

Foreword

The term ‘public service broadcasting’ is often misused. It has at least four different meanings, such as:

- good television;
- worthy television;
- television that would not exist without public funding; and
- the institutions that broadcast this type of television.

To avoid confusion, we will use the following meanings throughout this review.

- When assessing the current effectiveness of the broadcasters, defined in the Communications Act 2003 as ‘public service broadcasters’, we will call them the ‘main terrestrial TV channels’. They are all the BBC channels funded by the TV licence fee, and ITV1, Channel 4, S4C and Five.
- When we present our ideas on how to maintain and strengthen ‘public service broadcasting’ in the future, we will first define what we mean by the term. After that, we will use public service broadcasting (PSB) to refer to the purposes that PSB should achieve in society and the necessary characteristics of PSB programmes.

Introduction

In the UK, public service broadcasting (PSB) has been supported over many years by a combination of institutions, funding and regulation. Each has helped the other, but as broadcasting moves towards the switchover from analogue to digital, this delicate balance will not survive the change.

In the past, commercial broadcasters have provided PSB in return for access to the analogue airwaves. But, as the analogue audience reduces and more viewers go digital, this agreement will come under increasing pressure. In this report, we have concluded that PSB will have to be provided in a new way in the digital age if it is to maintain its unique ability to reach millions of people, with many different suppliers providing distinctive programme ideas.

The digital model of PSB will be different from today's analogue version. It will involve:

- direct and open (accountable) public funding to replace the current, less obvious subsidies;
- a new mix of programme providers;
- a changing approach to regulation; and
- using new distribution systems alongside conventional TV broadcasting.

Between them, ITV1, Channel 4 and Five currently receive about £400 million a year in indirect subsidies for PSB. This money is the result of their access to analogue broadcasting. By the time of the switchover to digital, the falling value of analogue will have reduced these subsidies to virtually nothing.

We believe PSB in the digital age should not cost any more, in real terms, than the current £3 billion public subsidy for the TV market. But there is an argument for replacing a large part of that current £400 million subsidy with funding specifically aimed at maintaining PSB's diversity and competition in the digital age.

The move to digital broadcasting will be challenging, but it offers the exciting prospect of high quality programmes, available to all, alongside a huge increase in choice for audiences. This is our vision for maintaining and strengthening PSB.

The end of the analogue PSB model

The TV market is changing rapidly. Most UK households now have digital TV, and in the past year alone another 10% of households have gone digital. Competition in the TV market is becoming fiercer, customer choice is increasing, and the balance of power is shifting from producers to customers. These are welcome developments.

New technology, such as broadband, will also transform large parts of the TV market into an increasingly ‘on-demand’ service.

The way the market is moving also creates large challenges for all existing terrestrial (‘through an aerial’) broadcasters who provide public service broadcasting.

- Although the BBC is in the strongest position, with secure funding from licence fees, it must continue to sharpen its sense of purpose and adapt to changing technology and public expectations.
- By the time digital switchover takes place, the money ITV1 earns from analogue TV advertising will not cover the costs of its existing PSB responsibilities.

- Channel 4 will face pressure to replace its current PSB programming with more commercial programmes, to earn enough money to cover costs.
- Five will be available in more homes after digital switchover, but it will have to work to keep its share of the audience in a more competitive market.

If we don’t plan now for life after the switchover, there is a real risk that PSB across the system will suffer, both in quantity and quality. Commercial broadcasters will not be willing or able to screen PSB programmes that do not earn them enough money, and the BBC will no longer face any competition on quality.

We are committed to maintaining and strengthening PSB and have set out a case for PSB to serve people in the digital age. If PSB is to thrive, Parliament, the Government, PSB providers and we at Ofcom must manage the inevitable decline of the commercial analogue PSB model and protect the best qualities of PSB in the digital world.

Principles

We need to start by redefining what PSB means for the digital age. In our phase 1 report, we argued that PSB should, in future, be defined in terms of purposes and characteristics, rather than by specific types of programmes or the output of certain institutions. We received wide support for this, as well as suggestions for improvements. After further consideration, we believe that the purposes of public service broadcasting are:

- **to inform ourselves and others and to increase our understanding of the world** through news, information and analysis of current events and ideas;
- **to stimulate our interest and knowledge of the arts, science, history and other topics** through programmes that are accessible and can encourage informal learning;
- **to reflect and strengthen our cultural identity** through original programming at UK, national and regional level, and by occasionally bringing audiences together for shared experiences; and
- **to make us aware of different cultures and alternative viewpoints**, through programmes that reflect the lives of other people and

other communities, both within the UK and elsewhere.

We believe that PSB programmes should have distinctive characteristics. They should be:

- **high quality**, being well-funded and well-produced;
- **original**, having new UK content, rather than being repeats or bought in from abroad;
- **innovative**, developing new ideas or reworking exciting approaches, rather than copying old ones;
- **challenging**, making viewers think;
- **engaging**, continuing to be accessible and enjoyable for viewers; and
- **widely available** – if the content is publicly funded, as many people as possible should have the chance to watch it.

Plurality – which means involving a range of different programme providers – is at the heart of successful PSB.

PSB means providing services that have something for everyone, whatever their interests. It makes sure that the audience receive a range of views in news, current affairs and other types of programmes, and it provides the competition needed to drive innovation and quality. For this

reason, we should aim to make sure that there is more than one large PSB provider, and that programme production is open to a wide range of producers. All of this means that we need a new model for PSB in the digital age because, without one, the BBC would be providing almost all PSB after the switchover.

To make sure that there are a range of PSB providers in the future, we should all be encouraging new providers into the PSB system to prompt new ideas and fresh approaches. If new organisations receive public funding for PSB, this should increase the benefits of competition. And competition should be actively encouraged to generate the best ideas for PSB and to achieve value for money.

We believe that there is a strong argument, backed up with strong evidence, for PSB to continue being funded after the digital switchover. Our research suggests that:

- even in the digital age, the UK market could not provide the current range and extent of TV content without the public subsidies now available; and
- the public currently want to pay **collectively** for their PSB, rather than paying subscriptions.

Our research says that if PSB programmes maintain their coverage and standards in the digital age, the public would support public funding on a scale similar to current levels. Of course, if PSB's digital audience fell substantially, so would the case for funding at the current levels. The right level of PSB public funding will change over time, so funding levels will be on the agenda for our next PSB review in five years' time.

Importantly, the PSB model for the digital age should be flexible enough to adapt to the major changes in technology, competition and public demands that are expected. Over time, PSB programming and the way it is distributed should develop so that it takes full advantage of new technology, and meets changing public demand.

This, then, is our ambition for PSB in the digital age: a lasting system with a variety of providers supplying programmes that contribute to PSB's aims and standards with maximum coverage and effect. In the digital age, PSB will:

- make full use of new technology and distribution systems;
- offer true value for money; and
- fill the gap that will be left in the market.

The BBC

The BBC should continue to be the cornerstone of public service broadcasting. A strong and independent BBC is essential for successful PSB in the UK, and should continue to be properly funded by the TV licence fee.

The length of the BBC's next Royal Charter should run for 10 years until December 2016, and this will take the BBC through the period of digital switchover. However, the BBC should be subject to a thorough mid-charter review in 2011, which will assess the BBC's funding and its progress in meeting PSB purposes and characteristics.

This midpoint review would coincide with our next five-yearly PSB review. The two reviews should examine in detail the role and funding of the BBC in a fully digital world. A mid-charter review has two main advantages:

- it provides the BBC with a strong incentive to contribute to the purposes and characteristics of PSB for the whole period of its next charter; and
- it makes sure that preparation for digital switchover and beyond is made well before 2016.

The BBC should aim to make sure that all its programmes, not just its services, reflect PSB purposes and characteristics to some extent. This should also apply to the way the BBC schedules its programmes. Our phase 1 report identified 'copycat' programming, the BBC screening similar programmes to those on other channels, and competitive head-to-head scheduling against other channels (such as screening *EastEnders* at the same time as ITV1 screen *Coronation Street* or *Emmerdale*), as particular concerns. We welcome the fact that the BBC governors are tackling some of the weaknesses in BBC schedules. In future, the BBC should consider whether Hollywood blockbusters and other expensive 'bought-in' programmes couldn't be provided equally well by commercial broadcasters, such as ITV1 at no direct cost to the public.

As the commercial sector faces increasing competition, the BBC will become more responsible for providing those areas of PSB that are at risk. In particular, they may need to focus on making a wider range of regional programming in the English regions. These are the kind of productions seen as costly by commercial broadcasters, due to their lower audiences.

Our phase 1 report proposed that the BBC's other activities, including commercial and production activities, should be looked at carefully against their distinctive contribution to PSB. So, we welcome the BBC's reviews of its production and commercial operations, announced as part of the charter review process – both operations should form an important part of that review. Where commercial strategy is concerned, conclusions should be carefully weighed up by independent, external specialists before any decisions are taken about the future of BBC Worldwide, or how the BBC should spend the proceeds from any sale of assets.

As far as production is concerned, we believe that by the end of 2004 the BBC should be able to reveal clear plans for the way it awards contracts to programme makers. These plans must be based on fair and non-discriminatory guidelines, with similar open terms for in-house and independent producers. If this does not happen, or if the new codes of practice do not work, we will take steps to make sure that independent producers get an equal chance, on equal terms, to make programmes for them.

In future, any BBC plans for new services should be closely studied by independent experts to make sure that they would add value for the public, **and** that they would not have a negative effect on any other commercial business. If independent advice suggests that the benefits of any new service would outweigh its costs, the BBC governors should order it to be shelved. (This approach is the same as that recommended by the Graf review of BBC Online, which you can see at www.culture.gov.uk). The midpoint charter review should also look at the effect of the BBC's existing digital services, alongside new commercial services and the opportunities for contributions to PSB by commercial broadcasters.

If the BBC is to maintain its role at the heart of broadcasting in the digital age, it must be properly funded. For the period of the next charter, funding should continue to come from the licence fee, which means that the BBC should not carry advertising or become subscription funded.

Although we haven't studied the BBC's future financial needs in detail, there are two important points for the BBC to

consider when deciding its funding over the next charter period.

- The BBC does not plan to expand its range of services, and is rightly committed to save more money through efficiency.
- The BBC's income will increase by more than the yearly increase in the TV licence fee, simply because there will be more households in the UK. After 10 years, the licence fee alone is expected to give them an extra £230 million every year.

In the longer term, the Government could strengthen the BBC's finances by allowing limited subscription services to fund any further growth. The Government should ask the BBC to make the case for limited subscription services at the midpoint review of its next charter.

The BBC should take a leading role in the UK's plans for the digital switchover. It should consider how new technology can help to:

- collect the licence fee;
- reduce collection costs;

- reduce the number of households not paying the licence fee; and
- reduce the burden on the courts.

In 2003-04, the costs of collecting the licence fee and chasing non-payers totalled more than £300 million.

There have been countless reviews of the BBC in recent years. Various services have been analysed by the Government, Parliament, us at Ofcom, advisers on the Royal Charter and independent experts. We think there are two reasons for this undesirable trend. First, the BBC already receives a very high and rising share of public funding for PSB. Second, there is an overlap between governing the BBC and regulating it. At Ofcom, we believe that:

- the future of PSB depends on public funding being available to many broadcasters; and
- identifying the separate roles of governing and regulating the BBC should be one of the charter review's main aims.

ITV

ITV1 has been an important force in public service broadcasting, and the BBC's main competitor for almost 50 years. Today, it produces a wide range of original programmes for the UK – particularly drama, entertainment and factual programmes – as well as being committed to national news, regional news and production outside London. Importantly, ITV1 is broadcast free-to-air (without needing a monthly subscription) and is nationally available.

Over the next five years, our main ambition for ITV1 is that it continues to make free-to-air PSB programmes of real value to the overall broadcasting environment and that are available everywhere in the UK. Clearly, its future contribution is directly linked to the costs of production and the funding available. We propose to:

- maintain the current programming quotas and targets for the UK production of news, current affairs, regional news and regional current affairs; and
- use the more flexible approach to regulation provided by the Communications Act 2003 to make

sure that, when the next contract is awarded to ITV's chosen news provider (currently ITN), there is enough investment in national and international news.

We also want to end the all-too-frequent negotiations between ITV1 and us, the regulator, over ITV's specific PSB responsibilities. We will introduce a more flexible approach to how we regulate content. This will mean moving away from insisting on fixed quotas for specific types of programme, and towards a new system that focuses on the following three factors:

- what ITV1 is contributing to each programme type;
- what viewers are watching; and
- whether audiences value what they watch.

This model should maintain the public service character of ITV1 in important programming areas such as the arts, children's broadcasting and religion, but in ways that also recognise changing public tastes and market trends.

As we approach the switchover to digital, ITV1 will find providing regional non-news programmes a particular challenge. Our proposals for a new agreement in this area are set out later in this summary.

After digital switchover, we propose that ITV1 maintains a basic level of PSB programmes, with 'home-grown' programmes of high production values, news, current affairs and, if affordable, a regional news service. All these programmes should be available free-to-air and in every format (terrestrial, digital and cable).

Channel 4

During the switchover to digital, Channel 4 should continue to be a vital force in providing PSB on a range of free-to-air channels, concentrating on its strengths as an innovative broadcaster to its particular target audience. Financially, Channel 4 is currently very healthy, and we expect it to use its resources to focus on its public service responsibilities, as set out in the Communications Act 2003.

In line with its own plans in the run-up to the switchover, we expect Channel 4 to work towards meeting its PSB responsibilities and funding challenges by being efficient and by exploring opportunities in the market (for example, generating bigger contributions from its commercial activities). Channel 4 should also be free to form partnerships with other organisations. We believe that they can be successful over the next few years in delivering PSB programmes.

We do not support the privatisation of Channel 4 – we believe that the channel should stay mainly not-for-profit. This status has allowed Channel 4 to make a unique contribution to PSB over the last 20 years so there's no reason why this should change.

Looking ahead, and particularly after the switchover to digital, we recognise that Channel 4 may find it difficult to maintain its income from advertising and still meet its PSB goals. So, it may not be able to provide the same quantity of PSB programming as it does now. This difficulty did not exist in Channel 4's early days because its income didn't depend on advertising.

However, if efficiency and commercial activities aren't enough to give Channel 4 the financial strength it needs to meet its PSB role in the digital age, we **may** need to consider further action. For example, assets that earn income could be transferred from the BBC to Channel 4. This would tie in with Channel 4's preference to support itself commercially rather than through public subsidy.

Five

In PSB terms, Five's role is smaller than that of the other channels, but still important. It has fewer obligations than the others, partly because it only has 80% terrestrial (aerial) coverage. Five therefore stands to gain from its PSB status at switchover as it will have total UK coverage.

Five's contribution to PSB comes mainly through its commitment to original UK productions and to news coverage. We will expect the channel to invest more in original production in the run-up to switchover. However, with our new, more flexible approach to regulation, we will look again at the level of obligations that apply to specific programme types, and the scheduling requirements for news programmes.

The nations and regions

The future of PSB in the home nations and regions has been an important focus of our phase 2 work. In the run-up to digital switchover, ITV1 faces a particular challenge with its non-news programmes for the English regions, and the nations of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. ITV1 will not want to provide non-news programmes after digital switchover, and we will not be able to make the channel show them because:

- the cost of making the programmes will be far more than the value of any privileges, (for example, access to the digital airwaves) available to Channel 3 licensees, such as Carlton or Granada; and
- many non-news regional programmes get small audiences, so are pushed to the margins of the schedule and have low production values.

After digital switchover, we will not be able to insist that ITV1 produces non-news programmes in the nations or in the English regions. Currently, most Channel 3 licensees in England have an obligation to screen three hours of non-news programmes a week, and licensees in the nations have to screen more hours a week than this.

Our long-term ambition is to build a strong model for regional and national PSB after switchover. A new framework would include the following goals.

- A continuing and important role for ITV1 in reflecting regional stories, characters, places and issues on its main network, with a high proportion of original programmes made outside London.
- A new commitment to regional programming from the BBC, in line with its own proposals. This would include striking a new balance between ITV and BBC on responsibilities for non-news English regional programming, as well as providing a new local BBC news service. We suggest the BBC should agree to support a range of regional producers.
- Using new digital opportunities to provide a range of innovative local TV and new media services all over the UK.
- Commercial national programming, increasing within TV broadcasting and many other media.

For the larger English regions, we propose reducing ITV1's duty to produce regional non-news programmes from three hours

a week to one-and-a-half hours in 2005, with all of the reductions coming out of peak hours (6pm to 10.30pm). This would concentrate non-news regional programming in peak hours. However, even this may not be possible before the switchover. We will continue to review the options and publish firm proposals for managing the switchover in phase 3 of our PSB review.

Many of the same considerations apply to the nations – Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. We won't be able to force ITV1 to make non-news programmes for the nations after switchover, so we will need to make changes well before that date. However, the nations each have their own cultural and political identities that need to be reflected in any PSB agreement.

- Their programming responsibilities are greater than in the English regions.
- In Scotland and Northern Ireland, SMG and Ulster are individual Channel 3 licensees and part of the ITV network but separate from ITV plc.
- There are particular issues surrounding minority-language broadcasting in each nation:

- S4C in Wales;
- the new Gaelic Media Service in Scotland; and
- the future of Irish Gaelic and Ulster Scots broadcasting in Northern Ireland.

Responses to our phase 1 report emphasised these different needs. We now believe a wider debate is needed, including contributions from our National Advisory Committees, before we propose any changes to ITV's responsibilities in this area.

At the same time, we propose to raise the quota of productions made outside London, to maintain the current level of over 50%. We also want to see these productions widely spread across the nations and regions of the UK.

After this debate, and with contributions from the nations, we will outline our specific proposals in phase 3 for the nations' responsibilities for non-news programmes.

In the longer term, a strong economic future is also needed for Welsh and Gaelic language services, using digital transmissions and access to appropriate public funding.

Production

Independent producers make a major contribution to PSB purposes across a wide range of programme types. We believe their role could be even greater, and we welcome the BBC's recent commitment to use independent producers for 25% of their programmes.

Since new terms of trade between broadcasters and the independent producers have only recently been agreed, we believe these should be allowed to settle down before the relationship between the two is analysed any further. We are giving the market and major players 12 months to make sure that the 25% quota represents a minimum, before we take any further action.

A new public service publisher (PSP)

Our analysis shows that ITV1, Channel 4 and Five all face difficulties in maintaining PSB programming as the digital age approaches, and the use of analogue declines. If no action is taken, the BBC will become the only PSB provider of any significant scale. This would limit choice in the TV broadcasting environment, which has served the UK well by relying on a range of PSB organisations, and viewers would be the losers.

The availability of PSB programmes through a choice of providers, with a range of producers making them, is vital for the future of PSB. If the BBC becomes virtually the only PSB provider, neither the BBC's content, nor the contribution from the wider broadcasting market, is likely to improve PSB aims and quality.

Having carefully considered evidence from around the world, we have rejected the idea of a central fund to finance PSB productions on a programme-by-programme basis. This is because it would involve too much paperwork and 'red tape', and the people in charge of the fund would probably struggle to distribute PSB content on TV channels that had different values.

It's interesting how many big changes and new ideas in broadcasting and PSB have come from newcomers shaking up the market. To refresh PSB for the digital age, and to make sure there are plenty of broadcasters to serve it, we think there are good arguments for creating a new publicly-funded service – we have called this a public service publisher (PSP). Just as the early Channel 4 had guaranteed funding and a strong ambition to pursue PSB with new ideas, so a PSP could encourage similar ambitions for the digital age.

In this report we have set out an outline proposal for a PSP, which could strengthen PSB after switchover. PSP would aim to commission (award contracts to programme makers) and distribute new programmes as widely as possible, using a variety of technologies to reach households. It could also have the opportunity to explore new ways of contributing to PSB purposes, without having to worry about protecting existing TV channels.

As technology progresses, cable, satellite and terrestrial broadcasting would be just the start. We could expect the PSP to move towards commissioning and distributing programmes on other digital systems such as broadband, and mobile networks. As a result, a lot of the PSP's early digital content would probably be very similar to traditional TV programmes, but it would not be a TV channel in the traditional sense, nor would it publish books, magazines or newspapers.

The PSP might:

- operate as a small commissioning and publishing organisation, using public funds to encourage creative ideas for all visual electronic media, such as broadband, from a range of producers;
- commission (award contracts to) independent producers to provide programmes for specific priority areas;
- make sure its new content is effectively promoted, advertised and made widely available using all the major distribution systems; and
- make sure that all its activities reflect our proposed PSB purposes and characteristics.

Importantly, the organisation that ran the PSP would be the winner of a competition between rival groups, on the basis of the quality of its proposals. It would operate for a set period of up to 10 years. However, as with the BBC's charter, there would be a midpoint review. At the end of the set period, another competition would be held to encourage fresh ideas for PSB in the UK, and a new winner chosen.

We expect that the PSP's greatest challenge, especially in its early years, would be to make sure it achieved enough coverage and viewing figures across the UK and was of a high enough quality to justify public funding. That's why ITV, Channel 4, Five or other existing broadcasters might bid to operate the PSP. There could also be 'carriage arrangements', where the PSP distributes publicly-funded programmes on an analogue TV channel for part of the week, before digital switchover. An equally strong case for funding might be made by a new provider in different formats (for example, broadband). However, any bidding organisation would have to demonstrate clear financial separation between the PSP and its other operations.

We believe that the advantages of creating a PSP are as follows.

- It will keep and increase the range and choice of PSB contributors in the digital world.
- The PSP can start from scratch when it comes to providing content that meets digital PSB aims and standards.
- The benefits of competition would mean that the best ideas get funded, and there would be the possibility of tenders from many different organisations, ranging from other broadcasters and producers to media publishing companies and creative organisations.
- Through competition, the PSP would reduce any serious concerns about European state aid being offered to an existing broadcaster.
- The PSP would be constantly renewed because of the competitions (every so many years) to run the PSP. Its managers would be more likely to be creative than an existing broadcaster not facing any competition in contributing to PSB aims and standards.

- The PSP could continue with the funding arrangements of existing TV channels without the risk of changing their culture for the worse.

We will be setting out our proposals for a PSP in more detail over the next three months, taking note of ideas and views we receive from the consultation process. We want to encourage the widest possible debate to guarantee choice and competition in PSB in the digital age.

Of course, the PSP would need financing. Our early estimate is that the PSP would need around £300 million a year to provide a deliberately limited quantity of high-quality programmes – not a 24-hour TV channel. With this level of funding, and a responsibility to provide three hours of new content each day, a one-hour programme would have a budget of around £200,000.

The PSP's funding would need to come from a new source, replacing the indirect subsidies that the Government currently provides for ITV1, Channel 4 and Five. This would be replacement funding rather than extra funding, so it would not involve more public money, although it would be a direct payment instead of the current indirect funding system.

The initial funding for the PSP could come from three sources.

- **Government Tax revenues.**

Government funded PSB already exists, with the BBC receiving £400 million a year from the Department for Work and Pensions for free TV licences for people aged over 75, and £220 million from the Foreign Office for the World Service. S4C also receives a grant of £85 million from the Government. Funding from tax revenues could either come from general taxation or charges linked to using the airwaves.

- **Raising the cost of the licence fee.**

Raising an extra amount, beyond the needs of the BBC, would provide a guaranteed income to fund PSB in the digital age.

- **A tax on the turnover of UK licensed broadcasters.** This is how the regulation of the broadcasting industry is currently funded. However, the extra cost could put off new channels from opening up, encourage others to avoid the tax, and reduce programme funding available for other broadcasters.

There are many ways these options could be varied and, in any case, the final decision rests with the Government and Parliament.

In summary, this is our proposed framework for PSB in the digital age.

- A new mix of funding, regulation and institutions that can tackle the challenges of a very different TV market and the demands of the audience. PSB will build on the strengths of existing institutions while also encouraging new ideas and fresh thinking on how PSB is created and delivered.
- At the heart of this new system, a well-funded BBC producing distinctive and high-quality programmes.
- As well as the BBC, a range of contributors who will compete to supply well-funded, high-quality UK programmes, and receive public funding to create the best model for PSB.
- A new provider, the PSP, to be imaginative in using new technologies and distribution systems to meet audience needs in the digital age. It will be funded from an increased licence fee, tax revenues or a tax on the turnover of broadcasters.
- A continuing role for Channel 4 as a mainly not-for-profit provider of innovative and varied programmes for its target audience group.
- A realistic level of PSB responsibilities for ITV1, focusing the channel on a set of central PSB goals, before and after switchover.
- A new approach to programming for the nations and regions, with regional production on ITV, transferring non-news regional responsibilities to the BBC, and using digital opportunities to create even more local services.
- More investment in original UK programmes on Five, alongside a more flexible system to regulate its content.
- A source of programmes that contribute to PSB aims and standards, by broadcasters who do not have specific privileges or financial incentives.

How to respond to this consultation

We have developed this plain English summary to help you understand the issues, it is not a formal or detailed account of our views. You can find our full report on our website at www.ofcom.org.uk.

We want to hear from the widest possible range of people and organisations with an interest in the future of public service broadcasting, including:

- viewers;
- television broadcasters, channels and formats;
- production companies;
- other media organisations;
- organisations in areas with close ties to television (such as sport, the arts and film);
- anyone with a commercial or employment interest in the broadcasting industry (such as trade unions and trade associations);
- consumer groups;
- anyone concerned about the importance of television for the economy; and
- anyone concerned about the importance of television for society.

We will use the feedback we get to draft phase 3 of our review and our final report.

You can get the supporting documents to this report, as well as copies of our phase 1 report and a summary of responses to it, from our website at www.ofcom.org.uk

Please send your written responses, marked ‘PSB Review – Phase 2 response’, by **Wednesday 24 November** to:

Khalid Hayatt
Ofcom
Riverside House
2a Southwark Bridge Road
London SE1 9HA.
E-mail: khalid.hayatt@ofcom.org.uk

If you are a representative, please summarise the people or organisations you represent, preferably by e-mail. If any part of your response is confidential, you should include it in a separate attachment so that we can publish the non-confidential parts along with your identity. If all of your response is confidential, including your identity, you should make sure this is clearly stated.

We will also assume that you transfer the copyright of your response to us, unless you specifically say otherwise. We would be grateful if you could fill in the

consultation cover sheet provided on our website.

One of our consultation principles is to allow 10 weeks for responses. However, since this is an interim report and represents the second of two major consultation exercises in the course of our PSB review, we have shortened this period slightly to eight weeks.

See appendix 4 of the full document for a summary of our stated consultation principles.

Our senior team responsible for this consultation and review are:

- **Ed Richards** – Senior Partner, Strategy and Market Developments;
- **Robin Foster** – Partner, Strategy Development; and
- **Tim Suter** – Partner, Content and Standards.

We have also appointed a ‘consultation champion’ who is responsible for the overall quality of our consultation process. If you have any comments or complaints about this consultation, please send them to:

Philip Rutnam
Partner, Competition and Strategic Resources
Ofcom
Riverside House
2a Southwark Bridge Road
London SE1 9HA.
E-mail: philip.rutnam@ofcom.org.uk