

From: Nick Kidd
Sent: 17 December 2003 16:29
To: BBC Charter Review
Cc: webmaster@culture.gsi.gov.uk

I hope this is going to the correct person. The website is far too heavy, poorly designed and presented, and certainly does not encourage people to give you feedback. Why for example are these questionnaires not done as an automated web page form? Its very poor indeed.

To help people think about the BBC, we have drawn up a list of key questions. We want you to send us your responses to them.

Of course, you may not have views on all of these issues, or you may have opinions about other things the BBC does, which are not covered by the questions. We want to hear these too. What is essential is that you make your voice heard

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?

I generally like to watch films, fiction series, comedy. I'm certainly not a sports person. I am not a fan of British news media in general, so avoid it as much as possible. I particularly HATE the way that the BBC doesn't run ongoing series at consistent times. X files for example requires you to follow regularly and religiously. The BBC constantly take it off ... put it on change the time run episodes out of order ... bump it in favour of some darts or snooker tournament .. etc. etc. etc. The same is true of many programs, particularly American series, which need to be run regularly and consistently. Your decision not to pick up series 3 of "24" is a perfect example of your lack of commitment to the kind of programming I typically enjoy.

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?

The BBC is kind of a "one stop shop" which tries to cater in a very small way to a very wide range of audiences,. The availability of choice now means that people no longer have to accept that. People have fast easy access to exactly and only what they want all the time. If the BBC did not have the luxury of being able to force money from the public to pay for itself ... if it had to survive based on the principles of free trade ... I think that it would find itself in trouble due to its lack of "identity" and proper commitment to any one type of programming.

What do you think of the television, radio and online services the BBC provides? What changes, if any, would you like to see?

The examples I have given above indicate my general thoughts on the matter. The BBC does produce some excellent programming, but for me it comes too little too rarely and inconsistently. It can't possibly hope to cater properly to everybody anymore, especially given the massive amount of choice the average person has and the diversity of our culture.

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?

I think the BBC should NOT receive public money unless it is donated freely. They should operate as a business and let the laws of free trade, and supply/demand guide your decision making processes. If your commercial operations generate revenue and at a profit, then of course you should continue to run them.

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

As I indicated above I don't see the need for a state funded BBC and feel that people should have a choice to pay for and watch what they CHOOSE to watch. Many people would still undoubtedly subscribe to the BBC if it were offered as a choice rather than by legislation, but the point is that people should be given the CHOICE. And that way the BBC would also have to be much more accountable to its patrons when it comes to choosing its programming. The proof is in the pudding ... simple as that.

Is the BBC organised in the most effective and efficient way? Is it managed and run to provide the very best services for the public?

No I don't think so. I think it is largely an out dated throw back to 70's Britain. It can be seen, from time to time, to make attempts at modernisation and to keep pace with the likes of Sky, but the reality is it is a slow moving behemoth which is firmly rooted in a by gone era. The fact that you don't have to worry about where your money is coming from, also keeps you from having to worry about getting things right.

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?

I don't see how it should be any different from any other commercial organisation

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 only way you can give the public their say ... and ensure that they believe their money is being well spent, is to give every single person a

CHOICE. The BBC should be a subscription/commercial service. Let people show you how they feel by voting with their feet/remote controls.

Nicholas Kidd