



29/30 September 2025



**Everywhere for Everyone, Always** 

#### **Team**

#### Presentation led by:

- Philly Moilwa Legal, Governance and Regulatory Affairs
- Dr Vuyo Nyembezi Technology Division
- SABC Team



#### Introduction

The SABC would like to thank the Authority for the opportunity to make this oral presentation on the Draft Digital Migration Regulations 2025.

As the Public Broadcaster, our mandate is to render TV and Radio services to all South Africans in all corners of the country.

South African audiences should be able to access SABC content regardless of where they reside in the country, and through whichever technology and platform is available to them to access this content.



#### Overview

**❖Part A – Highlights of the Draft Regulations.** 

**❖Part B – Draft Regulations key concerns.** 

**❖Part C – SABC's responses to submissions of other entities.** 

**❖Part D – Concerns on the status of DTT.** 



# PART A: Highlights of the Draft Regulations

## **Highlights**

- \* We appreciate that most of the SABC's responses/proposals to the Authority's Questions and Discussion Document on the review of the DTT Regulations have been considered in the Draft Regulations.
- ❖ The removal of the DTT/DTH split not only promotes a technology neutral environment but promotes the achievement of a 100% population coverage with convenience and comfort through multiple technologies such as OTT and DVB-T2 Lite. This is a welcomed change to the Draft Regulations.
- \* The 100% allocation of MUX 1 to the SABC and allocation of an additional MUX is also welcomed.
- \* Separation of MUX Operator and Signal Distributor functions is welcomed.
- Therefore, this presentation will deal with the following:
  - > The 36 months period for the "use it or lose it" principle;
  - > The Channel Authorization Process;
  - > Rollout and availability of set top boxes;
  - > Penalties.



# **PART B: Draft Regulations Key Concerns**

# Use it or Lose it Principle

❖ The 36 months prescribed for the "use it or lose it" principle is not in line with future expansion prospects of a Public Broadcaster. A special dispensation should rather be extended towards the Public Broadcaster to be able to provide services relevant to the public as and when the need arises within the allocated spectrum at any given time.

❖ We further suggest that licensees be rather granted condonation in cases where they cannot fully use the allocated MUX capacity due to external factors or financial challenges or any good cause.

❖ The future expansion prospects of a Public Broadcaster in the DTT space is also dependent on the digital migration process and availability of Set-top-boxes (STBs).



#### **Channel Authorisation Procedure**

- ❖ The Draft Regulations provides that ICASA may hold public hearings as part of the Channel Authorisation Procedure. Holding public hearings will lengthen the channel authorisation process for broadcasters except for Community Broadcasters which are excluded from this provision.
- ❖ Whilst it is appreciated that the Authority has not initiated public hearings during the implementation period; it is equally important to remove the said regulation with the view to level the playing fields and foster certainty, as this will allow broadcasters to be agile and responsive to audience needs.
- ❖ Public hearings may perhaps be held in exceptional circumstances where some clarification is needed from broadcasters.
- ❖ The SABC welcome fair and equal treatment between licensees for execution of the channel authorization process.
- \* Regulations should level the playing fields and foster certainty, as this will allow for agility and responsiveness to audience needs.

### Signal Distribution of DTT Services

- \*The proposal for the Regulator to invite other ECNS licensees to apply for the provision of services to a broadcaster due to the failure to comply with signal distribution stipulations is viewed as interference in the operations of broadcasters and has no legal basis.
- ❖ The SABC has reservations about this proposed action being followed in its entirety. Broadcasters should be independent to run their operations without interference from The Regulator.

We propose a tariffs structure for the signal distribution market instead of individual broadcasters.

❖ It is also advisable to have these regulations aligned with the upcoming signal distribution regulations for ease of execution.

#### **Penalties**

❖ The penalties proposed for contravening the regulations are too steep. A proportionate fining mechanism should rather be employed to specific contraventions instead of a blanket fine being imposed.

- ❖ The nature of the offence should be proportionate to the penalty:
  - a) For an example, a **R500 000 penalty for not applying for channel authorization might be deemed unreasonable**;
  - b) similarly, a R500 000 penalty for non-provision of an EPG may be deemed too excessive and unreasonable;
  - c) Thus, it submitted that a minor offense should not receive such a severe penalty.





### Spectrum usage

\*eMedia: The reallocation and granting the SABC two Muxes, means that the SABC has increased its percentage allocation of a Mux (or Muxes) from 85% to 200%, being an increase of approximately 135%.

#### **❖** SABC Response:

- a. The **SABC** is the only licensed public broadcaster in the country with the incomparable and wide public service mandate of educating, informing and entertaining all members of the public, in all official languages.
- b. The current 3-tiers of broadcasting systems exists to differentiate the existing types of licensees and this system is also supported by the AAVCM Draft White Paper.
- c. Thus, the **SABC should be allocated more capacity to deliver on this wide mandate**.
- d. The SABC is in a process to grow its channel offering to ensure that no South African language is marginalised.

#### Spectrum usage

#### **\*SABC Previous Response**

The Corporation has proposed, in response to Question 2, that it is allocated 2 MUXes. That is, it is proposing that the current Mux 1 allocation where it has the highest percentage capacity allocation of 85% be increased to 100% and 100% of the capacity of another additional Mux of Mux 4. The Community Broadcasters should be allocate a dedicated Mux for themselves as shown below:

Mux	Capacity	Broadcaster
1	100%	SABC
2	100%	Etv and DSTV
3	100%	Commercial
4	100%	Community Broadcasters
5	100%	SABC



### Use it or lose it principle

❖ MMA and Sentech proposed that licensees be granted 24 months to fill the allocated mux capacity.

#### **SABC** Response

a) The BDM Policy was developed in 2008 and to date the process has not been finalised.

b) This process has been marred with a lot of delays (i.e. inaccessibility of STBs, slow process of STB roll-out, litigation and may other challenges).

- c) Thus, it will be difficult to plan for **new channels with the existing regulatory and policy uncertainty.**
- d) The costs of the channels are also a challenge that need to be factored in on the channel growth plan.

## Use it or lose it principle

#### **SABC Current and Previous Position:**

a) There are high costs involved in the implementation of a broadcasting network which need to be factored in. The stipulation of the time period for the use of the licence capacity in the Multiplex places undue commercial challenge on the Public Broadcaster.

a) It is submitted that this provision be removed and give room for instances which are beyond the control of a licensee. For example, the Authority can grant licensees an opportunity to apply for condonation upon reasonable grounds, in cases where the licensee is unable to launch services on the allocated spectrum.



# **PART D: Concerns on the Status of DTT**

### Subsidised STB Registrations and Installations

- **❖ Status** of subsidised **STB registrations** unknown:
  - > Official registration figures in the remaining four provinces unknown;
  - > No latest feedback from the BDM PMO.

- **Status** of subsidised **STB Installations** unknown:
  - > Official STB installation figures in the remaining four provinces unknown;
  - > No latest feedback from the BDM PMO.

\*Active awareness campaigns activities to promote ASO and Digital Migration has subsided.



## **Rollout and Availability of STBs**

❖There are households who still don't have access to television services due to the unavailability of DTT Set Top Boxes in the retail market.

❖ These are the missing middle who do not qualify for the Government subsidised STBs and cannot afford subscription television.

\*Failure to adequately address this will leave millions of households without TV post ASO and render the Digital Migration process fruitless



### ASO Impact on prime-time audiences 2022-2025

#### \* Key Insights for ASO Impact Narrative:

- a) Audience cliff during ASO window (FY21/22): SABC's prime-time reach plunged by roughly 27 % year-on-year as analogue transmitters were switched off (Nov 2021–Feb 2022). Viewers without digital set-top boxes lost signal, triggering an abrupt migration to satellite (DStv) and other platforms.
- b) Persistent loss: Even after partial recovery, SABC growth remains 46 % below the FY20/21 baseline, showing that many analogue viewers never returned. This confirms that ASO caused a permanent redistribution of audiences rather than a short-term dip.

#### Channel vulnerability differs:

- a) SABC 2 absorbed the sharpest long-term hit (about -64 % vs FY20/21), reflecting its older, more rural audience segments least prepared for digital migration. SABC 1 lost about 45 %, while S3 remained flat but on a very small base.
- b) Competitors gained from disruption: eMedia held audience levels nearly steady (-1 % vs FY20/21) and DStv Total grew strongly (+27 % by FY24/25), highlighting how better-equipped rivals capitalised on SABC's analogue audience loss.
- c) Gradual stabilisation but no full recovery: From FY22/23 onward, SABC shows modest year-on-year improvements (about +3 % YTD FY25/26), suggesting that digital migration campaigns and content adjustments are slowing the decline but have not restored pre-ASO reach.

#### \* These points give a clear cause-and-effect storyline:

a) 1. Policy trigger (ASO) → 2. Immediate audience drop → 3. Competitor gains & structural shift → 4. Partial stabilisation with continued gap, supporting recommendations for stronger digital distribution, audience education and platform-neutral advertising strategies.

# ASO Impact on prime-time audiences 2022-2025

National	Live + VOSDAL		R %														_
Target						To	tal Indivi	duals (	(incl g	uests)	)						
Day Part group	18:00:00 - 21:59:59 Mon-Sun																
Date group\ <sup>Channel</sup>	SABC Group	F-O-F %Chan ge	Total eMedia Group	%Cha		F-O-F %Cha nge	SABC Terrestri al			F-O-F %Cha nge	SABC 2	F-O-F %Cha nge	S3	F-O-F %Cha nge	e.tv	F-O-F %Change	
FY19/20	14,2		7,0		8,3		14,0	)	10,2		3,0		0,8		5,4		
FY20/21	12,1	-14,8%	7,5	7,1%	8,8	6,0%	11,9	- 15,0 %	8,9	12,7%	2,5	- 16,7 %	0,5	-37,5%	5,3	-1,9%	
FY21/22	8,8	-27,3%	7,5	0,0%	7,2	-18,2%	8,7	26,9 %	6,5	- 27,0%	1,7	32,0 %	0,4	-20,0%	5,1	-3,8%	ASO during this fiscal Feb 22)
FY22/23	6,4	-27,3%	6,9	-8,0%	6,3	-12,5%	6,3	27,6 %	4,8	- 26,2%	1,0	41,2 %	0,4	0,0%	4,5	-11,8%	
FY23/24	6,2	-3,1%	7,2	4,3%	7,0	11,1%	6,0	-4,8%	4,7	-2,1%	1,0	0,0%	0,3	-25,0%	4,5	0,0%	
FY24/25	6,3	1,6%	8,1	12,5 %	8,9	27,1%	6,1	1,7%	4,6	-2,1%	0,9	- 10,0 %	0,5	66,7%	5,1	13,3%	
FY25/26 YTD (till Aug 25)	6,5	3,2%	7,4	-8,6%	8,0	-10,1%	6,3	3,3%	4,9	6,5%	0,9	0,0%	0,5	0,0%	4,5	-11,8%	
%Loss Current FY vs FY20/21:	-46%	)	-1%		-9%		<b>-47</b> %		-45%		-64%		0%		-15%		SABC

Source: BRC TAMS

# ASO Impact on prime-time audiences 2022-2025

Market	Activity	/	Variable													
National	Live + VOSDAL		are of ence%													
Target						Total	I Individua	ls (incl	guests	s)						
Day Part group						18:0	0:00 - 21:5	9:59 M	on-Sur	1						
Date group\ <sup>Channel</sup>	SABC Group	F-O-F %Chang e		F-O-F %Cha nge	DSTV Total	F-O-F %Chan ge	SABC Terrestria I	F-O-F %Cha nge		F-O-F %Cha nge		F-O-F %Cha nge		F-O-F %Chan ge	e.tv	F-O-F %Cha nge
FY19/20	43,3		21,3		25,1		42,7		31,2		9,2	2	2,3	3	16,4	
FY20/21	37,1	-14,3%	22,9	7,5%	26,9	7,2%	36,6	-14,3%	27,2	-12,8%	7,8	-15,2%	1,6	-30,4%	16,1	-1,8%
FY21/22	31,9	-14,0%	27,2	18,8%	26,1	-3,0%	31,3	-14,5%	23,5	-13,6%	6,2	-20,5%	1,6	0,0%	18,5	14,9%
FY22/23	27,4	-14,1%	29,4	8,1%	26,8	2,7%	26,8	-14,4%	20,7	-11,9%	4,5	-27,4%	1,6	0,0%	19,1	3,2%
FY23/24	25,0	-8,8%	28,8	-2,0%	28,1	4,9%	24,2	-9,7%	18,9	-8,7%	3,9	-13,3%	1,4	-12,5%	18,1	-5,2%
FY24/25	22,1	-11,6%	28,7	-0,3%	31,2	11,0%	21,4	-11,6%	16,4	-13,2%	3,3	-15,4%	1,7	21,4%	17,9	-1,1%
FY25/26 YTD (till Aug 25)	23,8	7,7%	27,2	-5,2%	29,4	-5,8%	23,0	7,5%	18,0	9,8%	3,3	0,0%	1,8	5,9%	16,5	-7,8%
%Loss Current FY vs FY20/21:	-36%	1	19%		9%		-37%		-34%		-58%	,	13%	o .	2%	ı

Source: BRC TAMS

#### Conclusion

\* High Signal costs and lack of competition in the signal distribution market continue to suffocate the SABC.

❖ ICASA's intervention in regulating the signal distribution costs through the Signal Distribution Inquiry and Signal Distribution Services Regulations is welcomed.

