

**Question 1: Do consultees agree that these are appropriate policy objectives for Ofcom in considering possible alternative arrangements for signing on television?:**

These are fair, but how can TV companies actually know the true figures of people watching either sign presented programmes or programmes with in-vision signers?

**Question 2: Do consultees agree that Ofcom has identified appropriate options?:**

Yes, the Deaf Community would like more but if a Community Channel is set up that would offset some of the disappointment

**Question 3: Do consultees agree with Ofcom's reasons for rejecting the ideas described in paragraph 3.18?:**

Yes and no

**Question 4: Do consultees agree with the proposals outlined in paragraph 3.32?:**

Hard to know which paragraph is which on the Plain English website -so cant really respond.

**Question 5: Do consultees agree that the aim should be to put any new arrangements in place from the start of 2008?:**

That would be good if it can happen

**Question 6: Do consultees have any comments on the impact assessment? Where possible, it would be useful for arguments about the cost of different options to be supported by relevant data.:**

In vision programmes are useful and many are educational and they appear to be cheaper - wish they could be moved to a more appropriate time for viewing as not all Deaf people have video recorders.

As long as Deaf people are able to provide information to the Trust Fund it would be appropriate - it would also be important for TV Channels to contact and liaise with Deaf tv, film and media producers for information and advice about programmes presented in sign language

**Question 7: Do consultees consider that the proposed revisions to the Code are sufficiently clear?..:**

Fair - but very little information has gone out to the Deaf Community - lack of access and publicity

**Comments:**

We do need more signed programmes, there is a dearth of good programmes with sign language presentations. Some programmes with in-vision signing is not always appropriate and can be difficult to view the signing.