

**Title:**

Mr

**Forename:**

Adrian

**Surname:**

Riddick (m0rdi)

**Representing:**

Self

**Organisation (if applicable):****Email:****What additional details do you want to keep confidential?:**

No

**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:**

With respect these proposals in my view are not far reaching enough! Many people in amateur radio believe that too much band access was granted to the foundation and intermediate licences from the outset which I think has led to some bad feeling across the uk amateur community. I don't think this has been good for the hobby and I believe a compromise solution should be found! i.e. That would maintain the present conditions for the people who currently have the FL/IL but for example might limit band access to those who after a 'defined date' are new to the hobby! This could possibly be achieved with a small modification to FL and IL identifiers !

I am proud to live in a country where people of all abilities and backgrounds can access amateur radio and I think the 3 tier system works very well indeed. Many people have progressed to the full licence so it does indeed work. I am firmly opposed to 'forced progression' concept (as suggested across different radio forums by a number of radio

amateurs) as I think people should go as far as they wish with the hobby and that amateur radio should continue to be accessed by all that are interested in radio.  
However I do believe ofcom should now look into this 'band limitation' for new licencees after a defined date just my viewpoint

**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 very much so

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:**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

**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 if people break the rules they should be punished

**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?:**

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?:**

yes flexibility is a good move

**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?:**

yes

**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?:**

yes

**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 i do

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

yes