

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

Option 2

1. Under the current law, blind people are currently unable to access 90% of the visual media and are therefore disadvantaged in keeping current on various topics. They also are denied access to non-verbal communications with the exception of audio descriptions. NVC's account for over 80% of most communication via nuance according to most work by HR and psychology field experts.
2. A 20% threshold would go a long way toward closing the gap of common access and understanding
3. I believe all stations should play a part in the social responsibility - and I do not believe only public stations should endure costs which might put them at a competitive disadvantage if their competitors (the non-public stations) are not required to bear the associated costs and create AD media
4. Finally, public entities should not be allowed to make media from a tax base which is paid for by blind persons who have no access to it.

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

I do not know if union contracts play any part in blocking the solution of creating greater access to media, but I would like to suggest the creation of a volunteer organisation which can help create the audio-descriptive contents. These volunteers would exceed the targeted 20% threshold and work from historical archives of existing media. That is, I would ideally like to see a 20% mandate for AD, combined with augmented access via voluntary organisation, possibly including drama students from many of England's great drama schools.

Comments: