

Title:

Mr

Forename:

David

Surname:

Wade

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club?s call sign remains with the club?: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

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?:

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?:

I do not agree with this. The current rules are perfectly clear. It is often hard to ascertain which stations are operating on a particular frequency, and indeed if they are licenced, at present, Further reducing the requirements for identification, this will become impossible.

After all what is "practical" for one person is too much bother for another. Please leave it as it is.

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 I do not agree with this proposal. It sounds like a recipe for disaster. The current phrase says "shall" which in English is equivalent to "must".

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/shall?s=t>

so seems clear enough to me. We seem to be replacing that with "may" so you can pick and choose, so on one day you could be G4XXQ and another GW4XXQ while operating from the same station.

How does one look that up in the call book?

If we are going to change either remove them all together, or make them part of the issued call sign.

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?:

yes

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?:

no opinion