

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

I believe that funding at all levels is important. But Ofcoms funding models will damage the BBC.

Ofcom has no right to take any part of BBC worldwide and just hand it over to Channel 4 or even suggest that part of the licence fee beyond 2012 should be handed over to ITV or Channel 4.

If these companies are to get money from the licence fee then the BBC should be allowed to recoup the money lost from this by taking limited advertising. These are commercial companies and Ofcoms funding models would distort the market.

Something often the BBC is accused of.

I for one would not be prepared to pay the licence fee if it was to be given over to ITV or Channel 4 without the BBC getting something back in return, like limited advertising or sponsorship of programmes.

As for the proposal of handing over Worldwide in all or part to Channel four, you have lost all credibility as an organisation. You may want to create a debate, but such a proposal is laughable and proves that no one at ofcom cares about broadcasting in the country or really care about the BBC.

You say that you do not want to damage the BBC. But this is in total contrast to your proposals. Worldwide supplements the licence fee. And provides extra funding for the BBC, why should Channel 4 be gifted this and damage the BBC.

Why in this country is the BBC seen as something that needs to be clipped, just because sky or some other commercial broadcaster thinks that it should not buy big blockbuster films or sport. Yet abroad the BBC is seen as something that should be treasured.

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

None of the funding models work. Because you automatically assume that the public either want to see parts of the BBC given away or the licence top sliced which will damage the BBC. I for one would not want to pay the licence fee if it was going to prop up ITV or Channel 4 or for that matter SKY.

I certainly am not prepared to pay more money for it to go to ITV or whoever for them to provide exactly what the BBC already does.

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 I do think channel four should be distinctive. But I do not believe that it should get any extra funding from the Government or from the licence fee or from BBC worldwide.

It should not be covering sport, such as horse racing, a sport on which it made a loss covering. What I would do is let the BBC take over channel four, instead of the other way round. I am sure BBC worldwide could take control of channel four and all its channels and turn them into profitable channels.

All your questions automatically assume that there will be extra funding where is this funding going to come from. If you assume from the BBC then your question is loaded. There should be no extra funding for channel four. Let it sink or swim. Let it compete in the market, and if it can't survive then so be it.

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?:

The question is what is public service. If the public watch or read it then that is a public service.

Bringing major sports to television is a public service. Ofcom and everyone is so highbrow over what is considered public service broadcasting. Everyone mentions news, current affairs and arts.

The Channel 3 licensing should be sold as one licence not on a regional basis.

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?:

TV companies have to compete for funding now as in advertising. Your question implies that there will be competition for the licence fee. Or extra funding. These companies are commercial companies, and if they go out of business then so be it. If they can't afford to keep going then they should hand back their licence. If you assume from the BBC then your question is loaded, one more. No

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 i do not, you are trying to scew the playing field. And if the playing field is scewed then the BBC should be allowed to take advertising or sponsorship. To help it in the future, whether this be just on radio, online or tv. Or on all three or just two of them.

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

None

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?:

Any changes in funding to provide public funding would scrow the market. And if ITV were to receive public funding then the BBC should be allowed to compete for advertising. Plus if one commercial company has to compete against another for funding. Then there are going to be arguments about why one or the other did not get funding for a certain programme.

All of your proposals are seriously flawed.

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?:

I think that you define public service content in a very narrow way. The funding model as it is should be left as it is. And left to market forces.

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

I favour the BBC proposal, of the BBC helping other broadcasters. But in return the BBC needs to get something back. It should be allowed to charge a nominal fee for other channels using their services. But personally I think that Channel four should be handed over to worldwide and not the other way round. Programmes and content could be shared to get the best commercial value out of the property.

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?:

YES

Additional comments:

Your proposals that involve the licence fee or BBC worldwide are seriously flawed. And you do not have the right or the power to suggest that the commercial arm of the BBC be handed over to Channel 4. This is beyond your remit.

Everyone who says they want a strong BBC, always has conditions on this, so the areas where the BBC is strong does not impact on them.

The BBC should have the funds to compete with all the commercial broadcasters on every level. The BBC should be the strongest Broadcaster in this country and we should make sure that it can compete in the areas of children's TV, news, drama, entertainment, sports.....

In some areas it should be protected so we should expand the areas where sports are protected for free to air broadcast.

If Ofcom's proposals are taken up especially those that affect the BBC. Then Ofcom will always be seen as the organisation that damaged the BBC beyond repair. Ofcom will then become a laughing stock around the world. It is clear that Ofcom's only real remit is to damage the BBC.

There are other ways to fund Broadcasting in this country. But Ofcom has missed the

chance to come up with any decent proposal. The only decent proposal has come from the BBC.