

**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?:**

Agree that the bands should be available to full licencees. However, this should be on exactly the same basis as the current conditions, in these cases as appropriate to secondary user. The term other electronic equipment should not be included, as this could be construed as non radio equipment. The clause concerning rf exposure is not appropriate, as it is extremely difficult to measure. The current stated erp limits serve the purpose quite adequately.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:**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

**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?:**

No.

**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. The standards of identifying stations should if anything be made more rigorous. At the very least retain the current requirement.

**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?:**

Absolutely not. This would leads to much confusion.  
The current system of identification with secondary locator is well understood. Why change something that has worked well for a very long time.

**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 callsign classes should be required to state their call sign prefix as currently prescribed.

**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.