

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

Absolutely, though I feel that there is more pressure on the BBC to deliver such public service provision than there is on ITV. For example, in order to maintain and grow its services, the BBC recently asked Ofcom for an increased license fee, but you denied them raising the fee as much as they would have liked. This is opposed to ITV, which when they asked you to scale down regional PSB, you intend to allow that.

I believe there is too much pressure on the BBC and not enough on ITV, which in turn is making it increasingly difficult for both to compete. Because you are so seemingly willing to allow ITV to make such changes, ITV has no real incentive to develop or improve its PSB. This is in contrast to the BBC, whom I believe provide far more services than it really needs to, but moreover, is struggling to afford its highly ambitious services. Now that you've stunted the license fee growth, the BBC will not cutback on unnecessary and expensive services, such as Radio 6 Music, BBC Four or the recently launched BBC ALBA, because it doesn't want to 'lose face', which would damage the BBC's reputation. Instead, they will have to cutback on key areas of programming, which is also bad for the BBC.

Both of these factors may work well financially, but believe me when I say the British public are not impressed by either of these contrasting, uncalibrated approaches. Ofcom appear to have over how the BBC and ITV can move forward.

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

The Enhanced Revolution model sounds best to me. The remaining models give too much power to Channel 4 and the already bloated BBC.

The ER model is heavily based on UK origination and an obligation to provide original UK programming, particularly on ITV, which I think is a good thing. It also allows Channel 4 to expand and continue to be a strong, diverse alternative to both the BBC and ITV, without becoming too strong, as I believe it would under the remaining two models.

I do however have concerns about what sounds to me like would effectively be the death knell for both Teletext and GMTV on ITV 1. People enjoy these services very much, they are a major part of our daily lives in Britain, and I doubt ITV would continue to provide them if they were not obligated to do so, for the sake of the viewer. It is this tunnel vision of PSB which does not take into account that people actually like and rely on these services; it's not all about money and remits. It is this kind of capitalist, aloof mindset that ultimately undermines public confidence in both Ofcom and British television as an institution.

**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?:**

I believe having to compete for funding encourages TV companies to work harder for their money, to improve quality, and to aim high, whereas direct funding simply allows channels to carry on as they are, without really thinking about where they are going or why.

So I approve entirely of competitive funding.

**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?:**

ITV 1, Five and Teletext should indeed have PSB obligations after 2014, as this will keep all three brands distinctive and strong.

As for the Channel 3 licensing structure, I fully supported the franchise auctions of the 80s and 90s, as this allowed ITV companies to compete based on the quality, contribution and competence of their contribution to the ITV network. I personally would like to see ITV have to compete for its Channel 3 license in Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland, as these countries all have their own distinctive cultural identities. Therefore ITV should have to compete with an alternative, national broadcaster.

Also, onscreen at least, the British public feel that ITV is losing its sense of regional identity. At best, we would like to see regional identities return. Not as separate companies like before, but as regional brands that local people can identify as their own. At the very least, we would like to see the regionality of the UK reflected in ITV 1 idents and advertisements. The current ITV 1 ident is meaningless.

**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?:**

There should be competitive funding for areas of content such as regional news, children's programming and original drama.

I agree with the comments on how this might work in practice.

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

Absolutely. National and particularly regional news is hugely important to the British public, particularly viewers of ITV 1.

I can tell you that myself and many, many others are absolutely dismayed at the scaling down of regional news on ITV from 17 regions to 9. All because of a reasonably small £40m deficit in ITV's budget? Is there really no alternative to this? I have a few:

- \* No bulletins in the week except the 6pm regional news magazine
- \* One or two commercial breaks between and after the 6pm regional news magazine (currently there are none)
- \* Introduction of 5-minute advert breaks on the ITV network (as on non-terrestrial commercial broadcasters) rather than 4-minute breaks
- \* Sponsorship of regional news magazines or increased sponsorship of ITV 1 programmes
- \* In-vision advertising; a relaxation of the rules on this
- \* Introduction of a weeknightly regional features magazine, removing the need for regional programming of other sorts
- \* A BBC/ITV regional news co-alition programme format, or an ITV co-alition with local and regional radio stations, newspapers and other media

A £40m deficit means only a couple of million pounds per genre of programme budgets reduced. I and many others would prefer a few less dramas or football matches every year if it meant 'saving' regional news. The scaling back of regional news is nothing short of a disgrace, however you choose to euphamise it, it is a disgrace.

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

For devolved nations, I think the competetive funding model is most appropriate.

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

Overall, 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?:**

Sponsorship; increased advertising; relaxation of advertising regulations, such as in-vision advertising; co-funding and sponsorship with third-party media groups such as internet media, newspapers and radio stations

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

The one outlined in the enhanced revolution model.

**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?:**

I am ambivalent about them, but you should probably refer to my previous suggestions to complete the rest of this question.

**Additional comments:**

Please take everything I have said into consideration, especially regarding regional news output.

It is hugely important to me and many thousands of other British people. I live in the East Midlands and in January, should you press ahead with ITV's regional output cutbacks, I am going to lose my regional news magazine - Central Tonight (East) - and its extremely talented team forever. I do not like BBC regional news as it is condescending, stuffy and boring. I am apoplectic that I am losing Central Tonight, and feel a part of East Midlands heritage is being callously removed from me. But I feel more sorry for the people living in the ITV Border, ITV Meridian Thames Valley and ITV West regions - they are losing their entire regional ITV identity if you approve of these plans.

Perhaps Ofcom should stop thinking about profit and think about the public for once. Your job is to be the bridge between the public and the TV companies. Right now, it feels like you are bi-ased entirely in the TV companies' favour. Whether or not that's how it is, that is how it feels, to me and many millions of British people.

Please consider this before you press ahead.