

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Patrick

Surname:

Gray

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:

Although I am responding on behalf of myself I am also Chairman of the Echelford Amateur Radio Society.

The general feeling among the members is that some of the proposed changes would have a deleterious effect on their amateur contesting activities with the confusion it would cause throughout the international amateur radio community

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?:

Not as proposed.: I agree that the bands should be made available to all Full Licencees in the same way as other bands Amateurs have on a Secondary basis. The standard wording applied

to other bands should be sufficient.

Para 2.26.6 this suggested requirement is irrelevant at the power levels in use. Near field measurements are very difficult to determine at these frequencies. This clause should be omitted.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?: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 do agree.

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':

Yes

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?:

Yes

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?:

Yes

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 - The current maximum interval of 15 minutes should be retained.

Proposing that the station must be identifiable at all times would mean that the call sign would have to be given continuously - this is not logical.

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?:

No - there is absolutely no reason to change the current, legal, and widely accepted practice. The change would create havoc throughout the national and international world of amateur

radio. This would have serious consequences for world wide contests - it would utter confusion.

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 disagree., All call sign categories should be treated in the same way by retaining the current clause in respect of the call sign 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?:

Yes

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

Yes