

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):**What additional details do you want to keep confidential?:**

Keep name confidential

If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts?:**Ofcom may publish a response summary:**

Yes

I confirm that I have read the declaration:

Yes

Additional comments:

It is interesting that you claim to have received no complaints about picture quality in the past few years. Perhaps this is because nobody knows it is possible to complain.

Question 1: Do you agree with the proposed amendments to the Television Technical Performance Code?:

3.9/3.20/3.21 lipsync, is frequently breached by the BBCs news programs on outside broadcast. I have seen/heard lipsync errors of over a second when the studio is behaving perfectly. I have also observed errors within studio broadcasts.

3.19 minimum picture quality on SD: I rarely watch SD. However the quality on HD channels is frequently less watchable than VHS - it has a different set of errors. The most annoying are lack of colour gradations, especially on such scenes as night skies, and lack of updates in dark areas of the picture. This latter is most obvious in Top of the Pops 1980s, where any dancer with an Afro hairstyle is apparently detached from his/her hair as it dances to a different rhythm.

Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed modifications to the DTT Reference Parameters?:

No.

The reduction to a 3/4 resolution is part of an apparent race to the bottom in our TV standards. A good codec should be able to handle the lower bitrate without blockiness merely by removing the high frequency parameters from the signal. That the codecs are unable to do this is an indication that the bitrate is already too low.

Question 3: Do you agree with our proposal not to include an HEVC profile in the Reference Parameters at this stage?:

I feel you should include a good profile, or we will end up with broadcast "Ultra" HD that is no better than 1080p HD was when digital broadcasting began.