

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Peter

Surname:

Taylor

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club?s call sign remains with the club?:

YES

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?:

NO

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?:

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

Updating the Amateur Radio Licence: RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Additional Specific Response to Consultation Questions Q7 and Q8

***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?*

MY RESPONSE: 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.

To remove current uncertainty (if any), I suggest that Ofcom might consider reversion to the very clear mandatory set of licence conditions that prevailed for all of the latter part of the 20th century. I.E to mandate the use of M, for Scotland, W, for Wales, I, for Northern Ireland, D for The Isle of Man, J, for Jersey and U, for Guernsey (have the

latter been consulted?). **The mandatory secondary locator should be used on all occasions to clearly identify the location of the transmitter no matter where in the UK the licensee normally resides.** I.E. I am G8BCG if transmitting from anywhere in England, GW8BCG if transmitting from anywhere in Wales, GM8BCG if transmitting from anywhere Scotland etc. This is completely logical and totally understandable.

The current press reports regarding the allocation of the K prefix for Cornwall seem to indicate that Ofcom have given in to political pressure generated by a small minority group seeking “vanity” callsigns. **The introduction of such county or regional prefixes with either optional or mandatory usage would surely cause considerable confusion within the UK and globally.**

If Ofcom are required to permit the use of such “vanity” prefixes then the most logical approach would be to do so on an individual basis (by way of NOV) for those seeking this unnecessary addition to their current totally unique callsign.

***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: This would simply cause confusion where none exists – see response to Q7 above.

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?:

NO

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