

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

No. You imply here that the BBC is indispensable and I disagree. There should be no public subsidy for any broadcast media.

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

No public funding for any broadcaster, in any way, shape, or form.

**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?:**

No public funding from tax payers whether in the form of a TV license or direct Government subsidy

**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?:**

No

**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?:**

No public funding whatsoever.

**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?:**

No. If the nation or region wants it, then it should be by subscription from those wanting to view it.

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

If you want local news, and the provider has carried out their own market research to identify demand, then those who want it pay for it, with/ out advertising.

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

No.

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

No. No public funding or license fee funding. You want to watch it, pay for it yourself.

**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?:**

Subscription from those who want to watch it and/ or advertising.

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

Subscription from those who want to watch it and/ or advertising.

**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?:**

There should be no licence fee and no tax payer subsidy for what is, essentially, entertainment. If you want news, there are commercial news stations and newspapers. Why does the tax payer have to stump up for this?

**Additional comments:**

The tax on owning a TV is indefensible. The tax payer subsidising an entertainment medium is no longer tenable. BSkyB seems to do ok without tax payer involvement? As do many newspapers. The local town newspaper performs a public service duty but isn't subsidised by the tax payer.... why should the BBC or anyone else be? The BBC has many commercial sidelines, why is the tax payer/ licence fee payer expected to fund these and then be asked to pay for them? The BBC has distorted the market and will continue to do so as long as it allowed to dabble in the commercial sector but at tax payer/ licence fee payer expense - all the benefits but none of the risk.