

**Title:**

Please select

**Forename:**

Philip

**Surname:**

Hobson

**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. While I agree that the bands should be available to all Full Licencees, I do not believe that there needs to be any variation in wording from that for other bands where Amateurs have access on a secondary basis. The draft proposal introduce precedents that if applied to other bands would seriously impact upon amateur radio in the UK. I believe that para 2.26.6, should be omitted entirely, and so should the phrase 'electronic equipment' in 2.26.3

Near-field measurements are almost impossible to understand with accuracy and are not at all relevant at the powers used.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:**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

**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':**

It may help

**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?:**

It may help

**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?:**

If it brings clarity without constraint for beneficial use of the licence then I agree

**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?:**

It is important that a station should clearly identify frequently in a way consistent with its current transmission. I do not think that more clarity than this is required and the current clear guidance of giving the callsign at a maximum interval of 15-minutes seems to adequately achieve that requirement

**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 do not think that there is any need to change current accepted and generally understood practice as change could lead to wide confusion and disruption for both UK and international Amateurs.

**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 believe that the requirement on any call sign level should be the same way as per the current clause relating to 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?:**

It may help although I am not sure that there is any real confusion amongst longer-established Amateurs.

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

Again, it may help.