

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 470kHz & 5MHz Bands should be included in all full Amateur Radio Licenses. However I do not agree with the wording used. The usual language used in the existing licenses should be used. The idea that Amateur radio cannot claim protection from other electronic equipment is completely unacceptable. 'Other electronic equipment' should be designed to avoid interference with W/T and other users of the radio spectrum. Surely the existing provisions in the Amateur Licence are sufficient to render the extra precautions around protection from radiated energy unnecessary.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:

Automatically linking revocation of a Club license seems more likely to stop the Club station operating until a handover of representation can be made.

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. The Club Representative is may well NOT be a Disqualified Person.

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. The wording 'may automatically' is nonsense. It's either 'will automatically' or 'may'. 'May' is more appropriate.

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?:

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 present requirements and practice are clear enough - at the end of each over, or every 15mins etc. This is well respected and identifies the station well enough .
Introducing a requirement of 'Clearly Identifiable at all Times' is ridiculously vague . What does 'at all times' mean. Taken literally, it would mean that the station would broadcast nothing but it's callsign. Same for the imprecise 'as frequently as practicable' - after every sentence.
Leave well alone please.

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. The situation is well understood within the amateur fraternity, both in the UK and the ROW.

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. This will only bring more confusion.

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. The clauses are clear as they stand. Writing a new clause will give too many opportunities to confuse these simple clauses.

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

No Comment.