

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:

The extension of the 2m band to include 146 - 148 MHz was discussed in a presentation made by Ofcom representatives to the Norfolk Amateur Radio Club early this year. It is disappointing that this suggestion appears to have been quietly dropped.

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, but in the same way as access to other bands is provided by amateurs. Furthermore the clause regarding interference to non-radio equipment should be excluded.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?: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

Not sure it will make a difference

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?:

Whatever the legal semantics of the process of revoking a licence, I believe there is sufficient time within 5 years for a licensee to revalidate his licence and so should not object if it is revoked for failing to do so. To do otherwise debases the value of the licence.

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?:

No opinion

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. Poor practice abounds on the airwaves already. I am a relatively recent licensee. I came across another licensee complaining about the lack of station identification during a contest. As I had had difficulty identifying him because he had not given his callsign at the start of each contact with a new station, I challenged his complaint. He told me my argument was flawed and that the frequency with which he gave his callsign had been sanctioned by an Inspector many years previously. At the start of each contact and every 15 minutes is unambiguous and easy to remember and should be retained. The mode of transmission should be the same as the mode of the contact.

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?:

No. There is no need to change the current system.

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?:

The callsign transmitted should reflect the location of the station being used.

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 but I do not see that the proposals will achieve this.

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

No opinion.