

Response form

Organisation name (if applicable)

UK Microwave Group

Your response

Question 1 (section 3): One licence

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposal that each licensee should only be able to hold one personal licence? Please state "Yes" or "No"

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

No comment

Question 2 (section 3): Supervised use

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposals to permit greater supervised use of the radio equipment by others? Please state "Yes" or "No"

Yes

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

We agree that greater supervised use will be beneficial

Question 3 (section 4): M8 and M9 Call sign

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposal to use M8 and M9 for Intermediate licensees going forward? Please state "Yes" or "No"

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

No comment

Question 4 (section 4): RSLs

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposals to change our policies on the use of RSLs? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

We strongly disagree with any changes to RSL policy. RSLs are a necessary part of well established microwave awards schemes. The need to change has not been demonstrated.

Question 5 (section 4): Suffixes

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposals to allow the use of any suffix? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

As this would require rule changes in our contests we are not in favour of changing the suffix policy.

Question 6 (section 4): Change call sign

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposals to allow a change of call signs? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

We do not agree with this change as our record keeping will become impossible to manage

Question 7 (section 4): Call sign limits

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposals on the limits to how many call signs can be held? Please state "Yes" or "No"

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

No Comment

Question 8 (section 4): Special event call signs

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposal to simplify special event call signs? Please state "Yes" or "No"

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

No Comment

Question 9 (section 5): Increase transmit power

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposals to increase transmit power? Please state "Yes" or "No"

Yes

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

We agree with the power increases, although the impact for Full licensees is minimal due to technological and EMF considerations in the microwave bands.

Question 10 (section 5): Remote operation

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposed changes to remote control operation? Please state "Yes" or "No"

Yes

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

We support this change for Beacon control purposes. Some form of failsafe mechanism needs to be included in the requirements.

Question 11 (section 5): Beacons

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposed changes to Beacon operation? Please state "Yes" or "No"

Yes

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

We support this change but need more clarity on what "reasonable steps" referred to in the proposal mean in practice. A requirement to conform to the band plans for personal beacons should be included.

Question 12 (section 5): Gateways

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposed changes to Gateways? Please state "Yes" or "No"

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

No Comment

Question 13 (section 5): Repeaters

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposed changes to repeaters? Please state "Yes" or "No"

Yes

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

Supported but there need to be clear requirements for regular identification of the output signal.

Question 14 (section 5): Foundation Licence

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree with our proposed changes to allow Foundation Licence holders to build their own equipment and access the 2.4 GHz and 5 GHz frequency bands? Please state "Yes" or "No"

Yes

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

Yes but the UK Microwave Group proposes that the frequency ranges 1240-1260 MHz, 1260-1270 MHz, 1270-1325MHz, 2310-2350MHz and 2390 -2400MHz should also be included in the Foundation Licence schedule. This would enable Foundation licence holders to operate and engage in all the activities alongside Intermediate and Full licence holders which the group considers important for encouraging their interest in these bands.

Question 14 (section 5): Foundation Licence

The UK Microwave Group supports the joint effort between the microwave and the amateur satellite community with the current availability of the geostationary satellite transponder known as QO-100 supported by the collaboration between Qatar and the German amateur radio satellite society (AMSAT DL). The transponder supports both narrowband and wideband applications in separate sub-bands. The 500 kHz wide uplink for the narrow band sub band covers the range 2400-2400.5MHz with downlink in the 10 GHz band between 10.489500 and 10.490 GHz. The equipment needed to receive the narrowband transponder downlink signals is readily available and not too difficult to implement. (E.g. downlink signals can be received using domestic satellite TV LNB's). Uplink is somewhat more challenging, typically requiring a frequency up converter and a specific antenna arrangement. As a result of this transponder the group is pleased to have seen a welcome increase in the interest in these microwave frequencies spawning many projects and system development of systems to support the activity. However the 1W power level proposed in the Foundation licence schedule for the band 2400 – 2450 MHz would make this operation challenging for these licence holders. At this power level with readily available hardware the signals through the transponder are weak and this may be a disincentive. Experiments have shown that even a modest a power level increase to 2W can result a good signal to noise ratio but with a larger than average large antenna system. Therefore the group proposes an increase in the Foundation licence schedule for the specific range 2400 to 2400.5 MHz to 5W to encourage this operation with readily available hardware (such as a domestic satellite TV dish).

Question 15 (section 5): Airborne use

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree to Ofcom's proposals to permit some limited airborne use? Please state "Yes" or "No"

Yes

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

We agree with this proposal

Question 16 (section 5): Alignment of terms and conditions

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree to Ofcom's proposed changes in licence format and the alignment of standard terms and conditions? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

The UK Microwave Group proposes using this opportunity to expand the UK 5.6GHz allocation to include the range 5680 – 5755 MHz. This would lead to a contiguous allocation from 5650 – 5765 MHz bringing the potential to develop wideband communication applications. Amateur radio enthusiast interests may not stop at the RF level and can include interests in networking radio systems to develop amateur data networks. The group considers this an interesting way to develop and modernise the amateur radio hobby. Any geographic or other restrictions on operation on any band need to be included in the new licence and not just referenced out to the Frequency Sharing between Civil and Military Services (PSSR) document.

The requirements for beacons in Schedule 2 are also problematic. A complete revision of schedule 2 to clearly show the non-allowed locations is required, and to remove contradictions with the new main licence text.

We would support the licence changes if the above improvements are included.

Question 17 (section 3): Changes to licence terms and conditions

Is this a confidential response? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you agree to Ofcom's proposed changes to the licence terms and conditions? Please state "Yes" or "No"

No

Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

Schedule 2 conflicts with some of the other proposals, it is too restrictive compared to the text, see response to Q16 above.

Paragraph 5.51 that refers to 70MHz, 146MHz and >250GHz bands should also include 2300-2302MHz in its scope. Paragraph 6.25 does not include any mechanism for consultation on significant changes that could otherwise be introduced through the mechanism described.

Please complete this form in full and return to <u>amateur.radio.review@ofcom.org.uk</u>