

Comments on Proposals from DCS Manufacturers Conference in March

A. Timing Accuracy: We agree .1 second seems too tight. Our vote would be for .25 seconds.

J. RF Power Output: We don't see what changing "Typical" (or nominal) to "Minimum" will achieve. If the desire is to get DCP power outputs to lower levels for better efficiency, why not specify a "Maximum"?

With regard to remote control, we see this as a cost and battery power life issue, trying to equip all units with receivers as well as transmitters.

K. Operating Frequency requirements: We are opposed to doing any changes to current channel spacing designations for two major reasons: One, this results in a major change to all parts of the system, both DCPs and DRGSs; Two, if increased data throughput for the system is the desired result, more consideration should be given to data compaction and general transmit data format, which could well achieve more efficiency at much less cost and impact to the existing system.

L. Long Term Frequency Stability: There is an assumption here that all manufacturers use GPS for their transmit frequency reference. This is not true. At least one manufacturer uses an OCXO to avoid having to rely so heavily on GPS signals. We would be opposed to reducing the frequency window to less than +/-215, or half of the current value.

O. Narrow Band Transmit Spectrum: We are not in favor of requiring the SRRC filter. This again affects the entire system, both DCPs and DRGSs, and is much more difficult and costly to implement at the DCP than the current Bessell Filter design.

4.5 DCPRS Transmit Spectrum: We do not see why the first unwanted sideband needs to be at -25 dB, and would recommend this requirement remain at the present limit of -15 dB. The other recommended sideband levels are acceptable.