

From:

Representing (self or organisation/s): self

The following part(s) of this response are confidential:
Name/contact details/job title

Can Ofcom still publish a reference to the contents of your response (including, for any confidential parts, a general summary that does not disclose the specific information or enable you to be identified)?
yes fine

I confirm that the correspondence supplied with this cover sheet is a formal consultation response that Ofcom can publish. However, in supplying this response, I understand that Ofcom may need to publish all responses, including those which are marked as confidential, in order to meet legal obligations. If I have sent my response by email, Ofcom can disregard any standard e-mail text about not disclosing email contents and attachments.

My response is non-confidential (in whole or in part), and I would prefer you to publish my response only once the consultation has ended.

Do you consider that the requirement to ensure equivalent services for disabled end-users would require a mandated VR service in some form for BSL users?

Yes. I think an unrestricted Video Relay Service is the only way to ensure a telecoms service for BSL users which is equivalent to that used by hearing people.

But isn't this the point- that Deaf BSL users who need access to visual information to communicate and understand information and have so limited options- that this is vital?

Do you agree that a restricted service would be more proportionate in providing equivalence for BSL users than an unrestricted service?

No. I do not agree with the proposal to impose restrictions on access to VRS. An unrestricted Video Relay Service is the only way to ensure a telecoms service for BSL users which is equivalent to that used by hearing people.

Can you imagine the uproar if we told Hearing people you can only use the phone for 30 mins a month?! If it was that limit for a day they would riot!

Already Deaf people are penalised by mobile tariffs offering unlimited talk time which we can't access. Must we now be penned into a ghetto time frame of only using VRS Mon-Fri for 30 mins not a week but a month? Calls take 60% longer as BSL needs constant clarification.

Please provide your views on Methods 1 - 5 for a restricted VR service discussed above. Are there any other methods that are not mentioned that we should consider?

I do not agree with any of the proposed methods of restricting access to VRS. An unrestricted Video Relay Service is the only way to ensure a telecoms service for BSL users which is equivalent to that used by hearing people.

I am not an expert there could well be other options- how do we with our limited communication and access to information... and with our local Deaf services being cut- how do we find out?! But isn't this the point- that Deaf BSL users who need access to visual information have so limited options that this is vital? Could you not at least give us a higher allocation until cheaper options can be implemented?

Do you agree that a monthly allocation of minutes combined with a weekday/business hours service would be the most appropriate means to restricting the service?

No. I cannot agree with the proposal to impose these restrictions on access to VRS. An unrestricted Video Relay Service is the only way to ensure a telecoms service for BSL users which is equivalent to that used by hearing people.

What about emergencies? What about if I have something important to share or friends in need of support or encouragement? We all live far away from each other and often our families too as we seek work or we move to where Deaf services are better. If we work full time that means we can't even use our 30mins! This time isn't long enough for a proper phone call Also it represents at a minimum ONE call! Its less than a prisoner gets allowed and they've committed a crime! If that limit was imposed there would be cries about their human rights- what about ours? Are we not cut off enough already?

--

This mail is sent via consultation response form on VRS Today
<http://www.vrstoday.com>