

**Title:**

Mr

**Forename:**

Robin

**Surname:**

Thompson

**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:**

Predictably the response will be small - complex white papers seem to take too long to unfathom for many users.

I know of many that have tried to take in the detail and have just given up ....

**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?:**

I agree the bands (470 and 5Mhz) should be made available to all fully licenced amateurs in the same way as currently with a secondary use.

However of particular concern is Paragraph 2.26.6, which should be omitted entirely,Causing interference to electronic equipment is far to broad an issue and has never been included

before. This is against Ofcom's past policy of not investigating interference to non radio related equipment.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?:**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

**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'?:**

Seems pointless.

Can this be implemented if prosecutions seem rarely to happen?

**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. A small charge should be made if re-validations are made but overdue.

**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?:**

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 (

**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 widely accepted practice. Any change of current practice

will lead to both confusion and disruption both nationally and internationally  
Any change would do away with over 50 years of accepted practice causing much confusion.

**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 I disagree

All call sign classes should be treated in the same way by retaining the current clause in respect of the call sign prefix&rsquo;

**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?:**

Yes