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of a named club, and by adding a further ground for revoking the Licence to include circumstances where the licensee no longer represents the club, will help ensure that a club?s call sign remains with the club?:

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?:

Happy with current provision, but no objection to change

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?:

Happy with current provision, but no objection to change

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?:

Happy with current provision, but no objection to change

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?:

Happy with current provision, but no objection to change

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

Proposed changes are good, but I query the use of the word 'RAYNET' - the current licence does not differentiate between Amateur's ability to support emergency comms between being a member of RAYNET or not - and definition of 'RAYNET' could be 'interesting' as not all groups are members of the 'Network'. Similarly some Amateurs operate in emergencies as individuals or on behalf of other groups such as 4x4 Response, whose primary purpose is not communications but still support User Services.

Recent changes to the Bandplan replaced the phrase 'may be used by RAYNET' with 'may be used for Emergency Communications and Community Events'