via new media, including the Internet, (live and on-demand), wireless devices, podcasts*

Community Media Centres

Community Media Centres will be required to:

- be not-for-profit organizations, the structure of which provides for membership, management; operation and programming primarily by members of the community to be served, on a non-discriminatory basis;
- provide a detailed description of the nature of the proposed service;
- provide the geographic area to be served over the air (if applicable) and/or via terrestrial BDUs; and
- demonstrate that the proposed undertaking would be operated in accordance with this policy;

The Commission will authorize Community Media Centres for a specific geographic community.

For the balance of this policy, the term “Licensee” shall Community Media Centres authorized by the Commission for participation in the trial.

Licenseses will be expected to fulfil all the applicable provisions of the policy set out below throughout the trial period.

Role and Objectives

The role of the Licensee channel should be primarily of a public service nature, facilitating self-expression through free and open access by members of the community. The Licensee channel should (the “Community Television Goals”):

- engender a high level of citizen participation and community involvement in community programming on all digital media and by all distribution platforms;
- actively promote citizen access to the community channel and provide and promote the availability of related training programs;
- provide feedback mechanisms, such as advisory boards, to encourage viewer response to the range and types of content aired;
- seek out innovative ideas and alternative views;
- provide a reasonable, balanced opportunity for the expression of differing views on matters of public concern;
- reflect the official languages, ethnic and Aboriginal composition of the community;
- provide coverage of local events; and
- publicize the program schedule.

Programming Requirements

Local community television programming

Licenseses shall devote not less than 80% of the programming aired during each broadcast week to the broadcast of local community television programming.

For the purpose of this policy, the Commission considers local community television programming to consist of programs, as defined in the *Broadcasting Act* (the Act), that are reflective of the community and produced by the Licensee in the licensed area or by members of the community from the licensed area. Programs produced in another licensed area within the same municipality will also be considered local community television programming.

Community programming

Licenseses shall not distribute on the community channel any programming other than those set out in section 27(1) and 27(2) of the *BDU Regulations*.

Licenseses are not permitted to distribute commercial messages on the community channel.

Licenseses are not permitted to distribute foreign programs on the community channel.

Licenseses are expected to adhere to the principle that local community television programs be given scheduling priority.

Professional major league sports programming

The broadcast of programs featuring professional major league sports, produced by companies generally engaged in the production of such programs, does not fulfil the objectives of this policy and will generally not be allowed on the community channel.

Access programming

For the purpose of this policy, access content is content produced by members of the community served by the Licensee, either assisted or unassisted by the Licensee.

Criteria for access content

The key criterion for defining access content is that creative control is in the hands of a community member, i.e. an individual or group residing within the licensed area of the community channel, and that this individual or group is not compensated for their involvement in the production. That is, the production is an act of personal or communal expression; it cannot be commissioned. Creative control consists of three elements:

- The idea for an access program must originate from a community member or group who is not compensated for their role in the production; and
- The community member must be involved in the production team either: (i) in an on-camera role (e.g., a personality or actor that appears in a predominant portion of the production); and/or (ii) as a creative member of the production crew (e.g., directing, producing, writing).

When a project meets these criteria, the Commission will consider that creative control is in the hands of a community member and consequently that the project qualifies as access programming.

The Licensee may assist in training and supporting community members in the production and distribution of access programming.

Exhibition

Licensees shall devote a minimum of 75% of the programming aired during each broadcast week to the broadcasting of access programs.

Access programming should be scheduled in a reasonable manner throughout the broadcast day, including the peak viewing period (7 p.m. to 11p.m.), and the ratio of original to repeat programs should generally be the same for access programs as it is for other community programming.

Expenditures

At least 75% of all programming-related expenditures, as reported under the reporting requirements set out below, shall be directed to access programming.

The expenditure requirement on access programming will take effect under the following conditions:

During the licence term, the Licensee shall expend on access programming, at a minimum, an amount equal to 75% of community programming--related expenditures.

The 75% access expenditure requirement will apply to the programming portion of community expenditures only. As such, technical, sales and promotion and administration and general expenses will not be included.

Expenditures for volunteer training and development and community outreach to generate access programming will be considered as eligible access programming expenditures.

Accountability and Reporting

Annual returns

All Licensees shall report the following information as part of their annual returns to be filed with the Commission and such information shall be made public:

Exhibition

Total hours broadcast and original hours produced

- i) By community members (access programming)
- ii) By other community-access licensees (access programming)
- iii) Produced by other non-community channel licensees (non-access)
- iv) Alphanumeric messages
- v) Other (to be specified)

Expenditures

1. Programming expenses (direct and indirect)
 - Produced by community members (access programming)
 - Produced by other community access licensees (access programming)

- Produced by other non-community channel licensees (non-access)
 - Alphanumeric messages
 - Other (to be specified)
 - Technical expenses
2. Sales and promotion expenses
 3. Administration and general expenses
 4. Depreciation

Furthermore, the Commission maintains the requirement of a preponderance of direct expenses over indirect expenses.

Volunteer participation and development and community outreach

Expenditures related to the training and development of volunteers, as well as those related to community outreach for the purpose of promoting and generating access programming, should be included within eligible access programming expenditures. For this reason, Licensees shall report on the following aspects related to volunteer participation and community outreach initiatives:

Volunteer participation and development

- Total volunteers in reporting year (# of individual volunteers)
- Total volunteer hours (hours worked by volunteers)
- Total volunteer training hours (received by volunteer participants)
- Total volunteer training expenses (can be included in applicable access programming expenditures)

Community outreach

- Total expenditures on community outreach (can be included in applicable access programming expenditures)

Access programming

Licensees shall file as part of the annual report the following, based on a reporting year:

1 Community outreach initiatives

- Number of meetings with the public
- Communication tools used to promote access opportunities (e.g. website, on-air announcements, participation at community events, visits to schools/colleges/universities, social media)
- Number of training sessions offered to volunteers

2 Access programming initiatives

- Number of hours of access programming broadcast during broadcast day and peak hours
- Percentage of access programming broadcast
- Number of requests for access programs by individuals and groups representing official language minority communities

3 Access programming available on other platforms

- Number of hours of access programming available on -demand (VOD), website, etc.

4 Composition of Board of Directors

- Names of members
- How often board met

Making Programming Logs Available

Licensees shall also make available on their web sites on an on-going basis for public scrutiny the programming logs the Commission expects them to keep showing categories of programming, including local and non-local programming, and access and non-access programming.