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 don't agree with all the proposed changes.

I do agree with making the 470 kHz and 5 Mhz available to full licence holders, but exactly the same way as other bands are at the moment.

Also I have great concern with some of the proposed clauses, if included could then be extended to include other bands.. I believe the clause 2.26.6 should be left out completely, and the phrase electronic equipment from 2.26.3.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club?s call sign remains with the club?:

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??:

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?:

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?:

I don't agree with the proposed changes. I believe the current time i.e 15 minutes is more than good enough.

To transmit your call sign as frequently as practibable is just unworkable, who would decide what is frequent 1, 2, 5 or 10 minutes, it's just palin silly.

I agree that the station must be clearly identified at all times, and the identity be given in the format consistant with the modulation, but I don't agree with the terms voice or morse, which should be left out.

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?:

I don't believe any changes are required, and the proposed changes would cause more confusion not only to the uk, but also to the whole world, every one understands the position at the moment, which we have had for many years, so changing will cause more confusion.

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?:

All call sign classes should be treated in the same way by retaining the current clause in respect of the callsign prefix'

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?: