

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:

I think this consultation has been poorly put to the community. It has been made Long, unintelligible with jargon in parts and difficult to discern the actual concept being put to the reader.

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. The NoV system has been automated to a certain extent, allowing ease of application. The controls which are already in place have been sufficient and as such there should be no change, including what I suspect would be a stronger policing element within the licence conditions as stated "subject to certain conditions"

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?: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 I agree that the licence structure has long been unfavorable to clubs with many call signs held hostage within club politics. I am concerned though, as to how this system could be managed, as this will involve Ofcom stepping into local club disputes which happen.

I think this area is a step in the right direction, but more clarification on process is needed.

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 comment

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 comment

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?:

no comment

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?:

This question is confusing as the general consensus is that the system has a flexible approach with a callsign being given within the licensed times, although many use it more often.

To do more than already happens would be pedantic and of absolutely no assistance to a listener and more a hindrance to an operator. The level we have is fine.

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 nothing uncertain in this area. if in northern ireland you use MI, wales MW, england M, scotland MM.

not only would ofcom be causing further confusion within the community. it would also be causing anger amongst the international amateur community through the possible loss of 6 dxcc entities to 1 instead of 7. On top of that you have a situation as in America where you think you have contacted a rare dx station only to find that the callsign does not match the location as the person has moved, extremely aggravating.

LEAVE OUR IDENTIFIERS ALONE

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?:

Reply as above in question 7

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?:

define at sea?

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

no comment