

BBC Charter Review

Seminar: Representation of Nations, Regions and Communities

17th November 2004

Lord Burns: Okay. Good afternoon everyone. I would like to welcome everyone – Panel member and audience – into this group which is the eighth of our series of seminars. This afternoon's seminar, which is on the BBC's role in representing regions and communities, is the second of five seminars with a slightly different focus to the previous seminars. These are cross-cutting seminars as we're calling them and they focus on what and how the BBC delivers on some very broad goals. Learning we actually did this morning. We're going to be doing informed citizenship, culture and sport and we'll be looking at it of course through the whole variety of channels and this afternoon is the turn of representing...sorry. This morning we were doing issues to do with education, as I mentioned. As you may be aware, the arguments and evidence we hear today will help inform. It will help to shape the government's thinking as it works towards the Green Paper in the New Year and this is all part of the process of challenge and of examining a range of issues. Before I give you an overview of the approach and the agenda for this afternoon, I would first of all like to cover a few housekeeping issues that will be familiar to those who have been to these seminars on previous occasions. The first is about mobile phones and blackberries. The BBC have kindly provided the cameras in the room and they're provide a live stream of footage via a link on the Charter Review site direct to the BBC's website and the problem is that telephones and blackberries cause havoc to the sound quality. And that means that you can't just turn them off as silent. You've actually got to turn them off. You have to behave as if you are on an aeroplane. So those who have got blackberries have got to power them off and those with the telephones, if you'd switch them off please. And every time you hear one of those tinkling noises in the speakers you know that there's someone who hasn't followed my pleas. So if you could do your best to help us on that please. The loos are located opposite this meeting room. The fire exits are all marked. We will be having opportunities to put questions and observations from the floor during the seminar. If anyone at any stage is feeling quite anxious that there is some point they want to get over, you will find there are some blank cards in your delegate packs, which you can complete and hand to a DCMS official but we will be having opportunities at various points for people to ask questions. And could I ask you also please to keep on your security badges and name badges at all times and not to go into other areas of the building. First if I could introduce Alan Budd, who's my colleague from the Independent Panel, who was going to be helping to facilitate this afternoon's debate, Professor Janet Finch and Alice Rawsthorn are also here from the Panel. To make sure that we have a lively debate on these issues I'm delighted to say that we've got a very good Panel here for this afternoon's session. Sue Balsom from Ofcom and also National Content for Wales; Susan Bassnett, Professor of Translation and Comparative Cultural Studies at the University of Warwick; Stuart Cosgrove...

Stuart Cosgrove: Hello and apologies for lateness.

Lord Burns: Hi...Head of Programmes, Nations and Regions, Channel 4; Donald Emslie, Chief Executive, SMG TV; Andy Griffiee from the BBC English Regions; Pat Loughrey, Director of Nations and Regions at BBC; Phil Morrow, MD of Wild Rover Productions; Colin Philpott, Head of National Museums Photography, Film and Television; Samir Shah, who's a producer with Juniper TV and Parminder Vir, producer and Diversity Adviser for Dynamic Asian Women's Network. We also had,

we thought that we might be under-staffed and I'm pleased to say that we also have close at hand and with easy reach of us all here representatives from the various BBC regions who we can call upon if there are any particular issues relevant to their sectors – Peter Johnson from Northern Ireland, Keith Jones from Wales and Ken McQuarrie from Scotland. I hope I haven't missed anybody out but if I have my apologies. Representation of nations, regions and communities is clearly a key role of the BBC and such is its breadth and reach of course at the BBC that it could be argued that it's an enormous unique position to undertake this. After a few words from Alan about the kinds of issues that the debate might cover, I'm going to ask Pat Loughrey to open today's agenda with a brief scene-setting summary of how the BBC sees its role in this respect. We will then have a round table discussion to focus on the principles, some of the principles behind the BBC's representation role. We will then have a break after about an hour and there will be tea and coffee available outside and when we reconvene, we're going to be looking at how the BBC's activities in this area manifest themselves in practise. We'll then have another short break and then we'll wind up by looking at the impact of the BBC's activities on nations, regions and communities and how we can build on value in this area. We're hoping to wrap up at about 5 o'clock and in part, you know, how the agenda goes will depend on how the discussion flows and some of the issues that will be raised. So to get things started I'm going to ask Alan to say a few words about the kinds of issues that we see the seminar covering, partly in the light of some of the other seminars that we have had.

Alan Budd: Thank you, Terry. Well I hope people will forgive me if I follow Janet Finch's example from this morning and start with a brief auto-biographical note. I was brought up a very long time ago in the London suburbs and I was entirely surrounded by people who used received pronunciation or who spoke with what was revealing known as a BBC accent and I was an ardent listener and usually happy listener, just as these days I'm an ardent viewer, mainly given the time to Children's Hour on the Home Service. And I listened very happily but every now and then something terrible would happen and I'm not even referring to the buzz bombs which were flying over head at the time. And I think it was called Regional Round. And what happened was that people with accents I couldn't understand would suddenly do dreadful things like singing folk songs. And at that stage I would start screaming uncontrollably and had to be removed from the room until I calmed down and I haven't quite shaken off those habits and that's no doubt why I've been chosen to, as a punishment to facilitate this afternoon's activities. The briefing notes we've been given refer at one stage to the BBC's association with older, white, middle class men. I plead guilty on all counts. I am mentro-scentricity personified. But of course those are the bad old days and it's those days we've spent the last - and the BBC has – 40 or 50 years moving away from. Of course in those days broadcasting only came from London. There was no other transmitters anywhere. And I think the central issue for this afternoon is how does the BBC both use and reach out to the many communities that make up our society? How does it do this in the appropriate way and does it have a special responsibility to do so? I suggest that for convenience we do use the general word 'community' to cover groups which are based on – and I have a list and I'm sure it's not exhaustive – geographical location, so we include the nations and the regions but also communities based on ethnicity, language, gender, sexual orientation, religion, social class, cultural assumptions and other shared interests, educational experience, age, state of health, level of disability or whatever. Those are all to me communities. Of course they overlap but they are, can be separately identifiable communities and no doubt the list could be added to. That's what I mean by communities – all those different ways of grouping people, some of them much more powerfully uniting forces than others. And I think when we're

discussing representation of communities, we should use the division that is usually usefully made between two sorts of activities. One is representing communities to themselves. In other words so that communities can receive programmes which reflect their special interests and experiences and may use a special language or dialect or accent or grammatical forms or whatever it is. So that's communities speaking to themselves. The other is representing communities to each other, so that we can become aware of and more tolerant of cultural differences and indeed have the opportunity to enrich our lives through new experiences at a humble level. It may be listening to different types of music, trying different types of food or so on, that's a humble level but not insignificant. At a higher level it is broadening the way we think about life and how we live it. And I would also include in that idea the notion that the BBC in thinking about communities should recruit talent from the widest possible range of communities, that it shouldn't be London, white centred. The BBC is of course committed to representation in each of those senses and that's produced the long report setting out its tasks and responsibilities under this heading and also of course in Building Public Value. I think the challenges of those two forms of representation may be different. When we're talking about representing communities to themselves, there is a problem there, there's an economic problem of scale that, as is typical of most of broadcasting, production costs are very high, communities may be rather small. So there's the problem there of how communities talk to themselves when you've got a small audience base. And I assume that Ofcom recognises this particular economic point in its proposal that the commitment of the independent companies to provide 3 hours a week of non-news regional broadcasting should be reduced to 1½ hours. I assume Ofcom has done that because they recognise the economic problems associated with that. No doubt we'll hear from Ofcom about that. When we're talking about representing communities to each other, then I think we're concerned with possible risks in programme content audience share, the risk that people won't want to listen to what other communities get up to. So it's that sort of programme risk. Well we shall hear more about the BBC's plans from Pat and I hope we have to try to decide how important this aspect of the BBC's work is in terms of Charter renewal. The big question, as in really all our topics, is what should the BBC's remit be in this area of activity? Does it limit itself to those activities that won't be provided by the commercial broadcasters? That's a question we ask ourselves in relation to every activity we look at. How can it be called to account for its decisions in relation to these activities? How do we measure its success in delivering these activities? There's also the question of boundaries. We were talking before this morning's seminar began about something that's actually drawn attention to in the BBC's report, which is an account of the BBC Welsh Orchestra. Orchestras are not primarily, and certainly not exclusively, involved in broadcasting. So what's going on there when the BBC seems to be taking on activities which certainly are important locally but not obviously and immediately and wholly to do with broadcasting. So those are some of the questions that we're going to hope to get answers to this afternoon.

Lord Burns: Thank you very much Alan. There is a little tinkle going on in those microphones. Somebody's got a phone on somewhere. I am sure that they will identify themselves shortly. Pat?

Pat Loughery: Thank you, chairman. I have a terrible feeling that I've got just the kind of voice designed to produce that terrible reaction. Apologies in advance for that. We are an unusual division in the BBC. We operate on all platforms, all three platforms. In fact we might be even opening a fourth platform – contact with audiences. 7,000 staff, 100 sites across the UK and the colleagues to whom the chairman referred earlier reflect that range of interest and it would be entirely wrong for one voice at the centre here in London to try to explain everything that we aspire

to do in the nations and regions of the UK, however odd that voice might be, so hence my colleagues in the front row who are far more qualified than I to explain the intricacies of broadcasting within the devolved nations and the regions of England. But I think if we convey anything to you in this period it's the range of what we do across the UK, the depth and I hope you'll see the value in a changing marketplace. Our primary division is based on the geography of the UK but please don't fall into the metropolitan assumption that that overlooks diversity between and within regions. We're acutely aware of the inherent diversity of all communities in the UK increasing as the UK changes. But there is an observation I would make and that is that, as our submission points out, the population of the UK live their lives within 14 miles of their home and most of us live less than 13 miles from our mum, that close to our original birthplace. And as society fragments, the local becomes far more evident. That's one of the ironies of the global village. The range of mid-Atlantic offer that's available on digital platforms actually encourages people to sink deeper roots in the known world and the familiar. And a second irony is that the BBC, which as Alan says came from a different place, London Calling was our manifesto really and we were bringing something from London that would improve and enrich the lives of us outsiders. It's an irony that the BBC is meeting a different audience now and it's a need that's developed as the commercial offer changes across the UK and I think that's no more evident than in the past few weeks you could see the changing tide of commercial broadcasting. But in the 90s I think it began with the. It became most evident I think with devolution and in John Birt's time as Director General it was obvious that the BBC have to make the same kind of investment in the devolved parliament and assemblies as we had here in Westminster. And that has been a differentiating service across the nations over recent years. Then more recently, we realised that devolution was about more in politics and the creative and cultural lives of the nations had to be nurtured to a greater extent. And then in Building Public Value you see what I believe is an exciting set of opportunities for the BBC to build its connection with and its service to licence payers across the communities of the whole UK and address an imbalance in the offer to the English regions that had developed both within the industry and indeed within the BBC. So the purposes, Alan has articulated the purposes perfectly. It's to guide the democratic dialogue and support and provide a platform for that dialogue within communities, between communities and then across the whole BBC and across the world. We offer a connectivity where the broad base if you like of the BBC's news gathering, journalism and creative life and not just for the BBC but for the industry, for theatre, for writing. And we look with pride at the kind of people – and maybe that's an indicator of what we do – from Jeremy Paxman to Kenneth Branagh, Billy Connolly to John Humphries. They began their time working in regional and local broadcasting. Obviously we're proud to have given that introduction to people who articulate cultural, social differences of the United Kingdom and who would not otherwise have had that opportunity perhaps without the existence and the connectivity that the BBC can bring. Thank you.

Lord Burns: Well thank you very much. Clearly the issue about remit is very important, as you've just described it, and as we've seen from the papers, I mean this is a very wide issue potentially and at some stage no doubt the BBC has got to define quite precisely what the boundaries of its activities are going to be in relation to this big ambition. And I'd just like to take some views from around the table as to how others feel that that ambition as now described, whether it is the right one, whether the remit should be changed in any respect? I'd also like people too if they could to mention and focus also on an issue that Pat has raised, which is what is happening to the commercial offerings? I mean in this new world that we have of multi-channel and of different methods of delivery, is this type of output likely to

grow or is it likely to diminish without intervention and therefore is there some suggestion that the BBC's role should increase or should it be shifted in one way or another? I mean these are questions that we are in a sense raising with lots of different topics that we have been dealing with. Who would like to start?

Stuart Cosgrove: I wonder, Terry, I probably should declare an interest here first inasmuch as, representing Channel 4 in the platform, my Saturday hobby is, I present a radio show for BBC Scotland called Off The Ball, which is one of their top radio comedy shows, so I'm beginning to feel schizophrenic and I notice that some of my Saturdays bosses are on the front row here, so I'm going to have to....

Pat Loughrey: 'Top' is a relative term in this....

Stuart Cosgrove: Exactly, so I'm going to say things that maybe are challenging whilst at the same time, in brackets, suck up to the BBC, right? I think it's really quite important that people understand what the BBC looks like from outside of London. I live in Glasgow. I commute around the UK daily, working for Channel 4 in the nations and regions and so I'll probably be in London one to two days a week and the rest of the time I'm viewing television and consuming and listening to radio all over the UK. The truth of the matter is that there is a fantastic service that's offered by the BBC. Certainly in the nations there's a kind of clear sense of cultural and political differentiation of narratives that are going on that are meaningful within that nation and perhaps less likely to translate across the UK. It's often the case, and indeed the BAFTAs in Scotland on Sunday night were largely dominated by the BBC in Scotland and one of their most successful shows is a show called Still Game, which is a situation comedy. Here is a series extremely well-funded, hugely popular, defining of the culture in Scotland and daily...or weekly rather – it goes out weekly – hammers the network. And we've got to keep that in mind. The idea that what we're talking about here is weak programmes that are tolerated by the local community that are less good than their London equivalents is frankly...I'm sorry.. horse shit, right. What we're often dealing with here is programmes that are massively popular within their area and often very well funded. Now that's a description I think in terms of nations. I think that's perhaps been more of a struggle for the BBC in the English regions where clearly the funding mechanisms and the devolutionary structures are perhaps slightly different. And that brings me on to my second point, which is I think quite perhaps more philosophical, throwing out a kind of thought as well, which is that you know the BBC shares with Channel 4 a significant set of public service broadcasting expectations, values and presumptions but I think that they actually derive from two separate but connected philosophical bases. I think that one of the things there, it's actually a big, big problem for the BBC going forward, is no doubt that the BBC's role is to inform, to educate, to entertain all those values that have been at the core of the BBC from its foundations but I think that there's also an expectation that the BBC connects – and that's a word that Pat's used quite a lot. To some extent there's maybe even also an expectation in some of the BBC's biggest pieces that it coheres as well, coheres the concept of the UK nation state called Britain. You see that in things like Restoration, The Big Read, Alan Titchmarsh's Natural History of Britain, those kinds of big projects. I think that Channel 4 derives from a very, very different PSB philosophical point, beginning. Its role there I think is to innovate, to extend, to focus on the difference, to focus on change. And I think that that's probably where the struggle for the future is because Britain is changing and it's changing in quite profound ways. And how the BBC can be expected on the one hand to cohere all of those often incoherent modes of representation, whether they're social, cultural, national, regional, local or whatever, and yet at the same time remain part of a statement about the big events of Britain, I find that difficult to imagine what that will look like in 10 years time because finally, to make the final point, if you actually view the BBC from Scotland, what you

begin to realise is that Scotland as a nation is actually full of regions with their own local needs, their own local demands. And this whole debate about the nations and regions, when you have this debate in Scotland it very quickly becomes about how the central belt of Scotland dominates broadcast discourse within Scotland. So to some extent we're only at the beginnings of this dialogue, certainly not at the ends of it.

Andy Griffie: I'd just like to pick up one thought that Stuart had and that was he kind of posed the dilemma as a couple of extremes and I wonder whether one of the creative ways in which we rise to that challenge is evident in the programme that Stuart talks about, *The Natural History of the British Isles*. Because there what you have is a kind of absolutely prime time programme that is going out across the UK presented by Alan Titchmarsh for 50 minutes and yet at the end of that programme for 10 minutes perfectly integrated is a regions or nations 10 minutes of how the Ice Age played out in your particular part of the country. And so what you're getting there is I think a great kind of creative answer to the dynamic challenge that you set up, which is about a programme that's playing to the UK, bringing different bits of the UK to a national audience but also perfectly illustrated using the strength of our coverage and our people on the ground with a region to region or nation to nation content as well.

Donald Emslie: I was just going to pick up, you mentioned the whole issue about the commercial offering and I suspect you refer to Ofcom's recent production of their second stage of the Public Service Broadcast Review which, as you rightly identify as indicated that ITV regions in England may reduce their regional programming. I think there are others within the audience who can perhaps comment on it but I think if I address the problem head-on. And I think the issue is that, I mean the BBC has a very privileged position and has got the licence fee but the market for all of the television broadcasters is changing quite significantly and we have a government policy that is pushing us into the competitive world of the digital spectrum and clearly in the digital spectrum the commercial broadcasters' ability to drive audience and on the back of that audience drive its revenue is going to be severely affected by the competition. And we all know that and we're all not scared of competing and we want to get into that environment but it does have an effect on your ability to invest in your programming. And we just can't get away from the fact that in a competitive environment, if your audience is lower because of the choice that's available to the consumer then you're not going to be able to sustain your levels of investment in original programming for UK and regional programming that we have in the past. And that's for ITV as a whole and the competitive tension is no different in Scotland for the areas that I represent versus England and Wales. In fact the competitive tensions in Scotland could be said to be greater because the commercial channels actually deliver a higher share of audience in the nation of Scotland than elsewhere in the UK. And you've clearly seen from the Ofcom review, in terms of looking at the audiences, what part of what ITV and the commercial world do they really value? And I think, as Terry as you split them out, in terms of regions talking to themselves and regions talking to the others, clearly aware that Ofcom are going is that ITV's, one of ITV's unique contributions would be allowing regions to talk to the whole of the United Kingdom and they see a move away from the regional production in the regions only for the regional viewers to a move towards creating more regional programming if you like made in the regions for the UK networks, if I can make that distinction. And that is a very valuable contribution to public service broadcasting in a devolved United Kingdom and one that they think is worth protecting while allowing ITV to reduce perhaps obligations and burdens in order to match the demands of the digital world. Certainly it's up for consultation in the....those of you who have read that report will probably see that they park nations and want to

come back to the nations in the future. We expect that we will probably be required to do more in Scotland, so Scotland will give BBC Scotland a harder run for its money on news and current affairs and sport and politics than perhaps the English regions and I think that is absolutely right because as a broadcaster in the nations you do have greater expectations and obligations but I think our challenge to Ofcom is how is that paid for because we are still a commercial operator and we can't be disadvantaged. But I think the important thing is that the world is changing. The BBC has got the privilege of the licence fee and every other broadcaster is going to rely on advertising and subscription in order to create the revenue that's needed to invest in its original programmes and that is going to face significant challenges as we go through to digital switchover.

Lord Burns: I mean you are saying, which is a slight paradox, you're saying that because we're moving into a multi-channel world we're actually going to get less broadcasting directive to particular parts of the UK through the commercial sector and therefore there is a greater responsibility on the BBC to do some of this...

Donald Emslie: And that clearly came out in the Ofcom report, that their direction would be to try and keep the same amount of money that's spent on public service broadcasting in the system and that if ITV was going to see some reduction, then the gap should be made up primarily by the BBC.

Parminder Vir: I want to pick up on just to kind of broaden this discussion from (?) is here to look at the BBC and its public service broadcasting remit and its role in the 21st century, 2004 going forward, in what Stuart described as a changing Britain. We can talk about conversion, we can talk about the impact of new technology and the fragmenting audience. From where I sit as, you know, part of this community geographical ethnicity, as an ethnic minority, I feel that the BBC needs to really get to grips with how rapidly that change is being driven by the demographics in this country. You know you're talking about only 5, about you know 4.6, almost 5% of the population but it's geographical location that creates an impact. If you go to Leicester, 50% of that city is now non-white. London is projected to be 50% by the year 2010. Similarly in Bradford and Manchester and you go out of, out of Scotland. So I think it's really important that we understand the demographic revolution that's taking place and how is that impacting. I think secondly you need to understand that the ethnic communities have been the early subscribers, the first subscribers of the new technology. It was interesting when Sky launched its research that they find that the Asians 95 or 97% said Sky was a must-have compared to 85% who said BBC was a must-have and ITV was way down. I have a 16-year old daughter. You know I meet her friends, a very multi-cultural mix of friends. Trying to get her to watch BBC is an uphill task. I noticed in one of the BBC's reports that it was recommended that the BBC should now start catering for the older Afro Caribbean and African community, which came as a surprise. Those people came here in the 1950s. In the last decade they have left. They have retired to the Caribbean or they left our shores. The younger generation is still here. They are not necessarily waiting for the BBC to catch up. They have found other means of entertainment and education. I feel that the BBC really must get a deeper, deeper understanding of how this particular audience, and they're just not an audience that's here temporarily. They are our next talent pool. Where are we going to get the next managers who are going to be running the BBC, whether it's regions or the nations or even in London?

Lord Burns: Why must Sky have this must-have quality?

Parminder Vir: No, it's not because Sky is suddenly a fantastic multi-cultural programme producer and has developed, you know, innovations around promoting new talent. It simply is a platform. There are 20 channels, active channels supported by a subscriber base and ethnic brand advertising that caters for the Asian community. When I asked my Arab friends here what channels do they watch, they

give me a list of all the Arab channels. Al Jazeera is Number 1 on their list. When I ask my Nigerian friends, African friends, what channels do they watch, they watch the Nigerian channels. And similarly with the other communities. Where is the Chinese community plugged into? The Chinese channels. And they are getting product from outside of those countries. Now the second, third generation, my parents were great, you know we grew up on BBC and the old ITV but you know I think about 5, 6 years ago they switched completely to watching Asian channels or getting their news through Sky News as well as getting it through... and you know every time I see my parents it's like, you know "Don't forget the BBC. It's still one of the best. You know you pay your licence for it. I know you're subscribing to the other channels" but their complaint is there's nothing that reflects their older Indian, older West Indian, older African experience. And then you talk to the younger generation, "Well you know it's not really reflecting my interests." And I say it's not because the BBC isn't trying. I think it's come up with a lot of initiatives and strategies but without a real understanding of the changing nature of the markets, the ethnic markets, the viewers and the consumers in this country and I think we really, as we develop the strategy of how we're going to win this audience back. And a final point I want to make is the nations and the regions are imperative. Where is this talent sitting? Where are the voices? You know, we should know, why what happened in Oldham and the Northern cities was happening. It is imperative that the guys who sit in London understand what are the deep changes that are taking place amongst the young, you know the future consumers of television.

Lord Burns: Yes, thanks very much.

Susan Bassnett: Thank you. Really just to follow on from that. I was very struck in reading the documentation by, a statement in the Opening Vision section that says – and I wrote this down in my notes – "The UK is fragmenting, becoming more diverse, older and more polarised" and my reflection on that is how is that manifested in tastes? That is what, I can see if you like a kind of sociological explanation that would present itself but how does it manifest itself in taste because it struck me that you might just as well be able to argue the opposite and I think what Parminder has just said about the significance of Sky – and again as the mother of teenagers that is certainly what they want to watch – that you could perhaps argue that one of the things that the offerings on Sky represent is a kind of greater homogeneity. And perhaps there is indeed a greater sense of homogeneity in what people want rather than this fragmentation. I don't know if I'm making myself clear here but it seems to me that you've got a notion of fragmentation and polarisation but then in terms of taste you could surely argue that you've got exactly the opposite. And just one other point about regionality. I was very encouraged to hear the notion of part of the future strategy is for regions to talk to one another because one of the things I find is really very much missing is almost a sort of ghettoisation of regions. You go to one part of the UK and you get a particular offering and you have very little sense of what's actually happening there. I mean for me one of the principal things is for example the Eisteddfod. The rest of Britain might as well not know that it's even happening because there's no coverage of the Eisteddfod and we wouldn't want to go back to Alan's point about having to listen endlessly to folk music and so on but I think perhaps a slightly different balance. And I suppose my final point at this stage is reading the documentation - and I have to say as an academic I sort of boringly read it and underline words and phrases – it seemed to me that there was a sense of uneasiness at best, lack of clarity at worst about what regionalisation is, not just, as some people have flagged up in the report, what is a region. I mean I live 10 miles between Coventry and Leicester in a rural area that is almost solidly white but there is a very clear pull from that rural area into one particular city and not into another. And these towns are regional...we were just

talking before this session began about Coventry and Warwickshire radio and I think this question of what, I suppose I would call it psychic geography, that is how you relate yourself psychologically to the nearest urban centre or to a particular community, is also something very, very important.

Lord Burns: Thank you so much.

Colin Philpott: Isn't part of the answer to this to do with...I mean looking at the second question - how does the BBC identify communities? - the reality is that everybody has multiple identities and the oft-quoted example of the Asian teenage girl living in Bradford who, when in the company of predominantly of white people stresses her Asian-ness, when in the company of older people stresses her teenage-ness and when in Leeds stresses the fact that she's a Bradfordian. And in a sense it seems to me that the BBC, and indeed other broadcasters, have got to build their sense of how they define communities, whether it's by geography or ethnicity or any other way of dividing people up. Looking at it, it's not a simple question of drawing lines around various specific geographical areas. It's much more complicated than that. And it seems to me it has to relate to two things insofar as it's to do with geography. One is people's sense of identity, whether they feel they belong, which is very complicated and is different in different parts of the country, and the balance between whether people feel very attached to their local city or a much bigger entity is I think different in different parts of the UK. But secondly, it seems to me it does have something to do with structures because if part of the role of the BBC as a local and regional broadcaster is holding authorities to account, whether they're governmental authorities or others, then there has to be some sense in which you know if the structures...for example say my own region, there are lots of things called Yorkshire this and Yorkshire that. There may not be a Yorkshire Regional Assembly for many years to come but, you know, we have Yorkshire Water, we have Yorkshire this, that and the other and it does seem to me that the BBC needs to reflect that and so the BBC establishes that sense of programming at that level where if you like government and quasi governmental structures follow.

Stuart Cosgrove: I think that comes as a really, really big challenge for broadcasting across the board but I mean specifically for the BBC here is your idea of what lived an experiential culture means to people in their daily lives. We broadcast to Channel 4 a documentary, a short documentary series only a month or so back called My Crazy Parents and I met one of the young teenagers that was in it and it was a series about mental health. And this young woman, who was one of the characters in it, was just a phenomenally emotionally articulate woman, Scottish woman, and we actually spoke about Scotland. And she said to me "Well, you know, I think about that twice a year. I live every day with being the child of someone with schizophrenia" you know and there's a way in which mental health defined her life more than Scottish-ness, you know. And there's a curious thing there about how do we manage a public service broadcasting culture that's nuanced enough to speak to those various voices of people of whom national identity may be one but not necessarily the driving identifying feature of their life.

Janet Finch: Terry, can I just ask a supplementary question to that if I may? Is there a further step which is about building national identity? Does the BBC feel or should it feel that it has a role particularly in this still recently post-evolution period in helping to support the building of national identity in the different nations of Britain?

Parminder Vir: Well I would trust the BBC to build a national identity.

Pat Loughrey: If being responsible for this bit of the BBC brings any feeling in the human being it's humility. The range of issues, the complexity, the Rubik's Cube of identity that is contemporary Britain is evident and the common stuff has been made, none of which I disagree with particularly, all of which are.. and it's actually

quite helpful to discuss in this way issues that perplex any of us who bother to think about these things. But if I might just take a few of those questions. I think we are politically impartial Janet, to take them in reverse, that core to our values. We don't take a political position. However, we are less impartial about involvement in the democratic debate. We encourage all viewers, listeners and users online to participate and we have many, in the democratic process. We encourage engagement. We celebrate the unique language, heritage and difference of the United Kingdom. We play a role in bringing the United Kingdom together, to offer the coherence that Stuart discussed. You know the Boat Race was arguably a marginal activity among privileged people on the Thames. Wimbledon, not dissimilar. The BBC with its power can bring that and turn it into some kind of a quasi national event in which we begin even to care who wins the Boat Race.

Lord Burns: Some do.

Pat Loughrey: Not all of us...and in the nations I think we have a similar role. The Eisteddfod was mentioned. You are absolutely right that the dialogue, the understanding between the different communities within the BBC in their inherent difference and diversity is a key part of what we play. The digital distribution opportunity means that the Eisteddfod coverage from BBC Wales is now as of the last two years available across the whole United Kingdom. That opens up windows of opportunity but I don't believe that you can say the multi-channel experience is in itself a form of homogenised culture. I think what Parminder described was choosing very particular, very culturally specific output there and maybe less of involvement and inclusion. And it is imperative on an organisation funded like the BBC to be obviously relevant to and engage people of all social, ethnic, cultural backgrounds. And there's a hierarchy I guess of challenge in that. In our core output we must represent to a greater extent the different ethnicity, the different heritage, the different demographics of the UK, that we poor at historically. From East Enders to the Office must be more reflective. People must see that which is relevant and familiar to them. They must not feel excluded from that shared experience. But, as Greg Dyke said on a BBC Scotland programme memorably, the organisation itself cannot achieve diverse representation if the staff who make the programmes are not of that background and that's why we've set very stretching targets – 10% moving onward in our staff – to come from those communities that might otherwise be excluded from the broadcasting experience. There's a range of challenges in what he said. I think we are, the word 'regional' in itself arguably tells you more about the transmitter map of the UK than about how people live their lives, which is why the Where I Live sites, local radio and now the prospect of local television offers a greater chance of engagement with people within that 14/15 mile radius that I described at the beginning where we really live our lives. And that initial sense of relevance is more evident there. But there's so much more I could say.

Lord Burns: Well hang on. Sue?

Sue Balsom: Thank you. I'd just like to make a few points about sort of where we find ourselves in terms of PSB and the fact that we're actually at a sort of watershed. I think we tend to forget that we're actually in the middle of a revolution and, if we actually stop and think about the implications to that, then they're pretty profound. In terms of the ITV question that Donald's referred to, the reason, because of this digital revolution the government has charged Ofcom with reviewing how to maintain the strength in PSB and the findings of PSB1 and 2 are clearly that actually the pattern that we know and love, and have done so historically, is no longer sustainable in the form that we have it and that is because PSB is a peculiar British construct. It's one that we've been able to manage, not only in terms of the BBC but also in terms of ITV in exchanging scarce analogue spectrum in exchange for the types of programmes that we as a society demand that we'd like to see. We can't do

that anymore. With the diminution of the value of the analogue spectrum then we're not in a position to demand those types of programmes post DSO. And so the indirect funding that has actually existed historically now has to become overt and we have to find ways in which we want, if we want plurality of voice other than the excellent cornerstone of PSB that the BBC is and long may it remain so, if we want plurality of voice then we've got to look at other ways. To go back to the point of the digital revolution and what that actually means, we've heard already here in terms of how we are fragmenting as a society and how our communities of interest as well as perhaps what somebody termed a geographical identity here, we have actually been classified in broadcasting terms according to geographical maps largely, which actually were historically determined by transmitters, not actually communities. If you look at Cambridgeshire, then you've got different counties there, etc. So it's far from clear as to whether or not we've actually got that right, whether at the local, the regional or the national level in the case of devolved nations even. So what we are seeing though in this fragmenting society is this sort of seeking out of communities of interest and there is an appetite there for connectivity. And I think we need to look beyond the broadcasting that we actually are talking about here today in terms of linear television channels for example. That's really going to become something of the past when we have RSLs, community radio and of course the Internet. And the BBC has a very particular role here to play, is already doing so in driving the digital agenda in actually empowering people. And I want to come then to the skills issue because I do think this is quite an important one in terms of the BBC has a tradition of network productions and productions in localities for particular audiences. And it seems to me that future questions are going to be about how people, if they are empowered, it's a media literacy issue really as to how you actually have the skills base to come forward and to take forward the agenda of communicating in different ways, not only one to many, one to one but also one to some. And I think the value of the BBC's work in the nations and regions, in particular when they take network productions there, and actually can actually feed into the economy and actually demand of the skills base locally, then that is a huge, huge contribution to the future of broadcasting to all sorts of communities, whether they're communities of interest or they are actually geographically or administratively based.

Lord Burns: Thanks. Phil?

Phil Morrow: Yes, interested in what Alan started off with about, you know, listening to regional accents. I think it's definitely clearer now that what we hear on television does not create that same reaction and I think that's indicative of what happened as we allowed plurality of voices to emerge. If society is fragmenting into lots of smaller communities, then I think it's very interesting that the BBC will explore new digital means to reach those communities in a variety of services over time I am sure. But it becomes increasingly essential that the national networks provide a place where we can get to know each other and communities can hear about each other and find out about each other and have a sense of shared ownership. If you like if broadcasting was once the oil of the wheels of democracy, it's possibly now the glue that can hold the fabric of this society together. The experience in America has been that the major networks still dominate even in a hugely multi-channel environment and I think the BBC's role within that is going to be increasingly important and I think the role will be here for quite a long time to come. However, you know, the level of nations and regions programming that's found on the web currently is fairly derisory in the sense that in terms of reflection on the network. You know the BBC are moving to a commitment of 30% and 25% of value, which is actually somewhat less even than Channel 4 have committed to and quite a lot less than ITV have committed to in terms of reflection on the networks.

It's absolutely critical if we are to have this plurality of voices that there is a sustainable supply chain from all sorts of parts of the UK and in order to do that there need to be real and long-term sustainable commitments to the sector right across the UK and increasingly obviously I speak for the independent sector, who as time goes on are providing more and more of the programmes. And it's at the moment, certainly sitting in Northern Ireland, it all seems a bit piecemeal. You know there's a huge celebration when one company gets a one-off 1-hour documentary but, you know, they can't build a sustainable base on those kind of commercial, in those kind of commercial decisions, so they're big, they're small, they disappear. There is no sense of long-term commitment. I think over time we need to be enabling the nation to speak to the nation from all across, all the different communities as described.

Samir Shah: Thanks. I'd like to begin by just saying you know that I've been in the game for 25 years and I think we should first of all acknowledge the transformation in British television from 1979 to now in terms of communities. It is a different being and not just an all over ITV versus the BBC but it really is different. There are many more people from ethnic minorities working in television and on the screen. I think that should be noted and it has been a good thing and you know life now in television is quite different from when I first joined in 1979. Having said that, however, I was just doing some calculations and I noticed that in the last census there were just over 4½ million black and ethnic minorities and just under 5 million Scottish from Scotland. I don't think that BBC Scotland, I don't know how much money the BBC put into BBC Scotland but I bet they don't put the same amount into British ethnic minorities, although it's the same population, and this goes back to the fact that actually it's much more easy to describe Scottish as its a geographical entity and you probably have transmitters there than a community of interest which we discussed which is black and ethnic minorities. So although I think there's been a lot of progress, I think it really isn't very much. And when you ask the question of representation, I think of representation in two arenas which Pat hasn't commented on. One is of course on-screen and one is behind. And there's little doubt there's been a real progress on screen. It would be difficult to take, I don't know the figures but it's pretty clear that there is a pretty good representation and the disagreements now tend to be in the genres. There will always be disagreements you know as you get narrower and narrower but I think there is a real progress there but it's pretty damn poor behind the screens. And you know Greg's famous remark about the BBC being hideously white went on for him to appoint 17 executive directors all of whom were white. So you know I really do think that targets have to come from the top down and not from the bottom up. What happens in large organisations is that you can hit the targets at the bottom but somehow it never quite manages to get to the top and I think that really is you know 25 years on not good enough. And you know the BBC particularly, especially since it is license fee funded and commercial operations aren't, has an obligation to meet that licence fee paying 4.6 million people in its representation. And think of it, compare Scotland as a benchmark and let's see how well the BBC does. I think the third point I'd like to make and it's a really important point about change that people have referred to. You know we're now getting into a situation where the Afro-Caribbean and Asian communities are really the old immigrants. They're settled and the BBC is just about getting its head round reflecting them but the world is changing. Half of that population in this country is African. A good example, the BBC met – this is because I was on digital radio review, Creating One Extra. A terrific station. A very, very good station indeed, aimed at young urban blacks and that kind of music. Not my taste but it's not meant to be for me. But what is a black person talking about? Not the Africans. Nothing to do with African music. It was for a very specific group of Afro-

Caribbeans. And that image of what is the black population of Britain is not largely Afro-Caribbean. It's African. That means you have to change what we're talking about. And now, as the migration comes in from Eastern Europe, the Middle East and the Magreeb(?), the complex, the nature of this society is going to change again and we all know that the demographics of the migration will increase. So the BBC has not only got to get its act together with the Afro-Caribbean nation. That's past, there's a new world happening and the BBC are going to have to get on top of that as well. So my feeling is that you really need to be a lot quicker, you know. 25 years is too long, you know. Move on it. Make it happen. Because I think there's tremendous goodwill. Everywhere you read there's lots of goodwill. There's no resistance but I do think you need to be quicker at it and make those changes of representation faster than they're being done at the moment.

Lord Burns: Alice?

Alice Rawsthorn: Samir and Pat referred to quantitative targets in terms of employment behind and in front of the camera at the BBC as being absolutely central in the BBC's attempts to represent a more broadly representative Britain. I wondered what you consider the cultural milestones to be? And it's obviously very easy to sort of pinpoint obvious successes and obvious failures. In the latter category you could draw on the example of the Ferreira family introduced in East Enders, the first time I think an Asian family have been introduced as primary characters to a flagship BBC soap opera and basic factual mistakes were made in the composition of the family. They were poorly written characters and so they're being withdrawn. Cue controversy in the media, questions being asked and so on. You also eluded Pat to one's minority, rather esoteric events that have both been popularised and turned into major national events by BBC television coverage – one was the Boat Race and the other was Wimbledon. Now both of them are posh and white.

Pat Loughrey: That's why I used them.

Alice Rawsthorn: Exactly but when are we going to have similar cultural milestones from what you could call the sort of softer definition of a more broadly representative Britain?

Parminder Vir: Can I throw a few more things? I mean I think you...

Lord Burns: I've got this feeling we're pouring things on top of a bonfire at the moment.

Parminder Vir: I love the BBC. I worked at the BBC in the late 80s, early 90s when they first moved to the regions, the then licence renewal was being talked, and a number of departments – I was working in the Religious Department and the Youth Department and a number of others were told that they were going to be moving out to the regions. And there was a complete disarray inside. And I thought wow, why are these people not seeing this as an opportunity rather than a burden? And I feel, you know as we've talked about, I was really delighted when people mentioned that BBC2 might be moving. Well it should because we've got BBC1 in London. The other one should be outside of London. Then it got down to BBC3. Now it's down to Radio Live 5. I think it's, you know, all of these appear just as the diversity targets, appears to be lip service. When are we going to get real? You know people live in the regions. They consume. They spend. They work. They earn money, yes? And there's a whole diversity from all the things that we've talked about. Let's treat those people with some seriousness. If you're going to move departments, it's not just that I can now go and raise the house prices in Manchester but that I also take money up there, money and resources, and I commit to developing local talent. Your next set of managers are going to come from those diverse communities. Whether you're talking about those who have decided they're not going to leave their region, sadly, I mean fortunately or unfortunately for us as the children of immigrants. We don't have the privilege of having set out roots in one place, yes. So that my sister lives in

LA, another lives in Singapore, my grandparents live in India. You know we are all over the globe yet we are connected, yes. And you are talking about those, you know I think that's the kind of reality also of a younger generation. So I think it's not enough to say we care about the nations and the regions and we are going to make some token gestures and move a couple of departments. It's the money and the resources and the commitment to developing those management skills, the managers, the future managers of the treasure called the BBC. And it is a balance between.. and part of that is supporting and nurturing independent productions and resourcing and financing those so that we don't have to get on a train or a plane to come and negotiate our next contract at Channel 4.

Pat Loughrey: I was going to say....yes, sure.

Parminder Vir: No, no, and I think just in terms of my final point is really picking up on the point that Samir made. I think answering talent, yes we have. Around the issue of raising diversity, we've made a lot of headway and that's been made, driven through the formation of the cultural diversity network as being an important catalyst. Behind the screen is where the key to change lies as far as I'm concerned. If I see another Asian newsreader on the BBC I think I also jaw because that is not, and yet when I turn on the drama, the entertainment, factual entertainment or news or documentaries or even to some extent the children's department they decrease in the number, in their presence, yes. And I think it's vital to have talent, both in terms of producing talent, writing talent because that's where you're going to get the diversity of voices, perspectives and experiences. It's not a face talent that we're looking for anymore. It's not for people to be able to walk through a department and say "Oh there are 5 Asians. I can tick that box." The ethnic minorities and the people of authentic representation, real representation and the real ability. I would love to be able to be in Alan Yentob's shoes and say "I retired from the BBC because the BBC developed me as a manager." I'd like to see that the BBC will commit that and develop people of African origin, Caribbean origin, Chinese origin. Vodafone, if Vodafone can find an Adam Sarin (?), the BBC should have delivered us 20 of those by now because the BBC is a place where we can grow and develop the managers who are going to manage, whether it's the public service unit or the commercial reads.

Stuart Cosgrove: I was just going to say, in addition to Parminder's thoughts there about the move to Manchester, I mean I think that you know we're looking at a here and now in the BBC where you know I think there's no doubt about it the BBC needs to go through the next generation of fundamental institutional change. And I say that not, and by that I don't mean things like downsizing and making departments redundant or out-sourcing things to the independent sector. They're all part of that. The institutional change I'm talking about is actually beginning to chip away at something that I think has actually been detrimental to the BBC since its origins, which is to some extent if you like the broadcasting elite at the heart of the BBC, which has been London dominated. I spoke only yesterday to two senior managers of the BBC about Manchester and the move to Manchester in the conversation and this place was being talked about as if it was the Gulag Archipelago. I mean this is actually a major international thriving city with one of the most exciting pop culture reputations in the world.

Janet Finch: Barcelona.

Stuart Cosgrove: Yes. Unfortunately within the BBC the concept of regions is where you're sent to die, right? And until the BBC manufactures fundamental change in that area, and that's cultural change within the organisation, then we'll still have this debate and we'll still be talking about the edges of it.

Lord Burns: Well we'll have a break. I mean we started off by talking in a sense about the programmes that people might want to watch and whether people wanted to

watch programmes about their local areas and their local communities and we then moved into this world of who it was who was actually appearing on television and now I think we have become much more rooted and I just wonder whether disproportionately but that is for you in the issue about who it is who is producing the programming and where it is that this programming takes place. But I don't, when we come back we actually rather helpfully have designed the next thing practicalities. I think we have you know touched on quite interesting but big issues. It's a sort of clearing throats really and identifying what sort of things we want to talk about but when we come to practicalities I think there are some issues that I hope we can focus on, which is you know do people really want to watch programmes which are about their local communities or do they want to watch national programmes? You know is this whole thing really an issue about making sure that everybody gets a go at producing programmes around the UK and get away from the London-centric nature and you know the London white-centric nature of this. So you know I want to keep each of the dimensions in play if I can. 15 minutes break. You can switch your phones on briefly.

(BREAK)

Lord Burns: Thank you all very much. Make sure my gadgets are switched off. As I said at the end of the previous session, I think there are three aspects of what I think has been raised so far. One is the issue of those programmes which are shown for communities, the regions, and many of them are for regions of course but also for others, and then there is this issue about in a sense who participates in them and also the issue about who makes them and where they are made. I mean I think we're just in some danger of now answering the examination paper that we have been presented with because, as you will see from the BBC's papers, I mean without belittling the other issues, which I think we've had a good run at and which I'm happy to come back to, but I would like to focus the next session upon the issue about programming for local communities, whether they be regions or otherwise, you know, and the issue about what it is that is put out. Is it the right amount? Are we doing too much? Too little? The sort of cynical view, is the local programming that people want is a bit of local news and a few traffic reports and maybe to see the highlights of their local football team? There is another view that says people want to see much more about what it is that is going on in their area. But as far as possible I would like to distinguish between this issue about in a sense who are the people who are participating in them and making them and the question about the audiences. I mean whether we are producing the programmes that people actually want in the right quantity, whether there should be more of them or less and whether there should be different types of programming? And bearing in mind that there are, you know we have at least three channels here. We've got television, we've got radio and we have Internet and I think we need to touch on all three of those because obviously all three of them have got a very important role in reaching out to the people as viewers, listeners, you know audience, whatever term it is that we would like to.... Would you like to....

Alan Budd: Can I just say something because it's very much another aspect of the question you ask and it's responding particularly to what Parminder Vir said about where people are currently getting their ethnic programmes from. They are getting them. Sky is providing them and you said we must...

Lord Burns: Satellite is providing them?

Alan Budd: Yes, satellite is providing them. The feature or the issue there is presumably they are foreign origin programmes. You talked about winning them back to the BBC but there's always a question about if it's being done by someone

else why does the BBC need to do it? What is it that the BBC needs to do? I think that's a question to throw into this.

Pat Loughrey: Well as in this whole huge topic, the BBC charges a licence fee to everyone who lives in the UK and therefore has a responsibility to produce programmes of relevance to those people. It's a huge task and therefore we are forced to regard communities as at least one currency of engagement with those audiences. But let me just give you a few specifics because otherwise it will be a bit if I could. The figures of diverse representation we achieved in 2003 were 10% of ethnic minorities in the workforce and 4% of senior management. We set new targets recently to be achieved by 2007 of 12½% of staff who come from ethnic minorities by 2007 and 7% of senior management. And recent appointments of executive board are evidence that this is a real commitment. This is not tokenistic. This is not vague. This is very hard and very specific and it's making a difference. These numbers are across the whole BBC. They include the staff base in areas of the UK where you know ethnic diversity is only 2% in the whole community, so when you achieve that level. The level of ethnic diversity in for instance our local service in Leicester or our local service in London is of course much higher because it reflects that community. From where we sit in terms of local programming, we are very proud that from the inception of BBC local programme, we produced output dedicated to those minorities. The immigrant communities it was called then by Frank Giller, and that's the parent of the Asian Network. And we're very pleased that the Asian Network grew from our little local radio stations across the country and has now become a network service in its own right with digital distribution. We can sew seeds of diversity within communities, nurture and celebrate that and move on. 20-30% we reckon of the production staff, producers, in peak time come from diverse backgrounds. These are programmes like East Enders and Doctors. We are making significant progress. No one in the BBC thinks we've arrived on any of these issues. It's a journey but there is significant progress we think towards representation. Let me say, I think with Peter Salmon leading the out of London strategy, which isn't just about Manchester but is about the whole of out of London, and the BBC has for all the reasons that Alan described at the beginning had a metro-centric weighting that was way out of alignment with the population of the UK. What we have set ourselves in Building Public Value to achieve within the next Charter period is 50% of staff working outside of London and a fifth of network commissioning to happen outside of London and an increase of the spend outside of London by a third. That's £1 billion a year to be spent outside of London. These are not vague targets believe me. These are very, very difficult. The prime genre that will be affected – and you'll hear all of this I trust from Mark Thompson early in December when these plans will be in their entirety unveiled – is that drama, entertainment, the key cultural representation genre are at the forefront of that because, thinking back, they have particular potency in involvement, engagement, emotional connection. And I believe that if we achieve that, the production base in the UK, not just for the BBC but for the industry, will be more balanced and healthy and I am really pleased about what Donald has said. If ITV truly engage with us in creating content from across the nations and the regions of England for the networks, it will be healthy. We have no wish to be a monopoly in these areas. It is unhealthy for the industry; it is unhealthy for the talent base and we are very pleased to work as we do with Stuart with the Executive Producer Development Programme aimed at independent producers. We so want that to be the case. And lastly, and it's not a finger in the eye, but I read with interest something the new Chief Executive of Channel 4, Andy Duncan, said, speaking to the independent sector. He asked the independent companies hard questions about the level of their diversity, about their social and geographic spread. Sometimes we work in the

assumption that only the corporations or the big employers have these issues. It is equally true and maybe more true of small independent companies, many of which are the plaything of privileged bourgeois people from the suburbs as well and we very much need to ask hard questions of that sector while offering them more opportunities within the output of the networks.

Lord Burns: Can I move on from the issue about who is making programmes to the issue about programmes that we're getting..

Samir Shah: I want to address that point from the point of communities, of ethnic minority communities. I think you know a long time ago there were television programmes aimed at ethnic minorities, you know, to help them settle into this country and they were known as ghetto programmes and on the whole, you know, nobody much liked to watch them and I think their time has come and gone. And I think frankly, and it's my view, I think the time has come and gone for those sort of programmes generally for the BBC. I think for the economies of scale here, I think it's jolly good news that there are now digital channels showing Indian movies because of course they reach a massive global Asian community and that's why it works and people can access them. I don't see any obligation therefore for the BBC to spend its licence fee doing that. I just don't. From a practitioner's point of view and as a member, as a nation, I want to see my community in the mainstream and I know from the people I work with as producers, they want to work on programmes that are on the network and on the mainstream. They don't want to work just on black or Asian programmes and, if they do, they want to move on pretty quick. Now that's not to say that, you know, the Asian Network's not doing a jolly good job but I think part of the jolly good job is that the people who work on it move on to other parts of radio and work on them. Obviously radio, the economics are slightly different than television but I see no particular reason for the licence fee to be spent on what one would call ghetto programmes aimed at local communities. There's really, what actually you want is to see yourself reflecting your community, your culture reflected in the main burden of BBC1, BBC2 and elsewhere. Maybe in small areas you can continue to be race specific and reflect their, those specific issues but pretty small and dwindling. I think, you know, let the rest of the world deal with that but I think from the BBC's point of view it should seek to embrace and include the different ethnic minorities into its mainstream programming and its workforce into its mainstream programme because, you know, trust me, black and Asian people don't want to work on ghetto programmes. They want to get out of it and they're always getting put into that place and they don't like it. It's their way in, which is fine. It's all right as a way in but that's not where they should be. It should be a way in and a way out into the mainstream.

Lord Burns: Okay. Now we have, I mean the number's in here and we have a paper from the BBC which sets out what their budget it as far as the regions is concerned and we see that there is a great deal of money being spent there. We know that, you know, that there is this audience for, certainly for local radio and there is an audience too for certain types of local television programmes. What I would like us to do is to address some of the...whether it's, we can do this in two ways. I mean there is a, in Chapter 6 on the future vision of this on page 60, they set out what the proposals are for the future. There is also in Chapter 4 a list of what the BBC's current activities are around the UK. And I would like to spend a bit of time focusing on these, on the issue as to whether this is a, you know...and I'd be interested too in audience research. Well there is some in here of course. Is this the kind of scale that we are looking for or in some sense does globalisation, as someone mentioned, mean that people are less interested in what is happening in their local community and they would rather watch national.

Colin Philpott: I'll attempt to answer that question. Isn't it the case that both things are necessary. The provision of specific programmes, I mean I'm not talking about minority communities but in terms of by geography...

Lord Burns: By geography, let's spend some time on geography.

Colin Philpott: But people want both things. They want programmes that are specifically for their community which speak to them, which may not be of interest to people even 20 miles away but certainly not 200 miles away, but they also want the representation, the reflection, the celebration of their part of the country to a wider audience – the rest of the country and indeed internationally. The two things are not mutually exclusive. But actually the opportunity that technology now provides is that these things aren't mutually exclusive in a technical sense either because satellite television gives you this massive, massive footprint, which means in fact you can broadcast everybody's local news to everybody else, which of course the BBC and others are already doing. If you go ferreting in the 900s on the Sky button you can find any regional programme you want from any part of the country. And in terms of the Internet and broadband of course the same thing applies. So actually the problems of the past where it was the transmitter pattern, which determined what programmes got and how areas were defined, to a certain extent have become things of the past. I mean obviously whilst analogue television remains and actually Freeview as well, they will still be in relation to that but you know the problems which have in a sense defined what is locality and regionality have gone away. It does seem to me as a final point that there is an issue for the BBC about range of local and regional programming but by subject matter. Now I used to work for the BBC and I remember saying in the same way that Pat and Andy and others have, you know, that the BBC is committed to reflecting culture and the arts, with a sort of small 'c' and small 'a', across the English regions. I'm not convinced actually that that is happening yet sufficiently, nor actually that there is anything in the current proposals that will necessarily address that because it does seem to me that yes, people want local news and they want travel news and all those sort of very factual, important things, but actually what they want just as much as that is the sense of you know the rich culture of every part of the country reflected and I don't particularly see anything in the proposals in the document which address that specifically in England. I think Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland is a different matter.

Andy Griffie: Chairman, can I pick up a couple of points? And firstly, yours on is the demand there and does the investment match that demand? You said local radio had a healthy audience. You know one in five of the population are still tuning into their local radio station in England. 8 million people. It's a very, very significant audience. For regional news, well the regional news, the regions and nations news from the BBC at 6.30 is their most-watched news programme on BBC television, ITV, Channel 4, national or regional. We started rolling out our Where I Live local online sites 3 years ago. We're now getting 6 million unique users a month who are coming to the BBC's online services through their local front door. Two years ago we moved our BBC2, our current affairs and politics output in the English regions from BBC2 to very respectable slots on BBC1 and we doubled and trebled the audience respectively and we've been doing it....

Lord Burns: Which programmes are those?

Andy Griffie: Sorry?

Lord Burns: Which programmes are those?

Andy Griffie: One is called Inside Out, which is transmitted on a Monday on BBC1 at 7.30 and that's a mix of hard-hitting original investigative journalism, environmental and heritage journalism as well. So our evidence is that the demand is there and remarkably stable and strong in spite of, you know, more and more

choices for people to go to. The audience at 6.30 on BBC1 for the regional news has remained remarkably steady in terms of just the sheer number of people over the last three years. Now where I think part of our previous discussion and this discussion starts to blend is we will increasingly find, as Colin has said, that people will no longer need the BBC to make choices for them about which is the most appropriate geography or content. They will choose it for themselves. The critical aspect is whether we have that content, it reflects the full complexity of identity and diversity and geographical attachment under our bonnet as it were. At the moment we're launching something called – forgive the jargon – a content management system across our Where I Live Internet sites. What that means is whenever a local team puts some content under the bonnet, it's not just tagged or identified as content relevant to Leicester or Coventry or Truro. It's also tagged by lifestyle interest and passion. So people may choose to come to that content on the Leicester Where I Live site because they're from the local Somali community. They may choose to come to that content because they're a member of a gardening club in Cornwall but what's most important to them is gardening rather than Cornwall. And I think we will see increasingly over the next 10 years what we're doing in that Internet service playing out on all kinds of new devices for video and audio content as well. And so I think one of the answers to this is there the content relevant to me and how do I access it is inevitably going to be able on demand digital services and the responsibility of the BBC to ensure that that richness of content remains there.

Lord Burns: Okay. Can we start with Stuart and then Janet.

Stuart Cosgrove: Okay. I just wanted to add another point, which is you know Kenneth picking up on that just where Andy's left off, which is that I think the other thing that you tend to forget when you're talking about what people watch in the nations and regions is that that's something that in itself is subject to quite remarkable change both within a period of the year itself that you're talking about, the transmission period of the year, or indeed over maybe longer periods of time as well. And I think that there's a danger of sometimes when the debate comes from the centre, you know the elite broadcast centre that I talked about earlier, that there's a danger that you believe that a lot of these things like Scotland or Northern Ireland are sometimes fixed in their meaning. And Alan opened the entire afternoon there satirising say folk music that was seen sort of popped up and kind of you know embarrassed posh people in the comfort of their own home or whatever it was. But the truth of the matter is that there's an area of culture within the Celtic nations that is going through the most fundamental modernisation and change and if you actually look at the way in which that music has evolved over the last 20 years, it would actually be wrong of the BBC. You might have got away with an argument in the BBC in the 70s to say well that's a bit dreary and old-fashioned but if you're trying to put forward that argument now in the Celtic nations you would be laughed out, you know. It's one of the most dynamic areas of the culture, you know, and I think that's a really, really important role of why programme production, the idea of where things are produced and where things are managed from and what content ends up on the screen is it has to be done close to the people who understand the changing nature of that culture. It can't be something that's kind of, you know that's convened from the centre. That's why devolution is so important and I don't mean in the political sense, I mean in the cultural sense. It has to be people that are responsive to change and that's why it's really important.

Lord Burns: Okay. Thanks very much. Janet?

Janet Finch: Terry, I wanted to link this in with a couple of questions that we've been looking at more generally across several of these seminars, which is firstly about what the BBC should not do and secondly about what it should do uniquely or at least perhaps very distinctively. And if I could sort of focus that on the kind of issues

that we're discussing now, in relation to what the BBC should not do, we have heard from a number of sources, though not always agreed, that the BBC should not do things that other providers could do equally well. So what is it in this arena of nations and regions that other providers can do at least equally well or at least better? And just to be provocative, I'd throw in the Where I Live website, something that I use regularly myself and it's brilliant but why is the BBC doing it? Is that the sort of thing that some other provider could equally well be doing and therefore why is our licence fee being spent on it? A question. Then on the question of what the BBC can and should do uniquely, well one of the answers that we've heard quite a lot in these seminars is that because of the licence fee and the responsibilities that that brings, the security of funding, the level of funding that it brings, what the BBC should be doing uniquely is setting standards in programme making and innovating to a very high standard because it can afford to do it. It can afford to take risks. It can afford to invest more in programmes. Now how does that play on the regions and nations' debate because so far we've, insofar as we've been talking about content – and Terry has struggled to make us talk about content a bit – but insofar we've been talking about it, we've been talking about it as if it's something fairly routine, you know local news, weather forecasts, all those sorts of things, but I think in a way Colin's last contribution moved us slightly further towards what I'm thinking about, which is should it be one of the functions of nations, national and regional broadcasting that programmes that are made that are of such high quality that they are clearly going to be seen BBC-wide. They are made in the regions. They may to some extent be about the regions, draw on regional interests and themes but they are made because they are such excellent programmes for a national or possibly even an international audience. So those are my two questions. What should the BBC not be doing in this area and what should it be doing uniquely?

Susan Bassnett: Yes, it's really sort of following on from a point that Stuart's made a couple of times, which I find was very much in my mind when I was reading the documentation and that's one of perspective, of where one stands looking at something. And I think that, I realise that this is part of a series of seminar and that there's another seminar that's addressing international issues but I did find the absence of the word 'Europe' and the absence of 'international' except for I think it's used three times. Internationalism is referred to in terms of, in this vision document, I'll just open this, "helping to connect British people to their international roots" and that's how international is used. And I suppose my question is to what extent is there joined-up thinking about this debate on regional, local, national and international, European given the great diversity of perspectives on Europe and internationalism from different parts of the British Isles?

Lord Burns: Yes, I think a reasonable criticism. I mean we must bear responsibility for the way we have designed this programme and we have divided up the issue. I mean we are now looking, we are purposely looking down within the UK rather than looking out from the UK. It just so happens that this is the point at which the two...

Stuart Cosgrove: Although there is a very, very good answer actually and Ken McQuarrie from BBC Scotland would know more about the detail of it. But for example there's a BBC Scotland series, award winning series called The Author and it's a perspective series from Scotland and particularly Gaelic speaking Scotland's views of change within Europe. The focus tends to be on those small nations within Europe, policies around language, the question of business across borders, all sorts of things, funded, well I'll not exaggerate but extremely well-funded for what in effect is a regional opt-out programme within Scotland not shown elsewhere in the UK. Standards are very high. A lot of people aspire to work in it because – and this is going back to Samir's point – that it actually has budgets that are good. And it offers a perspective on Europe that I don't see in the network and it's precisely because it's

coming from the perspective of a small nation to the north of Europe that has its own specific political and cultural challenges here.

Sue Balsom: I mean we've touched on a couple of things here, including the issue of very local programmes, including, there's an appetite for that, and something that needs to be addressed. Citizenship issues in terms of programmes about the governments and authorities that shape people's lives, clearly that's not in contention. But I'd just like to touch on the importance of network portrayal and the way in which not only does that promote social harmony and understanding but also generating people's own sense of value and as it were belonging in terms of a wider stage. But I'd just like to touch on the issue then of how do you get those programmes and those communities onto network when in fact the barriers are actually very high inasmuch as, certainly in the case of the commercial companies, clearly they are driven by commercial imperatives in terms of numbers of viewers etc. or in the area of ratings. I know the BBC has been charged with that historically but if you actually talk about impact rather than actually numbers, then in fact the BBC is uniquely placed to actually do something that commercial broadcasters can't do and that is actually to have those sort of programmes that reflect other communities in a way that they don't actually have to justify only by audience figures. So I think that's quite an important consideration.

Lord Burns: I mean you're talking about local programmes being offered on a network?

Sue Balsom: Programmes that are about those communities that are showing on network, yes.

Pat Loughrey: I think it's probably worth...sorry.

Parminder Vir: No, no, are we discussing audiences?

Lord Burns: Yes. For the moment I...

Parminder Vir: Whether they want to, whether they switch off, when...

Lord Burns: I mean there are two hypothesis which, I mean there are two streams of working which I can interpret from this. I mean one is the whole issue about local programmes for local people and you know to do with news, to do with current affairs, those things, maybe some local cultural issues but which people themselves would be interested in. Then what keeps cropping up in the conversation is the fact that what people also really love in the regions is to see things about themselves being broadcast to everybody because this gives them a great sense of worth, it makes them feel in the mainstream, you know in Newcastle, you know to see programmes that are all set around the city of Newcastle being on network television. The hypothesis is, you know, it makes people feel a great deal better and they feel much more connected with the nation than they do. But the bulk of this paper, it has to be said, is about the first of these issues, which is about programming that is done for people in the communities where they want to watch something that is different to that which the network is providing. That is my interpretation.

Sue Balsom: But with respect, I think that's actually part of the same spectrum precisely because people can actually look at things bifocally, trifocally, whatever, and they do want to see it across the spectrum. If the BBC is something that they relate to, then they want the very local but they also want to be part of the whole.

Lord Burns: Let me, no I think both of these things I think have come out very strongly.

Pat Loughrey: Just to give an example to demonstrate this point, with which I completely agree. Sometimes drama, non-news programming, can convey an empathy and understanding, an insight into a thorny topic that the very best current affairs might struggle to do. Take Holy Cross. Take that school in North Belfast where those horrendous things happened. I believe the drama BBC Northern Ireland made about that dilemma depicted and established an empathy in a truthful,

profound, non-partisan way that went beyond the normal reportage of journalism. It's one example from that to *Messiah*, to *Mrs Brown and I* trust *Dr Who* when it emerges from Cardiff, will establish a different insight into the creative life of communities and the potential of communities and extend the understanding of network audiences. That is a very important part of what we do. And as I said with those out of London commitments, you will see the BBC going beyond, at the moment 11% of all of network television comes from the three nations, just to take that isolated example. That figure is set to grow significantly and Mark Thompson will make clear the level of that growth in early December. I think the nation, that third level of kind of hierarchy of needs, the information you need to live in your community and then the cultural and community values moving on to the network stage that we described in Alan's opening, that is bound to grow. And what I'm really pleased about is that I think we share that responsibility with ITV and with Channel 4 and that's one where I trust that we can work together to sustain the creative base, the skills that make high end drama, to make entertainment possible across the whole UK because that adds as much to cohesion, to involvement. And let me just try to scotch one prejudice that's around, that local programming is somehow a switch-off. Andy has said it already but it's worth saying again because the kind of Alan Partridge stereotype of the youngest butcher in Norfolk hangs around this territory. That is if you read *Media Guardian* exclusively or *Broadcast* you would be forgiven for having that prejudice because little attention is paid to this area. But everyone in this room I think is combined by a shared appreciation of a different reality. We make the most popular, most watched current affairs programme in the UK. We make the most popular watched news programme in the UK. We make high end drama, entertainment. All of our output in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales for example add to network share. They increase the audiences because they're made by the best possible people with appropriate budgets, not excess of budgets but appropriate budgets, not to patronise or condescend or to be tokenistic, which I fear was the heritage in this area in the fifties and sixties when attitudes were formed. And when you do that – and the same is absolutely true online – you discover that irony of the global world, belonging to a wider world, not narrowing your vision. And just one thing you said Samir I want to respond to, somehow you could counterbalance BBC Scotland versus spending on ethnic minorities as if one couldn't be Scottish and of an ethnic minority. They are very substantial sections of the Scottish community that are proud to be of both. We all have layers of identity. Scottish output is I trust as inclusive, as reflective of diversity as the output of the whole of the BBC and so it should be, so it must be going forward.

Parminder Vir: I just want to say I really welcome and look forward to Mark Thompson announcing the increase in the spend which is outside of London and particularly looking at drama and entertainment. I say this because, as a film and television producer, drama is a window, an access into different cultures. When we saw *East Is East* a lot of people reflected, *God, Coronation Street* hasn't managed to reflect the change in its local community in the way that that story clearly did. *Bend It Like Beckham* is another example. And the recent Ken Loach movie, *Kiss Ponders* (?), a fantastic film, fantastic story, brilliantly told, a real insight at a very human level, universal story of what it is to fall in love with someone outside of your religion. *Yasmin* is another film that, you know. Those for me, that's what I, that's what I get when I watch stories and perspectives that come from the regions outside of London. I could name 40 other films which are all London-centric, including the first feature film that I ever made, which was very much set in London. But I know that that story could be set in Moss side, it could be set in Handsworth, yes, and I'd like to see the BBC not to make a commitment but to put resources and money in really enabling those stories because those are the stories I believe that connect us

as a nation. And as far as local news programming, we can get that, yes. My parents can get in from, you know, in terms of living in Southampton, they can get it from their, you know, their local regional channel but they can get it also through their local newspaper and their local radios, yes. But it's really, you know, that and then also I think increasing the spend on art and culture. I cut my teeth in the Music and Arts Department of the BBC. For me you know the artistic expression within these communities, the creative talent, it's out there in the regions. And I don't see why those people have to travel to London in order for their voices to be heard.

Lord Burns: Donald?

Donald Emslie: Yes. Thanks. Can I just make a couple of points? We're really talking here at the moment about, you know, who is producing, where it's being produced, what is produced and how much is produced and I think we're kind of missing a slight part of the argument, which is that we're moving from a traditional broadcast medium to one that is controlled more by the consumer than it is by the broadcasters and I think that's a very important medium to lay on top. And I think it was Sue that mentioned that perhaps the traditional model of a linear broadcaster is going to be confused in the future. I think the consumer is going to be able to use online, broadband, the digital networks in order to be able to consume what he or she wants, including PVRs, which is going to be a huge impact on our role as a broadcaster, that they'll be able to watch what they want to watch when they want to watch it and I think that's a very important part of this conversation which perhaps hasn't been touched upon because actually that opens up huge amounts of opportunities for us as broadcasters to make programmes that can be consumed several times at different points of the day. And I think, you know, whether it's local programming or regional programming or national programming or ethnic programming it can be consumed in a variety of different ways. And it's interesting that, if you look at Ofcom's research and the PSB2 paper, they identified and I think we've talked about how the transmitters are perhaps an accident of history where actually there's more interest in local programming than there is in regional programming. That is reflected in the radio market which hasn't been talked about much today where you see an explosion of local information on radio which the consumer wants and I think, if my information as I have gathered it locally, they've increased their local content by some 50% over the last 4 years, not because they've had to but because the consumer wants it. And I think that's a very important point to make. And I think, finally I think you know, talking about this mix of local programming and national programming, I've never met a programme maker who has set out to make anything other than a good programme, whether it be local or national, and I don't think consumes watch programmes just because they're local and national. I think they watch programmes because they're good and whether they're delivered on whatever platform by whoever it's made for, they want to be engaged and watch good programmes and as broadcasters that is our challenge. And I fully support the BBC in moving production out of, you know out of London. I think I'm right in saying that, sparing Stuart's blushes, Stuart's probably the only network commissioner that lives outside London and you know...

Stuart Cosgrove: In a suitcase.

Donald Emslie: ...in a suitcase. And just to make Pat blush a little bit, he opened up today by saying the BBC nations and regions centre in London, surely that has to change. Maybe Mark Thompson will look at that later on along this week. But I think the most important thing for the whole of the United Kingdom and the broadcasting industry is the production, whether it's local, regional or national, must be of high quality. It must move away from the centres and, you know, talking with my Scottish hat on, Scotland I think produces from a recent audit only 3% of network production across ITV, Channel 4 and BBC yet we're 9% of the population and I think

the same is for Wales and Northern Ireland. The nations are totally under-represented in the production of network programmes and that must be addressed for the benefit of the creative industries, the cultural identity and also the economic health of the nations. It's very, very important indeed.

Lord Burns: One of your ambitions is to have local television news....

Pat Loughrey: Yes.

Lord Burns:which is on the same basis as local radio news isn't it...

Pat Loughrey: Yes.

Lord Burns: ..in rather more decentralised places.

Pat Loughrey: Yes. Yes. We've conducted a lot of research into what audience need is likely to be going forward. I guess what inspired us to move into Where I Live sites, to come to something Janet said earlier, maybe let me just start with what is it not appropriate for the BBC to do? What should we not do? People sitting in rooms spinning discs and saying they're BBC Solent or BBC Shetland. That is available freely in the market, a music-driven policy. What we provide...on Where I Live it's not appropriate for us to help you select your best supplier of local pizzas, to give you listings of local cinemas and the price per seat and to help you order your theatre tickets online. That's not what we do. That is freely available online. What we, our research showed – and by the way you don't need to be an anthropologist to spot it – the nation is a good deal less deferential than it was. They do not want to sit down in awe of Huw Edwards, wonderful though he is, just when it suits us to broadcast the news at 10 o'clock. They want news available that's relevant and important to them when they need it. They want access to it 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. That's what Where I Live gives them. We have this huge licence fee funded news gathering resource that churns out information at public expense through the Where I Live site with minimal extra investment. We can give the people who pay for it access to that information all of the time. That strikes us as distinctive, enriching and broadening the capacity of BBC journalism. However, local television, in Hull where there is this wonderful window on a broadband on-demand world thanks to Kingston Communications – who would have thought it? In the most difficult demographics of the UK, where – and I shan't go on but certainly the lowest achieve LEA in the country, certainly not BBC heartland – there is this extraordinary opportunity to explore what life will be like in a totally on-demand world. So we invested very significantly across all the genres in a broadband trial in Hull with permission from DCMS. And out of it came – and some of us weren't surprised – that the single most compelling offer we made was local news, available in vision, a man sitting on a desk, not much grandeur in it but keep - Rippon readers, which were described in the business - bringing up-to-date information largely derived from local radio about what was happening in Hull and second most popular was as we would know in the business as video diaries, people telling their stories in their voice in a compelling way. And I must say they are so good they easily travel to network audiences because, if you want to know how it feels to be the victim of an assault as an asylum seeker in a place like Hull, you watch our video diaries and it's compelling. John Godber, a brilliant local playwright wrote for that platform drama in 3-minute chunks. It's called Thunder Road. It's been shown 4 times on BBC4. It's interesting how the different bits of the BBC can join together. Out of that came an insight. What we need to across the UK, we have 70, traditionally about 70 cameras on the road gathering what's interesting in the whole UK. I mean that's an insult isn't it? That everything that happens of interest in a 60 million population can be captured by 70 cameras, most of which are on the road for about 3-4 hours if we're very, very lucky. In one region in England, the East Midlands, we have that number of cameras on the road now because we, through days with people like Roger Bolton and BECTU here and through the NUJ and a shared vision of what's possible we've

created a possibility of a depth of picture gathering and story telling and have broadened the base of journalism in the UK, that in no way conflicts with any ambition of the commercial sector that I know of but which brings a compelling offer to communities that are otherwise overlooked in a global news gathering world. And those personal stories by the way are what travel far beyond the boundaries of the UK because that's what literature and theatre is about. That's what's compelling and interesting. And we offer on BBC World some of those stories and they work as well on that platform that's the vision for local TV. We must trial it now, in a real life situation, on broadband, on D-Sat on any platform we possibly can, to make sure it works over a sustained period in a competitive environment if you like.

Stuart Cosgrove: I'd just Pat also like to thank you for your influence this morning. We were on that website Channel 4 this morning and I was struck by the headline "Scottish vampire dies in his cell" which is now going to become a Channel 4 documentary next year. We're looking forward to that one. I wondered, I wondered, Chairman, if there was another kind of corollary, another way of coming at the area of the debate that you want us to stay on, which is this idea about, you know, what communities see and what they value and what they don't value. And I'm wondering if, if it's the case that we live in an increasingly socially diverse nation with all sorts of different gender and ethnic and regional and local difference and if we're becoming more responsive to those nuances, I wonder if Pat can help us by saying has there been a decline in as it were incidents of kind of if you like complaint or feelings of hurt within communities where they see representations of themselves on the network which don't accord with their own emotional values of who they are as a community? I mean I know for example Scotland historically has been an easy nation to hurt and often the BBC in London specialised in that role and I'm wondering if we've seen change in that? Has there been a decline in that?

Pat Loughrey: Perhaps the Controller of BBC Scotland, Ken McQuarrie would like to....

Ken McQuarrie: In the area of sport, probably because of a decline in the status of the national football team, we haven't seen much decline. You know it's still a wide topic, particularly in the year 2000 and also the World Cup.

Lord Burns: And goalkeepers?

Ken McQuarrie: Exactly. Thank you. In the other areas, such as grammar, particularly documentary, factual representation a considerable decline across all the other genre and that's measurable as well in Scotland where the reach of our services has increased over a 3-year period and that, traditionally the Scots are high consumers of television, perhaps the highest hourage of television consumed in the UK, and that leads. But the figures as far as the 50-minute reach are concerned over the last 3 years has demonstrated that. I just wanted to also say there was the trigger back of what Sir Alan Budd said at the beginning about the conversations, that as far as the, you know and addressing Lord Burn's questions in terms of practicalities, that I think that one of the practicalities is the critical mass of talent and the exchange of ideas. And I think it is vital that we have in an area such as Scotland a strong Channel 4, a strong Scottish media group to support the talent base and to have that critical mass because that, it seems to me that the outcome of the various editorial conversations whether at local, at regional or at national level is the exchange of what must be the most valuable kind of currency within the UK ideas. And I think that the three are in fact connected.

Lord Burns: Okay. Could I just have Phil and then I'm going to have a bit of a break.

Phil Morrow: Yes, I was actually just going to observe in terms of reflection on the network. I think it's very important that we don't see reflection of nations and the regions on the network in terms of simple photographs of those places and those

accents. There are perspectives that exist on many national and international issues that exist in the regions which are different. And you know, when I was a producer in London I didn't think about what we could make about jellied eels and I don't feel in Northern Ireland I should be making programmes about the Giant's Causeway or whatever. You know it is different but there is a problem and I think the scale of the problem that Pat has got to face – and I'm absolutely delighted to hear of the commitment and the financial commitment because that can translate into something real and that is terrific – but there are realities of commissioning where I think many production companies in the regions feel they have to if you like London-ise or metropolitan-ise the ideas and that there is an editorial spinning of the kind of ideas that we can actually get made, which don't reflect some of the best ideas that we sit and discuss around our production offices and talk to people in other regions about we think that would be great. London don't get it. They don't want to buy it and they don't want to make it and I think that's a problem. Commissioning editors inevitably I mean are a nervous bunch of people, you know. I mean it's often said they commission their friends but in my experience they commission their boss's friends and potential future employers, you know. And generally speaking....no but seriously....they are looking, obviously, they are looking towards their own careers. It's much easier to commission Endemol, which is a safe bet. The big question when you commission something is who gets fired if this goes tits up as they say and, you know, if it's a big reliable London supplier it's generally their fault. If you've picked a small independent from the nations and regions, it's generally your fault. Now these are huge, huge cultural issues. And also I think it's fair to say, even within the BBC itself you know, people who work in BBC nations and regions areas – and I'm sure Pat's not guilty of this – but there's a sense that we get from London that if you're not in London, you can't cut it, and that's you're working in nations and regions. Even though these same people have been through the same recruitment procedures, the same processes as everybody else, you know, and there's a, I couldn't underestimate the size of culture change required to move on from this.

Alan Budd: Can I just say this London centred. This is not just true of broadcasting. It's not as if you're...

Phil Morrow: No, of course.

Alan Budd: England is enormously London-centred and becomes more and more. It's where all the big accounting firms are. It's where all the big law firms are. So you're battling against something that's very, very widespread, yes.

Susan Bassnett: But I was just very struck when Pat was talking. I was suddenly reminded of that wonderful distinction that the Irish writer Patrick Cavanaugh makes between the provincial and the parochial, where he says, you know, "Provincially someone is always looking over their shoulder because they know it's really happening somewhere else, so they're in a state of permanent anxiety. But the parochial knows that nothing of any importance is happening outside the parish" and for that reason the parochial becomes universal because they can then connect to parishes everywhere where people are focused entirely internally and feel rooted.

Stuart Cosgrove: I think it's very much in a league within the independent production community that there is nowhere as parochial as a metropolis. The points of reference are localised and actually difficult to change.

Lord Burns: Okay. A 5-minute break and we'll come back and I'd like to start by asking the audience....

(BREAK)

Lord Burns: Welcome back. We're on the final stretch. Where's my agenda? In the last section we had the general heading of building values, the benefits of representing nations, regions and communities and talking about the value to the individual, the value to the citizen and the economic value of this activity. But either as an introduction or as a reflection on any of the discussion that's gone so far, I thought I'd just give the opportunity for those people who have been sitting patiently, watching me trying to get the whole range of issues discussed on this agenda, it gives you the opportunity for a word, a question or a statement but not attack.

Lisa Kerr, Commercial Radio Companies Association: Can I just expand on something that Donald said earlier, which is that I think it's easy to forget that in an age where, for all sorts of reasons, ITV particularly in England is having to move away from some of its regional programming. Radio is not doing the same. In commercial radio localness is becoming increasingly important and is increasingly being delivered. We have just carried out an audit of that at CRCA and we've shown really significant increases in local content over the last few years right across the UK. I know Pat's very aware of that but I just wanted for everybody else, let's not confuse television and radio. They're moving in different directions.

Lord Burns: Yes. Although there is also, as I understand it, some ambitions for some of the commercial radio stations to also become national.

Lisa Kerr: Individual companies have a number of different ambitions, of course they do, but we've now got more than 270 local commercial radio stations and they range from Peterhead, where you get your local fish catching report every morning as well as the news for Peterhead, to the big metropolitan stations.

Lord Burns: Thanks very much. Yes.

Ian Squires, ITV: I don't want to pre-empt the BBC's response to the public service broadcasting review, but just looking at Chapter 6 of the Paper that's submitted there's a very extensive list of proposals there about how the BBC might take its local and regional provision forward. But what isn't there is any sense of whether or not there is an appetite in the BBC to take up very directly some of the sort of regional programming that we've seen on ITV which may in future, as the Ofcom Paper suggested, might in future transfer to the BBC. And I wonder, as I say without pre-empting the BBC submission, whether we could get a sense of that was something that was on the BBC's agenda?

Lord Burns: What particular kinds of programming?

Ian Squires: Well in the sense that as we know the PSB review is saying that ITV shouldn't or might be in a position to reduce its non-news regional programming from 3 to 1½ hours a week and there's an implicit proposition there that at the same time the BBC might increase its provision to the regions by the same or by the balancing amount without being specific about the types of programme but programme that is for local communities, for local regions.

Man, Margo Productions: I was going to reinforce the same point. I'll declare an interest. I represent Margo Productions based in Norwich and know what Alan Partridge is going through. I was wondering what's going to happen to the regional programmes of that sort? I mean if you do the maths, there's nearly 40 years of ITV production of 156 hours a week across a range of genres. Those are the programmes, the stuff of the archives. They are classic documentaries and regional series on the arts, on religion, current affairs. And I'm just wondering, when ITV does close its regional production departments next year or the year after, which it will, who's going to pick up making those programmes? Where are the programme makers going to be? There will be a massive drain from the regions, the wider English regions, if that is picked up by the BBC. Some independent production, producers like ourselves have built up a network business so we don't rely upon those programmes

but there are a lot of other producers in those wider English regions who do rely upon them and they're just going to wither away and the stories won't be told because there will be nobody to commission those programmes if the BBC doesn't pick that up as an obligation in the next Charter.

Lord Burns: Okay. Keep the microphone going backwards and then we'll come round to this side.

Sylvia Harvey, University of Lincoln: I very much appreciated Parminder Vir's point about communities of interest that are not necessarily geographical and also of course I very much support the BBC's investment in the nations but I also like the point that Stuart Cosgrove made about the English regions being a little bit perhaps under dealt with. And one particular point I'd like to make is that some 10 years ago I think I'm right in saying that the way in which the BBC crunched the numbers and published the stats, you could see what the output was in a number of different English regions. Now one has the impression that the BBC is withdrawing to two great heartland centres – Bristol and Manchester – and you can't actually get the figures for where a production is coming from in the different parts of England. So I suppose I want to ask for a little bit more information about the English regions and the strategy for the diversity of English regions.

Huw Jones, S4C: Can I just make a particular point about broadcasting in Welsh, as you would expect me to probably? It is of course one of the, broadcasting in the indigenous minority languages is one of the things that you can't have any other solution for. You can, if you were to change your regional production quota to 80%, you might change the balance of network, the way it looks across the UK, you might get a better representation of the regions, the nations in English but in the minority languages you won't get that unless there are initiatives which work in a consistent and contemporary way. The establishment of S4C, the Welsh language channel, back 22 years ago was probably the biggest and most dramatic intervention in minority language support possibly in the world, certainly in the UK, and I would argue in Europe as well, and the BBC has always been a central core part of that. We think it's very important for the contribution, the nature of the financial contribution to be reviewed in the context of today's audience expectations, the greater diversity of expectation from audience. The availability of digital television – there is no reference in the current statutory requirement about the need for the BBC to be operated in Welsh language digital television as well and it's somewhat disappointing that in the future vision proposals the only reference to Welsh is that it should, the BBC should help future generations learn Welsh. Now important as that is, the provision of Welsh language service is also about enabling people who speak it currently to be entertained and to enjoy the service in the modern form and we hope that that can be revisited.

Lord Burns: Thank you. Let's work our way across.

Philip Read, City Broadcasting, Manchester: For the last year I've been coming to meetings in London, urging whenever I had the opportunity for the BBC to move one of its channels to Manchester on the grounds that it would have considerable symbolic not to say structural benefits to broadcasting as a whole as well as to the North West. Today I'm hearing it's probably drama. In the past I've heard it's childrens, it may be sport, it may be Five Live. We have these very sort of confusing messages coming out of the BBC as to what exactly. When you read Greg Dyke's book it's quite clear that there has been opposition at the most senior level of the BBC to moving a channel out of London. I do think it's quite critical that that is dealt with, that a channel should move out. It's interesting to follow on from S4C, it's quite possible to run a channel outside of London. You know people have done it and I don't see why the BBC shouldn't. The second point is just a sort of point of information on the local TV. IT set a local TV channel up in Manchester 4 years ago,

which is now run by the Guardian Media Group, and when you say that there's no conflict with the commercial sector, I think you need to be a little bit careful there. There are a few, not very many but there are a few commercial local TV channels in Oxford, in Leicester, in Manchester, in Derry as you know and there is opposition to what the BBC is wanting to do. Only yesterday I read a local newspaper company, Business Development Director writing to the FT saying that they're very concerned about the BBC going beyond its announced intention for local TV in the same way that it did with online. So that's just a sort of point of information.

Mike Hally, Northern Freelance Network: Two quick points please. The question how can the BBC avoid the old charge of being too London-centric? and obviously called an old charge but to us who work in the regions it feels like a new charge, a current charge. The answer is to get out of London. When three-quarters of production is based in London and nearly all the power and the decision making is based in London, then it's going to be London-centric. Related to that, Debbie Liddlement I noticed has called for sweeping changes a couple of weeks ago when these regionalisation, decentralisation proposals come through. I hope those will be specific targets within the Charter Review and some way of enforcing them. And a quick specific example – around '97, '98 when there was a new Controller of Radio 4, he brought in some sweeping budget cuts across the network and programmes like Woman's Hour, You and Yours and the afternoon shift all sacked all their regional producers. Now that's what happens when you've got power and decision making based in London and we want to be able to go and stop that. Those events were what made us form the Northern Freelance Network and we had to lobby for years. We had to get the support from MPs. We needed a new Director General and a new Controller to reverse those sorts of cuts. So at the moment I'm hearing some optimistic things but we've heard them before and it tends to ebb and flow a bit like the tide and depending a bit on the imminence of a Charter Review. So let's hope it really – in the words of Greg Dyke – let's make it happen this time.

Lord Burns: Okay. Thanks very much. Well I think quite, we have to start with you.

Pat Loughrey: Okay. Shall I just take them in turn?

Lord Burns: Yes. Yes. And then I will ask others to comment on them.

Pat Loughrey: I'm grateful for what Lisa said and I'm encouraged. I think that commercial radio's engagement with its target audience across the UK is terribly significant to that industry as ours is with our target audience and I think at the radio seminar it became clear, while we rub up against each other at the edges, there's a very clear segmentation of interest and target audience and form of engagement between us. And, as in television, the BBC seeks no monopoly of local broadcasting in radio and I'm pleased by what you say. I think it's clear that the distinctive offer becomes more distinctive over time in terms of the depth of our news and what we do and the level of speech we provide, so I'm pleased about that. Ian, this is a big issue about whether or not the BBC might absorb somehow ITV's former commitment to opt-out programmes in England and maybe even in the nations. My first reaction is slightly apprehensive, apprehensive for the industry that somehow a public service commitment can be transferred from one broadcaster to another - first regional programmes, then arts programmes, then religion, then maybe news. It seems odd. It doesn't seem sensible to me. What we want is a plurality of provision. We want the industry supported and healthy. Again the BBC seeks no monopoly and I wonder about a form of regulation that would make that kind of close season transfer, why it might be welcome for me, might give me you know more funds, more output, if I could achieve that, and also I'm not absolutely convinced that a wider range of opt-out programmes is future proof across the industry. What we are relatively convinced about is the local television concept, the 4,000 hours of extra output that that will bring, the information, local content on

demand that will be produced, not all within the BBC but by wider groups, independent companies, community media groups, partnerships. That I have more conviction about but obviously there are – Andy’s team and Andy will speak about it – produce opt-out programmes, landmark programmes, capturing moments of significance in English regions. They perform very, very well. It’s the scale of commitment that I’m wary of becoming an exclusive BBC provision. That cannot be healthy I don’t think in the industry. The English regions underdeveloped relates to that. I think if our out-of-London strategy – and to capture several of the questions that were asked – delivers anything in the North of England it is to ensure a better balance of reflection of the different identities, different experiences, different voices of England because England has been under-served, in our correction of the metro-centric BBC under John Birt in the early 90s, to his great credit he had the courage to do that. We began to hear the nations and the nations began to have relative equity. Until now that’s been less true of English regions, although I too may be delighted by the natural history series that allows us to engage across. Who Do You Think You Are, that genealogy series, Last Night of the Proms, bringing the whole country together, Comic Relief, Children in Need, they are examples of network and local engaging, bringing the country, sharing the different voices of the UK together. But out of London – I’m sorry to be coy about it, it isn’t characteristic – but we’ve got to give the DG his place and I think inevitably whatever we do some will think it’s absolutely loony that we’re working against a natural field of gravity of the professional life and creative life of the UK, others will think it’s not nearly enough, that it’s yet you know further shortcoming. I would wouldn’t I? I think it fundamentally changes, will change the geography of the industry in the UK and it is a proper response of the BBC to a trend within commercial broadcasting in the opposite direction, a trend that I don’t support, that I regret but that those who study these things more than I think is inevitable.

Lord Burns: And Welsh?

Pat Loughrey: The Welsh issue? I hear you Huw and you are I are in you know a kind of ongoing dialogue about that. I don’t think that the line you quote reflects and I’ll ask my colleague, Keith Jones, from BBC Wales to speak to this if I may chairman as well but....

Lord Burns: In English.

Pat Loughrey: ...what I’m determined to do is for instance in the local TV offer, which is our most costly, most adventurous Building Public Value, that will be provided we trust in Welsh in equal measure to in English. So the digital dividend for Welsh speakers will be exactly the same as for English speakers in Wales. I don’t think we’re limited. I think we provide the full genre range for S4C and we’re proud to do that and we’re pledged to continue to do that. Thank you.

Keith Jones: I can do a continuous translation if you like. To echo what Pat has just said, this, and also what Hugh referred to in terms of S4C, this relationship between us is unique. It is a partnership that has developed over 22 years and developed from the BBC’s pioneering in the Welsh language on radio initially and then developing the genre in television and then moving onto this new partnership established in ’82 with S4C. Having gone on to the third platform in new media, we’ve now developed the Welsh language portal, which is Cymru. So we’re across the three platforms. And we’ve been invited in this Charter Review process to discuss with S4C the development of this partnership into the digital age. We are already of course simulcasting all of our analogue programmes that are on S4C onto digital and very proud of the fact that we are providing the pillars of that schedule in terms of the news service. And there was a point made earlier about the international aspect of the work that we’re doing. And of course the news service that we provide on S4C gave us that international perspective of news and news is the news gathering

capability of the BBC's news service across the UK and across the world. And secondly, we are in other genre – sport, education and provide the early schools programmes in Welsh and also the daily soap bubble, Pol Y Cum, which is the BBC's longest-running television soap. It's celebrating its 30th anniversary this year. So all of that contributes I think to the base-line for this partnership which we hope to develop in the next weeks and months.

Andy Griffie: Chairman, there was one other point that I don't think has been picked up yet, which was the point about local television and some existing operators, who are there to make a profit rather than community television organisations. And I have been talking to the small number of operators around the country in places like Oxford and Manchester and Londonderry about what they do and their particular issues. Most of them tell me that, because of the length of licences they've had up to now and the distribution issues, which have been an uphill task for them, they have generally found it difficult to get established. And even in the last couple of years we've seen some of them pack up and go home. However, most of them in my experience welcome the fact that the BBC has this stated intention of moving into local TV news. Most of them have found it very, very difficult to sustain the expense of a local news operation. Some of them see all kinds of potential partnership opportunities around training and development and giving a critical mass to what they've been trying to do over the years and are saying to us that actually our intentions have helped escalate some of the issues that they've been trying to escalate over many, many years. There was an interesting point about the letter in the Financial Times and about, I think it came from a newspaper group. There's no doubt at all that in terms of the deregulation of media ownership and the possibilities now across media ownership in the commercial sector that, if we take a 10-year time frame, and after all that's what we are doing, one might see in the context of ITV and what's happening in ITV, one might see increasingly what is happening in Manchester, where you have a newspaper group, a well-funded newspaper group running a local newspaper which is also now running a local television channel and is pitching for a local radio licence – perfectly acceptable and proper. However, the BBC's stance has always been that a plurality of provision, particularly in the area of news, is healthy for democracy. And so I think there are all kinds of ways in which we might work together as we develop this idea and that's why we want to pilot it in particular but there are also opportunities for independence perhaps to play a part, for community organisations to play a part, for the increasing number of people out there who just want to make their own story and video, and to have that aired. So I'm actually hopeful that our intention will be to the health of that whole sector.

Lord Burns: Okay. What I want to do now is give each person on the Panel a sort of last go. As I count along this and as I've listened to the average contributions so far, I am making a prediction about how does one get this finished by. And if by any chance this goes so quickly that we have some more time, I might give people the right of a reply. I mean if you could speak, Stuart, as if this was your final contribution today.

Stuart Cosgrove: Very little chance of that being the case. Well let's start from the old adage that change is inevitable, except of course if you're trying to buy chocolate from a machine. It just never comes back. But change is inevitable and I think we're actually, as we go through this process of review both in terms of the BBC's Charter renewal and importantly I think PSB review that Ofcom is overseeing, that there is going to be I think a significant shake-up of the industry in one form or another and we shouldn't lose sight of the fact that many of the delivery mechanism of content in the future will be online via broadband or via mobile platforms or whatever and that that mix of different technologies will hopefully in the future provide solutions.

I guess Channel 4 would say that we have some reservations – and we've put forward our reservations in our PSB or when we submit our PSB consultation documents in the next couple of weeks. We've got some reservations about the argument that ITV have put forward about the proposed diminution of their regional responsibilities under their licence and there's a number of reasons why that is. Firstly, we feel that ITV has over-exaggerated the pain it's suffering. We feel also it's the case that were regional programmes well-funded within the ITV network and when there's evidence that programmes have been, as Donald said, good programmes that have been well-made, the audiences certainly come to them. And also there's a philosophical argument, which we probably don't agree with Ofcom on, even though I think there is within Channel 4 an immense amount of kind of goodwill towards Ofcom's method of measuring TV value, and that's the monopoly argument. They've said throughout their documentation that they don't believe that the BBC should have a monopoly in public service broadcasting and there should be plurality. And effectively what's happening if you follow the ITV argument, they are forcing the BBC into having a monopoly when regionally transmitted television and I don't think that's actually a healthy thing. And certainly we've gathered from our colleagues here in Norwich from Margo Productions that the fear of what might happen to a region like Norwich is it's deprived of its regional programme making capabilities. So that's something that we would probably be against. And no doubt that the change, the other significant change is that Britain is changing. It's changing ethnically. It's changing socially. It's changing in terms of its cultural diversity. And we, the television systems, are best able to represent them and I'm convinced that, as Britain devolves, then television will devolve with it.

Lord Burns: Okay. Thanks very much. Can I move on to Susan?

Susan Bassnett: Yes. I was just jotting a few notes. I'll be very brief. I think what I've heard has been actually very helpful, very positive. What I'm getting is a sort of equation though of, you know, intention, vision plus strategy plus technological changes which take one in one direction that is seen as very positive. On the other hand the kind of counter to that, which we've heard quite a bit about, is also in a sense what I call the pull of history. London-centrism is not a new phenomenon. It's a very long-standing phenomenon and so I think there's that tension. I think it's also, there's another tension there because I...someone made the point – this might have been actually during the tea-break, I can't remember – we were talking about in a sense north and south and ideas of geography. And one of the most striking things I came across a few years ago was when I first saw some of the Jennings propaganda films from the 1940s and the notion of England and Englishness that comes out of that, where you've got a strong metropolis but you've also got a really powerful industrial heart as it's seen. Well that's completely gone and Janet Finch asked a question right at the beginning that we haven't run with but which I think is implicit also in this about English identity. And I think there's a statement here that 57% of people in England define themselves as English and of course this begs loads of questions. How does everyone else define themselves and what's the problem of Britishness with Englishness? And so I suppose of one of my kind of more theoretical abstract questions is just to reflect on whether regionality is a way of trying to deal with the crisis of English identities since devolution? But what I particularly like, I've heard about and I'm very encourages is the notion not so much of the regional but this idea of the local and promoting the local. And I think if one put together the local and the international, this is a very positive recipe for the future.

Lord Burns: Sue?

Sue Balsom: Thank you. At the risk of alienating friends and colleagues here because I'm actually not in the industry, I'm not in broadcasting as a day job, but it does strike me quite often that it's sometimes inherently quite a conservative industry,

obviously with a small 'c', and what I would take away from today is how important it is for us to actually look at the future and say, you know, what is it, what is the shape of services to audiences and local and national communities that we want to see? And I go back to this point about, you know, the transformation. The cost of entry is falling. There will be new entrants. We need new entrants. Everybody here has articulated the need for plurality of voice and, if we can actually think ahead then to the shape of those sort of services, then I think that would be, you know, very, very positive. The point has been made I think very well about the limitation of the RSL licences to date and I know that Ofcom is addressing that. The community radio options are going to be introduced. Again, a very cheap entry. They are going to introduce different voices and means of communicating with communities, not to mention Internet and broadband broadcasting. So I'd just like to end on a note of caution in a sense. Whilst I think we must welcome the sort of developments that the BBC has been investing in and has been leading on – we've heard a lot of them here today – I think we do actually have to just ask this question then: if this is changing and we are going to have these new entrants then how do we create that breathing space for them to succeed alongside the BBC? And I think that does actually raise some quite important competitions in the long term.

Samir Shah: I was going to make two observations. The first ones are London. I think we all seem to be agreed that things should move out of London. I'd just point out that this may be in conflict with communities we've been talking about – the ethnic minorities. 46% went to minorities who live in London, only 10% of the population. So there are four times as many. So be careful, London moving out may work to the detriment of ethnic minorities. The BBC needs to be careful of that. But the bigger question, I want to address Janet's point about what should the BBC do uniquely? And give the example of when I was involved in the Digital Radio Review, one of the things the Asian Network did, which was clearly distinctive and clearly something the commercial or opposition or competition could not do was to do soap on radio. Now that's because it's simply impossible. Economically you couldn't make it commercial viable. But for us, we thought this was a very important thing the BBC did because it was something it could uniquely do and the licence fee was well spent doing that kind of programming. And then we were talking about, we also all agreed that you know people who work in the regions should make programmes for networks but people working in the regions making programmes for the regions, we've talked about local news, it seems what would also be distinctive is making programmes beyond just news, but drama and other areas. So one would hope that the money that comes out of the centre to the regions will help fund programming made in the regions for their local crews which are quite expensive and would not stand commercially on their own two feet but it would be something that seems to me – Pat used the word – would be distinctive. We were very keen that distinctiveness should be the criteria by which you should judge programming and it seems to me in this area that should be a criteria. What would be distinctive is making programmes in the regions for the regions which the commercial competition couldn't afford to do. And that does seem to be an important useful thing for the BBC to do.

TB: Okay.

Parminder Vir: Just a couple of points. I think the BBC has embraced cultural diversity in a really big way. It now needs to embed it into its organisation so that we don't continue to come back and talk about the hideously white senior management. The BBC needs to tackle diversity from the Board, senior management, and roll out that strategy into the nations and the regions. And in that also begin to identify and develop local and regional talent coming from those diverse communities. I think in shifting the focus out of London and into the region, it's not

simply an idea but with it goes power and influence, money and resources, so that you're really investing in a real way, real investment, i.e. putting deep roots down in the regions from which future talent will grow. I think it's important to develop not just, you know, commitment to on-screen talent but management talent as well. The next generation are managers and commissioning editors must come from those diverse communities from the nations and the regions as well as London, from around the country now and it's time to stop paying lip service and actually allocate those resources. I think the idea of the best ideas argument for me does not work and there's always this argument, you know, we take the best talent, we take the best ideas and lo and behold it always comes from the same two or three people, usually from the same cultural community – white middle-class men. Ideas, having been a film and television producer, I know the amount of money, resources, commitment that it takes to develop those ideas and it's really important that we begin to take risks. I think we've talked about that and the BBC needs to become less risk averse and begin to...for me ideas are linked to financial investment, to resources and to developing creative and management skills. I think it's imperative that the BBC in developing its nations and regions vision begins to work in partnership with those local and regional agencies and get the commitment to issues around diversity, around employment, training, talent development. I refer to organisations like SkillSet, the Regional Development Agencies and of course the existing nations and regions. My final point is that it's important that the BBC begins to widen its talent pool. There is a concern within the black and Asian community that there is only two or three faces that can represent their aspirations and their stories in terms of on-screen talent. That talent must now be widened to bring a new generation of talent onto the screen but also to begin to look at the other communities. Samir mentioned it briefly. I remember that I grew up on the Chinese Detective. What happened to David Yeo and his community? You know and I was at a conference where Bill Gates talked about look to China, look to India. We are living in a global village. The ethnic communities in Britain are global nomads. They are connected onto the online in a way that no other community is and it's really important that we begin to seize the opportunities flowing from those communities and not....and cease to see them simply as problems that we need to solve. Thank you.

Lord Burns: Thank you very much. Donald?

Donald Emslie: Thanks, Terry. I suppose this is really about Building Public Value and the contribution that the BBC can make to the nations and regions and the representation of the nations and regions to everyone in the United Kingdom. We've heard today that the BBC has, you know, has significant power and resources and it should use them wisely and responsibly. This is a, there's a current ambition of the current Director General that this should happen and I think we are all keen to learn that this is a sustainable change in BBC's attitude rather than one that's transient and could go if another Director General should be appointed. And I think in order to get production and network programming levels increase in the regions, I think it's vital that the decentralisation of power and decision making goes with it and goes hand in hand. And I'd finish just by saying few, Janet Street Porter, as you probably read this morning, is on the way to the jungle next week with I'm A Celebrity, Get Me Out Of Here and I think it's about 10 years ago that she was despatched to Manchester to run a BBC department but I'm not sure that that particular train ever arrived and, if it did, it was in a very part-time way and she was soon relocated back in London. And I think it would be a real shame if that happened again and I think this ambition and strategy of the BBC to really devolve power and decision making and production to the nations and regions it must, must be sustainable.

Lord Burns: Thanks very much, Colin.

Colin Philpott: Just two brief points really. One is a new one and one is an old one. I'm not sure we haven't answered the question about where in the BBC's plans for local programming or regional programming for those communities, a wider remit might be included beyond news and current affairs factual, information-based programming. And secondly, just a point about Manchester really - that, as someone who lived and worked for the BBC in Manchester, including working on network programmes, I would of course be delighted if the BBC relocates chunks to Manchester but I suppose there is potentially a danger of Manchester becoming the new London and the policy it seems to me has to be about reflecting every part...

Lord Burns: Except you can't get there by any normal mode of transport.

Colin Philpott: It's really important that areas like my own area in Yorkshire and other areas don't somehow continue to be disadvantaged as against Manchester and I think that's quite a balancing act for the BBC to try and achieve to really reflect you know the Norwiches, the Leedses, the Newcastles, etc. as well as the obvious centres like Manchester.

Phil Morrow: Yes, and I would absolutely agree with that. I think there's also a concern potentially that in the moving of, not moving BBC2 but what we hear of things like CBBC and various other options, that in fact the regional quota will be mopped up in specific genres and it's essential that right across the genres that we're reflected on the networks. I think, just a couple of other points really. I'm glad to hear Pat saying really that you know that a bit of competition in the market-place is very good for regional programming. I think it is. I think it's very hard for ITV. I mean we've all seen Ofcom's kind of projections as to the way things are going to go for ITV and, while they may be you know crying poverty too soon, I think in the long-term it seems likely that's going to slip. We would like to see ITV encouraged at least in the medium term until the BBC are ready to start taking on some of this commitment. We'd like to see ITV incentivised to make proper regional programmes because there's nothing makes regional programmes better for the viewers than a bit of healthy competition between channel controllers in those areas. ITV for too long has been allowed to get away with under-funding their regional programming to the point, I mean it's like as we've all said another service example would be meals on wheels. Now if you serve it late and cold and then you ask the audience do they like it, they're going to say no, and I think this has been the case with a lot of ITV regional programming. I think, as has been proven and as Pat has demonstrated amply, when people get proper quality local programming that meets and serves their needs, there is a huge demand for it and it's very, very important. And finally to say that all of this is very important, just the economic point that, I think it was Tessa Jowell who said that the licence fee is creative venture capital for the nation if you like. By encouraging and building creative centres across the UK, by allowing people to tell their stories, to learn how to tell their stories, there is a benefit for all of us, both internationally, economically. I mean as we move towards an international economy that's increasingly dominated by IPR in one shape or another, I think it's essential that we tap into the whole of the UK's creative potential, not just those that are centred around metropolitan areas.

Lord Burns: Janet, do you have anything else? One of your questions I think remains wholly announced but...

Janet Finch: Yes, I think that's true but I think at this stage I won't add anything.

Alice Rawsthorn: I'd like to reflect on how much gloomier the session would have been this afternoon without all the advances in digital technology. We've all sat here flexing our consciences, talking about what a complex, fast-changing, fragmented, multi-layered society we're becoming and how all our sense of self-identity is reflected in that. Digital technology will enable broadcasting to embrace that. And just as it enables the BBC to marshal its news resources to provide local information

websites, like Janet's favourite site, or to broadcast S4C internationally, it will enable the ambitious devolution to Manchester and other regions that Pat promises us Mark Thompson will announce in early December. And so the regional map of television as we know it, which as I understand it the transmitters were actually positioned where they were because the land was cheap and happened to be readily available at the time, to actually have nothing to do with regional self-identity, the names and regions were made up afterwards, that will be replaced by a much more self-defined sense of identity. One final thought is there seems to be an assumption that we are a very London-centric nation, which we are, and that we will continue to be so. I doubt very much that we will be. I am a typical Londoner. I was born in the Gulag Archipelago, otherwise known as Manchester, grew up in the provinces, planning my escape to London and memorising the tube map in preparation for that glorious day. I have no intention of going back I'm afraid. I suspect that the teenagers for me, who are teenagers now today will feel very differently. London is hideously expensive for the kind of talented young people we've been talking about and digital communications mean that they don't need to be here anymore. Stuart and I were talking at the break about the visual arts scene in Glasgow, which is incredibly vibrant, and the artists who are leading its development would have undoubtedly come to London 5, 10 years ago. They don't need to do that now. So whilst the devolution of the BBC to the regions will undoubtedly accelerate that process, I think culturally it would have to happen anyway.

Lord Burns: Well Alan of course never had to escape from anywhere. I watched the first episode of North and South last weekend and the description about going to Manchester sounded very much like your description.

Alan Budd: My first, the only comment I'd make on all this, it has of course been very helpful. To what extent it tells us what the government ought to be recommending in terms of renewal of the Charter is quite a hard one I think in terms of the questions that we've tried to ask. But I do think it's been interesting to me that particular direction which so much of the discussion has taken. And let me comment on this by an analogy of the industry in which two of us on this Panel happen to be involved, namely higher education, Janet and I. And we receive a great deal of public money to do this activity and I think our position tends to be that we want to have this money in order to do what we're told to do, namely higher education. And we do not wish to be involved in other activities like social engineering or correcting the defects of the school system. When we hear that sort of thing, we hate it. Now a lot of this discussion strangely enough has not been about what the BBC ought to do, which is what you would expect it to be about, but it has been about where you might do it, how you might do it and who might do it. And I find this really rather sad that this is thought to be necessary, that it should be, that the BBC should be producing programmes how, where and with the people that should be other than the best qualified to do that. You had to sit here if you like and be told be people like Samir, will you please, it's ridiculous that you're not recruiting sufficient ethnic minorities. To the extent that that is true, it's very sad that it's been necessary. I don't know whether it is true or not and there's an interesting question to me about whether that is the sort of thing that ought to be in Charter renewal. Is that the sort of thing we want to see in Charter renewal this giving those sorts of instructions to the BBC in exchange for your ability to continue to receive funding from wherever you receive it? So I thought that was a rather sad aspect of the discussion in fact.

Pat Loughrey: It's, I don't think it's sad that the questions are asked. It would be sad if we couldn't answer them and I trust we did. I think the proportion of diverse staff in our senior management and across the base compares with any other sector of British industry and is growing and is growing at a senior level and is unstoppable

and that's what it should be. I think that we are absolutely secure in that. But I do want to come if I may Chairman to Janet's question that remained unanswered: What will the BBC uniquely do, if that's the one that we're thinking of? And I think it begins to catch some of the other issues as well by way of closing. It sounds as though we will uniquely be commissioning programmes outside of London in the industry, that we will be representing the whole UK with Stuart's support, that we will have sustainable production bases - and that word I completely agree with you, it's critical - in the major population centres of the UK and that they will act as hubs, not exclusive, another London in the north, but that their task will be using independent production to reflect life as it's lived in a changing UK across the whole area. In the way that London seems to succeed in representing the core of the south, then Manchester, Glasgow has got to be..and Cardiff and Belfast, to reflect the totality of life in their places. Metro-centricity is not unique to London and part of the brief in here is to pay better attention to the regions and the nations than we've ever managed to do before. That will be unique to us. The depth of our journalism and news gathering across the UK will I fear be unique to us in time. Who else will have the level of journalists that we've got, the level of inquiry and picture gathering and news that we offer? I guess long form continuing series on current affairs, on politics across the UK occasionally yes, will happen elsewhere, but the sustained commitment of political scrutiny, debate across the UK week in, week out will I suspect be exclusively ours. 60, 70, 80 percent speech based radio across the UK will I think be exclusively ours. Online sites that carry much richer picture content than even at present I guess will be mainly ours. And local inclusive television produced by BBC staff, BBC journalists but also by the community and by independent producers I think will be mainly ours. The orchestras in the nations, part of the cultural fabric of the cultural life of the UK since Lord Reith had his vision for what the corporation might do, I can't see any commercial entity picking up that task. I do believe that it's critically essential the Scottish Symphony Orchestra does what it does and its tour of China was somehow symbolic for me of the local, the national and the international remit, not always at the forefront of our thinking, not something that we debated as much as we might today but critical. Our devotion to the languages of the UK - to Welsh, to Gallic, to Gaelic, to Scots, Ulster Scots in Northern Ireland to Punjabi, to Cornish, to Bengali, to Portuguese, to Cantonese - all that we provide on our local radio and online services. I think that will be inclusively unique to us as time goes on. I don't always relish it. I wish that there were more competition in these fields. The nation would be healthier were that the case. I'm really appreciative of Channel 4's work in this area by the way. And the partnership with Channel 4 and increasingly with ITV I think will be a note going forward. And I must say that if one thing emerges for me from today is the harmony of purpose, the kind of shared values that all of us have about the significance of a plurality of voice. That goes way beyond who employs us. It's a value system. And I think in another, the range of our opt-out programming. Those programmes, and I trust Colin in England, we will go beyond where we are and have a broader base of output but I can't say yet until we know, Alan, what government does decide. I would trust that the consensus out of today is that more funding should be found from the licence fee to fulfil the dream we've got but from Jeremy Paxman, to Kate Adie, to Liam Neeson, those people found their first outlet through local broadcasting. We need people with more diverse names and experience than that to be the breakthrough people of the next generation. We will.

TB: Thank you. Andy, do you want to....?

Andy Griffie: One tiny, tiny postscript. I'm sure Pat excluded Birmingham from his list of network centres purely by accident but the headquarters of BBC English Regions is in Birmingham. I'm based in Birmingham. I live in Worcester and it's a very

successful network centre, more successful with network and regional output than it has been for a decade and it's an important part of the mix as well. That's my tiny postscript.

Lord Burns: Thank you all very much. I thought, you know, if I look down the page I drew your attention, Page 60, about the future vision, I think we did manage to get through quite a lot of the issues there. I mean, as you know, I was slightly worried at one stage, worried about some of the issues at the bottom of the page about when programmes were going to be made and issues of talent but I'm sure that it was a very important area to cover but it's important that more should go outside of London and that we should be in the business of hiring the best talent for the BBC. I also thought there were some quite interesting issues about ITV that were raised about whether or not it really should be coming out of this whole area and whether the field should be being left to the...well not coming out of it altogether but that its commitment should be reduced and leaving rather more of a field to the BBC and I think quite a shared view about the importance of competition here. In terms of the services which I kept pressing on about, I mean I take from this that I mean there was a fairly broad-based view as well, which is in addition to doing news and weather, sport and suchlike at local levels and maybe at even more local levels, that there was just as much interest in doing that in a way which built up a capacity so that more programmes could be made in the regions which would actually find their way to the network and that people would have the pleasure of not only looking at themselves but thinking that the rest of the nation was sharing in some of their experiences. Thank you all very much for coming in this afternoon and for your contributions. It's been very interesting.