

Study Group on Current Status and Issues on a Fair Receiving Fee Structure
Summary of Minutes (6th Meeting)

1. Date and Time: Monday, September 21, 2007, 18:00 to 19:30

2. Location: Special Conference Room 1 at MIC, 8th Floor, No. 2 Joint Government Building

3. Attendees

(1) Members of the study group (honorifics omitted; in the order of the Japanese syllabary)

Minoru Sugaya, Akio Torii, Kiyoshi Nakamura, Masayuki Funada, Haruko Yamashita (5 members)

(2) Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (MIC)

Ogasawara (Director-General of the Information and Communications Policy Bureau), Kawauchi (Deputy Director-General of Minister's Secretariat), Imabayashi (Director of General Affairs Division), Yoshida (Director of Broadcasting Policy Division), Takeda (Director of Satellite and International Broadcasting Division), Nagashio (Senior Planning Officer of Broadcasting Policy Division), Osawa (Assistant Director of Broadcasting Policy Division)

4. Agenda

(1) Opening

(2) Items on the agenda

Draft Study Group Summary

(3) Closing

5. Outlines of Proceedings

The secretariat gave briefings on the draft Study Group Summary.

(1) The key questions and opinions voiced by the study group members are as follows:

○ Reliability of the basic data used in calculating the contract rate can be ensured by securing the transparency. In that sense, the fundamental problem is that NHK calculates the rate by using undisclosed data. The first step is to make it transparent.

When people discuss such an issue, the two terms, "fairness" and "transparency," often appear at the starting point and in conclusion. Although these terms are very important, they are rarely

used in the summary and do not seem to fit well.

- The portion referring to the public comment on Page 32 seems like a proposal for securing the transparency.
- The description of item (c) on Page 20 (“the number of households with broken TV sets” and “the number of households whose home is empty over a long period of time”) seems a little confusing.
- In regard to the footnote 40 on Page 29, it may be more helpful to provide the date of the data.
- The “NHK has not provided sufficient information” wording on Pages 30 and 31 seems too critical.
- In regard to the “NHK has not provided sufficient information” wording, I personally felt that the description provided by NHK at the hearing session was insufficient as a rationale. We may need to ask the opinions of other members, including those who are absent today, as well.
- In regard to the issues of the satellite broadcasting receiving fee structure, the proposals stated in the summary seem quite viable in determining the reality. I would like to know how these could be explained from a legal perspective.
- I believe the “free riders” on Page 37 refer to those who take advantage of the receiver’s contract or other proper steps for unlawful purposes, but some people may think “free riders” are those who watch NHK programs without concluding a receiver’s contract. As readers who do not have any background knowledge could misinterpret the term, it should be changed to a more specific expression.
- In regard to option 2, the table on Page 19 lists “the use of statistics instead of estimated values for time adjustment” in the advantages while listing “possibility of errors as the base statistics differ from the statistics used for time adjustment” in the disadvantages. The latter seems to deny the former, which readers may find very confusing. The expression may need improvement.
- The key information in the outline version of the draft Study Group Summary is that the new proposal is likely to expand the estimated value of the parameter. It would be more helpful if the figures in the table on Page 19 could also be provided in the outline.
In the meantime, “Matters discussed at other study groups” on Page 38 include issues that will be crucial in future discussions. Therefore, it may also need to be referred to in the outline to help readers better understand the discussions held at this study group.
- In regard to “(b) Review of statistics as a basis for estimation” on Page 18, both of options 1 and 2 cannot eliminate errors to some extent, so the point is which of them should be adopted.

The description of the options is acceptable as long as it refers to underlying possibilities.

(2) Others

- It was decided to review the draft Study Group Summary by considering the opinions voiced from the members during today's meeting, modify it as needed, and then obtain approval of the absent members. It was also decided to invite public comment on the summary following the review. The entire process was left to the Chair's discretion.