

**Contest Advisory Committee
Semi-Annual Report**

**For the American Radio Relay League
Board of Directors Meeting**

January 2007

Submitted by

**Ward Silver, NØAX
Chairman, CAC**

**PO Box 927
Vashon, WA 98070
n0ax@arrl.net
206.683.9710**

Summary

The CAC was assigned two topics following the ARRL Board meeting in July;

- 1) Consideration of log checking standards - this discussion is somewhat underway, but the discussion is not moving very fast. This is partially a consequence of the lengthy debate on public email reflectors about what constitutes assistance, the boundaries of SO/SOA/MO, and other related topics. I hope to get this conversation restarted with the goal of producing a set of basic definitions well before Dayton. To be fair, the fall (being contest season) has always been a slow period for CAC discussions.
- 2) Developing a logging accuracy metric in addition to percentage of score reduction - it is the opinion of the CAC (7-2 vote) that an additional logging accuracy metric is not useful or needed at this time.

In addition to the assigned topics, I formulated a set of guidelines for recommendations produced by the CAC. These are not hard and fast rules, but will be useful for helping steer our discussions to productive ends.

Log Checking Standards

Background - this topic was originally proposed by Dave Pruett K8CC on the basis that log checking was being performed differently for different ARRL contests. (Dave does the 10-Meter Contest log checking.) He suggested that the basic structure of log checking should be consistent for ARRL contests.

The CAC voted as follows:

Should having consistent standards be discussed? YES (9-0 in favor)
Should the standards be made public? YES (7-2) where appropriate
Should the standards be promoted for non-ARRL contests? NO (2-7)

We are currently at the point where a list of definitions should be placed before the group and discussed. With the holidays just past, this may be an auspicious time for the CAC to be more active on the topic.

CAC Guidelines for Recommendations

When making specific recommendations for rules or processes, each recommendation should meet the following four requirements (in no particular order of priority):

- 1) The recommendations should meet the intended requirements of the task. It sounds trivial, but we need to keep focused on the intent of the task and not tackle some other problem instead. The CAC Chair should keep the discussion on track. Significant diversions should be deferred to separate discussions and tasks. It is also incumbent on the P&SC that the tasks be clear as to intent.

2) All recommendations will result in some 'unintended consequences' and the CAC should make an effort to consider what those may be. Getting outside review is often a good way to see how the recommended items will be viewed and used.

3) The recommendations should be reasonably easy to understand. Like a lot of legal rules, a totally precise rule may not be easily understood by participants or administrators to understand. We have to keep things easy to understand, even if that compromises the exact rule or procedure.

4) The recommendations should be easy for participants to follow and for the contest managers to administer. A perfect rule may not be easy to follow nor easy to administer. Acknowledging the limited resources of all parties, we need to make sure that we recommend can, in fact, be implemented, even if this means a less-than-perfect solution.

Whether or not these guidelines can be followed is yet to be seen, but they are a useful target, at any rate.

Administrative Notes

- Atlantic Division representative Rus Healy K2UA has been replaced by Mike Gilmer N2MG.
- Reports to Division Directors on the activity of their chosen representatives were provided to our Board Liaison.

Ward Silver NØAX
CAC Chairman
Northwestern Division Representative