

Title:

Mrs

Forename:

Nadine

Surname:

White

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:

My Amateur Radio call sign is MM0WNW

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 - I do not agree with the way it has been proposed.

I DO AGREE that the bands SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO ALL FULL LICENSEES - but in exactly the same way as other bands to which amateurs have access on a Secondary basis.

The standard wording applicable to other amateur bands would be sufficient... i.e.
"Secondary. Available on the basis of non-interference to other services inside and outside the UK"

There is no need to devise other wording/conditions than those which already apply to holders of a full license. Doing so would not 'clarify' but would risk confusing things.

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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club's call sign remains with the club?: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

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 with the wording specifying the modes of transmission.

The existing requirements are effective and workable in ensuring that stations are clearly identifiable (there is no problem with them).

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 - ABSOLUTELY NOT!

The proposed changes would be hugely confusing- both within the UK and internationally.

There is ABSOLUTELY NO REASON TO CHANGE what has been in place successfully for many years.

THE CURRENT SITUATION IS NOT CONFUSING; THESE PROPOSED CHANGES ARE NOT PRACTICAL AND WOULD <CAUSE> 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?:

ABSOLUTELY NOT!

Why on earth would you want to introduce a special set of circumstances for only one class of license holder?

All classes of license holder should be treated the same in regard to the prefix of their call sign.

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 with this simplification.

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

YES.