



## Minutes of the HF Contest Committee meeting held via Skype

1<sup>st</sup> April 2021 at 1930

### Attendees:

Nick G4FAL Chair (NT)  
Andy G4PIQ Chair VHF Contest Committee  
Ian, G0FCT Chair CSC (IP)  
Mike G0GJV  
Graham G0NBI  
Pete G4CLA (PL)  
Paul G4PVM  
Mike, G7TWC  
Allan, GM4ZUK  
Stewart GW0ETF  
Clive GM3POI  
Chris GM3WOJ  
Nick M1DDD

1. Update on Covid effects on portable and multi-op contesting
  - 1.1. Noting that each of the home nations were planning to lift restrictions at different times and with permissions also varying across the UK, the need to strictly follow local rules at all times was stressed.
  - 1.2. It was agreed that CW National Field Day on 5-6th June should proceed although there would not be clarity about the extent of allowable portable operations until nearer the time (mid-May). It was anticipated that single-operator portable would be permissible but, for England at least, the exact restrictions that would apply to people meeting in groups was not yet known.
  - 1.3. In view of the uncertainty about how “normal” this year’s event would be, it was agreed to determine whether trophies and certificates would be awarded nearer the time.
  - 1.4. It was agreed that the above position be publicised in RadCom and on the website and contest reflector.

**Action NT/IP**

2. Special Contest Calls (SCC)
  - 2.1. Correspondence was received from an ex-RSGB member raising concern that a number of qualifying contests were only open to RSGB members, thus potentially disadvantaging non-members who wished to apply for an SCC.
  - 2.2. It was stressed that determining the qualification criteria for gaining an SCC was not within the remit of either the HFCC or VHFCC: this was a matter for Ofcom.
  - 2.3. It was pointed out that there was increased flexibility to achieve qualification in non-RSGB contests due to the plethora of different categories, and that very few SCC applicants used RSGB contests to qualify. One exception was the RSGB IOTA contest which welcomes entries from non-members.

**Action: IP to reply to correspondent**

### 3. Revised rules for FT4 Contests

- 3.1. It was noted that, whilst the rules sought to penalise stations that do not send four-character locators as part of the contest exchange, the adjudication programme was not able to reliably identify such transgressions, principally because the FT4 software automatically filled the “sent locator” field. This resulted in some receiving stations being unfairly penalised for not logging a locator.
- 3.2. It was agreed that the existing rules 6(b) and 6(c) be replaced as under
  - 3.2.1. 6(b) A QSO with a station that is logged without a received four-character locator will score 1 point with no multiplier credit for either the receiving or sending station.
- 3.3. It was noted that this would still require vigilance (by manual means) to identify those stations that omit to send their locator.
- 3.4. A further complication arises when stations find that a locator is missing in their log but they had actually received a locator either earlier in a QSO which had become detached by an interleaved QSO or had been received in a CQ call earlier in the contest period. To address this, the following supplementary rule was agreed for this series of contests only:
  - 3.4.1. “Call signs and locators logged must be the same as those exchanged over the air by the entrants during the contest period.”
- 3.5. It was agreed that the current “FT4 Hints and Tips” be augmented to advise entrants how to extract locators from the ALL.TXT file that may not be logged by the software.

**Action: IP to amend rules before the next FT4 Contest**

**Action: NT**

### 4. Signal reports in 80m CC Data contests

- 4.1. It was brought to the committee’s attention that, contrary to the rules, some entrants were not routinely sending signal reports. It was agreed that committee members should note rule infractions of this nature and report them to the contest adjudicator.

**Action: ALL**

### 5. Commonwealth Contest

- 5.1. NT reported a problem he had experienced when using GB5CC, notably that it was frequently copied as G6HCC. He drew attention to the fact that there were other call signs available for use as RSGB HQ stations that might be more suitable.
- 5.2. Members were reluctant to abandon GB5CC in view of its long-standing association with this contest. and that the “CC” call sign was known worldwide as a bonus station.

### 6. 2022 Contest Calendar

- 6.1. It was agreed that next year’s calendar should be a repeat of 2021, taking into account, as appropriate, the additional bank holiday.

**Action: NT**

### 7. IARU Contest 2021: GR2HQ

- 7.1. NT reported that he had secured the above call sign, and, for planning purposes, it was assumed that, by the time of the event in July, UK wide travel restrictions will have been lifted. This meant that we could look forward to a pre-Covid style of operation.

**7.2. Action: NT to prepare and circulate questionnaire to encourage participation**

### 8. Transatlantic Tests Centenary celebrations

- 8.1. NT described the chronology of events 100 years ago that saw the inaugural transmission and reception of radio signals between the USA and Europe.
- 8.2. It was noted that the first reception of signals in Europe occurred in Scotland in December 1921 and that arrangements were already in hand to mark this occasion by Scottish stations.
- 8.3. The first two-way successful transatlantic test was in December 1922. The UK station used the call sign (G)5WS and Nick reported that Ofcom had given permission for this call to be used to commemorate the event. December 1923 saw the use of G6XX in further



transatlantic tests and, in July of the following year, G3ZZ was used to successfully broadcast from a railway carriage.

- 8.4. It was agreed to consider the options for commemorating the above events, concentrating first on the use of G5WS and its regional variants in December 2022, perhaps in a marathon-style event in conjunction with the ARRL and other interested national societies.
- 8.5. The main challenge would be the provision of an IT infrastructure to support the event, much like Hamlogs had been used for the Cricket World Cup. It was agreed that providing this facility “in-house” would be a good investment for the future and that discussions be held initially with existing database providers to explore the feasibility of this.

**Action: NT/PL**

9. Date of Next Meeting: TBA