

## Industry Canada's consultation –Amateur Radio 60 metre band

### Comments from VE2KY/VX9GIN 2012-05-16.

Hi,

Thanks for allowing Amateur Radio consultation process to final approval for the use of six channels on the 60 metre band. Please find my comments on the five items.

Thanks and best regards

Pierre Desmarteau (VE2KY/VX9GIN)

Magog (QC)

Industry Canada Proposal	RAC's comments	VE2KY/VX9GIN comments
<p><b>Item One:</b> Should Industry Canada allow amateur radio operators the use of five frequencies that are harmonized with the US on a no-protection, no-interference basis? These channels are 5332kHz, 5348kHz, 5358.5kHz, 5373kHz, 5405kHz. Transmissions would be limited to a 2.8Khz bandwidth centered on these frequencies.</p>	<p>The obvious answer to Item One is that as amateur radio operators, these additional frequencies are needed for additional emergency communication capacity and having harmonization on frequency with the US will allow for cross border operation.</p>	<p>I fully agree with RAC's position.</p> <p>Furthermore there are still very few Canadian stations allowed to operate on 60 meters. Opportunity to establish QSOs with US stations is beneficial to develop NVIS communication operators' skills and equipment checks which will be mandatory in emergency communication.</p>
<p><b>Item Two:</b> Should Industry Canada harmonize the emission modes and designators on these five channels? In the US they are limited to telephony, data, RTTY and CW.</p>	<p>In Item Two, IC asks if the operating modes should be the same as the US on the five harmonized channels. It was assumed prior to consultation that this was not optional but in the consultation, it appears that input will be taken on this item. However in the proposed revisions to RBR-4, these designators are in place. Unless reason is shown to not harmonize this item, it will likely be implemented.</p>	<p>I fully agree with RAC's position.</p> <p>Allowing data, RTTY and CW emission modes will enhance Canadian operators to provide enhanced support in emergency response when telephony becomes unpractical in bad propagation or interference (QRN) situations.</p>

Industry Canada Proposal	RAC's comments	VE2KY/VX9GIN comments
<p><b>Item Three:</b> Should Industry Canada specify a maximum radiated power of 100 watts peak envelope power?</p>	<p>Again, in Item Three, IC asks if there should be harmonization on the output power on the five channels. In the US, the FCC has limited transmit power to 100 watts. In the proposed revisions to RBR-4, these designators are in place. Unless reason is shown to not harmonize this item, it will likely be implemented.</p>	<p>I fully agree with RAC's position.</p> <p>A maximum of 100 watts ERP is usually sufficient for communication in normal propagation conditions and power limit leads to control adjacent channels interference (QRM).</p>
<p><b>Item Four:</b> Should Industry Canada allow Canadian amateurs access to the 5329kHz channel? Transmissions would be restricted to 2.8 kHz centered on this frequency.</p>	<p>In Item Four, IC asks if they should allow a sixth, Canadian only channel. Originally, RAC had requested two Canadian only channels but one was found to be un-useable. RAC recommends Canadian Amateurs support the allotment of a sixth channel.</p>	<p>I fully agree with RAC's position.</p> <p>A sixth channel would be beneficial allowing "domestic" networking operations and operators' skills development.</p>
<p><b>Item Five:</b> Should Industry Canada specify emission designators and peak power for this sixth channel? If so, what would those be?</p>	<p>Given that the channel referred to in Item Five is domestic only there is little need to harmonize emission types with the US. RAC recommends that as few limits as possible be placed upon the sixth channel to encourage development of domestic communications on this channel.</p>	<p>I fully agree with RAC's position.</p>