

representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

What additional details do you want to keep confidential?:

Keep name confidential

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?:

I agree that the bands should be made available to all Full Licences but in exactly the same way as other bands to which amateurs have access on a secondary basis, but with reservations. It is good operating to check if a band is in use before using it, so access on a secondary should work ok. If you are going to give access to these bands, then why use NOV and make extra work for Ofcom unless it is planned at some time to allow repeaters on these bands if this is to be the case then NOV's would be the way to go otherwise what would be the reasoning for requesting a NOV?.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?: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

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, as many full licences holders are in their senior years and ill health can often stop them from doing things in the set time.

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?:

No - If it is not broke, then there is no need to change it.

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- We all have to learn and accept the current call sign prefixes as part of gaining our license. All my HF contacts know where I am from my call sign. Changing a system that is working well would make things more complicated. We have a system that works well, so no need to change 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?:

No - All call sign/prefix should be treated in the same way otherwise you are going to cause confusion. We all learn the correct way to establish the location we are operating from given as part of our call sign/and prefix. The system works well, and as a ham I want to know via the call sign /prefix just who I am talking to and where they are in respect to their home QTH if not operating from there, so no logical reason to change it.

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 it is already clear

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

Disability stops me from being a member of RAYNET, so it would be wrong of me to offer an opinion on this matter.