

**Title:**

Mr

**Forename:**

Roger

**Surname:**

Jones

**Representing:**

Self

**Organisation (if applicable):**

**What additional details do you want to keep confidential?:**

No

**If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts?:**

**Ofcom may publish a response summary:**

Yes

**I confirm that I have read the declaration:**

Yes

**Additional comments:**

**Question 1: Do you agree that it is likely that the benefits to UK consumers and citizens will be greater from the MoD's release of spectrum in the 2.3 GHz and 3.4 GHz release bands than from retaining the current amateur use?:**

In one word NO! The MOD have been a good primary user and no doubt would continue to be so. If the bands in question were required by government for a limited period this can easily be achieved for the benefits of uk consumers in general. Take the Olympic arrangements as a good example. For the release bands in question, the mod and the amateur fraternity could easily give up access for a short term. If these frequencies are released and used commercially it may be extremely difficultly for government bodies to take them back for a short period.

**Question 2: Are there current uses in the release bands other than those detailed in RSGB's band plan and discussed in Section 3 of this consultation?:**

YES again, the MOD as primary user has by nature been responsible. Commercial users may not be, may not stick precisely to allocated frequencies and may not honour the guard bands. The authorities have failed miserably to control the havoc that internet distribution over the 240v mains has caused despite this interference being over international limits

**Question 3: Are there further consequences of removing the release bands from amateur licences that have not been considered in our analysis?:**

See my response to question 5; the answer could be here

**Question 4: There is an option (although not preferred) to remove access to the adjacent bands, as well as to the release bands. What are the consequences of removing access to the adjacent bands from amateur licences?:**

It is obvious that amateur radio, as a hobby, has declined greatly due to various reasons. At a recent event, the RSGB gave a presentation to show that this decline may have bottomed out. The government / ofcom have stated that they give 100% support to amateur radio as a hobby. Removing ANY amateur radio frequencies would not be in that spirit AND may kick start a further decline in the hobby.

**Question 5: Are there current uses in the adjacent bands other than those detailed in the RSGB's band plan and discussed in Section 3?:**

Amateur radio is all about innovation and using a modern phrase "doing more with less". I take that to be more with less MONEY; less complexity possibly. Certainly not cut off or reduced access to "the ether"

**Question 6: Are there additional mitigation measures which would provide demonstrable proof that amateurs would not cause interference into LTE in the release bands following the release?:**

The RSGB has a good record of assisting amateurs accused of causing interference. Ofcom might like to give some financial assistance to the RSGB to beef up this work

**Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed process for varying licences following cases of reported interference and our proposal to vary licences should dealing with the number of reported cases become too onerous?:**

**Question 8: Do you agree with our preferred option?:**

**Question 9: Are there additional changes to the Amateur Radio Licence which would assist amateur in lowering the risk of causing harmful interference to new uses?:**

The voluntary band plans put out by the RSGB could be a license condition. Any amateur with a good reason not to comply could apply for an official NOV or similar