

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ernest Wilson,
Chairman, CPB Board of Directors Digital Media Committee

FROM: Michael Levy

DATE: 1 March 2009

RE: Aspen Institute Roundtables on Public Service Media

I. Introduction

Public radio and public television have served our nation well for over 40 years. Changes in demographics, economics, and technology, however, are now challenging the public broadcasting system with respect to audience, funding and, in some cases, relevance. At the same time, these changes as well as the interest of a new administration and a new Congress¹ are presenting the public broadcasting system with significant opportunities as it adapts to the digital era.

The purpose of this memorandum is to inform the Board regarding the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Public Service Media, provide a sense of the concerns that participants brought to the table regarding public service media in America, summarize the key conversation points from the first meeting (hereinafter “Aspen I”) and list the next steps in the Roundtable series and related events.

II. Background

Following the CPB Board Retreat in Palo Alto, California in June 2008, the CPB Board’s new Digital Media Committee, chaired by Dean Ernest Wilson, and CPB management engaged with the Aspen Institute Communications and Society Program to develop the “Aspen Institute Roundtable on Public Service Media.” Through a series of three, two-day long, conversations, the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Public Service Media aims to engage the major constituencies in the field in setting a vision for public service media in the years ahead as well as a roadmap for addressing obstacles to achieving that vision. In addition, it is hoped that the Roundtables will produce a set of actionable ideas to address opportunities for enhancing our service to the American people, consistent with our mission in education and news and public affairs journalism.

¹ Members of the Obama Administration have evinced a strong interest in public media 2.0 and Congress will be considering requests for funding for, and the possible reauthorization of, public broadcasting in the months ahead.

On February 1-3, approximately 25 stakeholders of public broadcasting, radio and television, members of the CPB Board's Digital Media Committee, led by Dean Ernest Wilson, CPB Board Chair Chris Boskin and Bruce Ramer, as well as CPB President/CEO Patricia Harrison, and leaders from other interested organizations met in Santa Barbara, California for the first Aspen Institute Roundtable on Public Service Media.²

Participants in the Roundtable included: Paula Kerger (PBS), Vivian Schiller (NPR), Larry Sidman (APTS), Tom Thomas (Station Resource Group), Rob Shuman (Affinity Groups Coalition/Maryland Public Television), Bill Kling (American Public Media/Minnesota Public Radio), Alisa Miller (Public Radio International), John Abbott (WGBH), Neil Shapiro (WNET), Steve Bass (Oregon Public Broadcasting), David Fanning (Frontline), Rod Bates (Nebraska Educational Telecommunications), Gary Knell (Sesame Street), Gordon Bava (KCET Board of Directors/Manatt, Phelps), Loris Taylor (Native Public Media), Patricia Borero (Latino Public Broadcasting), Orlando Bagwell (Ford Foundation), Walter Isaacson (Aspen Institute), Ellin O'Leary (Youth Radio), Josh Silver (Free Press), Joaquin Alvarado (Institute for Next Generation Institute/San Francisco State University), Robert Bole (One Economy Corporation), and Rachel Sterne (Ground Report).

III. Pressing Issues Presented

The Roundtable was divided into six sessions: (1) Setting the Context; (2) Surveying the Needs of America that Public Service Media Must Address; (3) Addressing New Media Challenges; (4) Reconciling with the New Realities; (5) Creating the Vision; and (6) Refining the Vision.

Prior to the start of the Roundtable, participants were asked to identify the three most pressing issues facing public service media. The below responses were used by the Aspen Institute Communications and Society Executive Director and Roundtable moderator Charles Firestone, to frame the conversation throughout the meeting.

A. Definition/Vision

(1) Defining Public Media – When there were only three commercial networks and PBS, the point of differentiation was clear. Today, what is it that makes public broadcasting so distinctive that the multi-channel universe, You Tube, the Blogosphere or Twitter can't supply without public subsidy? How do you define success?

(2) Public Media lacks a vision for: (a) exciting and compelling multi-dimensional integrated and complementary content that is distributed and accessed over TV and radio broadcast, broadband, Internet, mobile and social networking platforms; (b) the mission, structure and capabilities of local public media centers that operate at the highest levels across the spectrum of technology platforms; (c) strategic partnerships with government agencies, schools, libraries, cultural institutions and community organizations to raise awareness of and convene stakeholders involved in important issues; and (d) the creation and nurturing of national

² Invitations to participate were issued by the Aspen Institute in consultation with the leaders of PBS, NPR, APTS, CPB, Station Resource Group, Affinity Groups Coalition and the CPB Board's Digital Media Committee.

networks of public media centers, along with their strategic partners, organized to share information and locally produced programming around particular issues or common interests.

(3) We need a restatement of content imperatives for a 21st century media environment. The media landscape has changed enormously – for better and worse – since the advent of public broadcasting. What are the most critical issues of market failure that demand a public sector response? What are the most compelling dimensions of public service opportunity? In the largest sense, this is a renewed statement of collective purpose.

(4) Public media companies need to be created to be “significant community institutions” defined by their role in the communities they serve. They need to be built with the capability of addressing all audiences with content utilizing all technologies. And they need to be led by visionary individuals and boards.

(5) What will the new public service media look (sound) like and how will it retain its relevance in light of the demographic, social, political, and economic power shifts in the nation?

(6) New definitions or redefining old definitions. How do we define “media” in this new environment? Does it include citizen reporting, blogs, podcasts etc.? What do we mean by “accountability” as we invest in more new technologies and programming? How do we define “localism” in a virtual environment? What new metrics should accompany the paradigm shift in public service media?

(7) Relevance (in a rapidly expanding media and information landscape that already includes ‘public service values’ and content).

(8) Creating a ‘public service’ brand on the web, as in “What is the new public?” The Internet is our new, shared network with an ever-expanding media spectrum. Broadcast is used as the secondary medium to cross promote to the emerging primary/internet. PBS and NPR had a specific mission (as defined in the Act) and a relatively defined role to play in the broadcast spectrum. They developed a recognizable look and sound and included values that audiences appreciated (solid journalism, pursuit of truth, quality and inclusion). What now?

(9) Lack of clarity around public media’s mission and impact – articulating and understanding the need for public media in this media environment. As a result, we have not increased the size and diversity of our users. We do not think/act big enough as we are consistently worried about what can be lost, not gained. We need to forcefully claim our important role in American society. We tend to follow trends versus creating them and accept current constraints. This also contributes to revenue challenges (no big ideas, no big money from all potential sources).

B. Business Model

(1) Sustainability - The business models that were the foundation of legacy public service media have never worked well and now are in decline. In order for public service media to conceive and effectively execute a service plan for the future, sustainable business models are necessary.

Ideas, good intent, and positive purpose, alone, will not provide the resources necessary to realize the vision.

(2) Public Media lacks a business model that is appropriate for the level of citizen education and engagement that is required for the 21st century and that is possible as a result of multi-platform technologies. The current model is: (a) incapable of efficient and decisive decision making due to the lack of central authority and responsibility; (b) self-destructive as marginal and/or redundant operators dilute shrinking revenues in competition with stronger stations; and (c) rooted in operating models, technologies (i.e. broadcast) and management that is inadequate for the adaptation of the latest technologies in effective and exciting ways for public media.

(3) How is it possible to sustain a system that employs 20,000-30,000 people (with benefits and multiple administrative bureaucracies) who are producing and distributing when that work can be created online and be distributed at fractions of the cost?

(4) Public Broadcasting's structural, political and legacy-related obstacles.

(5) We need a new architecture for our service. We must preserve the strongest elements of the current station community – those that have captured a place as significant community institutions through important local programming, meaningful community engagement, evolution toward multiple services, and disciplined management and governance. We must leave behind costly infrastructure in outposts that add almost no value to the content delivery chain or net financial resources to the collective mix. And we must incorporate new public media participants who come without benefit of a noncommercial broadcast license.

(6) Fragmented infrastructure that duplicates costs and obstructs the coherent, coordinated implementation of policies and programming decisions.

C. Funding

(1) The economy.

(2) Public broadcasting was created with a funding birth defect that has resulted in political censorship of content, overt and hidden, and insufficient funding for a world-class media system. The lack of adequate funding has contributed to the lack of vision and an inappropriate business model. In the current era, it will be impossible to secure adequate, sustained funding unless the entire system is re-conceptualized and restructured in an exciting and compelling way appropriate for the 21st Century.

(3) We need to seriously review our funding models. We cannot be afraid to challenge the status quo, especially when it comes to Pledge. We have to create and innovate in order to thrive.

(4) Relying on the Congressional appropriations process to fund the CPB has left public media fighting for a relatively small amount of money, and under undue political pressure. America spends approximately \$1.35 per person per year on public media, compared to over \$100 per capita in European nations. With a collapsing commercial media system that has slashed entertainment and public affairs budgets, strong cultural, educational and public affairs

programming must come from the public media sector. That takes money, management and vision.

(5) Funding has to be adequate and non-politicized. Most importantly, it has to be sufficient to be truly non-commercial, both in broadcast and online. That non-commercialism is the cornerstone of our identity – the distinguishing and most trust-sustaining expression of our mission.

(6) Sufficient funding, especially (but not only) during difficult economic conditions. Includes both public and private funding. And seeking new areas of income. For example, consider e-commerce (not broadcast but internet) and video streaming supported by commercials (need to clear rights).

(7) Is it possible to change current market driven models of funding to increase the relevancy of our public service media; or is it time to explore new and/or hybrid models of funding? What partnerships for funding our public service media lie outside the current “federal” model?

(8) Reshaping the way in which we engage the public for support, so that we can raise more capital and see a greater portion of resources go directly to new content and experiences. The public media system can find new economies in the way we engage audiences, raise funds, and enlarge the community of Americans investing in Public Media.

(9) What new revenue sources can we tap to fund public service media?

(10) Surviving the economic crisis is clearly the primary and overriding pressing issue.

(11) ‘Public service media’ has depended on receiving public dollars. That makes the ‘bar’ for meaningful service much higher than it is for our commercial competitors, who are out there in the marketplace on their own.

(12) When public media was first funded in 1968, it was an almost non-existent player on the media landscape. None of us were invited to Herb Allen’s Sun Valley media mogul’s retreat – and we still aren’t. Few of us had measurable audiences. The vision was vague. The money that was appropriated was provided for a “dream” effectively espoused by E.B. White and a few lay and industry leaders. It was never meant to fund primary media for America. There has been no effective analysis since the 1960’s of what role public media should play or how it should be funded, and what appropriate funding means. As the strength of commercial media models like newspapers and broadcast television weaken and as new methods of distribution gain in popularity and use, public media’s role and relevance has increased but its potential and its future mandate has not been addressed. A case could easily be made that the federal appropriation should be a multiple of current funding (funding which essentially reflects inflationary growth on the 1968 base). While public media is often a lagging rather than a leading indicator, the current economy has caused an industry based on voluntary contributions, gifts from foundations and underwriting from corporate ad budgets, to be moving backwards from its modest successes. In view of what may be very significant funding declines in traditional support in the next few years we could lose much of the progress that we have made.

(13) As our current centralized public service media becomes decentralized due to the convergence of media, how will the funding be re-structured if and/or when other (currently non-licensed) entities also become eligible (in addition to legacy media: radio/TV) for federal funding? What stays and what goes?

(14) Politics. How will public broadcasting ever change when Democrats will protect it but not fully support its noncommercial funding and Republicans view it as a partisan “pork barrel” line item, which has outlived its usefulness in a digital age?

D. Technology/Innovation

(1) The digital platform. We have to build a robust and substantial digital infrastructure. It is the foundation on which the new public media service will be built, with access to the tools and technologies that will make it competitive.

(2) Adaptation. Public broadcasting must pivot to public media that is largely a digitally-based distribution model, which will require open minds and experimentation with formats, platforms, audiences, content, producers, and the definitions/boundaries of all these elements. Public media must adapt to a changing technological environment, as well as an evolving and shifting cultural environment in which the boundaries between institution, programming, and audience are changing.

(3) Digital Arts & Partnerships. Public broadcasting must continually invest in new forms of digital content, as well as promote the opportunities of digital content as a first response to community needs rather than a “For More Information...” We must recognize that digital content is a peculiar and particular form of media in that affords the opportunity to both engage and lead the user to action. The commercial world recognizes these facts and has created (and lost) great value in capitalizing on meeting the consumer where they live and offer leading edge digital services. When I ask organizations like Google, Twitter, Facebook and others about their efforts partnering with public media the most common response is “Nobody has ever asked...” Rather than be an innovator, public broadcasting must continue to be a rapid adopter of the market’s innovations.

(4) Accommodating, understanding the potential and making the best use of so-called new media and digital, both in terms of distribution and production. (For example, streaming).

(5) Creation of a system-wide new media strategy that attracts younger, more diverse viewers/users.

(6) Innovation and relevance in a dynamic media environment. If innovation is driving technology at lightning speed, how do we address the regulatory needs of an industry that often does not keep up; and which continues to hold diverse access, control and ownership of media facilities at bay? What are the hardware versus software issues? How should we build, encourage or advance community media capacity? Developing and sustaining cross platform applications while broadening audience appeal to new demographics is essential.

E. Content

(1) Improving the quality of programming, the diversity of public broadcasting (in every sense of the word) and balance (again, in every sense of the word, from political to content -- meaning educational, news, entertainment etc). Taking advantage of multi-casting opportunities.

(2) With traditional television viewing at historic levels, as PBS considers the options and opportunities relating to the distribution of content, it is imperative we remind ourselves of the scale of the audience utilizing and relying upon our current service and legacy series. Any transition to the future would best be built upon the proven performance of the present. The opportunities presented by multiplatform distribution are considerable as well. Public service media must assure the content it provides is representative of the diversity within our society and our world and meets the needs created by errors of market failure with an emphasis on service to children, the arts, and public affairs.

(3) Localism. The sources of public service media are stronger because of their distributed nature. In this time of diminished presence of local mainstream media, public service media should seize the opportunity presented by the technical and human infrastructure we have in place and respond to this significant market failure with unique and valued local content and services, empowering the local community to exercise its voice through participation in the production of as well as the consumption of local content and services.

(4) Localness. How can local and regionally based public service media organizations shape their present programs and services to their audiences in a way that is economically sustainable?

(5) Relevance. Public media needs to keep its finger on the pulse of what's happening in the country and the world. We need to create programming that responds quickly to the current environment and it must be both informational and educational.

(6) Relevancy. This has been expressed in many different ways and formats, but for public broadcasting to meet the challenges of the digital age (as well as for future broadcasting) it must become more relevant to more audiences. Relevancy is not just about authenticity, which is telling 'real' stories and reflecting the experiences of a diverse audience. Relevancy is also about utility -- the factor of being applicable to the opportunities and problems of everyday life. Public broadcasting must help people navigate their world, their community, but also their daily lives. Once that challenge is engaged, the audiences will bring their loyalty and attention.

(7) A reinvigoration of localism, diversity, and education as our core mission is vital.

(8) Public Journalism. There has never been a more critical time in journalism. Amid the collapse of the network news divisions, the death of newspapers, and the growing partisanship of cable news, there is an opportunity to gather together the accumulated intelligence and journalistic talent that has become available in the marketplace, and create a new integrated news and current affairs division. There is an extraordinary opportunity to build on the new online platform, and with the audio and video assets of public radio and public television's best

offerings, create a world-class journalistic entity. Journalism lies at the heart of much of what public broadcasting has always offered, from science to history to the arts, and this new enterprise will set the standards for the entire system. This is the great opportunity for public service media to serve the most profound need for the country and the democracy. And grow the audience.

(9) The crisis of foreign coverage. How will the media provide responsible coverage of world news going forward as foreign bureaus are often the first budget items to be cut? Responsible, vetted citizen journalism can fill this gap by providing original reporting, information updates and video/photo coverage.

F. Diversity

(1) Lack of diversity at CPB and PBS and regional stations, and lack of innovative, diverse prime time content.

(2) We need to shape an enterprise that is inclusive of a diversity of people in all its dimensions – those who create and control it, those who are served by it, those whose lives and values that are reflected through it. And we need to address how such an inclusive enterprise competes in an increasingly segmented communications marketplace. This is most urgent with respect to inclusion of people of color, but it extends in other dimensions as well.

(3) Catching up. Public broadcasting is currently behind the curve in terms of where the web/audience is; that is due largely to a lack of diversity in workforce (in age, ethnicity and region). A workforce that better reflects the national audience will create content and technology to serve it. We now have a President who uses new media and its 2.0 tools with far more facility than public broadcasting.

(4) Recognize the strengths in our diverse structure. Even as it can pose some real challenges to us, we often see our diverse structure and editorial sources as primarily a weakness when in many cases, it is also a strength.

G. Audience Participation/Engagement

(1) Audiences. Become more “porous” and inviting. How can our audiences and communities feel that they are in a relationship with their public service media providers? How can we build on the reputation of trust and authenticity that has informed our work thus far? By developing new ways to engage audiences with editorial programs and experiences, enhancing and invigorating communities.

(2) Taking Action. Public broadcasting must embrace the opportunities to materially improve the lives of citizens by helping them navigate major life moments. The richness of digital media is that it pierces the barrier between engagement and action. In the traditional analog world inspiration might occur at the television screen or radio speaker, but then that inspiration does not translate into action because, for example “the kids have to be put to bed” or “I need to run to the grocery store.” With digital, the action step can coexist and even be a part of the inspirational

process. However, the biggest hurdle is not technological, but rather embracing the need to help solve problems and not just report on them.

(3) How can our public service media reach out to and sustain existing, un-served and underserved audiences in meaningful ways that encourages and includes greater citizen participation in our democracy?

(4) Involving the public in public service media. With the rise of the internet, media is no longer a unidirectional, one-to-many system. If public service media is meant for the public good, how can we enable the public to play a greater role in this system? There is much we can do to involve more input from the public, and greater interactivity, from content submission, feedback and rating system to social networks, RSS, video and Twitter.

H. Leadership and Governance

(1) Because the public media community has been pushed into a defensive posture for so many years, it is difficult to gather the collective will and courage to challenge the root of public media's problems: poor public policy. The new political environment in Washington is an immense opportunity, but one that cannot be squandered. This is the time for bold steps and innovation.

(2) Leadership and funding are inextricably linked. You cannot attract high quality management and leadership with insufficient funding. Public media is a prisoner of its low funding which begets low expectations of its leaders and therefore low performance. Public media's potential and mission both vastly exceed the capability of most of its leaders. Many are hired into a "faculty" salary scale when in fact their job potential may exceed the impact and mission of the president of their university. Few are hired at pay scales that reflect the "market" for major media companies. Visionary leaders are unlikely to accept those kinds of jobs and those pay scales.

(3) Lack of system-wide commitment to innovation in core content and multiplatform potential; the need for courageous leadership, ability/willingness/commitment to pick winners and recognize in money, support, etc., the best stations and content providers who are dedicated to the future. An overall lack of understanding of what drives innovation is key component of this problem. Public media tends to bring everyone together to push "innovation" and yet this often runs counter to how innovation actually works. There is a lack of financial incentives to significantly support innovators. We need new voices and new perspectives at the table.

(4) The primary reason we have neither the money required to reach the potential of public media nor the leadership, is because of the governance structure. Too many public media companies are imbedded into other organizations with more limited missions: Universities, private colleges, and community entities. They belong in well-designed independent non-profit companies where they can achieve their full potential, not in institutions that subtract from their potential. Over time, the politicization of the governance of CPB (as compared to the original CPB Board where trustees were chosen because of their achievements, vision and commitment) has resulted in timidity, sometimes dysfunctional and rarely visionary public broadcasting

organizations. To succeed, public media has to be re-launched, reorganized, re-funded and re-potted to attract a new generation of capable, market competitive leaders operating within appropriate governance structures and fueled with a significant commitment of funding by Congress. We have a start. Much value has been created in forty years during which time the competitive landscape has changed dramatically and the technology for content development and distribution changes almost daily. Taking those successes and assisting them to become significant, focused, competitive, independent, non-profit community institutions will cause them to reach their potential.

(5) Cooperation. Public media has been like a series of islands -- existing together in the same unpredictable waters -- but each disconnected from the other. We need to cooperate and collaborate, we need to listen to each other and learn from each other. This will keep us strong.

(6) In re-designing the people's public service media, what types and kinds of leadership do we need at the table? Private sector, non-profit sector, government, people of color et cetera.

IV. Discussion Summary

A. Vision for Public Service Media 2.0

The first Aspen Institute Roundtable on Public Service Media was marked by robust and frank discussion of the role of public service media. There was broad agreement on public service media's core missions, namely education and news and public affairs journalism as well as the need to strengthen our efforts going forward in these two areas through innovation and collaboration. There was also absolute agreement on the need for greater diversity in every facet of public service media, reflecting the great diversity of our society today. As the participants considered public service media, a number of points of consensus emerged, including:

- (1) The principal goal of Public Service Media 2.0 should be to enhance the lives of the American people by providing unbiased information, tools and other resources that inform, educate, expand the cultural experience, and help create community and sustain our civil society.
- (2) Public Service Media 2.0 should be most closely associated with trust and trusted content. The content should be designed to support distribution across multiple platforms and where appropriate be interactive. Public Service Media content should be available on cell phones, CATV and satellite networks, the Internet as well as private networks and last, but not least, over broadcast radio and TV, which continues to be a vital component of Public Service Media in America.
- (3) Public Service Media 2.0 should be associated with content that the majority of Americans, but especially those who are historically underserved, need in order to make informed choices about their community, educational, political, family and economic life. We should pay particular attention to communities where other resources of information and news fail to meet their needs in a timely and effective manner.

- (4) Public Service Media 2.0 content should be broad-based, with many different voices of high quality and trust. The content should include interactive dialogue with, and contributions from those outside the ‘historic system’ as well as a forum for public debate. The ‘system’ should not create the majority of the content but should act as both a curator to insure quality and integrity appropriate to the need and a navigator for the user to find the best content possible.
- (5) Public Service Media 2.0 content and content creators should more completely reflect the population of the country, in age, gender, ethnicity and race. Public Service Media 2.0 should be diverse and work to enable diverse voices to be accessible, distributed and heard. Public Service Media 2.0 should seek to enhance local content creation and access and promote its distribution. Content creators should be served by a public media system which develops and operates shared facilities for the storage, editing and distribution of content and provides technological support for financial transactions.
- (6) Funding for the system should be a hybrid of governmental, foundation, corporate and individual support enhanced with licensing, advertising and use fees consistent with the brand and trust it represents, with the fees utilized in support of content creation, editing, curation, and distribution.

From the above, the following draft vision statement was crafted for review, further amendment, and eventual adoption:

“Public Service Media 2.0 will be a multi-channel network of diverse non-profit creators and distributors of high-quality non-commercial content that informs, educates, inspires, engages, promotes democratic governance, provides access to arts and culture, and builds capacity in the diverse American people in their homes and communities throughout the nation. This network, building on the assets of existing public media, will use digital tools to be universally accessible and engaging.”

B. The Barriers to Achieving the Mission/Vision

There was general consensus among the participants on the nature of the barriers to fulfilling the mission/vision for Public Service Media 2.0, including: funding, leadership and organizational structure.

Funding. Participants discussed the problems public media has in terms of making its case for funding, including: prospecting, maintaining national reference files, cultivating other sources of revenue (for example, that might come from serving a younger demographic); utilizing the public as advocates through *My Source*; and developing new tools, especially in the digital space for fundraising to supplement or replace Pledge (At the same time, it was noted that public media receives contributions from over five million households and that provides the system with a great opportunity for expansion).

Leadership. Participants discussed the need for courage to move forward with hard choices; to advance a clear mission that focuses on our strengths and moving into new markets; the need to create a culture of risk and innovation; the need for greater agility, speed and urgency; the need to reward those are changing the paradigm; and the need to bring in broader and more diverse

publics. In addition, the participants discussed the need to engage a new generation of leaders in public service media.

Structure. Participants cited the weaknesses and (relative strengths) of various types of licensees and stressed the need for having a public service media structure that will serve our future; the need for collaboration among public media organizations and stations; the need for partnerships nationally and in the community; and the need to address inefficiencies in the system, including duplication of effort, with a particular focus on back-office operations.

C. Opportunities Identified

During the course of the Roundtable, a number of opportunities were identified for near-term collaboration across platform and in the digital space and constructive ideas surfaced, including:

- Building out on the CPB/KETC (St. Louis) mortgage crisis initiative to create a national collaborative, multi-platform effort that would work to assist individuals and families facing financial hardship as a result of the economic crisis.
- Developing a public radio – public television collaboration for news and public affairs in the digital space.
- Developing a branded approach to news and public affairs programming in specific spaces that public media could “own” such as on the economy/financial issues (“following your money”); and being a public watchdog (regarding for example how bailout and stimulus money is being spent).

After Action. Individual conversations on each of these opportunities/ideas have been taking place in the aftermath of the first Aspen Roundtable. Meetings among interested parties – radio and television -- have been scheduled during the first ten days of March to attempt to move forward on each idea.

V. Next Steps

- Prior to Aspen II, CPB will be engaging a broad group of general managers – radio and television (up to 200) in a virtual focus group process to gain their input on the vision/mission for Public Service Media 2.0, obstacles/barriers to achieving that vision as well as opportunities that they are seeing for enhancing our service to the American people.
- CPB management and the Board’s Digital Media Committee, together with our partners at NPR, PBS, APTS, the Station Resource Group and the Affinity Group coalition, as well as with the Aspen Institute, are working to identify participants for Aspen II (scheduled for May 17-19 at the Wye River Plantation in Maryland).
- At the same time, we are also working to develop the agenda for Aspen II, building on the work on Aspen I and aided by input from the virtual focus group process. The goal of Aspen II will be to finalize a vision statement for Public Service Media 2.0, hone-in on the four or five greatest obstacles to achieving that vision, developing actionable steps for

addressing those obstacles, as well as ways in which public media, working collaboratively across all platforms (with emphasis on the digital platform), can immediately begin to help people respond to the economic/financial crisis situations that they are facing.