

Follow up comments on RM-11708

Matthew Pitts  
N8OHU

In the wake of the most recent series of comments, I would like to add the following:

In reference to the comments made by John R. Grimm, I would like to respectfully point out to the Commissioners that many of the numerous modes that he makes mention of in his Exhibit are very narrowly focused toward competitive goals, or are intended for very short focused messages. For example, JT-65 and the variants thereof are primarily intended to bounce signals off of the lunar surface, or off of the very briefly noticeable trails left by meteor showers. In and of itself, the modes developed by Dr Taylor are indeed a good example of what can be done, but they are also essentially useless to many people that do not participate in those activities, precisely because they are limited in symbol rate and bandwidth.

In reference to the comments regarding wideband signals interfering with narrowband signals that may have been transmitting already, and the request for "busy channel detection", I would like to point out that wideband modes such as Winmor and Pactor do have and use this capability to the best of the abilities of the equipment. By this I mean that a Winlink Radio Message Server will be monitoring for any activity on the bands; if a connection attempt is made while there is a local conversation between hams in progress, and the RMS server can actively detect this, it will refuse the connection attempt. However, if the local station cannot be heard when the connection attempt is made, it will be allowed; this occurrence will seem to the station that was interfered with to be a lack of such requested functionality, but is entirely in keeping with the randomly variable nature of HF radio communications. I would also like to point out again that the ARRL proposal is not intended to alter the current bandwidth limitations on fully automatic stations, as seems to be the general belief of some commenters.

Several comments have brought up wider bandwidth options; in general those would be more to my liking, but as should be apparent from the numerous comments against the ARRL proposal as it is currently written, there seem to be a large number of hams that would oppose any change to the status quo that is not to their liking. Many hams seem to feel that we do not need to have the same sort of bandwidth options as hams in other countries, but I would like to go on record to say that I highly disagree with this, and am in agreement with hams in other countries that feel that the US hams need to learn to adapt and work with each other instead of depending on government regulations written by non-hams for guidance.