

Member of the public 1

Question	Your response
<p>Question 1: Do you agree with our provisional conclusions from our review of the BBC's assessment of the public value of the proposals for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. the proposed DAB+ music stations; and II. 5 Sports Extra. <p>Please provide evidence to support your views, specifying which our conclusions you are referring to.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>No, I do not agree.</p> <p>Radio 1 Dance appears to be aiming at a similar market to existing commercial services such as Capital Dance, Heart Dance, Kiss etc. I struggle to see how R1 Dance is of benefit to listeners, as it doesn't appear to widen choice or offer a service not provide by the commercial market. Therefore, I think this proposed station should be rejected.</p> <p>Radio 1 Anthems appears to be another pop music service similar to commercial services such as Capital, Capital Anthems, Hits Radio, Heart. As much I agree with supporting new production talent, there is ample opportunity for the BBC to accommodate this across its other services. Therefore, I think this proposed station should be rejected.</p> <p>Radio 2 Extra appears to offer younger listeners an opportunity to access archive material that they might not have been able to experience before. This is something that doesn't appear to be widely accommodated elsewhere on the BBC, and is something that isn't provided by commercial services. Therefore, I think this proposed station should be approved.</p> <p>Radio 3 Unwind appears to be similar in format to Classic FM Calm. The proposed station seems overly niche, and I feel content could be carried of Radio 3 itself to accommodate this audience. Therefore, I think this proposed station should be rejected.</p>

Question	Your response
	<p>5 Live Sports Extra should remain as is. Talksport/Talksport 2 already offers a significant amount of sports based talk programming, and I feel 5 Live Sports Extra would be more effective continuing its focus as a platform solely for live sports coverage.</p>
<p>Question 2: Do you agree with our assessment of the likely impact of the proposals on fair and effective competition (including as set out in annex 1)? Please provide your answer and any supporting evidence separately for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. R1A, R1D and R3U; II. R2E; and III. 5SE 	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Yes, in general, I agree with Ofcom’s assessment, but I have specific concerns relating to Radio 2 Extra.</p> <p>Radio 2 Extra seems to have been rejected largely based on potential impacts on Boom Radio. Whilst both services are likely to appeal to the same audience, from my basic understanding of Boom Radio and the description of the proposed Radio 2 Extra, I’m struggling to see similarities between the two services, and believe both services can co-exist without overlap. I feel that the particular vocalness of Boom Radio appears to have unduly influenced Ofcom’s assessment.</p>
<p>Question 3: Do you agree with our provisional conclusions on the BBC’s proposed changes to its radio services? Please provide evidence to support your views, indicating which of the BBC’s proposed changes you are referring to.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>No, I do not agree. Reasoning as per Q1 duplicated below.</p> <p>Radio 1 Dance appears to be aiming at a similar market to existing commercial services such as Capital Dance, Heart Dance, Kiss etc. I struggle to see how R1 Dance is of benefit to listeners, as it doesn’t appear to widen choice or offer a service not provide by the commercial market. Therefore, I think this proposed station should be rejected.</p> <p>Radio 1 Anthems appears to be another pop music service similar to commercial services such as Capital, Capital Anthems, Hits Radio, Heart. As much I agree with supporting new</p>

Question	Your response
	<p>production talent, there is ample opportunity for the BBC to accommodate this across its other services. Therefore, I think this proposed station should be rejected.</p> <p>Radio 2 Extra appears to offer younger listeners an opportunity to access archive material that they might not have been able to experience before. This is something that doesn't appear to be widely accommodated elsewhere on the BBC, and is something that isn't provided by commercial services. Therefore, I think this proposed station should be approved.</p> <p>Radio 3 Unwind appears to be similar in format to Classic FM Calm. The proposed station seems overly niche, and I feel content could be carried of Radio 3 itself to accommodate this audience. Therefore, I think this proposed station should be rejected.</p> <p>5 Live Sports Extra should remain as is. Talksport/Talksport 2 already offers a significant amount of sports based talk programming, and I feel 5 Live Sports Extra would be more effective continuing its focus as a platform solely for live sports coverage.</p>
<p>Question 4: Do you agree with our proposal not to set additional operating licence conditions on R1D, R1A and R3U if we approve them?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>If approved, I feel that R1D, R1A and R3U should have additional operating licence conditions to ensure these stations do not excessively duplicate services offered by commercial services.</p>

Additional Commentary/Background:

The BBCs proposals in general raise concerns, largely due to the use of DAB+. I'm aware that the BBC have already conducted tests of this format on the BBC National DAB platform.

The rapid switch to DAB+ that has been implemented largely over the past two years has significantly reduced the number of stations that are available to me on DAB radio. My current and only working DAB radio is just that, normal DAB only and doesn't support the newer DAB+ format. Whilst I recognise that DAB+ sets are relatively inexpensive, my DAB radio is part of a micro-system, which would cost upwards of £60 to replace on a like for like basis. This something which I cannot justify with elevated living costs. I've had a number of portable DAB+ sets, included from brands such as Sony, but have found these to be of poor quality and these have now failed and have since been disposed off.

I'm not against DAB+ in principle, but find the way it has been implemented to be particularly poor. Bauer and Global, the two groups which have acquired a monopoly on the commercial radio market, have been using DAB+ to squeeze in several duplicating format stations, which mostly seem to be variations of pop music. Each station has been given very limited bandwidth (32 kbps being the normal standard, 40 kbps if you're lucky), giving absolutely awful sound quality (in some case worse than AM). For all there's loads of stations, actual choice is surprisingly limited. Core stations such as Classical FM, Absolute Radio, and Kiss haven't been protected from the switch to DAB+, which in the case of Absolute and Kiss is particularly problematic as Bauer have also removed these stations from alternative platforms (FM, Freeview, and satellite amongst others).

I fear that the BBC seems to be copying this trend, rather than providing something different, or preserving access to services on older radios. Unfortunately, small scale DAB hasn't helped matters, with poor coverage and again very low bit rates being used (though 48 kbps is favoured which does seem to work better). Independent broadcasters still appeared to be priced out of the market when attempting to secure carriage on the main DAB multiplexes, with stations such as BFBS, UCB, and Boom Radio being seemingly forced to use even lower bandwidth of 24 kbps.

I hope my additional comments provide a greater understanding of my reasoning for my responses to Ofcom's questions.