

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Julian

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?:

None. Publish all.

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 I agree that the 470kHz and 5MHz bands should be included a part of the schedual for full licensees.

However I do not agree with the clause 2.26.3 in referring to "electronic equipment". These bands should be treated as any other band that radio amateurs have access to. If interference is caused or suffered to electronic equipment which is not RT equipment, this should be investigated in the usual way.

In reality it is unlikely that non RT - electronic equipment will suffer/affect other AR bands, which do not carry this clause. So investigation would probably be required anyway. So this clause could be viewed as being the thin end of the wedge as far as protection of the AR service is concerned.

I do not agree with the wording of clause 2.27.1 referring to double sideband modes. Any bandwidth restriction requested by the primary user, should be an overall channel bandwidth limitation and be technology neutral to the actual modulation being employed.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?: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

Additionally it is important to confirm that the original license holder is representing the club by agreement of the club's committee. Rather than simply being a member.

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':

I have no views.

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?:

I agree.

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?:

I have no views.

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?:

I do not agree.

I believe that Clause 13 of the existing license is sufficient.

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?:

If I understand the question correctly, the proposal is that the use of RSLs will be voluntary, at the discretion of the licensee.

If so, then I agree with this proposal.

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?:

I do not agree.

The intermediate licenses should be reissued with the E locator as the default. Then be allowed to elect to use an RSL if they wish. As proposed in question 7.

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?:

I do not agree with retaining the prohibition against airborne operations.

I would have preferred to see some limited availability to operate amateur transmitters from manned or remote airborne platforms, within primary amateur bands.

If this cannot be accommodated, then the prohibition against installing AR stations on airborne vehicles should not preclude the installation of a receive only AR station. So allow experimentation in tele-command of airborne devices.

The obvious intention was to prevent the installation of airborne transmitting equipment. It is perfectly legal for anyone, even without an AR license, to install an amateur bands receive only system airborne. So this restriction becomes an argument on whether you may call an airborne receiver part of an AR station. This naming is important if the conditions in clause 11(2).

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

I have no views.