

From: Donald Clark
Sent: 12 December 2003 20:13
To: BBC Charter Review

What do you value most about the BBC? For example, is it the news, sports, arts or educational coverage? How well does it serve different nations, regions and communities throughout the United Kingdom? What subjects does it cover less well? More information

How should the BBC adapt to cope with changes in technology and culture? For example, how should it take account of the rise in use of the Internet or digital television? More information

What do you think of the television, radio and online services the BBC provides?

The TV channels I would buy. However, I'm completely indifferent to the Radio. In fact, Radio 4 drama is trite. middle class rubbish. The same old voices, actors, dull writers, presenters and content. Reith lives on. As for the online services, the website is good, but given the cost and poor technology behind the site, it's a criminal waste of money.

What changes, if any, would you like to see?
BBC should be a voluntary choice, not a compulsory tax.

Should the BBC run commercial services? The BBC produces magazines like The Radio Times and DVDs of popular programmes like The Office. Its main commercial arm, BBC Worldwide, put £123m back into public services in 2002/03. Do you think the BBC should continue running commercial operations?

Absolutely NOT. I run a business that has been seriously damaged by the BBCs dabbling and interference. Having worked on projects for the BBC for nearly 20 years I can assure you that the organisation is wasteful, sclerotic, nepotistic and technologically backward.

For example, the current educational material is error ridden. the English Bite Size has spelling and punctuation errors, and the maths, calculation errors. They should not be allowed near education projects, unless they tender like everyone else. The DfES is populated by ex-BBC staff who feed this stuff into the BBC.

How should we pay for the BBC? Is the licence fee the best method or can you suggest any alternative?

NO licence fee. Like any other channel it should be a voluntary subscriptions service, supported by the commercial activities that the brand provides. I'm with Jonathon Miller on this one.

Is the BBC organised in the most effective and efficient way?

NO. The Board of Governors, led by Gavin Davis, is merely a London-based talking shop.

Is it efficient? NO. It is costly and inefficient. Its online services could be run for 30% of the current costs if they were outsourced.

Is it managed and run to provide the very best services for the public?

NO. It is managed and run to provide the best for its employees and management. there is not a single department that couldn't be run at a

lower cost base.

How should the BBC be governed and regulated? The BBC's Governors currently have a dual role. First, overseeing how the BBC is run internally. Secondly, regulating it on behalf of the public interest - for example, making sure it meets standards on accuracy, impartiality and fair trading. Is this the best approach?

Why is it not audited by the national Audit Office? Because it would uncover wanton waste.

How do we ensure that the BBC is properly accountable to the public and Parliament? Should the public have a greater say and influence on the BBC? If so, how?

The public should be given a democratic choice by being allowed to either buy or not buy the service. Why should I not be allowed to watch any television unless I pay the licence fee? It's a tax. If the BBC is so good, put that hypothesis to the test - let consumers choose. We don't have state books, state cinema or state computer games, so why have state TV?

1. Make it stand on its own two feet commercially.
2. Or regulate within OFCOM