

From: Jody Lewis
Sent: 10 December 2003 21:45
To: BBC Charter Review
Subject: BBC Charter Review

- What do you value most about the BBC?

In a word I don't. I very rarely use any of the BBC 'services' as my needs and requirements are met by commercial broadcasters such as BSkyB. As someone who doesn't use the BBC I feel that I shouldn't have to pay my BBC subscription or TV tax as I prefer to call it. I have cable television and as such the technology for channels to either be made available to me to watch or not. If I didn't pay the TV tax then I wouldn't get the BBC channels. I'd save some money rather than paying for something I don't use. Radio and internet services shouldn't come into this debate. If I didn't pay the TV licence I would still be able to access these 'services' legally.

- How should the BBC adapt to cope with changes in technology and culture?

Rather than trying to compete they should offer an alternative. Why have a 24 hour news channel when that sector is already well served by Sky News or ITV News? Also, why does BBC News24 cost significantly more to run than Sky News - could this be an example of the BBC wasting the TV taxpayers money? Surely not.

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

Nothing of interest to me apart from the occasional sporting event. My entertainment needs are more than provided for by commercial broadcasters. I could live fine without the BBC.

- Should the BBC run commercial services?

No. How can it whilst claiming to be a Public Service Broadcaster and taxing every person in the UK who owns a television.

- How should we pay for the BBC?

Through subscription as we do now. The key change I would implement is that the individual would have choice on digital platforms of whether or not to subscribe. It would be easy to encrypt the BBC channels on digital satellite on cable and make them only available to those who pay the TV licence/tax. This would also aid another Government aim of people switching to digital television. Unfortunately, not all digital terrestrial boxes have adopted the required technology.

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

No. So much money is wasted (see my News24 example) - why offer the likes of Ant and Dec multi-million pound deals or pay out vast sums for movies. If the BBC didn't buy these rights I have no doubt that one of the commercial broadcasters would. The BBC should offer an alternative and be a true Public Service Broadcaster rather than a mirror image of commercial rivals but with only ads for BBC shows/products and a compulsory subscription.

- How should the BBC be governed and regulated?

As it is now but with a far stricter level of control over the way OUR money is spent.

· How do we ensure that the BBC is properly accountable to the public and parliament?

By them being forced to offer an alternative rather than more soaps or gardening shows. Whilst these may be fairly popular they can be found on other broadcasters. Offer an alternative! Just now there is no accountability in my opinion as we're not customers as such. We are tax payers who have no CHOICE of whether or not we pay for the BBC. I don't mind paying tax for necessary things like roads, schools or hospitals for example. I do resent paying for something that I don't use and is quite clearly not essential.

Thanks for reading my views. Please stop this robbery which means despite me not using the BBC at all I still have to pay well over a hundred pounds a year just for owning a television! It's a disgrace and shouldn't be allowed. There is room for a more scaled-down BBC which offers educational and informative programming on a smaller budget than now. Don't see why a Public Service Broadcaster should compete with the likes of ITV for sports or movies. It shouldn't look to compete - it should look to offer something different to viewers and something that is not offered by commercial rivals.

Mr Jody Lewis