

BBC Charter Review Seminar:
BBC Culture

26th November 2004

Lord Burns: Good morning. Could I first welcome everyone to the eleventh in our series of Panel meetings.. Today we're going to look at the BBC's contribution to and its impact on culture. As many of you are aware, the whole purpose of this series of seminars is to work towards helping to inform and to shape the government's thinking as it were towards a Green Paper in the New Year. I've first of all got to deal with one or two housekeeping issues. As many of you will know who have been to these seminars before, we have a live web cast going out. This means that blackberries and mobile phones can very easily interfere with the sound quality and I have to ask you to switch them off, not just on to silent but to actually turn them off, otherwise we will hear a lot of unpleasant noise. The ladies and disabled loos are located on this floor, around the corner from the lifts and stairs. The men's' are downstairs I'm afraid. In the event of a fire, I'm told the exits are clearly marked but we have to follow the instructions of the hotel staff. You may have noticed coming up in the lift, I think there's going to be a fire alarm at 11 o'clock this morning but we are told to ignore that. We don't actually have to leave the building. There will be plenty of opportunity I hope for everyone to make their contributions and we do have a roving mic I hope for that purpose. In terms of the people we have here, there are three people from the Independent Panel who have been working on all of these seminars – Alice Rawsthorn, my colleague here, who is going to lead off for us this morning; also Howard Davies and Janet Finch. In terms of our guests, we have Sir Christopher Frayling, the Chairman of the Arts Council; Miranda McKearney, the Reading Agency; David Ferguson, the Creators Rights Alliance; Phil Redmond from Mersey Television; Jan Younghusband, Channel 4 Head of Arts and Andrew Eaton from Revolution Films. And from the BBC we have Alan Yentob and Jenny Abramsky and we're very pleased to see you all. As I said, the purpose today is to discuss and debate the BBC's role in culture and, as we know of course, this term covers potentially an enormous amount of ground. What we want to do is to set it in the context of the submission that the BBC has made on culture and we've also had some responses from a number of people we have consulted – The Arts Council of England, UK Film Council, the Creators Rights Alliance, Museum, Libraries and Archives Council, English Heritage and the National Campaign for the Arts and we're very grateful for those observations. And I think you'll find the documents hopefully in your packs. I'm going to begin by asking Alice to start to outline some of the questions, general questions that she would like to put. The objective, the first session is to discuss the BBC's cultural strategy. In the second session we have labelled it how the BBC is delivering its programme output in the cultural field and then, after the coffee break, we'll look at the BBC's wider impact on culture, including its role in the increasing participation in cultural pursuits and building effective partnerships. Now some of these sessions inevitably lead into the others but as far as possible we will try and direct our comments in that way. So, if I could first of all hand over to Alice, who will start, and then I will ask Alan and Jenny to see if they, for their introductory remarks.

Alice Rawsthorn: Thank you, Terry. Now every one of the seminars in this series has been fascinating but this session deals with an area of BBC activity, which is particularly close to my heart. The BBC's achievement in celebrating and nurturing the areas about which I personally feel most passionate – the visual arts, cinema, literature, the built environment and what's inside it and the treasures of our museums – is indisputable, as is the BBC's ability to introduce new audiences to this world in an inspiring yet accessible way from the Big Read to, much as it pains me to admit it, Rolf On Art. The BBC is also one of most important cultural patrons. In Building Public Value it estimates that it spends £500 million a year on what it rather loosely defines as cultural programming and invests another billion pounds in the creative industries. Many people working within the cultural world owe their survival to the BBC and without its support many artists, authors, musicians, composers and actors would have to give up their dreams and our cultural landscape would be the poorer. Now if everyone here in this room was asked to cite their formative cultural experiences, many of

them would have been produced by the BBC. Mine would include – and I risk sparing Alan Yentob’s blushes here – his Cracked Act documentary on David Bowie and Screen International on BBC2 which, for a teenager living in the provinces in the 1970s, was a very rare and precious opportunity to discover independent film before DVD, video. It was even in the days when we still called them art films. Now your own lists of formative experiences from the BBC would be very different but equally poignant. If we think of the intensity of the public’s response to John Peel’s recent death, that’s testimony to the BBC’s power not only to shape contemporary culture but to touch our lives in doing so. The BBC’s position as one of our greatest cultural patrons is therefore not in question. What we will aim to explore in this seminar is the critical question of whether its patronage is all that it could be. Just consider the reviews of the BBC’s latest cultural initiative, the aptly named The Culture Show, and it’s tempting to conclude that whatever the BBC tries to do in this area none of us are quite willing to let it get it right. The Daily Telegraph condemned The Culture Show as being art’s answer to Changing Rooms, while the Observer criticised it for being too worthy. Worst still, the Evening Standard suggested earlier this week that perish the thought; the BBC had scheduled the series simply to curry brownie points from DCMS during the Charter Review period. That said, even the most churlish critic couldn’t contest the BBC’s recent success in developing an innovative new strand of cultural events-based programming – and here I’m talking about series like Great Britons, The Big Read and Restoration. But we do need to ask whether this success only serves to highlight the longer term decline and marginalisation of mainstream cultural programming and the lack of a coherent cultural strategy for the BBC across all its activities rather than individual channels and stations. Does this impressive list of events-based programming add up to a cohesive cultural strategy or a succession of one-hit wonders? And, if it’s the latter, does it matter? My feeling is that it very much does because if the BBC doesn’t have a cohesive cultural strategy, there’s a danger of its cultural programming only being as good as the pictures made to individual commissioning editors. Another issue which I hope we’ll explore later is that of partnerships. Some of the organisations who contributed to the BBC’s...sorry DCMS’s public consultation on this issue describe dealing with the BBC as something of a challenge to say the least. If collaboration with these partners is central to the BBC’s ability to move viewers beyond the broadcast, particularly with these very successful and innovative events-based projects, how can these relationships be improved? We will also probe how the BBC’s cultural output should respond to the dramatic changes in the cultural audience and also the cultural sector. In DCMS’s qualitative research, the public was asked to describe the BBC as if it was a human being and the answer frankly was pretty dull and dreary. The BBC was described, and I quote, as a white man in his fifties, suited, comfortably off, conventional, conservative, perhaps a little repressed, who appeared friendly but was powerful and sometimes domineering. In other words, we could conclude the Mr BBC likes Gilbert and Sullivan, possibly he’s so dull he even likes Gilbert O’Sullivan, but not Gilbert and George and refers Turner to the Turner Prize. In short, he sounds like a typical viewer of Kenneth Clarke’s Civilisation back in the golden days, the age of certainty, when the BBC slipped comfortably into its patrician role of introducing the glories of high culture to the masses. That certainly isn’t an appropriate role for the BBC today, nor does Mr BBC seem an appropriate emissary for the UK as one of the world’s most vibrant and provocative cultural scenes. So how can the BBC adapt its personality to reflect the richness, the complexity and the contradictions of the cultural arena that it has championed so successfully?

Lord Burns: Thank you very much, Alice. It gets us off to a good and challenging start. Alan?

Alan Yentob: Well I’m not going to answer all those questions but if you genuinely believe, as actually many of the people in this room do, that the power of broadcasting is not simply to make programmes and products but to contribute to the quality of people’s lives, then this debate today is an important barometer of the unique value of the BBC and of the licence fee. And really genuinely this is as much about the challenges, the ones that Alice has referred to, that we face as much as about propositions and policies in our document. So I briefly want to look at one or two of those challenges and acknowledge first of all that the DCMS does, as the DCMS does in its definition, the breadth and ambition of the BBC’s cultural remit, not to say its complexities, as Alice just said, from the Archers to the Kumars to Pride and Prejudice, from the Proms to Top of the Pops, from Flash Mob to BBC3 – on BBC3, I don’t know if you saw it – to Wagner’s Ring. And in all of these genres, the genres have to be renewed. There

has to be risk and there is bound to be, and certainly will be, failure in the midst of this complexity. Just a couple of examples there. Radio 1 for instance, in its pursuit of the new music policy in the 90s, discarded Smashy and Nicey, as you remember, and 30% of the audience disappeared as well at one fell swoop. Television drama neglected the classic serial in the mid-80s through complacency and a lack of innovation. And then there was Middlemarch and Pride and Prejudice and Trollop and Dickens and Mrs Gaskell, which in turn emboldened ITV and revived the 19th century novel, not just on television but in schools and libraries right across the UK. So what I really want to talk about is just the challenges that we have. The real challenge for us – there are two – but the real one is to reflect the cultural diversity and the change in Britain today. How do we rise to that challenge? How do we respond to not just the old historic legacy of culture in Britain but the new ones? First of all, are we too metro-centric? Are we too confined to London? Well we are trying hard to reflect the regional diversity of the UK. We've put far more money into the regions than we have in the past. We're problematically still trying to engage with the young. How do we do that? That's why our new services One Extra and BBC3 are there. How do we reflect the ethnic diversity of the UK, the vigour of that, the energy of that, both in our programmes, in portrayal and in our work force? Then we have this transition from digital to analogue, from analogue to digital. Who are we leading out of this? How do we respond to the increasing aspirations of our audience, to their diverse interests, to their plural identities? There are very difficult to reach audiences and these digital technologies now provide us with an opportunity to do that. Some of the opportunities we have are really to do with whether we can harness the BBC's resources and build that value, so here are some of the challenges that we have, to work across genres, to work across platforms, and you've seen examples of that in Restoration, The Big Read and others, not all of them successful. How do we ensure that our training and development responds to both the industry's needs and the needs of the talent? How do we ensure therefore that what we do actually taps in deeper than we have in the past? Well we now have a number of new initiative which are also documented in there – the Writers' Room, BBC Talent, Northern Exposure, Relationships and Partnerships. And I think this theme of partnerships, that Alice has brought up, is really at the heart of Building Public Value. It's about here are the BBC's resources, here is its legacy, here is its content, here is its history. How do we tap into that in a way beyond the broadcast? How do we engage with those other organisations and institutions which also have the same aspirations that we have? I mean in the end there are examples of this. Our investment in the film industry, which I'm sure we'll talk about today, £10 million but that's seed money. That's money, which creates a real potential across the industry. It's what we call the multiplier effect. It's not what I call, it's what Charlie Ledbetter calls the multiplier effect. How do we ensure that what we have has far more value in the future than it has had hitherto? That's really my opening and I think Jenny will...

Lord Burns: Okay, Alan. Thank you very much.

Jenny Abramsky: You ask do we have a cohesive strategy? Investing in the cultural life of the UK has always been part of our remit and you've more than recognised it. And I think the guiding principles have remained the same for years, sustaining and developing that cultural heritage, investing in the new, nurturing UK talent. Part of our strategy is that we recognise that the BBC can give its audiences access to things that they value by that investment. There's a huge range of content which people would never see or hear in any other way. For instance, 100,000 people can go to Glastonbury, millions can hear it or see it on Radio 1 and on BBC Television. Every night of the Proms we've got about 6,000 people in the Albert Hall but there are 140,000 listening on Radio 4 and an equal number watching it on BBC4. Almina's Kitchen, seen by a few thousand at the Cottisloe, by more than a quarter of a million on Radio 3 and on BBC4. On radio, we have a set of aims – to champion and nurture UK talent, to support the new, to offer the unique experience of live performance to our audience because it is quite a unique experience, to offer depth and breadth. By supporting British talent, writers, musicians, performers, we can contribute to the creation of a rich, diverse culture in the UK, helping it to thrive. Radio 3 commissions more new music than anyone else in the world - over the last 5 years, over 250 new pieces. We do see much of our role as a partnership. For instance Nicholas Moore's opera Sophie's Choice was a partnership between Radio 3 and the Royal Opera House. 18 months ago there was a wonderful partnership between Radio 4 and the Lowry Centre, creating a poetry weekend where over

1500 people came to the Lowry Centre and there was a whole series of events that brought people in but also was broadcast. Radio 4 commissioned 350 new plays and 300 hours of original comedy last year, from both experienced writers like Rose Tremain and Sir John Mortimer to others who had never had their work performed. It commissions comedy that has the ability to then move to television. I think radio is playing a nurturing role for the whole of the broadcast industry. And if you just look from The League of Gentlemen to today's Little Britain, it's played a very, very important role. We're breaking new ground with things like the Asian Network, Silver Street, its soap, providing new opportunities for Asian writers and Asian actors and of course the BBC funds 6 orchestras and the UK's only professional choir, all of whom perform new work around the country and all of whom are involved in innovative education work. Hundreds of people packed Preston Guild Hall last Friday to see Weaving the Future, a new oratorio celebrating the people of Lancashire and Britain as a result of a 6-month collaboration between Lancashire Music Services and the BBC Singers. All our radio networks are charged with supporting new UK talent, from the young brass soloists of the year on Radio 2 to One Extra's support of Dizzy Rascal, the Asian Network's similar support for J Shawn. Radio 1's One Music online service is the UK's leading source of information and advice for young people who want to pursue a career in popular music. Over 10,000 demos were sent last year. All were listened to by people like John Peel and 1,000 made it on the air and the site averages over 1 million page impressions a month and it's backed up by workshops and seminars across the country. And I think one of the things that we've recognised over the past few years is that we didn't have a coherent education strategy and a coherent out-reach and that's one of the things that over the past few years we've been working on and developing. Don't forget that the BBC is also a home for the culture of ideas, with programmes like In Our Time, Night Waves and the Reith Lectures. And we're also there to try to offer people different ways to consume those ideas. The technical developments that have been spearheaded by BBC Radio recently have enabled people, for instance 50,000 people downloaded the Reith Lectures last year. I don't think I would have assumed that people would have gone on to download the Reith Lectures but they did. A million have recently listened on-demand to Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy. That is giving people culture in a completely different way and, as soon as they are offered it, they are grasping at the opportunity and taking it. So in terms of our coherent strategy, whether it's coherent enough yet or not, what we see is it's to grow talent, develop public taste, underpin cultural life. We have a portfolio of radio and television stations that enable us to cover culture in depth, support artists across genres, cross-fertilise between stations and musical trends for instance, between writing and music. We think we can help to expand the public's experience and their taste.

Lord Burns: Thank you very much. Do you want to anything else to respond or shall we just see how the Panel respond? Howard?

Howard Davies: It's a sort of prior question I guess but I'd just like, I wonder if either Jenny or Alan could help on this question of strategy because just reading the first couple of pages or pages 6 and 7 really, I was left a little bit confused about just who is responsible for what. An awful lot of the use of the word 'strategy' on these 2 pages, about 20 or 30 times actually, but the first one really says it doesn't have a strategy. There is no single over-arching cultural strategy. And then it goes on to say that in fact the strategies are individual strategies, which I interpret as meaning by, channelled I suppose. But then on the next page we talk about the role of the governors and then the governors considered a new arts strategy. So there's obviously some, I'm not quite...an arts strategy is not a, because there isn't a cultural strategy but there is an arts strategy and I'm not quite sure about the distinction between the two. And then below under drama, there is a new drama strategy. Now what I'd like to understand is just who is responsible for generating strategy here? Is it bottom up? Is it top down? Is it a mixture of the two? Who is actually responsible for this?

Alan Yentob: Let me try to respond to that. I think the fact is, as I think Alice pointed out, that the challenge today is far greater than perhaps it was, you know, 10 years ago. The fact is that Britain is changing, that there are more diverse interests, that people, as I said earlier, have plural identities and greater needs. The cultural strategy of the BBC is, although this is a word which is recently rather like embedded into our culture because culture seems to be a word which people in Britain responded rather negatively to, but there is a creative board in

the BBC which the key creative leaders sit on and that is where the strategy, the programme strategy and the service strategy is defined. So that is the kind of harness for these ideas.

Howard Davies: But that's not mentioned in....

Alan Yentob: No, well it is mentioned in the document but further on in the document in fact. Somebody can, David will tell me. It says it. Perhaps it's not, it should have been I daresay in the executive summary at the beginning but it wasn't. So that's where the strategy emanates from. I think also we're talking about a way in which these services, now there is a portfolio of services in a way there wasn't before, so there are a number of television channels, a number of radio channels, there are the online and new media services. So the truth is that this strategy is still, is still information because, as you would see, the new channels, the new services are still, are still under review and they're work in progress. However, let me give you an example of how that strategy would work. In terms of the new channels, for instance BBC3 and BBC4, as well as BBC1 and 2 there are commissioning editors who are responsible to the Director of Television and essentially to the creative board for a strategic view of each of their genres. There are genre commissioners. Now for instance, if there is a commission on BBC3, that will be thought of in relation to the overall strategy, drama strategy say of the BBC or the overall comedy strategy. In addition, as Jenny pointed out, if there is a comedy commission on radio, that comedy commission will be seen in the light of the needs of the other services. So Little Britain will move from radio to BBC3, from BBC3, as we have seen very rapidly, it's going to be on BBC1. So this is not something, this pan-BBC strategy, which existed so much before. It existed in radio more and each, as a group of services but on television the channels have a more independent identity than they do today inevitably. Just one final point about this. Because of the gap between the analogue channels and the digital channels, it seems to me that the investment is not just in the services. The investments are in the content. If you invest a significant sum of money in a comedy like Little Britain, which might cost say £350,000 for a half hour programme, then it would seem wrong simply to allow that to be on BBC3. You need to have a strategy to ensure that it is seen, so it goes on BBC3 to begin with. It then 6 months later goes onto BBC2. And in fact rather amazingly, it is now going to go onto BBC1. So does that give you some sense of what that is?

Howard Davies: Yes. If I can just follow with one sort of sub point. I mean I can see that it's an impossible job to ensure at the BBC given the breadth that you know you are ticking every box all the time and no one would really expect you to, but to the difficult question sort of is our output over, our cultural output overall balanced, i.e. have we not had, you know to avoid the fact that we might have 6 programmes on Turner, all of which have been generated, but no programmes on any other living, on any other major British artist, I mean that's the cultural board is it then who is, the creative board, sorry, going to look at that?

Alan Yentob: Well there's a creative board. Each of the genres has a board, so there's an arts board, there's a drama board, there's an entertainment comedy board. So the strategies across the BBC are devised in each of those genres and overseen however by the creative board.

Howard Davies: So you're the responsibility, you're the person responsible for ensuring that there is a sort of appropriate balance?

Alan Yentob: Yes, that's right and I would have to say that this is, it is a complex matter. And if you look at a programme like Restoration for instance, Restoration had a, Restoration was not just a programme that went out on BBC2. Besides the partnerships that were had with organisations, perhaps some of whom are in this room, there was a partnership with nations and regions, with local and regional television and radio. There was a partnership with BBC network radio. Jenny was going to pick up on...

Jenny Abramsky: Howard, I think that you need lots of individual strategies that are part, that build up to create the cohesive whole, that's the first thing. The creative board also then reports up to the governors and ultimately the governors oversee what our cultural strategy is, hence the fact that they did look at the coverage of the arts. They looked at for instance the performance of Radio 1. So what do you have to do? You ask is it one, is it the other or is it a

mixture? Of course it's a mixture. It would be pretty wrong if it wasn't a mixture. What we're trying to do – and we probably weren't as good at it five years ago as we are now – is getting the organisation to work as a whole rather than working as 10 years ago, the last Charter. Radio went its way, television went its way, and part of the changes that have happened over the last 5 years in particular have been these creations of, for instance Nick Kenyon chairs a classical music board which brings together people from television, from radio, where they do look at the whole, and trying to look more in that kind of cohesive portfolio way but ultimately going up to what the governors are demanding from us, which is a coherent strategy.

Howard Davies: And that reports to the creative board, the classical music board?

Jenny Abramsky: Well the classical music board reports through me up to the creative board, yes, if it's got something that it feels that it needs to say.

Lord Burns: But in terms of maintaining a balance between the different aspects of culture and you know on page 16 there is a list in a sense what it is that is regarded as being included here – music, drama and theatre, literature and poetry, visual arts. Who is monitoring in a sense the expenditure or the amount of time, the effort that is being put into these various activities a) is balanced and b) reflects the balance that the BBC as a whole and governors want..

Alan Yentob: Well Terry, let me come back to that. I think the creative board is doing – and there are key individuals involved. For instance and there are not that many. Jenny, who is the Director of Radio Music, Jana Bennett, who is a Director of Television to whom all the Controllers report to, most of the production heads or many of them in the genres report to myself or John Willis. So there would be about 5 people. These – and of course Ashley who runs the New Media – these people sit together on a board and the different commissioners report to them. Now just to explain the role of the governors. The honest truth is that the BBC lapsed in its arts coverage, particularly on BBC1. And what happened there was the revival of drama became a priority for the BBC and in the course of that, particularly on BBC1, in the course of that Omnibus was discarded and, although there were arts programmes on BBC1, they failed to have the same impact as having a strand. The governors then said the strategy on BBC1, the art strategy, doesn't seem to us to be working. Can you come to us with a renewed strategy and we will interrogate it? And that happened in 2001, 2002. And, as a consequence of that, the arts on the BBC have been reinvested in and I think actually that's now manifest. Now whether the Culture Show is or isn't yet working, and Alice pointed out how difficult it is for the BBC to succeed at any of these things, that is there and £8 million investment, a new permanent strand. And I would also say to you, the governors had a, what the governors then did, they set up a working party which went round the country and they talked to regional arts organisations and institutions, to those interested in the arts in different parts of the country, and they came back. And one of the findings was this, we had thought about a strand late at night to replace The Late Show, which had gone, but the response very much was no, we want to see the BBC put a show in prime time. As a consequence of that, the show goes out at 7 o'clock. It's 22 weeks a year at the moment. It may go year round. But I decided in conversation with Roly Keating, who is now the Controller of BBC2 and where the channel is, and with Jana and with others that actually there should be a narrative repeat of that show at 11 after Newsnight so that different audiences could actually have the benefit of that. So that was a direct consequence of the interrogation of the BBC's art strategy by the governors.

Lord Burns: Janet and then...

Prof. Janet Finch: This is an interesting line to pursue I think because understanding how the internal structure works is actually quite germane to understanding the strategy in this regard. What I'm hearing, and I realise I'm going to caricature for a moment but then I'll explain while I ask the question, what I'm hearing sounds to me a bit like in my own experience running a university, which is what I do, where the deans of all the faculties, actually the people who are really responsible for deciding what courses you put on, and they get all excited about the things they're interested in and the courses they want to put on. They might pay some attention to student demand, which I think is your equivalent of

audience research, but on the whole it is in this sense producer-driven. And you know if the Vice Chancellor gets a look in at all it's just to sort of stop one or two things that are really going wrong. Now if a university runs on that basis, eventually it runs into the sand because there's no sort of clear sense of what the whole is. And so whilst I think that that sort of kind of producer-driven stuff is really vital and if I try to make it all up myself I'll get it wrong, there does need to be the other bit, which is actually what is the whole that we are actually all trying to aim for and work within? And it seems to me that I'm not hearing about that bit at the moment and it may be that it's just we're getting a partial account. But it's really questions like, if I can put it this way, what is special about the BBC licence fee and its relationship to licence fee payers which drives the cultural strategy of the BBC? The BBC has a very special position in which it has this long-term secure source of reasonably generous funding, which it can do all these fabulous things that we all support very much but what should it be that the licence fee brings distinctively to the BBC's cultural strategy? What responsibilities does it bring? What particular role should it give the BBC in the cultural broadcasting arena?

Lord Burns: Can I, rather than respond at this stage, if I can just ask you to just sort of sit back for a moment and we'll collect a few of these comments and then maybe have a response. Phil?

Phil Redmond: Yes, I hope to pick up a little bit what Janet said but first of all Howard was saying earlier about who, you know what's the strategy. I mean I think actually when you read the document, it's the kind of document that sort of says oh Christ, it's the first time we've ever been asked to answer this question and it's a word processing document the way I read it. It's that someone was sitting somewhere typing it out and every time someone would walk past they'd shout "Oi, don't forget that we did such and such a thing." Another bullet point, which is why I think the creative board sort of comes in very late into the document. Page 2004. But actually the discussion about it comes very, very late in the document. But I actually think we're in danger of drifting into the usual problem when you try and talk like the BBC and that is actually talking about process. And I think Janet's hit the point. I mean we really should be talking about what is a licence fee going to deliver. In terms of the future, and I think also we should not be talking about, you know, we've done fantastic things, you know. And I'm a great supporter of the BBC and actually what is a good thing about the document is it does remind us I think what the BBC has done and what it's achieved and I think that's good. But the world's changing, things are moving on and I think really what this debate should really be about is what are we going to get out of the BBC in the future? More importantly, what are we going to get out of one of the biggest cultural funds that we as a nation at the moment are quite prepared to fund and we'll go on funding for quite some time? The future strategy I think, as I understand it, is as laid out by the Chairman Michael Grade to the CBI, is in future it's going to be the governors who are actually going to set out the strategy. They are going to sneak off to their secret location for their meetings, not to be influenced by the catering of BBC Television Centre. Well I suggest its BBC Publications, which won't be too far for the Chairman to walk. And could I just make a note that can we watch the refurbishment bill just in case. But I think the idea is that the governors are going to set out the targets, going to set out the criteria, set out internal licences in fact against the services, of which the management are going to have to deliver, and I think that's a welcome move but we'll have to wait and see how it develops. The other thing too I think we should be thinking about is – and you'll have to forgive me because I come out of the old Merseyside Marxist school of sociology, so as soon as the word 'culture' comes up, the next question is who's culture?

Lord Burns: Exactly.

Phil Redmond: And I think again the document is very clear. This is a very top down culture. It's really BBC World view of what people actually want and people actually need. Again the world is changing. Technology is changing. I think we've got to move to thinking about how the viewer, how the participant in the BBC's public services move from being passive to active and that is not allowing them to download archive and manipulate it and show their friends their CD. It's actually allowing them access to the whole structures and processes and allowing them to generate the content that actually comes on. I mean Jenny made the point about people downloading the Reith Lectures and things and when you offer it to them they

grab it. You know, I think that's great. Also what you should be doing is looking for mechanisms that actually allow them to tell you what they want, tell you what to deliver. Now I think the only way to be doing that is also to be thinking about what will happen with the moves in the future. Regionalism's a big thing but that's not about moving bits around on the board. That is about actually empowering the regions, you know sort of letting them get involved in the local arts debates, the sports debate, regeneration debates, educational debates, and letting the regions feed into the centre rather than the centre keep possibly feeding out. And then I think we need to think about the timescale you know because this is a very, very fast process and so I think everything we talk about today is more or less going to be that's good, that's good, but we'll add it into the Charter as an appendix or something. So the monitoring has got to be over the next 10 years or something. I mean the BBC's projection to be spending £1 billion outside London and half its staff is something like 30 years when you follow the process through. So I think that's a thing and the most exciting bit of this document I think again because the word processing was just chugged in at the end and that's the paragraph that talks about the partnerships of the future and how the BBC will build its partnerships. And I think that's the thing we should be asking about. What are those partnerships going to be? What are the mechanisms for building those partnerships? What's the mechanisms to allow access, not passive acceptance but actual active participation within a generation of content across the whole cultural spectrum?

Lord Burns: Okay, thanks. Christopher?

Sir Christopher Frayling: I think it's unfair to call the document top down. I think it uses the right words - entitlement, which was sort of last year's word and public value, which is this year's phrase, access, diversity, complexity. I rather welcomed the discussion of process because it's how those words map onto, you know obviously strategic decision, map onto the programme. I mean how does it map onto not disciplines? And I completely understand what Alan was saying about the discipline level - music, theatre - how those decisions are made, which is one step up from the deans, right. It's the sort of faculty boards. But what I don't understand is how that maps onto you know deciding is it mainstream analogue, is it segmented television? I mean, okay, diversity. Do you deal with that by as it were infiltrating the mainstream? Do you deal with that by segmenting it and having a sort of dedicated area or do you beyond broadcasting deal with it on the Net with interactive things? I mean yes, the answer is you'll try and do all three. My sense is that those big words have mainly been dealt with in a segmented way and the challenges to deal with it in a mainstream way, my sense, you know and your point about BBC1 and so on, and I think that's a real challenge, a protest challenge, and it's not sort of governor dictate. Excuse my voice...a governor dictate. There's something about taking a bird's eye view of those media rather than the disciplines and deciding what they're for in terms of two things - one, reflecting diversity but one, where does your cultural authority come from, which isn't in here? What tone of voice are you adopting? Okay. Diversity is about audiences but what tone of voice are you adopting? Alice mentioned Kenneth Clarke. Everyone knew what tone of voice that was in. I don't know what tone of voice the BBC is speaking in anymore and I think that's an interesting point related to these structures, a sort of tartan number. Here's the horizontal themes. How do you actually map those onto the vertical bits.

Lord Burns: Okay. I'm going to have to ask you to be patient, Alan. Miranda?

Miranda McKearney: I just wanted to pick up on the things that other people were saying about partnerships and also about the balance of the cultural output. We were involved in delivering public libraries' involvement with The Big Read and coming out of The Big Read, which shone this brilliant light on reading and was a very interesting attempt I think to kind of move beyond adaptations, serialisations, you know, big block buster interviews with individual authors. It's been quite difficult to understand the BBC's kind of continuing commitment to reading. It's a bit sort of light in, light out. We are having really interesting discussions about the future potential of partnership with the public library network but it seems to me if there was more clarity about the kind of balance of emphasis on particular areas of cultural output, it would do a lot for the partnership base and understanding how we can bring all that kind of live community engagement to bear.

Lord Burns: Okay. Alice?

Alice Rawsthorn: Yes, two things. Taking Alan's argument about the lack of a coherent strategy to a sort of (INAUDIBLE) rather than simply a caricature, your point seemed to be that because we are operating, we are living in an increasingly complex, fragmented, diffuse culture, the BBC's strategy obviously had to embrace that but at the same time, given that you have this diversity of new media, all works in progress, as they rightly should be, the BBC couldn't adopt a coherent strategy because it had to allow itself time to evolve to these maturing technologies. But isn't this a recipe for (INAUDIBLE) rather than simply lack of coherence because surely at a time like this, this is precisely the moment when you do need a coherent strategy? And linking in to Jenny's point about point of difference in the BBC, I was quite puzzled by her examples – and this will link to my first point. You suggested Glastonbury. Fantastic that so many people listen to it on Radio 1 and watch it on BBC1. I mean Jan can say this for herself, surely Channel 4 will pick up that particular baton if the BBC dropped it. And for the Proms, I'd be, you've mentioned an audience of about 140,000 people watching it on BBC4. Isn't this absolutely germane to the argument of cultural marginalisation by the BBC. You've shifted that programme from BBC1 to BBC4, so its audience and potential audience will diminish accordingly.

Lord Burns: This is just dripping slightly into the next session about how we deliver the programme. I think now is the time for a reply.

Alan Yentob: Can I, I think this is also, I would acknowledge actually that this document is full of stuff but actually the strategy is not as clear from the document. We have to own up to the fact actually Alice, when I said it was a learning process, the last few years, particularly with these new technologies, with digital, with online, it's been a challenge to try to understand the needs of the audience to come to what Phil has just said. In other words first of all you have to, you have to listen and look at the way people are behaving and what their needs and aspirations are. That's the first thing because we've been out of touch with audiences for a while and the BBC historically has been very paternalistic in that sense. It's thought we know what's done. That's why I resist the notion of a top down strategy in quite the way we're talking about. The governors, I think it is for the executive of the BBC to set the strategy and for the governors to see whether it fits and to challenge it. Now I think there is more coherence than we imagine and I think you would say about The Big Read, I would absolutely agree with you that the continuity in terms of the BBC does a Big Read, it builds up these partnerships, the programmes in a curious way are less successful than the impact of the idea in my view. We learn from that but then how do we sustain it and what happens next? Actually I think we need to be given credit for the fact that, given the complexity of this environment, we have tried very coherent to bring together some very big ideas and I don't think they've been unstrategic at all. They have. I really, I acknowledge that this is, there are so many things in this document it's sometimes quite difficult to see but even the arts strategy, let's be clear you know, there was, there is an arts strategy paper. That arts strategy which had, which the BBC had failed to deliver in the previous 3 years, the governors addressed that, the BBC had to write another strategy.

Lord Burns: Okay. Jenny?

Jenny Abramsky: Let me pick up a few things. First of all very swiftly on the Proms, I mean in 3 minutes I just gave one or two examples of things. We have not reduced the commitment of the Proms on BBC1 and 2. In fact we do the same number of concerts that we ever do on BBC1 and 2. What we've done is introduce 3 weeks now of coverage of the Proms on BBC4 that wasn't there before. So I'm sorry but I was just using that as an illustrative thing across two particular things. In terms of Glastonbury, I could have given you Music Live earlier this year in Northern Ireland where we ourselves created 500 concerts across Northern Ireland where Radio 1 virtually took over Londonderry across a weekend because there are lots of different examples. Of course I'm not saying that nobody else could ever do these things. I'm just saying that the combination of us using radio and television sometimes can make a greater whole from just one thing. But can I also just pick up from what Phil said? I totally agree with you, Phil. I absolutely think that what you have to have is things coming from people telling us. We are trying to do that. I gave you the example of the One Music website

where young people are finding it and actually posting their own music on it. We're doing the voices project that we're doing with local radio. We've been doing story telling with local radio, where from all over the country we're getting people's stories and giving people the opportunity to write. And should we do more of it? Yes, of course we should. And I think it's an absolutely critical part of what we should do. And finally, Janet, yes of course in some ways we're a load of, you would never expect a creative industry.... Phil, Phil you know is a member of the creative industry. He wants to be creative. What we do recognise is that you still have to have something that then harnesses it and brings a coherence to it. So there are various things that we do. I mean the area which I'm responsible for, which is radio, I have made it absolutely clear to my controllers that part of their strategy is their support for UK artists and I've done that in ways where Radio 1 has an absolute target to do with UK artists. So does Radio 2. I've made it absolutely clear that part of our responsibility is live music. So you know the fact that Radio 3, over 50% of its output is live, is because it is part of a strategy that says we are committed to bringing live performance. And it's doing that in an umbrella way that then harnesses the individual creativity that's coming in from below.

Lord Burns: Jan, could I ask you to what extent do you think the BBC's cultural and creative role should be different to that of Channel 4 or are they just seeking to do similar types of things and do them in different ways?

Jan Younghusband: I think it's very important that in public service broadcasting that we're all, there's a lot of competition between us and I think it's good when we're looking down the central line at each other thinking what's Alan going to do next? I'd better buck up, you know. And, but the one thing that I find I notice a lot when I'm in this sort of situation is that there's a lot of talk about, you know, money and documents and papers and think and, you know, and how much of everything but actually really what matters is the idea. And actually today we've heard listed things like The Big Read but when you consider that Channel 4 and to a certain extent Channel 5 as well, we work with very small budgets and really it's got nothing to do with how much money you have. It's to do with the strength of the idea. And I mean for instance I could list probably as many powerful projects as have been listed today and on Channel 4 you know we're kind of one channel. It all goes on Channel 4 and it's all in peak and there's over 60 hours of it. So I have to say when I open my paper on Sunday and I look at the listings, certainly in the last 4 years you know it's been quite noticeable that the arts programming has slipped off BBC1 and BBC2 and that's caused a lot of panic in the industry among the creative industry, and I think we breathed a sigh of relief when BBC4 arrived, you know, because you know unless you, there's a space for the creative people to work you're not going to have the programme ideas that will stimulate the viewer. And BBC4 arrived but I have to say that we don't see BBC4 as competition because so few people watch it. For me competition is, you know, Alan, what Alan is doing on BBC1 and what's happening on BBC2. And I think you know we all need that. Channel 5 needs that too to keep, to stimulate the business.

Lord Burns: The other part of the, in a sense the creative support, which sometimes – I mean again just to caricature it – which comes to some of the things and particularly some of the submissions is the notion that somewhere here in the licence fee we have a kind of slush fund for culture and everybody wants to get a bit of, you know their hands on a bit of it and should there be, you know should there be some commitment that some of it should go on film because we've got to protect films, some of it should go on writing, some of it should go on different types of activities. And you know and there's a quite a bit of people come up, you know "Can I have my little bit of this please?" and there seems to me an issue about how one handles that.

Sir Christopher Frayling: I don't think that's fair actually. I think people think there's a cultural remit for the BBC which covers a range of disciplines and it's a matter of the balance between them. I don't think people are talking. I wish to God there was a slush fund.

Lord Burns: No but when I hear, when I talk...no, no but when I talk to David, I mean you know David's very concerned that you know this is one of the most important places where commissions come, whether it be for writers, for composers or whatever, and film is another one.

Andrew Eaton: I think it's easy to answer that if you think of, there's been a lot of talk about partnerships. There's quite a lot of talk in these documents about the notion of partnership. And Alan used the word 'eternal' earlier on, which I think traditionally a way a lot of us have viewed the way the BBC behave. And I think there are lots of different reasons for that, not least in which the BBC is often under attack and comes in for a lot of criticism. And I think sometimes they find it harder, well like when Miranda was saying about partnerships with different organisations, once they've done that to maintain those partnerships, and I think they need to work at having more of an open approach to that sort of idea because I think for example with the film industry, which is where I work, they have a, we have a development fund. If the film comes to £5 million, the BBC spends about £2 million I estimate, I believe on development a year and yet how many projects have been developed between those two organisations? The answer is none, which is really surprising to me. And I think that there are natural alliances to be made and I think that perhaps the BBC needs to work harder and let go of that idea of behaving in a paternal way to embrace those kind of organisations.

Lord Burns: David?

David Ferguson: I think it's, I think the whole question is very difficult and in fact also it's very difficult to even define what culture is. I mean the South Bank Show, which was what, ITV's sort of cultural platform, this Sunday did its thing on The Darkness, as if this band, you know, which arrived last year out of nowhere, were suddenly at the epicentre of culture. And it was astonishing to watch because it was more like watching a sort of re-run of Spinal Tap than actually watching a programme about culture. And so I think the...

Alan Yentob: It's not Melvin's natural territory.

David Ferguson: And I think the other thing is that you know one man's culture is another man's poison. I work as a composer and primarily the organisation that I start from represents composers and I have a large number of people who endlessly go on to me about Radio 3 has betrayed them because it doesn't play their music. And then I have the other half of my constituency saying Radio 3 is the most fantastic thing in the world and has to be defended, you know, if necessary by laying down in front of Broadcasting House. I think everybody has difficulties with delivering culture. I think the Arts Council has huge difficulty of delivering culture. When I was in my 20s I felt that the Arts Council should be spending all its money on fringe theatre groups because I was in a fringe theatre group. And now I'm in my 50s I thank God it's underwriting the National Theatre. So you know where do you go with this? I think these are enormously difficult problems. One of the things that I do think is important, the term paternalism has been used about the BBC and I'm not completely sure that paternalism is actually a bad thing in this context but may be that paternalism needs to be operated by a new man rather than by an old fashioned man and it needs to have that increased inclusiveness. Tessa Jowell, when she wrote her sort of paper on culture, in a sense poses a series of really difficult questions that I think actually need to be answered inside this sort of debate. And she said, "Culture as opposed to entertainment is an art of whatever form which makes demands not only on the maker or performers but on those to whom the work of art or performance is directed." Now I think that sort of thing actually needs to be included in a discussion about culture. The thing I regret about the BBC's approach to culture – and I would actually say broadcasting approach to culture – is that there's very little in it that shocks. There's very, very little in it that takes you by surprise these days. On the whole it's programmes into safe alleys, it's, again we've moved into a broadcasting environment where you don't hard about difficult things against easy things anymore. You run in sort of trying to keep the audience, myself included. The final swipe I'd like to make at the BBC is that I watched the Culture Show at 11 o'clock last week and this week there was snooker.

Lord Burns: Howard?

Howard Davies: Sorry to bring this back to money, Terry, I thought Christopher told you off when you referred to money but....

Lord Burns: No, no, no.

Howard Davies: ...it is a sort of conventional way of looking at things.

Sir Christopher Frayling: We'd expect nothing less from you, Howard.

Howard Davies: Thank you. The BBC will be bound to face constant pressures and indeed David's just demonstrated how they can vary even within one individual. But one way of therefore looking at it is sadly how much is being spent and if we think back to the earlier conversation about who decides a strategy, that we're told is the governors with the support of the creative board and right on the front of this paper, which says the BBC invests £500 million a year. So is that a figure that the governors have approved in that form? Is that a decision made that that is the appropriate share of the licence fee? And will it then be for the creative board to ensure that that is spent in that way and that it doesn't go off into snooker?

Alan Yentob: It's absolutely true that in terms of the investment, the governors have a very significant role. For instance, the insistence...

Lord Burns: By the way does investment means spend.

Alan Yentob: Sorry. I'm not trying to pull the wool over your eyes. In that case spend, yes. So for instance the governors insisted on seeing how much the BBC spent on its arts programming and insisted that went up. Also, in terms of drama, the big investment in drama a few years ago, that had to go through the governors. And much of that was dedicated to you know certain genres of drama which the governors wanted to know about. So I think the answer is that that £500 million incidentally does not include, because we had a discussion with DCMS about this, certain kinds of programming, Phil. So it didn't include the Holbys or the East Enders or those kinds of programmes. So I have to say profoundly that those do have a huge impact ultimately on the culture of the UK because most of the great writers, you know, writing in you know the high water-mark of British television have been nourished and nurtured in those areas. So that is, there's a lot of scrutiny of what could come under that £500 million. There has been up to this point.

Lord Burns: Now I want to move on in a sense to some of these issues of how the BBC delivers it, which many people have been alluding to in some of their comments, but before I do that and move on is there, on this issue of strategy and on the question of how the BBC approaches cultural strategy, are there any observations that anyone wants to make from the floor or questions?

Sir Christopher Frayling: Could I just say something before then because just in response to Arts Council thing because there's an interesting analogy, which I really would be interested to know how the Beeb responds. A couple of years ago there was a perceived problem in regional theatre, so we gathered together the Chairs of all the Regional Arts Councils and did all this mapping region by region of what the problem was, where are the holes, where do things need fine-tuning, diversity, etc. came up with some sort of punch-lines and some of the regions were very generous and held back and others said, you know, we need it, so we put £25 million into regional theatre, which had a huge impact. Is it possible for the BBC to do that because that's an operational issue where strategy is concerned, to actually sit back, take an issue, look at it and you know make financial decisions as a consequence of it, because I know that's process but I think that's an important...

Alan Yentob: Categorically, categorically and I would say, I mean I...

Jenny Abramsky: We've done just that.

Alan Yentob: We've done just that. For instance, when we put the investment in drama and were about to make a very big move in that way, when we made that investment in drama we said we're under-serving the North of England. And not only are we under-serving it in terms of the programmes on the air, but we're not actually investing in the area. And a substantial amount of the money that we spent in drama went into north. And the big change that's coming, which is not quite in this document but ought to be, is that of course we are now

contemplating a very significant shift of commissioning power and money to the North of England. Now that's not uncontentious. Why should it be Manchester for instance?

Male Audience Member 1: It is.

Alan Yentob: I shouldn't have brought that up.

Male Audience Member 1: Well drama's the area I agree with....

Alan Yentob: I wish I hadn't spoken.

Lord Burns: Just to make sure, does anybody want anything?

Male Audience Member 1: It's a question or a comment really in response to what Phil was saying about whose culture really. There was a programme on BBC3 I think a few weeks ago. I'm going to use two specific examples but I don't expect anybody to respond to specific examples. But there was a programme on BBC3 a couple of weeks ago which I had to turn off after 5 or 10 minutes because it was about something like rough places to live in the UK and they got this very well-spoken middle class television presenter to go into South London and you know it was like a visit to the zoo or something. You know it was like "Oh, look at how these people live." And you know I'm from Manchester and my girlfriend's from Liverpool and we just thought, you know, this is utterly ridiculous. Why wasn't a local person presenting that programme, explaining the problems that he has and, you know, showing what was really happening. The other example is I listen to quite a lot of the Today programme on Radio 4 on my way to work and when there was all that business the other week about the rap or the reggae singer or whoever it was who was homophobic and they were trying to keep him out of the country, they had Benjamin Zephaniah on reading a poem that morning and they asked him to comment on the rap singer, obviously because he's Afro Caribbean. Now he gave a very well-balanced answer to whether the guy should be allowed into the country, you know whether he should be allowed to perform, freedom of speech. And the presenter on Radio 4's reply was "Oh well, we can see what side of the argument you're on" which wasn't true. So there's a question of, you know, should you know Radio 4's, you know whatever the Today programme's core audience is, should they be trying to be enlightened about you know what I hesitate to call lower culture rather than BBC1's core audience trying to be enlightened as to again what I'd hesitate to call higher culture?

Lord Burns: Okay. Well thanks very much.

Male Audience Member 2: I have one comment. I'm still not sure what's driving the cultural strategy. Is it audience share, Reithian values, justifying the licence fee, getting more people engaged in culture or what the viewers want? I'm still not clear about what's driving the cultural strategy.

Lord Burns: Okay.

Female Audience Member 1: I mean this is just a question about the procedure here. The point that Christopher Frayling made about mainstreaming, I wondered whether we were coming back to that later in another session. I was particularly interested to hear more about that, not just around diversity but also arts, religion, you know some of the other genres that are being addressed or could be addressed in this way. I wasn't sure where we left it because....

Lord Burns: We're going, this first session was designed to talk about in a sense strategy and the next one we want to get onto the issue of how the BBC delivers it and I think the points you're making probably fall in that category. Okay, do you want to, any points?

Alan Yentob: Are we starting the next session?

Lord Burns: No, no, I just want to say does anyone have anything more to say either in response to those questions?

Female Audience Member 2: I just wanted to say, to remind perhaps Jenny that arts on radio particularly but also on the TV is not all music and news and current affairs. The radio is not all news and music. And we have so many, the BBC have so many orchestras that they're funding and yet find that the way that they are funding drama is a bit more confusing. And I'd like to know more about the drama and arts features on speech radio.

Jenny Abramsky: Drama, I mean I thought I said that right at the start, I think drama is absolutely critical to radio and we invest £13 million a year in drama on Radios 3 and 4. And, as you know, much of that drama is going out in peak time and it's a variety of drama. And part of what our role in drama is as we have interpreted it in terms of our strategy is a combination of nurturing new writers as well as supporting established writers. I mean Christopher asked have we sat down and looked in the way that you did? Well part of a big piece of work we did 3½ years ago was to look at where we were getting writers from and that's when we started Northern Exposure because we realised that we were failing to offer a centre for writers to come to in the North. So we put a huge investment into creating Northern Exposure, which is in partnership with many of the regional theatres that you are funding in terms of supporting and developing jointly writers within that area. It's a very, very important part of what we do and, in terms of speech radio, in terms of our arts programming, I believe Front Row and Night Wave nightly on Radios 3 and 4 are absolutely central to what those two radio stations are trying to do in relation to their audience. And they're a very serious approach to covering culture in its broadest sense. And I do think the BBC has a responsibility to cover culture in its broadest sense, picking up what David said.

Alan Yentob: Terry, could I just say one thing about that, which I think is important about how the BBC has tried to link the two things, what we do and how we broadcast and actually somehow or other staying in touch with the grassroots, and that is that over the course of the last 3 years the Writers' Room, which is something we set up on the website, which is a website in which writers from across the country can contribute, and Northern Exposure, each year we talk to, actually have meetings with at least 5,000 writers across the country, with particular emphasis on the North and the North East, something we had not done before. We spend £1 million doing that. And so I think we are not complacent about reaching out.

Lord Burns: I think this is taking us onto the next session. Would you like Alice just to wrap up and take us on into the next?

Alice Rawsthorn: Well we've covered an enormous amount. Sorry, you've raised your hand. We will have questions after this session. We do need to move on unfortunately. I mean we have touched on an enormous number of fascinating subjects in the first session, all of which frankly we could debate for weeks and months and it's perhaps foolish to imagine we can possibly deal with them satisfactorily in such a short period of time now. I'm still not completely convinced that we know whether the BBC is committed to having a coherent and cohesive cultural strategy or not but Alan has mercifully reassured us that should Smashy and Nicey rear their ugly heads again, they'll at least be pensioned off rather sooner and more efficiently than they were in the early 90s, so that's reassuring for all of us. Now moving on, we're going to look at the very, very thorny and intensely subjective subject of how well does the BBC deliver its cultural programme output and the diversity of response to the Culture Show is indicative of our uncertainty on that. We're going to look in detail at how the BBC does deliver its output, looking at the scheduling decisions, which are made, the quality of the programmes and the use of the BBC's portfolio of media. This of course brings us into the critical area of the impact of digital advances and the proliferation of new channels at the BBC's disposition. Now given that Jenny ended on the sort of high culturally uplifting note of the excellent Front Row and Night Waves, let's go to another side of the spectrum and let's look at a programme that appears again and again and again in BBC's submission to DCMS on this subject and it's that familiar bearded figure Rolf on Art. So Christopher Frayling...I know what you think of Changing Rooms. What do you think of Rolf on Art? Is it dumbing down or innovation?

Sir Christopher Frayling: Well it's interesting. I must say that when I heard about the Constable idea, you know the people's Constable, the people's Haywain, I thought this is

going to be absolutely dreadful but I watched it and I was very moved by it actually. I thought it was an astonishing programme and I rather ate my words. Okay, you know it's easy to mock but no, I thought it was a really interesting way of opening up sort of participation in the arts, so I eat my words on that particular episode. Some of Rolf on Art I wouldn't go to the stake for but I just thought that idea of everyone having a go at doing a Constable in Trafalgar Square and making a big event out of it and making a bit of a news story out of it was a very, very good idea actually.

Alice Rawsthorn: But what about the BBC's cultural output in general? How essential is it that the BBC moves away from the post-Reithian, Kenneth Clarke...

Sir Christopher Frayling: Well it does worry me. I mean you mentioned earlier this mainstream. You know storming the mainstream is for me the big challenge on television, not so much on radio as you say Jenny because I think there's all sorts of things in mid-evening that go on, like Front Row and so on, but I do think you know pre-Newsnight mainstream television is a real challenge for the arts. You know apart from lifestyle, humiliation television or reality as they call it, and heritage, i.e. things on kings and queens of England or the Nazis, apart from those there really isn't very much before Newsnight and there used to be. And that isn't being golden agey and Kenneth Clarke about. It's not about the tone of voice or the cultural authority. There used to be more confidence about putting on arts programming pre-Newsnight and I don't understand how it's slipped. Well I think I do. It's partly, as the gentleman was saying, about the different clashing criteria. Are you chasing ratings or are you adopting a sort of post-Reithian position? But it did slip and it has slipped and things are beginning to happen to try and put it right but I think there are huge problems about mainstream television pre-10.30 where culture is concerned, I really do.

Phil Redmond: I think when Alan says it's not contentious, it is. It's very contentious what the BBC is spending on drama and one of the reasons why you put it on the stand as contentious is, as you've just said, you just rediscover the need to talk to the North. Because when the BBC retreated to London and took all its drama departments back, back to Shepherd's Bush and Alan Platter later described it as, you know, a room with 9 doors and no matter which door you went through you ended up in the same room. I think you know when you look across what the BBC is actually doing in drama, it's pretty anodyne actually and the point about challenge, and there's nothing really difficult to challenge the audience or you know expose areas of Britain that we haven't actually exposed. I mean you could just run through and say well where's the programming about? Sort of Education. Where's the mainstream, you know, drama that sort of looks at what's happening in education from higher education right the way through? Where local community is a big issue, regeneration's a big issue. When Michael Grade addressed the CBI, he was taken to task because of the way drama represents business. A big area that's gone from the BBC in drama is family drama. They used to be absolutely fantastic at producing family dramas. Everybody could sit down and Sunday nights was really good. You can't do that anymore. Film is one area in particular where the BBC actually could be taking a lead in producing indigenous film for Britain, not just to come onto the schedules but every parent knows, as soon as the summer holidays come along and you want to take your kids to the cinema, you can't because there's usually only one PG film on. So I think that's, you know, that is a big area. I think this is how you should be trying to deliver but you really do need to come back to this thing again. Now not just talking to them by sending commissioning editors up on trains to sit in a hotel for a day to get a troop of people coming through a revolving door exercise. But actually, you know, you really do need to get really engaged in regions again. You talk about things, drifting across to things like the Proms, you know, which okay, that's great, it's fantastic, but why don't you rotate it? I mean why isn't it in the Bridgewater Hall, you know? Why can't you take it to Birmingham, you know? And where's the equivalent in popular music, you know what I mean? It might not be to everybody's tastes but the biggest cultural taste in music in Liverpool and Merseyside is country and western, you know. But everybody goes oh God, no, but actually that's what people like, you know. And then things like, you know there's lots of areas. I won't go on and on but I wanted just to reassure the guy at the back about the presenters. Actually in the document somewhere one of the key targets in the future is to find some new presenters.

Lord Burns: Janet?

Prof. Janet Finch: Terry, I'm just wondering whether now is the right moment to make a pitch for a well-funded soap on university, broadcast.

David Ferguson: They wouldn't believe it.

Prof. Janet Finch: But my (INAUDIBLE) is actually going to be something slightly different. Now in relation to drama, what I am hearing here and also reading in the Ceefax that has come through the consultation is where there is criticism of the BBC's recent approach to drama it applies to television and where there is praise it applies to radio. Now sparing Jenny's blushes on this, she said in her introduction that it's stated very firmly the commitment to commission, large numbers of new writers and established writers to write original work for the radio, and I think radio drama is outstanding and remains so. It's a personal preference but in a way it comes back to the strategy and the link with delivery. Is it the case that we're having different policies delivered by radio than by television? You know why is it that I haven't heard anybody criticise radio as far as its support for drama is concerned but a lot of people are criticising television.

Alan Yentob: Well, how many questions do you want to ask? Why don't you answer it?

Lord Burns: Isn't this partly because in a sense radio has its own channel, which concentrates on some of these issues whereas, when it comes to television, the notion that you put the same sort of things onto BBC4 is at this stage mock because people don't watch it. There is a great ambition to put programmes of high quality onto BBC1 and yet we know that in the world that we're going to be approaching in 5 or 10 years' time it is going to be much more difficult to lock people into things by simply the choice of the channel if you put them on? And isn't one of the reasons that in a sense people are more appreciative of radio? Isn't it you in a sense have your specialised area? At this stage people have not really become comfortable with the idea that television should have its specialised place in this type of output.

David Ferguson: Can I say something about I think you are ascribing some values of this in a broadcast market and I think in a sense the BBC actually shouldn't ascribe value to it in financial terms. It should try and think about its output in that sense as being out of the box. When I was working at the sort of peak of my career, the two most exciting television series that I wrote the music for were Cracker and a series the BBC did called American Vision. It was about the history of American art. And I don't know anybody who's ever watched American Visions and...and Cracker, each night that it went out I would be accosted in the pub and there would be a huge discussion about, you know...and I thought that both those programmes had fantastic cultural value and both of those programmes absolutely had to be made and that it's vital that the, the stuff that in a sense is there for a real future, that maybe just has to be sort of stored in museums, has to be one of the things that comes out of the cultural output as well as demanding that the drama that is produced really does – I think exactly as Phil says – has real interface with its audience. And I think that's what we have to sort of try and charge the BBC to do with its cultural output.

Sir Christopher Frayling: Can I just, chairman just taking up a tiny point about Radio 4. It isn't a dedicated arts channel and that's part of the point.

Alan Yentob: BBC4?

Sir Christopher Frayling: Radio 4.

Lord Burns: Radio 4, right.

Sir Christopher Frayling: You were saying that it's sort of niche, you know, it's one of these niches where you can put, the whole thing about Radio 4 is that it normalises the arts by making them part of a balanced evening's listening. So you get a bit of news, a bit of current affairs, a bit of arts and so on. It very much isn't BBC4 and I think that's a strength.

Lord Burns: But nor is it like BBC1, where you have a mass audience which is looking at a whole range of programming and we looked at it when we, we looked at BBC, at Radio 4. I mean in a sense it has a specific remit and purpose. And so it may not be as narrow as the way that the BBC4 is at the moment but it does have something which does not seek to be everything to all people. And my question is whether, you know, at some stage television is going to go down that route?

Alan Yentob: Can I, I mean I talked earlier on about the transition and believe me there is a transition. We all know there is a transition between the analogue world and the digital world and I think that requires one to be circumspect about how you do things. It's not easy. So, for instance, I think on this issue of mainstream, let me just reiterate one example which I think people know about because they've all somehow read about it or seen it – Little Britain. Little Britain started in the radio. Little Britain moved to BBC3. It got an audience last month of 2 million people watching the original programme. Later on in the week, because of the windowing strategy on BBC3, it got 750,000. And then later on, after some award ceremony on ITV where someone cheekily, one of the members of the cast cheekily said "Well by the way switch over to BBC3" and indeed they did and another...So the fact is that over 3½ million people watched Little Britain on BBC3. Since then, it went on, well the last season, series went onto BBC2. It is not quite riskily going onto BBC1. Those who have seen it will appreciate why I say quite riskily. The BBC policy people in the room maybe not even know that. Anyway it is going on BBC1. So in a way it is mainstreaming. It's moving across. Now I think that for all the, all the kind of key content that goes out on BBC4 as well and on BBC3 and BBC2...BBC3 and BBC4, sorry, in particular, they are going now onto the mainstream channel. So it's a brilliant way of finding a kind of space where things can thrive, even not with a large audience but so that people can see them and then move them across. I think that is a fantastic tool for the BBC and it's a way into mainstreaming. The other thing, responding to mainstream on the arts on BBC1, look let's be clear. We've acknowledged that we did take our eyes off the ball on the arts and I don't think this was for bad reasons. It was because the BBC was preoccupied with certain things – moving the news at 10, doing all those things, and lately I've taken to blaming Mark Thompson for all this but there you are. Once we'd seen that it wasn't right, we did change things and there are things that people don't quite notice and that is besides Imagine on BBC1, which I do, which incidentally has got on this run, besides Arthur Miller last night, Bruce Nalman going out in 2 weeks' time. Now Bruce Nalman – I don't know how many people even know about him but he has currently got a very demanding exhibit, which is non-visual, which is an audio presentation in the Turbine Hall.

Phil Redmond: Is he country and western?

Alan Yentob: He's country and western, yes. And the truth is he's a very difficult artist. That's going out on BBC1. John Coltrane went out on BBC1. Now we're not, so we're not avoiding the difficult subjects. Now one thing I think never gets mentioned is at 7 o'clock on BBC1, not always successfully but with a very big response from audiences, there is not just Rolf On Art. There has been Leonardo times 2, which got 5 million audiences. There has been Michelangelo. There has been the better forgotten Raphael you know a week or so ago. There's been Jane Austen. There has been an attempt to really bring these into the heart of the schedule on BBC1 and somehow or other they then get acknowledged. Now I'm not saying they always succeed but there is a strategy and there is no cynicism about trying to do this better.

Lord Burns: Okay. Jan?

Jan Youngusband Yes, I just wanted to say something about this sense I feel there's a lack of confidence in the scheduling even then, this sense of oh well let's take a difficult thing and grow it through BBC4. I mean don't get me wrong, I think BBC4's a wonderful thing and I mean every week at my routine with Kevin Lygo, he says "What do you want?" and I say the easy 4 because you know believe me we have enough ideas we could, you know, do it all over again, which is fantastic. But I think at Channel 4 there is only one place. It's, you know, for me its one place. It's mainstream and our arts are going out at 9 o'clock in the middle of the week and, you know, whether that's Operartunity, Musicality, whatever it is or whether it's a new opera by Judith Wear, you know that's where we put it. We just say we're going to put

it there. And although we have a public service remit, we are a commercial channel. So the risk for us is enormous but it's, it's not about the ratings or anything else. It's about commitment to the work and the importance of putting it where people can see it. And I mean I think the Culture Show is fantastic but it's kind of really annoying at 7 o'clock because I mean, hard as I rush to see it, I either miss it because I've not quite got home or I've kind of missed it at the office, whatever. But you know it would be so much nicer if we saw The Culture Show at 9 o'clock. You know Alan's programmes are late, you know. Why aren't they between, you know, 7 and..why aren't they between sort of 8 and 10? Why do we only see the arts after 10 o'clock? I mean I think that's the major thing for me and I think, I'd like to ask why there's this need to sort of grow difficult things because why can't we just put difficult things out in the middle of the BBC1 schedule? I just, I don't know the answer to that.

Alan Yentob: Well I'll very happily answer that. No, all right.

Andrew Eaton: I just want to pick up something that Phil was talking about earlier on and also relates to what Janet was saying about scheduling because films is an area that cuts across all scheduling. It can be used very broadly and I'm a huge supporter of what BBC films does and I've worked with them on many occasions but it's really depressing when you read in documents like this that the BBC boasts quite rightly about 85% of the programme is British made when you then see research that shows that last year 75% of films broadcast by the BBC were American films and that three times as much money is being spent on buying those films than on supporting British film. And I think that one might argue well are the British films there to feed that market? But the truth is that if you want Olympic gold medals in swimming you know you've a much better chance if you build a lot of swimming pools. And I think that the BBC, the gap between what the BBC says in this document about supporting culture and what they're actually doing, there's a huge discrepancy. And I hope that they would address it in the way that Christopher was talking about earlier on by what they did with drama, by actually you know putting money in that area and supporting and making films about the culture that we all know and we all live with.

Alan Yentob: Let me answer some of those. Let me answer the film question first and then you'll remind me what the others were, arts and mainstream. Okay. I...what?

Phil Redmond: Country and western.

Alan Yentob: Country and western. Guilty. On BBC Films, first of all I both agree, I agree with Andrew in a way. I agree that we should be showing a greater proportion of British film. The first thing I would say was that our film policy 3 or 4 years ago was less successful than it is now and I think the first thing I would like to see is some acknowledgment of the success of BBC Films. As you know Andrew, and you've been part of this, the BBC has taken risks even recently in supporting...and when the money wasn't there, we put more money in. So it has never been, as Terry sort of suggested earlier on, the BBC has now asked to be everything to the film industry. Now Mark said the other day that we will put more money into film. I mean that's also partly a consequence of what we get in the Charter. Now proportionately of course there are more American films.

Lord Burns: That's a bid.

Alan Yentob: Well it's a bid. Yes. You're right. You see I'd like to do it anyway but the truth is we've got a lot of things to achieve. There are a lot of people who want us to do things so we have to think about that.

Andrew Eaton: But can I just pick up on what you say about the film policy. I'm not sure anybody really knows, including myself who does a lot of work with you, about what the film policy really is and it comes back to the whole partnership idea. I think there needs to be, it would help people I think if there was more understanding of what that constituted. I think you'd get more praise as a result of that.

Alan Yentob: Well as you know we're now involved in a project, the formulation of a policy with the Film Council. But one of the things I just want to say ultimately is that I think the investment needs to be in development. I mean we've seen a lot of money wasted on British film, lots of cupboards of British films which never got on the air, so consequently I think we have an obligation to invest more because I think the mood is clear – people want the BBC to invest more in film. However, that needs to grow in proportion to the development of ideas, so we need to invest in the development of ideas. So I'm with you on that. Quickly on the mainstream thing on BBC1. There have never been arts programmes in the middle of the schedule on BBC1. Mainly they would drown. However, there are now. I've just described them. I mean we're talking about at least 10 hours a year - to people who know about arts, I mean that is quite significant – in the heart of a schedule on BBC1 besides Imagine. So I think we are improving our arts coverage and improving the spread. Actually if you include Rolf, it's significantly more. So I think we are making progress. That's all I would say.

Jan Youngusband: I think though there is a perception though that this progress is coming because of Charter Review and I think there is a certain cynicism in the business that once this process is over that the schedulers will once again marginalise the arts. I think that..

Lord Burns: I think part of our job is to have a structure which makes it more difficult to do that but..

Miranda McKearney: I wanted just to come back to the original question of how well is BBC delivering in my particular field, which is reading? I think great, it could be better and for me those two things, the betterness lies around participation of the audience in shaping, helping shape some of the creative approaches and joining things up. So The Big Read for instance, in terms of the mainstreaming things on BBC2 not BBC1, it focused on fiction. If you talked to grassroots readers, looked at the stats, you'd see that only takes in a tiny portion of the reading universe. Joining things up in terms of have a sustained commitment; I think it would be really interesting to look at the links between reading and writing. We've talked a lot about the commitment to writers but of course they grow through being young readers and I think there's some really interesting possibilities that are currently being missed around the online stuff which links back to participation, so fantastic to see reading trails linked to every programme created by readers done through partnerships with libraries, you know, building on what you did in The Big Read but taking it forward.

Lord Burns: Okay.

David Ferguson: Can I just say, I mean I think just to be very clear about what my job is. I think Rolf On Art definitely is dumbing down but by the same token, what purpose does it serve because maybe it's not dumbing down if the starting point is nowhere. Now the real difficulty it seems to me is that Rolf On Art ends up standing on its own. And I think that the key problem inside the whole question of how culture is programmed particularly on television is there's kind of something missing like you get on Amazon, when you buy a book on Amazon and it will flash up immediately afterwards and say "People who bought this also bought this. So if you like this you'd like that." There's no route map and that's what's needed in broadcasting is a route map to help people explore exactly what you were just saying. And you know, if people really enjoy Rolf On Art then maybe they should be encouraged to look at something that may be coming up on BBC4. And one of worst faults of the BBC at the moment in terms of broadcasting is not only does it have these endless trailers for things that are coming up but they're inclined to be two or three for the entire week and they don't cover a whole range of the output.

Lord Burns: Okay. Howard?

Howard Davies: Alan said earlier that there was a problem about arts coverage in the past and the BBC took its eye off the ball, etc. and presumably then the new structure with the creative board, which has grown in importance as we have spoken, to which Jenny now reports as I gather, but....

Jenny Abramsky: On it. Actually I'm part of it.

Howard Davies: But I mean in future though, if you think that the creative board is as it were the cultural conscience of the BBC and you said things like, apart from country and western you've said yes to everybody who wants more of everything really.

Alan Yentob: I think I've robustly....

Howard Davies: You said yes to more British film.

Alan Yentob: Yes, I have. Yes.

Howard Davies Supposing you decide on more British film, how do you implement that? What authority does the creative board have to then go and tell the Controller of BBC1 that there will be more British films on BBC1? I just want to understand how the mechanism works because that is the central hub of it.

Alan Yentob: Okay, there is, I think, listen it's a big organisation and it's complex but actually the mechanisms are there. It's quite straightforward, there will be a greater investment taken from somewhere else and put into BBC films, unless of course DCMS offers us a very substantial increase in the licence fee. We'll have to find savings and invest them in British film. Now one thing that will happen there is there will be I hope - I've rather overdone this about more money haven't I? - will be that BBC films will get more money to spend on, as I say, I would say on development because that's where it matters and then if it works we can make it happen. And those films then will compete with the kinds of films that audiences want to see on BBC1. So there will be money put there. In terms of investment of, the comparative investment in American films and British films, well the Director of Television, Jana Bennett, with me, who she sits on another board which is a film board which the Film Council also come and talk to, we will monitor it. But I suppose the promise is as far as market's concerned, and it will go...we had a paper at the creative board about BBC films only the other day and about this very strategy. I know that Mark, to be clear about this, Mark believes that programme strategy will be set and should be set by the creative board and he's getting closely involved in it and I think that is a change and I would say myself again in relation to the governors' role, the governors' role is to prove a strategy and then to ensure that the BBC is keeping to it. It is the job - otherwise I shan't be staying - it is the job of the, you know the executive and the creative board to create that strategy in response to the...

Howard Davies: I think that's very helpful but I will say it didn't really come out from this.

Alan Yentob: I take the point. I take the point.

Sir Christopher Frayling: Can I - and I'm sure you'd expect me to do this - list some of the things I think that could be done you know in the arts that are gaps at the moment.

Alan Yentob: Design?

Sir Christopher Frayling: No, no. No, no, I'm not going to mention that. In the non-heritage genres because the things you mentioned sort of pre-10.30, you know Michelangelo, that's great you know but young, emerging, contemporary artists, today's artists, not even emerging, even the Arthur Millers before 10.30 please, you know. Secondly, linking up with cultural events that are going on around the country, real cultural, you know drama, dance. There should be much more joining up with, there's a huge energy out there of live events and somehow both in terms of linking up with them and encouraging people to go and see them and also follow-up after them, which is maybe an online issue and so on, I think is a big one. Regions, not just for festivals or big bang events but actually accepting that there is as much art going on in the regions as there is in London, which you know is quite a big step. Where radio is concerned, obviously you know full marks on music and theatre but visual art and dance I think because it's a real challenge. How do you do visual art on radio? I remember you know when we used to do the critics someone would say "And now art" and then we'd all look at the catalogue you know and start reviewing that because it was words. It's a challenge but actually the visual arts cover and the non-music, non words kind of coverage on the radio isn't nearly as good. It's slightly embarrassing, as no one quite knows

how to do it, and finally an archival issue. You've got the best archive of the British Isles in the last 50 years of anybody and a lot of it's been wiped, as we know. Well and I think you know something, and the National Film Archive is working very hard to develop online access so people can get into it. And I think that's an issue that really is worth addressing because you've really got, you know, the crown jewels of the arts there and I don't think you're making enough of it. Those are some areas but I think the non-heritage pre-10.30 issue, I defy you to tell me about a range of programmes on the contemporary arts that have gone out before Newsnight.

Phil Redmond: Can I add just something onto that on the regional aspect of it? I mean I think one of the great artistic endeavours of Wales is the Eisteddfod and one of the great things about it is that every child and every parent knows that their child can actually enter and have a go at anything in any art form, whether it's dance, film, you know drama, whatever. And I've always been banging on about this, that it's something that the BBC could very, very easily do is to set up a kind of national Eisteddfod with regional Eisteddfods so that everybody could actually participate in the arts because what the arts actually need is competition and exhibition. Where is the national school play competition? Where is the national film, you know the national school student film competition? You know you do Young Musician of the Year, all those things, but where is the permanent infrastructure so that every schools knows that every year it will be participating in art which is sponsored and funded and helped by the BBC?

Lord Burns: Jan? There's a bit of a catalogue there.

Jan Younghusband: Let me try some of the catalogue. First of all Phil, in terms of your point about the Proms and classical music, should we be doing it for other forms of music – yes, we should. And part of, we are at the moment going through our annual round looking at our programme strategy and Alan bears a witness to the fact that I literally went with a proposal that we needed to extend that idea of the Proms to all the other forms of music and yes, that it shouldn't be just in London and that we have to do things that take it around. So point well made and point absolutely accepted. In terms of your list, linking up with cultural events, well we do, maybe not as much as you'd like but I mean if I (INAUDIBLE) but the support we've done with (INAUDIBLE), the partnership we've done with the London Jazz Festival, the fact that if you're a Radio 1 you do do Reading, if you're a Radio 2 you do the Cambridge Folk Festival, etc...

Sir Christopher Frayling: No, you're good on music.

Jan Younghusband: ...and we bring those in. Radio 4 has been beginning to do it and I think that was one of the things that Helen recognised, that she needed to do a lot more in terms of speech. And I think yes, we could move there. As somebody who loves dance, I do agree we've not found a way of doing dance on radio very well. So fine. On the archive, on the archive it's an incredibly...

Sir Christopher Frayling: The clog dance.

Jenny Abramsky: I know, but I do understand that. On the archive it's an incredibly important issue for the BBC and it's one that we absolutely recognise. And in the announcement we've made about the creative archive, it's our start at trying to move to doing very much the kind of things that you're talking about. And that desire to, I think it was David talked about, the kind of Amazon, if you like this, the route map, well if you go online now for instance to the radio player and you click on In Our time, at the end of listening to In Our Time it will offer you some other programmes that it thinks as a result of liking that you might like. So that if you go to a book programme, it will tell you about all the other book programmes, not just on the national networks but if there's one in Scotland or if there's one in Wales. We are trying to develop a similar system for our television programmes. It's called Imp. The technology is being developed at the moment to do just that because I think we recognise we need a far better route map. A final one on country....

Sir Christopher Frayling: Oh good.

Jenny Abramsky: Radio 2 does a lot for country. I suggest you switch it on. You're absolutely old enough for Radio 2. It does...it does a lot. It also travels, also once it does a week a year in a different town and one of the things it always does when it goes on the road is to do country. And if you've been listening to the country music awards from New York last week you'd have heard Dolly Parton paying tribute to Radio 2 for its support for country music.

Sir Christopher Frayling: Game, set and match.

David Ferguson: Can I just, I think one of the difficulties that television has is actually to do with the way that actual programmes have changed and what's been fascinating with some of the late night stuff on BBC4 where they've been using bits of archive is that they're suddenly able to take a piece of what I regard a culture, that was actually part of a light entertainment show in the 1960s, and put them altogether. And what we don't seem to have now is anything that resembles magazine broadcasting other than The Culture Show, which actually, because it's called The Culture Show, is ghettoised. And there aren't sort of little things to dip into and dip out of. I think that the BBC Radio by and large is really very, very good indeed. On television, I feel that the drift into the current formats that permeate across all five channels are the things that are barriers to having snippets of culture inside them and something that again the BBC, because of its special role, really ought to look at. And when it comes to talking about music, radio does a fantastic job with music. Music on television is very badly under-represented and it's skewed. It's either likely to be fluffy pop or alternatively it's the middle of the catalogue classical music from the Proms. There is not adequate innovation. The one programme that sticks out on the main channels is Later With Jools Holland. There's nothing that's addressing jazz seriously. There's nothing really that's addressing contemporary classical music seriously. And the really important point in terms of the licence fee here is that actually BBC spending is investment and it's investment in the future culture of the country. We...exactly we've developed a system in this country where, unlike continental Europe which puts maybe a lot more money into its equivalent of the Arts Councils, we've put a lot of money into the BBC. And in that sense the BBC has a banking and investment responsibility in the future culture of the UK, which I think it partially you know succeeds with its remit at the moment but it could do better, certainly on television.

Lord Burns: Okay. Now I'm going to take a few more questions from the floor and then we'll have a break and we'll come back and continue with this I think in part but move onto some of the other issues about measurement and how it is that we tell just how successful the BBC is, etc. Now you had your hand up earlier.

Female Audience Member 3 : Yes, I'd just like to pursue the question about the education strategy. Having worked at BBC Radio Schools some time ago, and Jenny I think you said in the first session that you recognised that there hadn't been an education strategy and now you felt that there was a more coherent one, I'd like, it would be interesting to have some clearer outline of that because linking with a lot of the things that Phil was saying, I do feel that you're not telling us clearer how you're going to address new audiences and your new audiences are the children in the schools at the moment. And I'd be interested to hear how you are going to do that. And I also applaud things that Phil was saying about going out into schools. Where are your strategies for involving every child, every parent in the life-long learning approach? I'd be very interested to hear a bit more about that.

Lord Burns: Okay.

Male Audience Member 3: Andrew, I'm just curious as to what you would see if you had a number in mind and some of the activities that you would like to see the BBC up its anti in its involvement with the film industry?

Andrew Eaton: Well I mean....

Lord Burns: (INAUDIBLE)

Male Audience Member 4: Thanks. I'm not sure whether it's a good question or a plea really.

Lord Burns: Either will do.

Male Audience Member 4: Yes. Okay. Going back to Alan's point about the Coltrane programme. I think that missed a trick because he's somebody who pushed the limits and challenged listeners throughout his career and I'm not sure I'm seeing that on the BBC now. I'm looking back, and it's giving away my age, things like Cathy Come Home, Edna the Inebriate Woman, they stick in my mind because they challenged me when I was younger and all I can think of now is Monarch of the Glen.

Alan Yentob: Have you been watching Blackpool on BBC1?

Male Audience Member 4: No.

Alan Yentob: Well it's reassuring.

Lord Burns: Any others? I've got one here.

Male Audience Member 5: My point's really about if and when I dare to turn on my local BBC radio station and they dip their foot into that murky pool of local culture, what often comes out is a response at the end of it, well wow gosh, that was posh wasn't it. And as a result of that there is this awful ghettoising simply because of the label. I think people would watch Panorama if it wasn't called Panorama because the content's good. It's got the stigma of the label above it. Developing on from that, with so much spent on packaging, promotion and presentation of television programmes, can't those....

Lord Burns: Lots of new titles?

Male Audience Member 5: Well no, not so much that but can't those black arts be used to actually disguise culture so that in fact....I suppose it's your magazine programme idea, so in fact they actually do become part of general programmes and they therefore become part of everybody's lives.

Lord Burns: Okay. Well let's, can you deal with your point?

Andrew Eaton: Oh sure. I'm happy to. I mean I know there have been some discussions already between the Film Council and Mark Thompson about trying to come up with a figure....

Audience Member: (INAUDIBLE)

Andrew Eaton: Well from my point of view I think, as Alan was saying it's almost saying that we need to find savings to spend more money on British film and I think from our point of view as an independent it would be more, well if there's an option instead of so much money on American films it's to look to the British films first and try and spend more money on them. And also I would disagree with Alan but I understand the point about development but actually I think it's an obsession with development in this country in film. And I worked on a British film called In This World, which is about two refugees coming to this country. There was never any script. There was no script and I think...

Alan Yentob: Who was that for by the way?

Andrew Eaton: That was for BBC Films.

Alan Yentob: Oh right, yes.

Andrew Eaton: 50% of the budget. But I think it comes back to the point that if we talk about innovation and taking risks then sometimes that doesn't involve spending 5 years in development. It involves just jumping in there and doing it. And I think there are situations where, for example the League of Gentlemen. They're making a film at the moment and they're making it for Film Four. Now I think that whether or not the BBC thought that was a good idea to make that film or not, I think there is something slightly strange about losing the branding when you've developed a talent like that that when it comes down to it there's more of an obsession with films about developing it for 5 years. So whereas one of the reasons why BBC comedy is so strong is a lot of its performers were allowed to take risks. They were allowed to, Amanda (INAUDIBLE) and Steve Coogan, who did Alan Partridge, were allowed to take tremendous risks with each series and I think that somehow it shouldn't change when it becomes about film. It shouldn't just be about development. It should be saying do we believe in this talent and should we support them? So I think sometimes if there were more money to spend on production then people like Julia Davies, people who have actually made their name, the Little Britain guys that we've just done a film with, people like that should be supported in a way with boldness and risk taking I think. Just because it becomes film rather than television, it shouldn't mean there's a different criteria applied.

Alan Yentob: Terry, can I just say....

Lord Burns: Could you do your decision about the magazine, about why is it that you know magazines sell in such vast quantities, you know, in print form, quite well on radio as well but we never have, we no longer seem to have magazine type formats on television?

Alan Yentob: Yes, I think there's some truth in that. I think there is some truth in that because that's what the Late Show provided but remember the Late Show was sort of, it had many, many detractors, you know, and people sighed with relief when it came off the air and now they think well where's the Late Show? You know, that's a magazine, we want it. But that is one of the things that happens in the BBC. I think that the Culture Show, although we can have a critique of it, none of us think it's right and my own advice to George and to the team was to say "Look, just grow the show. Find out what's right and it will find its way. Don't start pontificating about what it is or isn't." But one of the things that I think is clear about it is that it may be that 8 items is too many in my view. It needs to, you know rather like a good meal you need to have a main course and other things. But that is a magazine programme. That is going to go out for a minimum of 22 times you know a year, i.e. once a week, and hopefully it will extend. So I agree with you about that. And the other thing is, and I think we've seen it with the Late Show – Andrew you know this as well – that if you have a magazine programme it's fantastic for the industry because lots of different directors who nurture new talent emerges. So I'm with you, Terry, about that. And whether or not we'll find other forms for magazine programmes I'm not sure but yes, that's a fair point.

Sir Christopher Frayling: Can I just say something about this normalising the idea, that it's not a big deal and branded as culture and this sort of issue? I think there's two aspects of this that are worth getting on the record. One is arts correspondence and arts as news and you know what the BBC does with that because I mean if you take what happened with business news over the last 10 years, it's become normalised. I mean there wasn't any business news to speak of unless there was a crisis about 10 years ago and now it's every, it's a segment of the news and everyone accepts it.

Alan Yentob: And so are the arts and I agree with you.

Sir Christopher Frayling: And the arts are becoming that but it tends to be and another thing, you know, and off we go to some wacky item. Unless someone's died or an auction, an outrageous auction price has been reached, or you know an arts...

Alan Yentob: No, last week there was a 3-minute item on the Tate Modern exhibition, you know so I mean...

Sir Christopher Frayling: Right but that's an issue isn't it? Normalising it? Making it normal? But the other normalisation strategy is art and science. I think someone mentioned In Our time. One of the great things about In Our Time is that it slides from art to science effortlessly in the way that the old Kaleidoscope used to when it started and there isn't enough of that in my view because you put culture in a box and you don't explore its relationship with other aspects of human endeavour and I think the arts science thing is an interesting one to explore.

David Ferguson: It's vital that you do magazine programming in the mainstream. I mean this isn't, this isn't difficult. I mean that's what goes on during daytime television. Why can't you just up the ante and do it at 7 o'clock on BBC1 and have a cookery item, a do-it-yourself item, a band, a review of a film.

Alan Yentob: It sounds like Nationwide to me.

Lord Burns: But I was thinking news that was slightly more specialist.

Alan Yentob: I'm getting a bit frightened by this conversation.

Lord Burns: I think we should stop at that point.

Jenny Abramsky: Should I answer the education question?

Lord Burns: Okay.

Jenny Abramsky: Because the lady has been very patient.

Lord Burns: Yes, she has.

Jenny Abramsky: Let's take speech radio. Radio effectively; BBC Radio abandoned serious speech radio for children about 15 years ago. We've tried to revive it with BBC7. We have two programmes a day – The Little Toe Radio Show and The Big Toe Radio Show. They go out and we, that programme has linked up with schools. We always have school children in every day and teachers in every day. In fact the children help run the programme. And we are gradually building up a new network. It's very early days but it's a new network and a recognition that this was something that we, we'd really basically failed on. What I meant also by that we recognise we need an education strategy is we had our orchestras. They were effectively publicly funded by the licence and they have no education strategy at all. And over the last 3 years each one of them now has an education manager, an education strategy. In the last year 27,000 schoolchildren were introduced to live music performance through that new strategy. We've created various vehicles like Making Tracks On The Road, which is the children's programme that goes out on Radio 3, is now regularly going round and doing workshop performances with children and that has been a very, very strategy that we developed because we recognised that we had failed there. We're taking it a step further. If you look at Building Public Value, we refer to something called music for all, and what we've realised is, both with our spaces, with our orchestras, with our websites like the One Music site, we could do a huge amount more in connecting into every single school and actually really doing something to galvanise, become a catalyst for music learning in this country. And that's one of the things that we really want to develop in the next few years.

Lord Burns: Okay, thank you very much. We'll now have a break for 15 minutes.

(COFFEE BREAK)

Lord Burns: Now my real challenge in these things is throughout have been to ensure that we have just the right amount of challenge for the BBC. Some occasions I feel that we have been giving them too hard a time. On other occasions I can think of we've given them too easy a time. I mean so far, if there's any doubt, I think we've got it roughly right this morning and I hope that we can keep that up. We have two of the big issues that we have scheduled

to deal with – one is about partnerships and the other is about measurement and how it is that we tell just how successful this is. But again, I'm going to hand over to Alice to kick us off.

Alice Rawsthorn: Well before we look at the specific issues of partnerships and measurement, we're going to look more broadly at the BBC's impact on cultural activity in the UK and this is going to fall into two parts. The second subject we're going to address is the new phenomenon of the events activity-based programming, the great debates that the BBC has been generating like The Big Read, Restoration, Great Britons, which have formed a sort of central plank in Building Public Value and if you like the BBC's own defence for the BBC. But first of all we want to look at the BBC's impact on cultural activity in another sense and this is the BBC's own behaviour as a cultural organisation because obviously most of us define the BBC in terms of its output, its programming, but the BBC is also an enormous commissioner of cultural product in terms of architecture, graphic design, packaging, typography. Is this central to the BBC's image of itself as a cultural institution? Do these things contribute constructively to the BBC's sense of cultural identity or are they simply logistical disciplines in which it needs to engage to a given end? So I'd like to put that point first to Alan Yentob. Do you see the BBC's broader behaviour as a cultural animal being central to its sense of cultural identity or is that inevitably always going to be restricted to programming?

Alan Yentob: I feel it's increasingly important to the BBC, partly because of its proposition about Building Public Value that we make programmes and they're broadcast. But, given the fragmentation of you know the audience and the rest of it, people don't watch and listen as they used to. So how do you get potential out of that? I mean to hear Christopher talking about well your archive; your archive is so valuable, why aren't you using it? Now there's less of an excuse today to sit on that archive. I'm not just talking about its economic value but with its cultural value than there was many years ago. So I think that's important. Secondly, let's make a sort of mea culpa acknowledgement. The BBC has not been the best of partners. There are examples where we are quite good. I think we were not bad on The Big Read were we? You're nodding there.

Miranda McKearney: Well it would be good to talk some more about that.

Alan Yentob: But we're not, we're not always good partners and I think the fact is that many of our aspirations and objectives chime with those of other institutions and organisations. Now if we can both, you know, provide a broadcast experience but also have a life beyond the broadcast, whether it's about learning or whether it's about extending the reach of what we do, then I think that is clearly increasingly more important. Though, as I said to Terry just outside the room a second ago, that raises the expectations from the BBC to be good at that too. Now all that had to be managed. It costs money but I believe the ultimate value of the BBC to the country as a whole will be far greater if we can tap into it because I think this resource, given the technologies that are available, is much greater than it was 10 years ago.

Lord Burns: If I could follow up on that issue about resource, Alan, because the issue which has dominated quite a lot of our seminars has been about this whole question of how the world is changing and the whole impact of multi-channel, the whole impact that other people are going to be doing some of the things that the BBC has been doing. Should the BBC then be changing its remit, its objectives in some way or other? Most of the discussion we had this morning, it could have been about in a sense the analogue world than it has been up till now in terms of the very restricted number of channels that we have had. And you know there is obviously this air still around that as far as possible we just want to get everybody onto the mainstream channels if we can because that's where we're going to be able to introduce people to issues, that's where we're going to get our audiences. But you know as we go through the next Charter period and as we go into digital switchover, etc. I would like just to give some attention at some stage as to how we think that is going to change the way in which the BBC should approach its cultural activities because this must be one of the areas where it is going to have a huge impact, the fact that there are going to be so many channels.

Alan Yentob: Two things I'd just introduce there. I mean one is outreach and post-broadcast and partnership, which is open for debate and discussion. The other is a point that

Christopher made earlier to me in the break, which is that we talked about incubation and you yourself said everyone's expectation is put it on the mainstream. Well the mainstream isn't like that anymore. It's not quite that. I'm not saying that there's any excuse for the BBC neglecting its responsibility, you know, in the mainstream but they're much as they were, you know. Go back to the Thorn Birds argument 20 years ago. Why is the BBC not doing Jewel in the Crown? Those things are still, you know, arguments which need to be had but there's something more profound there and I think – and here I acknowledge – that the BBC should be taking more risks today than it ever did because it can. That's one of the opportunities of the digital channels. And, as I was saying, if you put something into the heart of a schedule on BBC1 and it's destroyed, it's over, you know. Whereas if you actually nurture it somewhere and then move it rapidly into the mainstream so it's all to do with this idea of the route map that you just talked about, David, which I think is very important, in a world in which there isn't linear scheduling anymore; it doesn't quite work; you put this in; they'll watch it; they'll watch the next programme. That doesn't happen in the same way. So we need the route maps. We need networks of relationships with people and individuals and, if it's possible, and organisations. So I think that is a very important seed for the future.

Jenny Abramsky: Can I just add, technology is, it's already revolutionising the way we all work and the way we all relate to audiences. It's going to get revolutionised even more. Much of the way it's going to do it we don't even know and some of us could say various things round this table and we'll be wrong in 5 years' time. But it also is a huge opportunity and there's no doubt about it, it's a huge opportunity again for all of us. The fact that broadband can connect for instance one of our music studios direct into a school suddenly makes our relationship with those people very, very different. So that, I think one of the things that's going to change is that some of the off-air things that we do are going to become more important than they have been up until now - that's one thing. Secondly, that we have to accept that people will consume what we do in ways they want to rather than the ways we have traditionally told them to. And that right from the start makes a very different relationship with our licence payers because they aren't going to say "Oh you've given it to me on BBC1, I'm satisfied" because if it's also not available in the ways that it should be available because the technology makes it possible, they're going to get quite angry with us because they'll say "We paid for this. Why can't we get it...we get all the other stuff, why can't we get it in that way?" And if we then offer those kind of opportunities, that offers us opportunities, rather following again what David said earlier, because you can start route mapping people and bringing a surprise. The final thing I'd just quickly say, we built some terrible buildings at one stage in our history. I have to drive past the White City building on a regular basis. One of the things we...

Lord Burns: I do it every day.

Alan Yentob: You don't have to live in it.

Jenny Abramsky: One of the things I think we've woken up to as well is the way we interface in a physical sense with our licence payers has to change and I think some of the buildings that we've now built, the buildings behind, the (INAUDIBLE) buildings that you've built and the Media Centre, very beautiful buildings, the buildings that we're building, for instance I'm responsible for the Asian Network. There's a wonderful new building going up in Leicester. I think that's also part of the way we should, we need to think about how we look.

Alice Rawsthorn: But is this part of a - again boringly I come back to the same phrase – part of a cohesive strategy for the BBC that in every form of cultural manifestation, including other than programming, you are going to adopt similar objectives, similar values, similar aspirations or is it something that's just happened in an ad hoc...

Alan Yentob: No, it hasn't happened in that. It's all to do with a response to audience need. I mean I genuinely believe that and I think that what you might say is that in bringing this together and saying well where does it stop? That is one of the questions. For instance, I've just been – I was saying to Christopher, which would never again have happened somewhere – I've just been doing, involved in arts conferences with the Arts Council in Hull, in Leeds, in Manchester and one of the things that's happened in Hull and Leeds, we've opened new

buildings. Do you know that in Hull, the notion of this new building and this space for people to come into, before the people of Hull thought the BBC didn't care about them. Do you know how many people have gone into the open centre in Hull? I know you've discussed it before. Half a million people since July. I mean that is an amazing thing. Now the question of how local you can be is quite a challenge.

David Ferguson: I think the BBC is sort of torn in two different ways on this. You know we live in a world where brand is very important. The BBC is a very, very good-looking brand and it's a brand that's known round the world. Now I think it's been quite interesting through the Charter Review process how the brand has also actually been part of what's been thrust at us. I think a lot of us thought there was a huge risk at the beginning of the Charter Review process, that there wasn't going to be a recognisable BBC at the end of it, and in fact there was a sort of bizarre rallying round the brand seemed to take place. And I do think that the brand, whilst it has its pluses in terms of putting things out, it also creates an internal problem for the BBC. I think it fosters an aunty mentality, which I think exists inside the BBC to this day, and I think that's what's responsible for the BBC not actually being very good at creating partnerships with people externally. Again, I have to accuse television in particular of not being good at this rather than radio. The organisation I represent is involved with the BBC on two different projects where we have partnerships. The radio one works fantastically, the television one was a disaster as far as we're concerned and we felt bullied, we felt not consulted. And I think the BBC really needs to look at this. It's high-handed. And I think it has its own problems here because I think also previous charters and previous legislation about the BBC has been too restrictive on the BBC as to how it can develop its partnerships, that it's not actually allowed to have external branding in its own things, which conceivably it should if it's in a partnership with somebody. Why should it really be an equal partnership? So I really wanted to make those points. The real worry I have with BBC branding is over the archive, and again I'm very unhappy with the way the BBC is approaching the archive because they are not adequately consulting with the people who helped create that archive in the first place. There are major questions that need to be asked about the archive. I desperately want the BBC to put it up there and give people access to it but it needs to be discussed very, very clearly.

Phil Redmond: You just introduced the scariest element in this entire debate and that is what's technology going to do? I mean I also speak as Chair of the International Centre of Digital Content at John Moores and that was set up to look at the kind of impact of digital technology, not just on TV, entertainment, the arts, culture but also on things like the built environment. And I think that Jenny's right. The big answer, the question to every answer you ask is that we don't know. Nobody knows exactly what's going to happen but there are some trends and the trends are that I think the networks are now down to 70% of people at any one time watching. In 5 years that could be down to 50%. In 13 years nobody actually knows what it's going to be. If it follows the American trend and speeds up, that actually might be back down to something like 30, 35% of people actually coming to the networks as we understand them, now. And if you just start looking at things like the projects, like there's a project in Cumbria called Cybermore, which is funded by the DTI, the wired up communities thing. The very interesting thing about that is there's a village of 900 people and they all, they give computer and Internet access to roughly 70% of the village. 50% of the village, round about 35% took up broadband access by themselves, right, and broadband access got to 33%. And when it hit that, the most significant impact was that people got involved more in the community and they actually got involved with their own community and they weren't sitting in chat rooms or anything like that but they were just communicating with each other. Knowledge transfer was faster and quicker and 8 extra jobs have been identified at the DTI just from that simple process. Not only that but 26% of the over-50s were actively engaged in community projects and that percentage of 26% equates to the national average of above 50s actually having a computer, never mind being an (INAUDIBLE) communities. If you taken the model and then move it across – and there's no reason to suppose that this model won't transfer – once you get to broadband access and people start communicating with each other and faster and faster and faster, they do tend to start abandoning the traditional forms of television. So the key thing – we're back to strategy again. The key thing that the BBC I think has got to think about is changing itself not into an organisation that's thinking about platforms or delivery or structures – and it's back to my point about process – but as content, you know,

as deliverers of content, developing content, but that has to be in consultation with everybody. We have to redefine what we mean by culture. You need – I'm not banging on again – you need to get involved with the regions and talk to them and let them come in and be an equal partner and sometimes actually a greater partner. A regional health authority will have a much stronger grasp of what the regional health agenda is there. For example, in Liverpool the smoking thing now, you know the council are adamant to try and ban smoking because the health statistics in Liverpool show that people, more people in Liverpool are dying through health-related diseases, it's attached to smoking, than anywhere else, you know. And what's happened they've gone into a cultural conflict with central government, who thinks that oh if we let them do that everybody else will have a problem. So I think you know that's one of the bigger issues and it has to come back to this thing about your Mr BBC, you know. Well we don't need to give Mr BBC a makeover. We need to actually ship him out and we need to put Mr and Mrs with 2.4 kids but the .4 of the kids has got to be a stepchild.

Alan Yentob: I mean I don't disagree there. The first thing you have to say, the caveat is we don't quite know what's going to happen but we do know rather rapidly that broadband access is just increasing in a rather astonishing way. Consequently, and we can look at the model in America and see what's happening there in terms of fragmentation and the rest of it. I think we of course have invested significantly in a broadband project in Hull. I don't know if you know about this, Terry, where it's been discussed which is really about the broadband future and about what Jenny was talking about, linking into a community, into schools, interactivity, and it's profoundly, you know, it's profoundly interesting. However, how you sustain the core activity of the BBC and then manage this and also of course you talk about what the BBC's allowed to do in terms of its brand, also we're quite possessive of our content, you know, for all kinds of reasons. There are regulations. You know there are watersheds. There is all this sort of thing. So we need to learn about partnership and I think we honestly do realise that. And for instance on Monday we have a partnership conference happening, so there are lots of questions in this area about how much can be done and we do need to sustain our investment in content, as you say, and our commitment to content.

Phil Redmond: But one of the big things you can get from this technology is connectivity, direct connectivity with your audience. I mean every single year you have one point of communication with every single household in the country and that's when you collect the poll tax off them. And you know whatever it is, 27 million households..

Alan Yentob: It's beguiling and also worrying.

Phil Redmond: But every single one of those in the return, when they're returning their form,. It should actually already be a computerised questionnaire asking about what do you think of our quality? And the technology is there to process that very, very quickly. And as that moves more and more to electronic forms, you know then the feedback, constant feedback, constant feeding in about how are we doing, what are we doing, what should we be doing, it's all there, it's very simple. All you have to do is just say let's do it.

Lord Burns: Okay. Miranda, you want to talk about your experiences?

Miranda McKearney: Yes, just really interested in the partnership stuff. We've noticed a really big shift in the BBC's approach to partnerships just really in the last 6 months, whether that's caused by Charter Review or not. The partnership with the Public Library Service over The Big Read was actually pretty tough. The timing was terrible. They told us about it incredibly late. You wouldn't give us; you wouldn't give libraries on air coverage, even though you know Channel 4 doesn't find it difficult to point people in terms of the route map stuff through to their public library. It seemed like the most perfect thing to do. The branding arrangements were a nightmare. But we had a really honest warts and all discussion with BBC Learning about that and they've been so open and I think you too have been really open today. So we're looking at building a 3-year partnership between Public Library Network and BBC Learning which really deals with everything we learnt and which I think has huge potential around all sorts of things we've been talking about, like buildings for instance, the engagement of young people, co-location between libraries and the BBC and recording studios, links between music and reading. You know the potential is enormous if we tap into

what that partnership really means. But there is this real difficulty. You know the partnership's been taken forward by BBC Learning. We've got a bit of a partnership with BBC Radio but it's not clear how that partnership can run across the whole of the BBC and that's back to the kind of bits thing of the BBC again.

Alan Yentob: If I could just say to Miranda, we realise the complexity of this, not least, you know remember the governors, the governors say to us "Well what are you doing? What are you doing with your content? Who are you talking to? What are you letting people have?" So we realise that we need a mechanism to marry partnership. We need to become a really good partner, learn about it.

Miranda McKearney: And what's fantastic about BBC Learning is that they have a whole partnerships person who you talk to about your partnership who's as anxious to make it work from your end as theirs and whose job isn't driven by the immediacy of delivering a programme and I think that's really powerful.

Lord Burns: Christopher?

Sir Christopher Frayling I'm supporting what Alan said about the Arts Council, which is doing a lot of partnership discussions with the Beeb at the moment. And, if the brand gets in the way, then let's loosen up the brand because we want to do it, you know, with the live contemporary arts; you want to do it. If anything's getting in the way, well let's change it really. But I think Alice's point is actually deeper than just buildings. I think it's also about to what extent the BBC is an exemplary organisation. You know it's not just, the point that was made about you know are we talking post-Reithian or are we talking audience driven? Because in terms of its commissioning and its whole image as an organisation I think – and we live this in the Arts Council as well –that you are to some extent an exemplary organisation, which should be an example of ways of doing things and a model of ways of doing things that others can look at. And I think isn't that what lies behind what Alice was saying about commissioning and so on and the whole way in which you engage with your own organisation? And I'm not sure that's always been the case with either of us but it's part of the public role of having licence payers, lottery players and taxpayers that you should be in some exemplary and I think we need to work that through actually.

Lord Burns: Andrew?

Andrew Eaton: Given what Jenny said earlier, that the BBC accepts that what happens on broadcast is going to become as important if not more important than what you're actually transmitting, is that does anybody here have any idea of how we are going to measure that because I'm certainly struggling how to do it because I do think that if you take a programme like Little Britain, that's easy to see how that can move through and start on the digital channels, move through to the mainstream but then there are other programmes, like there's a fantastic programme on called Little Angels on BBC3. I don't know if anyone's seen it about child behaviour patterns and that's the sort of thing where actually you could argue that instead of moving through the channels to get higher ratings, maybe that should be going straight to DVD and getting arts to a specialised audience in that way. But then again, you know, who's going to make these kind of decisions and how are they going to decide what's the better route?

Phil Redmond: Technology will answer a lot of those questions about how to measure, you know, because it'll be an instant hit. You'll know exactly...

Andrew Eaton: In terms of DVD, sales and things like that?

Phil Redmond: Well I think you've got to start thinking about it like kids now, they just think a bit seamlessly. I mean they don't think that they're going to now watch BBC1 or they're going to watch Channel 4 or whatever. They just watch a programme. They watch a bit of content, then they might flick to DVD and actually they'd be watching a DVD while they're playing a videogame while they're having the TV on, you know. I mean that's the way they kind of absorb culture.

Alan Yentob: But actually I think this is a very important point because there is a generation there – and I'm sure there are plenty of parents in this room who know – and you know even those of us who work in the BBC know that there's a way of responding to the world and interacting with it now which is completely different. And you're right, we're not as reliant on, you know the channel brands are not the only thing anymore and the fact is that, you know, they are one thing but actually the programme brands, the content, where it is and how you find it, people are then much more agile at doing that and they're much more discriminating about what they want. So I agree that that is something that we have to be aware of. The other thing I've said, I don't know how far it's come up in this, these series of debates, is the whole issue about the younger audience. Some people believe that this is sort of affectation on the part of the BBC, let's make BBC3, the news service doesn't work, let's dump it, let's do this, that and the other, but the truth is that if we are not in touch with that generation, if we don't understand, in other words some risk has got to be taken here. If we don't do...that's why BBC3 is so important to the BBC and why I don't really...we need ways of learning about their lives and about how we can interact with them. And I think for the broadband world that is increasingly important. And ultimately it's about the exemplary nature of what we do. It's about the pursuit of excellence. It's about broadcasting not just being a commodity but being about something which has, you know...that doesn't mean it shouldn't entertain. In fact that is even more important for that generation than it was for the previous one.

Phil Redmond: I'm sorry to come back again but this is actually a really key point because I don't know what it's like in your university but at John Moore's the standard basic stratification for student accommodation has to be broadband access on Sky Plus, right. And they will not take the accommodation if it doesn't have it, you know, and that's the way they perceive the world now. Now what that means for established broadcasters is a complete loss of audience, right, because as soon as they get those two things in the home they do drift off onto other things. And to go back to, you're right, you've got to be exemplary but it's got to be content. And this is where we've got to come back to finding the Cathy Come Homes, the Edna the Inebriate Womans. You've got to take the risk and you've got to make...

Alan Yentob: (INAUDIBLE)

Phil Redmond: Yes, but you've got to take the risk and do content which is described as really risky, not just rude or risqué but risky.

Alice Rawsthorn: I'd be very interested to hear Alan's views and also Jenny's on the impact of participation on the BBC because it seems to me that if you look back on the BBC historically, the need to engage the audience, to interact with them, to embrace participation, which for all the reasons you've just outlined is absolutely essential, particularly for the elusive 16-24 viewer is something that seems very antithetical to the history of the BBC, the monolithic notion of the pushing out of programming. Now could you talk about the organisational challenges that this raises but also the challenges for the spirit of the BBC and where you think so far it's worked and where it hasn't?

Alan Yentob: I think this comes back to this sense of if you go back to the Reithian idea of broadcasting, the sense that it's all, yes I think I know what they want, let me give it them. Now this is a dangerous thing and actually it began in John Birt's time and the way I would put it was this move of the BBC to try to understand its audiences better. You know how do they live their lives? Who are they? Try to match I suppose the needs and aspirations of this client base, you know, the audiences of different kinds with the passions and the enthusiasms of the people who make the programmes, who make the content. Now once upon a time I remember John had, we had this 100 tribes idea. You know there are 100 tribes we need to serve. Of course there are now thousands of tribes, you know, so how far can you go down this route? Well technology does make (INAUDIBLE) and I talk about little examples and so can Jenny. One of the factors in all this about this generation is content creation, which you can share. You talked about this. Well One Music – that's been an incredible success, you know. Jenny can talk a bit about that. I think our websites on CBBC and CBeebies have been incredibly critical and important, not just incidentally for the child. For instance, CBeebies, what's important about that? Well there's another constituency which is the young parent with

Little Angels. In other words we are losing touch with them but if we create the safe haven for their children and if they too are...it's not just for the child, it's for the parent as well and the parent can participate and the website allows you to do that, then you build a new relationship of trust but it's not easy.

Lord Burns: Alice pointed out two points if I interpret her right that, I mean again one of the paradoxes in all of this, that although we are getting much more diverse audiences, people spending much more time on broadband, Sky Plus choosing their own programmes, there seems to me even a growing demand for events, national events, which you know I'm a Celebrity and all of these Big Brother seem to capture, where people like to share, share these things and people can talk about and I can't quite understand it but that probably says something about me. You know they see this happening at the same time...

Alan Yentob: Well look at the Big Brother phenomenon. So basically you tune into Big Brother and the nation is talking about it but then in your own time you can download you know stuff and you can interact with it and the website is a huge success. So I think this is not just a phenomenon in the UK. I mean the United States is a much more fragmented society obviously, it's a much bigger country, but clearly the bonding thing, why for us these events that Jenny's talking about are live events – say Glastonbury. Well it's then available in different ways on different platforms for different people. So it's an event going on but you can come to it in different ways through different mediation, you know, whatever that may be.

Jenny Abramsky: But I mean if I follow through what Alan was saying, in one sense radio has had an interaction with its audience for years you know, through the telephone, through letters, etc. but it had it. What, I've always...

Lord Burns: And they terrorise it with Radio 4 don't they?

Jenny Abramsky: Why I've said consistently for the last 5 years is that radio and the Internet were the first convergence, way ahead of television. And I think the fascinating thing in terms of what that has done to our output is, if you take an example of something that Radio 1 has now done twice in the last year, where they've done something called the 10-hour takeover, where effectively they've used...because it's now, it's not the, it's text messaging and things like that and they've used text messaging for the audience to choose what they played the whole of that day and just people texting in and voting and it completely transformed the network and that was the audience taking control. If you take on a totally different way the extraordinary way, because I think, I mean Today, the Today programme has its faults, it has its strengths and its faults but I think the way it has embraced its website to include its audience, so that you take the, when they did Nick (INAUDIBLE) and the picture, you know the pictures in the morning and then they asked, they asked the audience to put their photos up and suddenly there was this completely different relationship with the audience. And I think that is only going to grow that kind of relationship and that real revolution in the way we operate. And then that ability of audiences to use programming to express and cope with events, for me the most moving thing I ever saw were the emails that came through to a Radio1 programme called Sunday Surgery after 9/11 where you suddenly had a whole load of young people who felt that they'd come face to face with mortality in a way that they'd never done before. And what it gave them was an outlet to express their fears because they suddenly realised that they weren't alone and that they shared it with others. And I think, as for all of us in broadcasting, this is a huge power that if we harness in the right way we can do something really fantastic with.

Alice Rawsthorn: What implications though does this have for the way the BBC values itself? Alan said something very interesting, well many things very interesting but one of them was that perhaps the BBC had to accept that with programmes like The Big Read the real impact wasn't the programme itself, it was the impact afterwards. How then do you actually turn this into a meaningful way of quantifying and qualifying your impact?

Alan Yentob: Well I haven't got all the answers but there will be others who will make that judgement, not necessarily within the BBC. For instance, I was saying to Miranda, one of the problems, the challenge of The Big Read was first of all it was a new kind of venture. Great

Britons was more our own in-house venture but The Big Read had to be collaborative to have the impact. And paradoxically the programmes were less good than the actual out-reach in a funny kind of way but it cost £5 million. It cost a lot of money. A lot of this costs money to do and building these relationships, managing them, brokering them if you're not to get disappointed people all over the place. And I say 1) we have to learn to do it better but secondly, if we launch something, and as I was saying to Miranda, we need a net...when I talk of networks I'm talking about not television and radio, I'm saying we need to build networks which will create these, make these relationships work effectively. And some of that responsibility will probably have to be given to outside bodies. Now that's what here in terms of the regulation of the BBC, as Christopher says, we need to take a few more risks. We need to say this is a genuine partnership. We will give you the tools, now you go and build this. And it may not mean there's another 10 million programme this year because it can't always be linked in quite that way but you can, there can be a continuity then and I feel what we've slightly done wrong with The Big Read is that we're starting to pick it up again, is that we did it and we said well we can't do another one of these, we've got to do something else because...

Jenny Abramsky: But Alice, I think one of the things that, you know we're trying to develop a public value test and what that public value test is going to aim to do is to try to measure impact. It's not easy and I assure Christopher it's what we all try to do in the arts but part of that public value test is impact and impact is both off-air as well as on-air. But doesn't anybody tell you that this is going to be an easy thing.

Lord Burns: Can we actually move onto this whole question about measuring success and failure and what it is that we are looking for? You know because again a lot of the themes that has run through all these seminars has been the need to be clearer about the remit purpose of the BBC with respect to different types of activities, which of course immediately raises the issues of how it is that you are going to measure how successful it has been. You know what is it that is going to enable these higher level boards the BBC has and also some of the lower level in more distributive activities to decide when things are working, when are they not, because you're going to have to start developing much wider types of measurement?

Sir Christopher Frayling: It's an incredibly important area which, as you say, we share at the Arts Council. I mean the extrinsic measures are quite easy aren't they – economic indicators, size of audience, social composition of audience, even political. You know things like that. There is size, cost. They're easy and the danger is that people restrict their notions of value to those easy bits, which are like blunt instruments actually. I mean they're fairly objective. But then you move into this area of the intrinsic cultural value. And I thought the gauntlet that was thrown down by Tessa Jowell was actually very interesting on this on that pamphlet she wrote, that we must somehow find a way of measuring cultural value that isn't a blunt instrument like all those objective social indicators but actually tells you something about what you're doing. I mean I've seen that done really badly. It's done a lot very badly. It's done at universities with appraisals and audits, very blunt instrument. It's done with research assessment exercise and it turns very rapidly into you know a battering ram if you're not careful and you lose what it was you originally intended to measure. And I think this is a very, very important area that one shouldn't under-estimate the problem. I mean years ago I used to teach art in the Albany maximum security prison on the Isle of Wight and what they had was 20 indicators of whether the class had been a success. Did the person use their hands? Had they returned the Stanley knife to the wall because otherwise...and you know you can do it but it didn't actually tell you anything about the work that the prisoners were, the inmates were producing. There is a danger that appraisal-itis, measurement-itis actually loses the thing that it's trying to measure and I think that's really....

Lord Burns: But Alan said with The Big Read the programmes weren't terribly successful but in a sense the event was.

Alan Yentob: Well I don't think I'd agree to be honest with you.

Lord Burns: How do you then justify that? That is what this leads to.

Alan Yentob: Well no. Well it's about accepting that there will be failures sometimes.

Lord Burns: No, no, I'm not saying that. It's by what standards are you judging that the programmes were not a success?

Alan Yentob: I'm afraid it's not a very scientific measure. I just watched them and I spoke to other people and I thought well why would a programme about, you know, a programme about a Jane Austen novel, which everybody loves, how come there weren't more people watching it and talking about it the next day? And that's because actually they probably wanted a proper meal and not this sort of series of aperitifs, which I think to some extent we got for that. Listen, I think this is very critical this issue because one of the things that will have to happen is that the BBC will have to become less defensive about some things. We will have to be, government and others have to be less risk averse, and I think the measurement, the measurement in the end will come from other organisations and from the consumers in how well that assumed to work. And I think that there are criteria there but I don't think it's going to be easy, particularly when we're talking about this non-broadcast thing, stuff.

Lord Burns: Miranda and then Janet.

Miranda McKearney: I think the partnerships measurement stuff is really, really interesting because we're all grappling with this. The Museums, Libraries and Archives Council has developed a framework called Inspiring Learning For All, which is learning in its very, very broadest sense and we're looking at can we use that in measuring this partnership with the impact of the work we're having in this partnership with BBC Learning? I mean things emerged from The Big Read that were qualitative impacts that we didn't really have a proper framework to capture but had we had one in the beginning it would have been fantastic. So, you know, a very large percentage of the audience questioned felt more inclined to talk to other people about their reading as a result of the out-reach work and programming. Library staff felt more confident about going out behind a desk, onto the floor, wearing badges saying 'talk to me about The Big Read' because they were kind of boosted by a broadcast initiative. Now if we had a proper framework for capturing that it would be really, really exciting I think and I think it would be interesting for the DCMS type bodies to look together at that.

Lord Burns: Okay.

Janet Finch: You're still on the question of measurement, Terry. You sort of pushed the question of measurement one stage back instead of what standards are you measuring them against and I think that's right. I think there's another stage back that one needs to push it, which comes right back to what are the cultural purposes of the BBC because you know if we don't have a clear view of that then you can't derive the standards....(INAUDIBLE)

David Ferguson: I was going to say that you can, it's relatively easy to identify cultural activity taking place in the UK. I think it's really important that the BBC goes out and interacts with that cultural activity that isn't just started by itself. I think this is exactly what Phil was saying earlier on. And I think one measurable you know way of looking at it is are those cultural activities enhanced by the forging of a partnership with the BBC? Now this is again where the BBC's, it's absolutely vital that in order to fulfil a remit that is created by the existence of a licence fee to pay for it, is that this works on both a micro and a macro level, so that you are investing in possibly obscure, I don't know, nose flute blowing, you know, activities if that's what's wanted or you know....and also that you're reaching to the different diverse cultures that come with you know multi-ethnic projects. And that must be measurable because you'll be able to tell after a period of time where, when the BBC has interacted with that cultural activity, is that cultural activity healthier as a result of that or weaker.

Alan Yentob: That's what Miranda is saying.

Miranda McKearney: Exactly. Put us together and you can get much more input.

Lord Burns: Okay. Can I have some more responses, questions or assertions from the audience? Well, look at that. We've driven them into the ground.

Female Audience Member 5: I do get nervous when people start talking about measuring things like culture and I agree with you that there are ways that you can assess the impact of something after the event. But if you're talking about no longer having a top down attitude to culture and therefore being more aware of the roots upwards, then the BBC, the role of the BBC is going to devolve into a kind of cultural mediator between you know the rest of the environment and the roots where arts events are happening. And I think that then the question that Andrew asked very much earlier, which nobody seemed to pick up on, it becomes important. If you're not going to measure and do a pre-measurement of the cultural impact you're aiming at then it becomes important who makes the decisions and that's got to be part of the identity, got to be part of the identity of the BBC. It's got to be people that are accountable, that you trust, that you feel deserve that role for the rest of us in order for them to be the mediators of what the rest of us are going to have access to.

Lord Burns: I mean when measurement gets a bad name, I mean aren't there usually two aspects of it, as Janet says. One is that people haven't stated correctly what it is they're trying to achieve and therefore you're not sufficiently clear about what it is you want to happen and not surprisingly, if you don't know what it is that you want to happen it's quite difficult to say whether or not you've succeeded. And the second thing is that even with the best will in the world having done that, there are some things in life which are quite difficult to measure but that again doesn't mean...you know and the problem arises in life when then people just measure the things that they can measure rather than measuring the things that they should be. But it doesn't seem to me that this is something one can run away from. You know it is inherent in every system where you have a restricted amount of funds, you've got a restricted amount of time, you've got to have priorities, you've got to decide what it is that you want to do and by some means or another you've got to begin to try to generate some measures which will help you tell whether you're....

Sir Christopher Frayling: No one's running away from that and I quite agree. I'm simply saying some things are more difficult to measure than others and I want to add, it is very expensive measuring things. You say you've got limited resources. That also needs to be thought about.

Lord Burns: But it's even more expensive to keep doing it if it's not what it is that..

Jenny Abramsky: You're right but you have to find the right way through because the real danger, I mean I know we have to measure and we've got to find ways of it but what you don't want to do is go down the road where the cost of trying to find the impact of The Big Read ends up being more than actually having made the programme. That's the critical thing.

Lord Burns: Howard?

Howard Davies: I mean in the BBC's own paper, it says that the methodology for public value, the public value test, has not yet been developed. But insofar as it offers us anything, it says the average weekly reach of all arts programmes is under 4%. I mean do you regard that as enough?

Alan Yentob: No, I don't regard it necessarily as enough. However, the truth is that I'm slightly dubious about some of these reach issues because of course arts programming also extends....one of the arguments, put it this way, is when you talk about arts on the news, as we were talking earlier, there is, it is critically important for the BBC – and here I think this is a sort of strategic issue – that the arts aren't, that somehow one reaches people in ways which are somehow, they're not subterfuges actually. I mean what is Rolf On Art? Some people may say it's not art but on the hand people when they're watching Rolf are expecting to be entertained in a slightly different way. So I think we need to find ways to reach some audiences who are hard to reach. The other is a sort of acknowledgment that this is important, that the BBC and other public service broadcasters need to generate interest in the arts and that it's sometimes difficult to, you know extending that reach is not easy. I mean one advantage is that we have more ways of reaching people today with these different platforms and different technologies than we did before, which is why on the first sort of, on its

first outing a programme may not reach the right people but if there are, for instance as there are on digital, more opportunities to viewers on different platforms, in different ways and there's also a sort of after broadcast element, then I think we may be making, we may begin to make greater impact than we have in the past.

Howard Davies: So as your creative board gets going, you'd expect that number to go up?

Alan Yentob: Well I would hope so. I would hope that we can improve that. Look, listen Ofcom also dealt with this and there was a sort of mixed message from Ofcom if you remember. It was well arts programmes are very important but nobody is interested in watching or listening to arts programmes. I mean I think speaking to me, I'm a bit born again about it as you might expect, so I feel that the challenge has to be addressed, you know. I haven't got the answer to it.

Jenny Abramsky: Howard, to be fair, it is the average of all arts programmes. There are some individual programmes where the reach....you know Leonardo was 27%.

Howard Davies: Well presumably that's the average is it?

Jenny Abramsky: Yes, it's the average.

Howard Davies: So that's in the average? Rolf is in the average?

Jenny Abramsky: But of course there are going to be some programmes, I mean look, if I....

Howard Davies: (OVERLAP – INAUDIBLE)

Jenny Abramsky: No, this is just literally arts programmes, arts programmes and of course some of them are on BBC4, some of them are on Radio3. Radio 3's Night Waves will not have a huge reach but the 130,000 people who listen to Night Waves every night value it as a programme. Significantly more listen to Front Row. You then take an average. Where I would be very concerned is if we weren't having programmes like Leonardo and the Devine Michelangelo and Imagine with that great reach. You've got to get the mixture of them. And particularly when you're dealing with some very specific genres, you're going to get small audiences and others who are going to get bigger.

Sir Christopher Fraying: I mean Howard, are you saying that if it's 4% you should drop it?

Howard Davies: No, I was just asking. I mean this figure is (INAUDIBLE). I was asking what the policy was, what you were trying to do but Alan's answered and so it's time to put it up. Jenny's not so sure but anyway they can resolve that on the creative board.

Jenny Abramsky: ...but I want to say you've got to get the broad picture.

Alan Yentob: Can I just come back to the point that I made very early on about this? I mean one is that there are more strategic ways to do it and you know it may go up a percent. Magazine programmes are one. Also you generate a kind of creative critical mass of people who are going out and making other kinds of programmes. The news is one place to engage those audiences and sometimes it's sleight of hand. I mean we don't include the dreaded makeover name but actually in terms of design makeover programmes have made a big difference to the dreaded Changing Rooms, which I am very proud of given in the early days we all thought what a great idea it was. There are ways of reaching people and I think we must come back now to the broader definition of culture, you know which is a....or the impact of an organisation, a broadcaster like the BBC. And I think there are territories and domain, design is another, where potentially I do agree there is a lot more that can be done. This is what Alice has clearly been trying to do in a lot of her career but it does touch people's lives. Now it takes ingenuity to do that and I would say the benefits of the makeover programmes probably have found their way into the people who visit the Design Museum and the V & A and other places. And I think the issue of the design of the workplace for instance is absolutely fascinating and we had this discussion ourselves you know 6 months ago. Do

people realise what it's like to live in a, to...for instance for kids in schools, how you design schools? How much light comes into them? How much space there is? This is about the quality of people's lives, it really is. We haven't discussed all this today but this...we have a lot more to educate ourselves about. Look at our cities today. They've changed in the past 10 years. We've got all these new buildings. We don't know what to put in them but we have got them, you know, and I...you know there are things that the culture is wider than simply either the arts programme or the drama.

Howard Davies: Put the BBC in them then.

David Ferguson: I'd just like to make a little point. Again, it's actually, it's another point about content. And one of the things that cultural or arts programming also has to do, and particularly if it's only reaching a relatively small share of the audience, is that people have to remember that this is the R & D department for the future. This is where things that may have absolutely miniscule audiences at the starting point have their chance to flourish. And I mean I know beyond any doubt at all that two or three programmes of that ilk completely changed my life. I would certainly never have had music for a living if these bizarre little things hadn't been there. And the values of those to UK Plc I defy anybody to measure.

Lord Burns: Janet?

Prof. Janet Finch: Just a very small point on the topic of measurement. All the comments on measurement have been about audiences but in fact we've heard earlier in this session that, amongst many other objectives, the BBC are trying to nurture new talent. I mean you need a different set of criteria and measurements about that and that's not about actually how many plays you put on and how many people watch them but over the last 20 years how many people have you actually successfully launched on their careers and what have they subsequently done that they perhaps might not otherwise have done? So I think in thinking about impact and measurement, you do have to look at the full range of objectives that the BBC is setting itself in this area.

Lord Burns: Yes. Okay. I would like to wind this up now and just give everybody a last chance to have a say and I'll take Phil first. If there are any of the topics where you.

Phil Redmond: No, no. I think I'll just come back to the point about mediation. I think what we have to keep in mind when we're talking about the BBC is back in the 1920s when it became, you know, the British Broadcasting Company, this combine of companies, someone realised that we had the radio but we didn't actually have the means to actually control or disseminate it. And since then it's been a structure that has actually been sort of still trying to deliver that. A scarce resource in other words. As we move forward, it won't be such a scarce resource. I think, you know, it really does have to come back to this point about content and concentrating on what the content is and that comes back to strategy; it comes back to what is going to be the cultural strategy and how are we going to culturally deliver it and that's really my point really to take away from today. You know to come back, it's not about processes, it's not about buildings, it's not about structures. It's actually what do we, as the UK plc, want to continue spending this you know £3 billion a year on? I mean what do we want it to deliver? Not who, not where or not why? You know what do we want it to deliver?

Lord Burns: Okay.

David Ferguson: I'd like to sort of quote again from what Tessa Jowell said about culture because I think it's very important this. Offering improved access to culture is a key weapon in fighting poverty and aspiration. Access – a huge vital word and I think the difference between the BBC and the commercial stations and the Murdoch stations is that we can turn round to the BBC and say we demand that you grant this access, so that people who can't afford Sky Plus in South London - since that was obviously given as a ghetto area earlier on much to my pleasure - can have access to some culture. You don't know where it's going to start off from and I just, you know, hope that the BBC charges itself in the same way that we had debates over the years about the museums should be free, that libraries should be free,

that's what we're getting, that's one of the key things we need to demand from the BBC is that access point for everybody and free from the point of that access.

Andrew Eaton: I just wanted to pick up on that. Now my recollection – I've worked at the BBC for some time – was actually that internally I think they're quite good at measuring success with quite a degree of vigour apart from audience figures and all kinds of statistics and it's Programme Review on a weekly basis and there are departmental discussions. There's a lot of internal discussions over what are the targets they think they're trying to hit. And I think if we, as the public, have different expectations, and as Janet said you have to understand from the very beginning what it is that we think we want from the organisation and I think we have to help them do that. I think there has to be some form, whether it's run by the DCMS or something, some external body who is also giving them guidance on what are the targets that they are trying to hit. And I just wanted to say that I'm a huge Gilbert O'Sullivan fan. I think he would be the perfect subject for the Culture Show because he's regional, he's Welsh, and also he's almost old enough to be heritage.

Sir Christopher Frayling: A couple of points that I've picked up from the discussion generally rather than the measuring issue. I mean firstly this issue goes well beyond the departments in the Beeb that happen to be dedicated to the arts. You know the issue about lifestyle broadcasting and all these other things, which carry culture in all sorts of different ways. You've tried the model of consumption. I think those lifestyle programmes sort of create the arts as buying things, shopping. I think there must be other models for doing it and it would be very interesting to explore them, you know. Secondly, the nub of the discussion in all the topics has been, you know, a balanced one – to what extent the BBC reproduces the culture it receives and to what extent it contributes to that culture as an innovator? You know it's actually pushing the envelope. And the balance between those two thoughts I think has run through virtually every aspect, you know what are you measuring and all those things. And finally about the...and forgive me for mentioning the mainstream again. I actually think Alan's idea of BBC4 as an incubator and the things they imply, they might fly onto other channels, they might fly you know into cinema. It doesn't matter where they fly because they're incubated and that's a good thing to be doing. But the mainstream issue, the admission – and I think it's generous to admit it – that the arts did drop out of the picture on the mainstream from the mid-1990s and I think it's worth exploring how that happened in order to make sure it doesn't happen again. And that's a structural issue I think.

Miranda McKearney: I think this discussion has been really interesting. I think the whole thing about public realm and the common ground that you share with other partners in that public realm is really important. I'd love to see a future's group and innovation fund, you know something that enabled more of that to happen, look at the issue of common aims, common measurement against those aims.

Howard Davies: It would just be one small point but I think it is relevant to the measurement point and that is that I think it would be helpful for the public exposition, the public understanding of what the BBC is doing if in this area the BBC adopted a more conventional approach to distinguishing between investment and expenditure. And under, in Chapter 4 on Costs and Benefits, it says 'levels of investment' and then underneath it some things which are just clearly expenditure. They're just current expenditure. Now I recognise that investment in culture is not wholly straightforward. David talked about the ways in which you sometimes you can actually generate returns and I think for example investing in development capability in the British film industry I would call investment. It will generate returns for the BBC but also for other people.

Lord Burns: (INAUDIBLE)

Howard Davies: Yes, but I think it would really help the exposition. I know that at the moment you know investment is sort of a good word so people call everything investment but actually it is helpful to the exposition and to understanding what your impact is if you can distinguish those two things, that the paper doesn't do.

Lord Burns: Okay.

Prof. Janet Finch: Yes, I think that by comparison with other seminars which we've had in this series, where usually most other seminars we've been focusing on one aspect of the Reithian trilogy of educate, inform and entertain and actually it's very clear that in the area of culture, the BBC is actually addressing all three at the same time and severally. And also a fourth, which actually doesn't (INAUDIBLE) any of those three but which is perhaps almost more important than the other three, which is the role of cultural patronage. And the fact that in the area of culture the BBC really does span a wide range I think lies at the heart of why we're finding it so difficult to pin down what the cultural purposes are.

Lord Burns: Okay. Jenny?

Jenny Abramsky: How to sum up from a BBC point of view? I think that in working out what the purpose of the BBC is I go back to some of the things I said right at the start. I do think one of our roles is to nurture talent and you're right, we do need to find ways of measuring it. There was that John Peel moment when so many people stood up and said "This man made me." I think in comedy people like Amanda Onichi would say it was that early support on radio that made me. We have to be able to demonstrate we do that but I think it's an absolutely vital role for the BBC. I agree access is absolutely what we're also there about. And it's when you start saying we're about that, we're about that, you suddenly realise it's a huge role that the BBC has to play and it has to play it on many, many different levels and across....what is culture? Every single one of us in this room would define it differently I suspect and it's a whole load of different things and people want to dip into certain things and dip out of certain things but access is absolutely what we should be about. I think we have to both contribute and receive and I think if in the end all we're doing is receiving, then we won't take risks, we won't innovate. We have to be able to contribute as well. So it's as much that. I've never been an economist, Howard, so, we will take away your comments about investment and certainly look at that and I think that's clearly something that we should look at. But if I could kind of say one of the ways that I, when I talk about investment, I suppose for me it's the money that I've given Roger Wright to invest in the new generations artists' scheme, where a huge amount of what's going on there is not being broadcast on air but is giving a group of artists the opportunity to perform at Wigmore Hall, to perform with orchestras like the BBC Symphony over a space of a certain amount of time. It's the fact that Nick Kenyon in the audience is able to commission a new work for the Last Night Of The Proms, which goes out on mainstream BBC1 Television and sometimes it's bloody difficult to listen to but, you know, it's there and that's how I would define investment because it seems to me if we hadn't put that money in it wouldn't have happened. And that's one of the ways that I think we do play a role.

Howard Davies: I don't have a problem with that but that's not the way it's defined.

Jenny Abramsky: No, I will take it away in that sense.

Lord Burns: Alan?

Alan Yentob: Well I suppose my big thought is – and I genuinely believe this – that we've seen broadcasting change and a lot of people talk about fragmentation, can the BBC play as significant a role as it played. I genuinely believe that there is an opportunity here for the BBC to have a greater role in people's lives than it ever has before. We need to change in order to do that. We need to share more. I mean, and I think there's another thing that we sense, creativity is something that, you know the BBC is supposed to be a creative organisation, that's what it must be. Just generally across the board that's what it's about. It's about creating things. And at the same time we know that there is a need in individuals now to share and participate in this in a way that they haven't had the opportunity to do before and the interactive world will do that. At the same time so technology is an opportunity but it is also a challenge and a threat because if technology is not harnessed to creativity, it isn't harnessed to values and to a kind of strategy that makes sense of it rather than sort of squanders it, then we have a problem. The other thing I'd say is that universality as well is a sort of paradox because once upon a time the BBC happily said "Oh well we're a universal broadcaster. That's what we do. We've got this all (INAUDIBLE)." Well today of course we're not universal

yet. First of all, the concept of universality is much more plural than it ever was before. People, as I said earlier, have dual identities. They have different aspirations. More is possible. More is expected of us. And I think that is a big challenge for the BBC. Just straightforwardly in technology terms, you know, we don't, we're not universal. We are spending money currently on BBC3, BBC4. It's an act of faith. Not that many people are watching yet. So we need to marshal this carefully. We need to make sure that the good content finds its way onto the main channels. We need to take more risks on the slopes than we did before because if we put them into the heart of the mainstream schedule they'll probably sort of, you know, they'll die so we need to take them and nurture them and move quickly. So we have a lot more to learn but I have to say that it's a very exciting opportunity and perhaps it's really going to be your BBC, the public's, more than it's ever been because that's what we're talking about.

Alice Rawsthorn: Well it would be nice to think that Mr BBC will become our BBC rather than your BBC.

Alan Yentob: Mrs BBC.

Alice Rawsthorn: Yes please. Going right back to the beginning, the central question was does the BBC have a cohesive cultural strategy. I'm perplexed as to whether it does, it doesn't, it will, it won't but I still believe that it should have one, all the more so for all the reasons that Alan has alluded to. What none of us can doubt at all is that over the next period of the BBC Charter, the cultural output of the BBC will become increasingly provocative and intriguing. It's an absolutely fascinating time for cultural programming. Because of the opportunities that Alan alluded to that digital technology is presenting but also the ineluctable change in the audience, people not being satisfied with just watching or listening anymore, they want to participate and the BBC has sensibly recognised the need to respond to that but equally sensibly recognises the problems - everything from the adaptation of its own organisation and culture to the issues of measurement. Personally I would love the BBC culturally to become an exemplary organisation in itself and every visual and cultural manifestation of itself as well as its output. So if we looked for a role model, we'd probably look at London Transport in the 1930s, which is the brilliant British example of an organisation that through really intelligent, coherent embracing of culture and visual identity, became more than simply the things it did. But that was driven by one man – Frank Pick – and the reason why the posters were so beautifully positioned, Harry Beckstein's grammatic map transformed transport maps across the world was because Frank Pick famously worked until 2 o'clock in the morning every day and patrolled every mile of the London transport network week after week to make sure that everything was as his...

Alan Yentob: It sounds like hard work.

Howard Davies: A job for the creative board.

Alan Yentob: I think we should give a little bit of credit for the BBC in the 1950s and the 1960s and the creation of the BBC, which so many people participated in. Frank Pick alone might have created London Transport but the BBC is the sum of many....you know of so many people in the UK. And I hope it's going to be so many more. That's the ambition we're looking for.

Sir Christopher Frayling: This is turning into the Olympic bid isn't it?

Lord Burns: Well thank you all very much. I felt, I mean my own personal view is with Alice really and I think Alan has alluded to, which is in the world as we go forward and in this fragmented world the BBC's role in culture could well become much more important. And part of the reason that I keep going on about the definition of purpose and what is the strategy and how is one going to measure it is partly from the point of view of wishing to protect it and fearing that unless one has a clear view and that one can demonstrate that there is a clear purpose and that it is delivering on that purpose, it will over time become that much more difficult to sustain. So you know my questioning is not from a negative point of view in saying why are you doing all this stuff. It is much more from the point of view of how it is that one is

going to confront that world. I agree that content being important but in my heart of heart I still also believe that process is important. I mean one of the ways you get good content is by having good process and I mean the question was asked why was it that the arts started to disappear from the BBC and is now getting some of it back? I mean that must, and Howard's in a sense been challenging throughout the morning about what was it about the processes within the BBC that allowed this to happen and what is it that is going to be put in place which then defends that and in a sense prevents it happening again? And on access, I think we've had some great – and it's a personal view – I think there are some quite difficult about what one means by access. Do you mean simply that it should be on? Do you mean that it should be free? Do you mean that you should introduce people to things that they otherwise wouldn't have been introduced to? You know and once you start doing that it becomes, the notion of access actually becomes quite a complicated thing in itself. However, we've raised a lot of questions this morning. Thank you all very much for being here and for participating in the seminar.