

## General Comments

- Are you a user these bands or other amateur microwave bands?  
**Yes I am a User.**
- Are you a member of an associated specialist group? (eg UKuG , BATC etc)  
**Yes, RSGB, BATC, UKuG**
- Typical use (eg narrowband, EME , ATV, data, beacon/repeater keeper etc)  
**Narrow band and ATV.**
- Any particular concerns or other general comments

## Questions and Answers

### The release bands (2350-2390, 3410-3475 MHz)

*Q1. 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?*

A1: Since there is great pressure on the spectrum above 450 MHz, it difficult to argue for retention of the release bands for secondary Amateur allocation.

*Q2. 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?*

A2: I don't know of any.

*Q3. Are there further consequences of removing the release bands from amateur licences that have not been considered in our analysis?*

A3: No.

### The adjacent bands (2310-2350, 2390-2400, 3400-3410 MHz)

*Q4. 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?*

A4: This option would remove access to an important part of the spectrum for the continued use of self education. The 3.4 GHz has a particular technical propagation characteristic that is important.

*Q5. Are there current uses in the adjacent bands other than those detailed in the RSGB's band plan and discussed in Section 3?*

A5: International use by Amateurs of the narrow band segment 2319 – 2322 MHz is highly desirable.

*Q6. 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?*

A6: RSGB and BATC would, I am sure offer advice and assistance in this respect. The use of additional filters for example.

*Q7. 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?*

A7: There has long been provision to vary individual licences in cases of onerous interference.

*Q8. Do you agree with our preferred option?*

A8: Ofcom's preferred option (1.4, ii.) though causing disruption to ATV is acceptable.

*Q9. Are there additional changes to the Amateur Radio Licence which would assist amateur in lowering the risk of causing harmful interference to new uses?*

**A9: This seems to be covered by existing clauses in the licence.**