

From: Duncan Wright
Sent: 16 December 2003 19:17
To: BBC Charter Review
Subject: BBC Charter

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 value the lack of business interest determining the output. Does the BBC have shareholders or vested interests that would cause it to suppress a story of public interest? Would they put cash over the truth?
No.

I think it was Greg Dyke that said, whilst in the US, that the job of news companies was not to be a cheerleader for the government. This is true, and the BBC does its job by analysing what the government does.

I also value the lack of ads. I consider 100 pounds a year a small price to pay for the lack of repetitive, inane, ads, particularly those for doubtful financial services (you know, the ones that promise debt relief, plus some money to spend on a holiday!)

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?

I think the balance is good, with regard to the internet. BBC News online is an excellent source of news wherever I am in the world. Excellent news is an increasingly rare thing these days.

I greatly enjoy BBC news 24. BBC 3 and 4 will benefit from greater publicity (the papers have their listings on a tiny corner as opposed to the whole sheet of the major 5 channels)

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

More nature documentaries, less interior decorating programmes.

Much much more investigative journalism.

Less of a playlist on Radio 1. Allow the DJ's more freedom to choose the tunes. They know what they are doing.

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? If it keeps the licence fee down, yes. No, in fact, just yes. Quality programmes should be available for sale, if people like them they should be able to buy them. I know that some claim that the BBC have an advantage cause of public funding, but if the quality of the programmes are better than ITV then the source of the money matters not, what matters is what is done with it.

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

You pay for what you get. The licence fee is fine.

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?

Money comes in, programmes come out. The output is the focus, not maximising stockholder value. Seems fine to me.

Keep the BBC as it is. Bringing in private companies will make things worse. Look at the trains, look at energy in the US. Keep the big money away.

Please.