

## Your response

Question	Your response
<p><b>Question 3.1: Do you have any comments or other views on the sector developments and likely future developments we describe in Section 3?</b></p>	<p>No, I think the section covers it well.</p> <p>As identified, there is a broad spectrum of viewing habits now. I do want to stress that while it is very important to chase content availability for newer habits (like VOD), it is critical to not forget that it has not replaced live TV and may perhaps never be - traditional live TV isn't dead among young people, it's just that there are alternatives now. This is from myself being a young person too!</p> <p>Evidence of this is from the BBC Three move online. There was an incorrect view that VOD had replaced live TV for young people. This resulted in poorer than expected audiences and the eventual reintroduction of BBC Three content on live TV in the form of a "Threetime" slot on BBC One.</p>
<p><b>Question 4.1: Do you agree with our estimate of the likely increase in BBC iPlayer viewing as a result of the Proposals? Please provide evidence to support your views.</b></p>	<p>Yes. There have been plenty of occasions that I have heard from family and friends about a show that was on and worth watching. However it's possible that this was weeks/months after the original air date of the show. If I don't find the show on iPlayer then that's a lost viewer. I'm not going to be looking for alternative shows, because I was there looking for a specific show that was recommended.</p> <p>I can only see the viewing numbers increasing with the increase in time of shows being on iPlayer.</p>
<p><b>Question 4.2: Do you agree with our estimate of how the viewing of other services is likely to be affected by the Proposals? Please provide evidence to support your views.</b></p>	<p>This is incredibly difficult to predict as it's massively situational and I can see from the figures presented that you have found it difficult to come to a definitive conclusion, with the massively large percentage ranges in paragraph 4.19.</p> <p>There's many scenarios. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A family may be substituting their dinnertime entertainment programme watch from a live TV channel to iPlayer due to a programme which catches their eye.</li> </ul>

- Equally, some live TV of sport may suffer less viewership drops due to the greater desire to follow the match as it is happening and not just catch up later.

Ultimately, it's difficult to generalise here and we will only truly know the effect once it has happened.

**Question 5.1: Do you agree with the findings from our review of the BBC's assessment of the public value of the Proposals? Please provide evidence to support your views.**

**Public value:** Yes, in the general case expressed here, I can only see this increasing public value.

**Social value:** I agree with your cautious "yes". I would want to push the BBC to give responses to your questions and not take the easy option and ignore them.

**Resilience of the BBC:** Yes, I agree with what's written here.

**Substituted viewing:** I find the BBC's response here quite poor and blunt - almost arrogant sounding. I think you've done a good job at picking up on this in your review, and I hope the BBC recognises this and does not have a similar attitude towards this response as what was fairly dismissive tone conveyed in their initial response.

**Impact of the Proposals on funding for other BBC activities:** Again, quite a poor response from the BBC. It is an incredibly vague response that boils down to "don't worry about it". I agree with your review, but will urge you to try and get proper answers from the BBC before they continue. How much this affects public value will depend entirely on the "efficiencies" the BBC plans to make. I don't think you can properly conclude on public value without these answers. For example, if the BBC was planning to trade certain sports rights for this, I may change my stance to be wholly against this proposal. It is absolutely critical that the plans are clarified.

**Question 6.1: Do you agree with our assessment of the likely impact of the Proposals on fair and effective competition? Please provide relevant evidence to support your views**

In general, I agree with the assessment here.

However, I do want to focus on the distribution of BBC iPlayer. I do agree with your review here but I will discuss a few points myself.

Sky's concern about making sure that the standard BBC iPlayer app is inline with the bespoke version on Sky as much as technically possible is indeed important. While I don't see too much widening here, with the main absence being live event streaming, it is important to make sure it doesn't widen further, as you've alluded to.

A particularly alarming point which has caught significant attention within the public from this whole review is where Sky claims that "the BBC currently refuses to allow Sky to include its catch-up content in its Sky Go and Sky Q apps, or to distribute UHD versions of the FA Cup final and Wimbledon tennis finals via satellite – preferring instead to restrict access to the BBC iPlayer". The situation around the Sky Go and Sky Q apps is not new, the BBC have always been against allowing BBC content to be streamed, both live channels and catch-up content, on Sky's apps. However the situation on certain live events, like UHD Wimbledon, has noticeably worsened in recent times.

There has been discussion on public forums on why the BBC have decided to withdraw UHD Wimbledon from the Sky platform in 2019 while it offered it in 2018. Ultimately, I gave the benefit of the doubt due to the "trial" nature of the UHD broadcasts and how Sky do not currently offer HDR support yet - but likely will in the coming weeks/months. However, the bigger surprise is one that Sky didn't mention - and that is the decision to make almost all live Glastonbury coverage a BBC iPlayer exclusive.

In past years, the BBC offered live (or "as live") broadcasts of certain stages at Glastonbury on the red button (the traditional service over satellite, DTT, etc. - not the connected red button service). This

was typically done using additional temporary BBC Red Button channels already set up for Wimbledon.

This year a similar channel setup was there, but the BBC appeared to make a decision to not use them. This unusual decision to make the festival an iPlayer exclusive sparked significant discussion on several public forums. The situation seemed to be neither technical nor financial since the capacity to broadcast was already available and the additional channels were even added to EPGs before the festival had begun. However, even if you forget about the additional channels, the standard BBC Red Button channel available throughout the year, which would have usually been one of the channels showing live or “as live” Glastonbury content, was instead used for a very short loop of highlight clips. As short as 15 minutes initially! This was something many agreed to be extremely low value and in fact was often already covered, and in a significantly better fashion, by BBC Two or Four, since the programmes on them were mostly highlights with the headliner act live. To add to the frustration, BBC Two and Four had a red button graphic saying “CHOOSE BANDS” when you could do nothing of the sort.

It appeared to many that this decision was purely an executive one. BBC iPlayer-exclusive live streams in the past are often used when space could not be allocated on the BBC channels or the red button. This situation did **not** fall under this, and nobody could think of any reason to it other than promoting BBC iPlayer, or perhaps the BBC Sounds app which is new for this year’s festival.

If there was a proper technical reason, I’m sure many people would begin to understand. For example, most understand the BBC don’t have the resources to offer the full Wimbledon coverage on the traditional red button service.

Does this proposal have anything to do with this? Not too much, as this proposal will

probably not affect this situation much since the BBC are already doing this before the proposal has gone ahead. However it was a key talking point from this review so I could not go without mentioning it. Hopefully the concerns are noted however and not glossed over.

In general, I hope that the BBC can be more transparent behind questions in this area, at least where possible.

Evidence:

Example discussion threads on Glastonbury:

- <https://forums.digitalspy.com/discussion/2338897/glastonbury-2019/p3> (posts #59, #61, #64, #65, #75, #80 in particular)
- <https://forums.digitalspy.com/discussion/2329546/glastonbury-2019/p11> (posts #259, #407 on page 17)

Random selection of social media reactions (from just day one!):

- <https://twitter.com/ICRESSWELL1985/status/1144701379379941381>
- <https://twitter.com/stephenphowell/status/1144660725874475008>
- <https://twitter.com/jollyfucker/status/1144676706168557568>
- <https://twitter.com/Chellogz/status/1144684134163521536>
- [https://twitter.com/\\_LuceSmith/status/1144688540875403265](https://twitter.com/_LuceSmith/status/1144688540875403265)
- <https://twitter.com/lanW60/status/1144693320293257223>
- <https://twitter.com/Paulturner79/status/1144694537123745792>
- <https://twitter.com/ManOnThe46/status/1144718948694417410>
- <https://twitter.com/JustJonC/status/1144724356582584320>
- <https://twitter.com/ianchadefc/status/1144724905424035840>
- <https://twitter.com/Lesetrangers/status/1144730229602160640>
- [https://twitter.com/Satans\\_Mother/status/1144731895772717056](https://twitter.com/Satans_Mother/status/1144731895772717056)
- [https://twitter.com/matt\\_40\\_/status/1144741174516899842](https://twitter.com/matt_40_/status/1144741174516899842)

**Question 7.1: Do you agree with our provisional conclusion that the public value associated with the BBC's iPlayer proposals justifies the adverse impact on fair and effective competition we have identified? Please provide relevant evidence to support your views.**

In general, yes. But there's some key points about public value I've already made earlier that should be clarified first.

**Question 7.2: Do you agree with our provisional conclusions on the conditions and guidance that should apply to the BBC? Please provide relevant evidence to support your views.**

Again, in general, yes. But again, it depends a little on the answers to some of the unanswered questions as mentioned in question 5.1.