

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Gavib

Surname:

Nesbitt

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

Email:

What additional details do you want to keep confidential?:

Keep organisation 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 proposed. While I agree that the bands should be made available to all Full Licencees but in exactly the same way as other bands to which amateurs have access on a Secondary basis. The standard wording applicable to other amateur bands should suffice i.e:

"Secondary. Available on the basis of non-interference to other services inside and outside the UK"

Furthermore some of the proposed clauses set concerning precedents that if subsequently

applied to other bands would radically change specific aspects of amateur radio in the UK. Of particular concern is Paragraph 2.26.6, which should be omitted entirely, as well as the phrase 'electronic equipment' in 2.26.3

With respect to Paragraph 2.26.6, near-field measurements at these frequencies are very difficult to determine with any accuracy and in any case 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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:

Yes, again I think this is sensible. In paragraph 2.35 you state, however, that the status quo already provides you with 'significant work'. I would question whether the proposed solution in 2.38 (having the club members presenting you with evidence that the individual had left the club) doesn't potentially result in an increased workload for you.

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, although I would be concerned if this results in a large administrative burden in an attempt to keep your records cross-referenced with the significant number of people convicted for not having a television licence.

Since this latter offence has been reported

[<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/tvandradio/bbc/10684639/Dodging-TV-licence-will-not-be-a-crime.html>] to be due for reclassification as a civil offence, however, I take it this would not be the case.

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, if that better reflects your procedures, although I am slightly surprised that you have opted not to take the opportunity to include a re-validation date on the licence (paragraph 2.111) given the efforts you have put into publicising this aspect of the licence recently.

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, I agree this would be a good change.

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 are supported (but that specific terms such as voice or Morse Code should not be 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?:

No - there is no need to change current mandated and widely accepted practice. Any change of current practice will lead to both confusion and disruption both nationally and internationally. To do otherwise would do away with more than 50 years of practice, widely understood throughout the world and would create far more confusion than is currently alleged to exist. The current requirements should be improved to make it clear that RSLs are used explicitly when you change a region in the UK. Please do not change this.

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 - As per the first part of my response to question 7, many amateur radio award schemes and competitions globally assume that the callsign indicates the location of the operator at the time of the contact, not the main station. To alter this would result in confusion for all involved in those awards and competitions, both in the UK and around the world.

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, this is sensible, although I note that the result of the proposed wording in paragraph 2.88 means that UK Full (Club) licences would no longer be able to be used in UK territorial waters. I see no particular problem with that, but wonder whether it was the intention? Incidentally, regarding paragraph 2.89, I believe the definition of 'At Sea' is relevant because it, in turn, refers to the definition of 'Tidal Water'. This makes it clear that maritime mobile operation also includes tidal rivers. If you remove paragraph 17(1)(e) of the licence document, therefore, I believe paragraph 17(1)(kk) also becomes redundant and, I assume, tidal rivers become 'mobile', not 'maritime mobile' locations?

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

Yes, permitting encrypted messages when in communication with User Services is a particularly welcome development having myself been involved in dilemmas of the sort referred to in paragraph 2.96.