

Dear Sir ,

I enclose my response to your Public Sector Broadcasting Review.

Firstly I would contend that channels in particular the BBC do little for what is referred to as Social Cohesion.

There is for example no BBC England whereas Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales have their own broadcasting identity. Even minority views such as Gaelic and Welsh are given a separate identity. Within the broadcasting community England is dismissed with regional labels rather than a single identifiable entity. With England paying by definition the greater share of the compulsory BBC tax such a situation is unacceptable.

Minority broadcasts must be paid for by the minority that benefits from their presence. With the advent of digital broadcasting the means to pay for such services by subscription are readily available.

Within the public sector in particular the BBC, there must be a greater realignment in the structure of the offering.

It's base is wholly excessive and unwarranted :-

Over 240 WEB sites

Eight National TV Channels

Ten National Radio Stations

Forty Local Radio Stations

A fleet of buses in the North East

An ever increasing number of interpreters for translation.

The notion that the BBC also has a Commercial Channel providing direct competition to fully Commercial Stations is unacceptable.

The BBC must be restructured so that it is not a large internet provider (going over budget) competing in the market place.

The BBC must either compete fully in the market place in which case we licence payers do not fund it at all, or it withdraws from the commercial and advertising arenas fully. It is untenable for it to do both.

Similarly it must not compete for sponsorship in the open market whilst receiving compulsory public funding.

The british taxpayer has no mandate to provide a service to the rest of the world and the World Service should be scrapped as soon as possible.

Also the BBC must be restructured to provide a British Broadcasting Service to Great Britain, nothing else, it's original objective.

Similarly the News 24 and BBC3 channels could be axed for no loss of quality and a gain in reducing costs.

The case for the digital switcover from which the following extracts are taken, says we have a wide range of choice yet it does not allow us to have choice over whether or not we watch and pay for BBC offerings.

This situation has to change in the future.

Choice:

Of channels: Digital television can offer a wide range of high quality channels and services, some free-to-view, some subscription. It can also provide households with interactive services and the possibility of access to the Internet.

Of platforms: We want to ensure that, wherever possible, consumers can choose the means by which they will access their digital services.

The current structure of the BBC model is totally wrong for the digital world.

The BBC Iplayer distributes TV programmes free of charge to any one irrespective of whether they have a TV licence. This situation must change whereby BBC programmes are paid for by subscription or on entry of a valid licence number. The notion that BBC programmes are funded by compulsion and then distributed freely to non licence payers is a failing and indefensible model. Similarly broadcasts are sent to mobile phones again without any cost or verification process that the recipient has a TV licence.

Any proposals to place a tax on broadband users to ensure the BBC can distribute programmes freely to non licence payers, is quite frankly immoral. It is up to the BBC to ensure that it contributes to the cost of networking or reduces it's traffic by charging those who wish to watch their offering. The free offering is flooding networks, one that incurs a charge is unlikely to.

Yours Sincerely

Jim Waugh

Northumberland