

Graham Alston
29 Arthur Ave,
Brighton, 3186

**Submission - Review of non-assigned amateur and outpost regulatory arrangement -
consultation 01/2021**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to advise that **my preference is for Option A**, not Option B or C.

Whilst I agree with the ACMA's wish to reduce expense and increase self-regulation, it is not acceptable for the Amateur Radio Service to be operated on a "no interference, no protection" basis.

As a real-world example, I am currently dealing with severe radio frequency interference from a power pole transformer located near my radio site. It is over a wide frequency range (1.8 - 20MHz), and strong enough to severely impact my stations receiving capability. I have identified the fault and notified the electricity provider, however at this stage after several weeks, no action has been taken. My next step is to inform the provider that as I have an Apparatus Licence, I am entitled to some protection via the ACMA, hoping to leverage this to get the provider to fix the problem. With a Class License, I would not have this option, and my investment of over \$50k in radio equipment would be at serious risk.

Class Licenses typically apply to low-cost Services such as CB, whereas operators using the Amateur Service typically employ much more sophisticated and expensive equipment. A typical CB transceiver costs less than \$100, versus well over \$2000 for an amateur transceiver.

I would be rather pay double my license fee for an Apparatus License versus a free Class License, to provide me with some protection for my investment.

The ACMA should be asking the peak bodies (WIA and RASA) to investigate and propose a fourth option, whereby the Apparatus License remains but ACMA achieves cost reductions through more Amateur Service self-regulation and responsibility.

Yours Sincerely,

Graham Alston, VK3GA