

**Title:**

Mr

**Forename:**

John

**Surname:**

Mccullagh

**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:**

I am pleased to have the opportunity to respond to this consultation. I have been licensed for more than 40 years and feel very strongly about some of the issues being raised.

**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 in the current form that is proposed. I do agree that 470 kHz and 5 MHz should be available to Full Licencees but it should be in the same way as other Amateur Secondary use bands. The standard wording already in use should suffice " Secondary. Available on the basis of non-interference to other services inside and outside the UK"

I am also concerned about the proposal that 'non radio' equipment be protected hence

reference to 'electronic equipment' in 2.26.3 should be omitted. Near field measurements are difficult to make and at the power levels being used are irrelevant, para 2.26.3 should therefore be deleted entirely.

**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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:**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, this is a good idea, although I am not currently a club member I am aware that many clubs are having difficulty with club NoV holders leaving and effectively 'taking' the club call with them.

**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, I agree.

**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, I agree

**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?:**

This seems reasonable as long as the fee charging regime does not change significantly.

**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 - Not as proposed. A clear definition of call sign usage and the current maximum interval of

15-minutes should be retained. However the requirements that a station must be clearly identifiable at all times and that the identity be given in a format consistent with the modulation in use are supported.

**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 definitely not. There is no need whatsoever to change current practice which is widely understood throughout the Amateur community. I am not aware at all of the uncertainty that is alluded to in the consultation document. I have been licensed for more than 40 years and have never encountered any problems. Changes as proposed would certainly create confusion where little if any exists. I am most strongly opposed to these proposed changes.

**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?:**

All call sign classes should be treated in exactly the same way by retaining 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?:**

I agree, it appears sensible to tidy up and clarify the various areas as proposed.

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

As an active member of Raynet NI these proposed changes are to be welcomed and would be of great assistance to our User Services.