JETIX EUROPE N.V.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

MINUTES OF MEETING

The meeting was held on 8th February, in Amsterdam.

The meeting was convened by announcements in Het Financieele Dagblad and De Prijscourant not later than the fifteenth day prior to the date of the meeting, as prescribed by the Articles of Association of the Company.

Chairman: Paul Taylor

Present: Dene Stratton, Paul Taylor, Olivier Spiner, Oliver Fryer

Shareholders:	present or represented.	votes.
	Citibank NA	4,427,489
	The Northern Trust Corporation	924
	Brandt Information	400
	BVS International N.V.	19,676,771
	Jetix International Holdings N.V.	2,852,884
	BVS Entertainment, Inc.	212,469
	ABC Kids SPC1, Inc.	39,750,285
	VEB	22

The following formal business was considered at the meeting:

1. That in the absence of any member of the Supervisory Board at the meeting, Paul Taylor act as Chairman of the meeting and that the meeting be conducted in English.

2. The reappointment of Peter Seymour as a supervising director retiring through rotation.

3. That the annual report of the Company for the 12 months ended 30 September 2007 be reviewed.

4. That the annual accounts of the Company for the 12 months ended 30 September 2007 be reviewed .

5. That, separately, any liability of the members of the Management Board and the Supervisory Board for management and supervision in the 12 months ended 30 September 2006 be discharged.

6. That the Remuneration Policy for the Company be approved;

7. That the reappointment of the Company's auditors be approved.

8. That the Management Board be designated as a competent body to issue shares and to restrict or exclude pre-emption rights of shareholders.

In each case, the motions were passed unanimously save as detailed below in the comments section. In terms of Item 8 on the agenda PT tabled the eighth proposal to designate the Management Board as competent body to issue shares, to grant rights to subscribe shares and to restrict or exclude pre-emption rights of shareholders, subject to the approval of the Supervisory Board, for a period of eighteen (18) months commencing on February 8th 2008. This authority shall relate to a maximum of 10 percent of the issued share capital of the Company as at 8th February 2008. This proposal when put to a vote was adopted with a majority of the valid votes cast. See further detail below in the report on questions and answers raised.

During the course of the meeting the VEB representative raised the following questions and points:

A; It was noted that no Supervisory Board member was present at the meeting nor had there been at previous meetings. This was regretted and the VEB representative wondered whether it reflected a lack of concern for the minority shareholders in the Company. The VEB indicated that the same point had been made last year but there was still no Supervisory Board representative this year. The VEB representative also confirmed that an external auditor was present as required under the Dutch Corporate Governance Code. He also said that the issue as to whether or not the Company intended to pay a dividend should be put to the shareholders as an agenda item whether or not there was an intention to make such a payment. Once again, this point had been raised last year.

PT responded that the VEB's concerns were noted.

B; The agenda item dealing with the discharge of the Boards was combined. It was usual practice for there to be two separate motions. This point had also been made in the previous year.

PT responded that this was noted and would be remedied going forward. The vote on these items was taken in two stages.

C; The VEB addressed the annual report. Bearing in mind that Mr Stratton was provided by a third party company, how did the Supervisory Board determine his remuneration. PT responded that although for reasons of pension and other matters connected with his long service for the Walt Disney and his pension entitlements, Mr Stratton's services were provided by and he was paid by a Disney entity, his actual salary and bonus as paid by that company are determined by the Supervisory Board of Jetix and Jetix reimburses the Disney company for those amounts. The VEB felt that this was wrong and showed dependency upon the majority shareholder and a potential conflict of interest.

OF and DS explained that DS is recused from any material decisions involving a potential conflict of interest and, in any event, the Boards always took the greatest care to ensure that related party transactions (which are reported in the Report) are conducted on arms length commercially customary terms.

D; The VEB also drew attention to the constitution of the Supervisory Board and the 3 (out of 5) Disney members. He felt this was not very satisfactory for the minority

shareholders and asked why any individual shareholder would wish to own shares in Jetix.

PT reiterated that the Boards took great care to negotiate the best commercial terms for the Company whether dealing with Disney or any other company and that there were also very many advantages for Jetix stemming from its affiliation with Disney. OF pointed out that the percentage of the Company represented by the majority shareholder had actually decreased in the years since the IPO.

.

E; Why did the Company persist in retaining a public listing. There had been no mergers and acquisitions activity and a large amount of cash still sat on the Company's balances.

PT responded that Jetix remained alert to good value acquisitions but was governed by the need for good value and fit and no suitable targets had been identified.

F; The VEB discussed the position of FX movements and the amount of apparent gain from that area.

DS responded that FX was an area where he was seeking to limit exposure and variances as much as is possible and that much of the movement stemmed from the application of IFRS rules to regular intra-company balances. G; As the Supervisory Board was not present to be questioned, the VEB and Brandt Information abstained on the motion in connection with the discharge of the Supervisory Board.

H; The VEB asked whether Jetix published the criteria on which specific incentives are granted to Management Board members. The Management Board confirmed that other than te information contained in the Remuneration Policy and Report, it did not. The VEB voted against the approval of the Remuneration Policy.

I; The VEB asked whether the senior partner of the auditor was changed in accordance with appropriate rotation and was told that this was the case in accordance with PwC policies. .

J; Brandt Information questioned whether the Management Board's power to issue stock was based on 10% of the company's issued share capital or 10% less one share. OF did not know the answer to this question. He assumed a straight 10% as this had been the wording approved on the last occasion by the AGM and prepared by the Company's lawyers. He indicated that he would check the point. Brandt Information abstained on the designation resolution.

K; The VEB then asked some questions in relation to the performance of the Company.

DS explained that he was not diverting from the public guidance already offered with revenue down this year by some 10 to 15%. A dividend was theoretically possible but had not placed been on the agenda for the next Supervisory Board meeting.

The meeting was then closed.

Signed by the Chairman and Secretary as a record of the proceedings

Paul Taylor Chairman	Oliver Fryer Secretary