

**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, not as the proposal stands.

I would much prefer the current system of issuing NOV's be kept for these bands, and in particular the 5MHz band. I believe that opening 5MHz to all full licencees could potentially cause problems (with regards to it not being a continuous segment of spectrum and with other 'users involved).

I also believe that some of the proposed clauses use wording that is too vague, e.g. 'electronic equipment' or introduce wording, which if applied to other bands could change certain aspects of amateur radio in the UK in a way that is not desirable

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:**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

**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, ,not with its proposed wording. There is nothing wrong with the current requirement regarding the use of callsigns and the max interval of 15mins between identification.

I agree that a station must be clearly identifiable, and that identity should be given in a way that is consistent with whatever modulation is being used.

**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?:**

There is absolutely no need to change what is NOT broken. The current system works fine and is understood both by the users and our international colleagues. Changing it in the way proposed would cause far more problems and confusion. Please leave it as it is.

**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, there is no need for this change.

**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?:**

Possibly

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

Possibly