

**Title:**

Mr

**Forename:**

Stan

**Surname:**

Goodwin

**Representing:**

Self

**Organisation (if applicable):**

**Email:**

**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 with the proposal to include, as a matter of course, the 470 kHz and 5 MHz bands into the Licence for all Amateur Radio (Full) licensees?:**

No Not as proposed "Secondary , available on the basis of non interference to other services inside and outside the UK" I believe paragraph 2.26.6 should be removed or omitted as should the phrase "electronic equipment" in 2.26.3

I am fairly sure that near-field measurements at these freq.s are difficult to determine accurately and are by the way irrelevant at the power levels allowed for our use

Clause e in notes to the schedule of the existing licence are sufficient and there is no need for reinforcement for 472kHz

**Question 2: Do you agree that expressly linking a Full (Club) Licensee's authorisation to use the spectrum to his or her representation of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:**

I am fairly relaxed about this and have no immediate concerns

**Question 3: Do you agree that Ofcom should include a further ground of revocation in the Licence as proposed above in order better to align Clause 4 with the definition of 'Disqualified Person'?:**

I am fairly relaxed about this and have no immediate concerns

**Question 4: Do you agree that the word 'automatically' should be removed from Clause 4(5) of the Licence, in relation to the revocation of the Licence for failure to comply with the revalidation requirements?:**

I am fairly relaxed about this and have no immediate concerns

**Question 5: Do you agree that Clause 15 of the Licence should be updated to reflect the wording included in Ofcom's General Licence Conditions Booklet?:**

I understand that Ofcom forceably introduced the "FREE" licence for on line users and specific validation terms every 5 years I see no reason at all for this to change we need to encourage young people to enter the magic world of Amateur radio, and to subject them to a fee for a licence at whatever cost now and any future raising of that charge is not acceptable

**Question 6: Do you agree that Clause 13 of the Licence should be amended to allow for a simpler, more flexible approach for identifying Amateur Radio stations?:**

No certainly not as per your proposals a clear definition of call sign at 15 minute intervals should remain I also believe that identity should be provided in a format consistent with the modulation in use but have no need for such words as voice, morse code etc to be used

**Question 7: Given the current uncertainty amongst Radio Amateur licensees in relation to Clause 2(2), do you believe that it would be a practical solution for Ofcom to remove this Clause and to insert additional wording into Clause 13, as proposed above?:**

Absolutely NOT there is absolutely no need to change current mandated and widely accepted practice which would lead to confusion and disruption both nationally and internationally to change would do away with more than 50 years of practice and would create more confusion than is currently alleged to exist

**Question 8:Do you agree with Ofcom?s proposal to amend Clause 2(3) of the Licence to require Intermediate licensees to transmit a call sign that reflects the location of their main station?:**

No I totally disagree all call sign classes should be treated in the same way by retaining the current clause in respect of the callsign prefix

**Question 9:Do you agree that replacing Clauses 2(1) and 16(1) with a new Clause to simplify and bring together all of the licence conditions relating to the operation of radio equipment away from the Main Station address will make these provisions clearer?:**

I am unsure that the present system for use of equipment away from the main atation address needs any clarification we all under stand what is required from us and fulfill these terms and conditions readily when required

**Question 10:Do you agree that the proposed changes will clarify RAYNET operation under the Licence?:**

I believe RAYNET operations are already clear and sufficient and require no changes