

7521150877.txt

In regards to the Bureau's request for comment on Voice Communication Exchange Committee's HD voice proposal, I would like to say that there is the possibility that this could have positive benefit, but there's also the possibility it could be negligible or even have a negative effect, as the term "HD voice" only commonly represents the ability to transmit anything beyond the standard 3.1 kHz bandwidth allocated to voice. Long removed, electromechanical switching equipment and early vinyl records meet this standard.

If it were to mean the widespread introduction of the G.722 codec, this could certainly be a good thing, as it uses the same amount of bandwidth as the currently deployed G.711 codec in the wireline network, and contains few noticeable artifacts.

However, if it were to mean the replacement of G.711 with the AMR-WB codec, it would represent a steep drop in performance despite the higher sample rate, as it uses very aggressive compression techniques which sacrifice overall quality in favor of lower bitrates.

It's worth noting that "HD voice" services have been available on the current PSTN for over two decades now with the introduction of ISDN, often with codecs such as MP3 and AAC, and bit/sample rates comparable to CD quality. Though these features remain in widespread use via ISDN, they have earned little notice outside of studio-oriented industries, such as broadcast and cinema.