Question 1: Which of the three options do consultees favour, and why?:

I prefer Option 2: 20% for all channels.

Given the current performance from your monitoring, and Sky's committment to 30% Audio description, it is clearly not a huge burden to the industry. Also, as the production of AD increases we will see innovation and volume driving down costs. AD is still a "Cottage" industry.

Much of the most interesting TV is on the non public service broadcast channels. They support minority interests and cultures. People with print disabilities find it really hard to get specialist news and information and entertainment.

Audio description is great for busy households who do not have a TV in the kitchen/eating area enabling us to keep up with a program even when not glued to the screen.

Question 2: Do consultees have any further suggestions for future access service provision? If so please provide the rationale for these suggestions:

In fact I'd like to see a higher target given the success of the industry according to your monitoring and Sky's committment to 30%.

Increased volume will drive innovation and cost reduction for access services.

I'd like to see broadcasters promote Audio description more, and OFCOM using its powers to require a certain audience reach with adverts. Currently it is only known to a few, though far more could benefit. It would help families socialise more as they would be less glued to the screen whilst doing family tasks like washing up, meal preparation etc. This to promote family cohesion.

Comments: