

Title:

Mrs

Forename:

Beatrice

Surname:

Jebb

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:

Licensed as G6AJF

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?:

In principle.

However, I wish to see the final version of the wording which will be used in the amended license document before making a final decision.

And I have concerns about paragraph 2.26.3, which requires, as ever, the station operator/licensee not to cause interference, but completely removes any protection from interference caused to the station by other equipment users.

Part of OfCom's remit is to investigate interference to non-radio related equipment.
Para 2.26.6 What people? Burglars?

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:

As I'm not associated with any club, I feel it is inappropriate for me to comment

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'?:

See above

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 - complying with revalidation requirements is an administrative issue, and any possible case which comes to OfCom's attention needs investigating, not rubber-stamping

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

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. It's relatively easy to identify Amateur Radio stations on the web.

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. It's worked fine for decades. I think that confusion within the Amateur Radio community is minimal. Not sure about within OfCom, though.

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. Why discriminate against intermediate licensees?

And I'm against being required to identify a main station address when the licensee is away from that address. I never make a closer identification than "in the North-East of England."

Crime prevention issue..

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 I don't.

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

No. RAYNET Zone, County and Group controllers, and most members, I trust, know what they're doing anyway.

Unlike, I feel, many people in "professional" communications companies and organisations.