

Title:

Forename:

Surname:

Name withheld 10

Representing:

Self

What additional details do you want to keep confidential?:

Keep name confidential

If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts?:

Ofcom may publish a response summary:

Yes

I confirm that I have read the declaration:

Yes

Additional comments:

There are eight generations of deaf people in our family and we have four deaf children and deaf relatives.

This is a collected view.

Question 1: Do you agree that it would be appropriate to increase the minimum contributions to alternative signing arrangements to bring them back to the 2007 level in real terms, and to make annual adjustments for inflation thereafter? If not, why not?:

Yes indeed but also to decrease the sign interpreted programmes and to increase sign presented programmes.

This would reduce the mainly redundant sign interpreted soap which we know many people detest.

Sign interpreted programmes should be reserved for just documentaries but NOT for any drama or soap programmes - it's illogical.

We have met many people and coming from a large deaf family, we know best.

Question 2: Do you agree that it would not be appropriate to base adjustments to the minimum level of contributions to alternative arrangements on comparisons with the costs of existing sign-presented programmes, or with general TV production costs? If not, why not?:

Currently BSLBT are finding it difficult for TV companies to tender for programmes as the costs are around £26k per programme and it won't be financially possible for a new company to start with this small amount of budget for any programme which meets the compliances set out by broadcasters.

In the view of this, we would need to see more money in the pot. It is unfair to say that the quality of the programmes in the mainstream would be affected by the money allocated for the BSLBT whereas the quality of the programmes with BSLBT are already compromised.

Question 3: Do you agree that it would be appropriate to make annual adjustments to the minimum contributions to alternative arrangements in line with the Consumer Price Index, and to make consequential change to the Guidance, as set out in Annex 4? If not, why not?:

Of course - we have to be realistic and follow the inflation costs.

BSLBT should not impose subtitles on their programmes as this is a cost outside their remit - BSLBT is for signed programmes (presented or drama based) - subtitles for these should come from the broadcaster.

Question 4: Do you consider that minimum signing requirements for relevant channels should remain fixed at 30 minutes a month or should rise progressively over a ten year period to 75 minutes a month? If the latter, do you agree that consequential changes should be made to the Code, as set out in Annex 4? Please explain the reasons for your preference. :

More signing - Yes please.

BUT

NOT interpreted - none, and I mean NONE of us watch ANY interpreted programmes.

There are many cultural conflicts with interpreting programmes, a recent research by University College Manchester has proved 100% of interviewees they met prefer presented than interpreted programmes. Translated programmes fall on deaf people's ears (mind the pun)

STOP wasting resources and money on interpreted programmes (drama and soap)

Keep a minimum with documentaries and get more deaf people presenting documentaries.

Question 5: Do you consider that the transitional arrangements set out in Figure 4 would be appropriate if relevant channels are made subject to rising

obligations? If so, do you agree that consequential changes should be made to the Code, as set out in Annex 4?:

Yes - we also need more varying programmes catered for deaf people but to realise the positive consequences that will befall on their hearing siblings and hearing counterparts as there are so many hearing people who would love to see and learn from sign presented programmes than interpreted.

Compare the number of programmes available for the hearing community and these catered for deaf people who RELY on sign language - It's logical to increase but at the same time to decrease the sign interpreted programmes.

We DO NOT WANT to see Hollyoaks interpreted, we do not want to see the children programmes interpreted - WE WANT SIGN PRESENTED programmes.

Please stop wasting your money, stop wasting our money, get real.

Question 6:Do you consider that minimum contributions by relevant channels to alternative requirements should remain fixed at £20,000 a year (adjusted for inflation) or should rise progressively over a ten year period to £50,000 a year (also adjusted for inflation)? Please explain the reasons for your preference.:

Rise to £50,000 per year.

We have paid our TV licences for many years and yet have received any top quality programmes presented by deaf people with quality.

Why not set up a monitoring team to ensure that quality is used with presenters (not interviewees).