

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Martyn

Surname:

Vann

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, but not in its present format. I agree that the bands should be made available to all Full Licencees, but see no reason why these new bands need any special treatment. Surely the normal restrictions for availability on a "Secondary" basis are sufficient and avoid unnecessary complication?

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circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?: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 a great step forward!

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

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?:

No. I see no reason why the Amateur licence, which is unique in many ways, should need to conform to the wording applicable to other licences. If, at a future juncture, it becomes necessary to introduce changes to the charges, the wording can be updated at that time.

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. I think that the current clear statements regarding identification should be maintained, including the current 15 minutes maximum interval. These are both helpful and necessary. I agree that the callsign should be given in a format consistent with the modulation in use, but don't feel that specific terms such as voice or Morse Code should be used.

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. The current practice (of changing the RSL to reflect the station's current location) has been in use for MANY years, and is understood abroad as well as in this country. (Any confusion may have been caused by the vague wording in the 2006 licence.) Changing this system has the potential for causing considerable confusion - a definite negative impact at home and abroad! (I've just checked my earliest licence that I can find - 1977- in which it is clearly stated that "the Licensee shall, in order to indicate the country or place of use, vary the prefix....by using the prefix letter(s) appropriate to that country" (my italics). I believe this dates back at least till the early sixties!). If confusion exists, the wording should revert to something along the lines of the earlier licences.

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. With the exception of the Intermediate station in England, where there is clearly a need for the "E" RSL, I think it would be preferable to treat all licence classes in the same way, i.e. using RSLs to indicate current station location. Otherwise, it is likely to create confusion when moving up from one licence class to the next. 2(3) should therefore be retained as is.

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