

---

**Minutes of the Technical Advisory Committee  
on Broadcasting (B-TAC)**

**MINUTES OF THE FIRST  
MEETING OF 2000, HELD ON  
FEBRUARY 15, 2000**

**ATTENDEES OF THE  
FIRST MEETING OF 2000  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BROADCASTING  
(B-TAC)**

The first meeting of 2000, held on February 15, in Room 381-A, Jean Edmonds South Tower, Ottawa. Present were:

R.W. McCaughern (Chairperson)	Director General Spectrum Engineering
----------------------------------	--

A. Lam (Secretary)	Broadcast Standards and Procedures
-----------------------	------------------------------------

**Canadian Broadcasting Corporation**

S. Lamarre	Delivery Technology
------------	---------------------

François Gauthier	Delivery Technology
-------------------	---------------------

**Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission**

A. Lubienietzky	Broadcast Technology
-----------------	----------------------

G. Bergin	Broadcast Technology
-----------	----------------------

**Broadcastors and Consultants**

D. Allen	D.E.M. Allen & Associates Ltd
----------	-------------------------------

P. Labarre	Pierre Labarre & Associates Ltd
------------	---------------------------------

D. Macaulay	D. H. Macaulay Engineering
-------------	----------------------------

E. Bogdanowicz Imagineering Ltd.

S. Edwards Rogers Broadcasting Ltd.

T. Young Rogers Broadcasting Ltd.

B. Crabbe Promethean Electronics

W. Stacey Stacey, Lawson & Associates

B. Dormer Consultant

J. Feltmate Consultant

Tetsuo Yoshino Consultant

**Other Organizations**

E. Augstman Nav Canada

**Industry Canada**

F. Bouchard Broadcast Regulation

J. Dadourian Broadcast Standards and Procedures

D. Tyrie Broadcast Planning and New Technology

P. Vaccani Director, Broadcast Application Engineering

D. Forde Broadcast Spectrum Engineering

K. Mehta Broadcast Application Engineering

M. Dumas	Broadcast Application Engineering
A. Leduc	Broadcast Automated Systems
S. Faucher	Engineering, Quebec Region
A. Leung	Engineering, Ontario Region
E. Lander	Engineering, Ontario Region
A. Choi	Engineering, Pacific Region
K. Anderson	Engineering, Atlantic Region
B. Klymochko	Engineering, Prairie/Northern Region
W. Ngo	Engineering, Ontario Region

## 1. CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS

Dr. McCaughern extended his welcome to the members and opened the first meeting of 2000.

## 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Stacey proposed adding 'Use of emergency broadcast transmitters' as item 6.6 for discussion.

Mr. Dadourian informed the members that Mr. Ngo would give a status report on SRSP-302.0 later in the day.

The draft agenda was approved as amended.

## 3. DRAFT MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING OF 1999 AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The following changes were made to the draft minutes of the second meeting of 1999:

4.1 1<sup>st</sup> para: '...now in place at the Manotock (near Ottawa) test site'.

**was amended to:** '...now in place at the Manotick (near Ottawa) test site'.

'...ATSC (U.S.), DBUT (Europe) and ISDB (Japan)...'

**was amended to:** '...ATSC (U.S.) DBU-T (Europe) and ISDB (Japan)...'

5.1 2<sup>nd</sup> para: '(www.apollo.ic.gc.ca)

**was amended to:** '(apollo.ic.gc.ca)

6.2 ' To use 'Predict' only for coverage and the F50/50 curves for interference.'

**was amended to:** To use 'Predict' only for coverage and the F50/10 curves for interference.'

6.4 '...to achieve the 40dB d/u signal ratio...'

**was amended to:** '...to achieve the -40dB d/u signal ratio...'

‘...and it may be possible to engineer for the use of such a channel.’

**was amended to:** ‘...and it may be possible to meet this requirement even inside the service area of the protected station, especially if co-siting was used.’

‘Ms. Lamarre supported this proposal pointing out that...’

**was amended to:** ‘Ms. Lamarre supported the proposal to review the current Rules and Procedures. She pointed out that...’.

The draft minutes were approved as amended.

#### **4. DIGITAL TV**

Mr. Tyrie reported that the FCC had denied Sinclair’s petition for reconsideration of the DTV standard and the incorporation of the COFDM system. He also informed the members that ITU had approved the recommendation to incorporate the Japanese band-segmented COFDM system as a standard, making it the third standard together with the European DVB-T COFDM system and the U.S. ATSC standard. In other ITU developments re. the draft standard for 720P, the U.S. had dropped the requirement for the 50Hz module and deleted any reference to high definition in order to have the 720P standard adopted as a preliminary draft recommendation.

On the status of the Ottawa DTV test station, Mr. Stacey said that it would be on air, on an as required basis, controlled by the CRC.

Mr. Forde informed the members that Canada and the U.S. had recently reached an agreement in the form of a letter of understanding on DTV coordination. This agreement would be signed by the Department as well as the FCC officials shortly.

Mr. Allen was concerned with the slow pace of DTV implementation in Canada in light of the rapid development in the U.S. He suggested that unless precautionary measures were taken now by the Department/CRTC, it could impact on the future of DTV implementation in Canada, especially in the border areas.

Mr. Vaccani said that the Department was also concerned with the situation after learning the only outstanding DTV application was rejected by the CRTC.

Mr. Bergin, for the CRTC, clarified that the Victoria DTV application was not rejected but simply deferred until the Commission could decide on an implementation policy for DTV. He said that the Commission was aware of the urgency of the situation and he expected that a policy would be in place shortly and would likely be along the line of the DRB policy.

The Chairman commented that the recent agreement would protect both the existing DTV allotment and analog TV plans.

## **4.2 DRB**

Mr. Tyrie reported that there had been no major change in DRB development since the last meeting and events were progressing smoothly.

Mr. Stacey added that the CAB had published a list in December of 1999, of all approved and pending DRB stations in Canada, with the last count being 55 stations.

With regard to the IBOC development in the U.S., Mr. Stacey reported that both the USADR and Lucent had submitted their test results to the FCC. However, the test results were incomplete with many of the important tests missing, e.g. the USADR tests did not include the 1<sup>st</sup> adjacent interference on both sides of the channel, and Lucent only performed laboratory tests etc. He suspected that there might now be

pressure in the U.S. for the two proponents to cooperate for a single system.

On the receiver front, Mr. Edwards said that receiver selection was still limited. He suggested that Sony Corporation may start manufacturing DRB receivers in the Spring of this year.

### **4.3 BPR UPDATES**

Mr. Bouchard tabled document TAC-00-08 which outlined the recent updates in the BPR's. He presented a brief status report on each of the changes. With regard to the recently released draft BPR-7, he thanked those who had sent in their comments and urged others to forward their comments to the Department as soon as possible for consideration.

Mr. Stacey suggested that some of the parameters and ratios used in the document should be referenced to the original working documents, under JTCAB, for the benefit of users who may want to know the sources of these figures. There were other discussions and suggestions on the content of the draft document, e.g. the use of the NTSC allotment table, etc. Mr. Bouchard suggested that members should review the entire document and forward their comments to the Department.

With reference to MDS/MCS, Mr. Dadourian said that the Department was considering to allow two-way operation in DMCS and some associated bands. MDS operators may need to use other return channels for interactive service. He also indicated that the Department would be re-negotiating with the FCC for an understanding with this type of service.

Mr. Allen suggested that BPR updates posted on the Department's Website should indicate their status, e.g. recent update within a certain period, etc. Mr. Bouchard replied that all the documents on the Web were dated. However, he would look into the matter to see if their status could be further highlighted

### **4.4. GAZETTE NOTICE**



Mr. Lam reported that the Committee which studied the measurement procedures for RF energy Exposure had completed its work and issued a draft document with measurement procedures for broadcasting installations, microwave systems, PCS/landmobile and radar systems. He indicated that the Department would be gazetting this document sometime in the near future for public comments.

## **5. RADIO BROADCASTING AND RELATED QUESTIONS**

### **5.1 DATABASE UPDATES**

Mr. Leduc informed the members that in the next database extract, digital low power allotment would be removed and placed in a separate file for reference as this data would not be updated. Mr. Leduc also indicated that the U.S. DTV allotment plan should also be available in the February data dump.

### **5.2 LOW POWER FM FAQ**

Mr. Bouchard said that the Department was preparing a list of FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions) on low power FM which would be posted on the Department Web site for information. It should provide some basic information on how low power FM stations were treated by the Department, the FCC as well as by the CRTC, which would include broadcast licence exemptions.

Mr. Stacey took the occasion to bring forward an issue raised in item 6.6 - 'use of emergency broadcast transmitters'. He believed that the CRTC broadcast license exemption did not include exemption for equipment certification from the Department. He suggested that the Department should require equipment manufacturers to notify users of the equipment of all relevant information, including

application forms for certification purposes, when approving such equipment for sale.

The Chairman commented that the same equipment would be available in both the U.S. and Canada and it would be difficult for the Department to enforce such a requirement. Besides, he suggested that the responsibility for applying for equipment certification would ultimately fall on the users.

## **6. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **6.1 NIR MEASUREMENT PROCEDURES FOR BROADCASTING**

Mr. Lam said that the draft measurement procedures for broadcasting installations were sent to the members sometime ago for review and comments. He requested that any comments on the document should be sent to the Department as soon as possible. Mr. Lam also said that the French version of the draft document was now available and any member who may need the French version could contact the Department for a copy.

### **6.2 FM COORDINATION WITH LICENSEES OF CLOSELY RELATED ASSIGNMENT VERSUS CONFIDENTIALITY**

Mr. Dadourian referred to TAC-00-02 which was sent in by Mr. Elder to the Department. He said that current regulations required the applicant to notify the affected party if a short spacing situation occurred.

However, he acknowledged that in some instances, short spacing would not cause any harm to the affected station due to the differences in class and power between the two stations. He said that the issue was reviewed by the Department and it was felt that the current rule should stay but perhaps with

some discretion given to the Department's engineering staff to decide on the need for notification.

Mr. Labarre agreed that such an approach would be workable based on the circumstances and the merits of the individual cases.

Mr. Vaccani commented that such an approach, if adopted, would substantially increase the workload for his staff, and Mr. Stacey stressed that confidentiality was a real concern to the consultants and he suggested that the current requirement for notification in all cases could lead to abuse of the process.

The Chairman commented that the Department may not be willing to assume the financial liability if the proposed approach was adopted.

Ms. Lamarre said the CBC would not favour any changes in this regard. In fact, she suggested that the rule should be applied uniformly and vigorously in a timely fashion. She speculated that any such rule change would adversely affect the smaller broadcasters who may not have the resources to closely monitor CRTC announcements for possible impact on their stations by new applications.

Mr. Bergin indicated that the CRTC would prefer resolving any dispute before the hearing. In any case, he suggested that the Commission would consider all circumstances with an application rather than granting a license on a first-come first-serve basis.

There was further debate amongst the members on the pros and cons of Mr. Elder's proposal. In concluding this discussion, the Chairman indicated that the Department would likely retain the existing rule but would revisit the issue if needed.

### **6.3 PERIOD OF COMMENT WHEN COORDINATING BROADCAST APPLICATIONS WITH OTHER LICENSEES**

Ms. Lamarre tabled document TAC-00-06 which outlined a request from the CBC to extend the

comment period from the current 30 days to 60 days. Mr. Dadourian indicated that the Department would review the current rule and consider the CBC proposal.

It was noted that a 60 days rule would mean that comment from affected station(s) would not be received prior to the CRTC hearing.

#### **6.4 NAV CANADA SUBMISSION FORM**

Mr. Allen tabled document TAC-00-03 which contained the 'land use and construction proposal submission form' as issued by the western region of Nav Canada.

Mr. Augstman informed the members the issue of submission form was under review by an internal Transport Canada/Nav Canada working group chaired by Mr. Kenn Moodie. He suggested that interested members should either join this working group or submit their input to Mr. Moodie for consideration. It was suggested that the Broadcast Application Section as well as the Operation Section in Industry Canada should join this working group to address the issue. Mr. Allen and Ms. Lamarre also indicated their willingness to participate in the process if teleconference meetings could be arranged.

With regard to Nav Canada objection to selected FM frequency(ies), Mr. Allen was interested to know the procedure which Industry Canada/Nav Canada used to reject FM frequencies for application.

Mr. Augstman replied that if the Industry Canada's Nav/Com analysis indicated a possible interference problem, Nav Canada would perform further calculation using its own database and may even involve flight testing before objecting to the selected frequency(ies).

Mr. Allen pointed to the U.S. situation where many more band edge frequencies were allowed to operate. To this, Mr. Augstman said that the FAA was very strict in applying the interference criteria. However, he suggested that many stations were grandfathered or were willing to pay for changes in navigational equipment in order to use the selected frequency(ies)

On a related matter, Mr. Allen suggested that including some sort of explanation for FM frequency rejection would be helpful to the consultants.

After some discussion, it was agreed that if the Nav/Com analysis software packages were available to the consultants to do the preliminary interference calculations, it would certainly speed up the application process and would be helpful in FM frequency selection for application. It was also agreed that even with such a tool, some form of training would be necessary for its use and interpretation of the results. Mr. Vaccani agreed to look into this matter, including making the required database available and for organizing a seminar on the subject to coincide with the next B-TAC meeting. However, he indicated that it may take some time before the system could be fully operational.

To alleviate some of the time pressure with current application procedures, Mr. Stacey suggested that issues related to NAV/COM approval could be dealt with only after the CRTC hearing, and the Commission's decision would be subject to Nav/Com approval.

The Chairman commented that this issue could be revisited after Mr. Vaccani investigated the possibility of making the analysis software and database available to consultants.

## **6.5 DISTRIBUTION OF LARGE DOCUMENTS**

Mr. Stacey said that downloading large documents from the Net required lengthy periods for many members who relied on Internet service providers. He suggested that the Department set up a dedicated location on its web site with password for access. Working documents could then be dumped at this location for authorized users only. The Chairman commented that the Department would consider such a proposal and would report back to the members in time.

## **6.6 USE OF EMERGENCY BROADCAST TRANSMITTERS**

Item was discussed under 5.2

## **6.7 STATUS REPORT REGARDING SRSP 302.0**

Mr. Ngo presented a brief outline of SRSP 302.0 to the members.

He said that this revision allowed for flexible bandwidth applications from 0.5MHz to 10MHz in the band 2025-2110MHz and 2200-2285MHz, and was intended for use by medium, low and very low capacity digital line of sight radio systems and TV pick up systems in the fixed service. He suggested that interested parties should contact the local and regional staff for information and/or suggestions. He also indicated that the document would be gazetted shortly.

Referring to the requirements for DRB signal distribution, Mr. Labarre said that DRB application needed 'pipelines' from the source to the transmitters and between transmitters for single frequency operation and he urged that application of the rules should be flexible. He also suggested that sub-committee 9, which was set up at the last meeting to address this issue, should meet as soon as possible.

Mr. Allen said that application of the rule should be uniform across the country rather than arbitrarily between regions.

## **7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next meeting will be set once the date of the Nav/Com seminar can be arranged.