

COMPARISON TABLE – STREAMING OF COUNCIL MEETINGS

<u>AUTHORITY</u>	<u>SYSTEM</u>	<u>COST</u>	<u>COMMENTS/EFFECTIVENESS</u>
1. A City Council	Camera in Council Chamber for Full Council only. Stream to nearby room. Recording posted on website at a later date. Uploaded onto YouTube.	£2,000 camera.	Between 42 and 98 views on average. Mainly used by Comms team and journalists.
2. A London Borough	Invested in a bespoke webcasting and AV system used for Council, Cabinet, Planning and Scrutiny.	£150,000	Interest varies from hundreds to single figures. Has led to complaints re late posting etc.
3. A City Council	Equipment hired at an hourly rate. Most meetings streamed.	£28,000 per annum.	Interest varies – Council meetings can get around 2,000 views and more for budget meetings. Smaller meetings get around 100. Main feedback from public is negative – e.g. distortion lack of sound, buffering. Useful as a record of the meetings.
4. A London Borough	Practically everything is live webcast. Any meetings not webcast are audio recorded. system bought 2½ years ago.	£140,000 plus £13,000 per year subscription to supply and host.	Various difficulties experienced. Generally, less than 100 views. Have been a number of complaints about it from public re quality and breakdowns.

<u>AUTHORITY</u>	<u>SYSTEM</u>	<u>COST</u>	<u>COMMENTS/EFFECTIVENESS</u>
5. A London Borough	Most meetings audio recorded	Minimal cost and not very onerous. Head of Dem Services had previously done a cost benefit exercise and decided this was the best option.	Limited public interest but useful for minute takers.
6. A County Council	Used to have expensive provider. Now use YouTube. Most meetings streamed.	YouTube free, but microphones and cameras cost £55,000 for Council Chamber and between £20,000-£30,000 for other rooms.	Numbers vary from 10-12 to 50 people. Negative feedback when system fails. Happy to demonstrate the system.
7. A County Council	Going through a period of change as webcasting solution failed. Engaging with providers to procure a new system. Have also used YouTube solution, but that was dependant on the system that failed. In addition, they have used national providers for individual meetings which was good, but cost could not be justified.	No costs given.	Viewing figures modest unless it is a matter of particular interest. Main feedback is when things go wrong. They feel it benefits transparency and helps with the understanding of Local Government. Happy to discuss further.

<u>AUTHORITY</u>	<u>SYSTEM</u>	<u>COST</u>	<u>COMMENTS/EFFECTIVENESS</u>
8. A local District / Borough Council	New system introduced in October 2019 to enable live video broadcasting or retrospective publication of recordings. System can also record audio only for either publication or the Council's own use. The system also has electric voting capability although this is not currently being utilised.	£104,000 initial equipment outlay (£16,000 related to the three cameras – linked to microphones). £5,000 ongoing annual support and maintenance charge.	System is currently operated by ICT team although Democratic Services staff will also receive training.
9. A local District / Borough Council	Operate an audio recording and voting system through the microphones. Have also broadcast occasional meetings live using Facebook Live.	Initial outlay for microphone / recording system (including microphones and hardware/software) in 2012 was £34,000	Audio recording system operated by Democratic Services staff – very easy to use and audio recordings are very clear (published on Council's website as a single recording). Recordings not linked to democratic management system. Live video broadcasts operated by Comms Staff using an iPad - feedback on Facebook Live broadcasts include many complaints about the quality of the sound.
10. A local District / Borough Council	New Council Chamber has AV equipment including cameras built in – 4 cameras linked to microphones). System geared towards Full Council meetings – needs greater flexibility for other types of committee meetings. Upload recordings of meetings to Youtube. Have also used an iPad to broadcast via Facebook	Initial costs included within new building costs.	System works well although limited viewing numbers but largely positively received.

<u>AUTHORITY</u>	<u>SYSTEM</u>	<u>COST</u>	<u>COMMENTS/EFFECTIVENESS</u>
	Live – sound quality is limited but good levels of public engagement.		
11. A local District / Borough Council	Trialled audio recording software – via Android tablet device, plugged into one of the Chamber's microphones.	Usual price is either £100 a meeting or £325 for a month, with different options / functionality available.	System was effective and costs were the main prohibitive factor in pursuing previously. System not linked to democratic management system but does work in conjunction with it – Democratic Services clerk taps on tablet device in the meeting to divide recording by each agenda item.
12. A local District / Borough Council	<p>New meeting rooms have AV equipment built in – facility to audio record meetings via touchscreen panels in the rooms (which records back at the building's server onto a datastick).</p> <p>Considering building in e-voting via software provider.</p>	<p>Initial costs included within new building costs.</p> <p>Free to upload to Youtube other than Officer time</p>	<p>A Comms Officer checks through the recording prior to publishing as a single recording to Youtube.</p> <p>Limited viewing numbers but feedback has been positive.</p>