Title:

Mr

Forename:

James

Surname:

Smith

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:

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.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club?s call sign remains with the club?:

Should do.

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

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. Take each case on its merits.

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?:

There is nothing wrong with the current system. It's fine as it is. Leave it.

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?:

Why is there uncertainty about Clause 2(2)?? Just give some practical examples about how the regional identifiers currently work (i.e. if you are in England and your call is G0OFE, and you operate while in Guernsey, then you use the call GU0OFE). Should make it clear. It was all in the exams we took anyway - wasn't it????

Leave things as they are. It would make it difficult to tell which country a station is transmitting from. at the moment, that is clear especially to stations in other countries if a station is G or GM or GI etc.
To remove the regional identifier would horribly muddy the waters for overseas stations, especially during contests. Keep it simple and uncomplicated as it is now.
If we must - then GW/G0OFE would be better than nothing when I am operating from Wales for example.

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?:

why not simply use a system for Intermediates where if they operate from (for example) Wales when their call is say 2E0AAA, they sign 2W/2E0AAA. Simple.
I am assuming that they couldnt use 2W0AAA? If they can, then leave things as they are, but make the wording clearer bu including some examples.

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

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

I am not a Raynet operator, so I don't have an opinion on the subject.