

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

Email:

What additional details do you want to keep confidential?:

Keep name confidential, Keep organisation confidential

If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts?:

I do not want name or personal details published but OfCom is free to publish my responses / comments.

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?:

Not as proposed: the bands should be made available to all Full Licencees but in exactly the same way as other bands to which amateurs have access on a Secondary basis. The standard wording applicable to other amateur bands should be ok i.e: "Secondary. Available on the basis of non-interference to other services inside and outside the UK"; Furthermore some of the proposed clauses set worrying precedents that if subsequently applied to other bands would radically change specific aspects of amateur radio in the UK. Of particular concern is Paragraph 2.26.6, which should be omitted entirely, as well as the phrase "electronic equipment"; in 2.26.3 Regarding Paragraph 2.26.6: near-field measurements at these frequencies are very difficult to determine with any accuracy and in any case are irrelevant at the power levels in use. Clause (e) in Notes to Schedule1 of the existing licence is sufficient and does not need to be reinforced in relation to the 472kHz entry.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:

If this only helps the club retain a wanted callsign then this is an ok proposal.

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 reason why not....

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 - sometimes people travel away from base for extended time and automatic revocation for non-renewal could cause needless stress. Better that OfCom take all reasonable steps to contact the licensee to renew prior to revocation. This could include an email to the nearest club which may be able to contact the amateur in question....

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?:

Keep things simple and uniform and easy to understand = no reason why not.

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 always good operating practice to identify the station in operation. It is entirely reasonable to identify when practicable and keeping a mandatory limit of 15 minutes should help instil some discipline in otherwise over-casual operations.

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?:

Let us comply fully with the international standards in place by the ITU.
It's not broken so don't fix it!

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?:

As above I strongly want all station protocols to follow the guidance from ITU.
Absolutely no reason whatever to deviate from this....

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 can understand the current situation, but if it is necessary to change in order to make things clearer I see no reason why not....

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

Probably not....