

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Geoffrey

Surname:

Wallis

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?:

No, not as proposed. I agree that the new bands should be available to Full licensees but in the same way as the other bands which we use on a Secondary basis . The wording as currently used should be retained and not changed to include electronic equipment which has never been included in the license schedule. This addition would conflict with Ofcoms normal practice of not investigating interference to non radio equipment.

Re paragraph 2.26.6 Near -field measurements at these frequencies will be difficult to determine and given the low power levels used the conditions set out in - Notes to Schedule 1 of the existing license are sufficient for the 472 KHz allocation.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?: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

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 I agree.

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 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?:

Yes I agree.

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?:

Yes I agree.

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 - In the 40 years I've been licensed I've never heard any expressions of confusion regarding the use of RSLs .There would however be scope for confusion along the lines of what happens in the USA where a station originally licensed in one region of the country eg Hawaii -callsign KH6XX then moves to another area eg New York but continues to sign as KH6XX. Our current system has worked well and I know of no good reason to change it.

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. This would introduce the confusion I referred to in my response to question 7 and would appear to discriminate against holders of Intermediate licenses.

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 I agree.

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

Yes I agree.