

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Jack

Surname:

Weber

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 as proposed. The standard wording relating to access on a Secondary basis is sufficient and appropriate. Also, paragraph 2.26.3 represents a major change in the licence conditions by requiring amateurs to avoid interference to non-radio related equipment. This requirement should be removed. In addition, paragraph 2.26.6 should be removed as it cannot realistically be implemented, at 470kHz. The current safeguards are sufficient.

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club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?: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

No, not as proposed. The proposal is too vague. The current requirement for identification at least every 15 minutes is unambiguous and appropriate. Identification should be in a format consistent with the modulation used, but there is no need to refer to Voice and Morse Code specifically.

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 believe that there is currently any uncertainty in relation to Clause 2(2). On the contrary, this proposal would create uncertainty by removing the need for a clear and simple secondary locator.

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. There is no need for Intermediate Licence holders to be treated differently in this respect. Anyway, callsigns serve a valuable role in helping to identify the transmitter's location. Merely identifying the location of the main station is unhelpful, irrelevant and will seriously impact many contests and awards, in which knowledge of the regional location is important.

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.