

**Title:**

Mr

**Forename:**

Ken

**Surname:**

Punshon

**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?:**

Clearly there is significant pressure for additional commercial bandwidth and thus the MoD release must be beneficial to consumers in general. To what extent the new usage following such release will degrade existing general services (e.g. WiFi) remains to be seen.

**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?:**

Not that I am aware of, but that does not preclude there being some.

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

Nothing that I am aware of.

**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?:**

Apart from disruption of general amateur activities, specific areas of research such as propagation and space

**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?:**

Not that I am aware of, but that does not preclude there being some.

**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?:**

Given sufficient information on deployment it might be possible to evaluate the situation in more detail. Clearly the suggested power limitation/NoV approach could provide some benefit.

**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?:**

There is a concern that a single case of interference could result in complete loss of the amateur allocations. This may just be the way the document is worded. Clearly the amateur community (RSGB/UKuG) could assist to reduce the workload of investigation of problems.

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

It is the least onerous, so yes.

**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?:**

Perhaps reduce the default power limit (by geography if appropriate), with NoV for higher power subject to testing or acceptability of test facilities?