

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:

Full licence holder.

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.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?: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

Unfortunately there are those who take pleasure in bending or breaking rules. They would use your proposed wording to suit themselves.

I believe the present wording is clear and specific and does not need changing.

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?:

Regional identifiers are an anachronism. They have caused confusion and would continue to cause confusion if used in the future. This is the UNITED Kingdom. Arbitrary ideas on this topic dating from 1946 are now irrelevant. All mention of regional identifiers should be deleted.

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?:

Also irrelevant.

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?:

A new clause would be useful. It is important that licensees should indicate that they are operating from alternative or temporary premises or a temporary location. This should be specifically dealt with in the licence so that the feckless and the rule breakers are left in no doubt as to their responsibilities.

I have a 30 year old gripe about the ban on use of amateur radio in light aircraft. The chances of interference to stations on the ground is negligible bearing in mind a maximum of perhaps 5W and the tiny number who might want such a privilege. CAA type approval is not a valid reason for refusal to consider this, since the CAA can waive the requirement. Restrict this, as with maritime mobile, on condition that written approval be given by the aircraft captain.

Also restrict to private flights in light aircraft only. Access by NoV would provide effective control. This is permitted without problem in other countries.

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

Yes.