

Do you agree with the way this paper defines convergence? Why/why not?

I am not an expert in this field -- so feel unable to comment

Do New Zealand's current regulations and policies need to change to account for convergence? Why/why not?

I am not an expert in the policy field -- but feel it is important to necessary to protect public service free-to-air broadcasting (i.e. free of advertising) into the future. I mean this to include reporters, analysts and presenters who should have no commercial affiliation other than informing the community.

Unfortunately current trends in communication do not support in-depth, impartial non-commercial information on local, national and international events and issues. However, our community needs this sort of service in order to properly function as a democracy separate from commercialism (including globalisation effects).

We also need to ensure representation of minority groups in the policies -- whether ethnic or other local special-needs (e.g. disability) groups.

Do you agree with the proposed convergence work programme?

The review has not taken community needs sufficiently into account.

Should the Government be doing anything else to address convergence?

Consult more widely with the community in a simpler, jargon-free way. And also to ensure that all New Zealanders can actually afford to access "convergence". This includes in times of natural disasters or other emergency.

What barriers are you aware of that prevent you from benefiting from, or responding to, convergence?

Cost -- and (for rural areas) access to cellphone and broadband technology.

Name

Penny Griffith