

Title:

Mr

Forename:

John

Surname:

Hardwick

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:

The license works adequately at present. The Ofcom Stakeholder document is long, obfuscatory and will have been read through by very few "Stakeholders" (what exactly does that word mean-management jargon"?). Nonetheless, if Ofcom feels it has to do something to prove it is still there, answers should be given to the consultation. Mine follow.

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?:

I agree:

Anything that reduces the bureaucracy and control over individuals by others is to be encouraged

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?: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

The perceptual complication of the existing process is a "mind" problem only for Ofcom. Shuffling the provision words will not change any substantive action.

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 disagree:

It seems that adequate provision already exists.

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 agree

Most persons do not have adequate 5 year reminder processes and can easily unwillingly and unknowingly miss renewal deadlines.

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 disagree.

Given the startling quality of all of the post war UK governments, "sticky fingers" and "removal of advantages and privileges" would seem to be more than likely if money is mentioned. Best to be avoided.

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?:

I agree

Anything that avoids barrack-room lawyer over the air criticism of other amateurs because of alleged deviation from some point in "the rules" can only be welcomed

.

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?:

I agree.

Most amateurs have common sense and can be relied upon to make clear where they are!

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?:

I agree

This change would remove a source of possible confusion.

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 disagree,

There seems to be no problem at the moment.

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

I agree

Freedom to operate in emergency situations would seem required. Encryption, however, would seem open to official abuse. Why would anyone need to encrypt in an alleged democracy?