



# International Amateur Radio Union Region 1

Europe, Middle East, Africa and Northern Asia

Founded 1950

## Committee C4 (HF Matters) Interim Meeting 24-25 February 2007 InterCity Hotel, Vienna

### Minutes

#### Item 1 Opening of meeting

The meeting was opened by the Chairman Colin Thomas G3PSM who welcomed everyone to the meeting

#### Item 2 Introduction of Delegates and Observers

Delegates introduced themselves and the Societies they represented. A list of attendees is attached as Annex A.

Apologies had been received from the following societies:

ARM Moldova, IARC, IARS, MARL, NARG, SARL, TIR

#### Item 3 Agreement of the Agenda

Suggestion to take papers 2 and 10 together. Agreed.

#### Item 4 Contests

##### Item 4.1 & 4.5 Investigation the future of the different field day events (UBA) & IARU Region 1 Field day rules (DARC)

UBA introduced the paper.

DARC commented that they didn't plan to change the dates, but will start discussions about introducing digital modes into Field Day contest. 95% of DARC members are not in favour of combining SSB and CW events, or to change the dates. They would like to make the CW more attractive to DARC members (as numbers of those participating are in decline), perhaps by harmonising their field day with the so-called European Field Day (EFD) proposal. DARC proposed that Region 1 form a Field Day Working Group to report back to the next general conference.

EDR commented that their society were satisfied with the current arrangements, would welcome harmonisation of events to provide more activity, but are not specifically interested in results coordination.

OeVSV pressed consideration to consider digimodes, suggested that the WG should try to give some leadership to encourage the younger members entering the hobby. They were also not in support of changing the dates.

**Action: DARC to setup sub-working group with DL6RAI as moderator.**

## **Item 4.2 South East European Contest (SEEAC)**

RAAG introduced the paper, saying that this proposal had been under consideration since 2005.

UBA: questioned the legality of the /QRP suffix. RAAG suggested that this could be disposed with; DARC thought that the slash could be omitted.

MRASZ: Questioned the weekend for the contest, in relation to some holidays are related to the religious festivals and could conflict with the celebration of Christmas for the Greek Orthodox Church.

HRS: Concern over the potential conflict over weekend in relation to religious festival and also in terms of the name of the propose contest.

URE: Concern that this is a busy weekend in EA, thus there would be little support on the proposed weekend.

OeVSV: Referred to an earlier Region 1 recommendation that we should not introduce a new contest without giving up another international contest. This would suggest that one of the countries involved should give up their international contest.

ARABiH: Suggested that the proposal could be improved by adding some countries in Eastern Europe, using the same exchange as an existing contest. Merely, sending in the logs to a central place for combining results. ARABiH were also less keen with the QRP category.

OeVSV & EDR: Spoke in support for a wider grouping of countries contest, thus widening the scope and activity.

RSGB: supported OeVSV view and also mentioned concern over lack of limiting the contest to “contest preferred segments” and where they don’t exist to specify, “contest free zones”.

NRRL: Supported all the comments, and would support the proposal for the SEEAC proposals, but fully support OeVSV, EDR and RSGB comments.

PZK: Expressed the view that some Polish amateurs would not be able to support the suggested weekend for the contest.

FRR: Commented that their society agrees with the idea, but had difficulty over the name of the contest and in which countries were to be involved in the coverage of the contest.

DARC: Reminded that paper 13 discusses some of the issues. Suggested that the name could be such that countries are not included could be included in the available contacts for an area contest.

Chairman summarised that there were two major concerns, the date and the fact that there were too many contests. There had been some good suggestions at combining this with an existing contest, such as the LZ contest. But at the moment R1 couldn't support this proposal. He proposed to form a sub-group to investigate further the key issues.

**Following further consideration external to the formal committee meeting, the ad hoc sub-group have agreed to consult with all proposed organising societies and report back on the HF Manager's reflector.**

### **Item 4.3 Contests and Band planning (withdrawn)**

### **Item 4.4 HF Managers Handbook – Guidelines for HF Contests**

RSGB introduced the draft guidelines, suggesting that the guidelines could be sharpened in respect of frequency segments for contests, both in terms of stating the boundaries and compliance.

PZK: SP2FAK is now active in PZK for the management of contests and agrees with the content of the draft.

EDR, UBA: agree that it is a good draft.

DARC: needs to have some comment to encourage cross-contacts between contests. This was covered in paper 13, Contest Activity (DARC). DK4VW suggested that contest software authors provide a column for alternative exchanges.

OeVSV: took this suggestion further to add comments for Award information.

HRS: Wanted to see some method whereby exchanges outside the national contest can be adjudicated to be valid for the national contest.

PB2T reminded that the exchange is there to be able to validate that a contact took place. Hence the fact that if the exchange doesn't match the national rules the exchange should not invalidate the contact.

RSGB: reminded delegates about the suggestion that Region 1 should be more active in penalising stations for operating outside the stated frequency boundaries for specific contests. DARC and OeVSV: supported this suggestion.

**The Chairman summarised by saying that the draft was accepted with the inclusion of the DARC proposal (paper 13) to encourage combined contests or to run contests in parallel, and the RSGB's request that the wording is tightened to recommend stricter observance of frequency rules for contests.**

## **Item 4.6 Contest preferred segments in the (new) 7 MHz band**

DARC introduced the paper that sought to introduce, when 7MHz is band-planned in 2009, a contest free segment for Region 1 contests. A suggestion of 50kHz was suggested.

PZK: Asked about the work of the Band Plan Working Group (BPWG). The chair responded by saying that the WG had not been asked to do anything since clearing up some detailed issues following the Davos Conference.

REF: Raised in respect of the BPWG that consideration should be given to broadening the sub-bands allocated to digital modes. REF was not keen on such a wide contest-free allocation as 50kHz.

EDR: reminded that there was an outline band plan for 7MHz and would prefer to have an ad hoc group in addition to BPWG. DARC suggested that EDR could be represented on the BPWG. REF suggested that the broad discussion on this issue ought to take place on the R1 HF Manager's reflector and then ask the BPWG to summarise and produce some proposals for Cavtat Conference to consider.

EDR also wanted to remind the meeting that it was the medium sized contests that we were keen to manage within the DARC proposal, not the CQWW type of contest.

OeVSV: We need to keep in mind that contesters tend to have narrow-band aeri-als and that a contest-free segment ought to be allocated to a band-edge. Others, however, did not agree.

NRRL: reminded that the US had recently changed their access for different licence classes at 7MHz (phone above 7125 kHz for Extra and Advance licences; phone above 7175 kHz for General licences), so the top 50kHz could be a good place for a phone contest segment.

OeVSV: raised concern about the problem of non-contesters causing deliberate QRM. DARC reminded that such action was illegal under ITU rules. The Chairman said that this matter could be discussed more fully later in the meeting.

The Chairman summarised that we should discuss views about this matter on the R1 HF Manager's reflector and then ask the BPWG to report at Cavtat in 2008.

## **Item 4.7 Contest Activity**

This item was incorporated within item 4.4

## **Item 4.8 European Youth Contest**

DARC outlined the paper.

OeVSV: Suggested that it should be a weekday contest, so that school clubs could participate. Rather than introduce a new contest, why not introduce a new category.

HRS: Strong support for the proposal, but suggested that a Saturday morning would work for school clubs.

RSGB: raised three points

- It is thought that young contesters prefer high-rate contests such as CQWW / WPX / ARRL events and that a relatively low rate event such as is proposed would not meet their needs
- Thought to be better to let the young contesters to take the initiative, with perhaps support from IARU in terms of a trophy, etc.
- WWYC has tried in the past to initiate a contest in the form suggested, but support was poor.

Therefore it might perhaps be better for IARU to remind national societies to encourage clubs to actively help young contesters by providing facilities, incentives, mentoring, publicity, etc. OeVSV again suggested that we aim to get the large contests to include a youngster's category.

DARC: wanted this to be a European wide initiative; DARC is open to which contest encouragement to young contesters would be applied, such as WAE.

UBA: The problem with WAE is that it is limited to working outside Europe.

The chairman summarise that overall it is a good suggestion and asked DARC to come up with some more ideas and that manager's discuss the matter on the R1 HF Manager's reflector.

**Action: DARC to produce a more 'in-depth' proposal**

PZK: raised the issue of the way in which the report is always 59(9). Should the signal report be dropped and just an exchange of serial number? PZK suggested that we discussed this matter at this Interim Conference to come up with a recommendation. REF was keen to have proper report and that it ought be down to the operator to send an appropriate report. OeVSV was keen to make the RS(T) more serious; it is a part of tradition. URE: suggested that we need to be honest, that if a report such as 349 is received many stations will not continue the exchange because it will disrupt the QSO rhythm. BFRA & PZK supported the use of honest reports.

NRRL asked what constituted a QSO: the R1 C5 have a definition of a QSO – both stations should have the call signs correct, that some other information has been exchanged and confirmation of this exchange has taken place. For some awards there is a need for a sufficient quality of RS(T) report, thus it was up to the contest organisers to determine whether an RS(T) was necessary and whether an alternative exchange would be desirable.

The chairman reminded the meeting that most software contest logging programs allows the reports to be relatively easily changed. He summarised that there wasn't sufficient interest amongst those present to make changes at this stage. It was agreed to add the C5 definition into the Contest Guidelines as to what constitutes a QSO.

**Chairman's Note: In fact the only definition used by C5 is that used during Meteor Scatter activity (page 138 of the VHF Handbook)**

## **Item 5.1 Beacons below 14MHz.**

RSGB introduced the paper.

MRASZ: asked what categories remain if you allow the exclusions stated in the paper. DARC replied saying that there are a number of beacons that have been operated for no apparent reason, often termed "ego beacons".

OeVSV: was concerned about the policing aspect of this proposal, and suggested that IARU ought to say what is possible rather than state what is to be discouraged. Austria's licensing rules allowed Amateurs quite a lot of freedom in terms of where and how they operate. The meeting was asked to encourage some guidelines on frequency, beacon networks and more sophisticated beacons.

ARI: Italy has a problem with their licensing rules, but doesn't mandate the band-plan.

EDR: Enforcement of rules that do not support unmanned beacons, too would be difficult would be difficult. It was not the intent of the EDR paper to discourage experimentation, but that the conference tightened up the outcome of the paper. Thus the RSGB paper is a sensible approach.

The chair invited DARC to comment on their paper 12 Beacon Policy. There was a need to discourage unnecessary beacons and a need to encourage useful beacon experimentation. DARC suggested that we should remove the Lillehammer recommendation that beacon sub-bands should be at the low frequency end of bands as there had been no move to locate beacons in those parts of the bands

HRS: Concern that the proposal changes the decision taken at Davos. There was a different approach across the EU, and some countries national regulation. HRS asked for clearer, more transparent, wording.

OeVSV: Commented that there more spectrum is coming or becoming available on 7 and perhaps 10MHz, so this might make it more acceptable to allowing beacons. However, the meeting ought to consider including a definition for a beacon.

PZK: reminded the meeting of the good work that Martin, G3USF carries out as IARU Region 1 Beacon Coordinator in influencing sensible beacon implementations.

The chair in summary concluded that there was general agreement to the proposal. To meet the MRASZ point we could replace the wording about the Beacon coordinator approving proposals to "coordinating". The DARC paper that all members of Region 1 should be invited to be involved in discussing Beacon Policy.

**RSGB introduced revision 1 of the document to meet the objections made during the meeting. These were accepted.**

OeVSV commented in terms of defining what constitutes a beacon, it should not be too restrictive in terms of future use of beacons and should take account of national definitions in their radio regulations. OeVSV agreed to upload the definition which was accepted by their Administration to the reflector.

**Action: OeVSV to upload Austrian beacon definition to the reflector.**

## **Item 6.1 Preserving the HF Noise Floor (RSGB)**

RSGB introduced the paper.

OeVSV: fully supports the proposal, and says that there is an urgent need to implement some measurement of noise floor and document the findings. In particular this needs to be applied to PLT (BLP); the fact that some operators will be notching their implementations, it should be easy to identify the noise increase to PLT implementation.

EDR: In Region 1 there is an EMC group that deals with these matters who are better equipped to handle these matters. We should therefore coordinate these matters with that group. OeVSV felt that it was important to coordinate with the EMC group, but that it was urgent to be more proactive in this general issue.

The chairman agreed that there was general agreement to the proposal, but that as EDR pointed out there is a Region 1 EMC Coordinator, the proposal should also include a reference to coordinate with that person.

## **Item 7 Deliberate QRM**

RSGB introduced the paper, emphasising that many of the points came from the informal discussion of the topic that took place at the informal meeting at Friedrichshafen, 2006.

NRRL: Reminded the meeting of the Lillehammer, 1999 recommendation (included in The IARU Region 1 HF Manager's Handbook Chapter 3.2 and 7;) handed out to the attendees and supported RSGB's attempts at developing the topic further as the matter is an important topic.

OeVSV: Questioned who gives DXpeditions the right to use very wide splits, etc, and questioned whether there should be some rules for DXpeditions. PB2T commented that this wasn't really practical for a number of reasons. OeVSV also mentioned the problem with people conducting QSOs finding that they are in the pile-up area for a DXpedition. The chair mentioned that on 30m amateur Dxpediton had interfered with a primary user due to using a wide split, which was a serious problem.

UBA: Was concerned that contest stations should not work split, as is beginning to start. In Belgium, you are permitted to take action by complaining to the licensing authority about stations that are causing QRM. DARC pointed out that in many cases it is not certain who was actually transmitting.

REF: would like to consider a difference between deliberate QRM and bad behaviour, and said that a recent study by members of Clipperton DX Club showed that poor operating practice of calling simplex on a KH8 DXpedition was not specific to one country.

The Chair, reminded the meeting there was a recommendation from the San Marino Conference to include with the call sign, information about the listening frequencies.

PZK: Raised that some of the problems are to do with people in the pile-up not following the DX operator, but responding incorrectly to their instructions such as partial calls.

OeVSV: stated concern about the policing form of response and emphasised the need for DX operators taking more responsibility for the pile-up.

HRS: Supported the paper apart from the proposal apart from the monitoring aspect, as it was felt un-practical.

NRRL: Reminded the meeting about the ON4WW website operating practice, and the practice of including a booklet on operating practice as a part of the training and education material for newcomers to the hobby. NRRL has made a small booklet regarding operation ethics, which for the last some 20 years has been part of the curriculum for the amateur radio licence, approved by the Norwegian PT Authority administrating the licence exams.

PZK: Agreed that we can and should educate newcomers, but what can we do to change the behaviour of experienced Amateurs. OeVSV supported guidelines for DXpeditions and also for those trying to contact pileups.

OeVSV: There are an increasing number of instances of amateur like operations passing commercial traffic.

REF: Reminded the meeting that the issue is about bad behaviour on the DXpedition on the calling frequency.

EDR: Sees the whole issue as a massive problem. There is a difference between bad behaviour on the DX frequency and within the pileup. The former is the important one to tackle first.

HRS: There should be some common recommendation, which we publish in each country. IARU could perhaps prepare and coordinate such an activity.

**The chair summarised that all agree that education and peer pressure is part of the solution. There is a suggestion that IARU AC considers issuing some guidelines for all societies to publish. The part of the proposal, item b), about monitoring was not seen to be practical or necessarily desirable.**

## **Item 8 QSL Direct only**

REF introduced the paper. An example of one of the recent DXpeditions was VU7LD, whose QSL manager is known to only accept direct QSLs. Clipperton DX Club requires that bureau cards should be processed as a requirement for financial support to be given to DXpeditions.

MRASZ: The cost of handling bureau cards for DXpeditions where the manager is within the society cannot be supported by the society. Thus, it cannot support the proposal.

URE: Their policy is not to financially support Direct QSL only operations.

OeVSV: raised the option of Award Managers accepting e-QSL confirmations.

REF agreed that the e-QSL or LoTW is a way of confirming a QSO via the Internet, but reminded the meeting that many operators want to collect the cards.

OeVSV also endorsed the concept of not funding DXpeditions that do not support bureau QSLing.

OeVSV: would like to accept e-QSL for awards without charge.

RSGB: Supported the proposal and reminded the meeting that IOTA Awards programme and the RSGB DXpedition Fund requires Bureau QSLing. RSGB have rules in place to charge DXpedition QSL Managers, within their membership, for processing large quantities of QSL cards. This would have to be regarded as an on-cost for the DXpedition.

NRRL: Generally supports the proposal, but for large DXpeditions the costs of the operation need to be partially funded by direct QSLs. NRRL feels that LoTW will gradually take over and you should support DXpeditions by helping to fund the DXpedition by direct QSLing.

The chairman summarised that there was some uncertainty and some opposition on behalf of the bureau's of smaller countries. It needs to be re-worded the proposal to cover the concerns. There was no support for the part of the proposal that dealt with the situation where there is not QSL Bureau in the country for the QSL Manager.

**Revision 2 of the paper was agreed by the meeting.**

## **Item 9 500kHz Secondary Allocation**

RSGB introduced the paper on behalf of the IARU Region 1 500kHz Working Group.

OeVSV, DARC has already gained their support of their administrations for putting 500kHz on the WRC10/11 agenda.

OeVSV supported the need to incorporate the interests of the ex-marine operators towards their interests in 500kHz.

LA2RR commented that the Norwegian Administration views are more inline with the German administration in that the Amateur service is preferred for the Amateurs in respect of 500kHz. There was also the political issue of considering the timing of this proposal in respect other requests from the Amateur Service. DARC commented that the paper proposes national administration approach rather than IARU Region 1 to overcome this political sensitivity.

DARC sees the value of 500kHz as providing data links as an alternative to microwave links, that are under pressure.

REF stated their support for the proposal and will be asking their administration for support within WRC.

PZK stated that they would be taking the matter to their Society.

**The chairman summarised there was support for this proposal**

## **Item 10 Echolink Frequencies for HF/VHF – Discussion paper with C5**

DARC introduced this paper, with some reservations over the validity of the proposal in respect of legal and applicability to Amateur Radio. Protected frequencies are sought for safety reasons, etc, and the impact may read across to other hobby groups, e.g. climbers, walkers, etc.

MRASZ: Questioned why this was being discussed, as it appeared to be against ITU regulations.

OeVSV: Suggested that the Austrians might call this proposal a matter of “gschaftlhuber”. A similar proposal was raised in the past under a different guise. It was felt that there was a question as to whether this it was appropriate for the Amateur service to be used to provide weather information, which might later be found to be wrong. It was thought to be a pecuniary interest, as it is thought to be saving money by not using the commercial available service. DARC was unsure whether one could use the pecuniary argument.

RSGB suggested that as a test of the pecuniary interest the proposers ought to be asked to consider paying for protected spectrum within the Maritime Mobile spectrum.

LA2RR: reminded that the committee needed to provide an appropriate response for DARC and that it was not in conformance with the ITU RR (Article 1.56) definition of Amateur radio. He is also concerned about the consequences of failure or incorrect information concerning a safety of life service.

**The chairman summarised that the majority of the societies represented were not in favour of the proposal, but there was a real problem for DARC in terms of the legality of arguments against the proposal.**

## **Item 11 Review the Standing Recommendations relating to HF Matters**

The Chair outlined this item, which refers to the removal of outdated recommendations. He would like this to be a regular review matter, which needs to be brought to conference, by referring those recommendations that are thought to be out-of-date to his attention in good time for a paper to be prepared for approval at Cavtat Conference in 2008.

## **Item 12 Spectrum Policy**

LA2RR introduced the topic of the need to maintain document that aims to capture IARU R1 spectrum policy. The document is on the Region 1 website under the title "Amateur and Amateur Satellite Service". It is important to ensure that this document is reviewed and suggestions for amendments should be passed to LA2RR or PB2T in time for the document to be reviewed at the Region 1 EC meeting in April 2007.

NRRL raised concerns, given that the document was in the public domain that no prioritisation of needs is presented. LA2RR responded that the document purposely does not aim to document Region 1 priority, but serves to represent the facts relating to Region 1 spectrum requirements.

NRRL and OeVSV was concerned that the public view of this document could be that it would appear that the Amateurs are dissatisfied with their spectrum requirements that are unlikely to change. However, it was common with other spectrum users, so they warned against re-drafting the document to reflect a more realistic view. DARC supported the view that detailed policy and priorities ought not to be public.

In response to a question about current priorities, PB2T responded that 7MHz expansion and the proposed 5MHz band were the top two priorities.

OeVSV asked whether there is any documentation of changes in the HF band, such as the reduced use of Maritime Mobile usage. The Chair responded that considerable work has been carried out in the Conference Preparatory GroupPT4, in this aspect. PB2T commented PT22, in CEPT WGFM is looking at the spectrum utilisation; it is good to see that 7.0 – 7.1MHz is quite well occupied during the daytime when broadcast activity in the 7MHz band is low. Access to this information via [www.ero.dk](http://www.ero.dk) and follow the navigation ECC Activities>WG FM>FM22, however the information is copyright and is therefore only available for internal use.

PB2T outlined the planning for WRC07, which reviews the ITU Radio Regulations. The following agenda items are of relevance to C4:

- Footnotes: In Europe most countries try and remove their names on footnotes. Currently, there are restrictions under footnotes 5.98 that limits access between 1810 – 1830kHz in some countries. Footnote 5.99 by contrast is an additional allocation for some countries.
- Agenda item 1.13: this is a Broadcaster's agenda item, which is seeking to find additional spectrum in the 7MHz area, but with a caveat that 7.0 – 7.2MHz cannot be re-negotiated. The IARU view is that we can continue our

requirement to gain the full 300kHz at 7MHz under this agenda item. PB2T clarified that it is agreed that 7.1 – 7.2MHz will be clear by 2009. DARC considered that it might be against our interests putting pressure on the Broadcasters to leave the segment 7.1 – 7.2MHz before April 2009; it could give the Broadcasters and other Services the view that Amateurs having gained some spectrum then seek to bring forward the transition date. Long-term this could cause others to give up spectrum to us. PB2T commented that the 5MHz requirement could also be discussed under this agenda item, more likely under the provision of a footnote.

- Agenda 1.15: this is 135.7 and 137.8kHz. The main opposition is from some Arab countries. The option of a footnote has been dismissed and there is a possibility of a limitation in terms of ERIP.
- Future agenda items: 50MHz requirement, spectrum above 275GHz

RSGB asked on behalf of the 500kHz WG two points:

- Considering 500kHz under agenda item 1.14
- Considering IARU Region 1 support, under Future WRC Agenda, at the next EC meeting.

PB2T commented that 500kHz had not been discussed in relation to Agenda Item 1.14 and it would now be too late to introduce this into the discussion at WRC07. In respect of gaining Region 1 EC approval on supporting C4's position on paper 06, 500kHz Secondary Allocation, LA2RR commented that C4 ought to highlight the need for EC to consider its proposal on this matter at the next EC meeting

#### **Action Chair**

EDR expressed concerned over the 7MHz position and noted that there was no plan to initiate a discussion of 10MHz expansion on the Future Agenda for WRC as it would be lower risk to other bands to drive this requirement under some other WRC agenda item. LA2RR commented that he would seek to raise the priority of 10MHz expansion within IARU after WRC07.

OeVSV commented that there ought to be a linkage between IARU discussions on spectrum matters and the manufacturers.

#### **AoB**

OeVSV wanted a definition of what is defined as “young” in terms of the paper 14. DARC said that their paper was aimed at school children; hence 18 years would be a suggested limit. It was agreed not to define a lower limit.

A second point was asked if the status of the informal meetings at Friedrichshafen could be made formal. The chair and LA2RR responded that the meeting at Vienna was more useful than the type of meeting that occur at Friedrichshafen, however it was a matter for C4 and the Conference to decide.

UBA: raised a question about RRWG; it was stated that Bob Whelan, G3PJT covers such matters.

EDR: Reported that new prefixes had been allocated for OZ – OU, OV, 5P and 5Q, OY – OW and for OX – XP

HRS: Announced that the website [www.hamradio.hr/cavtat](http://www.hamradio.hr/cavtat) has been created for information and links for the Cavtat Conference in November 2008.

RAAG: questioned whether the latest revision of the Greek HF band plan had been circulated. The Chair asked that it be sent to him and he would check.

**Action: RAAG - Completed**

NRRL: Reported that the WWYC define their age limit as 30.

NRRL asked for progress on the Contests and Bandplanning item discussed at the at the Friedrichshafen 2006 informal meeting. This concerned the interference between the JOTA and the WAG contests on the 3<sup>rd</sup> weekend of October. DARC reported that some tightening of the WAG rules in terms of using the “contest preferred segments” have taken place, that appear to have cleared most of the issue. NRRL emphasised the view that JOTA is one of the best events in the year to recruit youngsters into the hobby. LA2RR commented that the issue is more than just Germany as complaints had been received from other countries in Region 1; thus it had to be treated as an international matter.

The Chair stated there would not be any formal meeting at Friedrichshafen this year but he hoped we could meet at that venue in 2008 in the lead up to the Cavtat Conference.

In closing the Chair thanked OeVSV for hosting the conference and for their hospitality, the delegates for their attendance and wished everyone a safe journey home.



# International Amateur Radio Union Region 1

Europe, Middle East, Africa and Northern Asia

Founded 1950

## Committee C4 (HF Matters) Interim Meeting 24-25 February 2007 InterCity Hotel, Vienna

### Annex A

<b>Chairman</b>	Colin Thomas, G3PSM	
<b>EC</b>	Ole Garpstad, LA2RR Hans Blondeel Timmerman, PB2T	Region 1 President ERC Chairman
<b>ARABIH</b>	Emir Memic, T93J/OE1EMS	
<b>ARI</b>	“Joe” La Parola, IT9BLB	HF Contests Manager
<b>CRC</b>	Ivan Pazdersky, OK1PI	HF Manager
<b>DARC</b>	Ulrich Mueller, DK4VW	HF Manager
<b>EDR</b>	Hans Otto Pyndt, OZ5DX	HF Manager
<b>FRR</b>	Stefan Pit, YO3JW	
<b>HRS</b>	Petar Milicic, 9A6A	President
<b>LRMD</b>	Jurgis Ignotas, LY2CY	HF Manager
<b>MRASZ</b>	Laszlo Berzsenyi, HA5EA	Liaison Officer
<b>NRRL</b>	Tom Victor Segalstad, LA4LN	HF Traffic Manager
<b>OeVSV</b>	Michael Zwingl, OE3MZC Ronald Eisenwagner, OE3REB Dieter Kritzer, OE8KDK	President HF Manager
<b>PZK</b>	Wes Wysocki, SP2DX	IARU Liaison Officer
<b>RAAG</b>	Cliff A. Sacalis, SV1JG	
<b>REF</b>	Mauricette Martin, F8BPN	HF Manager
<b>RSGB</b>	John Gould, G3WKL	HF Manager
<b>SARA</b>	Anton Mraz, OM3LU	Vice-President
<b>UBA</b>	Marc Domen, ON7SS	HF Contests Manager
<b>URE</b>	Juan J. Rosales Fernandez, EA9IE	URE Board Member

**Apologies** ARM Moldova, IARC, IARS, MARL, NARG, SARL, TIR,