

Question 1: Do you agree that public service provision and funding beyond the BBC is an important part of any future system?:

Yes. Absolutely.

Question 2: Which of the three refined models do you think is most appropriate?:

Competitive funding.

Question 3: Do you agree that in any future model Channel 4 should have an extended remit to innovate and provide distinctive UK content across platforms? If so, should it receive additional funding directly, or should it have to compete for funding?:

It should have to compete for funding based on quality.

Question 4: Do you think ITV1, Five and Teletext should continue to have public service obligations after 2014? Where ITV1 has an ongoing role, do you agree that the Channel 3 licensing structure should be simplified, if so what form of licensing would be most appropriate?:

I see no meaningful PSB role for Teletext, in light of the unparalleled quality of BBCi.

Five also would probably be better without any PSB obligations.

ITV1 should either be given proper PSB obligations (i.e. a return to a solid level, including significant regional output, rather than the drip-by-drip reduction seen over the last decade and more) and funding to meet those obligations, or none at all.

The Channel 3 licensing structure, likewise, should be kept the same (17 regions and subregions) if it is to retain a PSB role. Reducing the number of regions - and for that matter allowing a single company to hold as many of them as at present - does not promote quality public service broadcasting or meet viewers' needs.

Furthermore, the 'nations and regions' phraseology suggests that Scotland, Wales and NI would be happy with coverage across their nations, whereas in fact Scotland has 2 and a half ITV regions, and Wales could arguably contain more than one. And in any case, England as a nation should not be contemplating 'national' (i.e. England) coverage as some kind of replacement for the numerous regions. The whole of the UK has scope to be divided into many regions (perhaps not the same ones as currently - important to establish what region Brits identify with), and treating the whole of Scotland as 1, or suggesting 9 would suffice in England, is not enough.

Question 5: What role should competition for funding play in future? In which areas of content? What comments do you have on our description of how this might work in practice?:

A quality-based competition for funding could apply in any number of areas. I don't care who provides decent regional and non-London sourced news, entertainment, sports coverage documentaries, social action, etc, as long as it is of the highest quality possible for the funding that is available. Companies that compete for it would do so presumably because they want to do it, rather than the begrudging let's-get-away-with-as-little-as-possible approach used in scheduling and producing public service material on ITV1 at present.

Question 6: Do you agree with our findings that nations and regions news continues to have an important role and that additional funding should be provided to sustain it?:

Absolutely. And this *is* an area in which viewers should have a choice and not simply be obliged to watch the BBC's coverage. Contrast and choice is essential in ensuring fair and accurate news.

Question 7: Which of the three refined models do you think is most appropriate in the devolved nations?:

Competitive funding, enabling the creation of cross-media services.

Question 8: Do you agree with our analysis of the future potential for local content services?:

Yes.

Question 9: Do you agree with our assessment of each possible funding source, in terms of its scale, advantages and disadvantages?:

Overall, yes.

Question 10: What source or sources of funding do you think are most appropriate for the future provision of public service content beyond the BBC?:

Ringfenced part of licence fee; moving part of BBC Worldwide to Channel 4.

Question 11: Which of the potential approaches to funding for Channel 4 do you favour?:

A blend of all the options in paragraph 1.43 (of the executive summary) sounds like a good idea to me.

Question 12: Do you agree that our proposals for 'tier 2' quotas affecting ITV plc, stv, UTV, Channel TV, Channel 4, Five and Teletext are appropriate, in the light of our analysis of the growing pressure on funding and audiences? priorities? If not, how should we amend them, and what evidence can you provide to support your alternative?:

Additional comments: