

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Paul

Surname:

Higginson

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

GW8IZR

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 strong view on this really, I can see the advantage of a general allocation rather than an NOV approach but I'm very worried about this statement:

"The station must not cause interference to, and may not claim protection from other wireless telegraphy or electronic equipment."

That implies that any old hardware made in China with no EMC consideration becomes higher in status than my station designed to avoid EMC issues. - NOT FAIR

Without some reasonable protection the hobby would be damaged.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:

NO VIEW

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'?:

NO VIEW

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?:

NO VIEW

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?:

NO VIEW

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?:

Disagree - identification should be regular - the current 15 minutes guideline is ok but digital services should also ID in a method of modulation allowing simple determination of who is transmitting. For example a D_STAR tx is hard to identify unless it ID's in (for example CW) from time to time. Not everyone has the decoding hardware so we cannot self police unintentional frequency conflicts or interference issues.

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- Absolutely disagree with this. Significant time invested in DXCC and other DX activities using my regional locator. This change would destroy twelve years of effort here. There is nothing wrong with the existing system.

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 license classes should retain 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?:

No View

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

No View