

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Closed Captioning of Video Programming) CG Docket No. 05-231
) ET Docket No. 99-254
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking)
Released July 21, 2005)
)

COMMENTS OF CAPTION COLORADO, L.L.C.

NOVEMBER 22, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. CAPTION COLORADO	2
3. GENERAL INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS	2
4. COMMENTS SPECIFICALLY REQUESTED BY COMMISSION	4
5. CAPTION COLORADO'S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING QUALITY STANDARDS AND ENFORCEMENT	14

CAPTION COLORADO, L.L.C.
5690 DTC Blvd., Suite 500
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
720.489.5662

Tad Polumbus
President, CEO

1. Introduction

Caption Colorado, L.L.C. is pleased to respond to the FCC's Notice to Refresh the Record ("NRR") on Notices of Proposed Rulemaking Regarding Closed Captioning Rules (the "NPRM") Released October 25, 2010, to examine the Commission's closed-captioning rules and appreciates the opportunity to do so.

2. Caption Colorado, L.L.C.

Caption Colorado, L.L.C. is a full service television closed captioning company offering both offline and realtime services for all types of television programming, including realtime services for breaking news and emergency news captioning. Our primary market niche is realtime captioning for local television stations and regional and local cable networks.

Our remarks have been prepared primarily by R.T. Polumbus, President and Chief Executive Officer of Caption Colorado, L.L.C., with significant input from other members of the company's staff. Mr. Polumbus has been the primary owner of Caption Colorado, and held his current positions with the company, for approximately 11 years.

3. General Introductory Comment

On November 8, 2005 Caption Colorado did file Comments in response to the FCC's request for same concerning its Rule Making Procedure identified above (herein "Original Comments"). Caption Colorado intends to update, refresh and supplement its Original Comments herein but, to the extent the Original Comments are not modified or changed by our Comments herein, they remain the opinions and recommendations of Caption Colorado.

As in its Original Comments, Caption Colorado's comments in this document will refer primarily to the non-technical quality standards being considered by

the Commission in its Rule Making endeavor and to both the positive and negative impact that non-technical quality standards and/or associated reporting, complaint procedures and enforcement rules could have on the industry. Caption Colorado generally believes that non-technical quality standards should be adopted by the Commission for both offline and realtime captioning but is concerned that the adoption of standards for realtime captioning could result in one of several serious potential adverse consequences to the television industry, the closed captioning industry and/or to deaf and hard of hearing and other users of closed captioning. Since Caption Colorado's opinion regarding offline captioning requirements remains unchanged from its Original Comments, we will primarily address real time captioning in these Refreshed Comments.

As it did in its Original Comments, Caption Colorado's concerns will be delineated more precisely below but, for the most part, the concerns will again fall into one of the following broad categories;

- i. The possibility of standards for realtime captioning being too difficult to define, apply and enforce due to the very nature of realtime captioning which requires captioners to make many subjective judgments and to use many industry accepted skills which are often difficult to track and that often result in what might be considered an error in offline captioning and other environments but should not be in realtime captioning.
- ii. The possibility of such imprecise and subjective non-technical quality standards being unfairly used as a basis for justifying viewer complaints, reporting or complaint response requirements for the television and/or captioning industries and/or as a basis for fines or other penalties for non-compliance with the standards.

- iii. The possibility of complaint procedures and/or response requirements, reporting requirements and/or fines for non-compliance being excessively expensive and/or time consuming, and creating unacceptable exposure to liability, for both the television and captioning industries; Also possibly resulting in caption companies exiting the business and reducing the amount of realtime captioning available to the deaf and hard of hearing viewers.
- iv. The possibility of reporting and response requirements and/or fines having the affect of pitting the television industry against the captioning industry in an adversarial relationship over responsibility for costs and liability, when exactly the opposite type of relationship is essential for teaming up on the challenging task of creating and delivering realtime captioning within the high quality technical and non-technical quality standards that the Commission is seeking.
- v. As a consequence of these concerns and others, Caption Colorado continues to be of the opinion that non-technical quality standards could be, and should be, defined and adopted for both offline and realtime captioning but, in the case of real time captioning, that such standards should not be used as a basis for fines or other time consuming or expensive response or reporting requirements.

4. Comments Specifically Requested By Commission

- A. FCC: “First, we seek to refresh the record on several issues raised in the 2005 Closed Captioning NPRM. Specifically, we seek additional comment on whether the Commission ... **should establish quality standards for non-technical aspects of closed captioning, ...**”

CC Response re Offline Captioning

With respect to Offline Captioning of pre-recorded materials, Caption Colorado's opinion has not changed from its original Comments and would incorporate those Comments for this response.

CC Response re Real Time Captioning

The Commission should establish standards for non-technical quality of realtime closed captioning for the purposes of clarifying and eliminating confusion about quality objectives and standards for the television and captioning industries; also for the purpose of providing deaf and hard of hearing viewers with clear and realistic expectations about the quality of realtime closed captioning. However, the potential use of realtime quality standards as a basis for regular periodic reporting requirements or as a basis for assessing fines or other penalties for enforcement purposes would not be appropriate, or in the best interest of the deaf and hard of hearing community, for many practical and other reasons discussed below. Their use for responding to specific viewer or FCC complaints might be appropriate depending upon the reliability and fairness of the specific formula adopted, and the time and cost of proving compliance with the adopted formula (see discussion below)

- B. FCC **“..., including, but not limited to accuracy of transcription, spelling, grammar, punctuation and caption placement,”**

CC Response re Offline Captioning

Quality standards for offline captioning should be limited to true “quality” issues such as “accuracy of transcription, spelling, grammar, punctuation, placement, identification of nonverbal sounds, verbatim and edited for reading speed.”

CC Response re Realtime Captioning

“Spelling, grammar and punctuation” are important and appropriate factors that should be considered in evaluating the non-technical quality of real time captioning. They should be used to measure the “Readability” of the captioning as discussed in more detail below. As far as “accuracy of transcription” is concerned, Caption Colorado is not sure if your reference to “accuracy of transcription” refers to the level of “accuracy” measured by a “verbatim transcription” of the words that were spoken, or to the level of “accuracy” in communicating the “meaning” of the words that were spoken. This is an important distinction in determining how to appropriately and fairly use this factor as a criteria in evaluating non-technical quality of real time captioning.

Generally, Caption Colorado believes that real time television captioners should strive for a high level of “verbatim” accuracy in their transcriptions, but use reasonable discretion to avoid literal verbatim transcription when it would distract from the enjoyment, accuracy or readability of the captioning. In the case of live television programming, a verbatim transcription would not always be easy or enjoyable to read, nor therefore, preferable to deaf and hard of hearing users of the captioning -- often due to false starts as the speaker clarifies what he or she wants to say, or due to unconscious repeating of the same words, thoughts or sentences while the speaker ponders what to say next, or perhaps due to the use of fillers such as “um, ah, you know” in the middle of a sentence or even when two or more speakers speak at the same time and sentences become broken, incomplete or split up. Realtime captioners are taught and trained to correct these instances, on-the-fly, to improve the quality of the captioning being read by the users.

In addition, realtime television captioners are often unable to keep pace with broadcasters when the broadcasters speak faster than even the best

and most experienced captioner in the industry are capable of transcribing. Similarly, realtime captioners are often unable to keep up with, or transcribe, what is spoken when more than one person is speaking at the same time. In these instances and other circumstances, it is appropriate for the captioner to paraphrase a clause or sentence with her or his own words, and/or to drop non-essential words or names, so long as the captioner correctly communicates the “meaning” of the spoken words.

All of the foregoing factors need to be taken into consideration when trying to establish quality standards that effectively and fairly measure the “accuracy of the transcription” and/or to classify what would or would not constitute an “error” in regard to “accuracy.” If a strict verbatim standard were used to determine the “accuracy of transcription”, all of the above accepted industry practices would inappropriately result in errors and a low quality score for the captioner. A verbatim quality standard would not, therefore, be an appropriate standard for measuring the “accuracy of a transcript.” As will be discussed below there are a number of other practical problems with the use of a verbatim standard, which make it an unfeasible means of defining or measuring “accuracy of a transcript.”

In the opinion of Caption Colorado, Caption Placement should not be a factor in measuring or evaluating the non-technical quality of real time captioning. Remote captioners often cannot even see the TV screen where overlays or screen conflicts might appear or which might offer the opportunity to determine the best positioning for the captioning. A good alternative, which Caption Colorado provides its customers with its proprietary technology, is to give the customers technical control over caption placement which can be used on-the-fly as screen conflicts appear from time to time.

C. FCC **“... what the adoption of such standards would cost to programmers and distributors ...”**

If the Commission were to adopt quality standards, significant reporting requirements and/or proof of performance requirements for responding to viewer or FCC complaints or to FCC fine assessments, the time and expense associated with such reporting and proof of performance measures would likely be too significant for either the FCC or the television or captioning industries to afford or enforce.

Caption companies are currently providing realtime captioning services to the television industry at rates that leave little room for profit. That circumstance persists today in spite of several significant reductions in captioner compensation that has rippled through the captioning industry over the past few years in response to significant reductions in the rates paid for captioning by the television industry. Due to those compensation reductions, the captioning industry has already suffered the loss of many highly quality captioners and it would likely lose another significant percentage of the remaining captioners if further compensation reductions should be necessary to offset the costs associated with quality control and reporting expenses and exposure to fines or similar penalties. The result could also be caption companies exiting the captioning industry thereby derailing the primary objectives of the FCC's captioning program.

It is important to note, however, that the ultimate cost of the monitoring and enforcement of quality standards will depend somewhat on the nature or type of quality standards adopted by the Commission. If the Commission, for instance, were to adopt quality standards that were based on a “verbatim” formula, or on a comparison of the real time transcript to the actual words that were spoken during the broadcast, a “perfect” verbatim transcript of the program audio for every real time

transcript that is evaluated, would have to be prepared in order to evaluate the degree of verbatim accomplished in the real time transcript. The cost of preparing a verbatim transcript for the quality evaluation would be 2 to 3 times the original cost of the real time captioning itself, and would certainly prohibit the use of a verbatim standard for high volume monitoring or reporting purposes ... probably also even for responding to specific individual complaints or challenges.

In addition, a “perfect” verbatim transcription of any live program or event is nearly impossible to create, even using professional transcriptionists with plenty of turnaround time. It is certainly not possible today using automated speech recognition technology which is highly unreliable, inconsistent and inaccurate. An even slightly inaccurate verbatim transcript would compound the number of errors that show up in the quality evaluation and that truly exist in the real time transcript. These types of problems tend to eliminate the potential use of a verbatim standard for evaluating the accuracy of a transcript since it would be unreliable and would result in unfair evaluations.

The person creating the perfect verbatim transcript would also need an audio recording of the live program from which the necessary verbatim transcript could be prepared. Audio recordings or other sources for the audio are not easily come by and are seldom produced in the normal course of business in either the television or the real time captioning industry. It would be quite expensive to resolve this problem. In addition, in order to assure having an audio recording available for any specific program at the time a complaint is filed, all of the programs that are captioned on TV would have to be recorded and those recordings stored and managed until they are needed. Another extremely impracticable and expensive requirement.

D. FCC “ ... whether the captioning pool consists of an adequate number of competent captioners to meet a non-technical quality standard mandate ...”

As Caption Colorado indicated in its Original Comments, the adoption of non-technical quality standards by the FCC could have a serious negative impact on the number of captioners in the industry. For instance, if the FCC established performance standards that represented a high, or optimal desired objective, only a small percentage of the existing captioners in the market would likely be able to meet the standards. If the FCC adopted “average” level standards, approximately half of the captioners in the market would be expected to be able to meet the standards. If a low level was established in order to try to keep all of the current captioners to assure adequate supply, the quality standards would be watered down and not be of much value in assuring high quality captioning.

As stated in our General Introductory Comments above, Caption Colorado generally believes that non-technical quality standards should be adopted by the Commission for realtime captioning but is concerned that the adoption of standards for realtime captioning could result in one of several serious potential adverse consequences to the television industry, the closed captioning industry and/or to deaf and hard of hearing and other users of closed captioning. One of those adverse consequences is the potential reduction in the number of captioners due to their inability to meet the quality standards. That is why we suggested in our Original Comments that the Commission do a study of

quality levels that current exist in the market place before it adopts standards. Caption Colorado believes standards should reflect reasonably attainable quality levels but that no fines or similar penalties should be established that would force the caption companies to reduce their captioner teams to only those captioners who are capable of meeting the standards. That would not be in the best interest of the deaf and hard of hearing community or any of the other parties involved.

E. FCC **“... whether different captioning quality standards should apply to live and pre-recorded programming.”**

Caption Colorado definitely believes that different captioning quality standards should apply to live and pre-recorded programming. See our Original Comments for a full discussion of the differences we recommend.

F. FCC **“We also seek additional comment on whether to establish specific per violation forfeiture amounts for non-compliance with the captioning rules, and if so, what those amounts should be, and whether video programming distributors (VPDs) should be required to file closed captioning compliance reports.”**

As discussed in several sections above and below, Caption Colorado does not feel forfeiture amounts or fines are appropriate for non-compliance with non-technical quality standards for many reasons. The financial condition of the captioning industry is currently very marginal and the VPD's will attempt, through their vendor captioning agreements, to hold the caption companies liable for any such forfeitures or fines. Standards, coupled with

forfeiture or fine enforcement means, will also cause the caption companies to let all of the captioners go who are not capable of meeting the quality standards to protect themselves against the threat of the penalties. That, of course, will reduce the number of captioners in the market place and endanger the capacity of the captioning industry to meet all of the needs of the television industry under the FCC regulations.

If forfeiture or fines are going to be adopted to enforce non-technical quality standards for real time captioning, Caption Colorado would strongly recommend that a “violation” be defined to be an average performance over a specified period of time, or number of programs, etc. and that it also be defined by program categories that involve similar captioning conditions, challenges and difficulty. The fines might also be based on a sliding scale depending on how many violations a VPD has within specified time periods.

Again, as discussed in several different places in these Comments and in Caption Colorado’s Original Comments, Caption Colorado is strongly against burdensome reporting requirements for VPD’s because those requirements will be passed on to their captioning vendors who cannot afford the cost of the reporting. If reporting requirements were adopted, however, we would refer to our comments above regarding the nature and potential cost of reporting associated with quality standards that utilize a verbatim performance standard. The captioning industry could not afford the costs of monitoring and producing quality evaluations and reports that required the use of verbatim transcripts in order to evaluate the quality.

- G. FCC **“The 2005 Closed Captioning NPRM also addressed the use of electronic newsroom technique (ENT), and whether the Commission’s rules should be revised to disallow the use of this technique for certain television Designated Market Areas (DMAs).”**

Electronic newsroom captioning is of little to no value to the deaf and hard of hearing because of its extremely limited coverage of local news and its extremely poor quality. It definitely does not meet the “equivalent” mandate of the national accessibility laws.

The cost of real time captioning has also dropped to extremely low levels in the past year or two and has become much more affordable for the smaller DMA market stations. Local stations in those markets also tend to have a small number of hours of local news programming compared to the larger markets.

Caption Colorado believes under these circumstances it would be appropriate for the FCC to reconsider this issue and disallow the use of electronic captioning in a significant number of markets below the Top 25.

5. Caption Colorado’s Recommendation Regarding Quality Standards and Enforcement

Caption Colorado believes that at the same time the Commission is trying to determine appropriate quality standards for real time television captioning, it should weigh heavily the practical considerations (like those discussed above) that will necessarily be associated the standards and formulas finally adopted.

For all of the many practical and other reasons discussed above, the use of a strict verbatim standard to determine the accuracy of a transcript would be inappropriate and impractical. A verbatim standard, modified to allow for the industry accepted exceptions from verbatim transcription described above, would appear to be a fairer or more appropriate approach from the standpoint of historical accepted industry practices, but the time and cost of investigating and determining when and if the appropriate conditions existed to allow paraphrasing or drops, and for determining if the captioner did, in fact, communicate the correct meaning when paraphrasing, would be well beyond practical possibility and would involve highly discretionary decisions by the graders. So that option also seems inappropriate.

On the other hand, Caption Colorado believes there is a good and effective set of quality standards that could be adopted and used to effectively guide and monitor non-technical quality within the industry while at the same time keeping a reasonably practical environment in which to do it.

Relative Importance of Readability verses Accuracy and Completeness.

From the standpoint of the deaf and hard of hearing users of closed captioning, the most important factor in the quality of captioning is the “Readability” of the actual words they are reading. Captioning that contains very few misspelled or wrong words, that has proper punctuation and that has complete sentences with good grammar and that make sense, always results in an enjoyable experience for the user and a feeling of “high quality” captioning, regardless of the accuracy or completeness of the captioning. It is extremely important, therefore, that real time captioning have a high Readability Rating. The real good news is that establishing and enforcing Readability Quality Standards is relatively easy, and practical, compared to accuracy and completeness standards.

There is little controversy about Accuracy and Completeness also being important considerations in evaluating the non-technical quality of real time captioning. As discussed above, however, when measuring accuracy you first have to decide whether you should determine accuracy based on how close the transcript comes to the actual words spoken or based on how close the transcript comes to conveying the proper meaning. Of course, as indicated above, both of those options have some extreme problems rendering them unrealistic solutions. It is fairly easy to also see that, with respect to Completeness, you have the same options and problems. I.e. Are you going to use a verbatim test, or a meaning test, to determine if the transcript is “complete”?

Another option for estimating both the Accuracy and Completeness of a transcript that would avoid the implementation problems associated with either the verbatim or meaning tests, is to compare the number of “words” in the real time transcript to the number of words actually spoken in the TV program. If, for instance, a captioner has a number of words in the transcript that is equal to say 90% of the total words actually spoken, there is an extremely good chance that the transcript is highly accurate and very complete. If the captioner has a high Readability Rating on the transcript as well (i.e. indicating relatively few misspellings, wrong words, punctuation errors, transposed words, missed speaker change or story change markers, etc.) you would have further confidence that the overall transcript should have a very high rating on Readability as well as Accuracy and Completeness.

It is true that in order to use this standard for evaluating accuracy and completeness, you would have to know the number of words actually spoken in the program with which each transcript is associated. The FCC could eliminate this potentially time and financial burden on the industry by funding and conducting a relatively small project designed to determine the actual number of words per minute at which broadcasters speak within various

categories of television programming such as local news, national news, live sports, etc. The results of that study could be used to set “Standards for Actual Words Spoken” that would be used by the entire industry to estimate accuracy and completion. Those standards could also have a standard or acceptable deviation range to make an allowance for a reasonable amount of paraphrasing and drops etc. that are permissible and acceptable within standard industry guidelines.

Caption Colorado’s Suggested Solution and Quality Standards

In respect of all of the foregoing issues, concerns and practical limitations, Caption Colorado would offer the following suggestions for establishing an effective, fair and practical set of Non-Technical Quality Standards for Real Time Television Captioning, and reporting requirements, that would stay within reasonably practical time and cost restraints;

1. The Commission establish and fund a committee to determine rates and formulas for estimating “actual words spoken” in a broadcast. The committee will eventually develop a specific “FCC Standard for Actual Words Spoken” for each category of television programming.
2. Establish quality standards for real time television captioning based on the following guidelines and standards;
 - A. For convenience in measuring the quality of realtime captioning, we recommend dividing errors into 3 major classifications as follows;
 - (1) Readability Errors
 - a. Misspelled words

- b. Wrong words
- c. Transposed words (see Note 1 below)
- d. Missing or Incorrect use of a “period” or “question mark” (see Note 2 below)
- e. Missing or Incorrect speaker or story ID; i.e. >>, >>> Reporter, >>> (see Note 2 below)
- f. Above errors properly corrected by Captioner = No error (see Note (3) below)

Notes:

1. *Transposed Words.* Each occurrence of 2 or more transposed words counts as 1 error. Words or clauses within a sentence that are out of order as a result of the captioner intentionally moving them, without affecting the meaning of the sentence, are not considered transposed words or errors.
2. *Adjustments to Word Count for Punctuation and Speaker/Story ID Errors.* In determining the number of words in a transcript from which accuracy and error rates will be calculated, periods and question marks and speaker and story ID's appearing in the transcript should not be counted initially. However, one word should be added to the total word count for each error counted for these types of errors.
3. *Adjustments to Word Count for Captioner Correction of Mistakes.* Errors properly corrected by the captioner during the realtime transcription shall not count as errors and the words or errors that were corrected shall not be counted in the number of words in the transcript.

(2) Accuracy and Completeness Errors

- a. Missing words
- b. Added words
- c. Above errors properly corrected by Captioner – No error (see Note (3) above)

Notes:

Missing or added words are to be found by comparing the captioning transcript to the actual words spoken.

Missing or added words are not counted as errors if;

1. in the case of missing words, they were dropped because they were non-essential words and the meaning is accurately conveyed,
2. in the case of missing words, they were the name of a person not well known and or a foreign name and the person was adequately identified by title, position or other appropriate characterization,
3. they were missing or added in connection with paraphrasing by the captioner and the meaning is accurately conveyed,
4. they appear during segments of the broadcast when the pace of speech was in excess of 180 words per minute.
5. they were missing or added immediately before a commercial in order to clear the encoder in time for the commercial
6. they were missing or added as a direct result of the following or other Mitigating Circumstances beyond the control of the captioner or customer;

- a) poor audio quality
- b) inaudible speech
- c) scripts or other materials not provided to captioner in advance of program
- d) continuous programming for longer than 20 minutes without a commercial break
- e) power failures, failure of equipment, software or telephone or Internet services at the captioner location, the customer location or elsewhere that is used for listening to the audio, delivery of the captioning text for encoding onto the broadcast signal or for any other purpose in connection with the captioning process.

(3) Timeliness Errors - Latency of Realtime Captioning

Suggest average 5 seconds or less latency between the time a word is spoken and the time it appears in the captioning, for an entire program. Maximum latency of 7 seconds for any specific word.

B. Quality Standards and Formulas for Calculating Readability and Accuracy and Completeness

Caption Colorado recommends the use of 3 categories of non-technical quality standards for real time television captioning. To meet FCC Non-technical Quality Standards a transcript must meet or exceed the suggested Minimum Standards for all 3 categories.

(1) Readability Rating

a. Readability Rating measures the quality of the captioning text itself, without regard to what was actually said on the television program.

b. Formula for Calculating Readability Rating.

Total Words in Transcript (“TWT”)

Less Total Readability Errors (See definition above)

Misspelled Words

Wrong Words

Transposed Words (2 or more transposed words)

Punctuation incorrect period or question mark

Missing/Incorrect Speaker Change chevrons <<<

Missing/Incorrect Story Change chevrons <<

Total Readability Errors

Equals Total Correct Words before Add-Backs

Plus Add-Backs for Mitigating Circumstances

Errors resulting from inaudible audio

Errors when pace exceeds 180 wpm

Errors resulting from overlapping speakers

Errors from Other Mitigating Circumstances

Total Add-Backs

Equals Total Correct Words in Transcript (“TCWT”)

Readability Rating Equals – TCWT/TWT

c. Guidelines and Instructions

1. General Weighting

- All errors count as 1 Error except as noted below.

2. Misspellings, Wrong Words, Wrong Numbers

- Proper nouns (names/ places) not widely or generally familiar

No Deductions

- Words/numbers spoken in language other than main language of program No Deductions
3. Word Spacing Errors
 - Word Spacing errors are two correct and adjoining words with no space between them.
 4. Punctuation
 - Periods and Question Marks ½ Error
 - Other Punctuation No Deductions
 - Punctuation not counted in TWT except add 1 word to TWT for each ½ error
 5. Errors Properly Corrected by Captioner No Error
 - Uncorrected Words are not counted in TWT
 6. Errors Caused by Mitigating Circumstances No Deductions

Patent Pending

- d. Recommended Minimum Readability Rating
 1. Average of a prescribed number of on-air captioning transcripts over a prescribed period of time 97.50% - 98.00%
 2. Individual Transcript 96.50% - 97.00%
- (2) Accuracy/Completeness Rating
- a. Missing or added words are to be estimated by subtracting the total number of correct and incorrect words in the real time captioning transcript from the applicable FCC Standard for Actual Words Spoken for the specific type of programming involved.
 - b. Accuracy and Completeness Rating is calculated by dividing Total Correct and Incorrect Words in

Transcript by the FCC Standard for Actual Words Spoken for the specific type of programming involved, the result being expressed as a percentage.

c. Example

Total Correct and Incorrect Words in Transcript	3,500
FCC Standard for Actual Words Spoken for the specific type of programming involved	4,000
Accuracy Completion Rating (3,500/4,000)	87.50%

d. Recommended Minimum Accuracy/Completeness Rating

1. Average of a prescribed number of on-air captioning transcripts over a prescribed period of time 80.00% - 85.00%
2. Individual Transcript 70.00% - 75.00%

(3) Timeliness – Latency

Suggest average 5 seconds or less latency between the time a word is spoken and the time it appears in the captioning, for an entire program. Maximum latency of 7 seconds for any specific word.

To determine a “Readability Rating” for a particular realtime captioning file, an evaluator would calculate the number of Readability Errors (see definition above) appearing in the captioning text file in the manner specified in paragraph 13.32 above,

subtract the number of Readability Errors from the total number of words appearing in the captioning text and divide that difference by the number of words appearing in the captioning text. The result, expressed as a percentage, would be the Readability Rating.