



THE WIRELESS INSTITUTE OF AUSTRALIA

ABN 56 004 920 745

National Society of Radio Amateurs
(A Company Limited by Guarantee)

PO Box 2175, Caulfield Junction, VIC, 3161
(10/229, Balaclava Rd., North Caulfield 3161)
Phone (03) 9528 5962 Fax (03) 9523 8191

Mr Paul Budde
Paul Budde Communication Pty Ltd
5385 George Downes Drive
BUCKETTY NSW 2250B
pbcbudde@budde.com.au

17th May, 2005

Dear Mr Budde,

The Wireless Institute of Australia (WIA) is the peak body representing Australian radio amateurs.

Your company's E-Newsletter of the 6th May 2005 included several statements concerning radio amateurs and BPL interference that we consider are inaccurate. We wish to take the opportunity to correct the record.

Specifically, you state: *"A blanket 'no', as was requested by radio amateurs, to BPL would not have been a good outcome."*

The WIA has taken care to explain our organisation does not oppose BPL as a broadband delivery technology, but we do object to the radio frequency interference that has been demonstrated BPL creates. If BPL technology were developed to the point where there was no harmful interference to HF radio services, the WIA would welcome its introduction as an additional broadband delivery system.

You state: *"I have twice organized a BPL summit and on both occasions I invited radio amateurs to attend these discussions. In addition upon my advise they have also been invited to the various industry demonstrations, seminars and trials."*

The WIA must consider carefully the cost of places at such conferences and will only expend its members' funds on travel, accommodation and conference fees where there is a clear and obvious value to members.

The WIA and its supporters funded three places (including attendance fees to Buddecomm) at the first two Buddecomm BPL Conferences, and two places at a demonstration of the Queanbeyan BPL trial.

We have not attended one or two recent Buddecomm conferences where the cost to us seemed excessive compared to the benefit. We will, however, continue to attend conferences where we see a cost benefit.

You also state: *"I had hoped that the amateurs would take up the invitation to work with the industry to find solutions. Unfortunately, despite several appeals from me, they have declined to do this ..."*

You should not infer from the fact we did not attend a particular conference, that this is evidence the WIA will not work with the industry. I make it quite clear that we are more than willing to work co-operatively with the power utilities and prospective BPL providers to properly address the interference issues.

You also say: *“But, whatever happens, the possible (still not certain) interference to radio amateurs would always be limited, while the benefits to regional BPL broadband users would be enormous”*.

In essence, you seek to balance the asserted benefit of BPL to “regional” broadband users against the cost of interference, by simply relating that interference to one radiocommunications service using the HF spectrum. With respect, while that may be a debating point, it disguises the true position as there are many users of the HF spectrum, including aeronautical and marine safety services, land mobile and fixed services, defence and emergency services as well as unknown numbers of HF broadcast listeners, all of whom would be significantly affected by interference. It is against all users of the spectrum for all purposes that the cost of interference must be measured.

On the matter of ADSL2+ you say: *“A totally separate issue is that ADSL2+ interference is potentially higher than BPL interference – the ACA would need to take an even-handed approach to all types of interference, and not just single out BPL”*.

ADSL and xDSL services have indeed been shown to cause electromagnetic radiation but, owing to the fact they are conveyed on a twisted-pair balanced wireline system, a significantly different physical environment to power lines, and that they employ considerably lower signal levels, the unwanted radiation is expected to be very much less than that observed from the recent Australian BPL trials. Our preliminary observations confirm this belief and tests conducted in Europe have demonstrated as much.

We hope that you will see fit, in the spirit of fairness, to publish this clarification of the WIA position in your publication.

Yours Sincerely

Philip Wait

Director, Wireless Institute of Australia