



**General Conference, Davos, 11 to 16 September 2005**

<b>SUBJECT</b>		<b>Improving Bandplan Compliance</b>	
<b>Society</b>	<b>RSGB</b>	<b>Country:</b>	<b>UK</b>
<b>Committee:</b>	<b>C4</b>	<b>Paper number:</b>	<b>I 38</b>
<b>Contact:</b>	<b>Peter Barville, G3XJS</b>	<b>e-mail:</b>	<b>g3xjs@gqrp.co.uk</b>

**Information Paper on behalf of the G-QRP Club**

**Improving Bandplan Compliance**

**Summary**

This information paper concludes that the IARU, through its member societies, has been successful over many years in establishing and maintaining MF and HF CW sub-bands within the IARU bandplan. However,

- a) an increasing proportion of the Amateur Radio community is using non-CW modes and deploying beacons within the CW communication sub-bands;
- b) national societies could do more to improve compliance with IARU bandplans.

**Limitations**

- 1) This paper considers non-compliance affecting the IARU Region 1 CW sub-bands only.  
Note: The authors believe that the degree of compliance within the CW sub-bands in particular is indicative of the respect for IARU bandplans in general.
- 2) This paper does not discuss whether the proportion of the amateur service frequencies allocated to the CW sub-bands is equitable.  
Note: The authors feel that where amateur service frequencies have been allocated to CW sub-bands, such allocations should be used for CW communication purposes only.

**Situation**

The IARU Region 1 HF Bandplan has served the amateur community very well for many years, and has always been made available by the IARU member societies through a range of printed publications and Internet resources. However, in recent years, it has been observed that

- a) an increasing number of Amateur Radio operators can be heard operating data and telephony modes as well as beacons that transmit position and propagation data within the CW communication sub-bands;
- b) non-Morse stations within the CW sub-bands are getting more aggressive and more confident, believing that they are 'entitled' to do what they do.

## **Analysis**

Given the recent changes that have facilitated 'code-free' and easier access to the HF amateur bands, protecting the CW sub-bands is becoming increasingly challenging due to

- a) an increasing proportion of the amateur community not having either an interest in Morse code or a knowledge of the techniques and constraints of CW operation;
- b) the current trend toward deregulation by a number of national administrations means that national societies are becoming responsible for managing amateur service frequencies.

National societies and organisers of Amateur Radio contests do not always present clear and consistent information regarding the status and applicability of the bandplans. This is unfortunate, when considering the time; effort; and cost involved in reviewing; maintaining; and publicising IARU bandplans.

## **Impact of Non-Compliance**

Most non-compliance in the CW sub-bands occurs when SSB and data operators slide down into the upper (HF) part of the CW sub-bands, generating significant interference and annoyance to CW operators. Such encroachment adversely affects

- a) newcomers to CW—because they tend to operate in the quieter, slower-paced 'straight key zone' in the upper part of the CW sub-bands, and,
- b) QRP CW experimenters—who tend to operate on or near the international QRP CW frequencies, also located near the top-end of each CW sub-band.

The deployment of beacons in the 30/40/80m CW sub-bands can also adversely affect amateur communications, whether such stations are manned or unmanned.

## **Conclusions**

The authors respectfully suggest that IARU Region 1 takes note that bandplan compliance could be improved by consideration of the following steps:

- 1) That the published IARU bandplan removes ambiguity by clearly indicating the status and applicability of the bandplan through the inclusion of a declaration that identifies
  - a) the date the bandplan was approved, who approved it, and the next review date;
  - b) to whom it applies;
  - c) to whom it does not apply (e.g. stations such as DK0WCY and DL4DSS/B);
  - d) when it applies (e.g. times of day, days of the year, etc.);
  - e) when it does not apply (e.g. during certain contests).
- 2) That each national society (or, initially, a small 'pilot' group of national societies) work together to develop common and consistent methods for bandplan compliance by
  - a) logging incidents of non-compliance within their national borders;
  - b) producing regular reports that summarise the non-compliances.
- 3) That each national society undertakes an assessment of their current methods for publicising and supporting the IARU bandplan, and hence develops an improvement plan appropriate to that national society.