

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

Email:

What additional details do you want to keep confidential?:

Keep name confidential

If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts?:

Name

Ofcom may publish a response summary:

Yes

I confirm that I have read the declaration:

Yes

Additional comments:

I joined the Radio Society of Great Britain as I accept that they represent all radio amateurs at National & International levels. I am amazed then that Ofcom do not accept this fact & require each & every individual to give of their time to repeat what the RSGB states, which in my opinion is the sensible & reasoned response to some non-sensical proposals by Ofcom

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 PROPOSED. I agree that the bands should be made available to all Full Licensees but in exactly the same way as other bands to which amateurs have access on a secondary basis. The standard wording applicable to other bands should suffice.. "Secondary. Available on the basis of non-interference to other services inside & outside the UK."

Proposed changes to certain clauses if applied to other bands would radically change specific aspects of AR in the UK. Paragraph 2.26.6 should be omitted entirely as well as the phrase `electronic equipment` in 2.26.3

WRT Para. 2.26.6, near field measurement at this frequency is difficult & inaccurate & are irrelevant at the power levels in use. Clause (e) in notes to Schedule 1 of the existing licence is sufficient and does not need to be reinforced in relation to the 472kHz. entry.

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club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:

Not until it is clearly established that the licensee no longer represents the club. Evidence from both parties must be taken.

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'?:

No. Unless & until it is proved that a licensee holding a club licence is no longer representing the views of the club & that fact has been established with evidence from both sides the term "Disqualified Person" is inappropriate.

IF & when the above has been met then Ofcom have to judge & inform both parties.

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 anything that results in the revocation of a licence should warrant at least an e-mail to the Licensee to advise him of his failure to comply. AMATEURS ARE HUMAN. WE ALL MAKE MISTAKES & WITH ADVANCING AGE ARE FOREGETFUL.

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. NOT AS PROPOSED. A clear definition of callsign usage and the current maximum interval of 15 minutes should be retained. However the requirements that a station must be clearly identifiable at all times and that the identity be given in a format consistent with the modulation in use makes common sense & I therefore support that view.

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 EXISTING MANDATED & WIDELY ACCEPTED PRACTICE. Any change to current practice will lead to both confusion & disruption both nationally & internationally. To do otherwise would do away with more than 50 years of practice, widely understood throughout the world & would create far more

confusion than that alleged to currently exist. IF IT ISN'T BROKE DONT TRY TO FIX IT !!

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. I DISAGREE. All call sign classes should be treated in the same way by retaining the current clause in respect of callsign prefix.
IF IT ISN'T BROKE -----

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?:

Hopefully YES.

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

Hopefully YES.