

**Title:**

Ms

**Forename:**

Jill

**Surname:**

Wilkens

**Representing:**

Self

**What additional details do you want to keep confidential?:**

No

**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:**

These questions are really badly worded and difficult to interpret. A D/deaf person (or anyone for that matter) with below average literacy levels would not be able to make head nor tail of them. Did you really think about these questions or are you trying to deter people from answering them?

**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

**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?:**

Contributions to alternative arrangements should be set as high as possible and should not be pegged to a minimum.

**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?:**

At least in line with CPI. Preferably CPI +1.

**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. :**

Signing should be maximised and added wherever possible. This should either be in the form of minimum requirements or funding to specialist programmes with engage with deaf culture.

**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?:**

If possible the rise in obligation should be faster.

**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.:**

£50,000 per year is really a very small contribution to enable BSL users access to tv programmes in their first language. As a legally recognised language in the UK channel should be obligated to provide high quality content which is accessible to all viewers.