Therefore any agreements at the conference would have to be **temporary recommendations, subject to later change through IARU**.

The general points made were:

"Before we leave here, we need to find frequencies to concentrate the activity that is beginning on JT44."

"We should try to avoid QRM between digital modes and CW by using frequencies above 144.150, and so on for the higher bands" (but see below).

"I want to be able to switch between CW, SSB and JT44 on the same frequency" (but this is contrary to all band plans when operating in the CW segment).

Over lunchtime, a group identified the common frequencies that were available on all continents on 144, 432 and 1296MHz. When the full discussion resumed, it was agreed that a centre of activity for JT44 could not be in an area of high SSB activity, and most people felt that it should not be in the areas of most EME CW activity.

Surprisingly, 144MHz seemed to be the easiest to resolve. Subject to consultation through IARU, 144.150-.160MHz seemed OK. Finally, **144.150MHz was agreed[2], strictly as a temporary recommendation**.

The higher bands were more difficult, because in some continents the SSB calling frequency is at .100. On 432MHz, there is probably no world-wide empty gap above .100, so it seemed that any world-wide frequency for JT44 EME would have to be inside the existing CW sub-band.

K2UYH's proposal for 432.024MHz was felt to be too low, because contest CW activity always spreads up to about .030. N6TX's proposal for **432.044MHz was adopted[3], strictly as a temporary recommendation, and the same for all higher bands**.

Once again – **these are temporary recommendations**. They are not only for JT44, but also for any other similar modes.

With all respect, '44' has no serious justification. The best we can say is that this frequency will do little harm to other interests. If more consideration produces a frequency that is workable and has some real arguments in its favour, then we should not hesitate to move.

---

2 By a large majority.

3 38 for, 10 against.

3 The Way Forward

The proposal to use a non-CW mode below .100 is contrary to the existing IARU band plans (at least in Region 1). The only excuses are:

- New technology has overtaken the existing band plans – IARU is already aware of this problem
- There was nowhere else to go (or nowhere better was suggested on the day)
- We immediately handed the problem over to IARU.

There were three national VHF Managers in the forum, and they will take this discussion forward to their next Region 1 meeting in November 2002.

Ian, G3SEK and Dan, OK1DIG

September 2002