

Email response received 15 July 2005 from Mr E Bailey GM8BBA:

Answers to OFCOM proposals to reform amateur radio licensing.

First comments are/

1 This is not really a consultation, you are already telling us what your preferred option is, and the questions asked are very selective and strongly slanted.

2/ Not all radio hams are being consulted and some are getting more than one opportunity to respond.

3/ Having struggled through your web site to get this documents and cover sheet it would appear to me that it is being made unnecessarily difficult to respond to this “ consultation “

Qu 1/ No I do not agree with introducing a lighter electronic licensing process.

There appears to be totally inadequate protection to prevent fraudulent information being input into the system. Also based upon how user unfriendly the present OFCOM web site is I have little faith in how dependable such electronic licensing would be.

Qu 2/ No I do not agree.

The licensing information record would descend into anarchy without a system of checks and balances.

Qu 3/ No I do not agree.

A free licence would have no value, it could very easily be pushed aside as of no importance. Only a paid fee qualifies a person to legal rights.

Qu 4/ No I do not agree.

This amounts to discrimination against those who do not have access to a computer on the web. Also based upon how user unfriendly the present OFCOM web site is I have little faith in how dependable such electronic licensing would be.

Qu 5/ Yes I do agree.

An amateur needs their license to prove they are qualified to follow their hobby to the full. To make, modify, acquire and use all they need to follow their hobby fully. Under international agreements to which the UK is a party a Radio Amateur needs a recognized licence to operate on an international basis.

Qu 6/ Radio Amateurs must continue with an internationally recognized amateur licence in the longer term.

For the same reasons as in Qu 5

Qu 7/ This is by far the preferred option as far as I am concerned, a renewal period of 10 years would be most acceptable.

This would maintain all the present advantages of the existing licensing system but reduce operating costs. It would retain the present records, ensuring that records were kept reasonable updated.

Surely an additional 63,000 renewals of ham licenses every 10 years and keeping and updating the records of them would not be that difficult, onerous or expensive when compared to the many millions of TV license renewals.

Qu 8/ No I do not agree.

The present licensing system is most definitely not over-burdensome to me. I am quite happy to pay my license once a year by direct debit.

Qu 9/ No I do not agree.

I cannot agree with this in principle but do accept that a fee purely to cover the costs involved would be justified.