

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

Yes. The consultation has already stated several good reasons such as regional reasons why public service may be better served by organisations other than the BBC. But there are other reasons, for example different journalistic viewpoints. While I am sure BBC strives to not show political bias it is interesting the differences between C4 and BBC news coverage on the same topics, also on the topics chosen. I, and I am sure many others, value the different insights and perspectives and choices and would hate to be limited to simply one viewpoint funded from the license see which after all is a TV license fee not a BBC license fee.

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

The "refined competitive funding model".

While Ofcom may wish to see BBC as the cornerstone of provision of public service broadcasting, and I am happy with that position, no organisation, BBC or otherwise, should pre-assume they have a god given right to the license fee without accountability and responsibility to show unbiased and broad coverage of issues etc for the public license funded financing.

Therefore to ensure BBC and other broadcasters wanting the public service program provision funding need to bid for the money showing the business case so the public know what they can expect for their money ... and the boardcasters should be measured against it. The license fees are a not unsubstantial amount of money per household and the license payers deserve to ensure they are getting good value for their money. No organisation should consider the license fee money to be used as they see fit.

It is also important not to use license fees in ways which are anti-competitive against other companies who may which to provide programming in a sector for a profit.

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?:

Yes, absolutely. C4 provides some excellent and innovative programming & always has since its inception.

They deserve to be encouraged to continue to provide the bredth of content to do now and even expand on it.

Given the C4 news and other programs represent exceptional coverage of events (time devoted to them quality of journalsim and apparent lack of bias) giving C4 a chunk of the license fee to deliver the content I, and I am sure many others, want at the times of day I, and I am sure others want it, makes perfect sense.

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?:

C4 is very centralised with national programming - at least in the main. BBC has both the centralised national programming and regional programming. ITV is much more along the lines of BBC given the mergers that have taken place.

Regional programmes, such as but not limited to news but including local interest programmes, may not be profitable in their own right and with increasing competition for advertising revenue ITV may not be able to cross subsidise unprofitable programs from the profitable main entertainment. In such cases it seems reasonable for them to bid for public funding, e.g. a slice of the license fee, just as for C4 previously, to provide for this important alternative viewpoint to the BBC.

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?:

Competition in funding should be instigated forthwith - its the way to ensure efficiency and good value for money.

The competition should be for a broad remit for public service broadcasting, e.g. news, local news, local distinctive programming, world affairs, history, nature, quality drama and so on but not including potential high revenue generating programs such as game shows (which I hate), and the genre of programs that include big brother etc. All broadcasters should submit proper proposals for their funding stating what they will provide for the money sought. They should be held accountable for delivery of said programs if receiving the revenue.

It is important representatives of the arts, other communities and the public at large are part of the evaluation process.

No organisation should consider they have an automatic right to the license fee revenue

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.

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

The "refined competitive funding model".

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?:

more or less.

The License fee is the simplest way to secure a significant pool of funds through which the public service programming can be paid for. This should be shared between all parties who submit proposals for funding and whose cases are deemed worthy. If other funding sources are available for public services these can be provided direct to companies to extend their provision beyond that funded through the license fee funding or added to the pool of central funding for distribution

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?:

Through the license fee primarily.

If other funding sources are available for public services these can be provided direct to companies to extend their provision beyond that funded through the license fee funding or added to the pool of central funding for distribution.

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

Through the license fee primarily - top slicing to coin the phrase in the papers and TV articles.

If other funding sources are available for C4 public services these can be provided direct to C4 to extend their provision beyond that funded through the license fee - not double dosing.

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 would prefer to maintain the ITV local news and local programming as they are today. Speaking as one whose parents live in one affected region, the west country, I can assume Ofcom that the diversity from Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly to Bristol covering the entire western region does not lend itself to a simply one size fits all bar a few minutes here and there for the various sub regions. Better to provide some license fee funding now to help maintain the regionality of news and local affairs. The diversity and differences between regions in the UK is what makes the UK what it is - this proposal is not recognising it. The local people pay their license fees its therefore reasonable they see programming that reflects where they live and what they relate to not some amorphous stuff from the main broadcasting centres of London, Manchester etc.

Additional comments:

