

Consultation response form

Your response

Question 1: Do you agree with our assessment of the key issues involved to inform regulations in this area?	Confidential? – Y/N
Question 2: Are there other ‘access services’ which you believe should be specified in any regulations?	Confidential? – Y/N
Question 3: Do you have views on the relative importance of sign-presented programming and sign-interpreted programming?	Confidential? – Y/N I could not find any relevant information regarding this but I would agree that sign presented programming are much desired and provides the best option compared to sign interpreted programming especially British Sign Language is a different language and translating it would lose out a lot. A number of interpreters provided by SignPost and Red Bee Media are not well suited for the programmes which are left as white elephants in the media, we would use these resources more efficiently with sign presented programmes instead.
Question 4: To what extent can or should regulations require usability features including (but not necessarily limited to): provision of information; accessible catalogues; and best practice relating to the creation, selection, scheduling and presentation of accessible programming? If you do not believe that these features should be required by the regulations, should the regulations require Ofcom’s resulting code to give guidance on these issues?	Confidential? – N We should see more Deaf presenters on mainstream programmes as we are equal rather than being sidelined to the interpreting route.

<p>Question 5: Do you agree that audience benefit, cost, and practicability are appropriate grounds for differentiating services/content for the purposes of regulations? Are there other grounds on which you believe ODPS programmes/services should be differentiated (prioritised, excluded, or subject to different requirements)?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>No services should be differentiated for any customers as we are all equal in society.</p>
<p>Question 6: Should the regulations impose more stringent requirements on public services broadcasters' ODPS than on ODPS provided by others?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Yes.</p>
<p>Question 7: Should the regulations limit accessibility requirements to programmes/services which have previously been broadcast with access services, or impose more stringent requirements on these programmes/services?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>It is sad to see that we have to fight for accessibility here where it should have never been an afterthought.</p>
<p>Question 8: Do you consider that ODPS programmes/services should be excluded from the full requirements on the grounds of audience size? If so, should there be different requirements for excluded programmes/services?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Absolutely not!</p>
<p>Question 9: Should the regulations impose different accessibility requirements on ODPS made available via certain platforms, and if so which?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Definitely not!</p>
<p>Question 10: Do you have any views or information on appropriate and available means of measuring the audience impact of ODPS?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>If you don't have it, you may not know you have not got it.</p>
<p>Question 11: Are there particular types/genres of programming which should be excluded from requirements, or subject to reduced requirements, on the grounds of limited audience benefit?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>This is discrimination in anyone's perception</p>
<p>Question 12: Do you consider that ODPS programmes/services should be excluded from the full requirements on the grounds of</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>No, definitely not.</p>

affordability? If so, should there be different requirements for excluded programmes/services?	
Question 13: Do you have any views or information on appropriate and available means of quantifying: ODPS-specific revenue; and costs associated with ODPS access services?	Confidential? – Y/N
Question 14: If you are an ODPS provider, do you have information on the likely costs involved in providing access services on your ODPS?	Confidential? – N Not applicable.
Question 15: Do you consider that ODPS programmes/services should be excluded from the full requirements on the grounds of technical difficulty? If so, should there be different requirements for excluded programmes/services?	Confidential? – N What technical difficulties? If we can send a man up to the moon and communicate with them then the ODPS technical requirements are a walk in the park!
	Confidential? – N Why should we impose percentages? Is it something for them to tick against their quotas? A number of broadcasters have by-passed their quotas with repeated programmes which should not count.
Question 17: Do you think that there should be a phased introduction of requirements? If so, please give details.	Confidential? – N No - what are we waiting for, they are all available. We've waited decades.
Question 18: Do you think that the introduction of requirements should prioritise particular types of ODPS programmes or services?	Confidential? – N We should not discriminate particular types here.
Question 19: Should ODPS providers be able to	Confidential? – N

propose alternative arrangements, and if so what type of arrangements?

They should pool in their resources for something like the BSLBT to create a regular weekly programme non-deaf issues related but presented in British Sign Language.

Question 20: Do you have any other comments or information you wish to share in relation to the drafting of regulations on ODPS accessibility?

Confidential? – Y

The standard of interpreting by a number of deaf people from SignPost and Red Bee Media are nowhere near satisfactory enough for broadcast, there should be an external monitoring service to ensure that quality is maintained.

We need to set standards for the interpreters and to continue to monitor their output.