

**Doc #22**

**Contest Advisory Committee  
Semi-Annual Report**

**For the American Radio Relay League  
Board of Director's Meeting**

**July 2020**

**Dennis Egan, W1UE  
Chairman, CAC**

## **COMPLETED ASSIGNMENTS**

Tasking 2020.1(Multi-Operator Club Scores) has been completed. Copy attached.  
Tasking 2020.2 (Single Band Scores ARRL DX) has been completed. Copy attached.

Tasking 2020.3 (Digital Contest 6M) has been completed. Copy attached.  
Tasking 2020.4 (ARRL DX MS Band Changes) has been completed.

## **CHANGES IN CAC MEMBERSHIP**

There were no changes in the CAC membership during the first half of 2020. The CAC members as of July 1, 2020 are:

- Atlantic – Charles D. Fulp, Jr, K3WW; [k3ww@fast.net](mailto:k3ww@fast.net)
- Central – Craig Thompson, K9CT; [Craig@K9CT.us](mailto:Craig@K9CT.us)
- Dakota – Dr Scott Wright, K0MD; [DrScott.Wright@gmail.com](mailto:DrScott.Wright@gmail.com)
- Delta – Stan Stockton, K5GO; [wa5rtg@gmail.com](mailto:wa5rtg@gmail.com)
- Great Lakes – Dave Pruett, K8CC; [k8cc@comcast.net](mailto:k8cc@comcast.net)
- Hudson – Zev Darack, N2WKS; [zevdarack@gmail.com](mailto:zevdarack@gmail.com)
- Midwest – Dr. Glenn Johnson, W0GJ; [w0gj@arrl.net](mailto:w0gj@arrl.net)
- New England – Chairman- Dennis Egan, W1UE; [w1ue@ARRL.net](mailto:w1ue@ARRL.net)
- Northwestern – Jim Cassidy, KI7Y; [ki7y@arrl.net](mailto:ki7y@arrl.net)
- Pacific – David B. Ritchie, W6DR; [w6dr@arrl.net](mailto:w6dr@arrl.net)
- Roanoke - Don Daso, K4ZA; [k4za@juno.com](mailto:k4za@juno.com)
- Rocky Mountain – Kenneth “Mike” Fatchett, W0MU; [W0MU@w0mu.com](mailto:W0MU@w0mu.com)
- Southeastern – Charles Wooten, NF4A; [NF4A@knology.net](mailto:NF4A@knology.net)
- Southwestern – Glenn Rattmann, K6NA; [k6na@cts.com](mailto:k6na@cts.com)
- West Gulf – James K. George, N3BB; [n3bb@mindspring.com](mailto:n3bb@mindspring.com)
- Radio Amateurs of Canada – Samuel A. Ferris, VE5SF; [ve5sf@sasktel.net](mailto:ve5sf@sasktel.net)

The CAC held a Zoom Meeting On Tuesday June 23. In attendance were K3WW, K9CT, K5GO, K8CC, N2WKS, W0GJ, W1UE, KI7Y, NF4A, K6NA, N3BB, and VE5SF.

Dennis Egan, W1UE  
[egan.dennis88@gmail.com](mailto:egan.dennis88@gmail.com)  
508-202-8373

## **Tasking 2020.1 - CAC Tasking Proposals.**

The PSC requests that the CAC analyze, study and provide more details on the following CAC proposals for potential new tasking's.

1. ARRL Affiliated Club (Gavel) Competition - Multioperator Station Score Apportionment - in the ARRL CW/Phone DX Contest:

Under current ARRL Contest Rules, where eligible members of US/VE Affiliated Clubs are operating from a DX entity during the ARRL DX Contest, 100% of a Multioperator Station's Score may be allocated to just one club toward the Affiliated Club Competition.

Task: Discuss how to apportion percentages of a Multioperator Station's score to more than one eligible affiliated club. Considerations:

- A. Allow the apportionment to multiple clubs (does the existing Club Competition allocation rule need to be changed)? Yes or No?
  - i. If yes, how many clubs can/should the apportionment be available/limited to?
  - ii. Must/should the club's receiving such allocations all be in the same club size/territory category (that is, all be in the Medium vs Unlimited category)?

Can/should one multioperator-station affiliated-club member (of the potential several operators at the station) be able to contribute 100% of his/her score allocation to say two clubs in different affiliated-club competition categories?

**NOTE: At least part of this exact question was answered in the CAC January 2020 report, specifically:**

**“2. Should a DXPedition Score be split according to the % of members of a club that participated (current rule is if one club has more than 50% of the operators, that club gets the entire score).**

**CAC Poll- 10 Pro, 1 Con”**

**3. Should guest ops, operating anywhere in the USA or Canada, have their score count for their chosen club?**

CAC Poll- 10 Pro, 1 Undecided

4. Should Multi-op scores be apportioned back to clubs in a % relative to the % of ops in different clubs, regardless of their location?

CAC Poll- 10 Pro, 0 Con

5. Should ARRL DX have a Foreign Club competition?

CAC Poll- 7 Pro, 2 Con

There are several other parts to this tasking, as discussed below.

To answer the specific questions that were asked in the 2020 Tasking:

1. Should a Multi-operator score be apportioned back to individual clubs?

Yes.

2. How many clubs should it be apportioned to?

One club per operator

3. Should all the receiving clubs be in the same Club Category?

No

4. Should an operator be allowed to split his part of the point total to more than one club?

No-One club per operator

Current ARRL DX Contest Rule 8.7: For Multi-operator Stations, the score may only count for one club, and at least 50% of the operators must be members of the club receiving the score and meet all other criteria.

Proposed ARRL DX Contest Rule 8.7: Multi-operator scores may be allocated to multiple clubs as a percentage of the number of club members participating in the operation. The log entry must spell out the full club name (and club allocations if multi-op).

For example, I go on a Dxpediton and the breakdown of club members is 25% PVRC, 25% FRC, 25% YCCC, and 25% NCCC. Under the current ARRL rule, no club would get credit for the score, as no club meets the 50% member threshold. Under the Proposed ARRL rule, the score would be split 25% PVRC, 25% FRC, 25% YCCC, and 25% NCCC.

CAC polling indicated 13 Pro, 0 Con.

---

---

**TASKING 2020.2: Addition of Power and Assisted Categories for Single Band ARRL DX Only**

In the ARRL DX Contest (which includes Single-Band competitions), currently ARRL Contest Rules limit Single-Band competitors to a single band category with no differentiation for power or assistance.

Should the Single-Band competition categories be expanded to include:

- Assisted and Unassisted categories?
- By allowing three power-level categories?
- Or both of the above? If all of the above are adopted, the following categories would be added to the event:

Assisted	Non-Assisted
QRP	QRP
Low	Low
High	High

This would add 30 categories to the contest, (36 added, 6 removed), and when multiplied by the number of states/provinces (63) would create 1890 possible new awards. The concept the CAC worked under is that, to create the 1890 possible new awards for the categories, would require a one time cost to set up the computer program to print the online certificates, and that no additional mailing or printing cost would incur to the ARRL.

One CAC member voiced the opinion that we're moving into the arena of participation trophies here, but the majority opinion was that this would foster participation. There are many small station contesters that could compete in some of these additional categories, increasing participation, and that anything that increases participation is a good thing for contesting. Many ops are proud of any certificate that they can win- no one gave that certificate, even if they were the only station in their category- they still had to go out and win it.

The CAC polled 12 pro, 1 con for this proposed change.

---

---

## **CAC TASKING 2020.3- Adding 6M to Digital Contest for Proposed ARRL HF/6 Digital Contest for 2021.**

Task: The ARRL requests further clarifications from the CAC, based on the following criteria.

Background: The PSC's original intent was to add a new HF plus 6 meter digital event. The comments previously offered by the CAC did not appear to consider adding 6-meters to the event. Would you please review your previous work and include the possibility of adding 6-meters to the proposed event.

If the PSC's original intent was that the contest included 6M, I am not aware of it. Regardless of that, the committee (it was composed of 2 CAC members and 4 ad hoc members) did deal with the 6M question, and made a deliberate decision not to include it. Reasons for not including 6M are as follows:

1. We're looking at a contest date in March or April. How many 6M openings are there in those months? Not many.
2. The scoring is distance based. If there aren't any 6M openings, ops won't go to 6M because all their Qs will be low point (local) Qs.
3. The multipliers are the first 3 characters of a grid square, counted once during the contest. There is little competitive advantage in going to 6M if you're not going to work other than low point Qs and nearby grids.
4. It would tip the "competitive advantage" to those in high density areas.
5. Techs can use 80-40-15-10M bands for digital modes. Adding in 6M really does not foster additional participation.

For the above reasons, the Digital Committee polled 4-2 against including 6M in the Digital Contest, and it was not included as a permitted band. If the contest was held in June, July, or August, the answer may have been different.

=====

## **CAC TASKING 2020.4- ARRL DX MS changing the Band Change Rules**

This topic was submitted by one of the CAC members, in response to conversations that he had with several Dxpeditors in ARRL DX earlier this year.

**Current:** Most ARRL Multi-Single entries use a Run and a Mult transmitter. They are limited to 8 band changes per hour, and both transmitters can't transmit at the same time.

**Proposal:** That the Band change rule be waived when the Mult station is working a new multiplier. This also has two variants; should the run station not be allowed to transmit when the Mult station is transmitting, or should the run station be allowed to continue to transmit when the Mult station is working the multiplier.

**Discussion:** The CAC was totally against the idea of BOTH the Mult and Run stations transmitting at the same time (as CQWW allows), so that variant was immediately off the table. Only one transmitter is allowed on the air at one time.

Should unlimited band changes then be allowed, provided that the Mult station work mults only? There was no support from the CAC for this proposal- no one saw any benefit from it. Several thought it would make it too close to the CQWW contests, and they liked the variation in rules. MS, in particular, has gotten to be a horsepower race in past years, as he who has the most equipment wins. The CAC poll was 0 pro, 13 con.

One aspect of the discussion that did meet with the CAC approval was to change the number of bandchanges per hour from 8 to 10. This would allow stations to work one additional multiplier over what they can work now, so would not make a major difference. The CAC poll was 13 pro, 0 con.

---

Dennis Egan, W1UE  
CAC Chairman