

**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. The 5MHz band is different in nature from the bands to which full licensees have access to as a matter of course. The restrictions placed on it's use if included in the standard licence set a precedent that could be later applied to other bands in a future review. It would be better continue to access the band via an NOV. The process for doing so is not difficult.

Paragraph 2.26.3 if included potentially opens a can of worms for Ofcom. Ofcom do not as a matter of course investigate complaints of interference to non-radio related electronic equipment but may have to do this if the license includes references to "electronic equipment" in general.

Paragraph 2.26.6 is not required as it is already adequately covered in the existing license.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club?s call sign remains with the club?:**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

**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?:**

**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?:**

The existing requirements for station identification work well and do not need to be changed.

**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?:**

The use of regional secondary locators is well understood by the amateur radio community and has been in use for decades. Their use brings a host of benefits that should be retained. The requirement to use RSLs should be left in it's current form

**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?:**

I strongly disagree, all license classes should be treated in the same way with regard to callsigns and the associated RSLs. To do otherwise adds unnecessary complication.

**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?:**

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