Please find below responses to your consultation re the proposed changes to data collection on the accessibility of On-Demand Services. As a regular AD user, my responses will mainly be coming from this angle. However, I feel that the need to consider Signing and subtitles is also important in this process.

Question 1 - the way in which data is collected.

I agree with the change to collect data twice yearly and putting the on-demand services in the same data collection process as the broadcast services. As someone who regularly uses On-Demand Services, and with them becoming more widely available, it only seems right that they are seen the same way that broadcast TV is. Service providers need to be made aware of the importance of giving both types of services equal recognition and therefore providing a consistent and equal level of accessibility across the 2 services. I do often feel quite limited when accessing on-demand services, as AD is very infrequent and is restricted to specific service providers. I also think that collecting the data at the same time for both services and making it an obligation to provide this data would mean that service providers may be encouraged to reflect themselves re the provision of accessibility features across the 2 services.

Question 2 - the type of data that is collected

Again, I agree with the type of data collected under the proposed plans. If one specific service such as channel 5 has multiple brands, then it is only right that they should be expected to declare what level of accessibility is being shown with respect to each service. It all comes down to equal access, as a blind person, why should I be restricted to a specific part of a service because of lack of accessibility. Additionally, keeping the current method of assessing accessibility across all platforms is key. With the range of devices giving access to on-demand services and with them becoming more accessible to AD users, naturally they will want to be aware of what devices are better for audio description.

Question 3 - data published

Yes, publishing data twice yearly seems fair. With the range of devices and programmes constantly changing, it would be quite difficult to keep up when trying to understand results if they were published every quarter. However, publishing them twice yearly would enable people to see how they started out and where they are half way through the year, and then make plans to improve for the following year. Plus, for consumers, it means that they are not constantly having information thrown at them.

My additional thoughts.

Audio description is the only way that I can really enjoy and engage fully with TV content. I therefore feel that it is vital that it should be more widely available through on-demand services. As a blind person, I would like the same right as my sighted peers to watch tv, when I would like, how I would like to access the content and where I would like to watch it.