

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Colin

Surname:

Presland

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:

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 do agree that apps on mobile devices could be useful for the young visually impaired. Who are capable of using them.

I am filling in the application form use an iPad. Text-to-speech are being used, also I am using speak to text for inputting most of 65 and older may not have a suitable demolition the text. I am also dyslexic as well is blind.

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?:

It is right that many people who are 65 and older may not have that sort of phone or tablet. However I do know some blind people and partially sighted people, who are older than 65 that use iPhones and tablets on a regular basis. They find them easy to use, when a family member or a friend have shown them how to use them.

So with a little bit of training. More pensioners would use interactive touchscreen technology. Plus the baby boomers are now using that sort of technology at work and at home. As soon as they get to pensioner age, then there will be more people using that sort of i device.

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? :

No. Why do we have to pay more for something which should already be there?

It's like we have to pay for the talking book service from the RNIB. While sighted people can go down the library to get a book out for free

I had sky television and paid for the sky talker. It was £50 at the time. I only used it for a couple of weeks before I got annoyed with it and stopped using it. I couldn't get my money back. I stop The sky talker, because electronic Asian voice which was hard for me to understand. I'm more likely to use a device like the sky talker if it was more of a natural voice.

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? :

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?:

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?:

Yes I will go with that, to have an additional equipment for voice EPG.

I would not like to pay twice, pay for their additional equipment to pay again for the new updated boxes when the voice EPG is integrated.

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? :

No I do not think that we should pay extra for these additional devices. The voice-over system is just our way of seeing what's on the screen, similar to audio description we don't pay any extra for that Service.

Additionally with all the cuts to the welfare more people who are disabled find it harder to paid for their day to day living.

I'm now using the talktalk youview TV system. I'm one of the lucky people on the TV trial. Which has assessability features to it. While one of the Assessability features is the zoom text EPG facility. which I find extremely useful. But when i go in to the interactive section i.e. Iplayer the zoom text does not work. Another feature is turning the text white and black, find it clearer to use. So if talktalk can provide the additional features for anyone to use. Am sure that other TV providers could possibly put on the speaking EPG free of charge.

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?:

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?:

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)?: