

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?:

No. An NoV is simple enough to apply for, but adds enough forethought to require some effort and help keep access to this spectrum to those who are genuinely interested.

A "normal" band at 5MHz will lead to an influx of poor operating standards as heard on the 7MHz region. Discrete frequencies (or small "bandlets") are easy to work with and instil some operator discipline in keeping with the self training aspect of the Amateur Service.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club?s call sign remains with the club?: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

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 views on this question.

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. Whilst there should be some effort to contact license holders, it should remain the responsibility of license holders to keep the license current.

Otherwise we should all save ourselves the administration overhead and have lifelong, no-revalidation required terms.

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?:

Providing the amended Clause is clear about the need to be consistent in identifying the station within good practice then generally Yes. It should not be interpreted as a charter for no-ID at all. Likewise I would not want to see over-prescription in this area as it could lead to clumsy net operating.

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?:

Broadly yes. RSL serve very little use as most stations identify with location as part of the communications anyway. There will be some need to carefully plan any changes if this goes ahead.

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 proposal makes no sense when only restricted to intermediate licensees.

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. Lets make this clear and simple. Leave it up to the operator to explain the situation over the air (as most do). It's usually obvious that a mobile station is indeed that (at least on VHF) and a portable/alternative location is usually part of the narrative of the communication.

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

Yes.