Abstract: This research aims to understand how public service media can encourage media entrepreneurship in the society to enrich user innovations as a source of ideas, products, contents, talent and creativity. The assumption is that media entrepreneurs turn users into sources of external creativity and develop user innovations into professional content. This study follows a qualitative approach with a document study of Denmark’s public service broadcast and two interviews. Findings indicate that the commitment to quality and professional content prevents managers of PSBs from outsourcing their production to media entrepreneurs, but they trust large media companies as external producers. This research contributes to the field by proposing that public service media can foster media entrepreneurship in a society indirectly and by creating demand for external sources of creativity. Large media companies that are contract-oriented, mediate the process of meeting those demand with media entrepreneurs.
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1 Introduction

In Denmark, public service broadcasts (PSBs) are rooted in a non-profit vertically integrated public institution financed by compulsory license fee. The PSB remit included universality of service, pluralism, diversity of programming, promotion of democratic processes, and strengthening of national language and culture [Nielsen, (2010), p.116]. Traditionally, public service broadcasting organisations (PSB), among other obligations, are expected to contribute to societal cohesion, nation building, formal and informal education and enlightenment [Sørensen, (2013), p.43].

“However, PSB changed continuously due to technological, socio-economic, political and cultural changes and since the mid-1980s several of the main pillars of PSB have been contested. This includes financial model, ownership, universality, programming policy, and non-broadcast activities. Anyhow, despite these essential changes and the ongoing political and cultural debate about public service broadcasting, public support for the existing form of PSB has been resolute in Denmark.” [Nielsen, (2010), p.116]

Nevertheless, advances in communication technologies and media convergence impacts on the media ecosystem worldwide and the PSBs are influenced by these ground-breaking changes too. Trends such as audience fragmentation and media reach changes many assumptions on which PSBs’ foundations are based. For this reason, it is necessary to rethink the mission and structure of public broadcasts and the way they adapt to new environment. As Jauert and Lowe (2005) argue, the key question in the research on public service broadcasting is the degree of relevance of publicly supported broadcasters in the age of commercialisation, convergence and globalisation.

The aim of public service media is to deliver public value (Martin and Lowe, 2013). Public value is what the public values most and also what adds value to the public sphere [Benington and Moore, (2011), p.14]. So, the users of PSBs’ are the receivers of value. Delivering what the users ‘value’ is the primary goal of the public service media. Here, user innovation plays a key role for public media to perform its mission. Crowds and users can contribute to activities such as collecting data, identifying problems, carrying out tedious work, rendering ideas, engaging in co-creative activities, voting for an idea, and developing solutions to a problem (Prpic et al., 2015). Von Hippel (2005) stresses on product development and modification by both user and firms. He identifies users as individual consumers and believes that user innovation from both users and firms are frequent, pervasive, and important. However, many organisations do not have sufficient insight on how the crowd can be engaged in innovation processes (Boudreau and Lakhani, 2013). Public service media is one of those organisations that has shown...
difficulties in utilising users innovation (Khajeheian and Tadayoni, 2014). They need creative and innovative ideas to deliver public value. Such creative ideas are scarce and difficult to conceive. As the creativity of talent pool inside the organisation is limited, media organisations and especially public service ones need to adopt new sources of innovation. Organisational transparency and recognition of user-led innovation are needed for future improvements in PSBs [Martin and Lowe, (2013), p.34].

Also, there is a growing trend of organisations tapping into the wisdom of the crowd to contribute to their innovation processes in order to create value (Ye and Kankanhalli, 2013). The sources of creativity are limited – especially inside organisations. Users are a rich source of innovation. This is because they are in touch with their needs, the needs of other groups of consumers and sometimes innovative solutions for solving the problems and needs. Media companies, in particular, depend on the creative content to successfully operate in market (Küng, 2007). However, there is low rate of innovation in PSB products that are derived from users (Khajeheian and Tadayoni, 2014). The authors base the research with an assumption derived from their previous research. This assumption is that PSBs can use user innovation to receive benefits in two-fold. The first benefit is to gain access to user creativity. The second benefit is to provide public value to the society by the promotion of media entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship enables individuals to create value for the society (Viswanathan et al., 2014). Thus, a service fashioned for the public is derived by providing the opportunity such services by developing the abilities of users to produce high quality content as well as assist them to commercialise their ideas. By helping users develop their innovative ideas professionally and commercialise their ideas, entrepreneurship in the society promotes and creates an inventory of creativity for PSBs.

By abovementioned, the main question of this research is: ‘how PSB, here DR, can benefit from users’ innovation to deliver value to the public?’

2 Literature

Nissen (2016) suggests a societal contract or pact between public service media and society. He discusses the obligations of PSB such as ‘to sustain national culture’, ‘to foster diversity and ensure media pluralism’, ‘to enhance social, political and cultural cohesion’ and to ‘to support citizenship’. Using his idea, two items namely ‘to foster opportunities for growth of citizens’ ideas’ and ‘to provide a space for release of public innovations’ can be added to this societal pact.

Jensen et al. (2016) have recognised five different forms of external funding (funding from sources other than license fee income). These funding sources includes: co-funding with external partners (most often foreign broadcasters and/or foreign distributors); canned programming sales; pre-sales of canned programming; format/remake sales; and international funds, both regional and international as well as pan-national funds.

Hope (2012) argues that users primarily benefit from using the innovation, while manufacturers primarily benefit by selling it. The conventional assumption is that manufacturers, rather than users, are likely to be the main innovators in any given field. This is because ‘making one and selling many’ items is assumed to be the most profitable way to exploit a piece of technology. By contrast, the user innovation literature points to
the empirical evidence that users, rather than manufacturers, are the primary innovators in many contexts.

Shah and Tripsas (2012) explain that user-innovators are likely to start firms. They also compare the competitive advantages of user-startups with established manufacturers. They point out that the likelihood that users will start companies is affected by their opportunity costs. In terms of resources and capabilities, user-manufacturers have natural information advantages with respect to user needs and desires. They may also obtain free assistance from members of their communities.

El-Ghul (2005) studied entrepreneurship in the non-for-profit media. She pointed out that PSBs, in her case, a community radio, are faced with the lack of proportionate funding increase from the government. Hence, they need to find ways to enhance sources of funding that maintains its status as a not-for-profit sector too. She suggests that media entrepreneurship is a way that can improve the source of income for public service media.

Another related concept in the use of external sources of innovation for organisations is the living lab. A living lab is defined as “a user-centric innovation milieu built on every-day practice and research, with an approach that facilitates user influence in open and distributed innovation processes engaging all relevant partners in real-life contexts, aiming to create sustainable values” (Bergvall-Kåreborn et al., 2009). Ståhlbröst and Lassinantti (2015) articulate four different phases for living lab namely:

1. innovation exploration
2. innovation design
3. implementation/realisation
4. evaluation and test.

Almirall et al. (2012) referred to those phases as contextualisation, concretisation, Implementation, feedback. This framework is applicable with regards to the study of user innovation in PSBs too.

Media entrepreneurship is a fundamental part of this research. Hoag (2008, p.79) defines media entrepreneurship as creating and owning independent media voices. This definition was previously presented in her joint paper with Hoag and Seo (2005). But Achtenhagen (2008, p.126) criticises this definition and implies that any person who starts a blog brings a new voice, but he/she is not a media entrepreneur. She, herself, defines media entrepreneurship as “how new ventures aimed at bringing into existence future media goods and services are initially conceived of and subsequently developed by whom and with what consequences” [Achtenhagen, (2008), p.126]. Khajeheian (2013, p.128) presents a concise definition from media entrepreneurs: “Individuals or small firms that use their own or others’ resources to create value by extracting opportunities via offering a service or product consist of any innovation in any of product/service characteristics, process, distribution channel or place, or different innovative usage, to media market, or any other market which media is its main channel of interaction”.

Hoag and Compaine (2007) credit media entrepreneurship as ‘marketplace of ideas’ and argue that entrepreneurs that enter media markets facilitates media innovation and ensure a diversity of viewpoints. Achtenhagen (2008, pp.138–139) argue that media entrepreneurs are change agents in society and five functions have been ascribed to them. Firstly, by adopting a mission to create and sustain some kind of artistic, cultural and/or
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societal value. Secondly, by recognising and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities that serves that mission. Thirdly is by engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning. Fourthly, by acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand, and finally, by exhibiting a heightened sense of accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created. Hang and Van Weezle (2007) characterise media entrepreneurs with risk taking and innovativeness, proactiveness and competitive aggressiveness and Hoag and Seo (2005) value media entrepreneurs for addition of innovation to the media marketplace.

Berthod et al. (2007) argue that the internet has provided a platform for media entrepreneurship based on user community innovation. By them, this new media entrepreneurship is characterised with user-contributed content; an interactive community; and network effect. Hindle and Klyver (2007) associate cultural values with levels of innovation and entrepreneurship in societies and believe that cultural values impact on innovation and entrepreneurship. Will et al. (2016) stress on the important role of media entrepreneurs towards finding solutions to the challenges of funding business models by the creation of novel and individual media services.

Hang and Van Weezle (2007) explain the reciprocal impact of media and entrepreneurship that assist us to connect the PSB to media entrepreneurs. They discuss essential characteristics of the entrepreneurial activities such as creation, innovation and novel ways of thinking. They argue that media influence on entrepreneurship by creating a discourse that transmits values and images ascribed to entrepreneurship and also by providing a carrier promoting entrepreneurial practices, and by encouraging an entrepreneurial spirit in the society. By these characteristics, media entrepreneurs play an important role in the society and lead to economic, social and cultural development. They also trigger the innovation and make real products from the abstract ideas of innovators. In all of these functions, we can put media entrepreneurs as a part of the ‘societal pact’ that Nissen (2016) has defines as a mission for public service media.

3 Theoretical framework

Theoretical framework of this research includes four models and theories that explain successful use of users’ innovation.

1 The competency-orientation theory: The theory explains the competence of the large firm to integrate large-scale operational efficiency with small-scale innovative capability through a distributed development work and an integrated production (Eliasson, 1996, 1998). It allows small firms to choose between growing aggressively on their own through acquisitions, or by being acquired strategically.

2 Transaction cost economics: Coase (1937) notes that firms incur some cost when buying a product or service. For him, firms and markets are alternative forms of organisation that manage the same transactions. And the choice of where to carry out these transactions influences their efficiency. Based on an analysis of the magnitude of these costs, entrepreneurs decide where the transactions should occur, either within the firms or in the market.
3 Theory of strategic acquisition: Eliasson and Eliasson (2005) explained the reasons for strategic acquisitions in markets. According to them, large firms are oriented towards large-scale operational efficiency. They also have problems with innovation capabilities. Small firms, on the other hand, are oriented towards innovative performance and pursuing radically new innovations. For this reason, large firms acquire small companies to enjoy from their advantages of innovation.

4 Theory of efficient media markets: Khajeheian (2013) expands the theory of strategic acquisition. He proposes that an efficient market provides the possibility of a match between large companies and small ones by facilitators. Though enterprises have an advantage in innovation and large companies have competencies in operation and access to resources, facilitators converge these advantages and create new opportunities by bridging the small and large companies. In this theory, innovations come from small enterprises (including individuals and users) and develop to professional products by large companies.

4 Materials and method

A quantitative strategy often limits the researcher’s ability to study context and environment. Adopting an ethnographic approach in non-quantitative research would enhance our knowledge and understanding of such pertinent and critical factors [Dana and Dana, (2005), p.83]. Because of exploratory nature of this study a qualitative approach was selected.

The first phase is documentary study. Using secondary data, the researchers acquired knowledge from the interaction of DR with its users and DR’s mechanism of dealing with innovation.

The approach of this research involves the thorough study, in depth and detail, of a limited number of objects, individuals or environments. Ideally, data collection in such research should include observation and interviews [Dana and Dana, (2005), p.83]. Thus, the second phase involved conducting interviews with practitioners in the industry. A set of interviews was facilitated with managers of PSBs, innovators, small companies, and facilitators. For this paper, two interviews have been conducted and analysed. The First interview was conducted with a manager of DR, Danish Public Broadcast. She is the manager of one of the TV channels and She manages the outsourcing of production. The interview lasted for 45 minutes. It was conducted by both authors in the office of manager. The second interview was conducted with a consultant from TV2 that was a PSB five years ago. Today, it has been transformed into a commercial television station. The insight and expertise of the consultant, who has experienced both different spheres of PSB and commercial TV and has worked with both kinds of managers, was found useful. The interviews were recorded using a digital recorder and then the voice file imported in MaxQDA 12, the software for qualitative analysis. The analysis is done by coding the interviews.
5 Analysis

5.1 Document analysis

DR commissions a portion of its production to external producers each year. The outsourcing contract specifies a number of initiatives aimed at promoting dialogue between DR and external producers. The contract notifies that DR shall prepare a plan for informing external parties publicly. DR’s obligation is to organise an annual external ‘producer day’ to inform the producers on the company’s considerations regarding programs to be placed for external production as well as DR’s overall program planning in general. Also, DR shall annually invite external producers to a ‘pitch day’, where producers will get the possibility to pitch new ideas for DR.

DR also annually defines the program portfolio in a strategy process that leads to a comprehensive program plan for the following year. This is usually presented to the DR’s board for approval in March. After which DR initiates a process for the internal and external producers. This enables the development of existing programs and the commissioning of new programs for next year’s programming. DR’s outsourcing to external producers within the period, 2011-2014, increased by 25 million annually. From 175 million in 2011 to 200 million in 2012, 225 million in 2013 and 250 million in 2014.

Pitch day and producer day: The aim of the pitch day in June was to give the producers time to develop ideas and program proposals to fulfil the wishes that DR had presented in the ‘producer day’. The pitch days are focused around the TV, as this is where the vast majority of the outsourcing and commissioning of programs were meant for. DR calls the producers with ideas for radio and internet to apply directly to the relevant editors in DR media.

Table 1 Demands on channels associated with producer and pitch day on 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DR1</td>
<td>Sharp journalistic series and documentaries</td>
<td>40 million DKK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspiring facts/lifestyle formats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Series that goes close to the Danes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The major new entertainment format</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR2</td>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>18 million DKK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reportages and documentaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR3</td>
<td>Visible flagship</td>
<td>11 million DKK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting – character with an edge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fascinating science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music on Saturdays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR Ramasjang/ultra</td>
<td>Comedy with volume for ultra</td>
<td>8 million DKK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Series for ultra with spin-off to Ramasjang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DR Plan (2014)
Figure 1 shows the shift from internal production to external and purchased programs during last 7 years. The shift is meaningful and depicts the understanding of DR in incorporating external programs to benefit from innovation outside the organisation.

External programs include programs purchased from external suppliers for first time viewing on DR. Purchased program rights include foreign films that DR bought the broadcasting rights to. Table 2 shows the amount spent on different categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>The change in production cost (in million DKK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External programs</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own production</td>
<td>297.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased program rights</td>
<td>123.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DR Yearbook 2007–2013

5.2 Interview analysis

The analysis of the interviews produced 73 codes. The researchers classified the codes in seven major categories namely: user innovation; quality and professionalism; social networks; Innovation development; decision and selection; production; and finally, facilitators.

5.2.1 User innovation

While creative and innovative ideas are the keystone for media companies, finding good ideas becomes harder. Media companies search for creative ideas everywhere. Although media companies hire best creatives and talents, but innovation inside the organisation is
limited and it is very hard to get great ideas from external producers. External producers are out of good ideas too.\textsuperscript{3}

By the way innovation is a scarce resource for media companies. And users as consumers are one of the most important sources of innovation. There are efforts to catch ideas from users. For example, DR annually invites external producers from small media companies\textsuperscript{4} to users.\textsuperscript{5} They pitch their ideas and innovative plans for production.\textsuperscript{6} This is an opportunity to extract innovation from external sources.

Companies, in our case DR, have extended their search for external producers to Universities too.\textsuperscript{7} However, university producers were found to be limited in creativity.\textsuperscript{8} For instance, competitions were organised to encourage innovation in university students.\textsuperscript{9}

In addition, they have established a relationship with creatives to let them communicate their novel ideas.\textsuperscript{10} And important thing is that the PSB understand that innovation costly and they have to spend money and invest in innovative ideas and to develop talents.\textsuperscript{11}

\subsection*{5.2.2 Quality and professionalism}
Quality is the biggest challenge for application of user innovation. Television stations are dedicated to quality and professional products.\textsuperscript{12} Thus, they do not see the benefit of ‘user generated content’. For PSBs it is more crucial because of the licenses fee. The users pay obligatory fees and they expect to receive high quality programs.\textsuperscript{13}

\subsection*{5.2.3 Social platforms}
DR uses its Facebook and twitter as a source of connection with its audiences.\textsuperscript{14} But there is strong opposition to use of social media as a source of production and user generated content for television.\textsuperscript{15} DR and PSB should remain professional.\textsuperscript{16}

\subsection*{5.2.4 Innovation development}
One interesting code from the interview was that PSBs still suffer from lack of knowledge on how to develop innovative ideas.\textsuperscript{17} DR provides some equipment for talents who have ideas.\textsuperscript{18} DR also provides training and education to develop the creativity and innovative ideas of students.\textsuperscript{19}

\subsection*{5.2.5 Decision and selection}
Selection of ideas to invest is difficult. This is because of limited budget and considerations for quality and professionalism. Normally, many candidates pitch their ideas\textsuperscript{20}, but at the end there is slot for just ten people to develop their ideas into media production.\textsuperscript{21} In the decision making process, the variables of history, record of action and reputation are important.\textsuperscript{22} PSBs hardly invest in small companies that cannot guarantee the expected quality.\textsuperscript{23}

It is important to note that PSBs, tend to foster media entrepreneurship and user innovation. They are very eager to do it, because it is their resource. More talent from society implies more diverse ‘innovation market’. And they can pick the more creative
contents. But they do not do it directly, but rather with facilitators—here, the large media companies act as the external producers.

External producers use small companies and media entrepreneurs to develop their ideas in a more professional process. DR provides support system for the promising ideas. They ask what kind of production it would be and which kind of support would be needed.

5.2.6 Production
When an idea selected by decision board for investment, it would plan an in-house production. The innovators participate in the production and it would be, in fact, a coproduction. Different departments are involving in production of good idea. It is very important for the production to be in-house because it guarantees the quality of production.

5.2.7 Facilitators
Media companies play a very important role and facilitate the access to users. Users are accessible for DR as an indie sector or sometimes as part of a media production company which plays the role of a facilitator. Many of those companies are international, but have Danish personnel and know the Danish culture, which is very important for DR.

Small companies cannot convince DR to invest in them, as mentioned above. This is the reason that they have to work with facilitators who make bridge between DR as large media company and project owner and small companies which bring ideas that need development. Very few small enterprises can survive and work directly with large companies. Facilitators can even be small investing firms or individuals who invest on ideas to develop them as professional media products.

6 Discussion
During the last decades, public service broadcasters as well as commercial mass media have tried different ways to create what is often referred to as a ‘closer’ or more ‘personal’ relationship with the listener, viewer or user [Sørensen, (2013), p.45]. Media entrepreneurs increase the touch of PSBs with user innovation and creativity. They work in the areas that are not economically viable for large media companies. Thus they are facilitators that enrich innovation inventory and create more resources for media companies. Media entrepreneurs are key players of the media market—not only in commercial media, but in public service media too. In the absence of media entrepreneurs, the media market is deprived from an important portion of external sources of innovation.

Based on this knowledge, fostering media entrepreneurship is a positive force in development of media markets. It increases resources for large media companies. Thus, promotion of media entrepreneurship in the society is a public value that can be presented by public media to serve different stakeholders, society, industry, users and the media at its own. However, the absence of public media in media entrepreneurship policy is a gap in literature and this research proposes the study of the role of public media services in promotion of media entrepreneurship.
The economics of PSB is arguable too. While media economics is based on abundance of products and scarcity of attention, PSB managers have lower concerns about rate of attention (refer to codes) and they are concerned with the quality of programs that license payer audiences watched.

An important contribution of this research is to distinguish between two different acts of promotion and the direct support in the relationship between public service media and media entrepreneurs. Findings show that media managers in general are not interested in using innovations of users directly. They are not interested in using media entrepreneurs’ productions too. The main reason is the importance of professional quality in evaluation of their performance. As professional quality is capital-intensive, it is rarely achieved by small media enterprises and users with low access to financial and other capital-intensive resources. Moreover, the PSBs are very strict with regards the supervision of the production process. Trust is another issue, and managers of public service media are very conservative to outsource the products to sources they do not trust. The main difference between managers of PSBs and commercial media is the accountability. PSB managers have to be accountable against the license payers and feel obligated to provide them best quality. Commercial managers are obligated to the owners and shareholders and they feel obligated to generate revenue. Thus commercial media managers are more open to use media entrepreneurs if they feel there is a potential to meet the audience demands. But for PSB managers, their responsibility is to deliver high quality content and it is not calculable by the marketing measures.

Considering the issue of trust to professional mediators, PSB managers mostly outsource production to the well-known large media companies. In our case, companies such as nordiskfilm and metronome are trustworthy partners that receive big portion of external commission and those companies, in turn, may outsource parts of production to the smaller companies and media entrepreneurs. Here, the role of large media companies is critical as facilitators. They fill the gap of trust and professionalism and manage demand towards the media entrepreneurs.

7 Theoretical development

1 With regards strategic acquisition theory, we read that “large firm normally oriented towards large-scale operational efficiency and has problems with its innovation capabilities, while small firms oriented towards innovative performance and pursuing radically new innovations” [Eliasson and Eliasson, (2005), p.91]. This theory shows the opportunities for companies with different sizes, but it has ignored the role of intermediators.

This research adds that the facilitators are oriented to contract. Their key abilities are managing of individuals and media entrepreneurs to deliver value for large firms. Findings show that mediators use their history, record of success, trust and access to innovators as key resource of which increase the power of contract.

2 The second contribution of this research is to locate public media at the media entrepreneurship policy. It shows that PSBs are not involve directly in development of media entrepreneurship, but they play an important role in the creation of opportunities and demand for entrepreneurial activities. This finding opposes
previous assumption that PSBs can directly promote media entrepreneurship by commissioning for the external production. Findings show that despite their need to creative content, they are very strict about quality and professionalism and don’t trust small media companies and nascent entrepreneurs to outsource production to them. They believe on in-house production or outsourcing to established and outstanding large media companies.

3 Facilitators are the key in development of entrepreneurship. They are the bridge between the innovation advantage of small companies and operational advantages of large companies. They are connected by contracting. Here, the Coase (1937) theory becomes applicable. It shows how a contract is a resource for companies in this level. Therefore, media entrepreneurship policy should stress on creation and strengthening of facilitators.

4 Transaction cost: Intermediator companies manage the cost of users’ innovation management. As we read in Coase (1937): “companies decide where the transactions should occur, either within the firms or in the market”. Users’ innovation is diverse, different, time-consuming and developable and needs high level of resources to manage, which is far from the scope and missions of PSBs. Here, the media companies, which are intermediators and mid-size ones, decrease the cost of using innovation.
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Interview codes

1. We as company really have to come up with the idea of how we can attract people who see the world with different glasses. To bring their good ideas.
2. What we need is good idea and we do not find it many times.
3. But in a big media company there are few creatives outside. It is very hard to get great ideas even from professional communities. Producers out of DR are out of good idea.
4. We do once a year invite all production companies. 200 people come on and we tell them what we need. Next is April 2017. Let us know if you have good ideas. They will back to us for pitch days.
5. Nascent entrepreneurs and users are appreciated to pitch their ideas but in investment they have lower chance.
6. We do once a year invite all production companies. 200 people come on and we tell them what we need. Next is April 2017. Let us know if you have good ideas. They will back to us for pitch days.
7. We have searched in sources like universities and schools.
8. We found it very hard. Universities are slow and boring.
9. We have PhD cup and we train young PhD students to communicate for their projects.
10. Media Entrepreneurs (small companies) have relationship with editors and they know me and every day they can write me for their idea.
11. Building talent costs money. This is PSB task to set aside money in that. The way we develop talents is good for total media industry.
12. We are broadcast and we are responsible and Slots in television are very limited. We are professionals and it is difficult to get ideas.
13. We should guarantee license payers get good value.
14. For our facebook and twitter we are more open.
15. I am against using our media platforms too much as an experiment for quality content.
16. People can upload in many platforms but we should be professional.
17. We do not have code to know how to do it.
18. Open studio facilities to help people to make Youtube video and publish them. So they actually experience facilities.
19. We give PhD cup and students trainers, performances, etc. We invite people from university for cultural life, etc.
120 companies have pitched from one man to big. But all of them have delivered TV products before.

They choose ten new talents. We have some slots on radio that are programs with senior editors who help to how to develop them (10 in year or two years).

Previous record is an essential: entrepreneurs assessed by their record.

My job is that we cannot pay five million to a small company without being very very sure that it can deliver the value we search. This is television (26:00) big budgets are needed.

We make support system before production made. We see final cut and we (unclear) but about support and facility.

We make meet up and We ask which kind of production is it. What do you need from us? We make support system.

This in-house department. coproduction.

We gather people from different departments of legal, etc. we say this program is worth.

I like everything in-house.

Aim is to create a strong indie sector of production. We use them a lot and they are even part of some kind of big production company.

They are still Danish and have Danish values and Danish point of view. That is important for us. So even metronome or other international companies they are, they have Danish directors and staff.

There are people who adjust for themselves companies but if you are small company it would be very hard to survive. Two or three of them are in market and they are one people.

An American lady invest on Danish company to produce ideas.