

General Comments

- *Are you a user these bands or other amateur microwave bands?*
- *Are you a member of an associated specialist group? (eg UKuG , BATC etc)*
- *Typical use (eg narrowband, EME , ATV, data, beacon/repeater keeper etc)*
- *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:Yes

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: No

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

A3:None as far as I know.

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:If access to the adjacent bands is removed it would remove an important stepping stone into microwave activity in amateur radio. Most users in amateur TV use these frequency's as a starting point into gaining knowledge and techniques in microwave transmitting and receiving. Retaining access to the adjacent bands and allowing X band TV repeaters would go a long way in solving the problem.

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: Not that I know of.

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: Amateurs in this part of the spectrum are well aware of causing interference to other users and with the help of the RSGB BATC and other amateurs with test equipment this is eliminated .

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: No. The currant procedure for reported interference is adequate .

Q8. Do you agree with our preferred option?

A8: While not being perfect it goes some way to solving the problem.

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: I don't see the need for any changes as the currant rules are adequate.