

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Andrew

Surname:

Holland

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?:

Yes, as the 5MHz seems to be so widely used. I assume that the interference with "other electronic equipment" will ensure that this equipment will be designed to be resilient to RF interference.

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circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:

yes

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?:

yes

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?:

This sounds OK that the Region RSL is not mandatory but optional. The use of short form Contest calls do not mandate any RSL or suffix. There should be a core call that can be altered within the guidelines. The CEPT visitors should have the option for G or M and a RSL if they want. The key location for a station should be identifiable by standard means e.g. Postcode, long lat, town, maidenhead etc.

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 think the 2c0 etc is a pain and should be brought into the M or G fold. e.g. G20 G21 etc

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. Provided we can still remote connect to the station. This must be the way forward in the "Rabbit Hutch" world. A club can have the station at a remote location suitable for antennas etc but operate it as a shared facility for its members who operate with their own call sign.

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

N/A