

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?:

Yes. I would not agree with any moves to open these bands to licence classes other than "Full";.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?: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

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. Without a prescribed minimum interval for identification it would become difficult to identify stations whose operators have varying opinions of what constitutes 'as frequently as is practicable during transmissions to ensure that the station is clearly identified'. The current conditions are not well observed by many, and removing the mandatory 15 minute interval will allow stations to become largely unidentifiable,

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?:

Yes

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 would be contrary to the proposal to remove the Regional Secondary identifier from other licence classes - asked in Question 6 above. It should simply be necessary to allocate a single (non-regionalized callsign) to all licensees in all licence classes which uniquely identifies the station regardless of which region of the UK the station is located.

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, although I don't agree that the changes should be restricted to 'RAYNET' operators, but should be open to all Radio Amateurs who operate on behalf of a 'User Service' - regardless of whether the

Amateur Radio operator is a member of an organisation such as RAYNET. The licence should allow all licencees the same freedoms to support user services.