Title:

Forename:

Surname:

Name withheld 13

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

Email:

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:

Question 1:Do respondents agree with Ofcom?s initial assessment that apps for mobile devices have the potential to be useful for those people with visual impairments who feel confident using touch-screen technology and can afford a suitable mobile device? If not, why not? :

I agree as certainly Apple devices have accessibility options to aid using such apps.

Question 2:Do respondents agree with Ofcom?s initial assessment that apps for mobile devices are less likely to meet the needs of the majority of visually-impaired people who are 65 or older, both because they are less likely either to own a suitable mobile phone and because touch-screen apps present a number of actual and perceived barriers to use. If not, why not?:

I agree they are less likely to own one.

Question 3:Do respondents consider that it would be reasonable for visually-impaired viewers to pay more than sighted viewers for the ability to use EPGs or substitutes for the same purposes as sighted viewers? If so why? :

I feel that the price should be the same.

Question 4:Do respondents agree with Ofcom?s initial assessment that the speaking EPGs integrated into TVs and set top boxes may be easier for people with visual impairments to use than touch-screen apps? If not, why not? :

I agree speaking would be easier.

Question 5:Do pay TV service providers such as Sky, Virgin, Talk Talk and BT TV see additional obstacles that would prevent them from committing to including text to speech capabilities in the next planned upgrades to the receivers they offer to subscribers? If so, what are these obstacles? Absent regulation, would these obstacles make it impossible on commercial grounds to commit to the necessary investment?:

I am a Sky user and over time the TV guide has become more difficult to use. Firstly there used to be a setting where you could turn off the screen previewing what's on now and that got removed. The next upgrade saw a darker blue background whereby the TV guide area got smaller. This forces me to swap TVs between rooms because it was totally unreadable. This helped but speech would be a massive improvement and I feel that many devices now do take into account visually impaired ie Apple, Samsung including the TV you can talk to. Sky are yet to make real inroads into this area; yes there's the commentary explaining what's going on but if you can't find that programme in the first place it's pointless.

Question 6:If the cost of providing speech-enabled receivers to all those who subscribe to particular pay TV services would entail a substantial delay to the roll-out of such receivers to all subscribers, would it be feasible, quicker and more cost-effective to offer suitable equipment first to viewers with visual impairments?:

Definitely. Perhaps use the fact that people are registered and start with most severe sight loss.

Question 7:Do respondents consider that it would be reasonable to expect visually-impaired viewers to pay extra for equipment that allows them to use EPGs or substitutes for the same purposes as sighted viewers? If so, why? :

I feel the cost should be the same; you wouldn't expect someone who couldn't walk to pay more for a remote.

Question 8:Do licensors such as Freesat and Freeview see obstacles to using their leverage to require manufacturers to incorporate speaking EPGs in

future versions of products authorised to use their brands, such as Freetime and Freeview Connect?:

Not a user of this so not sure.

Question 9:What are the main types of cost that pay TV service providers would face in incorporating speaking EPG features into the next generation of their set top boxes?:

You'd of thought the technology was already very much there.

Question 10:What is the scope for connected platforms to avoid the need for specific TTS provision within consumer equipment by using cloud-based resources (e.g. speech files on a central server delivered to the device as required)?:

This would certainly mean less internal space required.