

selected by itself, an affiliated video programming provider and/or unaffiliated video programming providers on the system.

[61 FR 28708, June 5, 1996, as amended at 61 FR 43176, Aug. 21, 1996; 62 FR 26239, May 13, 1997; 65 FR 377, Jan. 5, 2000; 65 FR 53617, Sept. 5, 2000; 67 FR 13235, Mar. 21, 2002]

**§ 76.1504 Rates, terms and conditions for carriage on open video systems.**

(a) *Reasonable rate principle.* An open video system operator shall set rates, terms, and conditions for carriage that are just and reasonable, and are not unjustly or unreasonably discriminatory.

(b) *Differences in rates.* (1) An open video system operator may charge different rates to different classes of video programming providers, provided that the bases for such differences are not unjust or unreasonably discriminatory.

(2) An open video system operator shall not impose different rates, terms, or conditions based on the content of the programming to be offered by any unaffiliated video programming provider.

(c) *Just and reasonable rate presumption.* A strong presumption will apply that carriage rates are just and reasonable for open video system operators where at least one unaffiliated video programming provider, or unaffiliated programming providers as a group, occupy capacity equal to the lesser of one-third of the system capacity or that occupied by the open video system operator and its affiliates, and where any rate complained of is no higher than the average of the rates paid by unaffiliated programmers receiving carriage from the open video system operator.

(d) *Examination of rates.* Complaints regarding rates shall be limited to video programming providers that have sought carriage on the open video system. If a video programming provider files a complaint against an open video system operator meeting the above just and reasonable rate presumption, the burden of proof will rest with the complainant. If a complaint is filed against an open video system operator that does not meet the just and reasonable rate presumption, the open video system operator will bear the burden of proof to demonstrate, using the prin-

ciples set forth below, that the carriage rates subject to the complaint are just and reasonable.

(e) *Determining just and reasonable rates subject to complaints pursuant to the imputed rate approach or other market based approach.* Carriage rates subject to complaint shall be found just and reasonable if one of the two following tests are met:

(1) The imputed rate will reflect what the open video system operator, or its affiliate, "pays" for carriage of its own programming. Use of this approach is appropriate in circumstances where the pricing is applicable to a new market entrant (the open video system operator) that will face competition from an existing incumbent provider (the incumbent cable operator), as opposed to circumstances where the pricing is used to establish a rate for an essential input service that is charged to a competing new entrant by an incumbent provider. With respect to new market entrants, an efficient component pricing model will produce rates that encourage market entry. If the carriage rate to an unaffiliated program provider surpasses what an operator earns from carrying its own programming, the rate can be presumed to exceed a just and reasonable level. An open video system operator's price to its subscribers will be determined by several separate costs components. One general category are those costs related to the creative development and production of programming. A second category are costs associated with packaging various programs for the open video system operator's offering. A third category related to the infrastructure or engineering costs identified with building and maintaining the open video system. Contained in each is a profit allowance attributed to the economic value of each component. When an open video system operator provides only carriage through its infrastructure, however, the programming and packaging flows from the independent program provider, who bears the cost. The open video system operator avoids programming and packaging costs, including profits. These avoided costs should not be reflected in the price charged an independent program provider for carriage.

## § 76.1505

## 47 CFR Ch. I (10–1–10 Edition)

The imputed rate also seeks to recognize the loss of subscribers to the open video system operator's programming package resulting from carrying competing programming.

NOTE TO PARAGRAPH (e)(1): Examples of specific "avoided costs" include:

(1) All amounts paid to studios, syndicators, networks or others, including but not limited to payments for programming and all related rights;

(2) Packaging, including marketing and other fees;

(3) Talent fees; and

(4) A reasonable overhead allowance for affiliated video service support.

(2) An open video system operator can demonstrate that its carriage service rates are just and reasonable through other market based approaches.

[61 FR 28708, June 5, 1996, as amended at 61 FR 43176, Aug. 21, 1996]

### § 76.1505 Public, educational and governmental access.

(a) An open video system operator shall be subject to public, educational and governmental access requirements for every cable franchise area with which its system overlaps.

(b) An open video system operator must ensure that all subscribers receive any public, educational and governmental access channels within the subscribers' franchise area.

(c) An open video system operator may negotiate with the local cable franchising authority of the jurisdiction(s) which the open video system serves to establish the open video system operator's obligations with respect to public, educational and governmental access channel capacity, services, facilities and equipment. These negotiations may include the local cable operator if the local franchising authority, the open video system operator and the cable operator so desire.

(d) If an open video system operator and a local franchising authority are unable to reach an agreement regarding the open video system operator's obligations with respect to public, educational and governmental access channel capacity, services, facilities and equipment within the local franchising authority's jurisdiction:

(1) The open video system operator must satisfy the same public, educational and governmental access obligations as the local cable operator by providing the same amount of channel capacity for public, educational and governmental access and by matching the local cable operator's annual financial contributions towards public, educational and governmental access services, facilities and equipment that are actually used for public, educational and governmental access services, facilities and equipment. For in-kind contributions (e.g., cameras, production studios), the open video system operator may satisfy its statutory obligation by negotiating mutually agreeable terms with the local cable operator, so that public, educational and governmental access services to the community is improved or increased. If such terms cannot be agreed upon, the open video system operator must pay the local franchising authority the monetary equivalent of the local cable operator's depreciated in-kind contribution, or, in the case of facilities, the annual amortization value. Any matching contributions provided by the open video system operator must be used to fund activities arising under Section 611 of the Communications Act.

(2) The local franchising authority shall impose the same rules and procedures on an open video system operator as it imposes on the local cable operator with regard to the open video system operator's use of channel capacity designated for public, educational and governmental access use when such capacity is not being used for such purposes.

(3) The local cable operator is required to permit the open video system operator to connect with its public, educational and governmental access channel feeds. The open video system operator and the cable operator may decide how to accomplish this connection, taking into consideration the exact physical and technical circumstances of the cable and open video systems involved. If the cable and open video system operator cannot agree on how to accomplish the connection, the local franchising authority may decide. The local franchising authority may