

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?:

Paragraph 2.26.3 proposes a potentially far-reaching precedent in relation to interference namely:

“The station must not cause interference to, and may not claim protection from other wireless telegraphy or electronic equipment.”

"electronic requirement" is too vague a wording and unnecessary in this proposal.Does this mean computers, cell phones, televisions, radios, etc?

Paragraph 2.26.6 also proposes that:

“The licensee must take suitable precautions, particularly in locations to which people have access, to minimise the risks associated with exposure to Radio Frequency (“RF”) radiation”

Why does this concern for RFI exposure only inserted in this specific frequency spectrum? It is again unnecessary and not relevant to such a low frequency..

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?: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

There should be no license terms that refer to specific modes. This is unnecessary and could in the future lead to confusion.

Having to ID "as frequently as possible" is so vague that it is unenforceable. I should be simply that identification at the start and end of the communication and at least one time every 15 minutes. Simple, enforceable, and reasonable.

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?:

This proposal is unnecessary and confusing. At present, amateurs adhere to international procedure.

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?:

Intermediate licensees should not be subject to different location requirements of their main stations as other licenses.

All licensees should should reflect the location of thier main station.

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?: