ABOUT THIS REPORT

This public report provides the main findings and a selection of charts and maps from the fifth edition of the EBU’s Media Intelligence Service Licence Fee Report, published in October 2019.

It aims at providing a unique international perspective on licence fees – recent reforms, amounts, collections, etc. The issue remains crucial for European public service media (PSM) as licence fee continue to be their main source of funding. Furthermore, international benchmark is all the more needed since many licence fee systems are under scrutiny or being reformed to adapt to evolving media realities.

DATA SOURCES

This report mainly uses data provided by public service media organizations that are Members of the European Broadcasting Union (EBU). The information was collected in the financial section of the 2019 Media Intelligence Survey.

When necessary, additional information was obtained and/or cross-checked with official sources, such as licence fee collection agencies and regulatory authorities.

Additional economic and demographic data from the IMF (population, GDP, inflation and PPP conversion rates), Eurostat (mean household income) and Bloomberg (exchange rates) were also used in the report.

COUNTRY SAMPLE

The EBU is a professional association with 116 member organizations spread across 56 countries. This report focuses on the licence fee and similar forms of contributions by households to PSM funding. Fees were practised in 26 markets in the EBU area as at 1 January 2019.

When data refer to complete years or when exchange rates are needed, 2018 was used as a reference year. In cases where 2019 is already comparable, we provide the latest available data.

Of the 26 EBU countries with a licence fee in 2019, there were eight for which only partial data were collected - Albania, Algeria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Egypt, Greece, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia. This is why the statistics do not refer to the same number of countries in all sections.

Please note that the full report – for EBU Members only - is available on our web page: www.ebu.ch/mis
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KEY FINDINGS

26 EBU COUNTRIES (46%) STILL HAVE A LICENCE FEE IN 2019

Despite a trend towards dropping the fee that has accelerated over the last decade, as at 1 January 2019, the licence fee was still collected in 26 EBU Member countries (46.4%).

Among EU countries alone, this proportion rises to exactly 50%, with 14 out of the 28 Member States collecting a licence fee.

At both EU and EBU levels, the licence fee remains, by far, the main source of PSM funding, providing around two-thirds of the PSM funding mix (62.7% in 2018) in the whole EBU area.

IT IS AFFORDABLE AND ITS COST IS DECREASING

On average, the annual licence fee in EBU countries was EUR 136.83 in 2018, or 37 euro cents per day (40 cents in EU countries). That is far cheaper than most European pay-TV subscriptions.

The licence fee amounts to only 0.4% of GDP per capita on average, representing a limited outlay for European households.

Furthermore, licence fees are kept relatively stable over time so that the cost for citizens remains quite constant.

Discounting the impact of inflation, the licence fee has even declined by 8.6% in real terms from 2014 to 2018 in the EBU area.

AN INCREASED PRESSURE TO TOP-SLICE

The licence fee was originally introduced as a way to fund public broadcasters.

However, in the last few years some licence fee revenues have been used for purposes other than originally stated - other broadcasters, cinema activities, other purposes.

In practical terms, top-slicing reduces PSM revenues for the purpose of financing other activities which, in most cases, would be or were previously funded by the government.

In this regard, increasing pressure in favour of top-slicing licence fee revenues may be particularly damaging. And top-slicing for activities far from those originally intended undermines PSM legitimacy and public acceptance of the licence fee principle.

Sources: EBU based on Members’ data
KEY FINDINGS

THE FEE IS FUTURE-PROOF AND ADAPTABLE TO NEW MEDIA REALITIES

The licence fee collection mechanism is not set in stone and can be easily adapted to national contexts and changing audiovisual environments. There are also many different ways to reform the system, from changing the collection body to fine-tuning the scope of collection on the basis of the three main criteria – devices, households, businesses.

A recent argument in support of abolishing the fee is the technological obsolescence of a system based on the ownership of devices that are no longer indispensable for consuming radio and/or TV. However, most European countries have actually already adapted the licence fee to new consumption patterns. In 2019, at least 16 EBU countries no longer limited the scope of their licence to traditional TV sets (64% of the countries).

The reasoning states that new devices used for consuming TV and radio should be charged the same as traditional TV and radio sets, as they fulfil the same purpose. Reducing TV and radio to broadcast-only nowadays is neither fair nor realistic, especially when PSM are encouraged fully to embrace the new distribution channels. However, when expanding the scope of the licence fee to new devices, regulations need to be updated to avoid confusion and potential regulatory conflicts.

Another way to avoid legitimacy conflicts and regulatory disputes is to disconnect the fee from device ownership, as in the German and Swiss household-based models, or as is the case in several countries where the collection is carried out by electricity providers.

IT COVERS CONNECTED DEVICES IN 64% OF EBU COUNTRIES (2019, based on markets with a licence fee)

IT FAVOURS INDEPENDENCE AND TRANSPARENCY OF FUNDING

The licence fee mechanism is less flexible than state grants, which can be reviewed at almost any time and are therefore subject to political bargaining and arbitrary cuts.

In that sense, the licence fee guarantees stable funding for PSM, which in turn allows medium-term planning. The licence fee can even be revised periodically. In that case, negotiations should involve experts and PSM themselves, and be based on well-defined criteria including a preliminary assessment of PSM costs.

In 2019, regular reviews of the fee (annual or pluri-annual) were in place in 14 of the 26 EBU countries with a licence fee (53.8%).

Overall, the licence fee is more transparent for citizens than other funding mechanisms, and this transparency continually needs to be reinforced.

Sources: EBU based on Members’ data
KEY FINDINGS

THE FEE IS UNIVERSAL AND FAIR

As it is compulsory, the licence fee is sometimes described as unfair by those who do not consume public service media. However, the universality and public service remit of PSM ensure benefits for all citizens, thus requiring collective funding.

The regressive nature of the licence fee is also criticized - taxpayers may consider the flat rate system unfair. The counterargument is the existence of exemptions and reduced rates, which are in place in most EBU countries and cover 10.6% of the households on average across the EBU area.

However, it should not be up to PSM to bear the cost of such exemption schemes, as such social responsibility goes beyond the PSM remit.

10.6%
OF HOUSEHOLDS ARE TOTALLY OR PARTIALLY EXEMPTED FROM THE FEE ON AVERAGE IN THE EBU AREA

Data actually show that licence fees are higher and evasion rates lower in countries where PSM performance is strong. Although many different factors influence this, it seems quite clear that public acceptance of the licence fee is linked to the perception and performance of PSM. PSM should therefore make an effort to communicate the overall value that citizens receive by paying their licence fee: the content provided by PSM, its reach, impact and perception by the public; in a word, its contribution to society.

AND STRENGTHENS PSM ACCOUNTABILITY TOWARDS CITIZENS

More worrying than technological obsolescence is the social obsolescence of the licence fee, i.e. its public acceptance.

With PSM organizations facing de-legitimization, the fee should be considered an excellent opportunity for PSM to address criticism and renew their legitimacy.

The fee establishes a direct link between broadcasters and the public, making the former more accountable to their audiences. This link is unique to this funding system and should be fully embraced by PSM.

190 million
HOUSEHOLDS DIRECTLY FUND THEIR PSM IN THE EBU AREA

Sources: EBU based on Members’ data
HOW IMPORTANT IS LICENCE FEE FOR PSM?

LICENCE FEE IS THE MAIN SOURCE OF PSM FUNDING

PSM EARNED

EUR

22.59 BILLION

FROM LICENCE FEE IN THE EBU AREA IN 2018, ALMOST TWO-THIRDS OF ALL EBU PSM INCOME

Chart based on 68 organizations in 50 EBU markets. Sources: EBU based on Members’ data

EBU Media Intelligence Service - Licence Fee 2019 (public version)
26 out of 56 EBU countries have collected a licence fee in 2019 (46.4%). As the licence fee is more widespread in western Europe, this proportion grows to exactly 50% when considering EU countries only (14 out of the 28 EU countries).

The most recent changes in licence fee countries were the abolitions in Romania in February 2017, following a surprise legislative proposal in December 2016, followed by North Macedonia in September 2017, the French-speaking community of Belgium in January 2018 and Sweden in January 2019.

**Licence fee about to be dropped from all Nordic markets**

All the Nordic countries have replaced or are about to replace their fees by public service taxes. The Icelandic public service tax was introduced in 2009, and is included in the state budget. Finnish PSM has been funded since 2013 thanks to a special income-based tax, outside the state budget. Since January 2019, Sweden has replaced its fee by a similar earmarked tax on individual’s income. Norway will follow with an income-based tax from 2020. In the case of Denmark, PSM will be funded via allocations from the state budget from 2022.

**Widespread in western Europe and Mediterranean countries**

Most western and central European countries still have a licence fee, some of the most notable exceptions being Spain, and Benelux countries. However, the licence fee remains the preferred way of funding PSM in western and central Europe.

A licence fee is also collected in most southern Mediterranean EBU countries, such as Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, Jordan and Tunisia. However, the amounts collected are generally not substantial and PSM organizations mostly rely on supplementary state funding.

**No tradition in south-eastern and eastern Europe**

The situation is more varied in south-eastern Europe, where there is less of an established licence fee tradition.

Finally, countries in eastern Europe and the Caucasus region have experienced drastically different media funding traditions. Licence fee systems have never been introduced in these countries, where PSM still rely heavily on state grants and subsidies.
HOW MUCH IS THE LICENCE FEE?

LICENCE FEE IS AFFORDABLE

THE FEE COSTS ON AVERAGE ONLY

EUR 0.37

PER DAY & PER HOUSEHOLD IN THE EBU AREA

Note: 2018 data.
Sources: EBU based on Members’ data and data from official websites and collection agencies.
In 2018, households in EBU countries with a licence fee paid an average of EUR 136.83 (and a higher EUR 146.44 in EU countries). This was EUR 0.37 per day per household in the EBU area (EUR 0.40 in the EU).

Chart 1 displays annual licence fees in the 22 EBU countries collecting a fixed licence fee in 2018. Owing to the following factors, an international benchmark of licence fees must however be defined very carefully:

**VAT** - Whether VAT is charged or not creates a methodological caveat for licence fees, since the 2018 VAT rates ranged from 0% to 25% from country to country (see p. 23 for more details on VAT).

**Top-slicing**: PSM do not always receive full fee - In several countries the total licence fee amount collected is shared between various beneficiaries. The fee may therefore be set at a higher level than in comparable countries where it exclusively funds the activities of the PSM (see p. 30-35 for more details on top-slicing).

**PSM rely on the fee to differing extents** - In several markets, PSM do not rely heavily on licence fee income as they have other sources of funding, typically state grants or advertising.

**National specificities and scope of remit** - A striking case is that of Switzerland, where the licence fee converted to EUR is the highest of all EBU countries: under its public service remit, SRG SSR provides broadcasting services in the four national languages. Such a pluralistic policy results in significant additional costs compared to other markets of a similar size.

**Exchange-rate volatility** - The benchmarking exercise also involves converting the fees from national currencies to euros. Exchange-rate volatility may have strong implications for data comparability and may affect the results in euros, such as in the case of Switzerland and the UK with the major fluctuations in the CHF/EUR and the GBP/EUR exchange rates in the last few years.
When the licence fee is not allocated in full to PSM, it is normally used for related audiovisual activities. In several cases, however, the fee is also transferred to non-media institutions, putting the public’s acceptance of the fee at risk.

Redistribution, or top-slicing, of the licence fee is one of the recurrent issues brought to the public debate by those challenging PSM access to the revenues generated.

Who are the various stakeholders also benefiting from the fee in the EBU area?

**Regulatory authority**

One of the most common uses of the portion of the licence fee not allocated to PSM is to pay for the broadcasting regulatory authority.

In 2018, in at least five countries (Croatia, Germany, Ireland, Sweden and Switzerland), the regulators were funded from the licence fee, from minimal amounts (0.1% in Sweden and 0.3% in Switzerland) to the 6.6% normatively fixed for the Irish authority.

In the case of Ireland, this transfer has a specific purpose, the Sound & Vision scheme, which funds independent television and radio programmes on a series of topics that are later distributed by eligible broadcasters (not only PSM) under certain conditions specified by law. In this sense, part of the money used under this scheme indirectly helps to fund programming at the two Irish PSM.

**Other broadcasters**

The licence fee also funds public service programming in Denmark: 9.3% of the amount collected in 2018 went towards public service programming on the regional network of TV2 (commercially funded but publicly owned).

In Switzerland, the licence fee is used to subsidize local and regional television and radio stations (4.8% of the total amount in 2018), most of which are privately owned. The fee also pays for the Swiss audience measurement system with 0.2% of the amount collected.

Local channels in the UK have also benefited from a small amount of income derived from the fee (0.1% of the total amount in 2017). This was to support the launch of local TV channels in the UK. However, this scheme did not prove very successful and is being phased out.

**Cinema activities**

Another purpose of top-slicing is to pay for cinema and other audiovisual activities in general. In 2017, this was seen in France (2.3% allotted to the audiovisual archives, INA), Slovenia (2.0% to the Slovenian Film Centre) and Croatia (1.8% to the Croatian Audiovisual Centre).

**Government departments**

Government departments were also allotted variably significant proportions of the fee in 2018. The amounts transferred to the state were quite substantial in several markets, ranging from 4.0% for the ministry of culture in Denmark, 17% (incl. 4% VAT) for the ministry of economic affairs and finance in Italy and a breathtaking 23.4% in Austria (shared between the federal states, the ministry of finance and the ministry of art and culture, and not including a 6.9% share for VAT).

**Top-slicing and public acceptance**

Top-slicing of the fee may prove to be highly problematic for PSM, undermining their financial resources and ability to remain relevant and to innovate.

On the other hand, the sharing of the licence fee income between various media stakeholders might help in creating alliances and building the case for preserving the fee and this particular funding model.

However, top-slicing sometimes also benefits activities which are far removed from those originally intended for the licence fee. Such a phenomenon clearly undermines the legitimacy of the fee and its public acceptance, and this kind of top-slicing should be avoided.

Sources: EBU based on Members’ data
WHAT LINK WITH PSM PERFORMANCE?

ADEQUATE FUNDING IS KEY TO PSM PERFORMANCE

The higher the licence fee, the larger the PSM market share in their domestic markets. This clearly speaks in favour of guaranteeing sustainable, stable levels of funding for PSM organizations.

Licence fee amounts are closely correlated with annual PSM radio and TV market shares.

The correlation should not be considered as showing an exclusive, one-to-one link between public funding and performance, as PSM may only receive a limited share of the total licence fee, and they may also receive supplementary funding.

Interpreting the correlations

The fact that the level of the licence fee correlates with PSM performance raises several questions.

Are well-funded institutions more inclined to develop appealing, innovative programming, allowing them to perform better on their market?

Or, on the contrary, are the best-positioned organizations on the markets also better armed to negotiate with the political sphere for an appropriate licence fee?

Finally, are the more popular PSM organizations rallying massive public support, explaining the higher public acceptance of the licence fee and the opportunity to charge more?

Sources: EBU based on Members’ data
Note: trend line in Chart 2 stands for both correlations with TV and radio shares.
Note: Norway audience data 2017.
WHO COLLECTS?

WIDE VARIETY OF COLLECTION METHODS

There are almost as many collection methods as countries charging a licence fee in the EBU area. Four main types of collection agents were active in 2019: the PSM itself, electricity suppliers, postal operators and the tax authority.

**Electricity suppliers:** they are the most widespread type of collection agency, collecting the licence fee in 11 EBU countries: Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina (under a July 2017 agreement switching from telecom operators to electricity companies), Greece, Italy (since 2016), Portugal, Turkey and several northern African countries.

**PSM:** in eight EBU countries, collection is directly or indirectly enforced by the PSM itself. More precisely, in six cases (Croatia, Denmark, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia and the UK), the fee is collected by specific departments of the PSM. However, the work involved in collecting the fee might be so burdensome that the PSM organization decides to outsource it, while maintaining ultimate responsibility. In the UK, the BBC Licence Fee Unit has delegated licence fee collection to private companies. The latest BBC TV licensing contract was signed in 2011, for a period of eight years, with the private company Capita Business Services. The partnership was expanded in 2016 for two additional years, extending the contract to June 2022.

PSM organizations may also set up a licence fee collection subsidiary. This is the case in Austria with the GIS Gebühren Info Service GmbH and in Germany with ARD ZDF Deutschlandradio Beitragsservice.

**Post offices:** they are responsible for collection in three countries: the Czech Republic (partially in conjunction with the PSM), Ireland and Poland.

**Tax authorities/public administration:** in France, the licence fee has been collected by tax authorities since 2005, when the fee was coupled with the housing tax. In Israel, the “additional sum for IPBC” is coupled with the motor vehicle fee, collected yearly by the ministry of transport.

**Private companies:** in Switzerland, the fee is collected by a private company. The current company is Serafe AG, a subsidiary of the Secon AG group. It was chosen thanks to a public tender covering the period 2019-2025. Serafe replaced the company Billag, which had long been collecting the fee. Billag was a wholly owned subsidiary of Swisscom, the 51% state-owned Swiss telecommunications operator.

---

**Sources:**
EBU based on Members’ data

**MAP 2.**
TYPE OF COLLECTION BODY
(September 2019)

Note: In the Czech Republic, collection is organized jointly by the PSM and the post office.
WHAT SCOPE FOR THE COLLECTION?

ALL DEVICES COVERED IN 64% OF COUNTRIES

There is a growing trend to include connected devices in the licence fee. In 2019, 16 EBU countries (64%) no longer limited the scope of their licence to traditional TV sets.

Map 3 shows that there is no geographical trend for the inclusion of connected devices within the scope of the fee.

The group of countries where the fee is no longer based on any specific reception device is very diverse. It includes Germany (thanks to its household charge) but also several North African countries plus Turkey, Portugal and Serbia, where the fee is collected together with electricity bills and has long been disconnected from any notion of device ownership.

**Recent reforms expand scope of the fee**

The licence fee has been reformed in many countries over the last few years to expand its scope to include reception devices. Recent examples are not only the German and Swiss cases, but also the renegotiation of the licence fee settlement in the UK with the inclusion of the BBC iPlayer.

**Fewer countries have a strict definition of radio and TV sets**

About two-thirds of European countries with a fee have started to move away from the traditional criteria of radio/TV reception-devices ownership. The number of countries relying on the most traditional definition of radio and TV sets is therefore decreasing year after year.

In 2019, only five countries were still operating on the basis of this restricted definition: Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, France, Ireland and Poland. In four additional markets, Austria, Czech Republic, Italy and Norway, the fee was also covering devices including a tuner, which remains a rather restricted definition of a reception device.

Before it was dropped in 2019, the Swedish fee was based on traditional TV sets. It is worth noting that one of the motivation for abolishing the fee was the need to adapt to new consumption patterns and the growing number of households not owning any TV set.

Sources: EBU based on Members’ data

EBU Media Intelligence Service – Licence Fee 2019 (public version)
WHAT SCOPE FOR THE COLLECTION?
SECOND HOMES SUBJECT TO FEE IN 11 COUNTRIES

Defining which households are subject to the licence fee is less complex than defining what devices are covered. However, the definition of what constitutes a household, for licensing purposes, may also vary from one country to another.

Fee is usually charged to a group of persons
In half of EBU countries (52% of the markets considered), for the purpose of the licence fee, a household is defined as a group of persons sharing a housing unit. This corresponds to the traditional definition of a household.

In such cases, the fee needs only to be paid once, and second homes are not subject to the fee. This is the case in countries such as France, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Switzerland.

Sometimes, the fee is per home
In other cases, the licence fee applies to homes rather than households. A single household, with several dwellings, may be subject to several licence fees. In other words, second homes become liable to the fee. This was the case in eleven EBU countries in 2019 (48% of markets where information was available).

The countries requiring an additional licence for second homes are often those where the fee is collected through the electricity billing system (Morocco, Portugal, Turkey), as the fee naturally relates to the home.

However, second homes are also subject to the fee in several countries where the collection is organized differently, such as Austria, Ireland, Germany and the UK.

The 2018 ruling in Germany
In Germany, the fee has long been collected on a per-domicile basis. However, a decision by the Federal Constitutional Court in July 2018 (which found the fee constitutional) ruled that owners of more than one home should not have to pay the full fee for private use more than once. A fee-payer should not have to pay more than once for the same benefit, since this was incompatible with the principle of equality. Collection of the fee must be adapted before June 2020. Until then, owners of several dwellings can apply for an exemption.

Sources: EBU based on Members’ data
See also European Audiovisual Observatory/IRIS Merlin’s article on the German decision by Sebastien Klein.
WHAT SCOPE FOR THE COLLECTION?

BUSINESSES CONTRIBUTE IN MOST COUNTRIES

Only in Albania and Denmark are privately owned businesses exempt from the licence fee. In all other countries (90% of the total), they are liable. The payment system for privately owned businesses is less uniform than for households; hardly any countries operate the same system.

**Fixed fees**

Fixed fees may be set per company, per business premises or per receiving device. In the first instance, companies pay the same as a household, i.e. the price of just one licence per company. This is the case for Austria, Norway, Sweden and the UK, for most businesses.

Meanwhile, in Ireland and Portugal, the fee is paid according to the number of premises (sites).

Finally, in three other cases, the fee depends on the number of devices, with each one requiring a licence. This is the procedure in Croatia, the Czech Republic and Poland.

**Variable fees**

The unit price of the fee might also vary, depending on the size or the type of company.

The first option is to base the unit price on the number of receivers. This happens, for instance, in France, where the fee is based on the number of TV sets. Another possibility is to link the unit price with the number of employees as is the case in Slovakia and Germany, where companies pay from one-third of a licence (up to eight employees) to the equivalent of 180 licence fees (for companies with more than 20,000 employees). In Switzerland, the system changed in 2019. Swiss companies pay a variable fee, depending on their turnover.

Another way to distinguish between companies is through the nature of their business. In France, there is a specific regime for businesses selling alcoholic drinks. Hotels also benefit from specific regulations in the UK and Slovenia, where the first fee covers a certain number of TV sets and a reduced fee applies for every additional one. In Italy, the fee also depends on the type of activity – hotels, bars and restaurants, retail premises, etc.

The final distinction applied in some countries is the public or private use of the receiving device. In Slovenia, a higher fee is charged for receivers intended for public use.

MAP 5.

LICENCE FEE FOR BUSINESSES
(September 2019)

Sources: EBU based on Members’ data
A low licence fee does not necessarily decrease evasion rates. Nor does a higher fee increase the probability of non-payment.

One recurring argument against raising or adjusting the licence fee is that this would make households less likely to pay. According to this logic, the higher the fee, the higher the evasion rate.

Evasion is not correlated with the amount

Interestingly, the countries where the licence fee was higher were all countries with only moderate evasion rates. On the other hand, low licence fees in Poland, Ireland and the Czech Republic did not discourage citizens from evading.

In other words, the amount of the fee is not positively correlated with evasion. The two metrics appear to be disconnected. This means that there is no particular incentive to avoid paying the licence fee beyond a certain amount.

One could even reckon that an appropriate fee, adjusted to PSM needs, enables a sustainable and well-performing public service audiovisual sector, which would in turn encourage citizens to pay.

Another way to interpret the negative link between the fee amount and evasion rates is that only an appropriate fee provides PSM with the resources to combat evasion efficiently.

Evasion can be more accurately correlated with collection bodies

Collection by network operators results in varying levels of evasion: the two countries with the highest and the lowest evasion rates both collect the licence fee through network operators. This highlights the fact that there is no collection system that in itself is more efficient than others.

Ultimately, the most important criteria for efficient collection may instead be the policy environment and the incentives for external agencies to collect the fee efficiently, rather than the kind of collection agency.

However, wherever the PSM corporation itself has been in charge of collecting the licence fee, evasion is systematically low to moderate. PSM organizations, which of course have a strong incentive to prevent evasion, are therefore ultimately effective in enforcing the licence fee.

Switzerland is a unique case of public referendum on PSM public funding. The popular referendum took place on 4 March 2018.

The text aimed at eliminating TV and radio fees (known as “Billag”) and prohibiting the Confederation from subsidizing radio or TV channels in any way. The result would have been an exclusively commercial funding arrangement for the Swiss broadcasting sector.

The Swiss PSM, SRG SSR, might have been forced to close, meaning the end of public service broadcasting in Switzerland. Losing the licence fee would have affected not only SRG SSR but also most of Swiss commercial broadcasters. Without any public support, many of them would have disappeared, especially in non-German-speaking Switzerland.

Result of the vote

The Swiss citizens voted overwhelmingly in favour of retaining the licence fee; the “No Billag” initiative was rejected by 71.6% of voters. The initiative was rejected in all Swiss Cantons and across all Switzerland’s linguistic regions.

PSM funding supported by young adults

One of the most interesting results from the referendum was the fact that the younger generations did not support the proposal to scrap the fee.

A full 80% of 18 to 29-year-olds and 79% of the 30-39 age bracket voted against dropping the fee and jeopardizing the future of public service media in their country.

Surprisingly, the 40-49 bracket was the most favourable to the “No Billag” initiative, with only 60% rejecting this radical proposal.

Sources: EBU based on Members’ data
WHAT SHOULD I READ NEXT?

FUNDING OF PUBLIC SERVICE MEDIA 2019

This study offers an accurate and comprehensive picture of the financial situation of our Members, providing valuable data and arguments for their advocacy activities. In addition, thanks to the in-depth analysis carried out, the report highlights the impact of current economic challenges and changes to funding mechanisms in different markets.

Take a look at our funding infographic as well.

This will be available December 2019.

Visit [www.ebu.ch/mis](http://www.ebu.ch/mis) for more Media Intelligence publications.
SUBSCRIBE TO OUR MONTHLY NEWSLETTER

Join our many subscribers and keep up-to-date with the latest news from the Media Intelligence Service.

Our market data and analysis covers a broad range of topics affecting public service media, including TV and radio trends, new media developments, market structure and concentration, funding and public policy issues.

Subscribers will also receive an alert whenever we publish a new study.

SUBSCRIBE NOW
(www.ebu.ch/mis)
This report is published by the European Broadcasting Union’s Media Intelligence Service (MIS).

MIS provides Member broadcasting organizations with the latest market data, research and analysis needed to plan their future strategies and stay ahead of the game.

Our experts cover a broad range of topics, including TV and radio trends, new media developments, market structure and concentration, funding and public policy issues.

mis@ebu.ch
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