

**BBC Trust HD TV Consultation
Analysis of Public Consultation**

**Helen Mather
Dipsticks Research Ltd**

November 2007

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Executive Summary	6
3. Main Report : -	
3.1 Agree to Trusts proposals subject to conditions	20
3.2 Priority for BBC to invest in HD TV	28
3.3 Available on all 3 main TV platforms	34
3.4 Availability through IPTV services in future	40
3.5 Four hour overnight service	45
3.6 Provide four hour service on cable and satellite	51
3.7 Launch four hour service in 2008	56
3.8 Agree with impact on broadband capacity	64
3.9 Types of programmes with HD upgrade	70
3.10 Loss of existing services	75
3.11 Do conditions seem appropriate	81
3.12 Any other issues	84
4. Four Hour Preview Question	88
5. Free form and postal responses	95

1. INTRODUCTION

High definition (HD) television is a significant enhancement to standard definition television – offering improved picture and sound quality. It is already offered as a pay-TV service on satellite (Sky offers a range of HD channels) and cable (Virgin Media offers some HD content on-demand). Both platforms have also been carrying the BBC's trial HD channel. The BBC Executive's application proposed that the HD channel be provided on satellite, cable and digital terrestrial television (DTT or Freeview¹). The channel, and/or content from it, may also be offered in the future on IPTV and over the open internet at bbc.co.uk.

Launch on Freeview will be affected by wider decisions about the future of broadcast spectrum and standards to be adopted in relation to HD. The BBC Executive's proposal assumed that additional spectrum capacity would need to be allocated to the platform in order to facilitate the provision of HD as a full nine-hour service. During the course of this PVT (and not specifically for it), Ofcom released analysis which suggests that a range of HD services, including the BBC's, could fit onto the DTT platform if the allocation of capacity on the multiplexes was reorganised and new technical standards implemented. This could help ensure that consumers have a choice of public service HD channels. The BBC Trust expects Ofcom to put a formal proposal to public consultation.

Despite these uncertainties in relation to spectrum, given the public value in the proposal identified in the PVA, the BBC Trust considers it appropriate to reach provisional conclusions now on whether or not to approve the proposal.

The BBC Trust has not sought to form a firm view in this PVT on the use of spectrum capacity. They have formed a view that the BBC is likely to be able to accommodate the proposed nine hour HD service within its own

capacity. They have focused on the public value of the BBC creating a high definition channel – which could be provided as proposed by the BBC Executive, in the first instance, on cable and satellite and then later on DTT.

The BBC Executive's application assumes there will be no costs for additional spectrum capacity, should this be required. The PVT has accordingly proceeded on the assumption that a BBC HD channel could be provided on Freeview in the medium term (i.e. by 2012) without the need for the BBC to purchase additional capacity. This could happen through DTT reorganisation along the lines mooted by Ofcom, through the BBC accommodating the channel within its own capacity, or through the public service broadcasters (PSBs) being gifted spectrum capacity at least temporarily.

The normal time horizon for assessment that is applied in the PVT is five years. The BBC Trust has applied that timescale in this instance but we have also found it necessary to look beyond five years, to consider developments up to around 2017.

Following the application of its Public Value Test, the BBC Trust published its provisional conclusions on the BBC's HD TV proposals and opened a period of public consultation for 28 days from the 25th September until 5pm on the 23rd October 2007.

The BBC Trust has proposed a number of conditions to the BBC management's HD TV proposals and seeks thoughts on these.

The aim of the consultation is to gain feedback from the public on these provisional conclusions.

The BBC Trust set out a number of questions to help respondents frame their answers. Respondents were able to reply either: -

- At the BBC Trust's website, replying to 12 set questions
- Reply to one question only relating to the four hour preview (Q7)
- By e-mail – free form responses
- By post

This report contains a summary in Section 3 of the findings from the 572 responses to the BBC Trust's website. The responses are from licence fee payers/ individuals.

Section 4 includes a summary of the 319 responses solely to Q7 – the question specifically relating to the four hour preview. Again these are from individuals/licence fee payers. A total of 34 respondents had replied to both the full consultation and Q7 only.

Additional free form e-mail (19) and postal responses (1) have been covered in Section 5.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A total of 911 responses to the consultation were received. However 34 respondents had replied to both the full consultation and Q7 only.

	Frequency	Percentage
Responses to the BBC Trust's website	572	62.79
Response to Q7 only	319	35.02
Free form e-mail	19	2.09
Postal	1	0.10
	911	100.00

2.1 *Q1. Do you agree with the BBC Trust's decision to approve the new BBC high definition television channel, subject to conditions outlined in the Trust's report of its provisional conclusions?*

Total number of responses: 572

Q1	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	492	86.01%
Yes - BBC needs to be at forefront of new technology	23	4.02%
Yes - Should be available to all	11	1.92%
Yes - TOTAL	526	91.96%
No	35	6.12%
Other	7	1.22%
Indifferent	2	0.35%
Don't know	2	0.35%
Total	572	100.00%

The majority of respondents (92%) agree with the BBC Trust's proposal to approve the new BBC HD TV channel, subject to the modifications outlined in the Trust's report of its provisional conclusions.

Any reservations related to the amount of HD content and issues relating to availability on Freeview.

While only a small proportion of respondents disagree with the Trust's proposals (6.12%), some comments relate to disagreement in principle and others relate to more specific issues within the proposals, such as channel content or the potential need to buy two set top boxes.

2.2 Q2. The Trust considers that HD will become a significant broadcasting standard. Do you agree that it is a priority for the BBC to be investing in this area, rather than other possible areas for licence fee investment?

Total number of responses: 572

Q2	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	423	73.95%
Yes - BBC needs to be at forefront of new technology	62	10.84%
Yes - Many have HD ready TVs	23	4.02%
Yes - TOTAL	508	88.81%
No	42	7.34%
Other	22	3.85%
Total	572	100.00%

Overall 88.8% of all respondents agree that HD TV services should be a priority for the BBC. There seems to be a general feeling that the BBC should be leading the way and developing technology in this area. Also increasing numbers of people are buying HD TVs and the BBC should make HD programming available to all licence fee payers.

Only 7.3% of respondents disagreed that it was a priority for the BBC to invest in HD. Of these, many believed the BBC should instead concentrate on programme content.

2.3 Q3. How important is it that a BBC HD channel is available on all of the main television platforms – Freeview, digital satellite and cable?

Total number of responses: 568

Q3	Frequency	Percentage
Important	356	62.24%
Important - Freeview	111	19.41%
Important - Satellite and Cable	39	6.82%
Important -TOTAL	506	88.47%
Not important	42	7.33%
Other	20	3.50%
No answer	4	0.70%
Total	572	100.00%

Nearly two thirds of respondents agree that it is important that the HD channel is available on all platforms.

In addition, 19.2% of respondents feel that the BBC HD channel should be available to all on Freeview, as not everyone has access to Freesat or cable, whether for economic or geographic reasons.

Some respondents (6.8%) feel that due to technical restrictions, the HD channel should be provided on digital satellite/cable rather than Freeview.

2.4 Q4. At present, it is not possible to provide the BBC HD channel through IPTV services, such as Tiscali or BT Vision, because of capacity constraints. Is it important to you that the channel is provided through such operators in the future?

Total number of responses: 569

Q4	Frequency	Percentage
Important - TOTAL	179	31.29%
Not important	310	54.20%
Not important now...but in future, yes	46	8.04%
Not important - TOTAL	356	62.24%
Other	27	4.72%
Indifferent	3	0.52%
Don't know	4	0.70%
No answer	3	0.52%
Total	572	100.00%

Overall, 31.3% of respondents feel that it is important that the HD channel is provided through IPTV services. This is mainly so that everyone has access where possible to the HD channel and the channel is provided across all available platforms.

62.2% of respondents do not think it is important. However of these, some respondents think that while it is not a priority at the moment it should be something to work towards in the future (8.04%).

Also some feel that it is not necessarily the responsibility of the BBC to tackle technological/capacity restraints but the responsibility of the service providers. They believe that Freeview, followed by Freesat and cable, should be the priority rather than providing HD TV through IPTV services.

2.5 *Q5. Until the full, nine hour service can be offered on Freeview, do you think it would be valuable to offer a four hour, overnight service on Freeview – broadcasting between 02.00 and 06.00, programmes from the following day's nine hour schedule?*

Total number of responses: 569

Q5	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	249	43.53%
Yes - People have capability to record	34	5.94%
Yes - Second box/cost an issue though	3	0.52%
Yes - TOTAL	286	50.00%
No	161	28.15%
No - Low viewing figures / need to record	61	10.66%
No - Second box/cost an issue	22	3.85%
No - TOTAL	244	42.66%
Possibly	24	4.20%
Indifferent	3	0.52%
Other	8	1.40%
Don't know	4	0.70%
No answer	3	0.52%
Total	572	100.00%

Respondents are divided on this question, with 50% agreeing that the four hour overnight service on Freeview would be of use until the full nine hour service can be offered on Freeview. Respondents who are aware of the facility to record this type of output appear more likely to agree that the four hour service would be of use.

42.7% of respondents disagreed, many because they did not feel that anybody would want to watch at that time of night and were either not aware of the options to record output at that time on HD or were not prepared to invest in the equipment required to do so. The issue of the potential need to buy two boxes was raised here.

2.6 Q6. Given that viewers with cable and satellite would have access to the full nine hour service from the outset, the Trust concluded that it would not be a good use of licence fee money to provide the interim, four hour, overnight service on cable and satellite. Do you agree?

Total number of responses: 572

Q6	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	418	73.08%
Disagree	125	21.85%
Indifferent	19	3.32%
Don't know	10	1.75%
Total	572	100.00%

73.1% of respondents agree with the statement that it would not be a good use of resources to provide the interim four hour service on cable and satellite when the nine hour service is already available.

Some respondents however could see value in having the four hour preview to give as much exposure to HD as possible on cable and satellite.

There did appear to be some confusion in answering this question, with some people appearing to refer to the four hour service being available on Freeview rather than on cable and satellite. Therefore it may be that some of those who *disagreed* with this question (21.9%) were actually referring to Freeview – and not cable and satellite.

2.7 *Q7. A number of technological developments relating to the provision of HD on Freeview are expected in the next two to three years. If the four hour, overnight service on Freeview were offered from next year, the set top boxes viewers would need to buy to receive this service may not be able to receive potential future HD services on Freeview. Would you prefer the BBC to launch the four hour interim service next year anyway, even if it meant having to buy two set top boxes within a very short period of time?*

Q7 and four hour preview only question combined

Total number of responses: 853

Q7 and four hour preview combined	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	342	39.91%
Yes - But inform public of future upgrades needed	30	3.50%
Yes – Cost-dependent	22	2.57%
Yes - People will upgrade then anyway	18	2.10%
Yes - Launch ASAP	9	1.05%
Yes - Provides a taster	5	0.58%
Yes - TOTAL	426	49.71%
No	218	25.44%
No - Better to wait	57	6.65%
No - Waste of money / time	18	2.10%
No - Technology needs to be better	11	1.28%
No - Would confuse people	8	0.93%
No - Other	31	3.62%
No - TOTAL	343	40.02%
Cost-dependent	22	2.57%
Technology needs to be better	5	0.58%
Indifferent	10	1.17%
Don't know	15	1.75%
Other	32	3.73%
No answer	4	0.47%
Total	857	100.00%

When the results for Question 7 and the “four hour preview only” question are combined, nearly 50% of respondents are in favour of the launch of the four hour overnight service in 2008, while 40% are not.

Full consultation Q7 only

Total number of responses: 568

Q7	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	167	29.20%
Yes - But inform public of future upgrades needed	19	3.32%
Yes – Cost-dependent	11	1.92%
Yes - People will upgrade then anyway	18	3.15%
Yes - Launch ASAP	9	1.57%
Yes - TOTAL	224	39.16%
No	166	29.02%
No - Better to wait	57	9.97%
No - Waste of money / time	18	3.15%
No - Would confuse people	8	1.40%
No - Other	31	5.42%
No - TOTAL	280	48.95%
Cost-dependent	20	3.50%
Indifferent	10	1.75%
Don't know	15	2.62%
Other	19	3.32%
No answer	4	0.70%
Total	572	100.00%

The results of the main consultation give an opposite result with 39% of respondents agreeing that the BBC should go a head with the four hour interim service in 2008, while nearly 50% disagree.

Those who are in favour of the four hour interim service going ahead in 2008 tend to feel that as long as people are informed about the likely need to upgrade in the future this should not be a problem. Many respondents refer to the fact that technology is constantly being up-dated and there is always going to be a “need” to upgrade if consumers wish to.

The majority of negative responses relate to the fact that it has been necessary to upgrade equipment for the digital switchover and people will not want to have to potentially upgrade again twice more in the next few years.

Four hour preview only question

Total number of responses: 319

N. B. 34 respondents had replied to both the full consultation (Q7) and the four hour preview only, therefore their responses to the four hour preview only have been excluded to avoid duplication

our hour preview	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	175	61.40%
Yes - But inform public of upgrades needed	11	3.86%
Yes – Cost-dependent	11	3.86%
Yes - Provides a taster	5	1.75%
Yes - TOTAL	202	70.87%
No	52	18.25%
No - Technology needs to be better	11	3.86%
No - TOTAL	63	22.11%
Cost-dependent	2	0.70%
Technology needs to be better	5	1.75%
Other	13	4.57%
Total	285	100.00%

Of the respondents who replied only to Question 7, 70.9% were in agreement with the proposal.

In line with those who responded to the full set of questions, respondents felt that consumers should be made fully aware of the need to buy two boxes and that the costs should not be prohibitive. Also the BBC needs to be keeping up-to-date with technology and that it was vital that people had the opportunity to view the HD channel without having to subscribe to a cable or satellite channel.

Those who disagreed (22.1%) did so because they thought it would be preferable to wait for the full nine hour service as technology improves or because they did not want to see the loss of the overnight Freeview channels. They also believed the need for two boxes would be confusing coming quickly after the digital switchover.

2.8 Q8. The Trust concluded that the impact on broadband capacity of the BBC providing HD content over the internet would be small, given that demand for broadband capacity is being fuelled by a number of factors – such as gaming, user-generated media and on-demand content from traditional media around the world. Do you agree?

Total number of responses: 572

Q8	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	386	67.48%
Disagree	127	22.20%
Not BBC's responsibility	12	2.10%
Indifferent	12	2.10%
Don't know	35	6.12%
Total	572	100.00%

67.5% of respondents agreed that the impact on broadband capacity, of the BBC providing HD content over the internet, would be small. While these respondents agree that the impact on broadband capacity will be small, they also feel that it is not the BBC's responsibility to increase capacity. They feel that gradually capacity will increase over time anyway due to other demands - as well as demands from the BBC. Some feel that the UK lags behind other countries in terms of broadband capacity.

22.2% of respondents do not feel that there is sufficient broadband capacity.

Some respondents said they did not feel qualified to answer the question.

2.9 Q9. Do you agree with the Trust's decision that the channel should not automatically simulcast BBC One primetime content, but should broadcast programmes that most benefit from the HD upgrade?

Total number of responses: 568

Q9	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	434	75.87%
Yes - But move to simulcast/full HD channels later	21	3.67%
Yes - TOTAL	455	79.54%
No	91	15.91%
Indifferent	2	0.35%
Don't know	5	0.87%
Other	15	2.63%
No answer	4	0.70%
Total	572	100.00%

79.5% of respondents agree with the Trust's decision that the channel should not automatically simulcast BBC One Primetime content, but should broadcast programmes that most benefit from the HD upgrade.

Some respondents are quite specific about the types of programmes that should be included. Also respondents mention that although in the early stages only the best HD programmes should be shown, over time all programming should be shown in HD.

Those who disagree (15.9%) tend to feel that all BBC One programming should be simulcast on the HD channel right from the start.

2.10 Q10. An interim four hour overnight service on Freeview would necessitate the withdrawal from Freeview of four BBC services between 02.00 and 06.00am. These are BBC Four, BBC Parliament, two BBCi video streams and the BBCi news loops. Do you agree with the Trust's conclusion that the loss of these services from Freeview would be outweighed by the benefit of offering the four hour overnight HD service?

Total number of responses: 562

Q10	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	393	68.71%
Yes - But don't want to lose channels	12	2.10%
Yes - TOTAL	405	70.81%
No	117	20.45%
Indifferent	15	2.62%
Don't know	10	1.75%
Other	15	2.62%
No answer	10	1.75%
Total	572	100.00%

Overall 70.8% of respondents agreed with the Trust's conclusion that the loss of the nominated services from Freeview would be outweighed by the benefit of offering the four hour overnight HD service. These respondents tended to feel that, without having access to audience figures, or potential audience projections for the four hour HD service, the existing overnight services were not widely used and could be accessed at other times or through other platforms. Therefore the available time slot could be beneficially used for the four hour preview of the HD channel.

Some respondents partially agreed but did not want to see one or more of the channels lost – in particular BBC Four.

20.5% of respondents disagreed with the proposal, either because they felt it was a waste of resources, the existing channels should not be lost or it would be better to wait for the full nine hour channel.

2.11 Q11. Do the conditions proposed in the draft BBC service licence for the HD channel seem appropriate?

Total number of responses: 521

Q11	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	396	69.23%
No	50	8.74%
Indifferent	2	0.35%
Don't know	60	10.49%
Other	13	2.27%
No Answer	51	8.92%
Total	572	100.00%

69.2% of respondents agreed that the conditions proposed in the draft BBC service licence for the HD channel seem appropriate. Only a limited number of respondents made comments in relation to this question on different issues.

19.2% of respondents either said "No" or "Don't Know" and a further 8.9% did not give a response.

2.12 Q12. Are there any other issues you would like the BBC Trust to consider in relation to the proposal?

Total number of responses: 572

Q12	Frequency	Percentage
Increase HD broadcast	57	9.97%
Launch HD ASAP	46	8.04%
Quality is essential	36	6.29%
Availability for majority	24	4.20%
Educate and inform public	18	3.15%
Cost to viewer	12	2.10%
Other	113	19.75%
No	266	46.50%
Total	572	100.00%

At this final opportunity for respondents to address any further issues, a wide variety of responses were given by just over 50% of the sample.

3. MAIN REPORT

3.1 Question 1

Do you agree with the BBC Trust's decision to approve the new BBC high definition television channel, subject to conditions outlined in the Trust's report of its provisional conclusions?

3.1.1 TABULATION

Q1	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	492	86.01%
Yes - BBC needs to be at forefront of new technology	23	4.02%
Yes - Should be available to all	11	1.92%
Yes - TOTAL	526	91.96%
No	35	6.12%
Other	7	1.22%
Indifferent	2	0.35%
Don't know	2	0.35%
Total	572	100.00%

The majority of responses were positive with 92% of respondents overall agreeing with the Trust's provisional conclusions.

3.1.2 POSITIVE COMMENTS

On the positive side it is seen vital that the BBC keeps up to date with current technology trends. The BBC should be seen to be at the forefront of technological developments and should not be falling behind competitors.

Also many respondents are very positive about the benefits of HD TV. As HD TVs are becoming more widely available respondents feel that the BBC should make as much programming available as soon as possible on an HD TV channel.

BBC should lead the way in HD TV

Totally agree the BBC should be at the forefront of digital and HD broadcasting and support these conclusions – ID 337

A BBC HD Channel is critical to the future of the BBC as a credible broadcaster and would surely act as a selling point abroad. It is imperative that the BBC retains its reputation as the world's supplier of quality programming content. – ID 793

Yes, I agree. The BBC needs to lead the way in new technology and introducing this new channel will encourage development of HD TV across all platforms. In addition, consumers and licence fee payers will only benefit from this. – ID 789

Yes, I feel the BBC should be leading the way in public service broadcasting and this involves moving towards HD content – ID 399

Yes, absolutely. With Sky, ITV and Channel 4 all launching (or planning to launch) HD services, it is essential that the UK's most important public broadcaster does not get left behind. – ID 470

Absolutely: I already watch BBC HD on satellite and it has reinvigorated my view of public broadcasting. In my view, and bandwidth issues aside, the BBC is even not embracing this new digital standard quickly enough. Full time HD content is long overdue. Programming is excellent in its variety and content, there is simply not enough of it yet. – ID 379

Quality of HD TV

I agree completely. The trial has been a great success in my opinion having enjoyed the service since last May. The difference in picture quality is breathtaking. – ID 440

Yes. I already have access to a BBC HD Channel through Virgin Media and am impressed with it. It is important that the HD channel reflects the breadth of BBC output - which it does at present. I wouldn't want it to be all sport for example. – ID 463

Yes, I believe the BBC Trust is correct to approve the new BBC High Definition Television Channel. It is important with other channels launching HD channels that the BBC provides a quality HD channel of its own. – ID 546

Absolutely, more and more consumers are getting HD televisions and it makes sense to start delivering content that can utilise these TVs – ID 567

Yes. The BBC should be looking to provide all their programmes in HD at the earliest possibility. – ID 596

Availability to all TV viewers

Yes. HD channels should be available to all TV viewers, and not just those with TV subscriptions. – ID 344

Yes, absolutely, with all the HD-ready TV's being sold in this country, consumers should be have a HD service available without subscription. – ID 504

Yes, though this service should be made available to all licence fee payers. – ID 393

Yes. As much content as possible should broadcast initially on satellite/cable with Freeview following when it's technically feasible. – ID 565

Yes, the BBC needs to be at the forefront of High Definition broadcasting, to delay any longer will put create second class non-subscription viewers, when compared to subscription viewers. – ID 394

Availability of HD on Freeview or Freesat

Yes, but the BBC need to launch their own Freesat service as promised earlier as soon as possible. I live in Sheffield, the 4th largest city in the country, but can't receive Freeview. We're not due to be changed over until 2012 but everyone I know, myself included, is absolutely dying to get Freeview and dying to get a HD service. The BBC need to address the unavailability of Freeview by launching their own Freesat service as soon as possible with boxes capable of receiving HD content from the outset. – ID 400

Yes, I agree with BBC broadcasting in HD. I believe there should not be any conditions on this and BBC should be free to broadcast any or all of its channels in HD. – ID 419

Yes, HD channels are a must, but they should not be released until they are ready and then on a standard Freesat platform. Users should be given one clear choice Freeview or Freesat, with Freeview channels and HD channels. Using Freeview for HD is ludicrous at a time when we are all supposed to be going green to have boxes switched on downloading for four hours in each home each night and then throwing the boxes away and downloading over nine hours is stupid. Analogue should never have been turned off until HD on Freesat was available. People would have paid out once for Freesat and had what they wanted. Digital is useless until full HD was available. People who did not want HD could have made informed choice of free to air digital. People have spent lots of money on aerials and boxes and TV's for Freeview, now to be told they will need another box for HD and then another box - ludicrous. – ID 553

Other

Yes. It is highly regrettable that the high level of bureaucracy of the BBC in general and the BBC Trust in particular, mostly caused by the arguably somewhat excessive level of accountability that the BBC is required to maintain, is causing the BBC to take an excessive amount of time to endorse new technologies such as HD TV, and this excessive accountability it seems is actually resulting is a reduction in the quality of service provided by the BBC, because it is taking so long to adopt and embrace new technologies. – ID 736

3.1.3 POSITIVE BUT WITH RESERVATIONS

Any reservations related to the amount of HD content and issues relating to availability on Freeview.

Yes, with one exception. ALL BBC channels should be available in HD as standard. The BBC has a duty to ensure that the British public has access to the very highest standards of broadcasting - both content and picture. We are falling behind the US which is unacceptable. HD must be made standard ASAP. – ID 646

Yes. However, I think the current proposals are not ambitious enough. I would like to see BBC 1 and BBC 2 available (where possible) 24/7 in the HD format. – ID 487

Yes, however negotiations with cable (Virgin) and satellite (Sky) should result in the BBC HD channel to be available in the lowest priced standard package and Sky Virgin should not extract part of the value provided. Also BBC HD should firmly focus on broadcasting in 1080i unless good reason not to do so. BBC HD should take a firm position that 1080p will become the future standard, pushing people to buy 1080p compatible equipment. Otherwise you will have to make another step while the technology already exists for years, this would be a waste. – ID 369

Yes, I agree that the BBC should introduce a HD channel as this would be fulfilling the remit of Public Service Value; however, I do not agree that this channel should only be available on Sky/Virgin and not Freeview. If the Trust cannot see the justification of launching the channel on Freeview for whatever reason, then the HD channel in my view should not be released on the other (Pay) channels either. The majority of licence fee payers does not have either Sky or Virgin, and therefore would end up contributing to paying for a new channel that they could not access. This is not serving the vast majority of licence fee payers. – ID 471

Broadly, yes. But I have concerns about DTT. – ID 390

I fully approve of the idea of HD channels although I do not believe that they should be broadcast on DTT. – ID 441

Yes, apart from the decision to delay the launch until DVB-T2 is set. This disenfranchises those who ought to utilize Freeview and undermines the move towards digital service and cutover by favouring Satellite and thus favouring those who can pay. – ID 415

Only partially, I would prefer the HD TV channel to start on Freeview and run 9 hours a day to start with. – ID 766

3.1.4 NEGATIVE COMMENTS

While only a small proportion of respondents disagree, some comments relate to disagreement in principle and others relate to more specific issues within the proposals.

Disagreement in principle

No. It is an unnecessary innovation at this time given the BBC's financial constraints. The current trial should be extended until such time as actual demand, rather than assumed demand, is established. – ID 468

No it is another waste of licence payer money as are all soaps and makeover shows. The BBC should support only radio, news and documentaries. – ID 502

No. I do not believe that HD Television adds significantly to the BBC's core public service remit. It does not improve the BBC's ability to educate, inform or entertain. It does not improve the (editorial) quality of programming, the quality of journalism, nor the range and diversity of programming generally. Indeed, all programmes are to be repeats of existing content. The one and only benefit of HD Television is in the quality of the picture content (and the sound to a lesser extent). In my experience as a Broadcast Engineer who has demonstrated HD to both trade professionals and consumers, most people cannot tell the difference between a standard definition and HD picture. It is accepted that there is no benefit to be had at all from normal sized screens less than about 32 inches, and so the only benefit in picture quality comes to those who can afford to buy, and have the space for, very large flat panel displays. Even then, such HD ready displays will upscale SD content into HD with such efficiency that most people cannot tell the difference even on these. The only reason that people are sometimes able to differentiate between SD and HD broadcasts is not because of the picture resolution, but is because the amount of data compression currently used on SD broadcasts is so high that the picture is degraded to a quality that is barely acceptable, and in many cases of demanding

content like fast moving sports or high contrast pictures, unacceptable. Given an adequate bit rate on SD broadcasts, the difference from HD is minimal. If it is thought that picture quality is an important aspect of TV transmissions (which I do believe) then it would be much better to divert the 8 to 12 Mbit/s of data needed for one HD channel into providing 2 to 3 extra Mbit/s to four existing SD channels. By doing that, 100% of digital viewers would benefit from a significantly increased picture quality, overnight, at no expense to themselves, and needing no new equipment of any sort, neither TV nor set top box. Surely better than to provide an improved service to a minority of people who can afford and/or be bothered to replace their equipment. I don't doubt that there is a genuine demand for HD content for the small minority of people who know how to appreciate the marginal difference, but this is a premium service for a small number of people, not a universal public service to be funded from a license fee, and as such should be funded by subscription and consigned to satellite and cable only, where bandwidth is easily available. In addition, after switchover, over 1000 out of the BBC's 1160 TV transmitters will only transmit 3 of the 6 available multiplexes. To transmit any HD on these transmitters would be to deprive these viewers of other SD channels that are available, and so HD reduces choice (though not necessarily of BBC services) to those viewers. It is not clear from the consultation whether HD is to be transmitted from these transmitters. If so, then many SD viewers lose out at the expense of a small number of HD viewers, but if not then the service is not universally available. – ID 580

No it should only be set up if the facility is available to all licence payers. The BBC and government should provide free to all licence fee payers, the appropriate equipment to receive anything which they produce or broadcast. Updating any analogue equipment before being allowed to switch off should also be a requirement on the BBC. – ID 603

No, unless the BBC Board can offer meaningful and quantifiable assurances that the move to this service (as it has not done on the digital roll out of Freeview or DAB) will not increase power consumption, either on transmission or reception. Unless it does this, it is inconsistent with the government/BBC agenda towards sustainability. – ID 664

No, I don't. Considering the BBC's current channel output is subject to cuts, and with the much promoted digital switchover date moving closer this is another instance of the BBC Trust channeling money from normal viewers and funding a technocratic elite. – ID 739

No. Any launch must ensure that there is no adverse impact on sound or picture quality of existing services. If this means the service is delayed until sufficient spectrum is added then so be it. The point of HD is to improve picture quality, not reduce it for everyone else. – ID 765

No, I cannot see the benefit in having greater picture quality if this is at the expense of less channels (due to HD taking up more bandwidth), and less investment in other areas of the BBC. Quality of programming is more important than the quality of the picture. – ID 810

Disagreement with specific issues

Not at the minute no. I would not be willing to purchase an extra set-top box just for a four hour BBC HD television channel. We don't have Sky or Virgin television services and the majority of people simply don't have HD televisions. I think you should focus more on improving your other services. In particular, the new BBC iPlayer has been very useful so far for me and I use it much more than I actually spend watching BBC on Terrestrial/Freeview television. My only problem with the new iPlayer is that you can only download television shows that have been downloaded within the last seven days and browsing through the TV guide on Internet Explorer is slow (and Mozilla Firefox is not supported). – ID 659

No. This is a channel that is already well served and you should simply syndicate re-run content on existing channels. A general facsimile of BBC One in HD with feature programmes like this included is a better use of licence fee money and will ensure more diverse entertainment and drive the proliferation of the technology and make better use of available bandwidth. – ID 641

No - I think the switchover to HD should wait 2-3 years for the technology to become cheaper before the BBC puts more money into the technology. Especially as most people still won't be capable of receiving HDTV for the next 2-3 years – ID 716

No, I do not agree with the Trust's decision to approve the new HD service. Only a couple of years ago you planned and implemented the Freeview service - the quality over this service (Standard Definition Digital Terrestrial) whilst improving does not currently offer an similar robustness to the analogue terrestrial. The BBC should not be considering cramming more TV onto that platform until the current problems have been sorted out. Secondly, my main reason for upgrading to Terrestrial DTV was for the expanded TV offering and the interactive services - you now plan to cut back these. Thirdly - The sheer audacity and contempt you show for your viewers is amazing - why do you now expect everyone who has bought into DTV to suddenly replace their equipment to continue viewing and how confusing is this for people? I know new services require new STB's - but to change even SD channels to MPEG4 (and therefore new STB's for everyone) to cram in a 9 hour service is unacceptable. I wonder whose interests the BBC Trust are really serving. Why was MPEG4 not considered when the BBC drew up the plans for Freeview? - ID 815

No: the BBC should be targeting full BBC1 and BBC2 HD 24 hour broadcasts before DSO, distributed via DTT, cable and satellite. I would happily go out and buy new set top boxes (MPEG 4 capable?) in order to receive this if necessary – ID 418

No. Planning to deliver only a nine hour service will mean that the BBC will fall behind other broadcasters who commit to full HD provision. There will be a significant move towards all non BBC material being produced in HD driven by other broadcasters at home and abroad which will leave the BBC's position both as the national broadcaster of choice in the UK and it's potential revenue streams worldwide, vulnerable. – ID 496

No, so many people have at least HD ready TV's, and most are buying full HD 1080p sets for their living rooms for Blue ray/HD DVD. However the point of buying one box for a 4hr service is a joke! – ID 607

3.1.5 CONCLUSION

The majority of respondents (92%) agree with the BBC Trust's proposal to approve the new BBC HD TV channel, subject to the modifications outlined in the Trust's report of its provisional conclusions. Any reservations related to the amount of HD content and issues relating to availability on Freeview. While only a small proportion of respondents disagree (6.12%), some comments relate to disagreement in principle and others relate to more specific issues within the proposals such as channel content or the potential need to buy two set top boxes.

3.2 Question 2

The Trust considers that HD will become a significant broadcasting standard. Do you agree that it is a priority for the BBC to be investing in this area, rather than other possible areas for licence fee investment?

3.2.1 TABULATION

Q2	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	423	73.95%
Yes - BBC needs to be at forefront of new technology	62	10.84%
Yes - Many have HD ready TVs	23	4.02%
Yes - TOTAL	508	88.81%
No	42	7.34%
Other	22	3.85%
Total	572	100.00%

Overall 88.8% of all respondents agree that HD TV services should be a priority for the BBC.

There seems to be a general feeling that the BBC should be leading the way and developing technology in this area. The BBC needs to keep up with its competitors and provide comparable services. HD TV is seen as the way forward for the future of TV viewing and the BBC should be at the forefront.

3.2.2 POSITIVE COMMENTS

The BBC should be leading the way for technology of the future

It is more than important - it is vital! It should be no one priority. This is as important, if not more, as the switch to UHF and colour TV was back in the late 60's – ID 418

The BBC is committed to HD production already. Not to back this up with a broadcast HD service would seem foolish and hesitant. HD is the future of TV (for decades, at least), and the BBC has a responsibility to its customers to provide such a service. Since it involves broadcast TV, this is a far better use of licence fee money than, say, the non-broadcast aspects of the BBC's involvement in the Internet. – ID 427

Yes, the BBC should always be at the forefront of any new technologies. This country needs to keep in the forefront of new media technology,

and particularly the BBC which is admired the world over, should be leading the move toward such technologies as they emerge. As new technology, especially in the broadcasting areas evolves (and as this seems to be happening at a faster and faster pace as time goes by) the BBC should be leading the way. As a licence fee payer, this is only what I would expect from the BBC to be spending some of the licence fee on.
– ID 471

BBC should be at the forefront of creating new standards in television broadcast and by taking the lead can avoid the spectre of a two tier HD system. By making this available on the Freeview platform, HD could be opened up to all. – ID 506

The BBC should continue to build on its existing HD service and the ground breaking programming it has already delivered. Other broadcasters are adopting this standard rapidly and the BBC should not be left behind. – ID 337

Yes - the BBC should develop high quality programming by investing in High Definition. The BBC as a public broadcaster should be in the forefront of technology and not trailing behind. – ID 338

I think the BBC should create and innovate in all areas of media production that are beneficial to the British public. High Definition is a new emerging broadcast standard that is rapidly becoming the new standard in television broadcasting, so the BBC should be pursuing HD actively with TV Licence money. – ID 394

BBC should pursue HD quality

Yes as quickly as possible. I currently receive BBC HD TV using a Pace HD Satellite box. The quality of the picture is astounding and I think once viewers have experienced it they will have little time for Standard Definition. – ID 598

Evidence from US television is showing that more and more series are being broadcast in HD. Shows such as 24, Lost, Alias, and Heroes (at least I think Heroes is) are available as to watch in HD, and undoubtedly, they are better for it. I do not think that the BBC provides anything nearly as polished or as expensive as that, but with programmes such as Doctor Who, Spooks or Life on Mars which are popular around the world, the BBC would be foolish not to look to exploit the opportunity to provide these shows for the British public, as well as sell them to the US and world markets. I think HD has become a readily available standard. HD televisions are cheaper than ever, the BBC has shown itself to be quick to move into new areas, its website is excellent, HD is just another step. Cut back in areas with unnecessary

managers in the Corporation and invest the money in HD programming. Planet Earth in HD was absolutely breathtaking! - ID 799

BBC should invest money in this area and create revenue

Yes. It seems reasonable and appropriate for the BBC to be spending a relatively small amount of money on a service which makes better use of existing content. – ID 341

Yes, the BBC will lose out in overseas programme sales without producing in HD, and the British public will lose out if we do not have the opportunity to also enjoy the HD broadcasts. The broadcast side, as opposed to the production side, does not seem to have a high cost to licence fee value, and the production side would go ahead anyway. – ID 368

Yes. This investment will also generate high returns from international programme sales of HD programming – ID 373

Yes I do and think the BBC is 3 or 4 years behind in being able to broadcast just one channel in HD. The setting of a £4million budget is too low when it should be triple that if the BBC wants to be at the forefront of content delivery in the UK and globally. – ID 556

Types of programmes to benefit from HD TV

The BBC should invest in HD programming, especially in areas where it will have the most visual impact. A prime example is the Planet Earth series, alongside movies and sports. Other programmes such as soaps or games shows may not receive much benefit by going to HD. – ID 344

I think that the amount of money and effort on behalf of the programme makers that is spent on the BBC's most valued shows (Nature programmes/documentaries, dramas etc.) can only be truly appreciated through an HD picture. The BBC is not servicing the British public if the HD versions of these shows are only being broadcast overseas. – ID 528

HD TV should be available for licence fee payers

I feel it is important for the BBC to not fall behind with new technology, and having been recording content in HD for many years, I believe it is paramount that people who do not subscribe to HD services provided by Sky or Virgin Media aren't missing out on the technology that licence fee payers money was invested into. – ID 346

HD TVs are readily available

Definitely; a majority of TV receiving equipment is HD ready and the current availability of HD programming is low compared with the amount of SD programming. As the BBC is currently filming most of its programming in HD already it is selling the viewer short by not broadcasting in the highest quality format. – ID 354

I think HD should definitely be a priority for the BBC. HD is so much better than the standard broadcast and with nearly all new TVs HD ready, I think that if the BBC doesn't pursue HD, then unless you are able to afford Cable or Satellite then you will be disadvantaged. So yes, it should be a priority. – ID 456

Yes. As TV screens have got much larger in recent years but resolution has stayed the same, the definition is now worse. HD reverse this and as most new TVs sold are flat-screen and HD capable it makes sense for the BBC to broadcast programs that make the most of such equipment. – ID 411

Yes - High Definition TV is already a de facto standard in the United States, and with it now being almost impossible to buy a non-HD Ready TV in the shops, HD TV production and broadcast has to be a priority for the BBC. If the BBC doesn't start HD services now, public service broadcasting is in danger of becoming a poor relation, in a standard definition ghetto, which cannot be allowed to happen. – ID 462

It should be a priority, all new television sets sold today are HD or HD ready and therefore the BBC should be providing suitable content for them without the need to pay for a cable or satellite subscription. – ID 389

Other

Yes - High Definition programmes and a Free-To-Air channel to host them should have a high priority. – ID 357

Yes as Channel 4 and ITV HD services are coming on stream from December this year (2007) – ID 362

3.2.3 AGREE WITH CLARIFICATIONS

Yes, without question. However, this should not be at the sacrifice of expanding the digital terrestrial signal coverage which is still inadequate in many areas. – ID 464

HD should've been the standard with Digital television not after; DTV (current Digital television quality) is far superior than the STV (analogue

television) so to switch to HD for another box seems to be crazy. After the HD has got on well I presume a super duper HD will be brought out after it has become standard? The problem is when Digital switchover finally is finished it is already outdated. – ID 795

3.2.4 NEGATIVE COMMENTS

Only 7.3% of respondents disagreed that it was a priority for the BBC to invest in HD. Many believed the BBC should instead concentrate on programme content.

Programme content should be a priority

No. Content should always be prioritised over format in public service broadcasting. – ID 468

No, not a priority to transmit it: investing in HD in programme production IS essential, I believe, due to the necessity to sell programmes to foreign broadcasters and to future proof content, but transmitting it to a small number of elite viewers at the expense of quality universal content is, I believe, a mistake. – ID 580

No - your content is rubbish, why would anybody with 'real TV' (Sky) want the BBC? – ID 586

Not really. Much more concerned about the quality of BBC programming. Even BBC4 does not seem to be of the highest quality. World Service news is better than Radio 4. – ID 783

No: should concentrate on developing high quality drama, news, radio and entertainment. Content is important, not how it is delivered. If people want to watch it, you should make it available online. – ID 786

The only reason I would disagree would be if it were to the detriment of the level of quality content that the corporation currently provides. Quality should be the emphasis, rather than quantity. The BBC should be investing in new technology. – ID 789

No, the BBC should concentrate on delivering high quality programming rather than following the electronics manufacturers' wishes. – ID 810

The content of the BBC has become ever more diluted and of a lower standard ever since their launch of widely unnecessary Freeview channels. Of higher priority should be the maintenance of the, previously flawless, reputation and impartiality of the BBC's services. – ID 820

Other

No. Not until sufficient spectrum is made available to run an HD service without impacting other channels. – ID 765

No HD television ownership at its current levels makes the expenditure nothing more than an ego boost for the BBC suits to brag about, developed at the expense of more worthy projects – ID 796

I do not agree that HD will become a significant broadcasting standard in this country. In America their NSTC SD is a very poor picture when compared with the UK's PAL SD (remember this is a HD service already). Frankly the picture quality is very good already - we do not reap the benefits like other countries will do from HD. HD - users should be catered to by using actual designed for HD content platforms - SkyHD and the Cable HDIPTV are fine. It should not be a priority for the BBC to invest in this area. Get your Freeview, DAB sound quality, IPTV and iPlayer up to standard first. – ID 815

Most certainly not: HD is still a rather expensive and inaccessible system. I feel the BBC would be better using said taxpayers money to develop strategies to encourage original programme and the development of BBC 3/ BBC 4 both of which (as a viewer) I feel have great potential. I also feel a third BBC digital channel would be beneficial and given the right support could rival Sky One and the other flagship channels, the BBC is a brand most British people trust. – ID 827

No. HDTV is exciting and important. But with such budget constraints I feel that BBC can not afford to be a market leader in this area, better to take it slowly and adopt the technology when it is mature. This goes against the BBC's normal practice, but, again with such limited budget there is little choice. – ID 848

3.2.5 CONCLUSION

Overall 88.8% of all respondents agree that HD TV services should be a priority for the BBC.

There seems to be a general feeling that the BBC should be leading the way and developing technology in this area. Also increasing numbers of people are buying HD TVs and the BBC should make HD programming available to all licence fee payers.

Only 7.3% of respondents disagreed that it was a priority for the BBC to invest in HD. Many believed the BBC should instead concentrate on programme content.

3.3 Question 3

How important is it that a BBC HD channel is available on all of the main television platforms – Freeview, digital satellite and cable?

3.3.1 TABULATION

Q3	Frequency	Percentage
Important	356	62.24%
Important - Freeview	111	19.41%
Important - Satellite and Cable	39	6.82%
Important -TOTAL	506	88.47%
Not important	42	7.33%
Other	20	3.50%
No answer	4	0.70%
Total	572	100.00%

Nearly two thirds of respondents agree that it is important that the HD channel is available on all platforms.

In addition, nearly 20% of respondents feel that the BBC HD channel should be available to all on Freeview as not everyone has access to Freesat or cable, whether for economic or geographic reasons.

Some respondents (6.8%) feel that due to technical restrictions the HD channel should be provided on digital satellite/cable rather than Freeview.

3.3.2 AVAILABLE ON ALL PLATFORMS

Available on all platforms as and when technology permits

Any HD service should be available as widely as possible, technical limitations notwithstanding. In the early days cable and satellite should be exploited and Freeview adopted when the technology is capable. – ID 337

Very important eventually on all platforms, but less so to have them all together. i.e. Freeview before switchover. – ID 352

Initially, the capacity exists to deliver HD on satellite and cable and the BBC should move swiftly to use this capacity on all four BBC channels. While there might be logistical difficulties short term with Freeview, there should be commitment to use this at the earliest, viable, opportunity. – ID 496

Very important: the TV licences have already been paid for, so the HD channels should be rolled out across all platforms for free. Providing the platform/platforms can handle the newer HD broadcasts, if not then wait until it/they can, don't waste money. In fact there should be one universal reception box standard for all HD services including Sky television/Cable company's, people don't need 6 different types of HD boxes this is totally inefficient and a Rip off. – ID 372

This should be done in order of feasibility - satellite; cable; Freeview. – ID 373 Technological problems with DTT should not stop other platforms

The channel should be made available Free-To-Air on all the main platforms, but it is for Ofcom to make the necessary change to DTT for the 9 hour schedule to become viable within the near future. – ID 481

It would be ideal - but lack of capacity on Freeview should not hold back cable and satellite – ID 491

Very important that it is available to all via as many platforms as possible - satellite, cable, Freeview, IPTV and download. However not being able to launch immediately on all platforms shouldn't delay introduction on others. – ID 462

Everyone should have access to BBC HD channel – not just if can afford satellite/cable

It is vital that BBC HD is available on all three broadcast platforms as soon as technology and capacity allow. In particular Freeview and Freesat are vital as a social exclusion measure. – ID 341

Very important: those of us who pay for a BBC licence should be able to receive BBC services without subscribing to third parties such as Sky or Cable. I do subscribe to Sky but at the moment they charge an extra monthly fee to obtain HD. If the BBC is broadcasting in HD then it would be wrong for Sky to capitalise on this and charge for the service. Therefore HD would need to be either free through Sky and Cable or accessible via other means, all without paying an extra subscription. – ID 376

Very important to bring HD to as many people as possible. At present Sky seems to have the monopoly. – ID 401

Everyone should have access to BBC HD Channel – many cannot receive satellite/cable

Very important. HD services are also available on cable and satellite, but not cable TV is generally only available in towns and cities, and planning

regulations mean that some households are not permitted to install a satellite dish. Therefore it is very important that BBC HD is available through a standard TV aerial, too. – ID 411

Whilst there are a proportion of viewers with access to all three formats, the overwhelming majority have only one. In some cases this is not a free choice due to signal quality and/or provision of the service. It is therefore vital that BBC HD is available on all the major broadcast platforms. – ID 450

3.3.3 PRIORITY ON FREEVIEW

I think it is more important the channel is available on at least one, preferably Freeview. – ID 363

Over time it is important that HD becomes the norm - the same as broadcasting in colour is now the norm. Start with Freeview! – ID 351

Extremely important, more so on Freeview than on cable/satellite as it reaches the majority of the population. – ID 353

Very important to be made available to Freeview to ensure those on limited income do not miss out. – ID 415

Freeview is a priority for the public and particularly those whose budgets do not stretch to subscription services – ID 431

Terrestrial is the most important as that is the ONLY one available to everybody. That means HD on FREEVIEW is vital. Following that, HD on a FREE SATELLITE is the next priority as most people could receive that. Cable is a more restricted availability - so less important. – ID 433

It is most important that it is available on Freeview, more so than on the other platforms since it may be the only means of access for a large majority of viewers - who will be funding it through the licence fee. – ID 356

It is essential that it is available on all platforms especially Freeview – ID 367

It is important that the channel appear on all broadcast delivery systems, most importantly Freeview and the Corporation and Trust should recognise that there are people who do not wish to pay for HD but should not have their choice penalised as a result i.e. by being limited to SD because HD is only available on subscription satellite or cable. Free alternatives should be available in terms of delivery format – ID 371

Very important: in fact, it is most important that HD is available on Freeview first as the majority of other platforms only have a limited audience. – ID 378

For me the priority is Freeview, since I have no wish to invest in subscriber-paid services. – ID 388

Very important to deliver BBC HD on all platforms with a minimum of delay. Everyone pays the same licence fee but many are not able/permitted to have a satellite dish so would lose out if Freeview is not properly supported. – ID 396

Very important to be on Freeview as that is the format that has been promoted to the majority. If you launch on Sky then it's a kick in the teeth to all those viewers that have gone with Freeview rather than Sky. – ID 498

Very important. Although I feel that a Freeview service should be far more of a priority than satellite and cable. Not everyone can afford, or wants a satellite dish on the side of their house, and cable coverage is limited. The only way HD can reach 100% of the population is for a Freeview service to be implemented as soon as possible. – ID 529

3.3.4 PRIORITY ON DIGITAL SATELLITE/CABLE

It is important but bandwidth restrictions shouldn't delay deployment on platforms that have enough bandwidth - i.e. satellite – ID 365

It is very important, but the cable and satellite offerings should not be held back waiting for Freeview to catch up. – ID 368

Digital satellite and cable aren't going anywhere due to the subscription options, so it would be essential for the BBC to be on these platforms. If the BBC disregards Freeview for its HD broadcasts, then Freeview will become extinct in my opinion. – ID 370

In the long-term I think this is important, but I don't see that this has to be done immediately. It seems reasonable to start the service on satellite/cable and then add Freeview when this is technically possible. – ID 447

Satellite and cable transmission is essential, and given that these platforms have plenty of bandwidth available, they are the obvious home for HD. Between them they have near universal coverage even before switchover. The service should not be duplicated on DTT if this has a significantly higher cost per household than the other platforms. – ID 448

On Cable and Satellite - then these carry enough bandwidth for the services. Freeview (DTT) adds different technical challenges which will only be available after analogue switch off. Whilst it's important that as many people as possible can get access to HD, the significant milestone of Analogue Switch off needs to be taken first, when this has happened then the BBC should then start looking into the DTT option. – ID 338

Absolutely vital to be Free to Air on digital satellite ASAP to counter the general impression that HD is a Sky only service. All the major terrestrial channels should be available on Freesat, NOT Freesat from Sky; Probably important on cable for those who presently have cable but I would guess that once the channel is available then it is pretty trivial technically, possibly more challenging commercially, to add it to a cable mix. Freeview is the difficult one. Much as I would like to see terrestrial HD I think we must acknowledge that even if the regulator frees up more spectrum there is just not going to be the bandwidth available for a good HD service with several channels. I feel very strongly that the present Freeview service is a total over compressed mess that is offering nowhere near the quality that SD digital can achieve. On occasion (Planet Earth) you can see what can be might have been achieved on SD with decent source material and a reasonable allocation of bandwidth and fewer rubbish channels. I would be afraid that if HD was on Freeview it would ultimately degrade into another over compressed technical mess due to lack of bandwidth. – ID 347

Ultimately, the BBC should seek to serve all of its customers equally. Having said that, the argument in favour of digital radio holds true for HD television. A gradual roll out starting with the cable and satellite providers seems a logical first step. – ID 377

Satellite, cable and the Internet but not Freeview. There is not the capacity on DTT at the moment and there will only ever be enough for a few channels in the future. Freeview has achieved its success because it is cheap and simple and the issue around two box upgrades shows how absurd this would be. (this is also at odds with the amount of time spent pushing integrated TVs but that is another story). What is most important is that HD is delivered to a wide audience, subscription-free as soon as possible and that means launching on satellite. – ID 441

3.3.5 NOT IMPORTANT

Not very. Satellite is easy. Cable will look after itself. Freeview presents exceedingly difficult engineering problems, and I doubt it's worth the expense, especially as it could only be delivered effectively using dedicated DVB-T2, MPEG-4 national SFN multiplexes, post-2012. – ID 390

Not really that important. How does HD sit with compression required for transmission of digital TV once the analogue signal is turned off? – ID 407

Not especially important, however I believe it must be available through a subscription-free method. – ID 469

Not at all important. Frankly, if you can afford to splash out on a TV that will show a massive difference, you can afford to pay for Freesat or cable. For those, like me, the picture I've already got is fine. – ID 488

3.3.6 CONCLUSION

62.2% of respondents agree that it is important that the HD channel is available on all platforms.

Also 19.4% of respondents feel that the BBC HD channel should be available to all on Freeview as not everyone has access to Freesat or cable, whether for economic or geographic reasons.

Due to technical restrictions some respondents feel the HD channel should be provided on digital satellite/cable rather than Freeview.

Only 7.3% of respondents say it is not important for the HD channel to be available on all channels.

3.4 Question 4

At present, it is not possible to provide the BBC HD channel through IPTV services, such as Tiscali or BT Vision, because of capacity constraints. Is it important to you that the channel is provided through such operators in the future?

3.4.1 TABULATION

Q4	Frequency	Percentage
Important - TOTAL	179	31.29%
Not important	310	54.20%
Not important now...but in future, yes	46	8.04%
Not important - TOTAL	356	62.24%
Other	27	4.72%
Indifferent	3	0.52%
Don't know	4	0.70%
No answer	3	0.52%
Total	572	100.00%

Overall, 31.3% of respondents feel that it is important that the HD channel is provided through IPTV services. This is mainly so that everyone has access where possible to the HD channel and the channel is provided across all available platforms.

A further two thirds do not think it is important. However some of these respondents think that while it is not a priority at the moment it should be something to work towards in the future. Also that it is not necessarily the responsibility of the BBC to tackle technological/capacity restraints but the responsibility of the service providers.

Many believe that Freeview, followed by Freesat and cable should be the priority

3.4.2 IMPORTANT

Those who believe it is important feel that the BBC HD channel should be available to everyone who contributes to the licence fee therefore everyone should have access through whatever service.

Yes it is important to develop in this direction. Why is there no room on the internet - no room for even four hours in the middle of the night? This doesn't make sense in the context of this consultation. Yes please develop in this area - it is only a matter of upping the file size. – ID 815

Yes, I am with BT Vision for the potential HD access IPTV in the future and hope to trial this when it becomes available. – ID 776

I would say that it is vitally important the BBS HD channel is available through as many services as possible – ID 733

Very important: it is possible for the BBC to provide a TV service in general and an HD TV service in particular via the Internet, the capacity constraints simply prevent content being streamed. Current broadband internet connections are more than adequate for the provision of standard definition and even HD TV services. The main issue with this method of receiving content is the lack of investment by the BBC, which is mostly manifested in an inadequate amount of bandwidth being provided by the BBC for online services such as the iPlayer and online video from the BBC website. The BBC does not seem to have realised that broadcasting is dead, and that it must cease to be a broadcasting company very quickly and become a content production and delivery company if it is to continue serving the licence payers adequately. The BBC should not provide its online content through proprietary services such as the IPTV services Tiscali and BT Vision. The fact that it initially seems to intent to do so clearly shows that the BBC has not yet comprehended how content will need to be delivered in the future and the massive role that the internet will play in this. Content provided via the internet should be available to anybody, on any platform, at any time. It should not be 'farmed out' to commercial services which simply happen to use the internet as a data transfer medium, such as Tiscali and BT Vision. – ID 736

Yes, not all people will have cable TV and Broadband only 12 million people can access this, whereas 95% of population has a BT phone line. When the BT network is upgraded to ADSL+2 this will make IPTV just as obvious choice to receive TV then any other platform. – ID 705

Yes. I think that this also has a bearing on the question of whether an interim four-hour service should be provided on Freeview. I would much rather access HD content via the internet than purchase additional equipment that will become quickly obsolete. Perhaps internet provision could be the alternative to providing the interim service? – ID 476

Yes, I think that the BBC has a 'all platform, all services' need, but as IPTV services are normally 'pay' services, this would obviously need to be worked out carefully with these providers of such services. I am a very firm believer that the BBC should be 'free to view' on any platform, and this I should imagine, often causes the BBC a dilemma if the said platform 'incurs a charge to the BBC for being on that platform' This should not be tolerated (but here I do realise that the BBC is tied to obligations imposed on it by the government) that it has to remain 'platform neutral' however, I can well remember how incensed many of

us ordinary licence fee payers felt when the BBC ended up having to pay Sky vast amounts of OUR licence fee moneys in order to make themselves available on that platform. So although I do agree that the BBC HD service should be made available to as many platforms as possible, this should not incur a vast expense in order to do so. In fact, the BBC HD broadcasts are so good, and so enjoyed by the majority of viewers, that I believe that the individual platforms should pay the BBC for the HD material (if they do not already do so!) – ID 471

I think the Channel should be available on every platform that is technically equipped to carry it. Freeview and Freesat are important in this regard. Bandwidth is a severe limitation to communication companies using ADSL - but that is there problem and not the BBC's. If they launch these services they need to be clear about the limitations of their offer. – ID 463

Yes I think HD over IPTV should eventually become available - however the priority should remain with Freeview / satellite. – ID 456

3.4.3 NOT IMPORTANT NOW, BUT IN THE FUTURE

It is important, but only as and when the platform is suitable to support it. – ID 803

Medium term no: long term yes. Again, let others be the leaders in this area. – ID 848

I'm not interested in IPTV and don't believe there is a future for it for live television. However, the BBC should have a presence on IPTV in an HD format in the future, for on demand programmes. – ID 789

Initially no, but in the interest of a free market economy and fairness in the market place, you would have to say it's fairly important: gives a choice to the public. – ID 757

Maybe in the future but until broadband speeds increase to the likes of France and Japan then initially no it is not important – ID 752

Ideally, but it is up to ISPs to provide adequate bandwidth for all channels, not the BBC – ID 720

I believe that is a subject for discussion in the future but broadly speaking the BBC should be transmitting the best possible quality pictures to all current available platforms. – ID 477

Not important now, nor for the next 5-10 years. Maybe it will become important one day, but this will need nationwide fibre-optic broadband

internet (currently in the news, 26 September 2007). Realistically, 100Mbps internet would be necessary for reliable HD viewing. – ID 474

3.4.4 NOT IMPORTANT

Two thirds of respondents feel that it is not important and also that it is not the responsibility of the BBC to provide this capacity to do so. Many feel that the priority is for the HD channel to be on Freeview which should provide access to the majority of those who would wish to access it.

Responsibility of IPTV service providers

It is up to the providers of IPTV services to pull their technology up to standard. If they can handle it, the BBC should offer it to them, but providing HD over IPTV isn't the BBC's responsibility. – ID 836

No... I don't consider these systems up to the job of being a primary broadcaster. – ID 798

Not really. I am a heavy internet user and I understand that the infrastructure is not in place and is not likely to be for a long time. – ID 835

Should be available on Freeview

Not if it is available through DTT / or a free to air satellite service – ID 830

As Freeview is where the BBC should focus it's efforts I think that it should not compromise its standards to meet IPTV which has some way to go before it becomes mainstream. It will also allow the infrastructure to catch up. – ID 465

No, these are secondary to Freeview, Freesat and cable – ID 444

Not really. I use Sky+ to record what I want and watch it when I want. I don't care to watch TV on my PC or phone etc. Certainly not worth watching HD TV on a mobile device in my opinion. – ID 826

BT Vision and Tiscali are still very new concepts in terms of broadcasting, and I believe that it is they that must work along side the BBC HD service to formulate equilibrium between the two. However, at present, I do not believe it is necessary to worry about such problems, as BT Vision still do not own the market share of broadcasting, and they won't until they formulate a less constraining service. – ID 811

Not really, BBC should concentrate on providing HD TV on Freeview. – ID 766

No. IPTV services are an expensive unreliable mess, and I have no intention of using them for the foreseeable future. – ID 764

When bandwidth naturally catches up: not worth the money to accelerate bandwidth just for HD. – ID 749

No - because this is contingent about consumer bandwidth as well which the BBC has no control over - the BBC should ensure that it delivers quality broadcasting through the airwaves and provide internet content to support and enhance these programs - most people aren't going to want to watch HDTV on 19 inch computer or laptop monitors anyway. – ID 716

No it is not important that Tiscali or BT Vision have BBC HD. These are premium services with a limited user base and BBC HD would be excluded from those people unable to afford the costs of these services. – ID 475

3.4.5 CONCLUSION

Overall, 31.3% of respondents feel that it is important that the HD channel is provided through IPTV services. This is mainly so that everyone has access where possible to the HD channel and the channel is provided across all available platforms.

62.2% of respondents do not think it is important. However some respondents think that while it is not a priority at the moment it should be something to work towards in the future. Also that it is not necessarily the responsibility of the BBC to tackle technological/capacity restraints but the responsibility of the service providers.

Many believe that Freeview, followed by Freesat and cable should be the priority rather than providing HD TV through IPTV services.

3.5 Question 5

Until the full, nine hour service can be offered on Freeview, do you think it would be valuable to offer a four hour, overnight service on Freeview – broadcasting between 02.00 and 06.00, programmes from the following days nine hour schedule?

3.5.1 TABULATION

Q5	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	249	43.53%
Yes - People have capability to record	34	5.94%
Yes - Second box/cost an issue though	3	0.52%
Yes - TOTAL	286	50.00%
No	161	28.15%
No - Low viewing figures / need to record	61	10.66%
No - Second box/cost an issue	22	3.85%
No - TOTAL	244	42.66%
Possibly	24	4.20%
Indifferent	3	0.52%
Other	8	1.40%
Don't know	4	0.70%
No answer	3	0.52%
Total	572	100.00%

Respondents are divided on this question, with 50% agreeing that the four hour overnight service on Freeview would be of use until the full nine hour service can be offered on Freeview.

3.5.2 AGREE

Respondents who are aware of the facility to record this type of output appear more likely to agree that the four hour service would be of use.

Facility to record

Yes it will be worthwhile. Freeview users will require some kind of PVR to watch this programming but it will offer more reach to those users. – ID 338

This would obviously only be valuable if the set top boxes had full recording abilities. Such boxes will not be cheap, and may, as the BBC Trust stated, have to change once sufficient spectrum becomes available for prime time HDTV. – ID 427

Yes absolutely. People can set videos, DVD or HDD recorders to sample the programmes. Does it matter that Planet Earth or Torchwood is repeated (actually I will care if Torchwood is repeated) because it shows that the BBC is taking HD seriously. In the meantime, introduce HD cameras to Doctor Who, more football matches, the excellent drama series that are shown. State of Play would have been brilliant in HD, and think how many women would have enjoyed watching Mr. Darcy coming out of the water in HD! - ID 799

Yes - I would anticipate using a PC based PVR solution with a DVB-T card installed to record it – ID 343

Yes. There are many people who already have the capability to record or watch DTT HD programmes. STB's are already available, and those with digital TV tuner cards inside computers are able to view HD programmes – ID 344

Yes - however an analysis needs to be made on the availability and spread of recording equipment that can record HD signals. Is HD recording equipment (in the vein of Sky+) available? Most viewers would be unable to record HD overnight to watch next day and would simply be watching an SD recording. Communication and marketing would need to be undertaken in tandem with a night time Freeview broadcast to instruct viewers on how to get the most from the broadcast. – ID 354

Yes. Given the rise in the use of 'TIVO' type recorders people will be able to still watch the programs at a more sociable time. – ID 359

Yes but consumers may be confused how they could record such programming as many haven't got a decoder or recorder that could be used. – ID 375

I don't see any reasonable argument as to why this shouldn't be carried out. If a user wishes to pay for a compatible PVR unit, then the service should be there for them to use. With most people now moving to using PVRs to time shift programmes, this would fit exactly. Just the same as using the iplayer – ID 380

Yes get on with it: what's taking so long??? I can record the programmes overnight. I already have all the capable equipment but am still stuck with standard definition programmes. I almost bought a Freesat dish and box in order to view some HD content but I don't want a dish on my house. More people will start using the service when it starts. But I am fed up of reading discussion and consultation after consultation only for it to be found a good idea. Its only 4 hours! – ID 397

Yes, this service would be extremely useful to me. It allows me to get the best out of my current equipment, and I will be able to record any programmes that are broadcast during these hours on my BT Vision set top box for viewing at a later date. – ID 437

Absolutely: with personal video recorders becoming commonplace, many people already record programmes and watch at their leisure. I think the same is true for overnight HD broadcasts. – ID 472

Need to buy two boxes

Yes, as there is a significant minority out there who are waiting for HD on Freeview. However, the full situation should be made very clear from the start so that people do not end up complaining of having to buy two boxes in a short space of time. – ID 368

Yes. It would be a disaster to delay Freeview HD until end-2009. It simply needs to be made clear that the 'interim' STB has a limited lifetime. –ID 396

Yes I do, but I think it would be sensible to broadcast in DVB-T2 from the beginning. Otherwise viewers would need to purchase two boxes in a fairly short space of time. This does not make sense from a cost or environmental perspective, and could potentially delay the Digital switchover if consumers become reluctant to upgrade existing analogue equipment. – ID 411

Other

Definitely - as a BT Vision user I have an HD-capable (MPEG-4) set top box but currently no HD content to view on it. An overnight service featuring a good selection of HD programming would be very valuable to me. – ID 366

I think that would be an excellent idea it would allow viewers without cable or satellite (the majority of licence fee payers) the opportunity to view the service with acceptable limitations. – ID 356

Yes; people who have a HD TV but no cable/satellite should not have to wait for up to 5 yrs to see BBC HD. – ID 434

3.5.3 DISAGREE

Many respondents who disagreed did so because they did not feel that anybody would want to watch at that time of night and were either not aware of the options to record output at that time on HD or were not prepared to invest in the equipment required to do so.

Facility to record

I think this option is limited to those with Sky HD boxes as you would have to record in HD format to get the benefits offer by HD? I would rather the content was available for 28 days as a download. – ID 711

Seems a pointless option: not many people would view between these hours and few people have HD enabled recording facilities. – ID 337

No, as few people are likely to bother with the hassle of having HD-compatible recording equipment in the early stages. – ID 803

I do not think it appropriate to broadcast it at this time. I for one, and probably most others, do not have the capability to record in HD and will not be available at these hours to watch it. If it were recorded, then it is unlikely to be recorded/playback in HD format so defeats the object. – ID 376

For the hours that BBC HD will be able to broadcast, and taking into account 'temporarily' removing other functions and channels, this would not be a sensible move. Few people will be up to watch it and even fewer will have an HD recorder to be able to record what is shown. I feel the BBC should really wait until they can broadcast at the same hours as Satellite and Cable. – ID 405

No, not to me: as I work the 9-5 routine any programming at these hours would be irrelevant and I would see it as a missed opportunity. It would also be a waste of time to record this programming on a PVR or Hard Disk based recorder, as the various compression methods used in these devices would make the fact that the program was originally transmitted in HD irrelevant. – ID 668

Need two boxes

Not if a hardware upgrade is necessary to receive 9hr service later. Once combined DVB-T/DVB-T2 boxes are available then go for the 4hr service, so long as this means a 2nd purchase is not required.

No - not if Mpeg2 has to be used and as stated in the report - then 2 equipment upgrades would be needed in a short space of time. Also there are a number of times when I watch BBCi overnight - i.e. when the Australian Open Tennis is on. – ID 357

No: does not make sense for such a short viewing time at these times of the day. Viewer numbers would be so low and I would not be prepared to buy two boxes – ID 406

No, the public are already being ripped off by all the different set top boxes they need. Let's get one system and stick to it. – ID 425

No, a total waste of resources to have such a service. – ID 448

Other

No. The full BBC HD service should be launched on Freeview now. – ID 764

No. The four hour service should be providing programmes from the previous day's nine hour schedule, not the following day's. – ID 765

I do not think the overnight service would be used by that many people. So I don't think it would be necessary to broadcast the 4 hour service. – ID 701

I am unsure of this; I don't think people will be willing to buy new equipment just to receive this limited service. – ID 705

No. What's the point? No-one will watch at that time and very few people will be bothered to record other than for novelty value - unless there is a good reason (such as testing the technology for a week prior to going live with a decent channel) then I think it is just a gimmick so that the BBC can say it as gone HD - don't waste money or time - put it on properly or don't bother. – ID 716

No: this would not be much use to anyone. You are better offering specific programmes in HD for download on the internet to be viewed at an appropriate time for the user. – ID 749

No. I do not feel this would be worthwhile. Whilst the idea of making this available to all users quickly, is commendable, I do not see many making use of this service. – ID 399

No. People who could be bothered to do this would most likely go out and buy a Sky box – ID 410

3.5.4 POSSIBLY

Possibly - it depends on timescales Yes - If 9hr service at least 4/5 years away No - If 9hr service less than 2/3 years away – ID 383

Only if HD set-top boxes provided to view the service included some form of Hard Disk recording. – ID 439

Yes - though only for those with Media Centers or PVRs. I don't think the BBC should promote the service unduly if a new set top box is likely

to be required for a 9 hour service, however if the costs of broadcasting 4 hours overnight are not extreme, and manufacturers are clear with the limitations of their boxes, I think there is scope for a 4 hour service to be in the public service. – ID 462

Probably not in the short term: I think that most, if not all of the households that are equipped to receive HD broadcasts will also have a subscription to cable or satellite services. However, if it is the intention of the BBC to ensure the widest possible take-up of HD programming then yes, an overnight service may well have a place in the schedules. – ID 761

If the HD-PVR equipment required for the 4 hour service was the same as the 9 hour service, then yes. If not, no, it would be better to invest time in getting the 9 hour service up and running sooner. – ID 370

3.5.5 CONCLUSION

Respondents are divided on this question, with 50% agreeing that the four hour overnight service on Freeview would be of use until the full nine hour service can be offered on Freeview.

Respondents who are aware of the facility to record this type of output appear more likely to agree that the four hour service would be of use.

42.7% of respondents disagreed, many because they did not feel that anybody would want to watch at that time of night and were either not aware of the options to record output at that time on HD or were not prepared to invest in the equipment required to do so. The issue of the potential need to buy two boxes was raised here.

3.6 Question 6

Given that viewers with cable and satellite would have access to the full nine hour service from the outset, the Trust concluded that it would not be a good use of licence fee money to provide the interim, four hour, overnight service on cable and satellite. Do you agree?

3.6.1 TABULATION

Q6	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	418	73.08%
Disagree	125	21.85%
Indifferent	19	3.32%
Don't know	10	1.75%
Total	572	100.00%

73.1% of respondents agree with the statement that it would not be a good use of resources to provide the interim four hour service on cable and satellite when the nine hour service is already available.

However there did seem to be some confusion in answering this question, with some people appearing to refer to the four hour service being available on Freeview rather than on cable and satellite. Therefore it may be that some of those who *disagreed* with this question were actually referring to Freeview – and not cable and satellite.

Confusion

No! I would argue the opposite; in fact if the Trust believes that, then the HD channel should not be launched on any platform! However, if I am misunderstanding the question and it means that the BBC would provide a full nine hour service on cable and satellite and also the overnight service as well, then the overnight service should not be provided on either of those platforms as it is 'surplus to requirements' and it not needed. – ID 471

Do not understand this question? If you have cable or satellite services then surely you have what's in the 4 hour service anyway? So I suppose the answer is yes. – ID 418

No, the more opportunities to get HD the better. Terrestrial reception whether analogue or digital is still how the majority of people receive television. As such it is vital HD is released via this medium as quickly as possible. – ID 449

I don't agree, people who are currently watching Freeview don't want to go out and also install a satellite dish and box, I think all people should be able to experience HD television without disadvantage or having to sign up for cable or satellite. – ID 456

Whilst I am eager for the service to launch, if holding off the launch of the 4 hour service can provide the full 9 hour service in a timely fashion, then yes. – ID 457

No... it is important to have a foothold in Freeview from a technical and marketing point – ID 523

No. Why should people with Freeview, who perhaps do not want the expense of regular subscriptions be penalised? They pay their licence fee too. – ID 525

No - not everyone can get (or wants to pay for) cable and satellite, which are run for private profit anyway- not with the interest of the average citizen. Could you give a small licence fee reduction to those paying Mr. Branson or Mr. Murdoch to keep them happy? – ID 530

Given that a new set top box is needed, with yet another one some point in the future, and that the service won't be used after the full service is launched - I do find it difficult to justify the expense. However, the overnight service sounds very similar to the Sky anytime system, so if the BBC were to be planning a similar thing, then this interim service may prove a cost effective way of getting ready for an anytime service. – ID 552

No, you need to push HD as widely as possible and move it mainstream on Freeview as soon as possible. – ID 569

3.6.2 AGREE

Yes - cable and satellite HD has been made available for some time and viewers already have the ability to record programmes to watch later in HD format. There would be no need to broadcast the same programmes overnight assuming that the overnight broadcast showed only those programmes that were broadcast during the 9 hour service. – ID 354

It would be fairer to deliver the same service through all delivery routes at the same time. However, since DTT cannot handle the bandwidth requirements at present, it is sensible to deliver the 9 hour content through channels that can handle the bandwidth. So, yes I agree. – ID 360

Yes, Freeview needs to have more focus as it is becoming the choice of households to access programmes along with on-demand – ID 364

Yes - there seems little point in providing them with an additional 'watered down' version of a service they already have anyway. – ID 366

If I have Sky HD then I have Sky + and can therefore record / time shift programmes as I wish. The need to repeat programmes is therefore not essential. – ID 377

I have no interest in cable and satellite services, but I see the reasoning behind this viewpoint. The four-hour overnight service on Freeview is very important though. – ID 409

Yes. What is most important is that subscription-free services are launched on satellite as soon as possible. – ID 441

Yes - there is no point providing the same content twice and offering two services on satellite and cable. However I would hope that the current HD trial service continues, rather than there being a break before the 9 hour service launches. – ID 462

Yes. It seems silly to duplicate effort. It is, however, unacceptable to me that it has come about that terrestrial viewers cannot receive the full nine hours that cable and satellite viewers will receive. I believe making the same service available on Freeview should be an absolute priority.

Yes - if the 9 hour service is available on cable and satellite that would suffice, providing there interim 4 hour service is made available on Freeview. – ID 593

I would agree with that. There does not seem to any point in broadcasting it all again if viewers already have access to the full service – ID 546

3.6.3 DISAGREE

No. An overnight repeat or preview channel on cable and satellite would be a good addition to the nine hour service. The BBC's high quality HD programming deserves to have as many showings as possible. With the availability of standardized PVRs on satellite and cable, giving more opportunities to view programming outside of peak is a good use of resources. – ID 341

No, I do not agree. I think the 4 hour overnight service would be very useful for people like me that have BT Vision (which is capable of decoding MPEG-4 broadcasts). And it means that we do not have to pay a large subscription fee to Sky or Cable providers. – ID 437

No. Why not provide both services on satellite/cable if it has the capabilities. – ID 439

No, I think the abbreviated service should be broadcast overnight on all providers. Much better than the continuous promotional loop. Let's see some proper programmes which we can record. – ID 440

No. I think if there is a service it should be available to all who have the capacity to receive it. Why should Cable/Satellite viewers have to wait to view programmes broadcast earlier on Freeview? If the four hour service was a delayed transmission of programmes it wouldn't be too bad but I would still like the option of receiving it. Showing a programme multiple times (as this would effectively be) presents more viewing/recording possibilities and I don't see that this would cost very much money since the BBC HD channel would already exist on Satellite/Cable anyway. It would just be broadcasting in dead time. – ID 447

No - because all television owners are required to purchase a television licence, it is not up to the Trust to decide when that service should be made available to the general public through non-chargeable mediums. The BBC has an obligation to provide access to all content through all mediums and should endeavour to achieve this goal as best as possible when faced with an interim situation. – ID 464

No I feel that the four hour service should be on Satellite and cable as well so that people can record overnight the HD channel and a more varied viewing overnight as more channels after midnight are chat or phone-ins – ID 678

3.6.4 INDIFFERENT

I'm indifferent, though if the additional cost is low, I don't see why they shouldn't make the extra programming available on cable and satellite. – ID 344

Yes, however see above - so to not disadvantage Satellite and Cable customers, I believe the 4-hour Freeview service should be a catch up; , rather than a preview, so should show programmes from the preceding day's nine-hour schedule rather than the following day's. Ultimately not a huge amount of difference will be made, given the amount of time shifted viewing in Sky and Cable HD homes already. – ID 470

I see no reason why the 4 hour overnight service should not be simulcast on all platforms. In the case of the satellite and cable viewers this would add value by covering the annoying situation in which a viewer misses an episode or fails to make a recording. In this case the overnight service would provide another chance to capture the

programme. However I agree that this is not a priority if the cost implications are significant. – ID 515

3.6.5 CONCLUSION

73.1% of respondents agree with the statement that it would not be a good use of resources to provide the interim four hour service on cable and satellite when the nine hour service is already available.

Some respondents however could see value in having the four hour preview to give as much exposure to HD as possible on cable and satellite.

There did appear to be some confusion in answering this question, with some people appearing to refer to the four hour service being available on Freeview rather than on cable and satellite. Therefore it may be that some of those who *disagreed* with this question (21.9%) were actually referring to Freeview – and not cable and satellite.

3.7 Question 7

A number of technological developments relating to the provision of HD on Freeview are expected in the next two to three years. If the four-hour, overnight service on Freeview were offered from next year, the set top boxes viewers would need to buy to receive this service may not be able to receive potential future HD services on Freeview. Would you prefer the BBC to launch the four hour interim service next year anyway, even if it meant having to buy two set top boxes within a very short period of time?

3.7.1 TABULATION

Q7	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	167	29.20%
Yes - But inform public of future upgrades needed	19	3.32%
Yes – Cost-dependent	11	1.92%
Yes - People will upgrade then anyway	18	3.15%
Yes - Launch ASAP	9	1.57%
Yes - TOTAL	224	39.16%
No	166	29.02%
No - Better to wait	57	9.97%
No - Waste of money / time	18	3.15%
No - Would confuse people	8	1.40%
No - Other	31	5.42%
No - TOTAL	280	48.95%
Cost-dependent	20	3.50%
Indifferent	10	1.75%
Don't know	15	2.62%
Other	19	3.32%
No answer	4	0.70%
Total	572	100.00%

Approximately one third of respondents (29.2%) felt that the BBC should go ahead with the four hour interim service in 2008. A further 10% agreed it should go ahead but with some type of clarification.

However, nearly 50% of respondents said that the four hour interim service should not go ahead in 2008.

A total of 5.42% of respondents said their decision would depend on the cost involved.

3.7.2 AGREE

Those who are in favour of the four hour interim service going ahead in 2008 tend to feel that as long as people are informed about the likely need to up-grade in the future this should not be a problem. Many respondents refer to the fact that technology is constantly being updated and there is always going to be a "need" to upgrade if consumers wish to.

This is a problem, however it should be considered that most households have more than one TV set, for those who have HD Compatible TV's then a HD STB, would more than likely relegate the initial box to a second TV with a HD box then being purchased so it's not such a major issue in my opinion. The downside is that new TV's with Digital Tuners will not contain a digital HD Tuner. This is a problem that the TV Manufacturers should have addressed, and have built in obsolescence from the outset, something that they alone should bear the brunt of. I think the BBC would be right to go with an overnight service from the 2008. - ID 338

Consumers are used to upgrading anyway

Yes. Even if my current box didn't support MPEG-4 (which my BT Vision box does) I would still like to have an interim HD service. By the time any future re-organisation of the DTT platform occurs to incorporate DVB-T2 I would likely be wanting a new TV and/or STB anyway. – ID 366

Yes. Give the public the choice. Many thousands of people buy new games consoles every year when a new model comes out, why shouldn't they have the choice and ability to do the same with television viewing? – ID 379

Yes, as a consumer it is my choice to spend my money on the services I want. The sacrifice to use new technology is that it costs more, and lasts half as long. If it wasn't for these people willing to pay, then people would just wait for a long time, and never get anywhere. If we wait for the new transmission standard, by the time this is agreed and units manufactured, we will all be talking about the next big jump forward and wondering if we should wait for that instead. – ID 380

Yes. People interested in HD and wanting it on Freeview will pay for 2 STBs - technology is always moving on, so this is necessary. – ID 385

People that are HD ready like me have gone through 4 or 5 Freeview boxes already trying to get a decent picture. Another box would not be a problem. As long as my mum can watch TV in her house on normal

Freeview and I can watch HD by whatever means needed. Everyone is happy. – ID 397

Yes, consumers want HDTV now, if we are talking about buying a box for £100 or so now and another £100 or so in 2-3 years time people who have spent £800-£1500 on a new HDTV would consider that £100 a small cost for the service received. The £100 first purchase would have enabled you to view and enjoy HDTV now and if that cost is spread over a couple of year's usage, most people would see that as good value. – ID 434

As long as customers are aware of implications

I believe it is OK, so long as the consumer is fully aware of this. – ID 344

If it is made clear to purchasers that this will happen, then yes, they should have the choice. Although, if this results in hardly anyone buying the equipment, then there is no point in broadcasting it. I will not be buying equipment that will become obsolete quite quickly. – ID 376

Yes - as long as the purchaser of the 'interim' equipment is fully informed before purchase. It would potentially allow those people using computer based PVR functionality to immediately receive HD over DVB-T for minimal cost. Assuming the price difference of an HD enabled box was relatively small (say around £50-£75) that seems a small increment to pay (if one is buying a new box anyway) to get HD a couple of years sooner. Additionally, if it were possible to continue the 4 hour service for a few years after the full (incompatible) HD signal started this would strengthen the proposition of an immediate start to the 4 hour service. – ID 445

Depends on time

Yes, I would not see this as being a problem as long as 'short period of time' was defined as 2-3 years. If it was measured in months, then I do not see any advantage. – ID 353

Yes, as two to three years is a very long time in terms of technological advancement. – ID 361

Technology is constantly moving anyway

Yes. The continual upgrade of technological features is inevitable - how could anyone judge that this progress has effectively ceased making an upgrade a logical event. It is better as now to let the user decide when to upgrade and to what degree. – ID 373

This is true of most technology these days. Procrastinating will not alter the fact that technology moves on and four years is not a sufficiently short period of time to cause a viewer to be surprised by the need to buy a new set top box. – ID 377

It is always the case that technology early adopters are putting themselves at risk from future market changes / price alterations. It would be fair to all buyers to tell them that there is a risk their new equipment would be obsolete in a couple of years. It would generally be preferable if the BBC launched the new HD services on Freeview as soon as possible. – ID 394

I believe it is possible to anticipate the likely technical developments relating to provision of HD on Freeview. Foremost amongst these would appear to be the move to MPEG-4 coding. There seems no reason why set-top boxes for the interim overnight service should not incorporate MPEG-4 from the outset. – ID 466

Yes in one word. Those viewers like myself who are 'technology' savvy and also into new technology, are always buying the latest thing, and although I realise that we make up just a small proportion of the total viewers on Freeview, those who are capable of viewing HD content and want it available on the Freeview platform would be quite prepared for this eventuality. After all, the Trust should be reminded of the alternative costs of viewing the BBC's HD channel on the alternative platforms, taking into account how much it costs to subscribe to those platforms (plus of course the licence fee) and any worries about having to purchase two separate PVR's or boxes in order to view that content becomes not as important a concern as the Trust currently thinks. Besides which, as per my other replies, there is a larger and bigger cost to the Freeview platform itself to take into consideration, does the trust want Freeview to end up being the platform just for old people and the vulnerable or poor? Once the BBC 'starts the ball rolling' on the Freeview platform, then everyone will benefit, the viewers, the platform itself, and demand for HD to be available to ALL will increase. The trust should also remember how much it will cost for viewers if they decide next year to get the new Freesat, new dish, new box, there is always an expense when new technology comes along, we all had to buy colour TV's when colour came along, but we did it as and when we could afford it, and this will prove to be the same. – ID 471

Yes. Freeview boxes are IT hardware. IT hardware is a 3 year capital item from a business point of view. There is a reason for this; Hardware has been shown to last approximately 3 years before it become less reliable. It may last much longer but the pleasure it will bring in those two to three years will greatly surpass the frustration felt by people having to replace it. This is particularly true when they have been warned before they bought it that they would have to replace it.

Alongside this, you need to remember that the people buying this have paid much more to have an HD Ready Television; a waste if they are not able to receive HD programming. – ID 498

Use another provider

Yes. The interim STB would be good for around 2 years, as I understand it. That is a perfectly acceptable life for that kind of device. Many viewers may be able to use a PC-based solution, using a current DVB-T receiver and software decoding (I have been able to view the HD trial on my PC, like thousands of others). That would remove the need for buying a dedicated interim STB. – ID 396

Yes, I would prefer the BBC to launch the service next year anyway. I am a BT Vision user, and the BT Vision set top box is capable of decoding MPEG 4 broadcasts already. This means that any BT Vision users would be able to view the 4 hour overnight service immediately with no set top box upgrade. This would mean that I would only have to buy one set top box upgrade in the future when the full service is released. I am more than willing to do this. – ID 437

I would prefer to access HD content via the internet in the interim, rather than purchase an additional set-top box. If the internet route was not available then I would like to see the four-hour service introduced. – ID 476

3.7.3 AGREE, BUT WITH RESERVATIONS

Others agree with the idea in principle, but feel that their decision would be influenced by the potential costs involved.

If the price of the STBs was low enough, and the purchaser is making an informed decision on availability, then this is acceptable. If there is any doubt about hardware pricing or future plans, I would prefer the Trust to take a wait and see attitude. – ID 341

That depends on the retail price of the digital set-top boxes. If they are as cheap as some on the market at the moment, then yes I would purchase the boxes as and when needed. However, if they are prohibitively expensive, I would wait until the Freeview situation is resolved. – ID 360

Depends on the cost of the set top box. To view anything from the overnight service, you would need a set top box that could record to watch later. This would add to the cost of the first set top box. I think if it lasted for at least 3 years would be ok if not too expensive. – ID 419

It would all depend on the cost, if the costing was not a major impact then yes for the BBC to launch the interim service. – ID 547

This is somewhat dependant on cost, with current Freeview boxes available as low as £15 then this is not a massive investment for 2-3 years. But with HD Freeview boxes likely to cost significantly more then I am not sure if this is what many consumers would want to do. On one hand I am torn to say release it asap and let the consumer decide, but on the other hand this could have a detrimental effect and heighten the confusion in already confused consumers. – ID 679

Depends what the price of the set top boxes would be. If under £100 then I guess it would be ok, but it would reduce its appeal. But if you have shelled out £700+ for a HD TV, then a bit extra to actually get HD programs would be ok. I guess you have to compare it to the cost of getting an HD capable cable or satellite system. – ID 707

3.7.4 DISAGREE

The majority of negative responses relate to the fact that it has been necessary to upgrade equipment for the digital switchover and people will not want to have to potentially upgrade again twice more in the next few years.

No, I think people have just adjusted to digital TV now comes along HD, I think cutting out unnecessary boxes which will become obsolete for following year is a good thing. – ID 705

No. I think that allowing non-Freeview channels on digital terrestrial has already spoiled Freeview - so making a situation where there will be two upgrades will not be the best way forwards. Also there are a number of people (myself as well soon) who will have two HD TV's in their house - either like myself moving my 26in LCD into the bedroom whilst I buy a 42in for the living room - or who just buy a second HD TV for the bedroom. I've seen TV's as small as 19in that are HD Ready. These people would then have to buy four boxes in a short time. Also if these programmes are broadcast at these hours - unless there is a hard disc enclosed to record at HD - people will have to stay up overnight to watch. If they have hard discs in them they won't be cheap. – ID 357

Viewers should not be expected to buy hardware, which will then need to be replaced once the BBC HD Freeview service has started. This will undermine the so-called service and duty of care that a professional broadcaster should undertake. So, it would make sense to DELAY the Freeview HD service until suitable NEW HD hardware is available. – ID 358

No. Unless the final nine hour channel could be viewed on the boxes it would likely deter viewers from making the upgrade, unless manufacturer sponsored upgrade program could be negotiated before the launch. – ID 359

No. This would lead to market confusion. Personally I would not consider buying hardware knowing it may need to be replaced so soon. I regard myself as quite a technology loving person, and would guess people less interested in technology would be far from impressed with this idea. – ID 399

No! If MPEG4 and DVB-T2 are likely to be available in 2009, they should not introduce a Freeview HD service until then. To tempt the public to buy two new set top boxes (which will probably be imported) in only a couple of years will be bad for the economy and the environment. – ID 420

Most people, even today, expect a TV to last them at least ten years. STBs are not such a major purchase, but switching the technology and forcing everyone to buy a new box would be considered incompetent by the average viewer. It would also be very hard to convey to viewers why the box needed changing - most will not understand (or even know about) compression technology. There would also be a period just prior to the technical change, when a viewer might have to buy two STBs in a matter of months. This would not be acceptable, and would reflect poorly on the BBC and the level of trust it is granted by the public. – ID 427

No, I think the BBC should wait until DVB-T2 based boxes are available before launching the 4-hour overnight service. This avoids legacy issues and helps to drive adoption and price reductions since the consumer will be investing in technology that has an ongoing useful life. – ID 443

No. This would be a mistake. Don't launch the Freeview service until it is ready to take the channel proper. People will feel less forced into spending money on something with a limited lifespan. I guess Freeview customers are less interested in technological bells and whistles but as an HD TV ownership grows they will look for more content -but I'd wait until the full service was ready. – ID 463

No. HD enthusiasts are already likely to have alternative access to HD broadcasts. Therefore, if the method of HD broadcasting is likely to change significantly, resulting in viewers needing to upgrade existing equipment twice to continue to receive HD broadcasts, I would prefer the BBC to wait to launch its interim 4-hour service (unless some financial assistance were promised to early adopters). – ID 470

No. It would be more sensible to introduce HD on Freeview after the digital switchover has been completed. Even then at least a two year gap should be introduced, most people would not want to have to upgrade again so soon. – ID 493

No. Please let's have a proper long term strategy for HD on Freeview and make the transition once. Whilst many "techies" may love the idea and want it sooner, a large proportion of consumers have struggled to get to grips with Freeview as it stands. You really need infrequent changes that actually deliver substantial, reliable and lasting benefit. – ID 522

I have considered this and decided that if I wanted the HD service enough then I would invest in a satellite dish and HD receiver. If any HD Freeview set top boxes were not future proof then I would not buy one. – ID 540

Definitely not: working for a TV and Hi-Fi specialist there is no way I can envisage the public relishing having to make two further upgrades when a huge amount of the public have already just upgraded their equipment. – ID 544

3.7.5 CONCLUSION

29.2% of respondents felt that the BBC should go ahead with the four hour interim service in 2008. A further 10% agreed it should go ahead depending on other factors.

Those who are in favour of the four hour interim service going ahead in 2008 tend to feel that as long as people are informed about the likely need to upgrade in the future this should not be a problem. Many respondents refer to the fact that technology is constantly being updated and there is always going to be a "need" to upgrade if consumers wish to.

However 49% of respondents said that the four hour interim service should not go ahead in 2008. The majority of negative responses relate to the fact that it has been necessary to upgrade equipment for the digital switchover and people will not want to have to potentially upgrade again twice more in the next few years.

A total of 5.4% of respondents specifically said their decision would depend on the cost involved.

3.8 Question 8

The Trust concluded that the impact on broadband capacity of the BBC providing HD content over the internet would be small, given that demand for broadband capacity is being fuelled by a number of factors – such as gaming, user-generated media and on-demand content from traditional media around the world. Do you agree?

3.8.1 TABULATION

Q8	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	386	67.48%
Disagree	127	22.20%
Not BBC's responsibility	12	2.10%
Indifferent	12	2.10%
Don't know	35	6.12%
Total	572	100.00%

Over two thirds of respondents agreed that the impact on broadband capacity, of the BBC providing HD content over the internet, would be small.

However some respondents said they did not feel qualified to answer the question (6.12%).

3.8.2 NOT ABLE TO ANSWER FULLY

If the provision were to become widespread (i.e. not just BBC) and similarly the use of the service widespread, there could be an impact but you are better asking networking and internet experts this question. – ID 567

Don't know what the impact might be – ID 535

Don't understand the question. HD over internet is better than no HD at all, but Freeview is where it really should be. – ID 530

I do not know enough about this particular topic to be able to express an opinion. – ID 505

I am not sure of the facts, but I think the more ways HD can be delivered, the better. ISPs need to keep up with what customers want. – ID 473

I am uncertain, I feel that IPTV is not at a critical mass yet so it may not have a negative impact on bandwidth, but if it is available immediately, the ease of access may mean that people saturate any spare capacity by just previewing - ID 465

This seems reasonable - but HD content is likely to be bandwidth hungry and I don't feel competent to comment on this. – ID 445

Not sure what you mean - surely an online HD service would have a huge impact on other online services especially for the last mile even if you use store and forward techniques like Akamai does – ID 375

3.8.3 AGREE

While these respondents agree that the impact on broad band capacity will be small, they also feel that it is not the BBC's responsibility to increase capacity. They feel that gradually capacity will increase over time anyway due to other demands as well as demands from the BBC. Some feel that the UK lags behind other countries in terms of broadband capacity.

Yes. While current broadband capacity is insufficient for streaming HD content it will increase over time regardless of the availability of HD content. – ID 851

If the data is transmitted through the internet properly (multicasting) then the capacity it would take up is very low. – ID 824

The total bandwidth of the BBC would not come anywhere near the likes of bittorrent sites or apple's itunes so see no problem. – ID 823

Yes, the BBC's impact on the 'net globally would be small... and new ways of accessing the internet are becoming available, e.g. Wimax, leading to higher competition and reduction in download limits for users. – ID 810

Yes. With 8mb broadband rapidly becoming standard, it is already evident that for many users, this amount of bandwidth is more than surplus to normal requirements. – ID 792

I agree that impact would be small - but, the Trust should not be concerned with broadband capacity issues - that is for the government (assuming FTTx is required) and ISPs to resolve. – ID 768

Yes, ISPs will have to increase massively their infrastructure over the coming years anyway; the provision of a limited number of programmes by a single source will have a negligible effect. – ID 666

Yes, people will use their broadband service for whichever service they want to use. The internet suppliers would have to raise their game and improve their service to meet the needs of the users. – ID 546

Yes as long as real time streaming is not required. – ID 540

Absolutely: with the proper adoption of IP multicast technology relatively little extra strain is placed on networks. Multicast media streaming is in many ways much less harmful than other applications such as YouTube. – ID 472

Yes I do agree with this, however, at this present time, the broadband speeds in this country are not sufficient for even downloads of SD content as many will contest. I personally cannot see any big massive 'view HD over broadband at this point in time. The same for the viewing of TV content on ones mobile phone, again this has tended to be 'manufacturer lead' not consumer lead, and I can't see people and viewers actually requiring these services. I am at this time the BBC's archive trial which is wonderful from the content perspective, but leaves a lot to be desired concerning the method used (broadband) and its constraints. If given the choice, I would far rather be viewing the BBC's archives on my big TV in the lounge and not via the internet. So until we have broadband speed that allows you to view BBC HD content 'on the fly' then I can't see this taking off. – ID 471

Yes. It is not the responsibility of the BBC to alleviate bandwidth burdens for ISP's and British Telecom. However, the BBC should be putting pressure on these organisations to upgrade their equipment as Britain is lagging far behind most 1st-world nations with respect to Broadband Infrastructure. Providing HD content over the Internet should be a non-issue - the fact that it is not the fault of the BBC or its intentions with respect to HD service. – ID 464

Yes - and broadband operators have to accept that now they are offering high-speed services (8-25Mbs) that users will seek new applications to exploit these speeds. HDTV via IPTV is a key benefit of high-speed broadband - and broadband suppliers should accept that if they offer unlimited services, users will want to use this for HD downloads. – ID 462

Yes, although ISP's are under pressure to supply capacity at a cheap price, without the demand being placed on them by services being available, faster speeds will not become widespread as quickly as they are required. – ID 380

3.8.4 DISAGREE

However over 20% of respondents do not feel that there is sufficient broadband capacity.

No, as I have an 8gb connection but have never come close to getting this bandwidth in reality. Focusing on mobile support would be a better next step, if people want to view it over the internet they can use hardware/software to stream it themselves e.g. Slingbox. I think an online HD strategy will be good for 2009/2010 – ID 834

It's sad but it'll take organisations like the BBC placing increased bandwidth demand on ISP's before organisations such as BT and NTL (Virgin etc) are forced to upgrade their capacities. I agree the BBC should be helping the public force the ISP's to keep the infrastructure up to date (increase bandwidth and speed capabilities) – ID 826

Do not agree; we are too far behind the rest of the world in upgrading our Broadband. In South Korea they have download speeds of over 200 megs, we just get 20 at max. – ID 794

No. There needs to be serious investment in broadband capacity to the home. We can only get .6 mb/s because we are in a rural area. This makes video on demand a non-starter. – ID 790

No. Demand for data on the internet is increasing exponentially anyway, without HD, and users are not receiving good data rates now. Adding to the burden without very significant improvement in broadband data rates would be effectively a retrograde step. – ID 772

No. It will impact broadband speeds detrimentally. If people want to watch it, then watch on Satellite. – ID 765

No. How on earth can this be determined? This kind of development will encourage ISPs to further reign in low end users and give more access to high speed connections to those who can pay. The BBC ought not to be driving the market in this way, nor participating in the exclusion of the majority of its license fee payers. – ID 664

No. I believe that competition between users for capacity would be adversely affected, especially outside the major conurbations. – ID 619

No. Providing long form TV broadcasts over broadband (as opposed to little clips on You Tube) significantly increases broadband usage. Someone on a 2GB capped internet broadband service (not uncommon) would use all of their monthly allowance up in one evening of TV watching. This is already a problem with the iPlayer. If it becomes

popular then every broadband supplier will have to introduce even more strict data usage restrictions and broadband will grind to a halt. Broadband speeds currently depend on the fact that most of the time most of the people use very little bandwidth. As soon as you start transmitting mass TV services and it becomes popular, broadband speeds will collapse. Add HD into that mix and the problem becomes 4 times worse (assuming 4 times the bandwidth of SD pictures). – ID 580

No. I think our broadband network is substandard compared to many other countries and do not think that in its current state it would be good enough for large scale HD broadcasts. – ID 554

Not entirely. I suspect that it would be wise to delay introduction of HD IPTV for at least five years to give the infrastructure time to catch up with the recent introduction of standard definition on-demand services. – ID 515

Providing streaming HD on the internet would have a very significant impact on bandwidth under current system of copper wiring. – ID 506

No. The BBC is mainstream media. Just look at the statistics for the websites. The take up would be huge and of course, upwards of 20 frames a second for a good moving image would put the bandwidth under pressure. Many users do not buy the top bandwidth from their ISP though. They may well upgrade to allow them to watch what they want. As a result, the ISP gets more income and has more to invest in the infrastructure. I understand that there is pressure on content providers to pay ISP's to get them to take their content. I don't see Google being charged by the ISP's. The BBC has a premium service. If an ISP won't offer it to their customers but another ISP does, it will be the catalyst that leads to a great loss of market share to the one that doesn't offer it. – ID 498

No - once HD from BBC via Internet is available, there will be huge amounts of downloads for 'just in case' viewing, which WILL have a significant impact on BBC Internet volumes (of data) – ID 433

No, I believe it would be significant! People using enormous amounts of bandwidth will clog up the available bandwidth. Until the telecoms providers replace copper with cable for the local loop, bandwidth will be expensive and fail to meet the demand of HDTV services on demand. – ID 420

Not really. HD TV is very demanding of bandwidth. Many ISPs already limit the amount of data for downloading because they are charged by the GB by BT. Given BT feel the need to charge in such a way that implies to me that capacity is limited and so the addition of BBC HD

delivered over the internet could require some large capacity upgrades.
– ID 411

3.8.5 CONCLUSION

67.5% of respondents agreed that the impact on broadband capacity, of the BBC providing HD content over the internet, would be small. While these respondents agree that the impact on broad band capacity will be small, they also feel that it is not the BBC's responsibility to increase capacity. They feel that gradually capacity will increase over time anyway due to other demands as well as demands from the BBC. Some feel that the UK lags behind other countries in terms of broadband capacity.

22.2% of respondents do not feel that there is sufficient broadband capacity.

However some respondents said they did not feel qualified to answer the question (6.12% said "Don't know").

3.9 Question 9

Do you agree with the Trust's decision that the channel should not automatically simulcast BBC One prime time content, but should broadcast programmes that most benefit from the HD upgrade?

3.9.1 TABULATION

Q9	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	434	75.87%
Yes - But move to simulcast/full HD channels later	21	3.67%
Yes - TOTAL	455	79.54%
No	91	15.91%
Indifferent	2	0.35%
Don't know	5	0.87%
Other	15	2.63%
No answer	4	0.70%
Total	572	100.00%

Nearly 80% of respondents agree with the Trust's decision that the channel should not automatically simulcast BBC One Primetime content, but should broadcast programmes that most benefit from the HD upgrade.

3.9.2 AGREE

HD channel should show best of HD

If the BBC is to have only one HD channel than it should make the best use of it. I believe that this would mean picking and choosing the best content. – ID 531

As this would be a single channel service, as opposed to the 'sport' specific channels of Sky for example, it is most important that BBC HD offers the widest spectrum of programming possible that not only brings a wide variety of viewer to the channel, but also enhances their experience of picture and sound quality. In the main all programmes transmitted should be HD original. There are bound to be exceptions but it has to be the aim to keep them to as few as possible. – ID 450

Yes although it might be nice to try and match the timing of those programmes that ARE also being broadcast on BBC One. – ID 517

Types of Programming for the HD channel

It should simulcast any HD content from any of the BBC channels plus at other times its own schedule of HD programmes. Much as it has in the pilot. – ID 451

Quality documentary and drama, like Planet Earth (and not East Enders), should be simulcast. Apart from these landmark series simulcast should be limited. Is BBC HD a showcase for the best content available on HD? It should be. – ID 337

Yes, I think light entertainment content does not have to be in this format. Rather, docu-dramas, dramas, sport etc. – ID 339

I agree that given the brief broadcasting hours available to it, the BBC HD channel should broadcast their flagship programming, using HD-filmed content, and brand new programming. I'd also like to see the major yearly events that the BBC has rights to show, like Wimbledon, England International football matches, Golf, Rugby, Olympics etc. Only when a service flanked by the other public service broadcasters is available, would I see simulcasting necessary, and at its most effective. – ID 346

Yes including extension of hours for special events outside the 1500 to 2400hrs timeslot. There are many late night films which would also come into this category. – ID 352

Yes certainly - the BBC HD channel should only be broadcasting native HD programming and not all BBC One content will be appropriate for being upgraded to being broadcast in HD. I would be looking for nature programmes, select sport events, and action-filled drama series to be in HD - that sort of thing. – ID 366

Pick the best programmes to benefit - who wants to see soap operas in HD? Put on the high production documentaries, sports, dramas, films, etc that can show the qualities of HD. In particular, live events and outside broadcasts demo HD and highlight its value. – ID 386

Yes, but they always seem to forget about the top American dramas at the moment, so they should make sure things like Heroes and Medium are too. – ID 398

Yes - major BBC One shows shot in HD should be broadcast in HD. However there will be shows from BBC Two, Three and Four also shot in HD, and these should have equal airings on BBC HD. Equally HD production shouldn't be limited to BBC One programmes - factual and music entertainment on BBC Two and Four benefit hugely from HD production and should be available via a BBC HD service. – ID 462

Absolutely: it should be a showcase of the best HD content from across the BBC, but should also simulcast where appropriate. Shows such as Strictly Come Dancing, Who Do You Think You Are, and (of course) live football are simulcast on BBC HD, as are annual events such as the Proms; this should absolutely continue as HD viewers would not want to wait to watch in HD something that's already been shown in standard definition. However, by allowing an automatic simulcast, that would risk up scaled content where no simultaneous HD content is available, and I would prefer that this were avoided. The BBC HD service should be for material sourced in HD alone. – ID 470

Yes I do agree with this. Those viewers who were lucky enough to take part in the Crystal Palace trials were more than happy with the content offered, and I think that a lot of the BBC's output is ideal for HD broadcast anyway. Content such as Bleak House, Blue Planet, Torchwood, Robin Hood, etc, lend themselves well to the content that I would love to view from the BBC in HD. Nature programmes and Dramas are what the BBC has always excelled at, and I am sure that the BBC can and will find the best content to show. Anyway, as many of us (who keep in the know) know, the BBC will eventually be using and filming everything in HD! (How I wished that I was part of the trial when Wimbledon was on!) - ID 471

Yes, definitely. It is not necessary to see daily soap operas or reality-TV junk in HD. Please can we have more HD programming like Planet Earth, Bleak House, Heroes and that child-friendly Swan Lake that was broadcast at Christmas 2006. Movies in HD are always nice, too. Oh, and football - the BBC HD coverage of World Cup 2006 was outstanding. – ID 474

Yes. Programmes like the Discovery and National Geographic documentaries and travel and natural world should be the priority. – ID 520

Initially – then move to simulcasting in the future

Yes I agree - until 2010 - for then I believe the BBC is committed to make all its programmes in HD - and at that time a BBC One simulcast would work. I do not want to see SD programmes 'up scaled to HD' passed off as HD. – ID 357

Initially I think the BBC should showcase the best programming that HD has to offer. This would act as a catalyst to viewers to want more HD content in the future. Then, the BBC could introduce simulcasting as and when demand increases. – ID 360

Yes, perhaps 10 years from now we will have HD versions of BBC 1; BBC 2 etc. for the moment with one channel the best HD programmes

from across the channels should be shown. It will also help it to stand out from the likes of Channel 4 HD, ITV HD and Sky One HD, and make BBC HD the only fully HD mixed genre channel. – ID 368

Yes, but the BBC should intend to migrate all content (starting with BBC1 and 2) over to the HD Platform. – ID 378

For now I feel this is the right decision. Although as most content produced for the BBC will be produced in HD in the near future, this should be kept in review. At some stage in the future, after 2010, it may be possible to simulcast BBC One, BBC Two, BBC THREE and BBC Four, as well as the CBBC and C Beebies channels. For now a selection of the best HD content for all channels would be the best for all in my opinion. – ID 394

Other

Yes but you run the risk of becoming a copy of the HD trial channel where you are cherry picking content. Put Match of the Day on it, put Eastenders on it, put some news on it and beat Sky – ID 375

3.9.3 DISAGREE

Those who disagree (15.9%) tend to feel that all BBC One programming should be simulcast on the HD channel right from the start.

No, BBC 1 should be replaced by BBC 1 HD. – ID 370

No, it should broadcast all normal BBC content in HD. Where the BBC wants to showcase its prime HD content it should use a dedicated HD channel to do this. – ID 400

No I don't agree. I think the BBC should simulcast HD programmes at prime time. I can't see any reason why the BBC should hold back their services. – ID 456

I think it would be better if it mirrored BBC One prime time content. In other words I think that BBC One should be transmitted in the highest quality possible. – ID 477

No. I believe normal BBC One programming should be broadcast. Let the viewer decide what they want to watch in HD. It is very frustrating to have the choice dictated to us, just because a panel thinks it should be that way. If it is not good in HD then the viewer will turn over; the BBC can then adjust its programming to suit the majority after several months of trial. – ID 498

No, would prefer a mix of prime-time content (that is shot in HD) and new HD content not available on prime-time channels. – ID 501

3.9.4 CONCLUSION

79.5% of respondents agree with the Trust's decision that the channel should not automatically simulcast BBC One prime time content, but should broadcast programmes that most benefit from the HD upgrade.

Some respondents are quite specific about the types of programmes that should be included. Also respondents mention that although in the early stages only the best HD programmes should be shown, over time all programming should be shown in HD.

Those who disagree (15.9%) tend to feel that all BBC One programming should be simulcast on the HD channel right from the start.

3.10 Question 10

An interim four hour overnight service on Freeview would necessitate the withdrawal from Freeview of four BBC services between 02.00 and 06.00am. These are BBC Four, BBC Parliament, two BBCi video streams and the BBCi news loops. Do you agree with the Trust's conclusion that the loss of these services from Freeview would be outweighed by the benefit of offering the four hour overnight HD service?

3.10.1 TABULATION

Q10	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	393	68.71%
Yes - But don't want to lose channels	12	2.10%
Yes - TOTAL	405	70.81%
No	117	20.45%
Indifferent	15	2.62%
Don't know	10	1.75%
Other	15	2.62%
No answer	10	1.75%
Total	572	100.00%

Just over 70% of respondents agreed with the Trust's conclusion that the loss of the nominated services from Freeview would be outweighed by the benefit of offering the four hour overnight HD service.

3.10.2 AGREE

Those respondents who agreed tended to feel that, without having access to audience figures, or potential audience projections for the four hour HD service, the existing overnight services were not widely used and could be accessed at other times or through other platforms. Therefore the available time slot could be beneficially used for the four hour preview of the HD channel.

Yes, I don't see many people watching programmes or recording news loops overnight, whereas I'm sure many people would record HD programming overnight to watch at another time. – ID 344

Given the broadcasting hours employed by those channels means you often see barkers and promo loops: having an HD service taking place of channel markers is an excellent use of bandwidth. – ID 346

Yes, I believe the audience share would be much greater for the overnight HD content than the audience for those channels at that time. – ID 356

Massively. How many people are actually watching any of these things in the middle of the night? HD is a must over BBCi news loops! – ID 386

The loss of the aforementioned services would have little impact on the vast BBC viewing audience between 02.00 and 06.00 daily. It is likely that most viewing activity would be viewer's hard disk recorders recording HD content or other channels. – ID 394

Yes they are only half channels. After 12 there's not much on anyway but repeats. BBC Parliament: does this need a whole channel? Put it back in its little box. News loops is just News 24 speeded up, News 24 shows you the same content just in a watch-able size and the video BBCi streams broadcast red 301 and 302 screens all night. I wouldn't miss them during the day never mind over night. – ID 397

Most of the programmes are repeated so I can't see there is much of a problem. – ID 440

Wholeheartedly, yes. Video streams and loops are, by their very nature, repeated. BBC Parliament overnight coverage is specialist in nature. BBC Four often shows repeats of previously aired shows overnight, so I believe the benefits of an HD service would outweigh the loss of these services. Any more than four hours overnight, however, would not meet with my approval. – ID 470

Yes I do agree. Unless you are a 'night rake' or there is something of interest on during the night and you own a PVR, these nightly broadcasts are probably not going to be really missed I shouldn't have thought. I think that this is a capital idea, and shows to me as a licence payer that all at the BBC are willing to find ways of overcoming obstacles in order to innovate and give viewers what they want. – ID 471

3.10.3 AGREE BUT WITH CLARIFICATIONS

Some respondents partially agreed but did not want to see one or more of the channels lost – in particular BBC Four.

Yes - with the qualification that the BBC News loops are a useful service, especially overnight. If any method can be used to continue with these - then I would suggest that it is followed. However BBC Parliament, BBC Four and the two BBCi video streams can easily be stopped overnight. – ID 462

Yes to BBC4, Parliament and BBCi video streams, but no to the BBCi news loops - those are invaluable if you want to instantly see what's going on.... although I'm never up at 2am-6am so don't really care – ID 571

Don't want to lose BBC Four

Losing BBC Four would be a shame, but then I suspect many of the programmes that might benefit from HD would be featured on BBC Four anyway. I certainly wouldn't miss the other streams. – ID 472

Yes, absolutely. Except while you're at it, why not make it 5 or 6 hours overnight? With the exception of BBC Four, I think it would be a benefit to remove these other minor-interest BBC services from the air altogether. You probably have a better idea than I do how many watch them, but nobody in my household has ever watched them, nor has anybody that I know done so. – ID 474

As a fan of BBC 4 I'd be a bit put out as I often record programmes overnight. It's more convenient than recording from satellite - I have a DAB recorder. – ID 624

I'd miss BBC Four. It's an excellent channel. If the ratings mean more would benefit from the loss of these channels then yeah. It would be quite a loss though. – ID 512

Keep BBC Four. I only watch the video streams during sporting events i.e. Wimbledon Tennis, Commonwealth Games and Olympics. – ID 689

No, I believe that BBC Four is a great channel, I would happily forgo all BBCi services as I believe that interactive TV is 2nd best to the internet given the availability of broadband and the %age of the population that has access to bbc.co.uk I believe this is where you should concentrate. Removing the BBCi channels could free the space for HD Channel? – ID 711

Provisionally yes. There's no good reason to lose BBC4 over BBC3 - I'd rather see BBC3 go and this should be considered. Ultimately, the answer is yes. – ID 482

Not knowing the viewing figures at these times makes it difficult to answer, but personally BBC 4 might affect me. Of course it could always be shown in HD overnight – ID 752

BBC Four isn't broadcast 24 hours a day now so to reduce it further may mean the eventual loss of the channel altogether. The BBCi video streams are mainly used during the day or until midnight, so don't make much of a difference and BBC news 24 is on so the other won't matter. – ID 556

Other considerations

No opinion. I consider both options to be of equally small value at that time of the night. You have one contradiction on your hands though. What happens if there is a major sporting event (Olympics, Commonwealth Games, and World Cup) at that time of night (i.e. broadcast from a foreign country)? You might want to carry it in HD, but also this is exactly the time you'd want to use as many interactive TV streams as possible. Who wins? - ID 580

Yes, I agree that they should make way for HD content, but the Trust should also have considered that there may be less demand for HD content at such obscure hours, so whilst it's viable to remove less popular channels whilst the HD service is active, they need to consider whether the uptake in the four-hour HD service will justify the removal of these services, or whether it will prove to have equally low ratings at the allotted time-period. – ID 680

Definitely but subject to an analysis of viewing figures for these programmes in the period 02.00 to 06.00 and an analysis of current viewing figures for the trial BBC HD service and the ability of Freeview viewers to receive and watch content in HD – ID 354

Yes, I do. A Freeview HD service would get more viewers than these channels combined, provided that the STB are cheap and easy to use. – ID 427

3.10.4 DISAGREE

Just over 20% of respondents disagreed with the proposal.

Waste of money

No. HD broadcasting over Freeview from 2am to 6am is not a worthwhile use of airtime or money – ID 358

No, four hour suggestion is a waste of licence payer's money. – ID 480

No again what's the point in wasting money broadcasting HD for 4 hours when that money could be used to speed up the arrival of a 24 hour broadcasting of HD content. – ID 372

Wait for full nine hour launch

No I do not agree, I think the BBC should wait for the 9 hour service. – ID 477

It would be better that the HD service is held back until ready for full launch rather than withdrawing other services available to all on the Freeview platform. – ID 506

No. No point broadcasting HD if people have to buy specialist equipment to receive which they will then have to replace when the full nine hour service commences. – ID 522

Should not cut these channels

No, as the BBC recently introduced BBC4 as the quality viewing channel after years of “dumbing” down the other channels, BBC2 in particular, I think it would be a shame that they should reduce its already limited content. Far better to spread it across BBC1 and 2, or take it all from BBC News 24 as this is simulcasted on BBC1 during this 4 hour period. – ID 420

Absolutely not: I suspect a very small percentage of people would actually be able to watch BBC HD at those hours, let alone have the equipment to do so. Your average viewer would much rather access BBCi and any other channels which are still running through the night. I think you would upset a lot of Freeview customers if this were to happen. – ID 405

No. The loss of those services would be a huge blow for Freeview. I REALLY hope this does not happen. – ID 488

I do not, since the Trust does not consider the impact on the 2008 Olympics interactive service. In order to broadcast the Olympics from Beijing live, the BBCi streams would be used, and probably one of the news loops. The withdrawal of the streams and news loops would adversely affect the live multi-sport coverage the Olympics had in 2000 and 2004. The BBC should consider the benefit of one HD stream vs. live multi-event coverage of the Olympics. Also, as noted earlier, simulcasting News 24 on BBC One overnight appears to be wasteful of bandwidth, and I wonder whether bandwidth freed from not simulcasting News 24 could instead be used for BBCi. – ID 544

No, as the benefits from the 4 hour service are marginal at best, the loss of the loop of the BBCi news headlines cannot be justified, especially given that during those hours suggested, there is not rolling news, but often feature programs that do not break for the headlines on the 1/4 hours. – ID 666

No, I believe that BBC Four is a great channel, I would happily forgo all BBCi services as I believe that interactive TV is 2nd best to the internet given the availability of broadband and the %age of the population that has access to bbc.co.uk I believe this is where you should concentrate.

Removing the BBCi channels could free the space for HD Channel? – ID 716

I certainly do NOT agree. Loss of BBC Parliament would remove the BBC's capacity to televise all-night debates and, secondly, BBC Four's informative documentary programming could be expanded during this time of night. I question why BBC Three's status remains untouched? – ID 739

3.10.5 CONCLUSION

70.8% of respondents agreed with the Trust's conclusion that the loss of the nominated services from Freeview would be outweighed by the benefit of offering the four hour overnight HD service.

Those respondents who agreed tended to feel that, without having access to audience figures, or potential audience projections for the four hour HD service, the existing overnight services were not widely used and could be accessed at other times or through other platforms. Therefore the available time slot could be beneficially used for the four hour preview of the HD channel.

Some respondents partially agreed but did not want to see one or more of the channels lost – in particular BBC Four.

20.5% of respondents disagreed with the proposal, either because they felt it was a waste of resources, the existing channels should not be lost or it would be better to wait for the full nine hour channel.

3.11 Question 11

Do the conditions proposed in the draft BBC service licence for the HD channel seem appropriate?

3.11.1 TABULATION

Q11	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	396	69.23%
No	50	8.74%
Indifferent	2	0.35%
Don't know	60	10.49%
Other	13	2.27%
No Answer	51	8.92%
Total	572	100.00%

Nearly 70% of respondents agreed that the conditions proposed in the draft BBC service licence for the HD channel seem appropriate. Only a limited number of respondents made comments in relation to this question on different issues.

3.11.2 AGREE

Yes, the limits on sport and feature films seem appropriate given BBC HD's remit. The changes to the existing licences are minor and justified given BBC HD's potential. – ID 341

At this moment in time yes, but I would hope this is reviewed before 2009 as I expect the demand for HD to grow dramatically in 2008 once people start realising that HD doesn't just mean Sky. – ID 552

3.11.3 AGREE WITH CLARIFICATIONS

Yes with the proviso on getting an agreed standard for Freeview and extending the hours where appropriate. – ID 352

Yes with the exception of 1080p broadcast. It would be important to push this through right now to ensure that broadcaster and consumers use the best broadcast available, from the start. Now, one would need to consider whether or not set top boxes can adapt a 1080p signal to lower resolutions. But as most people will need to buy a new set top box anyway, it would be worth considering. – ID 551

Yes - with the caveat that the interim service should be made available straight away. It should not wait to review whether or not to launch this service. I don't believe it would impact negatively, or confuse consumers. Those consumers who want the interim service, will be early

adopters or those wanting/ keen to watch HD content (i.e. BBC HD) on their HD-ready (DVB-T) TV's and will likely be very tech savvy and aware that another set-top box upgrade will be required in the future to receive the full-nine hour service. Having to wait to earliest 2009 to watch HD content would be more frustrating for those with HD-ready TV's but no platform available from which to fully utilise/ appreciate the technology (HD -ready TV). – ID 615

Not fully - if the comments made above are taken into account. The Licence should give the Executive the authority to provide additional HD simulcast channels for BBC1-4 and CBBC as soon as capacity becomes available. Could this be achieved by simplifying sub - regional coverage for the evening local opt outs to principal bulletins - referring users to switch to Freeview? Behind these comments is the view that the BBC Trust should discuss with government and Ofcom as part of the Freeview mode switch discussions - the issue of Freeview's basic role. In my view it will, in the medium to long term, become a support service - with Satellite the main provider. The rapid transition of all the BBC's output to HD should not be constrained by any attempt to require platform neutrality for the BBC's output and increasingly restrain the BBC as the leading national provider of high quality leading edge programming. – ID 617

3.11.4 DISAGREE

No - I would rather see extra spectrum 'ring-fenced' for new HD channels. I want a HD future - which means to me at least the current BBC1, BBC2, ITV1, Channel 4, Five and say a local channel (in my case Channel M) all in HD on Freeview. One HD channel is a start but with all the old channels gone - not all the spectrum should be sold off to the highest bidder. Space for five to ten HD needs to be made available. They could get rid of those +1 channels and all those Shopping channels!! (rant over) – ID 357

Not really....some of this seems to be political fudge. Why not just agree to the service and then roll it out to relevant platforms as and when they are capable of taking it. i.e. for satellite and cable: NOW and Freeview: once suitable hardware is available. As host broadcaster for the Olympics, it'd be a shame if the majority of UK people couldn't see it in HD...! There's only 5 years to go. We need HD up and running ASAP to ensure as many people as possible can see this spectacle. – ID 358

Focus on 1080i vote for 1080p now to be adopted on a fixed timescale; do not give BBC value away to commercial companies like Sky and Virgin – ID 369

No 4 hour should use MPEG2. 9 hour service can use DVBT2 / MPEG4. There should be NO channel logos on the broadcast pictures. HD should be free of on screen graffiti and clutter! – ID 495

No. We need ALL BBC channels available in HD. Start with BBC1 and BBC 2, and then expand to all the other channels. Ladies and Gentleman of the trust, this is the future and you are failing the British public with this half hearted approach. We are falling being the developed world in broadcasting standards and need to catch up. – ID 646

No - Put HD on the back burner and invest the money in the services people are actually watching/using – ID 716

No. as I have said, if high definition is going to be the future then let us wait until we can have it on all channels and do away with the present standard – ID 726

No. At the current rate of technological adoption the BBC will have the entire population of the UK paying taxes simply to own computers, mobile phones, internet connections and data storage devices. The only way forward for the BBC to embrace new technologies is for them to charge subscription rates on an introductory basis, until the technology becomes standardised. – ID 739

Not the loss of services from Freeview for such a pathetic offering of four hours. – ID 815

3.11.5 OTHER COMMENTS

Arbitrary percentages of time allocated to different types of viewing may be unhelpful. The controlling factor should value of HD in each production. HD may change production values. – ID 460

I would want the BBC to commit to an early adoption of the HD standard company wide and move towards 24/7 HD broadcasts on ALL channels as soon as possible. – ID 496

3.11.6 CONCLUSION

69.2% of respondents agreed that the conditions proposed in the draft BBC service licence for the HD channel seem appropriate. Only a limited number of respondents made comments in relation to this question on different issues.

19.2% of respondents either said "Don't Know" or "No". A further 8.9% did not give a response.

3.12 Question 12

Are there any other issues you would like the BBC Trust to consider in relation to the proposal?

3.12.1 TABULATION

Q12	Frequency	Percentage
Increase HD broadcast	57	9.97%
Launch HD ASAP	46	8.04%
Quality is essential	36	6.29%
Availability for majority	24	4.20%
Educate and inform public	18	3.15%
Cost to viewer	12	2.10%
Other	113	19.75%
No	266	46.50%
Total	572	100.00%

At this final opportunity for respondents to address any further issues, a wide variety of responses were given by just over 50% of the sample.

3.12.2 COMMENTS

Increase HD broadcast

I would like to see 24 hour-a-day HD content on BBC HD (satellite/cable) as soon as possible. No better way to showcase what is best about the BBC - some of its original programming. - ID 379

Only that speed is important. Don't wait ages before the full BBC HD channel is available. I love the current trial version but wish it was available for more hours in the day! – ID 447

The hours of programming seem adequate for weekdays but I would prefer to see a full day's HD transmission on weekends. - ID 449

Long term switch to HD versions of all BBC channels on satellite as HD becomes the new standard. – ID 513

After speaking to friends who have watched HDTV, it is unanimous that the government make available all of the current TV bandwidth to HDTV instead of selling it to the highest bidder and betraying future Freeview customers from enjoying high quality low cost output. – ID 551

We are falling behind the developed world in broadcasting standards and need to catch up. In the US, Comcast cable and Dish satellite

network provide many HD channels as standard. The least the BBC can do is provide their channels in HD. ITV will follow suit as soon as it becomes obvious that the need to, to keep up. It will also put pressure on BSB-Sky, as their HD technology has significant technical problems, and thus the BBC would regain market share. ID - 646

Provision of all newly commissioned series to be available in HD. ID - 694

Please simply work steadily towards full HD, an interim 4-hour HD service is only of any value as a test. ID - 804

Please don't plan for 9 hours; plan for 24. ID - 819

Launch HD ASAP

Please don't spend years debating the issue. It is needed NOW. ID - 363

Launch BBC HD as soon as possible - it will be a massive benefit to Freeview. ID - 374

The huge investment in HD Ready and Freeview that has been made by the viewer over the last several years - we have been waiting patiently - but shouldn't be made to wait any longer. ID - 498

Move forward quickly and decisively. The hardware has been out there for too long to not be used to its fullest extent. ID - 542

Please speed it up. The States has been using HD channels for years and we are just waiting and waiting!! There is so much HD content available of US/Australian programs. We need to follow quickly. ID - 543

Please get more HD available on satellite and cable soon, and then do Freeview at a date that is possible after this. ID - 595

I would like to urge the trust to allow the BBC HD channel to go ahead. I have had a Sky HD box for several months now with a full HD subscription and I have actually watched the free BBC HD channel more often than Sky's HD channels - which do not always show HD content!! This is a major advancement in TV technology which must be made available to as many people as possible and the BBC should lead the way as the major TV broadcaster in Britain. ID - 710

Quality is essential

Don't let Ofcom boss you around. The licence fee payer wants the best that technology provides. ID - 425

We would like the HD technical quality to be matched by the programme content, production and presentation. ID - 499

I would like all BBC channels to be HD without any charge (apart from a one-off cost too but a box and dish). I am keen that we have better quality programmes rather than quantity. I am also very keen on sound quality and would like to see improvements to the sound quality of BBC radio on all platforms. ID - 537

High definition television should comprise not just the video picture quality issue of 1080i, but also due consideration for higher bitrate audio streams too - particularly when (as I hope you do) you begin transmitting high definition movies. ID - 758

I believe the BBC is an international flagship for the UK. An institution representing quality throughout, particularly the documentary and news services! Please ensure that such a reputation is maintained throughout, ranging from not just the content and nature of the program, but the quality it's presented in. ID - 828

Availability for majority

BT Vision and on demand services through that route are growing rapidly, the BBC should be working closely with BT to provide the majority of the public with what they want (which isn't overpriced satellite services). ID - 364

The BBC Trust should set an objective to the BBC, that anyone in the UK can see all of the Olympic broadcast for London 2012 in HD by investing in HD TV equipment and a moderately costing set top box. Use the Olympics to make a breakthrough! ID - 369

Consumers are now looking to find digital TV services as analogue switch off starts (October 17, Cumbria). The BBC Channel should be used proactively to turn people on to HD and all efforts should be used for Freeview HD to happen. People now want quality not so much quantity and HD once seen remains with you. ID - 375

Supporting IPTV more, as this offers a pay-as-you-watch option for customers who can not afford Sky and are not in cable area. ID - 403

It is very frustrating to know that many of the excellent programmes made by the BBC are produced in HD but are not available to the

licence-payer without paying a subscription to a third party. BBC HD services of satellite would stimulate the development of commercial free-to air channels to the benefit of viewers who are investing in HD screens but are being denied access to subscription-free services. Launching on DTT would create a platform which prevented access to new commercial entrants, against the public interest. ID - 441

Making HD on the BBC available for those on low incomes so they do not miss out or feel they should get into debt affording the service providers. ID - 475

Concentrate on Freeview only, you should be supporting this cheap platform, not helping out satellite and cable companies by providing your quality output on their platforms. ID - 814

Educate and inform public

Please consider that all current BT Vision subscribers already have a set-top-box capable of decoding MPEG-4 broadcasts, as well as recording. The overnight service could be advertised to these users, and I would suspect that take-up would increase considerably considering the amount of people that are buying HDTV's at the moment. The overnight service is an excellent idea that I am sure will be used by many people. ID - 437

The general education of the public about the benefits of HD. A lot of people are still confused even by the basic digital broadcasting. There needs to be a much bigger push to educate people of the benefits. Many people have bought HD compatible televisions and have just assumed that they are watching high definition by default. ID - 529

The public would need time to swallow the idea of needing another hardware upgrade to receive HD via DTT. Most have a hard time understanding the concept of HD Ready TVs as it is. ID – 554

Cost to viewer

Impact to licence fees. ID – 382

Licence fee increases should not occur until the population all have the facility to receive and view HD. ID - 731

4.1 Four hour preview only question

Should the BBC launch the four hour interim service in 2008, even if that means buying two set-top boxes within a very short period of time?

4.1.1 TABULATION

N. B. 34 respondents had replied to both the full consultation and Q7 only, therefore their responses to the full consultation have been included to avoid duplication

4 hr preview	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	175	61.40%
Yes - But inform public of upgrades needed	11	3.86%
Yes – Cost-dependent	11	3.86%
Yes - Provides a taster	5	1.75%
Yes - TOTAL	202	70.87%
No	52	18.25%
No - Technology needs to be better	11	3.86%
No - TOTAL	63	22.11%
Cost-dependent	2	0.70%
Technology needs to be better	5	1.75%
Other	13	4.57%
Total	285	100.00%

Of the respondents who replied only to Question 7, nearly 71% were in agreement with the proposal.

4.1.2 AGREE

BBC needs to keep up-to-date

Given how your competitors are already so far ahead of you, it's imperative that you get any form of HD accessible via Freeview *NOW*. Otherwise, the gap will just widen, people will buy into Sky HD, and you'll never claim them back. – ID 97

I think the BBC as a world leader in television should be at the forefront of TV and that means High Definition. Technology will always keep changing and no doubt in 2-3 years time another technology will take place. The BBC needs to offer HD broadcasting now. – ID 103

A four hour HD service would be a valuable tool in promoting HD services and products, which provide vast improvements in sound and picture. As a consumer I would like to see more HD channels appearing. If the advent of the four hour service by the BBC is likely to encourage other broadcasters to develop their services, then I would like the four hour service to go ahead next year and would be willing to buy the first HD box to receive this service and the second when it becomes available. – ID 122

As long as people are informed

Yes, providing HD on Freeview as soon as possible would showcase HD and allow people who want HD without satellite the opportunity. As long as the facts are made clear then I see no issue. – ID 27

I would not mind having to purchase a 2nd set-top box in the interim providing the price wasn't too bad. I would like, however, for this to be made VERY, VERY clear to the public. Also the costs would have to be around the same as a current set top box for the purchase to be viable. – ID 29

I believe that the BBC should launch the HD DTT interim service immediately, even if it is only for four hours, to allow those who have invested in HD compatible TVs to take advantage of them. Early adopters should be given the opportunity to buy current HD DTT compatible boxes and then replace them later on when necessary, provided that the BBC makes it clear that this will be needed. – ID 30

Many viewers have HD compatible TVs but very little HD material to watch on them. It is therefore of keen interest to those customers to receive HD services as soon as they can be provided. Additionally it is solely up to the viewer to decide if they want to invest in one or two more set-top boxes rather than it being decided for them. As long as the BBC make clear to viewers that future technology changes may require a further set-top box purchase, then this leaves it entirely to the viewer to decide whether they invest now, or wait. Set-top box prices have continually fallen, and compared to the cost of an HD ready TV, the cost of ownership is still comparatively small. I look forward to seeing Freeview based HD services very soon – ID 49

Yes, for HD to be a success it should be launched as soon as possible, as long as people are made aware that they would have buy two boxes within a short period of time. Many people have HD TV sets now, but there is very little HD content around. I currently watch BBC HD through Sky and the picture quality is fantastic!!!! – ID 60

Yes, I would prefer the four hour service to be launched as soon as possible. As long as people are made aware of the fact that the boxes

they buy may not be future proof it should be left up to the individual to choose whether to delay their purchases or not. – ID 87

As long as costs are not prohibitive

Yes, but it really depends on the retail cost of the digital set-top boxes that will be required. If they are as cheap as the DTT boxes are now, then yes I would upgrade. However, if they are prohibitively expensive I would wait until the full service is broadcast before upgrading my equipment. – ID 33

YES! The BBC should launch the Freeview HD service. The cost of set top boxes has dropped significantly now; additionally it will give people a choice and can only further the wider adaptation of HD and keep the momentum up on production companies to provide more HD content. – ID 78

Yes, I would prefer the BBC launch a four hour interim service on Freeview with the proviso that the cheapest HD Freeview set top box available should be reasonably priced. I would expect the cheapest box not to retail for more than £100. – ID 123

Want to watch HD TV without subscribing

In a word, YES! Short of buying an expensive satellite system or a HD-DVD or Blu-ray player, I have no affordable way of getting any HD content in the near future. I would absolutely buy an affordable box to watch the 4 hour HD channel, or, I could use my Mpeg 4 compatible BT Vision box. Loads of people are signing up to BT vision so there is a lot of people with compatible equipment already. Please don't make me wait for HD on my HDTV! – ID 44

Yes. Have been following closely the trial results on STBs and am willing to upgrade twice, having invested in an HD TV and starved of HD content. Would probably still be cheaper than installing dish, etc. – ID 47

I feel that HD services should be available to anybody, not just the customers of digital subscription platforms. – ID 54

Yes. Please, please launch the service as soon as possible. Getting HD content is expensive and Freeview viewers are being penalised to be forced to buy satellite equipment which is impossible to install in many cases due to planning restrictions. Paying for an updated STB is a viable option as manufacturers will probably provide updates to cover the new standards anyway. If necessary, don't advertise the service and provide warning messages to buyers. – ID 83

It would be best for the BBC to launch HD as soon as possible. Many people have HDD ready TVs with the only way of viewing being through expensive subscriptions. There are Freeview boxes existing that could receive this service at present i.e. BT vision and no doubt the launch would generate introduction of low cost Freeview equipment with HD ability. Gone are the days of keeping equipment for 20 years as models are very often replaced by the consumer for style and design as well as technological reasons far more frequently. – ID 118

I would be happy to have the 4 hour interim service, as at the moment there is no HD content that is free. I don't want to be forced down the Sky route as I dislike Sky as a company, and Cable is not an option in my area. Please launch a HD-TV service ASAP so that I can use the full potential of my investment in a HD-TV – ID 127

Launch as soon as possible

Have HD on Freeview as soon as possible. A large number of people have HD ready TVs now with no HD material to watch! – ID 32

Yes, as this means people who are desperate for HD on Freeview can get it, while people who are not as bothered can wait. – ID 111

But do not divert resources from full launch

I think that as long as resources were not diverted away from researching and implementing the 'final' HD service, then the interim service would be a good thing. I feel that this applies equally to the service providers (BBC etc) and the set top box manufacturers. – ID 36

Access through other platforms

Yes, Please offer the four hour service as early as possible as I have BT Vision and I believe this box is already compliant with MPEG4 services over the air. I would suggest yes, but please make it clear to customers that this would be the case. – ID 58

Yes please. HD television is clearly the future and it is important that the BBC is seen to be at the forefront of technological improvement, not lagging behind or dependant on commercial rivals. Set top boxes are affordable for most people and the pace of technological change means that they are likely to be superseded by superior models soon, regardless of the changing demands of a Freeview HD service. Also, there are a growing number of viewers who have Freeview tuners in their PCs. Some of these computer tuners, including my own, should be capable of receiving the proposed interim DVB-T and MPEG4 Freeview HD service without any modification. – ID 70

As I am a BT Vision user, I would have the ability to watch the 4 hour trial of this service. I would imagine that all the owners of the HD ready televisions that have been sold recently, are patiently waiting for a chance to see them in action. A 4 hour taster may well be enough to encourage people to back the full launch, and with prices of set top boxes falling all the time, I cannot see that being enough of a reason not to launch the 4 hour trial. – ID 76

Yes. Boxes are relatively cheap. Also note that if people have "Freeview sticks" for their computers, then no extra equipment is necessary to get the HD stream, just an MPEG-4 decoder, of which there are many available. – ID 99

4.1.3 DISAGREE

Wait for the full service

No. I think they should wait until the spectrum is available for a long term service – ID 125

I see no point in launching an interim service. Having just invested in an "HD ready" TV it is disappointing to learn that it will not cope with the new standards you are to trial and I will have to resort to buying yet another set-top box. Buying two is therefore not an option. Can you publicise the new standards so other people do not get caught like I have? – ID 82

I would prefer it if the BBC and other operators were to work on a scheme that "gets it right" from the word go, even if it does involve waiting longer for HD to arrive on Freeview. Customers may be willing to purchase one new box over a short period of time for HD; two is probably pushing it a bit. Some more time spent on development to ensure a consistent scheme that only requires one upgrade would be best, in my opinion. – ID 106

No. BBC and other public broadcasting efforts should be spent on establishing a long-term HDTV service in all broadcasting sectors. The public - myself included - are very wary of the old Betamax vs. VHS war in which people found themselves having to buy new videos when one format lost out. This is having detrimental consequences for HD-DVD / BluRay discs. Add to that the ITV Digital / On Digital debacle, BsB (remember them - the Squarial?), and you'll find that 'buy a box now, but in 4 months it won't work' will be a bitter pill to swallow for us public. Talk to other broadcasters about starting some joint HDTV services across satellite, cable & Freeview - you never know, the picture on ITV might one day be watchable! – ID 109

Facility to record

No. Who is going to watch HD in the middle of the night if a temporary set top box cannot record? The new set top box must be future compatible and able to record onto a hard disk. – ID 38

No. There is no point in an overnight service when no recording equipment exists which is able to capture HD quality broadcast. – ID 110

Should not replace existing services

I personally do not believe that launching the four-hour interim overnight service on Freeview is a good idea. I think it is wrong to expect the public to possibly have to replace their set top boxes in a short period of time. I also believe that it would be a retrograde step to deprive overnight viewers the streams of BBC4, BBC Parliament and the three BBCi services – ID 40

Majority of consumers will be "confused"

No. Early adopters are likely to have already switched to a subscription based platform to receive HD services. I would imagine the majority of the public still receiving analogue SD channels are already becoming confused about the digital switchover. I expect they would only anticipate having to purchase a STB once in order to receive digital signals. The launch of HD on Freeview should therefore coincide with the digital switchover, so consumers are only required to purchase one new STB. So digital STB's recommended for the switchover should be "HD ready" (assuming they will still have the capability to receive, decode and display standard SD channels on a SD TV set). – ID 43

No - too much confusion over digital switch over is already an Issue. Please wait to launch a full service on DTT! Those who want HD will have the option to obtain it through Freesat and Cable. Please give Digital switchover a chance. The British press and public will be very quick to say that they have been ripped off if they buy a digital box and then have to replace it in a short space of time. Those without digital TV at the minute will be the refusenics and the venerable they don't need confusing by rushing out HD with a box that needs replacing in a short space of time! Wait for spectrum capacity to be available then launch on DTT; Freesat and cable offer the opportunity to trial and perfect the format for the future. Let's not run before we can walk! – ID 115

4.1.4 CONCLUSIONS

Of the respondents who replied only to Question 7, 70.8% were in agreement with the proposal.

In line with those who responded to the full set of questions, respondents felt that the BBC needs to be keeping up-to-date with technology and that it was vital that people had the opportunity to view the HD channel without having to subscribe to a cable or satellite channel. However consumers should be made fully aware of the need to buy two boxes and that the costs should not be prohibitive.

Those who disagreed (22.1%) did so because they thought it would be preferable to wait for the full nine hour service or because they did not want to see the loss of the overnight Freeview channels. They also believed the need for two boxes would be confusing coming quickly after the digital switchover.

5.1 FREEFORM AND POSTAL RESPONSES

Nineteen freeform replies and one postal response were received by the final cut off date.

5.1.1 FREEFORM RESPONSES

Free response	Frequency	Percentage
Give the public the option to choose	3	15.79%
Launch HD TV ASAP	3	15.79%
Better to go for quality (of picture and sound) than quantity of channels	2	10.53%
All BBC channels should be on DTT	1	5.26%
Educate public on using PCs to watch HD TV	1	5.26%
Educate public, keep information simple and keep costs down	1	5.26%
Freeview doesn't need HD TV	1	5.26%
Launch HD TV full service	1	5.26%
Licence fee payers should not pay extra for HD TV	1	5.26%
Make Freeview available to all before launching HD TV	1	5.26%
Remove permanent logos on HD channels	1	5.26%
Use focus groups instead of public consultations	1	5.26%
Viewers shouldn't have to keep upgrading. Find a standard.	1	5.26%
What benefit is HD TV to old people with poor eyesight?	1	5.26%
Total	19	100.00%

As far as I'm concerned there is no need for High Definition channel yet on Freeview...but certainly have it on Freesat when it finally starts – ID 1

I don't really think it's essential that ALL BBC domestic channels are available on ALL possible platforms but they should ALL be made available on DTT in the highest available quality. That's where half the licence payers are – ID 2

I have worked in the Television industry since the early seventies, both as a domestic Television design engineer with Rank Bush Murphy (UK based Television manufacture and later with EMI. I have seen the

transition from 405 to 625 lines and the change to colour. Colour Television picture quality on 625 lines has remained very much static since the introduction of colour back in the late sixties. There have been great improvements in television components that have resulted in consistently good pictures over the life of the television receiver and I'm sure similar improvements at the camera/studio end. However, if one could take a first generation television set that was carefully and correctly set up, I would be VERY surprised if we could see any difference in picture quality between it, and today's television receivers. Digital television has some advantages over the old analogue system and some disadvantages. The advantages being 1. No colour fringing or bleeding 2. A clean picture with no added noise from the transmission system 3. A massive saving on bandwidth, but that is of no immediate advantage to the average viewer. The disadvantages seem to be - 1. The picture freezing or blanking out for a few seconds. This only occurs a very few times in an evenings viewing and seems to depend on the model as to freezing or blanking. 2. The digi-box is slower to respond to channel changes and can be susceptible to latching up. From normal viewing distances, I can see no difference between digital and analogue, (I am assuming good signal strength and a correctly set up television in both cases,) and I dispute the often voiced statement:- "Digital Television displays a better picture". If it really is better, could someone please send me comparison specs in terms of horizontal resolution with modulation depth percentage figures? Having said all that, we are stuck with digital television, and we have to make it work. First - keep it simple. Second - keep the cost down. I'm on my second digi-box (the first being designed for "On Digital" - first generation). Third - Educate the public. This is happening, but seems to be slow. I think we will learn a lot when the first analogue switch-off occurs next month. Now, you ask for comments about HDTV on Freeview. I am of the opinion that a new set top box, only four hours of HDTV, and only in the middle of the night, will not be in anyone's best interest. I believe it would be better to wait for the additional multiplex channel to come on line, and then go HDTV. Having said that, HDTV could be fitted into the existing Freeview network if some of the rubbish channels were removed - but that is a subject for another time – ID 3

I'd like to raise some points not in your consultation document: 1. Are the BBC sure that in choosing MPEG 4 they're choosing the best broadcast codec as VC1 is comparable and doesn't suffer from compression effects like MPEG 4 does? Specifically MPEG 4 suffers from "Mosquito Noise" problems when transmitted via satellite. As the BBC is starting from scratch this seems the ideal opportunity to cherry pick the very best quality codec possible. 2. Can the BBC make sure they transmit the HD broadcasts via satellite in the lowest compression possible as some US TV providers HD broadcasts suffer from severe artefacts caused by the over use of compression? See www.highdefinitionforum.com for threads with compression artefact

complaints. There seems little point in transmitting a HD picture to only then severely degrade the quality with artefacts as with some US providers. It would be better to have slightly less channels and a higher quality service than a few extra channels and a degraded picture. 3. Can the BBC please transmit HD Audio on their Satellite HD Broadcasts as there's a marked quality difference? With HD audio up to 40 times better and there seems little point in having a HD picture with Dolby Pro Logic which is sound quality from the 1980's. Many new receivers including the entire Onkyo range are now HD audio ready and by the time the BBC service is launched, this should be pretty much universal. I see no reason why HD audio couldn't be downscaled by the set top box via a switch option for those with older equipment or if not possible why Dolby Digital couldn't be transmitted in tandem given its very low bit rate. – ID 4

My family and I have been thoroughly enjoying the BBC's experimental HD service via Sky HD. We watch many programmes on the channel and are disappointed when we know a programme has been made in HD but is not shown on the channel (for example, the current series of 'Not Going Out.')

We are very much looking forward to the new permanent BBC HD channel when that takes over from the current service. One thing alone spoils our enjoyment. The Digital On-screen Graphic identifying the channel name is very irritating and distracting. For some reason, this seems even more so in HD than on an SD channel. It is, in our view, essential that the permanent channel carries no 'DOG'. In fact, please could we have the one removed from the current channel? We know what channel we are watching and don't need to be constantly reminded in this irritating and annoying manner. – ID 5

I welcome the Trust's provisional approval to the BBC's proposal for its HD service. HD is clearly here to stay and it is only right that BBC programmes should be made available in this format. I am happy to leave the decision on the timing of the DTT launch to others. I am however concerned about the issue of the cost which appears to be glossed over in the Trust's conclusions. There is a stated assumption (2.5) that the additional spectrum will be free. Hopefully this will be the case but the provision of the transmission equipment will most certainly not be. There is an acknowledgement (4.5) of the additional costs for production in HD over that in SD, with an expressed hope that this margin will narrow. I think it is entirely unreasonable to the vast majority of licence payers if the HD service diminishes in any way the range and quality of programming currently available from the BBC. This would include diverting funds to pay for it, either from the licence or from the proceeds of the sale of the BBC's production arm BBC Resources. Instead the service should be a premium service in very much the same way as the introduction of colour television. In time, if the differential has have been eroded and production costs equalised

and the transmission plant paid, for the different levels of licence could possibly disappear. – ID 6

Four hour viewing to take place ASAP on Freeview and the fact about the boxes having to be replaced is really not even coming into my consideration. Once you start everyone will require HDTV. It will become the norm----better picture better sound and there is nobody that can deny these facts-----sorry forgot about politicians who, given the chance, would argue that the clarity and sound was imagination and because everybody cannot receive the signal it must not be allowed. Carry on the good work and give the option to the general public to have a choice, BBC, Sky, Cable, value for money goes to the BBC. – ID 7

There are a lot of people with HD TV ready TV sets, myself included, who do not want to have to sign up to Sky's package, and already receive Freeview through an aerial. I appreciate the difficulties at the moment with terrestrial digital HD free view transmissions and would urge the BBC/ITV engineers to try and resolve those difficulties. I do not particularly want another piece of equipment cluttering up my lounge (a set top box) and have to install a satellite dish. – ID 9

The Trust must implement HD at the earliest opportunity. Ideally it should start immediately and transmit two channels matching the output of BBC 1 & 2 on digital satellite. While such a scheme is not practical on Freeview, a cut down version - probably broadcast overnight for recording - should be implemented as soon as is practically feasible. Since its inception the BBC has lead the way both editorially and technically. For the first time the Corporation is lagging behind by not offering a full HD service. The Trust now has an opportunity to correct this. Around half the homes in the UK are now believed to have sets that are HD ready. To see ITV, Channel Four and BSB, as well as other channels, ahead of the BBC is unacceptable to the licence payer. Please do not be confused by the Freeview issue – of course a full service should be made available on that platform when it can be technically achieved – but digital satellite is up and running and BBC 1 & 2 should be on there. – ID 10

In your consultation reference page "HDTV – questions about equipment" you fail to mention a very important point. Broadcast Freeview HD content can also be received by suitably equipped home PCs. Modern PCs using a sub-£20 TV tuner card and suitable PVR software (costing in the region of £10) were able to receive the Crystal Palace BBC HD trail, as far away as North Herts and Essex. The majority of HD-ready TVs allow SVGA computer input, which enables the high quality HD signal to be viewed. This was discussed in detail during the HD trail, on the AVforum.co.uk website, here: <http://www.avforums.com/forums/showthread.php?p=5653039#post56>

53039 For a UK-wide HD service, in particular a 4-hour overnight service, the use of home PCs in this way will allow many more people to trial HD content at a lower cost than implied by your statement. Also this PC route will be future-proofed for DVB-T2 via software upgrades.
– ID 15

5.1.2 POSTAL RESPONSE

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write from a technical background including early research and broadcast engineering, in my support of proceeding to the introduction of the final HDTV standard (DVB-T2) future in a normal public service provision. This directly avoids the further interim period with widespread temporary complexity for the BBC and thus the particular added cost in set-top box or integrated TV design for users.

Howbeit, the implementation of HDTV service as may have been seen already is to be greatly encouraged in quality towards the end finality of new provision for digital TV.

With this however the trial Preview Channel may be allowed to continue a little further.