#### epresenting:

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?:

Not as proposed.

Yes the bands should be made available to all full licensees, but, as per the other Amateur bands that are accessed on a Secondary basis that encompass the existing arrangements as quoted below:

"Secondary. Available on the basis of non-interference to other services inside and outside the UK"

I consider that the phrase 'electronic equipment' in paragraph 2.26.3. should be deleted, whilst paragraph 2.26.6, should be withdrawn.

Failure to do so would create precedents that will seriously and detrimentally affect aspects of amateur radio in the UK, which would be wholly unacceptable.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club?s call sign remains with the club?: Question 3:Do you agree that Ofcom should include a further ground of revocation in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?:

No - Not as proposed.

The current arrangements of a of maximum 15 minutes are completely sufficient and should not be changed.

Clear callsign identification utilising the type of modulation employed at the time is supported.

However, it is suggested the sentence: 'that the station's identity be given in voice, Morse Code or a format consistent with whatever form of modulation is in use'. Be amended to: 'that the station's identity be given in a format consistent with whatever form of modulation is in use'.

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?:

There is no need to change current practice.

NO confusion currently exists.

The existing practice is widely understood and accepted nationally and worldwide. Any change would be totally unnecessary as well as being very disruptive and confusing.

Please do NOT 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?:

Disagree

This would not only cause confusion, it would also conflict with the other licence classes, creating unequal treatment of amateurs, as well as contradicting with the identification requirements of the licence.

# 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

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

Yes