

Results – 2013 CQ WW DX Contest Participant Survey

Table of Contents

Survey Methodology	2
Q1. Which is the best description of your operating interest in the CQ WW Contest?	2
Q2. What category do you normally enter?	7
Q3. How do you feel about the 5 day log submission deadline?	8
Q4. Should the Single Operator and Single Operator Assisted categories be combined into one Single Operator category?	40
Q5. If all single operators were in one category, should there be a marker in the score listings for those stations that did not use assistance?	40
Q6. If all single operators were in one category, would you...?	40
Q7. The CQ WW gives a penalty of 3x QSO points for a call sign error or a Not in Log. This penalty is.....	46
Q8. Should all QSOs with unique call signs be removed from the score?	46
Q9. Should stations in Caribbean/Central America receive 3 points for working other North American stations?	86
Q10. Should the rules add a new scoring exception for Asia?	111
Q11. Should it be possible for the CQ WW Committee to disqualify stations with wide signals.....	124
Q12. Should the 275 km distance limit be changed?	125
Q13. Have you visited the www.CQWW.com web site?	132
Q14. What features of the CQWW.com site have you used?	140
Q15. Which modes did you operate the CQ WW Contest in 2012?	142
Q16. Which is your favorite mode for DX contesting?	142
Any comments or suggestions you would like to make to the CQ WW Committee?	143

Survey Methodology

This survey was conducted online between March 10 and March 29, 2013. Invitations were sent to email addresses from the top 10,000 scoring logs submitted to the CQ WW DX Contest SSB/CW 2012. In addition, the survey was publicized on the cq-contest reflector.

A professional survey product was used (surveypro.com). There were some technical issues with the survey. A number of people reported failures or slow page updates in getting through the survey. While this caused some lost responses, we feel the quantity of responses received is sufficient to represent the CQ WW participant community.

The results below are after the database was cleaned of duplicates or non-answers. Some comments have been edited to remove duplicates or to de-identify them.

The CQ WW Contest Committee thanks everyone who responded to the survey. The answers are very helpful for us as we consider rules changes or other improvements.

Q1. Which is the best description of your operating interest in the CQ WW Contest?

Which is the best description of your operating interest in the CQ WW Contest?

Serious competitor trying to win a certificate or plaque	1675	31.6%
Part time operator trying for the highest score possible	1831	34.6%
Chasing contacts for awards	546	10.3%
Having fun and giving points to others	1023	19.3%
Other	217	4.1%
Total	5292	

Other (comments):

Serious competitor but usual enter MM with no chance of a plaque but want to max Score

We used the contest to introduce new hams to HF operation, contesting and DXing. It is a great opportunity for that.

Serious competitor trying to maximize score for club and provide opportunity for newbies

It depends on conditions and time available. Sometimes I am serious and sometimes just playing around and giving out points.

Cherry picking for new counties and having fun and giving points to others but mostly looking for "new ones."

Points for club

Part time operator having fun

Actually, a combination of several reasons: I want to get a higher score than I did the previous year and improve the components of the score. If I get a certificate out of the effort, that's great, but that's not my only objective; I want to enhance my ability to pick calls out of a pileup, quickly and accurately; I want to add new entities to my DXCC collection; and I want to give out what seems to be a wanted multiplier (BC).

Contesting to improve my CW speed and for practice with emcomm training

helping club score

Serious competitor trying to make it to the bottom of the top 10.

Part time operator having fun.

Serious competitor trying to do OUR best and get fun with the local group and share this fun with the rest of competitors.

competitor with myself

All of the above (depends on how much time I have and what my motivation level is)

Sometimes trying to make Top 10. Sometimes playing. Always there, however. It is "the Gathering."

Goal varies from contest to contest.

Just for fun and to get more new Prefix/higher score

Semi Serious going for band and modes for DXCC.

Serious competitor that knows I won't win a plaque.

Multi operator training

When I have the time I will put in a Serious effort.

Personal satisfaction

Serious competitor with no chance/hope to win anything

Having fun, seeing friends and filling band slots

Working new countries

Normally pretty serious. this year sidelined for most of contest with illness

I like the competition and if I win a certificate or plaque would be happy if not just leave my country and participate in high enough.

dabbling

for the soul

Make points for club

Serious competitor trying to have fun.

DXer looking to fill band slots & have fun

I do all of the above, depending on my situation at the time of the contest.

QRP DX'ing -highest score

Low Power doing the best I can

West Coast - we are not competitive in CQWW

Do the best I can - beat personal best

Semiserial op trying for best score I can get with limited antennas.

Aiming highest ZONE multiplier from a limited operating site

DXCC

Looking for an occasional new one - and having fun / giving points

Wannabe seeing how well he can do with what he's got

Fun during stn setup. Enjoy meeting old friends; share experiences with others OM.

Because I love competition (special CW),no load for top results, simple, psychic holiday.

Try to improve my score and have fun with the chase.

Ant ability and my brain ability check and test.

DX QSO

Combination of Serious some years, Part Time other years. Not sure what this year is going to be yet.

Organize an activity for the radio club and have fun contacting all the countries being there

for my soul

Trying to get as many multipliers as possible on single band.

Generating points for my contest club, so in a way serious but not as an individual.

contest for me is verify myself and my homebrew construction

both, trying for highest score possible and chasing contact for awards

Test of propagation from my new QTH

Using the contest to collect DXCC

QRP part time operator

Having fun, get a good place in ranking and chasing contacts maybe for an award

test my antennas

I love contesting

To challenge myself to improve each year

Part time operation and having fun!

Trying for the highest score possible for WRTC.

Making DX contacts I don't have.

Having fun and serious QRP contester

Serious team-playing competitor in club competition

Having fun and making new DXCCs

Operating for a few hours to help (FRC) with Point standings.

Join multi ops because DX contesting from Texas sucks

See how many countries I can wk on one band

Trying to beat last year's score!

Full time operator-part time contester

Serious effort to train new contest ops for our club

Have fun running

Both Serious competitor trying to win a certificate or plaque and Having fun and giving points to others

Working new DXCC entities

Participation with multi-opr team.

Contributing for Club score.

Club competition

Former serious competitor. No longer.

Sometimes #1, sometimes #4

Competing to give points to my contesting club, PVRC

DXCC

Adding to aggregate club score.

Both serious competitor AND part timer

new band/ctrys

I am a bit of all except for serious competitor. Part timer trying to get the best score I can, while also looking for new entities but having a ton of fun!

Combination of these answers. Looking for DX contacts, having fun and trying to beat my previous years' score.

Trying to win a cert. but there is no M/S low power category, so trying to get highest score, and teach new kids on contesting

Cannot really explain the reasons

I enjoy the CW test and can work a couple of DXCC same time.

I have not got much time because I work weekends but I try to be the maximum and gives multipliers and points. I always want more in less time

Opportunity for QSO to different stations on a separate range

Ability to work with a large number of stations for one period. I increase personal achievement.

I want to contact to more HAM

Chasing DX and antenna testing.

make a lot of contacts, see if i can compete and have fun

Do not have the station to be "serious competitor" but always try to win a certificate or plaque

Club group - always m/m - semi serious. Main aim to have fun and do our best without getting overly serious. Always trying to bring in newbies.

Trying for highest personal score.

Just participating when possible

Points for PNW Club trophy

Having fun and testing antennas

I try to get more points in present contest than I did in last contest.

serious competitor trying for the max score

relax

I don't know yet

Trying to improve my last year score.

Team member of serious multi-op

all except for trying to win a certificate or plaque

A combination of the above. Giving points, having fun and if I get a cert, that's all well and good!

Contributing points to club score

Serious competitor and having FUN

All of the above and order seems to depend on the year, motivation, etc.

Listening only

Having fun and trying to beat my previous records

Compete with myself to try and better my score against last year. Not interested in awards in particular.

When going with team to D4C it's serious effort; from home - just for fun

I try my best to improve score each year but using the same rigs and power. I use the results breakdown to determine whether my hearing has deteriorated much over the previous twelve months!

Serious competitor for my club. Station not likely to win a certificate or plaque.

I just set myself targets each year and also use the breakdown afterwards to find out if my hearing has really got worse over the last year!

Actually all of the options

More than 40 years tradition

Compete with myself.

To win in HA, enjoy the contest

More or less a combination of serious part time competitor doing the best possible score (I mainly try to compete with my own previous efforts), and also chasing rare dx is a part reason.

Serious competitor trying to having fun

A combination of all of the above

Good opportunity to gain DXCC contacts

The opportunity to work with many radio amateurs together. To improve your results.

my personal score

a bit of it all

trying to improve my previous score and if lucky win a certificate for my country or continent

trying to be serious, time depending

Having fun and giving points to others. Fulltime contest run.

Serious competitor trying for the highest personal score possible

To make the most points for the FRC contest club and beat YCCC

Just playing around with QRP 5w having fun. Should have gotten a little more serious.

Training fellow club members in "how to contest."

Try to win a plaque or certificate, chase a new DXCC and try yourself

Team op for M/2

for fun

Points for the club.

Checking out new antennas

It all depends. The SSB is always the same time I am out elk hunting so I haven't done a CQ WW SSB in many many years. CW I have tried to do one seriously but just haven't had the energy. Plus I have such noise on 160 and 80 from a uncooperative neighbor that its no fun anymore.

Supporting every contest as possible.

serious,(w/o winning); Fun with small station m/s,

Has-been thinking about a comeback

serious competitor trying to make points for our club

Have been very serious in the past. Could be again.

serious competitor trying to support my radio club

Some years I travel out of the country for a "full bore effort." Others, I participate to have fun

Generating points for club

Depending of available time

Q2. What category do you normally enter?

What category do you normally enter?

Single Operator	3254	61.8%
Single Operator Assisted	1377	26.1%
Multi-Operator	636	12.1%
Total	5267	

Q3. How do you feel about the 5 day log submission deadline?

How do you feel about the 5 day log submission deadline?

Not enough time	858	16.5%
OK	3745	72.2%
Make it shorter	413	7.9%
No opinion	174	3.4%
Total	5190	

Comments:

I have a full day drive to get to the contest station, and often combine the event with a visit to friends and family. So 5 days is sometimes just not workable. How about 15 days, or at least 10.

10 day needed.

No problem. Look at the log for missing or bad data. Take 3 minutes to fix it. Send it it.

Almost got caught because of storm related power outages... 10 days should do it, or a required explanation of circumstance.

Usually post the log within the day. There's nothing much to do to a log after a Contest except correct known typos.

In today's world with PCs and logging programs - 5 days is plenty of time to get it sent in. Just a couple of clicks and it's sent in.

7 would be nicer

Just fine for me although I worry about more casual operators.

Some operators cannot file in such a short time. Those with 'automatic' filing have a distinct advantage and that is no fair.

Guys that are away from home need a reasonable amount of time to get home before worrying about the log.

It's just different. Will take a little time to get used to, but OK for non-big guns. Can't say about impact on the big boys.

7 days would be better - allows the weekend following to complete transmitting the log.

When I travel to places with poor internet connections (there are many), 5 days is a bit rough...

Not long enough when it normally takes a year for the results anyways...

There have been times in past on overseas trips with minimal internet and other responsibilities that it would have been difficult. From US, OK.

It's a bit too short. Perhaps 10 days would be better. If you think it has resulted in reduced cheating, then 5 days is OK.

It's a very good idea. WAY too much 'log massaging' is going on! The log should be submitted 5 minutes after the contest ends. If you screwed up during the test, too bad! 5 days is more than reasonable.

Should be no more than 12h or less.

10 days OK. 5 days too short

For me it takes only minutes. Multi ops may have more challenges than I do to insure the log is factual, not manipulated.

A great idea that, I am sure cuts down on Log laundering. I feel that it puts everyone on a common plain.

Don't mind a shorter time period but it takes me a few days to get (back) to it after a contest!

I like it--no point in holding onto the log any longer than needed.

There really is no need to have a longer deadline. Aside from checking for obvious typos, there is no reason to play with a log and it should be ready to submit within the new timeframe. If more time is required by, let's say, a DXpedition station for which the submitter might be flying home or on the high seas, then a request could be made, right?

Sometimes 5 days is OK. Sometimes 10 days would make more sense.

This was the contest I officially entered and had difficulty locating software to submit my log

10 days might be better.

7 or 10 days would be a good choice

2 weeks is much better

Maybe 7day will be better? Because I'm very busy Monday to Friday. So 7 day will better for me.

Feel that another 5 days would be better considering that the contest ends late Sunday and that work may keep you busy till late every work day. Having the following weekend past the contest will permit a close revision of your log before submitting it to the robot and less probabilities of rejecting a log with mistakes..

It is satisfactory even if it carries out a deadline early, since the office using the contest LOG is most. Moreover, since the administrator side can also ease huge time, I think that it is good.

If the Logs are in within 5 days we should have the results sooner

perhaps better if 15 days

I don't see why it's not long enough

10 days would be better

I think that two weeks would be better than 5 days... especially for people who went away from their home locations and some travel may be in order or they may not have internet connections.

I'd make it even shorter, if the concern is post-contest log editing. However, stations operating from remote locations may have trouble with this requirement.

No problem if logging software working well..,

The logging software makes the log available immediately after the contest. 24 to 48 hrs is more than enough time to submit your log.

5 days is plenty of time and it cuts down on procrastination. :-)

The N1MM software makes compiling the information pretty easy so the 5 day deadline is not a problem

7 days would be better - gives the following weekend to prepare the log

I usually send my log in half an hour after the test. Check a few things and if I have a call wrong it's my fault.

I can get used to it

Too much log massaging going on. Make it 5 hours, not 5 days.

usually I upload within 3 day after the contest

I would prefer at least 7 days to have the next weekend to submit.

I knew I was going to operate the contest from Bermuda. My flight home was on the Wednesday following the contest, so I knew time would be short to submit my entry. I requested (and was granted - thank you Randy) an extension to get my entry in after I returned home. For situations such as this (where operators may be in travel shortly after the contest ends), a deadline of perhaps 10 days after the contest ends might be more appropriate than the current 5 days for log submission. .

I understand the reasons for shortening the deadlines. That said, 14 calendar days or 10 business days would be nice.

7 days would be better to allow submission on the following weekend.

It would be nice to have at least a week.

For a small op like me, 5 days is usually enough. However when a contest ends on a Sunday night and I'm tired I don't always take the time to do the submission right then. Monday arrives, it's back to the salt mine, and before you know it the week has passed and so has the deadline. I've never traveled to a DX location for a contest but some ops do. For them I imagine packing up, traveling home and getting the log in on time is a challenge. I suggest 10 to 14 days. Here's an idea; offer 100 bonus pts to stations submitting in 5 days or less.

I have no problem with the 5 day time frame.

I usually submit my file for ALL contests within a day.

unnecessarily short

Make it a week! Even though I try to upload as soon as it's over, sometimes I have to QRT early and can't get back to the shack to file the log until the next weekend.

It is plenty of time. Has anyone considered 24 hours with a 1% cut each day for submissions that are 1 to 5 days late. I don't like the idea of having time to doctor the logs.

In general it's enough time because I usually endeavor to submit my log on Sunday evening, however in the past that hasn't always been easy, so 7 days might be more of a 'round figure'.

If the goal is to be a good operator, I think correcting a log is out of this goal. Making it shorter would be fine once consolidated the 5 day log.

The period is sufficient to send the log. No need to be larger

Is fine for me, give chance to evaluate my performance in the region and in my country

I did not understand the deductions for mistakes but I would not have time to recheck or make corrections. I keep a running paper log and a computer 'log' but my fingers and brain have a problem multi-tasking. I need 10 days to have weekend time.

Shorter with continued case-by-case extensions.

Seven or eight days would be better for me. There is some kind of contest almost every weekend and preparing for the new contest is a built-in reminder of getting the previous week's log in.

Should be enough time to submit the log.

There should not be problem to enter a contest and hold your log longer than 24 hours

Serious participants mostly use software; so, they don't need more than 1 day to submit their logs. Considering Internet issues, ok, say 2 days. On the other hand, occasional and 'old fashion' participants, and also very busy people, if they are only active on weekends, perhaps don't have time the very same Sunday to finish and submit their logs, so they need to wait until NEXT weekend. Given that case, they need at least 6 DAYS (not only 5).

Make it 7 days.

More than enough time to submit a log. I usually submit logs within 24 hours... that is when I do submit logs. It takes no time to do an ADIF extract and email it!

2 weeks is better. On a long contest weekend it takes me a day two to recover. Then its the work week.

Works for me. Within 5 days of a contest i can always get my log submitted to the contest administrator

Hope 2weeks

Just enough time to digest the weekend and check for obvious fat finger mistakes, like a zero instead of an Oh.

I use an Excel spreadsheet log that creates a Cabrillo file, so I can submit immediately.

People have lives and sometimes they finish a contest and have to live their lives and it lasts longer than 5 days. 2 weeks is a better time frame in my thoughts.

I'm in favor of a shorter submission window but 5 days is too short. I think 10 days is about right.

I try to submit the log right after the contest period is over.

I would like an even shorter deadline...perhaps one hour

Personally I have no issue with shorter deadlines as long as it also means results getting published sooner. However, I don't agree with the argument that it is being done to prevent people massaging their logs. If a person is inclined to do that sort of thing they will do it even if the deadline was 24 hours. So stop using that as a reason.

I think 5 days is generally OK, but 10-14 days would be better. I am a 'pencils-down' tester, but sometimes it does take me several days to take care of all the log administration and backups before submitting. A busy week ahead at the office or a business trip after a contest weekend increases the likelihood I will not make the deadline in 5 days.

It is good so that we can see the results qui queer as people don't qrz the information. I think it should be shorter with the option to request an extension

More than enough time

With time extension for those who travel to places where the internet is not so good.

If computer problems, there is little time to submit a corrected log. I hate being rushed. 10 days would eliminate high blood pressure and nail biting.

A full 7 day week would be nice.

Seems like a pretty long time to me as I usually submit right after the contest.

I think until one month.

48h on the field and no more than 24h to send in the log. Internet is everywhere nowadays.

Not enough time when operating from DX country. Time OK when operating from Home.

It is ok for me but you are forcing some of the older testers to go all electronic.

I submit logs after all contests soon after within a day so I have no problem with it.

Think a 10 day deadline would be better...

The numbers on logs submitted suggest that it is workable, right? Love it if it helps results come out sooner.

Not terrible, but seems a little short.

Lengthening to a week would be better. It can cause problems for some guys, especially for guys who travel.

I usually drop it in right after the contest. I do not like going over the log. It should be as worked.

But what happens if you have a power emergency or other emergency that keeps you from submitting.

Like it. Keeps the competition honest.

5 days is okay, maybe 10 days better if not significant for the contest checker. Almost no time left to submit if happen to temporarily forget to submit.

For me, using N1MM and being in the states, not an issue. I could see where some DXpedition would find this a potential issue...

very short cycle time equates to fewer chances for log editing

I generally submit immediately after the contest -- or as soon as I copy the N1MM screens I want to save, generate the Cabrillo, etc. Not a problem -- why wait -- one shouldn't edit the log, so get it done.

Helps, but doesn't eliminate, log massaging.

After the contest is over, I need to go to work the 5 days. Checking, transferring, and uploading often waits for the next weekend or two.

I think it's OK in many cases, but twice or three times will be better, for urgent business or family problems.

suggestion 15 days

Make it just a bit longer. Maybe a week. There are circumstances when I just cannot get the log submitted immediately.

If logging programs supported the reporting function, I would support a much shorter deadline.

It's just a matter of converting the log to Cabrillo. Some folks who travel a lot may have a problem meeting the deadline.

At least put the entire following weekend in the submission time.

I have to work the days after.....do not have time till next weekend....

This is really too short. If I forget to send in the log during the week I don't even have the next weekend to go back to the club station, download the log and send it in. I think it should be at least 7 days if you really need them that fast. Two weeks would be even better, in case I forget to do it that week.

The shorter the better. I don't think participants should be scrubbing their logs after the contest. It is what it is: submit what you've actively logged. It's ridiculous to scrub scores in other sports and radio sport should not be an exception.

Maybe 10 days. Gives those on DX trips or serious business in the week following

It should be at least a full week.

Software logs make it easy to conform to the deadline My opinion there should be no paper logs in contests.

I think 7 days would be better, for time on the following weekend.

I have been on DX/contest expeditions sometimes without internet connection. It's possible that a few extra days of operating time plus travel time could result in missed timing. Is there consideration for some of these types of situations????

Ok for me. Maybe difficult for more remote stations.

If I need to travel immediately after the contest, 5 days can be a challenge. I think 7 to 10 days would accolade most needs and requirements.

With computer logging, 5 days is plenty of time. A once over to make sure 0s & Os are in right place should suffice. Anything else is 'massaging'.

Short, to discourage 'fixing' the log afterwards

As long as it results in faster results publishing. No point if results still months away.

The deadline is a minor PITA for those of us who still stupidly hand-log - heck, I suppose it would still be a PITA if I smartly hand-logged....

I suppose that it's time to grow up and adapt N1MM or something similar - SIGH!

What's wrong with cuniform & clay tablets?

I would say 8 days is optimal. At least give another weekend to submit.

It seems to me that 10 or 14 days would be better so that the submission deadline includes the next weekend.

Too many stations uses the 30 days period to 'handle' the log. 5 days are enough to check it only.

As long as you allow discretionary exceptions for computer failures and other extenuating circumstances. Sometimes crap happens.

I think 5 is fair, shorter would be fine too

Shorter is fine with me, but let's let the world get wrapped around '5 days' first.

Seems unnecessarily short for a contest that takes months to publish final results. A 5-day deadline makes more sense for a contest that can provide log-checked results within a week or so.

Considered appropriate within seven days.

Just too soon after the test to submit the log. I like to have time to look for typos and other stupid errors.

Sometimes I immediately have to leave on business travel for the week as soon as I turn the rig off. I might not be home for at least the next 5 days.

Fine, absolutely no problem.

I think it is ridiculously short. I may be travelling or have a work emergency or whatever to keep me from submitting within that short a period of time.

I like the 5 day, however if you do change anything, 7 days might do the trick.

Generally possible to get it done on time. Internet at home (rural Wisconsin) and in rural Honduras makes the 5 day thing questionable, but, so far, no problems. Overall, I'd consider the 5 day limit to be a good thing as it motivates a 'manana' guy like me to just get it done.

I think 5 days should accommodate everyone. I would not have a problem if it were shorter.

It's a detriment to me. I rarely have the time or energy right after the contest to take care of it. And it's not only the Cabrillo submission that gets done...there's also the 3830 reflector, importing to my main log, uploading to LoTW. Many times I can't get to it until the next weekend, which is now too late. I think it should be a week.

I see no reason to be any longer.

Why 5 days? It's easy enough to upload the log when you're done operating in the contest. I assume that you have a good reason for 5 days instead of requiring it to be turned in within say 5 hours. I have no real horse in this race. It's easier to just submit the log right away before you forget about it. However, whatever you guys decide is fine with me.

Needed one month for paper submission.

I like the shorter deadline. In this day and age, 5 days is reasonable.

10 days would be sufficient

10 day is better.

Glad to see the shorter deadline implemented...

Two weeks would be better. 5 days is too short.

I think 10 days would be better to give folks a bit more time.

I am ok with it, but expressing concern that DXpedition stations may not meet deadline

It would be good if the log submission were long enough to include the following weekend.

I usually submit my log within 24 hours.

I was initially opposed. But it got me off my butt to send in my log. I am happy with it if it means earlier results.

5 days is fair enough, but using sophisticated databases and software some people still can and do prove their logs on the correctness of the logged call signs. It is to think about sending logs within hours after the event, at least for the top scores anticipants.

If someone wants to cheat, 5 days or 30 days makes little difference. The short time makes a strain on the rest of us who may forget to get the log in quickly for some reason and lose out on the entry.

If I have Internet at the time, five days is fine, but sometimes I do not have reliable internet. We do not all live in internet ready areas.

Since I'm not trying to win anything, it's not a problem if I don't get the log in on time.

Heck, I need two days just to recover.

Contest is my main activity but submission of log is not. 5 days are too short.

Just after the contest we can send our electronic log technically. Have to want only. :-)

I still do a written log during operation; it must be keyboarded into EXCEL for sorting, duping etc; then I must export the EXCEL file as an ASCII or .txt; and finally, use a Cabrillo applet to convert the log into the Cabrillo format with proper heading etc. For me, sending cw with one hand and keyboarding with the other is a real acrobatic trick.

Just makes me get off the ASS

After 48 (ish) hours, many are beat and ready for sleep. Monday starts work week - job, family, life. Finally Friday arrives, time off and able to think about contesting, but wait - just missed deadline. Seven day deadline makes MUCH more sense. Especially true for those who may have been DX and must travel home and still deal with 'life' during the week. I appreciate the sponsor's efforts to shorten the window between the competition and the results/awards. I understand a 3 week shorter entry window could help, but does that really translate into several months earlier results, as some have said? I'd say 7 days is a better choice, as then there shouldn't be nearly as many 'exceptions' needing to be granted since competitors would have at least part of a weekend to work on getting their submission in.

I need one weekend (Sat and Sun) to prepare and E-mail the log to you. Remember many of us are not retired yet....

24 h after contest

5 days is plenty of time to get a contest log submitted.

DXpeditions may need a little more time to get their logs processed (and find an internet connection) but you have that covered. OK.

Should be long enough for those who have computers. It is hard for those who don't have electronic media.

Very good idea. Make it shorter

Possibly too short. I am on an airplane as often as 30 weeks out of the year...

Why do you need any more time? Your records are your records.

I think this was long overdue. There is no reason to give contestants longer time.

I'd say make it shorter, but five days seems about as short as it can be without making life too difficult for DXpeditioners to exotic places.

Send it in as it is - no messing around with it!

Fine for fully retired.

Finish contest Sunday, get to sleep after dinner, get up Monday morning and off to work. Do the log the following weekend, oops, too late.

Not enough time if there are corrections required by the ROBOT. 14 Calendar Days OK

End of the contest is Monday at 09:00 in JAPAN I quickly shut down and go to work so it is hard work till Friday, No time to make E-mail, so I need 7 Days include next Sunday !

It's okay, there is no opportunity for speculation and further corrections in the log

No problem at all. The longer a deadline is, the lazier people get!

It is 100% correct.

But grant a grace period for anyone who asks with a legit reason.

Since most people have to use computer logging in the first instance to be serious of competitive, it could be one day to avoid redoing the contest with recording devices--but for most people five days seems reasonable. Creating a Cabrillo file only takes maybe ten minutes, and filing it maybe another ten minutes max. I usually do it exactly at the end of the contest, and consider the immediate submission to be an integral part of the contest itself. I get a reply from the contest robot usually before i can look for it on my e-mail. The system seems great.

Because take one day off for a contest, subsequent days are relatively busy working, thus not enough time spending more for radio hobby

I think it was a great move by CQ! 5 days is reasonable.

I work throughout the week and after a weekend contest, it doesn't give me enough time to complete the submission. I feel that 10 days would be more ample.

It's fine for me but I think it would discourage others who may use paper logs and need more time to prepare submissions. A few weeks would seem more reasonable. I usually submit within 24 hours. We should encourage others to participate and submit their scores. 5 days could do the opposite.

Normal not a problem but if on holiday would not have internet connection!

Excellent, 5 days I feel it's better.

Should be at minimum 7 days, preferably 15 days. Allow at least the following weekend for ops to process their logs. The next weekend may be the first opportunity to do so after getting some rest.

I usually travel to a DX location for the contest. I think a short deadline is fine, but I think 5 days is a little too short, given travel, possible little or no Internet connectivity, etc. I think 10 days or 14 days would be more reasonable for those of us that may be delayed at least a few days before we can get home.

7 to 10days later

I think 5 days with current policy of granting exceptions to many is just fine.

Personally I'd be OK with a 72 hour deadline. The key thing making the short deadline acceptable is the willingness to accept late logs when appropriate (DXpeditions lacking internet; regional week-long blackouts, etc.)

Since I'm computer logging and have internet - fine. If I was off in a more remote area, it would be a little more difficult.

I think that it is a principle to submit as soon as it was finished.

For top competitors (placement) only one hour after last loggin QSO!!!

Five day is normally time for all class

With internet access from almost everywhere, 24 hours will be fine. A exceptional extension of 3 days for dxpedititions...

I usually take part in CQWW CW from Caribbean islands, so sometimes it is not easy to get Internet access. But if asked, one can get a little more time to submit log.

I do not using the electronic log system. Even now, I use the paper log while in the contest. Then I have to enter after contest. Usually I enter the log at next weekend. It had better at least 7 days log deadline.

There is no reason any entrant in the contest needs more than 48 hours to submit their log. I normally submit within an hour after the contest ends.

Not enough time for hams who works offline.

I HAVE ONLY OVERCOME MY LAZINESS....

It's really not enough time. I would suggest extending the time to include through the end of the following weekend.

I think the time period is OK.

Give the participants one more week, to have a glance on their logs, let 'em check for errors....

You can be hold of job and family and other things. So 5 days is little to short, one week(7 days) i think is better.

Now all serious ops using electronic equipment and i-net? So it is not problem? but ask DX! how does op from 'hell corner' ? You must look at his problem. The stations from DX countries ARE MOST INTEREST for us! We must to do ALL for them. 73! Albert

The first time I heard this short proposal, was surprised it was too short. But when claimed score was announced very shortly after the contest, I really understand the importance of short dead line. Probably this is the way we have. Thanks a lot. (7 days is better, I think)

Impossible when keying logs for club competition. Five days is actually not long enough to receive the logs much less key them and submit.

It was Not clean to me to have only 5 days.

Get the log in ASAP

I usually submit mine almost immediately after the end if the contest.

I try to send the log in 10 minutes after the test

Should emphasize that on rules...if not someone will be late on submitting lists...like me....HI HI

Your log should be correct at the time of the contest end. Why anybody would need a long time for submitting their log could only be to modify it after the contest.

I have work. The return to a house is slow, too. It is necessary for one week

I am aged and have bad eyesight thus working on the computer to check the log and making a submission file takes time. I simply cannot prepare everything in 5 days.

Box score applicants should have many things different from the 'regulars' - this is just one of them. Can you see the point - the concentration should be on demanding more from those who apply for box score. Two different worlds!

IS WRONG!

Usually, i not have free time after weekend, business and other... I make log in next weekend, usually.

Must be enough for everyone.

Difficult for operation from other countries!! (often missed the WEB-connection)

Such as when a job enters and or me and my family illness.

Processing of the log after the test I took 1-2 hours. I think 5 days is enough to send the log (5 days, you can return any of the DX-pedition :-))

It's easy to send the same day. For me if you made long, you can see on the log no real QSO !!

For top participants it will be appropriate to connect logs on line. It's more Crystal clear and makes competition more exciting.

If all amateurs had notebooks then it would be enough 5 days, but in Russia not everybody has it.

almost PC logging so OK

Since everyone uses computers and thus does not need to convert the log to a more readable there is no need for long submission times. I would say that 24h is acceptable but with the possibility to prolong if the participant have been in a place without internet connection

Great decision!

Absolutely OK with current electronic logging. Perhaps checklogs could be sent later too, up to 1 month?

No time for log tuning after the contest is good, as it better reflects the entrant's achievements. Infrastructure in most countries should allow for log submission very close to the end of the contest.

It is difficult to send immediately after the contest. I think after the competition check is required. 5 days is necessary at first to send log.

14 days give more chance to finalize the contest

Why would anyone need 5 days to submit a log, with modern communications? Even a contest DXpedition can submit a log within 5 days. Longer = more log massaging.

I prefer to have 10 days.

A seven-day week would be easier to remember than 'five business days'.

May be a few days longer

usually the log is ready at the end of the contest; the only problem could be for station having no access to internet within the 5 days (expedition on rare island)

5 is OK with me, but shorter = less time to 'wash' the log.

It had been discussed over and again for many years. CQ finally made it happen and others will follow.

Before I retired, having had computer breakdowns and having to work as well, I barely made the one month time frame. My computers are better now, and I have more time, so it's OK.

Just include the next weekend. Make it 8 day's

I need next weekend for summarize contest log. More than 7days is better.

no comments, it is ok using electronic contest log and Cabrillo.

Very good rule!

I think it is a halfway approach. If it intends not to allow cleansing, it should be shorter. If it allows some post-contest review like current five days, it is fair to allow a week so that you can use next weekend. People who can afford weekdays can review logs, but those who work in weekdays have very limited time which I think is no equal.

Could be difficult for a DX-pedition with limited or no internet connection.

Is already tight, but OK with PC. 10-14 days safer

It could be shorter, but taking into account the number of participants and possible overload of robot it seems OK.

It would give QSO checkers less time to correct their log

Maybe 7-10 days, covering the next weekend

It's a really good idea, maybe you should make a mail service for a reminder if for some reason people forget to submit. Like a, 'subscribe here to enter the x contest'.

A way to have more 'security' to submit a REAL log by everyone.

Since massaging one's log is not permitted, I don't see why 5 days shouldn't be plenty.

Long due. Should now strive to move to real time submission

2 WEEKS WOULD BE BETTER

Difficulty for for some stations in getting their log entries ready and available in time.

24 hours

Should not be longer than 5 days!

With computer logging no problem.

enough time

I think 7 days starting at the end of the contest. This time help to send on next weekend the log, otherwise during the workable week maybe not possible.

could be a little longer as i am as tourist with callsign and have not always access to internet

I think two weeks would be reasonably long for them who have daily obligations.

Hoping, it should also help to reduce the time we have to wait for the final results!

Some of my contesting locations have no network connection. Thus a few days is needed to get into a location with network.

Not a problem when using electronic logging as they can generate Cabrillo log immediately.

Well, 5 days deadline prevents unorganized log collection and correction. For 'all better organized' DX communities, this time is enough to do the same as before. Less than 5 Days, you get in Trouble if the DX qth isn't locally. You must be back to home and prepare the log (convert to Cabrillo and cleanup them). For just me, this time is enough at all, but i am unsure about others.

For me OK, but for helping others to put the paper logs in to Cabrillo to short (I do it for US7WW and the post is not so quick)

5 days is long enough time even for ops that have to come back home from contest expeditions.

Especially in CW we want to check the logs by listening again to CW contact which were recorded. This is time consuming but necessary if you want to optimize your score

Sometimes during the week there is no time to submit it .. 7....10 days would be better

If you operate on holidays could be a bit short. Personally I'd be shot if I did..

OK but I will appreciate if you set the deadline later, for instance, 15days.

We have XXI century!

It should be 7 day deadline. Some people have no time in the week.

Nowadays you'll get a log in seconds after the contest. Sending it in 5 days should be not a problem at all.

minimum 2 weeks

Two day is enough

Nice to see some urgency added to the closure process of the contest, 5 days is about perfect, any shorter may be problematic, any longer is too relaxed.

For remote location in hills without the connection this is too short. Other than that, it looks ok

Is perfect, not too long not too short...

5 days is short if you consider that it takes half a year to publish the final score. seems not ok to me

Make it shorter

too short when I make the contest on holiday from abroad

It is short, but sometimes I forget the deadline. I need to write it in my agenda, so I can't forget.

It is not a problem as contest software are common now and it does not take a long time to check and send the log.

Deadline should include the following weekend. Time after contest is needed for of business. It is very hard to find time for log submission during week.

I'm torn two ways over this!

On the one hand if you really want to avoid 'post event log rationalisation' five days is too long. But on the other hand it might be difficult for stations operating from exotic low- tech locations to get the log in in time. Suggest hold at 5 days for now and see what happens!

a turning point

2 weeks

The test in my opinion is about accuracy throughout the event even when tired. Most logging programs will highlight an error at the time which can be challenged real time. Cleansing of logs via audio is not really in the spirit of contesting.

Good idea - focuses the mind. Guess it may be difficult for some people at DX locations to get back to Internet access, so would be OK with extending it to say 2 weeks.

Most of us use a Computer logging program which makes it fairly easy to meet the 5 day deadline. As it takes almost a year for the results or a certificate to reach us in VK the 5 day deadline would speed things up for sure??

I think is a short time, lots of stations don't have Internet and have to make a trip to submit the log 15 days is a good time

5 working days is still way longer than needed, The log perhaps only needs the header added although most s/w does this automatically now. As a MixW user I usually need some time to check the format and header and after a busy weekend and working on the Monday, teaching on a Monday evening its usually Tuesday evening before I can get close to uploading the log. But I think making it shorter to 23:59 3 days after the contest ends is still more than enough.

The logs the log, warts and all and for people using s/w that generates the CBR and header automatically, they can submit that directly at contest end, for others 3 days max is enough.

I can upload my log within minutes of the finish. Almost everyone active in Radio Sport had internet connection otherwise they wouldn't get rbn and the likes. Maybe give a little leeway to DXpedition ers!!!!

Could be shorter, but after 48 hours of contest i sleep 48 hours!

Only if it is sent immediately after the contest log changing can be avoided... Even if the team agrees to be clean, the mate sending the log can 'improve' it, and - highly unjustly - the Red Card will punish the whole team... what about offering a bonus for an immediate entry???

e.g. Russians require logs 36h after Contest end, if you want to claim place 1, 2 or 3 in a category

8 days would be better as log conversion requires some time and every day duties after the contest limit spare time.

My time is minimal, but try as far as possible to the already known weekend. Anything decide the majority will try to implement

Not all of us are retired already. So 5 days don't mean the same to all of us. I.e. I can only spend time on weekends if I want to avoid taking vacations. If shorter timeframes to avoid log cleaning is the paradigm then let's get a centralized server and do real time logging.

That's great!

may be 1day more is better -> until Saturday, if you are running a 5 days job

Great improvement to discourage changing logs whilst realizing not everyone can submit immediately.

As a make a little amount of QSO, I sometime don't even recheck my log before submitting it, even before the end of the contest

It's been OK for me so far, but could be a problem if I was going away immediately after the contest.

14 days

'5 days' is enough. Various kind of the 'Logging Software' will help testers' work for their results submission to the committee.

I'd love to see the deadline be 5 minutes or at most 5 hours. Otherwise it's too easy to 'scrub' your log.

More time is needed to send it.

I am retired and it is not a problem but if you used paper logs and had other commitments I could see where 10 days would be better

There is no reason that the log cannot be submitted immediately after the contest.

Some times can happen that 5 days or less is to short, but any one can ask for few days more.....don't see any problem

I work in portable and I don't have time to send log , 10 14 days is ok.

I think 5 days are enough as all major testers are using computer logging.

As long as DXpeditions can get an extension

Needs to be at least 30 days..

Having a long contest is fine but when a contest finishes at 01:00 local time I'm straight off to bed as i start work at 04:30 and that at the age of 62, so i need time to send in a log.

With the Cabrillo format requirements now, this should not be a problem for anyone.

We need 3 weeks time to transfer it.

I usually put my log in within 48 hours

What's in log is in log and that's it. Making corrections or anything like that afterwards isn't fair so sending email-log shouldn't be that big issue right after contest.

With Cabrillo logs shorter period is possible however you never know what happens in the meantime - so 5 days or 1 week seems to be correct period to prepare and send your log.

I'm fine with the 5 day log submission, however, if money were no object, I'd like to see everyone log into a server for real time logging purposes. Immediate results would be available at the conclusion of the contest.

Not sure shorter would make any difference. Instant submission would for sure, but it's not technically possible unless scores can be buffered somewhere for off line stations (secure in an encrypted container).

At least one month.. didn't send it in time so it seems - another reason to not participate next year

Better are 1 week.

With computer logging programs, the time is more than adequate.

Let us at least the next weekend to think about radio again. 10 days should be ok.

OK now, because i can generate an automatic Cabrillo log.

Why not 7 days? If someone traveled to the Caribbean or another location for the contest, it might take a few days to get home. Add in a day to get out of contest mode, and maybe a few days of relaxation, and you are right at the deadline or even over it.

I send log 1 our after contest finishing. Why 5 days. For what??

It is good enough time for submitting log.

Its more than long enough for electronic logs

10 days maybe better...

Five days is no problem. I usually send off the log as soon as the contest is over. Despite this, I would not make it shorter than 5 days.

It seems so good idea to get results earlier than ever!

7 days is optimum for me

We're not all glued to the internet

it's a busy life we all live and we sometimes mean to do sooner but find we forgot to send in that contest file....at least a week would be nice

Contest ends on Sunday late night and we step into our normal life duties just a few hours after the contest... Personally the time given is much too short. My suggestion is to allow us having tome at least till end of the weekend after the contest...

2 weeks

With electronic logs, there is no reason to have a longer deadline.

With today's technology, 5 days is plenty of time.

What's the rush? I try to submit contest logs at the end of the contest, but would like at least 2 more weekends in case I'm busy.

Better 10 days log deadline.

Now if we could get all other contest sponsors to do the same

I think 2 weeks is a reasonable time frame

Computerized logging avoids the past need for longer submission times.

At least a week needed.

No problem finishing the contest, creating Cabrillo file from N1MM, and sending it in right away...only takes a couple of minutes.

With the majority of people using computers to log, there is no reason to wait more than 5 days to submit a log.

I see no reason to extend the deadline. After the contest I see no reason not to submit your results within the 5 days. I believe it cuts down on cheating and in today's contest everything is on a computer program anyway. I like it!

We missed the deadline because we were not aware of the new rule. Our log was accepted. Now we know it's no problem to submit soon after the contest.

This year was an anomaly for me. Normally, I shut down PC right after contest and get to submit log later in the week. Hurricane Sandy hit less than 24 hours after the contest ended. Fortunately, I was able to take time off from work Monday to submit before I lost power (and Internet) for 11 days!

It can be a hassle if you're out of the country on a mini-expedition

Should be 1 hr for me.

With the new logging software - it is easy to send score almost immediately - after my post contest nap :-). Usually within a few hours I send to 3830 site, contest log site and LOTW. I would not make it shorter.

it could be longer because the time until results are published is much longer

No strong opinion but work obligations can interfere.

It's a hassle if you've been out of the country on a mini-expedition

I usually send log 1 day after contest.

it would be better to have 7 days - so people who are having a job or much to do at work (sometimes I come home and do not want to do anything else...) have the weekend to send the log properly and also have the chance to react on the answer of the robot.

It's a good rule!

All you have to is Cabrillo the log and have your wife email the file in.

one day option is OK too

10 days are better

It is not enough time for people who go to remote locations to operate. It is fine for those of us who operate from our home QTH.

i don't use a logging program and do it by hand

Since I go outside the USA it's a concern that I won't have reliable internet all the time.

At least one week (7 days) to have one more weekend.

I work manually and to process the log in the next 5 days of the week could be difficult. Sometime this requirement makes me renounce to take part in Contest.

I need about a week (including weekend).

many operators transmit in different locations from the usual home, 5 days to send the logs is not enough if you are in countries with internet access difficult

more long at 10 day - 20 day.

I believe that 7 days is just enough time. Sometime i have a business trip just after the contest and taking a rest in the next weekend. Well I justify this because where I do contesting do not have Internet access.

Would like 7 days as this includes a weekend which allow working people time to submit the log and check the robot reply etc

I would like to check a log during the next weekend.

I send my log the day after the event but I'm retired. Working men probably need a weekend at least.

5 day is good choice, LOGs can be sent without corrections.

The shortened deadline is a positive development. Thanks!

everybody should use a computer log, and if you can't sent in 48 hours, then you are modifying after the event

There is nothing to do with the log when test is finished. For me 1 day is enough. But the rule is for everybody, no exceptions. This year I can see the number of logs increasing day by day, after 5 days.

If it is the intention to avoid log checking based on own audio recordings and notes taken during the contest, the submission deadline must be shortened to no more than 2 hours after end of contest. Personal comment: I do not share WWROFs opinion of such practice being unethical. But that's my personal opinion. If the rules forbid it, the deadline MUST be shorter !

Should be 48 hours maximum!

for me is very good

I think bit more time is needed. There are those that work, have families, traveling, etc. and have spent the whole weekend contesting, and really need some time to get their life back to normal.....

You can easily do it in couple of hours, at least in single operator category

There may need to be allowances for dxpeditions and single ops returning home from far-away-places.

Between family, grand kids, work, bad memory, and life in general, a five day deadline seems to be a stumbling block.

Could be an issue for DXpeditions unless they have reliable internet access

Still, I would make it 7 days so that people might check his log for eventual typos or so NEXT WEEKEND. If somebody is not retired yet, finding time during 5 BUSINESS days is not easy.

It was an improvement.

At that length, it needs to happen as a part of the contest activity so you don't forget it. Might as well be 5 hours.

I don't know this at a time of SSB test. I think its a short even I can apply computer logging...

After a weekend of contesting, I have home and job responsibilities. Seldom have time to deal with contest log submission till the next weekend. Sooner or later I will miss the 5 day deadline.

I was a serious contester in in the 70s and if it is a entry for a score or a win, I favor having the entry at the end of the contest. I think the goal of the contest is getting the exchange right during the contest and not how good you can post process a log.

Having operated from DX location and a multi station, I realize after the contest it can take time to merge logs and tear down and catch a flight. Maybe allow casual operators the 5 day period, but they would not compete for the top scoring stations.

I enjoy the CQWW contest, but don't submit a entry and only did because of your e-mail

I worry about myself or others who get distracted by other pressures and might miss the deadline

only 24h

Much better than previous and good to see results out quicker.

No big deal - I usually have my score and log immediately at the end of the contest.

DX-peditions might need more time, to get home, unpack, etc. Otherwise, no reason for anyone operating at home to need more than a week,

I want about 1 week(7 days).

By now everyone is using computer logging so making the extract and sending it via email should be no problem.

I think it should be 7 days to give the next weekend for preparation time.

Make it shorter for the series competitors

To soon to tell...maybe 10 days be more to my lifestyle.

Some people travel to prime locations, so this would prevent added stress on a stressed out person who just returned to work ect. 10 day deadline would be a better solution.

It may be difficult for DXpedition ops that may be scrambling to get back home and may not have convenient internet access abroad.

I would actually prefer 10 days, in case something comes up that precludes getting the submittal log generated, reviewed, and submitted quickly. Having said that, in most cases I do send in my log within 2 days.

In the most recent contest, N1MM formatted my log in a manner unacceptable to CQWW. Silly things like that cause delays for me.

Immediately after the contest

I send my log right away, or next day. No reason to wait that I can see.

7 or 10 days would be better. I had to leave on a business trip right after the contest, then rushed to submit the log just before the deadline.

I think that there are too many multi-operator stations that use the time after the contest to review and make changes to their logs. I always was of the opinion that at the end of the contest, the log is submitted as is without changes.

Should be 2 weeks minimum.

If I don't submit my log right away, as soon as the contest ends, five days is plenty of time for me.

a month would be better

It much more time i thing and possible have to sleep time after contest and write-check logs.

Two days would be enough even for us who don't have Internet at home.

This is okay for fixed stations, but for mobile or portable stations logging on paper this can be a real burden.

Should be at least 7 day, so you don't have to deal with it until the following weekend.

I would prefer at least 10 days just due to sometimes things come up and I don't get in front of my computer quickly... but 5 really is OK.

I think it is very reasonably as computers have made logging and submission so easy. Maybe for working operators that submit hand written logs a little longer time might be helpful.

Submission deadline should be at least 30 day minimum. There are many ops that work or attend school full time that simply do not have the luxury of time to submit a contest log within 5 days. I am one of these ops and most likely will be many years ahead.

It's a solution looking for a problem.

Good idea. Normally I used to start to complete the log only 1-2 day before the deadline :-)

We are returning home from Madeira (CR3L) after having cleared the station. That means we are back home 3 to 4 days after the contest. That is too short to check the log for major errors. 14 days would be ok.

It does not take more than 24 h to check the own log

This depends of the kind of activity. After major events you have to solve several tasks with high priority after the contest and then 5 days is to short - 14 days is better, because you have one weekend in between.

Outside distractions, like life, sometimes take time away from contesting!

When the contest is finished the log is ready to be submitted.

No shorter than five days. If someone is going to mess with their log, it would take no longer than an hour or two in any case.

It's excellent, especially if you're a serious competitor, trying to win the contest. I wish in the future it would be less than 5 days for those top folks, thought.

2-3 weeks

When I am off on DXpedition, that is usually not enough time to look things over before sending the log in.

Should be shorter. There is still a temptation to edit your log using the list of submitted logs. Furthermore, the on-line contesting should be encouraged and there at the end of the contest the logs should be submitted as such.

5 Days deadline will not prevent organized log file collection and compare. Less than 5 days will be not enough for multi-op stations. I had not a Problem with 5 days last contest.

Should be 10 days.

I sometimes forget to submit - give us a little more time - 7 days.

Have to get family time. XYL has some problems and may not get to the computer til the next week end.

Operated from another county without e-mail.

It is ok, but a lot of people will probably miss it because the time is shorter than in the past. A lot of people only look it up twice. Once for contest times and once (much later) for submission address. This questionnaire will help.

Many competitors still use paper logs.. And 5 days is short time to translate it to PC and make Cabrillo.

The result must be earlier too than before

No problem for me because of computer logging.

48 hours would be enough!

I actually like the 5 day submission deadline in that it is a step forward to eliminating the 'category shopping' that has occurred over the past years. You pretty much have to pick a category and stick to it in the contest.

Eight or ten might be better.. Time to unwind, go over notes and of course, go to work.. hi hi

Make it one hour.

Normally upload to LoTW after contest ends. No issue with sending the Cabrillo log by the next day.

With good logger and without wish for fixing the log, 5 days is enough.

I would like to see it as 7 days instead of 5 days.

With any serious operator logging by computer five days to submit a log should never be a problem.

45 days well

I would rather 30days

I recently had computer problems when trying to enter the CQ 160 contest and could not get them resolved in the 5 day time frame and consequently did not enter a log for that contest.

This is good to prevent confirmation exchange

perhaps a week or ten days

Five days is kind of okay, but seven days would be better, giving you the following weekend to 'catch up' on the paperwork.

I like it.

Better to have 7 days log deadline

It is simply too short, if you have a job and business obligations. The short deadline was supposed to prevent cheating. But cheaters now only have less time to do their job...

Suggestion: Make it the 3rd Monday after the contest. Then there are 2 weekends to submit the log.

it was good decision made by contest committee

Perfect

my opinion it's too long. what it means "paper log" nowadays ? the contest is over - 10-12 hrs to sleep ... normally the follow Monday is a day-off ... shower + coffee + log submission just simple and clear ! what else ? who has 40 hrs and more to work and hasn't 10 min more to submit his work ??? 72 hours is enough ... in accordance with the ham spirit - do it 73 hrs after the contest is over :)

This way I don't procrastinate about submitting my log.

In the UK, the contest finishes at midnight. My logging computer can't be networked, so it takes a while to copy the log to another PC. I work away from home during the week, so don't have the opportunity to deal with logging until the following Saturday.

Make it 7 days to allow for the work week

No problem

maybe a month?

When like me you do more than 1 contest in a weekend it is very demanding to send off the log right away, even more so if you want to check for evident typo's like 0 or O or inverted letters in a callsign. I think that kind of errors should be allowed a correction, especially if not correcting results in more deduction than the QSO score

At least include the following weekend. Perhaps an eight day submission deadline?

Only problem would be if you were traveling in an area where internet access was not available. There should be allowances made for this so you could get a few extra days (maybe 10)?

Does not need to be 30 days, but 5 days is not much time when traveling out of the country to operate

I think the 5 day rule is plenty of time. Even stations that operated from a location away from home should have no problem submitting in time.

Could be a problem for some countries where internet not so easy. Did a contest from C9 a few years ago and we didn't get good internet until we got back to ZS several days later.

As busy as everyone is these days, 5 days to too short. Should be a minimum of 10.

It's OK for me now but even shorter time than that will be OK because I never do any corrections of log after contest.

Everyone can easy send his log by e-mail immediately after completion of the contest.

except for specific situations - remote locations - no internet access - the logs must be sent in a very short delay after contest end in order to avoid any manipulation

I can do it in 5 days but sometime might need more. Suggest 2 weeks.

I think that all the log should be sent in 24 hs after the contest.

If it helps bring shorter results, great. I don't see that it changes anything relative to concerns on cheating.

Just don't be too hard on us if we have a moderately good excuse.

Not an issue. We relentlessly informed our members to ensure they submit their logs within the deadline and they did.

7 days would allow sufficient time to complete the log merge / log submission process during the weekend following the contest. 5 days is really much too short for a DXpedition.

I had to have eye surgery the day after the contest, so I had to complete my log as soon as the contest was over. No time to double check anything.

Given enough time. say, half of the original submission deadline. Cannot fully attend the log after the contest because of tired, works and other activities that lift behind before and during contest.

Plenty of time now that we all are using electronic logging.

Continue to allow exceptions as presently permitted.

Barely enough time if no other issues at home intervene.

For non-DXpedition ops, why not 1 day?

If I have a serious score I will probably meet the deadline, otherwise I may not bother to submit the log. I find no intelligent reason for 5 days. After a serious effort I am more concerned with recovering from the effort than submitting a log.

Great. Glad you took the lead in doing this. I would vote for 3 days.

Give me at least one more weekend to look at the log. When I'm done with the contest, I have to spend time catching up on things I neglected while at the rig.

With today's technology, five days are enough. Perfect!

Should not take any longer than five days. Longer times might lead to people fudging their logs.

I log on paper and type into Cab format later, so 5 days is short for me. I could send paper logs in, but I understand why any contest would like all logs on Cab format, so I type it so no one else has to.

I use a logging program, if I used a hand log I would never make the 5-days.

If there is a problem with a log, one may have to take a week or so to get it straightened out. Sometimes the person does not find out about a problem until the contest time and the problem may need remedied before submitting it.

Very good, prevents fraud.

I've got a life! Don't make me put log submission at the top of my priority list.

We had a snowstorm and I lost power and I didn't have enough time to submit my log on time. For me, personally, it was not enough time.

It's a bit short, but I understand that it helps reduce post-contest processing. In my opinion post-contest processing is cheating.

It is ok

Very good change to the time of submission rule.

Provided my internet is functioning no worries with 5 day submission.

Because I am not competing and don't have logging software I have not been very interested in sending in a log

I didn't know CQ has such short deadline. When I tried to upload, deadline is already came!

Seems short but I try to submit right after a contest and get it done.

I need few days to input QSO data to PC (i.e., offline operation), and need more few days to review the data, and to post contest log.

I would think about 2 weeks as a deadline is more reasonable.

At least it is required 7 days includes next full weekend.

Maybe need a little more days: 7-10

I've seen some complaints about it.. But I think it's perfectly reasonable, we should be all logging by computer now anyway.

It is okay if no problem with internet connection at our end ... Otherwise I see it fair...5 days are enough.

participate in the contest to be present and to give the possibility to increase the core to who is calling me

Two weeks or 14 days!!

I need at least the next weekend to send logs as usually contest ends at 01:00 local time ant must wake up at 06:30h for work after 48hours without very small sleep. With 2 works and family and usually 6hours sleep a day, I am having no really time to do the process until next weekend INCLUDED. In any case will accept any decision you make.

Make IT LONGER 10-15 days for example

Just couple of days is enough...

As a blind operator *I have to use MixW for the contest as it works with my screen reader. However I have to combine the contacts from MixW into another Cabrillo header as for some reason CW WW WPX will not accept the MixW one. The five day deadline is OK providing there are no snags, otherwise I just do not submit a log. I understand there are instructions for MixW but again they do not work with screen reader.

Could I suggest say 7 days, as flying islands can play havoc with finding time doing paperwork..

You should have at least a weekend to fix the log. I'm working Monday-Friday and have very little time for radio those days. I would say minimum 7 days and hopefully 10 days for log submission

should be 10days

I get the point that is being made. Given that major pre-disclosed excuses are allowed there seems little problem.

Stupid...the majority of hams are not cheaters...fix the problem by targeting the ones who are. Too bad u can't get the plaques out in 5 days. How about thinking of us for a change.

7 day will be better

I think two weeks is much better. A lot of operators sacrifice family time to take part in the contest and having to immediately sort out the log puts more pressure on family time etc.

Excellent!

With computer logging, the 5 day log submission should not be an issue.

Sometimes, in the press of family obligations, 5 days is awful short. Usually I can make it happen. But this first experience just happened to be tough. And sometimes I do like to compete. So just because I happen to do more contact chasing than otherwise is not sufficient reason to abide by the 5 days.

Maybe 7 days would better to spread it over the next weekend when people have more time (if log not send after the contest).

Five too short, ten just right

The contest ends when it's over

At least 7 days, so one can use the weekend after.

It will allow to receive results of the contest more quickly.

I normally scan my log at the end of the contest for any obvious problems and then send it immediately so 5 days no problem

one full weekend after the contest would be better.....if the contest ends at 2359z on Sunday, then the log is due by 2359 the following Sunday. Would give those of that that work full time a chance to review everything without rushing.

Only objection I can imagine is for truly remote DXpeditions.

In the age of computers and internet, it's not a problem. Only remembering to do it on time!!

48 hours

36 hours like RDXC

When the contest is over, we should put 'pencils' down and the contest software should immediately and automatically send in the e-log. Contesters should only be allowed to update, correct, or fix their logs during the contest, not afterwards. Part of the contest competition is how well you send and copy Morse Code.

I completely agree with the intention behind shortening the deadline, however, it leaves a lot of room to get busy right as the contest ends and to forget to submit.

It seems that 5days should be enough time for any operator to submit their log.

What's the bloody rush?

I think it's should be at least one week. I have my contest station 60 km away from my home and I have no internet there, I'm too tired after contest remember about all other deadline terms, therefore sometimes I didn't send my logs. Some with my activity from EK no way to do that in such a short time without additional costs, my position is fair away of any city and internet.

I usually submit it closer to 5 minutes!

Prefer 10 days.

Most people have jobs. Give them the next weekend.

That's enough time. I send my log immediately after contest, and I think the mostly other Hams also

For Top entry participants, deadline should be made as short as possible to reduce risk of RD3A syndrome.

Once I did not have time to send a report. I had a good result. I regret this misstep.

Maybe with 10 days would be better. In my case I have to remove antennas throughout the week to be a large installation and after one week of preparation prior to the contest are many employees for the contest days.

Computer logging is now commonplace. Why do you need more time? To edit the logs?

Excellent choice!

Still too long, It has been known some serious big contesters record the whole contest to check every contact after the contest and correct their mistakes, that is false playing!

sometimes contest could be operate in a portable station having no access to web, and need one week to be send

Work commitments for some can cause 5 days to be a problem. Should be at least 14 days to allow a couple of weekends for review and submission.

10 days much better .

Some of us have a life outside radio contests. I know this is hard to believe but there are a few of us.

Perfect, at least don't make it longer again.

Suggestion: 10days

When the contest is over, it's over.

I think it is a little too short

Only just found out in time that it was a 5-day submission deadline!

I like it, hope the results will be out much sooner indeed

Have a lot of other things to do too. 10 days would be a lot better.

As long as there continues to be flexibility for those stations travelling on DXpeditions where do to lack of internet access and / or travel might impact the deadline I feel the current submission deadline is fair. I think reducing the submission time in conjunction with reducing the delay in getting the results published was a smart move.

Don't make it any shorter! Recently, I had to correct the log times, then check for typo, etc. (O for 0, etc.) That meant all e-mail, etc. had to be delayed, plus at age 79 I was too tired out to start immediately.

All OM use PC ... and 5 days think is the right time for check. There are a lot of others sites where the 'declared score' coming up just few minutes after end of contest

7 days would make more sense especially for DXpeditions.

Have to work the next week and the family need me the next weekend so it's not easy to get the entry in. I think 3 weeks would be much better.

Sometimes things happen in a multi-multi environment that take some time to straighten out before log submission - after all, our M/M uses 12 logging computers! :-)

OK, except for some DXpeditions.

I like it

I could see expanding it to 10 days to make it easier for dxpeditions and other ops who may want to travel home before submitting a log. But under 15 days makes abundant sense considering that the world is now doing things electronically.

10 days would be OK

It's a struggle to get my log submitted in 5 days

I don't massage my log after-contest but I'm quite busy during the week and I may end up not sending a log unless I can do it the following weekend or the one after or...

Often I'm not back to the USA until about 5 days after the contest. I'd like a chance to check for typos, etc. before sending in the log. Folks who operate from home have a little time to check for obvious errors. Maybe make it 10 days.

Needs to be flexible for those operating from places with no Internet access, etc.

I don't have internet at contest station location so if I forget to bring a memory stick - I am likely screwed!!

I would like 7 days so I can get to the next weekend. By the time the contest is over I am exhausted and having taken time off two days before I am swamped at work. Some nights not home till 22 or 2300. It would just be convenient to have through the following weekend. If someone is going to tamper with their log they can do it as well in 5 days, 7 is just more convenient for the rest of us.

I would prefer it be lengthened to maybe 7 days - but I can get it submitted in 5 days. We travel to Costa Rica from the US and it's usually Tue or Wed before I get back to the US to submit our log.

I always submit my log immediately following the contest, so a 1-hr time would also be OK with me!

OK for me. I always submit the same night. Problem for DX with iffy Internet access.

30 day I Guess is good

Don't want to spend time submitting log during the remaining time of my Dx vacation: rather do it after returning home!

it's good

Wouldn't mind having a few days more - i.e. thru the weekend after the contest, but not a huge deal.

This is an issue for us guys traveling home from contest. it would sure be nice to have the following Saturday - lots of things happening

a 15 day deadline will be reasonable for log submission

5 hours is OK. I send it as soon as the contest is over.

Plenty of time to send in 'my' log, but for the big guns it may not be enough!!

7 to 10 days is OK (next week end)

I was late. I should have read the rules and would have known it was only 5 days.

Enough time because most of competitors use computers to log the QSOs, the submission is easy and fast.

OK 1 day is also ok, but maybe servers not allow?

Faster final results

I think that was a good improvement, and probably also for instance cuts possible checking of recordings for possible log correcting.

I need next weekend because I don't use PC for contest logging. I still use paper log sheets, Hi!

I am now an old-timer , using paper log only

5 day is normal time for log submission.

Log should be sent right after the end of the contest.

It could be one week, because some people may have no time during the busy working days.

for me: just 1 hour after the end of contest! No more!

Should at least allow for the full weekend following the contest.

With no internet in the shack, I can get the Cabrillo file to a thumb drive and get it to work or the library in the 5 day limit with no issues.

I would give no more than 2 days. Until next Tuesday after the contest

24 h are more than enough!

No problem for hams with logging software, but I would guess those who log by hand (are there any left?) might have an issue

Less time better.

2 weeks would be OK.

Making the logs due right away will reduce log editing and manipulation. In this electronic age there is no reason why logs can't be uploaded sooner rather than later.

Usually less than 12 hrs after contest closes, I have to be at work - am very busy, so can be hard to keypunch and check log.

I always submit mine a few hours after the contests end. By that time, I am tired and I need to get back to the family. Looking over all those contacts isn't going to do me any good.

Contest software has many updates before and after the contests, so final log preparation time does required more than normal. This was reflected after last year contest season.

What is it about computer logging that people don't understand? DUH. If you can utilize PacketCluster for an assist, you can hit 'send' at the end of the contest. 5 days is plenty long enough.

It might be difficult for stations with large numbers of contacts.

3 days enough

make it two weeks

I think it's great. You should be logging what you hear, and not what you didn't. I wish all contests had the 5 day rule. By the time the contest is over, your log should be ready for submission right then. At least that's how I operate.

May be too short for DX/DXpedition stations who don't have reliable internet access

For workers like me (Bakery) think 5 days not so much time.

When i am closing the test, I have to hurry up to come to QRL right in time. There will be no Internet access for the whole week, and when I am back at home next Saturday noon, deadline is over.

I would like to see it a little longer than 5 days. Maybe a week (7 days) to include another weekend for busy, working folks

After the contest many hams have other things to take care of in their lives and working on submitting scores so quickly can be a problem. I'd like to see the amount of time lengthened a bit (how about 10 days?).

Might be a bit short for some international stations with limited internet access.

10 days would be better. Longer would let me forget.

The station I operate most frequently is in rural Wyoming, without Internet access. My practice is to prepare a logging file for submission after I have returned to my home QTH. Depending upon winter road conditions and other commitments, it is a genuine struggle for me to meet the five-day deadline, so much so that it undermines my interest in CQ-sponsored contests.

We are very busy at work and it is always a big effort to have some days free before the contest. Then we have to go back home that is far from contest QTH, then very busy at work with all day long busy time. It wasn't possible to send raw logs this year because we HAD to adjust some computer mistakes and problems experienced with new software. Maybe next year we will have a better policy. But 10 days, or a complete week, should be better as we can have a free day to check the log without making mistakes and something that can be considered fraudulent if badly observed.

The 5 days after a contest are work days -- gives very little chance to make appropriate edits per log notes. No objection to immediate submission of 'raw' log, with longer period to make necessary and appropriate edits -- and understanding that the Committee can compare versions to make sure no 'scrubbing' or other inappropriate conduct.

8 days makes more sense. I don't have Internet at home and can only get on-line, sometimes, once per week.

Cabrillo file should be uploaded/sent right after the contest. This way, makes it impossible to scrub log.

2 weeks would be much better. If a person has some problems such as computer issues or no time due to immediate family items etc. Then 5 days is too short.

Shortening the time is fine, as easy to submit sooner as later.

It's good for me. How those (who have jobs) feel?

I think that it will be possible by electronic log submission.

The shorter deadline the better. Ideally immediately after end of contest if possible.

It is more than enough

With logging software, it only takes minutes to email in the log, if you remember to do it. If you forget to do it right after the contest, 5 days is not enough.

Is fantastic. And the future is online.

Allow a longer duration for entrants who contact CQWW organizers beforehand to state they will not have internet access, to encourage DXpeditions.

There is no reason why a station with a good quality log needs extra time to submit it (unless they intend to massage it).

It's possible to amend the log within 24 hours for those hell-bent on doing so. I reckon a much shorter deadline than 5 days is appropriate - and extend that for anyone that has a reasonable excuse (such as no Internet access from their DX location etc). Perhaps a 24 hour deadline would reduce the chances of anyone 'editing' their log

Big Guns are always ready to optimize the contest log5 days after the contest? ...nothing will change..

I do not change my logs after the contest, can dump from N1MM and submit to LoTW and contest robot in about 30 minutes. 5 days is plenty of time. Otherwise I put it off for 3 weeks, to process it.

probably 5 days aren't enough to guy who are in serious DX-peditions

Make it a week to include next weekend for those with tough work schedule.

Well let's see how it worked out for you guys. I think a week would have been the right amount of time

I hope the shortened deadline will also lead to quicker processing and publishing of the results.

don't have a reliable internet connection (don't run assisted) so don't want to mess with immediate submission after 48 hour contest - then go to work for a week - would like 7 days better so can do next weekend when free

Some log's software have trouble in cabrillo format and take some time to fix the errors

For Dx-expeditions allowance 15 days.

Reasonable in the days of the Internet

Before I retired, it was not unusual to have to leave home on Monday AM and return late Friday. I would suggest allowing a week-end in addition to the 5 days (i.e. 7-10 days)

It's fine for someone like me with electronic logging but for someone doing the paper/pencil check-log route, it's too demanding as it's a full week of work & home after the contest & not much time to put into hobby book-keeping requirements.

10 days will be better

Could be too short for some people who have not internet at their contest station or been very busy by their professional job (me)

Except for DXpeditions, where facilities may not be available, I see no reason to take longer than 24 hours to send the log except where after the event editing is done.

What's the driver here? Preventing people from log cleansing? Speeding up turnaround on results posting? 7 days at least. We should be working toward real-time or near real-time scoring anyhow.

24 - 36 hours is appropriate as RDXC does

I use paper logging at present and enter data after the contest

It was great to get a log check report months earlier this year

Make it 7 days, or to be exact - the next Sunday following the contest 23:59 utc.

Ten days would be more realistic

Think of Nascar races.....hmmm they are done with the checker flag.....I say a max of 24 hours-----and also require people to send score to 3830 instead of hiding until results in the magazine.

Some of us work for a living and can't spend time getting log together until after a workweek. 14 days is reasonable.

Should be two weeks.

The change has helped me to be more timely in log submission... and procrastination.. hi hi.

Dont make it any shorter.

Generally OK but if out on a DXpedition, cannot always get home in 5 days and more often than not, do NOT have internet access.

It is a good idea.

Gotta allow travel time to get back from the DX'pedition, kiss the wife and check in on work.

Give us at least another weekend to do the log submission. It's tough to do a contest all weekend then have to do the computer book work to do a proper log submittal with the kickbacks of form errors.

Only because I found out about N1MM logger which made it easy - without it would be a bit of a rush.

As long as an extension can be applied for in special cases (i.e., DXpeditions without reliable Internet access), a deadline of 24 hours is sufficient from my point of view. After all, all you need to do is mail one file that has already been prepared for you by your logging software.

if we are abroad for the contest with no internet period is a little short

OK, as long as official results are published as quickly.

I suggest at least 10 days

Hope it will be reduced ad maximum.

Please do not make it shorter.

Sometimes being abroad for the contest without internet connection the period is to short. Time given is used for travelling home.

Make cheating more and more complicated!

it's o.k. because I believe, it also makes the time shorter until the results are published.

10-14 days would allow some breathing time in case of a computer crash or unforeseen business/family urgency. I generally also upload to LotW as well, so I like to make sure it's correct.

Do not let contestants rewrite History.

I strongly support this deadline.

For a serious tester, speaking for myself, after around 36 hrs of operation I would go back to some tasks I should have done while contesting. I wanted to leave my log for at least a week before generating my Cabrillo log. But 5-daylog submission is of course very doable in order to follow rules up to the end.

If you are on contest expedition the 5 days are sometimes not to meet

I usually submit logs within a few minutes of the contest end, just to get the task out of the way. But then, I almost always operate from my home station.

I am not the person responsible for log submission in this contest. However, for other contests I have no problem, given electronic logging, with such a deadline - indeed I think a short but reasonable deadline encourages submission at the end of the contest.

For most entrants in the contest, the logs should be due within 24 hours of the contest ending!!! Others that require more time (DX-Peditions, folks with computer network issues, etc.) could file an 'automatic extension request' for a few more days.

I love the 5 day deadline and can't wait for it to be even shorter....once the contest is over, it's over.

shorter deadline , so nobody can do some corrections , except dx-expeditions will have 5 days , because they do possible not have internet connections to send directly

I really appreciate. I would say: incoming logs are more 'save' against modifications after the contest. Most serious testers log with a computer.

Since I operate from an area with no chance of 'winning' anything, I can submit my log within 15 minutes of the contest end. All I have to do is export the Cabrillo file and email it.

You guys have to remember that not all of us testers are retired!!! Some of us need at least an additional weekend to get the logs submitted. For me, I go to bed right after the contest is over and I don't make it down into the shack until the following weekend because of my work schedule.

Glad 5 day limit was implemented. Two days might also be good.

Normally I examine my log the day following the contest for any irregularities, fix if necessary and then send so 5 days no problem for me but could be for those he only enter the shack on weekends.

Is OK for E-Log, but if someone do it by paper it is too short. 10 Day will be nice for all.

Make it 10 days

Should at least be seven days so there is a weekend to get the submission in. But overall, one can cheat just as easily with five days as with a month.

Perfect and enough time, I usually submit right after contest as well as upload to LoTW at the same time. Later I might forget!

7 days would be better for me -- I paper-log and then transcribe. That gives me the next weekend to finish. But 5 days is OK.

It changes the game in a positive way, making it clear that post-contest aided log checking is unacceptable. Most importantly, it gets the awards cycle moving (though I still await my 2011 plaque!).

hopefully 5 days or shorter will discourage the e-mails trying to claim non-existent QSOs...

The exemption, if there is a reason for delay, should be retained with prior approval.

Perhaps 10 days would be more realistic considering other commitments

Should be one week or more for everyone without requiring preapproval

It's a change, but I think a good one. After a contest, I like to use N1MM to look at my stats such as runs, mults/entities/zones; but then after spending hours in the chair, I want to get out of my shack. It is my obligation to get back in here for the contest submission. Even though I'm not a big-gun, I first want to support my club (Willamette Valley DX Club) and I've managed to get a few certificates as well. [Thank you CQ for your contests' category/certificate structure--See question #1] I don't think I would favor shortening the reporting time unless you-all are seeing contest ethics violations with this reporting period.

I fully understand the intent however I just don't think 5 days is enough time. I have to wonder if it has impacted participation by some of the more casual entrants. I'd say 10-14 days is more reasonable for working stiffers that may travel back from a location and have to play catch up at work

Still developing a new habit to get the log in quickly.

The time frame is appropriate. There's no reason for a longer period (giving due allowance for reasonable time to double check logs and sanitize, if necessary) and it, presumably, speeds up the dissemination of the results of the contests.

Immediate submission gives an asterisk after the call in the listing

Well 5 day might not be long enough due to health, family or other valid reasons. I think 15day or 10days is a better alternative. But for me I usually turn a log in as soon as possible. Same day or night if possible.

At least ten days would be ideal.

I normally turn in my log within a half hour or so anyway. If it takes 5 days for someone to turn in a log, it's being massaged.

Sometimes with family and other commitments 5 days is pushing it. Recommend ten days.

In the UK by the time the contest finishes it is time for bed to get some sleep before going to work Monday morning. May not get time through the week to check log or indeed submit within 5 days. 7 days would be better so as to give the following weekend.

This should be enough time due to the use of contest logging software.

I have concerns about people in very remote areas needing more time to get to working internet connections. Obviously, does not apply to the vast majority, but those remote ones are the DX that I want to work. I would be very unhappy if a short deadline caused them to decide to not operate in the contest.

I think it's OK provided it means earlier publication of results. If that's not the point, what is?

Good in that it makes us get with it, check everything and get it in. Sometimes tough if we have business travel or other commitments.

This should be plenty of time for someone to submit a log. Good idea!

I am not quick enough to use a computer program during a contest, so I go old school on paper and later transfer it to a computer program. I think 15 days would be an appropriate time frame instead of 5. This gives 2 weekends to get everything squared away.

OK for 'at home' but allow exceptions for expeditions

As long as there remains a means to get an extension for unusual circumstances, it's fine.

How about 10 days.

Sometimes you have to leave on a biz trip for the entire next week and no time to work with the log etc etc This is unreasonable ... CQ TAKES FOREVER in getting back any results. Why hack at us?

If this time is shorter the time for announcing the results time should be also much shorter. And it is a very important point for the contesteer because the only thing he/she needs is to know the results and compare with others.

As extensions are possible by request. What could be the gripe?

This is an EXCELLENT rule!

At first I thought that 5 days was too little, that 10 would serve the purpose. But 5 is OK with liberal exceptions permitted for special cases, such as DXpeditions etc. that may not have Internet until return to home country.

It's ok, I understand the reasoning but would have preferred 7 or 10 day deadline.

In the days of the internet and with all the available post contest assistance in massaging a log, less is better. I would like to see within 24 hours of the end if at all possible.

I think some flexibility is required for those who travel to a DX location. The return travel and then the frenzy to get the log submitted can be difficult. But if we all special 'pre-contest' requests for these kind of delays, we should be OK - but it does put a burden on someone to approve all the requests. In general I am OK with the 5 day rule - but I also know there are potential problems.

I don't message the log, unless the logging computer causes errors, that will be fixed, but it doesn't take 5 days.

Would 2 weekends later kill your schedule? 5 days doesn't get you through the next weekend.

Could be as short as 48 hours; maybe a postmark deadline for paper logs.

I have operated from Uganda, Haiti, Ethiopia, Paraguay and other remote spots. Some locations do not have internet access. This means you must rush back to a capital city (or the USA in order to enter in time. There also are unplanned emergencies that can arise. I think the time should be longer. Currently you need to be VERY FLEXIBLE if an emergency should arise. Current rules suggest that you should pre-plan an emergency.

Many of us have day jobs, so there have been cases where I finished the contest, turned off the computer, packed, and was on a plane for a business trip the next morning. That gives zero time for even reviewing with my log.

Move toward on-line logging.

This seems to have reduced the problems with unsportsmanlike conduct of log massaging and category jumping. You could have a 1-hour deadline.

I will go for 7 days = 1 week.

If I have travelled out the country, generally it is a few days short on time. Otherwise, it is OK.

Contest ends then back to 'reality' aka 'work, family, chores'. So only have next weekend to do the log submission step.

going back from contest expedition you can spend more than 5 days for travel, so if you want introduce 5 day log deadline rule, first disable all contest expedition

Make it a little easier for those outside the United States to get an extension, especially those who will be in places that may not have easy Internet access and may be in transit. No extensions should be allowed for fixed stations in the US or even Canada for that matter and even provide some kind of benefit (don't ask me what, just *something*) for having it sent via e-mail within 30 minutes of 0000z, with an un-altered timestamp on the file.

Life happens (sometimes...) I think 10 days minimum.

5 days is a reasonable time limit. I like it much better than the older, longer time periods. At the end of a contest, I usually generate the Cabrillo file and submit it within a day or so....then move on to the next contest!

I think a few weeks would be better.

Best practice is to do it right after the contest, then it's done and over with. I don't see the need for a long delay, but perhaps extensions could be granted upon request.

It is ok, but paper log submissions should still be possible. Otherwise you exclude certain groups from participating.

I think 24 hours should be long enough for logs generated by computer logging software. If some people still do paper logs then they could be allowed more time.

dumb to do My PC has issues at times

often wasted at end of contest – non contest things postponed during contest get done afterwards- submission has not happened on occasion

as an op who operates from a carib island, we have spotty internet service after the contest and we might not be able to meet the 5 day deadline

I am 71 yrs old and need more days for log submission.

I have no problem with a short deadline. I think longer deadlines leaves too much room for correcting errors before submission. I have often thought that logs should be submitted as is after the contest officially ends, some computer mechanism that would not allow changes or tampering.

5 days is plenty. I don't think post-contest log editing is appropriate.

Awesome

make it double

it's not always enough, i.e. Ur long way from an internet connection, or having trouble with the pc/log software. All in all it takes several weeks or months to see the result anyway, so why the rush??

5 days should mean 5days

When the contest is over - it is OVER. Most of them submit directly to 3830 so why can't they submit to the Contest administration. 5 days are OK. - Can only be a problem if You are on remote Island.

It can be managed

Its ok. With logging programs it is simple to get a good log. After some sleep, especially for EU contesters there is enough time to submit the log.

By the time this contest ends I'm done with ham radio for a week or two, at least, and the last thing I think about is submitting a log. This year, for CW, I didn't.

30 days was way too long. I would have great plans to run through to check for typos, but life would intrude and I would end up sending the log in as it was at the end of the contest.

Most of ham's uses computers, so 5-7 days was sufficient

10 days would be better

No more than 10 days. Maybe an exception for dxpeditions which may not be able to meet the deadline. NO LOG SCRUBBING!

What if I am in a location with no internet or post mail?

The 30 days much comfortable. The 15 days is OK. The 5 days quite short as especially someone is out of home after the contest.

Would prefer a shorter deadline but feel need to accommodate those on dxpedition type operations..?

I make a point of NOT looking at the log for a few days. Then I review my written notes (paper) and perform whatever corrections they indicate. I formerly waited 21+ days, now I wait 3-4... At 2400Z Monday, I am in no fit state to interpret my scribbling.

Times when I have operated from the DX side I almost certainly would not have been able to make that deadline. Two weeks seems better.

2-3 days deadline for serious competition would be Okay.

10 days is ok 4 me. I am not active every week.

In my case, I must have fallen asleep and did not get to submit a log until the 5 days passed, but I doubt I'd have gotten to it if I had not been nudged by an associate.

7 days would be nice

Doesn't allow for any hiccups in the logging software that have to be fixed before a log can be submitted

For people who want to be ranked in the Top 10 they should email their log no more than 24H after the end of the contest.

10 days sufficient for travelers and expeditions to get home and submit the log without the nuisance to ask for extra time in advance -> less bureaucracy and still a high pace for log submissions.

I go back to work on Monday and if it is a busy week or I need to travel for work, 5 days is not enough, need another weekend in between, I say 10 days is better

Q4. Should the Single Operator and Single Operator Assisted categories be combined into one Single Operator category?

Should the Single Operator and Single Operator Assisted categories be combined into one Single Operator category?(The Single Operator category would allow ALL entrants to use spotting networks, DX cluster, packet, reverse beacon network, telnet, and DX Skimmer to help the operator find contacts.)

Yes	2315	44.9%
No	2839	55.1%
Total	5154	

Q5. If all single operators were in one category, should there be a marker in the score listings for those stations that did not use assistance?

If all single operators were in one category, should there be a marker in the score listings for those stations that did not use assistance?

Yes	3017	60.0%
No	1143	22.7%
No opinion	869	17.3%
Total	5029	

Q6. If all single operators were in one category, would you...?

If all single operators were in one category, would you...?

Operate more	493	9.9%
Operate the same	3761	75.5%
Operate less	441	8.9%
Not operate	286	5.7%
Total	4981	

Comments about combined single operator category:

I don't want to compete against assisted. I would likely not compete in the contest if this is the case. I enjoy contesting without outside help.

A single operator is individual office waging war. An assistant operator is a team event. If it is mixed and it is made a single operator, the office currently fought alone is disadvantageous.

I operate mostly from a portable location where I do not have internet access.

To me that seems to be a very bad idea. Most likely I will stop competing in the single op category and will join part time some multi-op team. I don't do the WAE and Russian DX anymore exactly for this reason, although WAE used to be my favorite contest for long years.

The ability to maintain sufficiently high S&P rate and to find new multipliers is the only weapon if one has to compete against a bigger station or a station with geographical advantage. Taking away this weapon essentially turns contesting into a power game - if you're louder, you win. Given the CC inability or unwillingness to fight against power limit abuse, the outcome could be easily predicted.

I often operate contests from portable locations (several times I have operated All Asian from Mt. Abel at 8200') where internet is not available to me. So to lump me with assisted stations is not fair because even IF I wanted to run assisted, I can't.

Keep assisted a separate category. Just because some cheap does not merit getting rid of SOAB unassisted.

Frankly this is an abhorrent idea. Assisted operators already horribly distort the contest for non-assisted operators. Whenever a spot goes up an instant pileup results mostly drowning out any chance a low power station has to work a rare station. Better that you outlaw the use of spotting and make the contest a truer test of an operator's station and skills.

What's the point in participating if it were all on category? I'm not a big fan of CQ contests anyway so you just give me the final reason to stop participating.

I would operate only to chase needed countries. Have no interest in spotting operation or pileups they cause.

Leave it alone

To leave former categories: Assisted and no Assisted

SOHP unassisted is the Gold Standard. The best of the best. Don't muck it up.

я думаю нужно разделять результаты конкурса позывных коллективных и индивидуальных, некоторые радиолюбители работают из коллективной с мощным антенным хозяйством и очень большой мощностью под-single op.

Single Operator Assisted is the same as Multi/Single. Bringing spotting information obtained by other stations into my station makes it a multi-operator effort.

I would prefer that all assistance be disallowed, and further, bandwidth-hogging multi-multis should be eliminated from the contest.

Don't kill contesting for me. It's bad enough now.

I operate single, not assisted as my contest station is not within an internet connected computer. I don't even have cell phone service at the remote cabin. I am truly on my own, just the me and the VFO.

Maybe I will operate more maybe less it depend on things how it will go during the contest.

I will only operate for fun during short periods of best propagation to distant areas if they converge the SOs in one category.
Combining two different sets of operating styles and skills is unwarranted. I would sit out the contest.
I already know of operators that are assisted and claim they are not. Obviously they believe they don't have a chance running in the right category.
You have to be kidding. Do you believe everyone has a good cluster connection, or even internet. Was this put together by a PR agency, couldn't have been testers.
single operator thinks that the freedom is enough to some extent
Madness... assisted is just a video game. Popular, no doubt, but hardly radio, and certainly not any kind of competition in which I'd be interested.
These are two entirely different categories...please do not kill the essence of single-op by his skills - not by machines.
I have no Chance to get a better place if assist and non-assist ops are in one category. I know that 'not' all ops are fair and work in the correct category, but this are hopefully less than i am assume. I will never be a contest winner, but the fun to the rumble before, at the contest and until will be getting lost. My reached ranks in 'EU, non-ass, HP' CQWW cw are about 10 up-to 40. To get a better rank, that's my motivation without digital media Support like Skimmer, Cluster or ever. If this separation is lost, my motivation will be lost too. This time, the CQWW CW is the only contest i do, actually. That's fun, even i know that i couldn't get win everything. Please let it, as it is.
multi operatori sono 'MALEDUCATI' (LID operator)
Please keeping live operators, hunting mults blind as 'non assisted' category is
Combining is not fair for operators that work unassisted. In that case I will probably not participate.
NO, NO, NO, NO NO!!!!
As Old Man - owner of the station using only own station no support from friends and no assistance at all!
I'm one of those conservative old farts who wish that spotting didn't even exist.
It's hard enough to get 6 bands integrated and working without the added complexity of automated spotting, which becomes the emphasis because it is such a game changer. Single op should not depend on how effectively you can use the spotting network.
What would be the point of marking who was Non Assisted and Assisted when at the end of the day only the score counts, hi Helping tools kill the skills and create mess. I think all kind of help should be prohibited. MAX POWER OUTPUT 150 Watts for all participants in all categories...
What could possibly lead to combining the two single operator categories? Why would more participation be desirable? This would be a terrible idea from my viewpoint.
I would be very unhappy about it because I don't use forms of assistance and haven't since I began contesting seriously in 1973.
I take great pride in finding mults and forcing myself to run as a SO; the man against the bands. I've played 'assisted' at multi-ops and I get lazy, letting the technology bring Q's & mults to me. To me, SO is REAL CONTESTING, assisted is like 'fishing with dynamite'

Can't believe that you would even consider combining SO/A with SO.
Most of the BIG BOYS have multi towers and big power so they can run on single freq all day....I need assist
Perhaps my answer to the previous question is a bit of an overstatement, but I do feel very strongly about separating assisted and non-assisted categories. Yes, packet/skimmer cheating is a huge problem, but combining the categories is essentially allowing everyone to cheat.
The category log files should not be joined because this would be unfair for all who don't want or can use this kind of Information source. I know that this isn't easy to checked if the declared category is the right one. I vote for the actual System.
Single operator is for those who don't have huge antennas and/or 1500 w. If you use the cluster, you need the ERP to get in among all the other high ERP people who are trying to get in very early on a post. Low power people don't have a chance once a station is newly posted. They have to wait until the high power people are satisfied. Why don't you eliminate high power as a category instead. You don't need high power to reach India, or Australia, etc., unless you can afford to wait only 1 minute to get through the pile ups.
I am non-assisted. If I have to directly compete with people using DX spotting, DXSummit, skimmers, etc why try, I have NO chance of beating these people. I would quit the CQWWDX completely.
In my opinion they are completely different categories.
There's a great difference from many points of view about these two operation modes. SO unassisted stimulates ops to improve their ability to find mults. Today it's possible to keep under control unassisted entries, so I'll leave them separated.
This would not be fair for those of us who are old school and do not use spotting websites, skimmers, etc. I will not enter if I must compete against those who do use them.
It's unfair to mix assisted with non-assisted operations.
I find no interest in operating assisted. In my opinion operating assisted should be in the multi -single category.
I have no desire to waste money on extra equipment to enter assisted. If I have to compete with assisted when I am not, then I will no longer operate the contest.
I enjoy it as it is now and consider that using assistance takes part of the challenge from the contest and therefore I would not be interested.
Non assisted operators should be checked much severely to confirm 'non-assistance'.
Would not affect me as a multi station op, but I do not agree with dumbing down just because it makes it easier for you to adjudicate. Pure single op is an important cornerstone of the category mix. In many other contests I do operate pure single op, but not often in WW due to circumstance.
Don't force us all to use assistance, it's just not right, despite it allowing massive cheating in the unassisted area.
Rather than combine single operators in one category, attempts should be made to discourage cheating by using both technical means and peer pressure.
CW/Skimmer is CW only technology. Don't make rule changes due to a small minority of cheaters on one mode.
Not a good idea - please keep the Connected and Unconnected sections separate.
I think using skimmers, clusters etc. is cheating especially for CQWW where there is nothing to copy except the callsign. If you want one category then the exchange should be made much more complex than 59+zone as stations can get the callsign from the Internet and can guess the zone.

I cannot see the meaning by assistance in single operator category. Or is it so bad that people are cheating and we are giving it all up with making one category. Instead, take away the single operator assisted category!
I would probably choose not to operate in any single operator categories. I kind of wish that the multi-operator categories had unassisted and assisted but I understand why they do not.
What is the organizer advantage in combining clearly different classes in one? Is like comparing apples with pears!!! You have nowadays s/w packages that monitor people that put themselves in a different category, because of a reason or another reason, then why not keep the categories separate??? I guess there are still plenty of people that do not use CAT interfaces, that still like to play the 'straight' way, why handicapping them???
I'm starting to get very suspicious about why this same question is being asked over and over again??? Sounds like it's just a matter of time until you give to the pressure put by the pro-assisted ranks and get rid of the unassisted.
I would not compete. I might operate to a limited degree, but no logs or check logs. The contest would simply become a semi-useful tool for harvesting band countries. I cannot think of anything that you could do that would de-motivate me more.
I don't see why this question is even on the survey. Combining categories is a totally absurd idea that would ruin the contest.
I am located at a QTH with obstructions to Europe and Africa. I need packet to be able to be competitive.
Please leave the true single operator class intact; there's nothing giving more satisfaction as doing the real human thing: tuning that vfo, finding the mults, weak ones, learn and optimize that strategy. Let others enjoy the endless assisting pc gaming aids in a different class. Everybody happy.
I would change to another category.
No challenge for true classic operating vs new tech pc gaming-mouse -clickers
The biggest fun - is a NON ASSISTED category. Why I must look to monitor and wait for a new mults... this is not my effort ...I look like a monkey...
Seems like you are leaning toward 1 lump so category...which is what the RAC did in Canada whose contests I no longer enter for that reason. What you have now works ok dont mess with it. You have to keep some of the smaller categories for people who are getting older and slower HI HI
Some of us enjoy operating the radio not just playing computer games.
This would be the absolute end of any meaningful competition. Those who would deem it to be 'entertaining' need to take up something less stressful.
On those occasions that I am operating low power, the moment the DX shows up on the cluster, I have no chance as all the W4 superpower boys belly up to the hog trough. Assisted operation completely changes the face of the competition, turning the tables STRONGLY against the 'little pistols.' I would go so far as to say that assisted operation can remove the 'sport' from radiosport, by permitting lazy, unskilled operators to 'win' contests while spoiling the fun for those of us who prefer to test and improve our operating and technical skills (as opposed to merely exercising our wallets to buy ever more powerful transmitters and computers.) So I guess I'll just have to turn on the computer and the 'leen-yer' and join the crowd, 10-4?
Skimmer, spotting, and other 'assists' has done more to diminish my interest than anything else.
I think skimmer is a bad idea. If it takes over single op then this in my opinion is the end of contesting.
If it isn't broke- DON'T TRY TO FIX IT!!!

Have you LOST your MIND? This is a COMPLETELY DIFFERENT SKILL SET we are talking about here. I promise I will call it quits if you do this. Life is too short to use a hunting bow to compete with a machine gun, and I have no interest in using the latter.

Running assisted, in my opinion, is for 70% a competition in using internet media and for 30% in using radio technologies. It is absolutely right that internet media is integrated more and more into ham radio. But for OPs whose passion is classic radio, there MUST remain a classic non assisted class inside the classic big Contest CQWWDX. Where else, when not in the CQWWDX ? For me, contesting would completely loose its spirit when assisted and non-assisted classes would be combined.

I can't imagine a more self-defeating decision for any sponsoring agency than to eliminate the SOAB category. If people want to operate 'assisted,' that's fine for them. I don't, I won't, and I won't be part of any contest that throws those categories together--that is, effectively kills the SOAB category. Hope I'm being clear on that...

DON'T DO IT!!! YOU HAVE NO RIGHT TO DESTROY THIS CONTEST!!!

Why would you have a marker differentiate SO ops? That's what 2 categories do. It's nonsensical.

Being assisted is a different contest strategy altogether!

Combining would eliminate a very popular category. If cheating is a reason for considering this combination, think about all the other ways one can very easily cheat... remote receivers anywhere in the world, greater than permissible power, etc. At the end of the day one has to rely upon the contestant's integrity.

Even though I usually enter this contest MO, I feel strongly enough about the SO category that I will probably stop participating in CQWW when you make this change.

Added into one category eliminates the guilt of operating assisted, and claiming un. That's all. It may be easier to score, and that's ok too. IF it must be done, at least leave a note for the results to be seen as claimed un.

In the past I have always been a SO1R operator and always asked for separate categories for SO1R and SO2R but the contest sponsors didn't split the two categories. I haven't operated SOAB ever since with no intention to enter again in the near future so I don't care if the SO entrants are put into a single category.

Running 100w maximum into 5m wire on a balcony (as i do) up against KW' no way. There should actually be a class for small (not QRP) stations. That to promote interest in contesting for hams in apartment blocks.

Not assisted makes more fun

A category should be homogeneous. Entrant in a category should be treated the same way with the same weapons. If not, this is not a category but a melting pot.

Q7. The CQ WW gives a penalty of 3x QSO points for a call sign error or a Not in Log. This penalty is...

The CQ WW gives a penalty of 3x QSO points for a call sign error or a Not in Log. This penalty is...

Too high	1627	32.7%
OK	2690	54.1%
Too low	63	1.3%
There should be no penalty	591	11.9%
Total	4971	

Q8. Should all QSOs with unique call signs be removed from the score?

A unique call sign is one that is reported only by one station. Most unique calls are copying errors. Should all QSOs with unique call signs be removed from the score (with no penalty) during the log checking?

Yes	2261	45.6%
No	1994	40.2%
No opinion	702	14.2%
Total	4957	

Comments:

Don't agree with unique call penalty. There is a significant chance the call is legitimate for various reasons, so this does not make sense to me. Errors should be penalized. Getting the call right is part of the game.

I have has Unique call reported error and then got QSL cards from them. But the truth is MOST are broken calls! But there are Unique maybe a Rule you must work at least 10 or 20 stations to make your call count? I know another rule argghhhh

If you were to validate the call then the call should stay. If the call is not a legitimate call then a penalty of some sort should be given.

With today's software you should be able to tell real unique vs copy error - maybe penalize over a certain number or percentage

There are some folks that do not turn in a log - I hate being penalized because there was not a locking log

I operated 75M during the daytime for K3LR working Canadians. Most of them were not testers. Such a rule would negate a competitive edge. Other geographic areas have competitive edges, so wouldn't those be fair game as well?

Sometimes I will make a local ground wave contact to a club member who does not make any more contacts. Not my fault they don't make more.

Some DX stations are known to send more than one call sign during the contest due to operator error. Punishing the 'receiving' station for errors by the 'sending' station is not right.

The penalties seem a little high. But uniques can be that. I've only made 1 Q myself a time or two just to give a pal some pts. I'd suggest no penalty points for errors up to X% and a higher penalty if the error rate was above x%.

Can't discourage people who only make 1 contact with a station that submits a log.

Sometimes I work one station only on multiple bands. If you are concerned about a unique call, why not send email asking if you worked the station before penalizing the station?

I once called on 10 meters during low sunspot activity, and actually worked a local on 10 meters. The penalty for that one contact unique callsign cost me a 'perfect log' and knocked me down several places in the standings. Lesson learned; don't take a chance on actually doing something unusual or introduce a local to contesting.

I confess i don't have a lot of data on how many uniques are typical but i know top stations that run will inevitably have a small but legitimate number of these. I always ask if they're not in SCP. I've checked a few after the LCR comes back in the past and many if not most have been verified in audio. I really don't like losing a legitimate QSO. Let's not go to the extreme of RUDX where you lose points if the other guy screws up. If there are serious signs of abuse, I'd probably reconsider.

Not in log could be an issue on the other side but the penalty hits the op that had the call in their log. Many times when I haven't had time to operate in a contest I may work one station that I need for a new counter for something. It is a legit QSO so why should the other station get a penalty because I was too lazy to make more than 1 QSO?

The quality of a contest has never suffered for penalizing inaccuracies.

It is both operators' responsibility to make certain the call is correctly received. It is frustrating to have your call copied incorrectly by the other operator especially when repeated.

Example: Frequently my QSL mgr, who does not often work contests, looks for me on the different bands. He may only appear in my log as a result. The change would remove him from my log. But when all is said and done, one contact more or less would not matter one way or the other.

- (1) There are stations who give a report but do not log you if you are a zero point QSO for them, resulting in an NIL (even though you may need that zone for a mult).
- (2) I often work 2 or 3 or 4 unique calls who are looking for a sked w/ a buddy on my freq, give me a report, and move off for a rag chew. I really don't care if they are removed but it seems a shame to lose the points. :-)

I see the reason for removing them, but am reluctant as some are probably legit QSOs.

Just because an operator deleted a contact by mistake shouldn't mean that the deleted callsign loses points. Most if not all of the contacts that the log-checking software says are NILs I remember very clearly. They were particularly hard to get and I know that my callsign was called and confirmed. So I have to assume that the operator didn't hit 'enter' and the Q was deleted or not logged. Obviously the other op loses me as a possible mult and certainly the Q, but so do I. Why should I be penalized? I do understand that some operators might try to pad their logs, but what happens when it is the fault of the receiving end not my fault?

Unique calls... as a YL, I can tell you I get LOTS of OMs 'giving me a point'. These Qs are '001' or 'what exchange do you need' kind of Qs, and it's quite likely that these guys probably didn't make many other contacts, maybe none except for me because I had the lovely YL voice. Yes, some unique calls may be copying errors. But what if they aren't. Again, like the NILs, why penalize an operator if s/he hasn't done anything wrong?

No penalty for duplicate QSOs, even if not recorded in log (some logging programs throw dupes out!).

I am not sure. I would like to know more about the statistics that you find. Share with us please.

I've listened to my uniques and while most are errors, some are good calls.

I feel that operating fast pressures the contester to make errors for the sake of speed, and feel that is not good contesting practice.

It has participated in the QRP category. When an output is weak, if it flies far away, there are many possibilities of becoming an error so that it may be hard to catch a call sign. Moreover, Q and that character are not caught, so that an output is weak. Punishment is not satisfactory to me about it at three mistakes. Conviction will be possible if it is a high power office and for low offices. However, a QRP office does not take a call sign easily. It is communicating by the impatient thought each time.

I know some stations that do not turn in a logs and sometimes they work local stations

As long as there's a fair administration of the penalties, the size of the penalty isn't all that important.

IF A STATION IS ACTIVE THERE ARE GOING TO BE A SUFFICIENT AMOUNT OF STATIONS WORKED AND LOG ENTRIES TO INDICATE VALDITY.

I have been burned by unique callsigns in other contests and it can cause operators to have to be rude if they know that the person they are working is new and a bit lost in the contest. Therefore it is hard to encourage folks to participate if you ignore them because they sound new or like they will be a possible unique.

If there are too many uniques - say more than 1% then there should be a penalty

Uniques: If a rare entry/zone/prefix is spotted, he would attract uniques in the form of stations interested in the QSO, not the contest. Seems unfair to punish the station for being in high demand.

Unique calls could be because someone just needed that country.

Suggest 2x penalty instead of 3x

I don't feel strongly about this mostly because I don't have enough information. As I am sure you are aware, there have to be more legitimate uniques when the station is a DXpedition (the JA's working their buddy in T8, etc.) Have you done a study to see what would happen to the scoring if uniques were removed? Historically, would it ever make any difference? I would be interested to know how strongly correlated 'U' is with 'B' and 'N' in the UBN reports? If you can demonstrate that U is a strong predictor of B and N, and that this makes no difference to the 'DXpedition' stations, then I will gladly support the decision to remove the uniques without penalty.

Copying errors are part of the process. As the operator improves, there will be less of them.

Keeps my operating in check and keeps me from entering marginal contacts.

The top eliminators would be punished for working more stations than the rest.

Unique calls signs should not be removed unless there is evidence of fraud. Possibly, if someone has multiple unique calls signs they should be removed, but not one or two. Once in a while, I only make one or two contacts in a contest if I am chasing a DX call or only have a little time and I have had some stations work very hard to pull me out and they should not be penalized.

Since there is no way to separate a copying error from somebody who really did make contact a station that just made one QSO, I wouldn't penalize anyone. If you are going to assess a penalty, only do so if the call is invalid (i.e., not in FCC's database). I have seen lots of guys take the time to work a new HF station who isn't familiar with contesting, and use it as an opportunity to introduce the new ham to contesting. The newbie isn't going to turn in a log for one contact, so it would be nice if the experienced tester didn't get penalized for being nice to the newbie.

I suggest deducting only one point, or allow the QSO to score only one point.

There are some stations that one make one contact. Especially when it is a rarer DX station.

I assume the unique is also required to not have submitted a one-QSO log, so there would be no penalty to the 'unique-ee'. Yes, take them out.

Many call sign errors are due to lousy sending by the person being copied. Some time it is really difficult to get their call.

The 3 point penalty was in effect when logs were not really checked well. Checking is much more thorough now.

Some unique calls are not errors and should not be removed. Once an old friend, AA9DX(sk), gave me a QSO and CQWW removed it and gave me a penalty because he did not work anyone else and someone with a similar callsign was active.

I like an emphasis on accuracy. One reason my rates are not higher is that I am mostly an S&P operator who listens carefully to make sure I get the exchange correct. I'm not sure what to do about unique calls. I know that you have done careful analysis about how these occur and have no doubt that 85% or more are erroneous copy. However, many a time I have heard a DX station walk a non-contestant through the process because the inexperienced wanted to work that country. It is certain the non-contestant did not submit a log. For this reason alone, I think it would be a bad idea to remove score points for friendly help. I would hate to see contestants shun inexperienced ops for fear it will cost them points. I think this behavior would be contrary to the spirit of the ham radio brotherhood and our proud tradition of Elmering.

Maybe there should be a maximum number (10? 20? 0.5%?) after which all others would be discounted. This would make sure that ops weren't padding their logs, worked hard for accurate copy, but still give some leeway for guiding neophytes (I was one once).

Only submitted logs should count when scoring the contest. Never score a QSO that cannot be matched in another log. Encourage all to submit a log.

The final rankings would be the same, only the 'scores' would be lower.

Make the penalty = to the QSO points. It's still a reason to work on accuracy. Unique calls -- I doubt there are that many ops who only talk to one tester, so toss them as they probably are typos, etc. Plus, we would then be encouraged to tell them to stay in the 'test and get more Qs.

It works - don't mess with it.

3x is too high for NIL -- the other guy forgets to hit enter on his computer and I get the penalty!

Although I agree with the 3 QSO penalty, much more effort should be put into further improvement of the checking algorithms to make sure the NILs are really NILs and not something else. For example, about 40% of NILs in my WPX CW and WW CW 2012 checking log reports were caused by mistake of the other operator. Although they correctly logged my serial number (WPX CW), instead of my call they logged another station that was spotted earlier on the same frequency. In some of the cases, the other station was more than 10 KHz away at the time of the QSO. Since I usually sign after every QSO, the 3 QSO penalty seems to be on the higher side here. Such cases could be easily identified by log checking algorithms and the penalty removed.

Then come people who intentionally remove QSOs from their log. Since usually they don't remove only one station, it should be easy to identify logs that create higher than usual amount of NILs in other logs. Several years ago, SF7WT WPX CW log had more than 5%, if I remember correctly, removed QSOs.

Whether to log a QSO that you have the slightest doubt about is a judgment call. If you feel you legitimately made the Q, and don't log it, the other guy could get nicked unfairly. If you do and he doesn't, you get the penalty. 3x is kind of high if you're sure you worked him but he isn't.

I think there should be a 3X error for us getting a wrong callsign but just throw out the contact if the other station only misses one letter because he may have logged it wrong but said it properly

The problem with a penalty for not being in someone's log is that I am potentially being penalized for a mistake made on the other end. As for penalizing unique callsigns, that is completely unfair. For example, in November Sweepstakes SSB I will often encourage non-contesters to give me a QSO. I will explain to them what the contest is about (good PR for Radiosport) and then query them for the information that I need. I have also done this in the W.W. Dx contest. Sometimes those 'unique' contacts can add up to a lot of points. So please, don't penalize me for being creative and introducing others to the contest.

Scoring penalties are the only reason people take the time to be sure they absolutely have the call right. take away the penalty and you will see lots more uniques

Most... but not all... unique calls are copying errors.

A unique call can be a good (valid) QSO - to remove them under those conditions IS a penalty, albeit one you may not have wanted to administer.

a lot of people work only one or two station, and may be not check-in the LOG, No penalty for that QSO

Unique calls for me come from old friends who DO NOT participate in contests. Ten free errors or so, or a percentage error rate would not sting so bad. 55 years as a ham and just now trying a big contest.

Many times over the years I have been a unique call sign by giving someone a contact even though I wasn't participating in that contest.

I think that a call sign error or a Not in Log should be like a BLANK line. No points, no multiplier, and no further penalty... unless you have too many of those. Say, 10%.

Maybe there should be a maximum numerical or percentage limit to how many are allowed.

There are times when the locals will come on just to give me points in US contests. Then there's the casual guy that will work only a couple of stations and then quit.

After listening to recordings of ourselves operating as a DXpedition, we were clearly penalized for working stations who signed as we received.

Most are copying errors, some are legit.

Unique calls might be an error, but they might not be with non-serious ops on during the contest. Don't penalize the guy who happened to work one of those.

Tough call on uniques as we've all had a friend or a casual op make a contact, but overall probably a defensible change to delete uniques, no additional penalty

I think that points should be deducted based upon the percentage of incorrect QSOs in the log. If a contestant makes, say, 200 QSOs, and at least 95% (190) of the contacts are correct, then no points should be deducted.

I have locals who know I'm going to be in the contest and work only me. They have no other interest in contests.

I have given out single contest contacts and I would hate to see someone penalized because didn't participate more. Last weekend, my radio quit after one QSO and if I hadn't replaced it, someone could have been penalized.

I should not be penalized for someone else's error. Many ops do not acknowledge a corrected call and it is hard to tell if they logged me correctly or not.

Penalties discourage marginal operators from participating. I think that the contact should be removed and the score reduced with no penalty. Or create a recreational division and let the big guns fight it out in the big guy division but provide a forum for smaller operators to prosper in the contest.

There are times when the language issue causes the copy error in Phone Contests. With CW I have had some QSOs where the running station actually made a mistake with the call sign when going at a high WPM level.

As a YL I have more uniques than others.

I don't agree that most unique calls are copying errors. If that was really true and you could back that up, then why are you're removing them from logs?

CQ penalties are too aggressive as they automatically make the receiving station guilty and the sending station innocent. Some errors in the log are due to the sending station making the error and the receiving station logging what was sent. I have no issue with the QSO being removed even if I didn't make the error. But a 3 QSO penalty is pretty severe for someone else's mistake. Unfortunately there is basically no way to catch this type of mistake so it is assumed the receiving station made the error. I would even be willing to accept a 1 additional QSO penalty but not 3.

2X for NIL or busted callsign. In my experiences, uniques are Sunday drive-bys.

Too many people rely on the calls on the spotting network, and don't bother to verify them by themselves. There should indeed be a penalty for bad calls

3x penalty results in many NILs going the other way. If I'm unsure of the call I'm not going to log it .. that results in a NIL for the other guy.

Not all uniques are caused by the receiving op incorrectly copying the call but the sending station sending or saying the wrong call. This is common at a multi op. Plus there are times when a non-contester ham buddy will get on and make a QSO with his friend and not work anyone else.

Uniques can also be illegal buddy contacts solicited e.g. by email

Sometimes a QRP operator may only be able to make one contact...the station contacted by that QRP station shouldn't be penalized and should be given the points. If the unique call isn't a licensed call this not counting ruling would be okay.

3 QSO penalty is too high - maybe just total all errors and deduct that % from score - 20 error entries in 1000 - deduct 2% from score.

Many stations call ZL because it is relatively rare. They are not in the contest - just want to work a ZL. I waste my time working them. I often get qsls after a contest marked 'thanks for ZL' etc etc. I just get penalised.

Scoring penalties are too harsh. There have been contests where I made only 1 contact (To grab a new band country). Stations should not be penalized.

I very much resent having scores reduced unless there is some sort of sign of outright cheating.

Single band guys milking the band for every last Q sometimes get someone no one else works. This is especially so on SSB where one can garner such Qs.
I think it is tough to copy calls. I found that in CW dits are dropped by the ionosphere. Since the start of these penalties I have been copying the station 2 to 3 times before QSYing and I still get many wrong!!!
If a unique call sign is a friend who gives you a point, why would that count against you?
Penalties are too high. Honest efforts should not be assessed excessive penalties. Out and out cheating should.
Every year I get penalized for NILs when I _know_ I worked the station. Since you began publishing logs, I have looked up my QSO in the other station's log, and I have _found_ it, but the other op has busted my call and your stupid scoring program failed to recognize the fact when it was obvious. For example, once I worked a nearly local station, KC1XX, in order to get a mult for Zone 5. The op at KC1XX logged my call as G1HIS (wrong) instead of W1HIS (correct). The time and frequency were correct, but you penalized me for a NIL. I've seen this too many times. It makes me mad. It makes me not want to work your stupid contest.
For me, I try to report truthfully and accurately but feel penalized too much if I make an error. However, if the contest directors find that too many operators are cheating, then I guess a 3x penalty is justified. I can live with the penalty.
I know that I work unique callsigns only because they know me and want to give me a contact only.
My typing is bad...I make honest mistakes. I think if you make too many 'mistakes' the log should be reviewed. Tough question here...
A call sign error or NIL should equal to a penalty for just those points, not 3x.
You do not get all of the contestants logs, therefore you cannot possibly know if a call is only used once in a contest. If it is not a valid call, then remove it.
Don't penalize ME for what somebody else does. If I'm the only QSO someone wants for some award, that's not my fault. But I do understand why someone might see this as a problem. How about a limit to unique call signs -- that would slow down the speed merchants and preserve the QSOs of one-QSO fun seekers.
I have in the past worked a single station in a contest. That station worked me in good faith. It was a valid contact. This is especially true for rare DX stations.
When I was working from Saipan I., my home-town hams called me and got some Q's. They were not contesters nor dx'ers and didn't work any other stations. They are all unique. Should my score be down, even with penalty? I do not think so.
While most unique are errors, there are still the small part who are working only one or two QSOs. I've been many times giving a point out in the contests that I have not partaken. I think they shouldn't removed
I depend on the scoring report to improve my capabilities. For example, If I see a lot of errors in copying my call or report, then I know I need to do something about it.
I assume you've done validation testing on your scoring algorithm, but without knowing the results of that I find it difficult to render an objective opinion. Therefore, I could not recommend change at this time.
Many stations bust my call on cw when I am running stations with low power and wire antennas... they copy K1GC but I don't know it...and I lose the QSO because it's not even close to my call (KJ9C)... so a SINGLE QSO penalty is plenty....wasn't my error to begin with
The callsign error should remove the call from the log and awarded zero points for that contact.
Yes if uniques over 1%

My Father was not a tester. So when he got on just to give me a Q, now someone wants to take that type of contact away from the operator in the contest?
Everyone makes mistakes. Each op should be held to the same standards set by the committee.
When I give a station's call and he says QSL, I shouldn't be penalized. Also, not everyone is an expert typist. Some errors are obvious typos. I don't use master call databases.
Unless it is deliberate there should no penalties associated with them other than removing them from counting toward your score.
3x is pretty severe, but I can live with it. 2x seems more in line. As to uniques, maybe a limit of (x) number of uniques, and discard any above that number.
'Not in Log' should be just removed from the score with no penalty.
I have had friends give me a Q that are not active participants. Depends on who/what the 'unique' is...a W6 for a zone 3 on 10, for instance, or a relatively exotic that could be a typo.
Remove the penalty. Just remove the Q and any score impact, such as mults, it might have. That should be enough of an incentive to copy correctly. It shouldn't be a contest within a contest to see who comes closest to a 'golden log.'
I have worked many non-testers that i have taken the time to talk thru the exchange. And thanked them gratefully for their points and maybe encouraged them to join the fun. if the case exists that just because they don't work anyone else, their QSO doesn't exist, why should we bother? true uniques should not be removed. miscopies are different and should be removed, as long as there is a good way of deciding that they ARE miscopies.
Publish the UBN numbers in the boxes and line scores.
Current penalties are too high
I try to dig out weak ones on 160 and 80 in high noise. There is a high chance of error there but it is fun and should not be penalized. Unique calls also occur when a friend calls you in the contest who doesn't operate other than that. Why should it be removed?
I can recall many instances where I know some of my uniques were, in fact, properly copied and were unique. Recently I had a UA0 call me in another contest. I asked him to repeat the call three times, as I knew it was unique. He did. The organizers removed this call and penalized me. If you can't prove it, then you shouldn't remove the calls.
Within the past two months, I got into a contest casually and made one contact before my wife came to me with her 'honey do' list. I ended up making only one contact, and I never bothered to submit it. Why should the guy I worked get penalized. Now, if he lists 100 uniques, that's a different story.
QRM is probably the cause for a miss copy. If unsure about the call ask for a confirmation or listen to the next couple of cq's the station makes. As far as a penalty I say no.
Simply put, penalties for uniques are bullshit.
In the hectic one may be allowed a few errors, just discard the QSO.
I think all incorrect contacts should be removed with no penalty. Because some stations don't submit their logs out of their participating band or sometimes log the band of contacts wrong.
I sometimes get on a contest just to work a single station, so I'd be a unique call in that case. Heck no, do not discourage us unique calls, unique calls should count unless there is some compelling reason for that particular call to not count. Also, there may be times when that 'unique' call may have worked more than one station, but only one of the stations submitted a log.

No problem with 3x QSO for not in log but seems a bit high for a busted call, especially with some of the heavy accents and poor audio quality in the phone contest. One of the Russian contests removes a contact from the sending station when the other guy gets his call wrong - perhaps a 1x penalty for this? Current rules don't provide much incentive for making sure the other guy has your call right.

There are times when friends hear you operate and give you a contact if they hear you on. Should this be discouraged? Should operators question contacts that are not in the SuperCheckPartial to verify they are making multiple contacts? I am sure DX-peditions get a fair amount of DXCC QSOs from people looking for the country. I don't believe this type of contacts should be discouraged, nor should the DX station be penalized for the DX-ers (non-contest participants, but give a valid report) that work them.

The reason I feel that the 3x penalty is too high is because sometimes hand sent code (paddle, key or bug) is actually sent incorrectly - which penalizes the receiving op.

Because you never know for sure, but if a station has too many it could mean he is making up some.

I'm to the point with the penalties that I will now delete a QSO if I don't get explicit confirmation from the station I worked (some operators are notorious about keeping QSOs so short that you THINK it's a good QSO, but you aren't always sure). That will cause him a penalty, but I won't get docked for it! Is that outcome you want from the penalty system?

I didn't know there is a 3X penalty . . . maybe there should be an entry category for people who don't read the rules? :)

Simply remove the callsign and its associated points without extra penalty deduction.

This is a false negative problem, what about those stations that copy unique call signs and it was a valid QSO.

One should not be heavily penalized because of the heavy accent of a DX station that can result in a busted call. Not all of us have perfect hearing. Sometimes it seems like a race to see who can say their call the fastest. They are the ones who should get the penalty.

if penalties then as russians does penalty for both QSO-partners

I would be happier with 2x QSO point penalties.

Unique calls are not necessarily copying errors. Some operators do not submit logs.

I've been dinged a couple of times which I think was due to the log checking progress, not due to my miscopying call. JA's are VERY loud here and there are a couple of stations that I hear and correctly copy, but the log check program flags anyway. Not sure why unless the stations I've worked are newbies or rarely enter and by happenstance have a similar call to one in the log checker. I've heard others complain about this too, so I know I'm not the only one...

Uniques that don't resolve to a valid callsign (per qrz.com, buckmaster etc.) should certainly get removed.

If I am not really in the contest, I may call a station I need for, say an award, or who is a friend. If that is all I have time for and I don't use my contest software or send in the log, they get nicked? Not right and it discourages anyone from giving a QSO to someone like me.

There is the odd time that I have operated in a contest & for whatever reason (usually vry poor condx) have just given up after a contact or two

one call sign error of NiL should be a penalty of single QSO points

It could well be someone who turns on his radio and hears a friend, gives 1 contact and turns radio off.

More than once, worked one and got a nil. From public logs, show they logged a 'more well known' contest with similar call, only to work same 'more well known' again later (only one contact per band/mode allowed). From 'more well known's' log, showed they were not even on band when contact happened. Submitted proof to sponsor and got...ignored. I'm a big boy, and if I'm wrong, I'll take a penalty. However, if I am right, and PROVE I'm right, getting a 3X penalty is just wrong. I may not be in the top ten, but may still be working my way up through the ranks, and competing against someone at the state or zone level, and it could make a difference there. When we submit an entry we agree that the sponsor's decision is final, but the decision must be fair and applied equally. By ignoring my messages, that sponsor proved that neither my mid level log, nor the fact that the software was mis-scoring logs, was of importance to them at that time. Honestly, while I try for a clean log, a contact or two wouldn't change things for me, but the fact that the integrity of the system was at question and it didn't matter to them really saddens me.

I agree that most unique calls are copying errors. I know that. Difficult to answer this question. Whatever decision you make, better to review it after a few years.

Keep the quality high and make participants as concerned with accuracy as they are with QSO rate.

When I enter a contest, I basically agree to abide by the stated rules. If I screw up a callsign or exchange, that is my fault not the log checkers.

Enough logs are submitted and cross checked that any unique calls should be considered busted and penalized accordingly

Should get higher penalty

The contest reports produced after scoring has been complete showing all the details of who copied the call wrong, who botched the exchange, etc., are fantastic. Kudos.

Some of their errors are due to typing errors and should not be penalized at such a high rate.

Unique call signs could be due to a station making 10-20 contacts and no logs are exchanged...

I think you already remove a unique call if it is obviously a copying error. If I operate from a rare country, I will work a friend in that country for the mult. He may well be a unique.

I don't think it makes sense to treat uniques differently than other copying errors. My call is generally miscopied in several different ways more than one time in each contest, which would make me not unique and just a busted call. Why should someone be treated more leniently just because they were the only one in the contest to copy my call wrong in a unique way? It rewards them for being more wrong.

Lot of people not aware about the contest answer to our calls, and don't make other QSO in the contest.

I do SB 40m (48 hours) and while local daytime, there are not many contest stations to work. I work some locals and ask for a contest-number, when I get one, I log it and I'm sure many of them are such uniques

As long as the operator errors are the ONLY deductions then that is fair.

Penalties are all about punishment. A mistaken call should not count (obviously), but punishment has no place in contesting.

Penalties are OK in any competition.

I've always thought that losing the QSO is penalty enough for busting a call. That said, I won't lose any sleep if we keep the 3x penalty -- it certainly encourages better copy. As for uniques, I'd like to better understand what the log checker does before deciding. Do they make an effort to determine if the call is real?

Initially I thought that the 3 point penalty was rough--you could wind up with a negative score!! However, the essence of communication is the ACCURATE transfer of information. The three point penalty makes you vastly more careful, and stations more willing to repeat reports, and repeat call signs. In the real world accuracy is truly the measure, and there has to be consequences for errors, intentional or not.

Penalty for my error OK, but don't think I should be penalized the same amount for poor copying/logging at the other end (NIL)

I personally have friends who are not good at CW but when they hear me, they will give me a QSO. One station actually is in Delaware and that often is my only multiplier with that state. This would not only remove my points but also the multiplier! Maybe an email to verify the contact with the other station if there is any question? You stated it in your question, 'Most' but certainly not all.

Unique call sign penalty is a purely philosophical issue. What is the contest about? Making max number of DX contacts or passing traffic correctly?

Mots log errors are due to sending from the other station.

3x - ok for not in log, not for copy error. If it appears that the contact was made, but the callsign wasn't correctly copied, simply remove the contact, but no penalty. Too many ops slur their own callsign or otherwise do a bad job of giving it out. Maybe there should be a penalty against any op whose callsign is incorrectly copied by others far more than is typical. (Are there any studies on what is a normal number of miscopies vs. abnormally high busted calls?)

Uniques - there are a lot of hams that really do make only one contact, often by accident, and get scared off the air for the duration.

The higher the QSO totals, the more uniques there will be, and the rarer the DX station, the more uniques there will be. I think encouraging more activity means making sure even those that only make one or a few QSOs are considered important - making them not count IMHO makes the opposite statement.

Maybe penalize if there are more than 10 uniques

I would be OK for a 1x penalty for call sign error. I think a 3x penalty for NIL is appropriate.

There are also little guns who probably only make a few contacts in a test. They should be counted too and not removed. Often these require the most effort to work.

The scoring penalties keep us on our toes, and incents operators to copy callsigns themselves, rather than simply trusting spots or code-readers

The fine is not necessary, but I record it as such, and the attention is necessary

That unique call might well be mine, giving someone a point.

It always happens that if you are a rare DX that a few guys only work you and nobody else. I have lots of QSOs in my logs with number 001 (in other contests of course).

It is not necessary that a unique QSO is an error... Maybe a real QSO has been done anyway?

Even your question indicates that SOME unique calls are just that, unique. The only time a unique call should be removed is when it's a multiplier. This has the smell of fabrication.

There should be no penalty unless a pattern of probable cheating can be seen.

But without 3x QSOs points penalty

One or more 'not in log' call can be found in log easily, because of a station that can't be heard by me. It can just be removed.

The penalty (3x QSO) was actual before few years to prevent cheating , today the check system is more complicated and there is no sense of it. The uniques which are met at least in 5+ logs must stay....otherwise - removed

No problem. QSO is not confirmed. Simply remove.

The strict checking on the score makes me my stance to the contest more realistic and to focus on copying signals. (And measure the capability of solid copying).

Removing the QSO from the score is plenty of penalty. 3 is extreme and penalizes for poor typing skills not operator skill.

It should Be a good balance. over 10% calls Not in log penalties should Be higher.

3 x QSO points penalty is OK for call sign error .

If I am not in a log, just remove the QSO without penalty. For example, if I worked K5ZD in all 6 bands and I didn't put this 6 QSO's in my log, why K5ZD must be penalized with the extra 3 QSO's?

However, a dx-pedition will probably having lots of that kind, because someone not in contest wants new country, so why a penalty to the tester because he is special?

Incorrect zones should be penalized. I'll say it again, but louder: INCORRECT ZONES SHOULD BE PENALIZED.

Maybe someone need only a new DXCC, MODE BAND

No penalty, just remove the points for error QSO

I have had a few unique scores not allowed over time, and i know for sure some of these were stations just wanting the country for award etc.

It often happens, especially with rare PX stations. If it is about a top score, or a tie breaker, an attempt can be made to verify the QSO contacting the unique station. Not very convenient but it's a possible way to go.

Big stations who work a little pistol gets penalty's and that is not fair.

There are people who do not pronounce their call explicitly. Mistake is a mistake so everything must be equal to everyone.

We need rare mults in contest - for those uniques are natural result. Again we should see worked differently--- those submitting to box score need to be treated differently than other competitor segments. Unique is one good thing - error QSO is one bad thing. They cannot be lumped together.

Call mistake are no valid but why remove other valid contact?

Some stations DO come on and work a few people, maybe their friends, but have no interest themselves. In some cases they only have a single QSO, but that was a genuine QSO. Such QSOs should not be penalized, they are genuine uniques.

My experience from VU7SJ activity:

Many stations need the country, make only 1 QSO to get the DXCC-point and close the station - this would be a unique call sign and would reduce the points of the active station!

There are cases where strange call sign will appear during the contest, I may not know the question that has been recorded or not it is wrong.

Operator in question should be the appropriate action by examining whether that strange call sign had appeared on the web site immediately contest finished here after.

Sometimes people just participate in the contest for making new DXCC countries and don't send the log, and it's not our fault.

It doesn't matter. If a big station wants to cheat will make all his ham mates calling him to make more than one QSO.
If a unique callsign is greatly distorted then it must be removed, but if only one letter is distorted then you should not be in a hurry.
Here on the west coast we can work BA and JA QRP stations that may just be happy to work even one US station and go back to working locals.
I have not thought about this, however it seems like a good idea if it is true that most unique calls are copying errors
As a low power station I think we need to make it worthwhile for stations to try and make the contact. I find that many stations avoid working weak stations even if they could copy them. Possible a unique call sign allowance as a small percentage should be allowed, for the same reason I sighted above. As sure their real contacts also with a guy just turning on the radio for a few minutes.
Probably they should be removed only in case they are a new mult.
Perhaps simply removing broken calls and similar would be enough penalty. This is now very easy with electronic log checking. Most operators don't make mistakes on purpose and purposeful 'crimes' are usually treated with different from simple mistakes. I guess in contests carelessness and desire for speed makes more errors...
This penalty should not be exaggerated. Mistakes can be made on both sides. You cannot be sure who is responsible. Innocent person may apply sanctions. Or people with bad intentions can occur intentionally to punish a person who does not like (only the bad will). Suffice cancel QSO at both stations.
I am not sure I agree with the statement 'most unique calls are copying errors' - every year I work friends or stations who make only 1 QSO. However this is a potential source of cheating.
If I make a mistake, I should pay for it. No penalty would be unfair to those who make a big effort to have quality operation. Why is society being so lenient on everything??
Unique: Most means not all; therefore do not remove all of them.
Keep it, it's an incentive to improve copying skill and also a must for OP's using cluster to verify that they work the right station.
The unique QSOs are a problem. Stations working from a 'rare' country will be penalized if uniques are removed.
If there is checklog for this unique call then ...
If you have a special call (J43J e.g.) you receive some calls from people who contact nobody else
Some unique operators make a QSO to only one station to give points to a friend.
Call sign error should be removed from the score. But 3x QSO is too much.
The callsign error may be caused by the inexperienced operator transmitting it so the receiving station should not be penalised other than zero points for the contact.
Big guns have more uniques than others, so why punish them for spending time on little pistols.
Many times i contact rare stations not in the contest. It's a contact i make while not in Log. These contacts should be counted as well. Uniques should be rewarded more points than normal contacts because of their uniqueness.
As long as some stns run cw at 35 wpm, there WILL BE copying errors

I think a 2 QSO penalty for a callsign error or a NiL is more fair. How could you keep from deleting valid contacts? Maybe a guy made several QSOs, but only one of the stns submitted a log.
Mistakes are made - penalty should be 1 QSO
It would be fair if all unique calls removed without penalty.
Penalty is necessary to keep people from guessing and taking unfair advantage and also it is important for the continuity of the records. Unique calls though might indeed be removed to make the results much more accurate. Many contests remove even calls say less than 10 times in logs.
if someone want to give you only points why not. many people are not interested in contest but want to speak if they hear me get often a friend of my out of LX who only give me a call an then quit
The competitive element in ham contests is about precise transmission and reception of the maximum number of messages form stations from all over the world. Lack of precision in reception and logging, often for the sake of increasing the number of contact, should consequently be penalized.
call sign errors or not in logs should only be penalized if there seems to be a pattern - say, someone has more than x QSOs or more than x multipliers due to this. Sometimes the other station simply does not log a QSO or logs incorrectly.
some stations work you only to get a new DXCC country and always give as number 001, keep it with full points in the log
I understand the problem with uniques but many ops outside big population centres may well have genuine uniques. If I miscopy a call I deserve to be dinged x3 or whatever, but I have no control over a NIL much of the time so I am less comfortable with this penalty
Copying errors will be cross checked anyway and penalized. Unique calls make operation faster and are easier to copy right!
When one has a rare QTH many DX-hunters make only one QSO. That happened to me when operated 80m SB in OJ0. Penalties mult was lost when operator had recently got new vanity call which was not yet in database. All of them were however asking for direct QSL.
I mostly enter CW contests in the QRP category and find that my call is misread by a number of stations either not hearing the first dit or logging S instead of H. My call EI8FH
Sometimes I may just have one QSO, to give a friend a mult. Why should he be penalised if I don't make more QSOs?
Most of the time I've 1 or 2 uniques on 500 QSOs. Maybe it should be a certain percentage. Max. 1% may be unique. More uniques mean point reduction.
If you are rare dx you might be called by person just wanting you and then works no one else... or he drops dead with the excitement of it all.
Making an error after 40 hours of operating is quite normal, human. Remove the QSO from the score, and that is it, why penalty?

I gave no idea how to make this penalty - there are 3 next (after bad) QSOs deleted or before? Or maybe random? What if they are unique multipliers in these deleted QSOs? It means that final result is not only my work but partially the result of the algorithm used in software.

General reflection: an inherent feature of the amateur communication - especially in difficult circumstances - is a possibility of error or difficulties in receiving information. Often correspondent, especially not English-speaking, says very indistinctly. Also in the case of digital emission interference, defeating even the most sophisticated algorithms.

Why should it be further punished? It's like fishing in a competition for the fish broken of a hook throw of three other caught from bucket. Just such QSOs are not included.

Not in Log means, that there is another participant who sent his/her log. I would prefer having higher penalty only in such case. This would be slight motivation to ensure correct exchange of information and not to just add 'random' QSOs into log. I have heard about such cases.

Call sign errors do happen, but in this case there is some kind of confirmation from both sides (not just plain unique call!).

Cabrillo and short times makes log massaging more difficult and that should be recognized with a lesser penalty for what is a mistake not a deliberate attempt to improve score.

In every contest i have penalties 'not in log' but most of them was really QSO. The error was in logging on the other side.

Removing uniques also wipes out valid QSOs with operators who want to have a few contacts in their personal log but don't intend to submit a contest log.

penalty just the 1x QSO points for call sign error

Unique calls are not all copying errors, and many local or limited equipment stations can only hear a single contester. Having a penalty for working a local QRP station, who may not appear in anyone else's log, is unfair and discourages these marginal stations from taking part. Maybe a % of the total log allowed as uniques would be a better way to police this phenomena.

Accuracy is important, especially with so great cs checking databases available. If no penalty, then exotic mpl can run carelessly of copying errors knowing that most of the people would call again till their call sign is copied correct. There would be more dupe contacts [incorrect copy] but who cares if these will be just removed, Perhaps you cannot penalize but publish the number of incorrect copied contacts in each top score just to show who is the greatest harvester :)

for a limited number of unique call (3>5)

Can't it be a bit more intelligent? This is a disincentive to reach deep for weak signals. It is a given that the better antenna'd stations will move towards uniques. Seems a pity to penalise them for being good!

DON'T FORGET WE'RE HUMAN, HI HI

In my few QSO I noticed that the errors were not caused by me but by the correspondent. Some NOT LOG IN are sure to have them connected as in a hundred contacts this is easy to verify. So many mistakes I certainly defendants were copa correspondents. How do you judge?

It should be some penalties for mistakes

We should all know the rules and we all have the same rules applied (for our category). Everything is fair :)

I have had occasions when I have worked uniques who I know from previous QSOs. they are not testers but often just shout because they know you and to give a point away in the spirit of ham radio. Unless the log revealed a pattern of abuse including uniques which were mults then let it stand.

Gets very frustrating when the other guy can't copy your call correct no matter how many times you tell him: don't think you should be penalised for this, as it's out of your control. However realise that you should be penalised for logging errors, so it's a tough call.

NILs often happen because of QRM etc causing the other station to decide not to log the QSO even though it happened, this is out of your control so I think been penalised for the decision or actions of other stations is a bit OTT.

Call sign errors should be removed from the log with one penalty point.

Call sign errors with bad copy on serial should be removed from the log with one penalty point.

Call sign Not In Log should have NO penalty. In EU we have a huge disadvantage with a lot of excessive power stations who are rude and this leads to call 'doubling' in hard conditions, few people have nice filtering or know how to drive their radio. If the receiving station omits a contact it is because the contact was not made. In WPX there is a call+serial number match which allows for resolve of this. If station 1 claims contact and has call and serial correct and a match to station 2, that is fine. If station 1 has the call correct and the serial is in station 2 long with different call, that is a bad copy (no contact so penalty=1), if station 2 has a match to station 3 log on serial and call, then station 1 is just skimming and hoping for the best. I hope that makes sense.

For CQWW DX, its more difficult dues to lack of serial

Basically yes, but what about DXpeds which can have a real amount of real uniques

There is little excuse these days for such errors with SCP and spotting etc unless the operated suffers from a disability however, that last would open up a horrendous can of worms !

removing would be most unfair to entrants from rare counties... as long as the number (percentage) of uniques is not excessive uniques should be tolerated

A participant can ask to correct if he gets a LOTW or e-QSL confirmation or e-mail... you never know he did work a unique multiplier !

The top guns have the most uniques, therefor canceling all uniques would affect the top scorers more than the 'just for fun' participant. This is my experience from be the contest manager of WAG for 50 years!

During huge pileups it is higher potential for errors on callsigns even if the running station does not operate split. It is fair if the QSO is not valid, but the penalty is ceased.

It would be very very fine to get also penalties for the transmitting station. so both parts should be sure to copy the QSO data correct. This was the origin plan in transmitting information in 2-way, not one way!

2 * QSO Points should be enough.

An unusually high percentage of uniques should, of course, be penalized. But there will be one-offs caused by legitimate DXCC-chasing by non-contesters, so you shouldn't penalize a few such QSOs. The penalty for NILs is good to encourage accuracy, although it may also encourage people to change logs post-contest.

Station witch have error should receive penalty. Other station remove contact without penalty. Not in log without penalty

Not all Unique are mistakes, some are a rare multi. But if the rules are in such a way, have the log a better quality

the way is vy good in the moment... my penalties gone less in the past years

This is a hard one.... maybe CQWW has so many logs to look into that one could say more or less for sure, that the callsign is busted and not unique?

Penalising a definite copying error is OK, but a unique call may be a genuine QSO with a station that didn't want to be in the contest. Or it may be cheating. You as contest organisers probably have a better idea than we as competitors do whether many unique calls are cheating or genuine QSOs. If it looks like cheating is happening then remove them all.

I find three times the value to high. I often operate QRP and sometimes I'm not sure if they really logged me because they have all alright but strike me anyway to not get penalties.

Sometimes someone may have worked one station for the contest so better not to remove

A good station scores more uniques, depending on propagation. If uniques would be removed I would stop contesting !

I have had some penalties for copy errors. The errors were cause by qrm and crowded band. Actual point would be better than 3x. We are operating for fun and good sportsmanship.

This would be bad for those operating from a exciting DXCC!

The unique call must be a valid call. This is however a difficult question. There are situations where a station could run in a unique call.

At present there are too many errors by the other party due to logging program deficiencies/operational quirks. The 3x penalty is ok, but the problem needs addressing somehow, why am I being penalised for the other parties error.

Unique calls are just that unique, someone came on and worked one station, it happens. Although most would be errors.

While I say no, if someone has too many uniques I would want to verify their log more closely. There should be a zone of tolerance for unique %. When working a weak station, you are sometimes not 100% sure you worked him. Do you log him, and risk the penalty, or do you not log him and he risks the penalty? No easy answer.

As long as everyone gets treated equally, I have no issues with penalty points. Re unique calls: yes, just remove the call with no penalties.

Especially top scorer have a quite huge unique rate. It's unfair to penalize them.

At least when a unique is a multi, It should be removed.

Most unique calls are copying errors, but not all.

First 3 point error. At last contest (or year 2011) I was sure and I still am that I worked new DXCC for me. I was tough one, but I got report logged it and everything was ok. Later noticed that I wasn't in om:s log. So no points, no new DXCC and no qsl and wasn't my mistake.

About uniques. For pedition testers in rare DXCC or places like that, losing scores might be too big penalty. I guess that there are many unique contacts in log simply because someone want's a new DXCC and not to take part to contest.

I think it is highly unlikely that a ham would work only one station in a contest and no others, even if he/she were not a contest entrant.

Is there any statistics of how many of the unique calls that are actual contacts? I believe a real contact should be valid as long as its made according to the rules. Maybe unique calls could be confirmed by the audio recording made to monitor other cheating.

While most of them are, as a DX station I know a number of stations that seek me out - while I always tell them to work a few others, I'm never sure whether they do or not.

I believe copying the call correctly is part of the contest. We should all strive for proficiency. A callsign is a callsign, no matter how unique.

If you can verify that the callsign is not a valid call, yes. If there is a possibility that the call is okay, leave it in.
Just not count QSO
Since not all uniques are copying errors, removing all uniques penalizes those who didn't make mistakes. Plus, some uniques are sending errors.
I know from recording the contest QSOs that often Not In Log QSOs were clearly worked and acknowledged by the other station. My guess is that band change violations cause others to remove QSOs from the log causing the NIL.
I think 2 times QSO for wrong call. just 1 QSO for not in log unless there are a lot of them then DQ as Not in log is often far end incompetence with logging software.
Gives you more of an incentive to log accurately
This would be unfair for all the stations with no errors with the unique calls in the log.
The 3x penalty is way too high. The operator on the other end may be asleep at the switch and did not enter the contact, however, you did enter it correctly and you get hit and hard. I would keep the 3x point penalty for systemic errors, but everyone should get 2 instances per contest where only the call is removed from the log and there is no penalty assessed. If it is a systemic issue then the 3 x penalty (or even higher) should be assessed. As far as unique calls, you want to encourage the very occasional contesteer to dip their toes into the water. Therefore to remove entirely from the log all unique calls would discourage more serious contesters from making an exchange with them. I would suggest that up to 5 unique calls be permitted per contest per log. After 5 unique calls (6 and more) they should be removed from the score with no penalty.
Some unique calls are true QSOs.
Most is not ALL, so uniques better stay as of now
I'm in a semi-rare country using QRP. Sometimes I can only work one station if condx are poor and I don't operate seriously.
yes, but only if they are copying errors
Removing uniques removes the incentive to look for them which is part of the game.
Contesting, it's all about improving the skills - right ? I used contesting to improve my Morse Code receiving skills - I managed... hi
I think the 3/penalty is too severe. I don't see it's point. I operate the best I can and make all attempts to avoid errors. When I make a mistake, why kick me a few extra times? Yes, just dump all uniques (no extra penalty in addition)
We are all human! Especially when some stations don't identify very often, those of us who don't use spotting networks may make an error-I think removing the call is penalty enough.
Sometimes I'm not sure the DX station ack'd me. It's a quandary whether to log the QSO (and maybe get dinged) or not log it (and maybe get him dinged). I don't think there is an easy answer.
Penalty should be no more than simply removing the errant QSO and mult if any.
Depends on how many uniques are typically found. Does the committee actually check QRZ.com (etc.) to see if the unique is a valid call? The population is aging as are contesters. Some people have hearing problems, dyslexia, etc. and are still making a legitimate effort to copy as well as they're able.

To my own score it doesn't really matter at all.

To high end competing stations this may be a strong reason to not having 'friends' making only one QSO to let record aimers find there log growing by having lots of friends making one single QSO only. That is cheating.

Many stations has several calls to use whenever wanting to. Myself I have 6 calls personally connected to me. It is an easy task for any N1MM operator to quickly change the CALL and do one QSO to one big gun but not to any other. Would take some 5-10 seconds in total. No good thing to do.

Remove all unique calls !!!!!!! It is a competition. No BBQ for funny-fun.

Really only the concern of stations looking for plaques/certificates in close competition. I try my best, but if I make a few honest mistakes, a reduction of 1%-3% in my score is no big deal. I'm in it to have fun, and contribute points to our contest club.

the 3 points in the long run costs more than the 3 points when you include the mult it loses also.

While some uniques may be copy errors, I have had numerous 'uniques' send me QSLs! I don't know why they didn't work other stations. BTW, I've had NILs send me QSLs too!

You always have buddies down the block or fellow club members who may want to get on just to 'give you a contact' in a contest but never participate in the contest. If the robot detects a nonsense call (one that could not be valid) it should just be deleted without penalty.

No problem for me, I never win but I have a lot of fun to work a new one on new band !

I am sure many of the 5 watt JA stations I work are going to be unique. It would be reasonable to have an audio file of the contest as a requirement to avoid removal of uniques. Also if the unique call shows in supercheck partial - it is more likely to be real and not error.

I feel that in a major contest like the CQWW it's nearly impossible to be the only one to work a given station. In other smaller contests this is a different story. Removal of the Unique Q's without penalties seems like the way to go.

I see the problem from the committee's perspective, but uniques can be legitimate, and removing them can be unfair and may create other problems.

Occasionally I will pick up a contact with a station that is not in the contest. I try to be as accurate with those as I am of contest participants. Every contact is valuable to me.

They worked somebody that most likely would count. Typos are common place in the heat of battle. On voice the other operator may have very poor enunciation. Unless the Q results in a multiplier I don't see any reason to penalize the operator.

I sometimes call CQ upband, with the goal of working many stations. And I sometimes get the impression that the stations I work are making very few calls. So it may be a unique call but still be a perfectly valid contact.

Why should one ham be penalty for someone else error. For not copies the callsign right.

I have no problem with QSOs being removed that are incorrect. I never understood the penalty part. Maybe when there was written logs and not all logs got checked it made some sense to dock additional QSOs to discourage padding the log. With all logs being checked seems to make less sense. Leave unique QSOs in you never know when someone just wants a card from your country and just makes the one QSO.

Remove only these uniques and claimed points/mults, without another penalties. Miscopy sometimes begins with syllabic tone from who English isn't His native language. Example: 'radio' were copied 'india' several times in the heat of battle.

3x Penalty

The level is OK for the occasional tester. However there is another picture for the hi competitive ones, in particular in CW contests. There are many new-bees and CW starters that chases hi end testers for QSL confirmations, although we REALLY try to QRS, they very seldom listens, understands, etc when their call is repeated back to them (normally these guys are LP/dipole stns). Well hope you see my drift. We shall always encourage these guys but feel we unfairly are penalized.....

3x penalty forces accuracy

I have made contacts which I didn't know were part of a contest and whilst doing so, only made one or two contacts.

You lose too much points in the QRP-section with a 3x-penalty.

In big pile-ups possible call sign error is coming more times. Also rare multiplier having big pile-up sometimes receive call sign wrongly what is causing 'not in LOG'.

In case of doubt, I would not penalize or remove a QSO. It really happens that some 'Uniques' only work 5 QSOs and only appear in one entered log. Removal / Penalty in this case is extremely unfair.

This is very touchy area for all of us. I have been contesting since 1988 and heard it all....Issue I have is one reports what one hears!!! In SSB, for most part, our English is pretty good and call sign phonetics are mostly understandable.....However, some DX countries with their different accents and enunciation makes them hard to understand and we record what we think we hear. As for a not in log call, I may have logged 9A1A thinking he was coming back to me, however due to qrm it wasn't him but somebody else...so he would not be in my log, but I would be in somebody else's log..

When operating abroad from a rare or semi-rare entity, there will be lots of unique calls. If they were to be removed, it would kill the idea of giving multipliers to others.

On the off chance that a single unique in a log is legit, I prefer that it not be removed. How about removing all unique calls from a log that contains two or more unique calls, thereby squashing the possible cheater?

A unique call should be removed with no penalty. This way if they cheat they need to also enter that call with others thus taking more time to do so.

Uniques can be unique for some stations. I would leave them in.

There is no proof the QSO with the unique station is a false.

What if it is not a copying error? People still will be punished for LIKELY an error? Think of presumption of innocence.

nil's are not fair because it penalizes you for another person's error.

I am often a 'unique' call in contests where I am not a participant. I'll pick one station, and work only him, on multiple bands if possible. Also, I've had non-contesting friends work me and only me in a contest. Why? Friendship. To judge all 'uniques' as copying errors is an assumption.

I am sometimes called by a station that is clearly not in the contest by wants a QSO with me I would not want to be penalized for this

Some odd callsigns are frequently miscopied. Do they still create an error, may be keying problems. Can we get rid of /QRP please.

It is common for a casual operator to make one or two QSOs in a contest (for example, from a mobile station on the way to a short shopping trip). Uniques have to be accepted as is.

I only operate CW contests because of my hearing, but now CW transmissions by some stations are terrible with 'multiple' calls given by bad sending... I think there should be some kind of thought put into 'quality' and no penalties for the receiving station ... somehow put a routine in the score checking for the number of times a particular station is miscopied and at a certain threshold, drop all the penalties???

YES, if we put in the rules, that "Unique" station has to be in at least two logs.

A station with a unique callsign can also take part in the contest. A contest station can maybe lose multiplayer points with the unique callsign.

Check to see if unique calls are valid calls even if worked by one station.

I think there should be some penalty but 3x is probably too high. Maybe it should be 2X.

I would distinguish between call sign error and not in Log - the last is worse.

There really are unique callsigns.

I would support increasing penalty points, only if, single operator all band category is opened to spotting assistance and skimmer technology. Potentially, an increased point penalty may provide enough listening incentive instead of copy then enter into log.

I'm not privy to the statistical significance of unique call signs however the likelihood of one station logging only one station maybe valid without reliability there isn't validity.

Out here in the West we usually work some JA that's unique. I hear what the question says, but would not like losing a good Q.

Make them the minimum to preserve incentives not to guess because they do have bad side effects.

Easier for you to implement, I would expect the number of valid uniques to be vanishingly small. Encourages 'dedicated cheerleaders' to work others, which is a good thing.

There are new special calls used during contests that show up as Unique.

This is a difficult area. I have experienced when I have been working a station and yet another station very close gives a rpt and serial number, etc. Knowing that you worked someone else and then when you try to work that station you get a Wrkd B4 response. I am not sure of the work around except that you always include the call sign of the station you are working in your report.

Based on this one should not receive a penalty if a call does not show up in your log as that station may have either worked you while you were working another station or copied the call incorrectly when they worked you.

seem fair for stn's trying to win a contest.

seems a bit harsh for stn's with 100 QSOs or less.

does not allow for stns not in contest making only one contact for a new state or DXCC.

If a DX station decides to turn on his radio and work me and a few other ops who decide not to turn in their logs why should I be penalized?

There are stations that only get on to help a station in their club. Or friends. I have heard them. Perhaps to be a valid counter, all players must make a minimum number of contacts, with allowances for a couple errors and still be a counter.

Unfortunately there are 'friends' that only work their friends and therefore show up as unique. It shouldn't penalize the receiving station who (hopefully) doesn't have any control as to who calls in.

Only those with more that 5% error will be penalized...5% is the tolerance and more than 5% is not acceptable and considered ignorance

There are times I do fat finger a call...sometimes I just copy wrong due to QRM/QRN etc. I get pissed at myself either way. Keep things as they are.
If the receiving station miss logs your call, it's not always because they did not get it. They confirm correctly, but log wrong on their end, then it should be there penalty, not mine.
I think there should be some balance made by considering the percentage of errors in the log and allowing a certain percentage without penalties. Also, I am sure that some probabilistic/statistical algorithm could be developed to cross check logs with similar callsigns to the erroneous log entry to see if there is a potential match and determine a statistical level of confidence that the errors were random (and therefore no attempt at cheating). Ultimately, one could ask the contestant to produce QSLs, but that could take a long time...
Sometimes a unique is a real unique. With today's software log checking, most busts can be tracked so if it can't be tracked to a busted call, the odds are that it's a genuine QSO. As long as the number of uniques in a log is very low of course. Maybe there should be a limit on the number of uniques?
If you get a call incorrect, I think you should just remove that contact and lose those points say 3 points, and not 3x3 or 9 points. Same goes with unique call signs, just remove them and take away the normal contact point amount, or 3 points in this case.
Penalty welcome if rules same for any participants, this is way to trust and love radio...
I have worked uniques in various contests and I *know* that they were not all busted calls.
Being at EA8 I get MANY calls that is unique and that I know won't appear in another log. If you suspect an error in reception the penalty should of course apply.
The style of operation would certainly be different if there would be no penalty, especially when running QRP and try to get another final confirmation.
I think that just removing the points for that QSO should be removed...
How many unique call signs must be reported before they are accepted?
I have been a unique call sign during some contests! Only 1 QSO in that contest because of interest for awards.
The checking works fine today. Uniques are real QSOs.
Looking over my checked logs I seen a unique that was a typo that should have been removed
I like the current system
Part of contesting is getting the DX call sign correct the first time. If you make a mistake, then you are not in the log and suffer the -3 points.
Before the final result, give a possibilities to the stations to prove (e. g. with a clear own AF recording) that the penalized contact is not the station's error, especially if multiplier should be lost.
If there is an error then delete the QSO this should be enough. Deleting uniques is no option!!!
Eliminating unique calls without penalty might: (a) ensure that all stations making contacts are actual contest participants; (b) give all participants a fair shot at contacting a particular stations, even those that are just making casual QSOs; (c) discourage or even eliminate schedules and other private arrangements.
There should be no penalty for stations that miss copy my call
as there are really uniques in the contest, also if only a few, they should not be wiped out
Honest mistakes happen. There should be no penalty other than removing QSO from scoring.

It is great fun having casual operators call in. Many are looking for states or counties and wind up becoming testers.
I may be naive in my understanding of penalties but would just delete wrong or unique & recalculate score. I find most penalty is others copying VE for my VA
If the other station copies my call wrong but has a close entry instead, e.g. K2HX rather than K2SX, that is not my fault and I should not be penalized for it. If there is no entry, then penalty should apply.
It's about communication 1st - including being able to copy.
Tough break if your friend pops up on channel and says 'HI'. Especially if he's in Tanzania. Otherwise, it's not a large 'hit'.
The unique calls are a potential problem. These unique calls station should be present the logs but it's impossible.
In today's contests most call sign errors are typing errors. This will increase due to the aging contest population.
Sometimes I participate only for a few QSOs on some contests (with a complicate call for a contest). So I would like to let the chance to someone who worked me
A penalty for a miss-interpreted callsign is a bit too hard. The lost Points should be enough for all.
Some operators should send slower so you wouldn't have to guess calls. i.e. 5:H;B;D's
Should only lose contact points for incorrect call and exchange, not penalty points. I believe mostly errors rather than cheating. We are a radio club with newbies. Causes problems as some want to exclude newbies because of errors.
What you really need to penalize is operators who only give call sign when asked (usually about 1/10 minutes).
My experience is that a significant number of Uniques are in fact legitimate contacts and should be included.
No penalties please; just remove it as invalid and no just no QSO point.
If an error is found, the penalty should be just for that QSO and not multiple points deducted in addition to each error.
I think there should be no points awarded to anybody for unverified QSOs. The station should submit either the contest log or LoTW to count. CQ can work with ARRL and get LoTW records as a 'last resort' verification.
The call should be removed with no penalty. It's not the operators fault he made contact with a un-valid, a pirate or dis-honest station and have points deducted. This is an important issue with me.
There are a number of unique calls that appear in logs that are just that, uniques. Unless it is obvious that the unique is a busted call, they should be allowed to remain in the log and be counted with no penalty.
There is a problem for the case where two stations exchanged their numbers but one of them removed the QSO from the log perhaps due to uncertainty. The other station would have a penalty that the station logged its counter part's call sign by mistake.
There may be many folks who get on the air and make contacts during the contest who do not submit a log.
Copying errors is one point, but some local club members /friends give points from time to time to just for one station even though they're encouraged to run at least some few QSOs more....
All invalid QSOs should be removed with no penalty.
The log checking program source code should be publicly available.
Not all unique calls are errors, particularly for the big guns working the QRPp stations.

I sometimes get a call from a friend who is not in the contest but ask him for a report anyway and log him. I sometimes call CQ CONTEST on 10 or 15 mtrs near the end of the contest when I do not hear any new stations during my S&P. Many low power JA stations answer me. I am sure most do not send in a log so if I log them (as I should) I would lose 3 QSOs. Not fair.

a 'unique' call that only appears once is probably made up to help with points. Anyone with a 'unique' call in the log that does not appear anywhere else should get some penalty.

Call sign errors: A one point penalty would be fine. Unique calls: Not all unique calls are errors. Many are stations making their first HF contact or first contest contact.

Its more fun to me.. If I make an typo error in a contest at 3AM...well

In the past, I have gotten on and worked only one station for one reason or another. Unless the unique call can ABSOLUTELY BE PROVEN TO BE FALSE (not by a preponderance of the evidence but beyond a shadow of a doubt), it should not be removed.

Not unless there is a high percentage of unique calls

This is possible that someone just did one station and left the contest.

Its about right from my point of view

I suppose, it is quite enough to remove bad QSO. No penalties are needed.

Really unique should be removed, but if this stn. worked more than 3-4 QSO, should be counted as regular contact.

rtty especially is an inexact science. You are lucky if you see the same callsign more than twice in a typical exchange. to be penalized for errors caused by conditions and the medium is not really fair. I expect someone to correct my miscopy when I echo it to them a couple of times in the exchange, but not all do..

Some stations only work a few q's, especially new testers. Legitimate uniques.

With a log of 1,000+ QSOs, knocking 3~4% off the total for 2 or 3 errors (I feel) is excessive. Those who operate sloppy, will not achieve error rates of 1 or 2 percent in the first place. My goal is for an error rate of 1% or less and I achieve that often, no matter which contest I am entering.

Regarding uniques... I have 'talked people into' giving me a contact. It's part of the fun when things are slow.

Years ago, 'running' stations made little effort to actually get their callers' callsigns correct because there wasn't much downside to having an incorrect callsign. The 3x penalty addresses that problem well.

A station that is 'unique' really isn't in the contest. Most of the time it's a busted call that just can't be found by log checking. And when a station truly is unique, it's usually somebody trotting out a spouse's callsign or a club callsign to give extra points only to a friend and not to others. That doesn't add anything to the contest. Yes, occasionally there will be a true unique where a station only contacted one other station, but to me that situation is so rare that its occurrence fails to outweigh the advantages of eliminating uniques (with no penalty).

Sometimes you can only log what you hear, whether it be right or wrong, other time WE ALL make typing mistakes

Maybe a friend or so want to give points to a station! Perhaps these stations should send their log....

We find that we get most of our uniques on Sunday afternoon when some casual operator hears his first VE5. We think we would be unfairly penalized if these were removed.

Too high penalty for call sign error! I think that 'not in log' should have higher penalty then 'sign call error'

removal of a unique call sign would be acceptable if you can prove this is a non-existent call sign

Not in the log may often be unfair since it is the other station that didn't copy or type correctly.

If they are usually copying errors, it should be possible for the checking software to determine the correct call. Existing records will become even more difficult to reach if the unique QSOs philosophy were changed and the uniques are allowed to remain in the record scores.

there is no sense of penalty !

cross check is 100% - unique call sign is a call sign, if there is a log from this unique call - there is a cross check. If there is no log - no points. But also no penalty ...

Penalties are an artifact from manual log checking. There is no reason to have a penalty with computer log checking.

Given that the rest of a CQ WW exchange is guessable, there has to be some motivation to get the callsign correct. Some stations are more interested in run rate than accuracy.

At the end of the contests I seem to run out of new stations to work using S&P. At the ending hour of the contests I am usually on 10 or 15 mtrs and having already worked everyone I hear I might call CQ CONTEST. Sometimes a friend may answer me who is not in the contest just to say hello and I log him. Sometimes weak JA stations who I doubt are in the contest may call and I log them. It is not fair to have these QSOs removed.

either way - I believe there are many operators which work just for fun. So both options are ok. How you make sure 'unique' call is 'error copy' ? This is very difficult...

Guys looking for a particular country will work one QSO with that country and quit. Rare ones would get penalized more than common entities.

They make too much profit of it

I think the penalty is a result from thinking about errors not found in the past, nowadays however over 98% of the contacts are verified so this kind of errors should just be corrected and the score discarded but no further punishment be given. I for one have remarked compatriots not entering the QSOs, resulting in deductions which are really not justified.

I agree most uniques are errors, but some are legit.

For one error it's too much but if the OM do the same kind of error plus time need e serious penalty, also more single op don't declare to use dx cluster..... one category erase the problem from the start

In the heat of logging as many contacts as possible within the 48-hour period, there are bound to be a few errors. The ARRL robot makes a quick check and advises of possible errors, which gives the operator the opportunity to make simple corrections.

As a YL I usually have more uniques than others.

I am usually operating from OH0 that is wanted by casual operators who gives you exchange and not operate anymore. This happens to me not only during CQWW contest.

As an HS DX station, I have many one-QSO calls from people looking for new ones, and will not enter the contest in any way. This gives me many uniques which are mostly 'unique' to the DX op situation

2X QSO point error I believe is sufficient penalty for call sign error or not in log. For some operators, too much a reduction in their submitted score discourages them from seriously participating.

Cross check against 'known active license' database. If it's on there, keep it, if not remove.

Not in Log errors most often seem to be the result of situations completely beyond the control of one of the penalized operator, such as logging program faults, power failures, computer problems, or simple typos by the 'other' operator. These unconfirmed QSOs should be removed, but not penalized additionally.

The penalty was instituted during the time of paper logging, to discourage 'creative logging,' especially used to work multipliers. Removing the multiplier credit for such 'faked' QSOs is sufficient penalty these days, when such invalid QSOs are easily recognized by log checking software. Perhaps a 2x penalty is a reasonable compromise.

Removing unique calls give an unfair disadvantage to stations with great antennas and ears. I receive many thank you from stations who work me as there first PA with 5 watt and antenna at the attic.

An error is an error.

I really believe that there are some stations that may only work one contest station.. or others that don't submit a log..? it would mean that any station giving You a 001 number may cost You 3 QSO Points.??? Unfavorable conditions can make contacts on certain bands virtually impossible... but what if one gets thru??

Just remove the bad Q, no additional penalty needed

With electronic log checking there is no real need for a penalty, the offending QSO is easily removed. Uniques - DQ the person if it is abused.

Many club members want to support their member in the contest even if they aren't contesters themselves so they may make only the one contact. However, how could you tell if the contester did or didn't make up the QSO? So there should be at least 2 contacts made by a station for it to be counted.

Errors must be penalized in some way, and I agree.

Limit uniques to those reported by only one station.

Cluster use leads to this problem big time. Maybe penalize assisted ops since they obviously never copied the call.

Unique callsigns do happen.... I've been one myself a few times, and I've never sent in a log for 1 QSO.

Some of my friends work me and no other station, it should count. Sometimes the call sign error is bt the sending station. I have heard B and D used interchanged. Is cheating a real problem?

Leave the rules alone!

Penalty is appropriate both to encourage good operating and to compensate for QSOs which cannot be checked (no corresponding logs) and which may themselves contain errors.

Not being privy to how good log-checking software is, it's hard to comment on uniques. But occasionally I've gotten on only very briefly for some contests and only made one QSO.

Remove all unique call signs. Did you come up with any statistics that showed how often these unique call signs were multipliers?

It is Possible to have legit unique calls. Someone might just want that particular station, Country, location, iota, etc. and not be in the contest. I have worked DX stations that came on the band and disappeared just as quickly.

With SDR's violators of rules should be easier to find.

I think that the penalty should be 1x QSO points for error. The unique call is a tough question as I have made Q's with folks that will only work me just to give me points but if ALL unique calls from all logs are removed then good idea.

It's possible that the unique call sign made the contact because they needed You for their own award or DXCC.

A unique call sign should be removed from the score, but no need of penalty.
I don't like the penalty. I would prefer if the contact that was bad was just removed.
Keep the penalties as they are.
I have only sent in one log and it was for CQWW. I received back a report from the contest which showed how well and not-so-well I did. I really enjoyed that report; it let me know where my really weak points are. The penalties are OK.
Single contacts by people not really participating in contest can happen. Friends, acquaintances, just a request by the contest operator, etc. Why penalize someone for it?
Don't hurt stations that work folks that don't submit logs (unique calls). And please don't penalize (3x QSO points) us part-time operators that may only have a total of 200 QSOs, (50 per band worked). Knocking off 3x QSO points hurts a small per-band score badly. Maybe a percentage of some sort.
Leave the unique call in the log but count as no points, in the rare event the contact can be proven later by confirmation QSL.
A penalty for 'a call sign error' and a penalty for 'a Not in Log' should be separated, i.e.) A penalty of 3x QSO points for a call sign error A penalty of 1x QSO point or a Not in Log.
Why penalize the entrant? The loss of score from errors or NILS should be penalty enough. To penalize someone for a NIL is not good sportsmanship if the other station (especially another W) just does not put you in the log for slowing down his run.
I respect the rules but as a part of this hobby let us be soft and remember that it is a hobby .
Not all unique calls are copying errors. In our log Uniqs = 0.06% QSOs, not enough to be a cheating factor.
Sometimes people give you a report but do not submit their log to the organizer, but in my point of view it is a normal QSO, so these points have to stay.
Uniques are not always errors. There are literally hundreds of stations out there that never enter contests - that do occasionally play in contests for their own reasons. Errors are picked up by the software, but leave uniques alone. I too, hear friends at times (while operating another M/M) and call them with my own call to give them a point and say hello. Remove me? Hell, NO!
Seems right to be quite tough in a contest where the report is just the zone (i.e. does not require an accurate serial number)
It could be a callsign with several errors, so it looks like a Unique (no penalty) I don't agree
Have some Contacts with Friends - they had given me Points, but they are not active in the Contest.
When we operated V3M I had someone call me because we are friends that never works contest. He worked us and no one else. How can you figure out if it is a bogus call or a situation like the one just described?
My view is biased. As i am blind I probably make more mistakes than sighted operators. Also a lot of stations do not acknowledge your report so you are unable to correct callsign and report errors. They are in too much of a rush.
Unique call signs should be checked for previous event or on-air history.. [[not just this event]] case eg VK9XD where most QSOs were unique looking for a new country (and not the contest)..
Define a max. eg. max 1% of the total QSOs may be unique calls.

Penalties are a hangover from ancient practices...time to emphasize the positives. Look at it as a learning experience rather than a penalty.

Even though as you state that most unique calls are copying errors. I see no reason to penalize those stations that may have worked a unique call. It may have been a QSO with someone who is not in the contest and worked the one station because it was a country the operator needed for an awarded or some other reason such as a radio check.

In a large database, more than half of the calls can be uniques. However, the number of uniques in a single log is limited, up to 1 % or so.

The current advanced log checking algorithms can very often identify the 'correct' call for a unique, which then becomes a 'busted' call. The remaining uniques, for which there are no 'possible calls' can then be searched for in available national databases, such as that of FCC.

When a log has an unusually high number of unique calls that are 'good', the Committee can send an Email or letter to these stations to verify/refute the QSO.

To summarize: THERE NO NEED TO REMOVE ALL UNIQUES:

Call sign errors should have a penalty of 2 QSOs because is clearly an error. Not in log must be just removed. In my personal operation usually not in log are mistakes or errors of the other station. Unique calls in my case are few and usually are from DX stations that need CX in the band/mode of operation.

Sometimes one op comes on just to work a friend. Genuine unique QSOs do occur.

The problem with unique calls is that the judges never know which is a legitimate one-QSO-only station and which is not. Also, unique calls can be a source of cheating, so 'yes.'

No one likes to lose points, just like no one likes to get a traffic ticket - both are necessary to enforce the rules of the game.

Sometimes a unique call can arise from a casual operator only wkg 1 or several stations.

There are receiving errors and there are sending errors. There are also bad quality signals that are difficult to copy.

How about give forgiveness to first few errors, no penalty.

I have worked one station and not submitted a log before why should he be penalized for my casual operating.

I have worked stations with bizarre, unique call signs, especially for special event stations. I question if they are counted without penalty.

no way for me to tell if a guy works me only and no one else in the contest, no penalties here please

I suppose someone has to make a judgment as to how many they are and whether someone is deliberately trying to stuff his/her log. I have a friend who did genuinely find his own window in conditions and worked some unique calls from his location. As he was the only UK station to work these, they were discounted, that wasn't right.

the other guy makes a mistake, for whatever reason, and removes me from his log, I get dinged for a NIL and costs me 3x ?!?!?!?

'Unique call' may need exception for some DX, since casual ops use the contest only to increase award totals. Check QRZ.com to see if the unique call is valid, at least.

I'm not sure about the 3 point penalty. I assume it was set at that level after careful deliberation and I'm not inclined to suggest it be changed without be party to reasons it was set at that level initially. Off hand, I might have suggested 2 points, but that's what I consider a relatively uninformed opinion.

Bad calls from busted spots in multiple logs should be penalized more since the operator using the spot did not validate the call. However some stations never seem to identify often enough!

You have SDR recording to verify. So if they are real QSOs they are ok otherwise they become penalties.

I think that penalties are ok, just check carefully station with too high number of uniques

I would prefer 2X QSO points for a penalty because often the DX station sends so fast and only gives his call sign rarely that I can end up with a penalty due to his sloppy operating procedures to save a fraction of a second or so. Yes, yes, I know that I blew the call sign with my sloppy code copying and I should have patience to get the DX station's call sign correctly, but one loses patience after waiting 10 QSOs to hear the call sign one more time at 45-50 wpm. - However, I think the penalties must be about right as I have noticed that the DX operators are starting to verify they have the call sign correct before logging a QSO. So, the 3X may be about right since it is an 'attention getter' for the DX multis.

Penalizing uniques would hurt Multi-Multi and loud SOSB entries because they work more uniques.

Score penalties seem fair as is.

There are some contests I do not have time to operate much, and I have made only one QSO with a station I needed for DXCC on 80 meters. Do not penalize them for my low activity level.

Being a YL I seem to snag a lot of uniques.

If you believe they are copying mistakes, is there not a way to tie the mistake with the proper call.
Logs with unusually high numbers of uniques must be audited. We all work friends that may or may not work other stations in the contest. I might get behind removal of all unique calls if they are done across the board and there is sufficient proof that they did not work a station that has been active spotted etc lately.

Absolutely not. Some of them are real QSOs and just like our judicial system, you are innocent until proven guilty

Occasionally I have given a contact to just one station in a contest due to time constraints. This would be a genuine QSO but would be reported as a unique station.

What you are doing now for uniques seems about right.

I had several times where I have had assistant operators, especially when I'm trying to train the assistant how to DX. The inexperienced assistant tends to make many mistakes, yet I'm the one who is penalized in the scoring.

I consider the actual operating way as right and correct.

The use of 3x surely has a long history (I don't know the details), and the reasons for it may not be as valid today. Still, any change that affects comparability of scores over time should be considered very carefully. The Committee could review samples of past logs in various categories and calculate the impact of changing 3x to some other formula or of removing uniques from logs. (I don't recall when I last had a unique in my log, but I tend to do more search and pounce than running.)

Sometimes it's unique b/c the other person might have copied it down wrong.

I think it's enough if the wrong QSO count no points.

Uniques do happen when one speaks with a friend or acquaintance on the air during a contest.

The penalty is harsh on 'non-assisted' category as stations using the Internet can check callsigns.

The current penalty is tough, tough enough to make me emphasize on it and spend additional efforts to secure my logging is correct, - which is good.

Not quite sure if it is correct to remove unique calls, - with our special prefix I think we really work a few uniques in all contests.

Why penalties? With electronic log-checking penalties are no longer necessary.
The extreme example of NIL penalty is Russian DX. Score reductions of 30-40% versus Claimed Scores are commonplace. Kind of ridiculous.
3x penalty is tough, but if that's the rule... Always get uniques on 40m here. Someone will always try to give me '59001 but I'm not in the contest'.
Need to do a different chk on unique calls. That can and does happen, not often but should not be indiscriminately tossed.
I feel that the 3x QSO point penalty is excessive. I think 2x would still provide an adequate deterrent for logging errors while still assuring fairness to all competitors.
Here in EWA it is common practice for a station to work only 1, 2, or 3 others in a contest.
That will remove longer and personal QSO's with Stations not participants in the Contest, ergo loss of Multi. Very often this Station could be verified via Cluster-Logs.
Sometimes another station may only work one contest station so leave them in!
I do a lot of tuning and usually get one-two-ten stations to actually give me a viable report for the contest.
We work uniques and solicit contacts from non-contest stations during slow periods. We need to be welcoming and take the time to explain the exchange and contest to potential and curious hams who call us. Nothing that makes us less 'friendly' and accommodating, including having to worry if that casual guy that called will even count, should be considered. Finding that ONE multiplier who isn't in the contest or serious is part of the fun.
If you are a rare station you sometimes are called by other rare stations that only call you for a new one
Should be a penalty for wrong copied call.
I've worked only one station that I wanted to give points to without working any others and spotted it. I've worked only one station to test my equipment or add another country-band. Someone could work only one station to give it a bad Q. How many times is a 6Y5X spotted as a BY5X?
If you are a rare call you sometimes are called by other rare stations that only want you for a new DXCC and they maybe only make one QSO in a contest weekend.
I think they should be kept in the log and points should be given for them, unless it can be shown that the call could not have operated in the contest (the licensee does not have adequate privileges, has never operated HF, etc.)
If you are rare and good at drawing in casual ops during a run, there will be some uniques. It's a shame to just remove them.
Rather unfair to remove a QSO with a unique call-sign if it is actually genuine.
Penalty x3 should be when a call sign has error. When not in log should zero - Why? If you worked station (in my log fe J34K on 80m) who had called you on your run QRG but he logged my 400hz neighbor why should I penalty?
No i the second Q is very wrong for rare DX station who has always pileup- with only one station during all contest and not sending their log
If uniques are not removed what prevent dishonest ops from making up QSOs??
Uniques happen. Sometimes I am a unique to somebody else. Too much doubt for it to be removed from a score, IMHO, although I know the statistics say different.

3x penalty for Call Sign Error. 0 or 1x penalty for NIL
I think penalty of 3x goes back to paper logs. Errors will now be caught so drop the penalty to 2X.
A few years ago, you guys nicked me for logging Malawi - For your information, I ran across a missionary guy trying to make contact with someone supporting his operation - I could hear both guys, so I stopped contesting & relayed info back and forth until they were done. In exchange, the guy gave me a QSO & exchange - It took me over a half hour to work that multiplier, but of course, no good deed goes unpunished.
Whatever the penalty, everyone is equally affected so I don't think it really matters much.
Penalties seem to be excessive compared to the actual errors. 1% becomes 3% automatically. I have some hearing issues and sometimes my typing fails me. I don't go back and recheck the entire log...it goes out as it came in!
For a call sign error it is possible to give 50 % from an all-round price for QSO. But to set off QSO if it as mult-QSO.
I have to admit that I've made only a couple of contacts before, to work an entity or zone I needed, a failed to submit a log. The other guy should be penalized by my laziness.
Sounds like a reasonable compromise between a possibly undeserved penalty and a legitimate one-of-a-kind QSO.
Valid calls should remain. I sometimes cherry pick a few contacts in a few contests. May not submit a log.
I think the loss of the QSO is sufficient, along with the loss of the 'new' multiplier, should there be any. I would penalize those using web assistance more for 'copying' errors.
It is difficult for one to change the 3X penalty and have the 'records' mean same. Pulling uniques seems worthwhile but no penalty _ except those guys you can tell are padding
People should remove dupes/errors themselves wherever possible.
Not sure why someone has to be punished for making a mistake by 3X points. Simply delete the contact so it doesn't count. The stations would be better off ignoring a QSO if they are not sure of the call! But we want people to work DX, so just delete the bad QSOs.
Three x QSO points penalty is excessive. As regards unique call signs, I have occasionally worked such a station and made no mistake in copying the call. But I agree in overall terms it is probably fair to remove all with no penalty.
When i make a QSO i put it in my log, not in the log of the other operator, and i need something of it.
In my opinion, some uniques are hams that just stop by to give a contact, or see you spotted and need your county or state. Some uniques are copying errors. It would be hard to single out copying errors from those hams who are not interested in the contest so they probably all need to be removed without penalty. Although if the frequency is near 14.230 +/- (and some other OWNED and private frequencies) the uniques are ops throwing out fake calls to disrupt the contest log.
Some time it happens that a friend want to give somebody a point or a DXer need only this DXCC. A QSO what happens should count.
Only station that miscopied the call should have penalty. The QSO for the partner should be valid.
I think the scoring penalties are quite good as they are. For myself, there is only me to blame if I copy a call (or manage to type it down) wrong... I usually believe the latter + being tired is one of the reasons for me having wrong calls. I still rather see a penalty than no penalty for these kinds of errors.

As ever a station with good setup close to usa may work more us/ve if he's in exotic DXCC, the same in Asia with JAs! So if this station have unique call, that isn't a problem?
many operators do not send statements, but why suffer the others who have done so much work
Rules in a contest for me are something to accept other than changing them.. as long as I am not the one to write them. These penalties make me think twice to go on without being sure of the callsign in qrm/n or just relying on cluster spots.
Be human, we are not robots!
I support the current method of removing 'not in log', but can a 'not in log' on the other station not be a 'mis copied' one in the other stations log?
1 call sign error = 1xQSO points penalty.
Recording shows that many callsigns are right, especially NA calls.
I feel strongly that unique calls should NOT be removed from the log. I know that in the past I have worked unique stations and logged them correctly. Just because they decide to work me and me alone is not ever an acceptable reason for removing them from my log.
not in log; is not easy to know which station is the responsible of the error.
Remember the DF0HQ affair in IARU HF . Many uniques in DF0HQ log were simply a huge lot of fraudulent contacts of log-padding
How do you know the unique call is error? I know there are some friends who work some stations in a contest for trying DX but they do not submit their logs, especially QRP stations.
If one station had the call correct and the other wrong, the station with the incorrect call should lose the point and grant the point to the one who got it correct.
As long as penalties are consistent, they can be whatever. You already find copy errors, so unique's aren't really unique. If you are going to penalize for copy errors, then uniques shouldn't be treated any differently.
If the call is truly unique, it should be counted for a QSO point. A point is a point! If a copying or typing error occurs, it will be removed anyway.
Maybe this already happens, but I would like a 'spell check' algorithm to analyze uniques. If another (similar) call can be identified, then there should be a penalty (assume they got the call wrong). If the callsign exists (super check partial?) there should be not be a penalty. But I know that I have worked ONE station in a contest and not anyone else in the contest. Should the station I called be penalized for this? NO. And again, publish the rules as to how the determinations are made.
Those of us with Low Power and QRP stations can be difficult to copy. This can persuade the large stations to ignore us (since they may get a penalty for a broken exchange). Perhaps they should not get penalized (or penalized less) for incorrect exchange info with Low Power and QRP stations.
Usually in the competition call transmitted PC. No some hams in this case are wrong at the reception. This is no wine transmits, this wine was adopted (poor knowledge of Code Morse)
Uniques are a tough one, but don't think the need to be removed.
I am cw only and the older you get the more likely you are prone to errors!!
There are many times a unique call is not an error, so why remove it and why penalize someone for it. A busted call and removing 3 QSOs is extremely high in my opinion. I would suggest removing the busted call QSO and penalizing one additional QSO.

3X is very punitive, though the same for everyone. 2X feels better. I have been looking into UBNs in depth to improve our operating at NK7U. The NIL log checking logic needs to be improved. From my examination of all logs 2/3 of NILs we got penalized for were likely logging errors by the other operator (I would be glad to share my study) -- NILs are 'Guilty until proven innocent' which is not right. Same comment on Checklogs -- and it is even worse because I can't see their log and since they did not submit for a score who is to say they logged with accuracy rigor? Busted call identification feels good -- the data is clear and irrefutable unless the other op sent their call wrong. Uniques are 'Innocent until proven guilty' but is probably too lenient. So my comment above.

It's ridiculous to penalize an operator if his counterpart cannot copy his call properly. Remove from log - OK. Penalty - no.

How do you distinguish between a busted call and a legit call? There is NO WAY one should be penalized for working uniques.

Some QSOs with unique call signs are perfectly correct, and often represent superior resourcefulness. The problem lies in unusually high numbers of uniques. The sponsor should use judgment about the rate of uniques to consider imposition of penalties, and perhaps delete unique QSOs that exceed a reasonable rate. Also, the rules should state openly that, if true, errors in Zone logging will not be penalized.

I think it should be a percentage level to be considered. I think 0.5% of uniques are normal. If more uniques are found, then remove those in excess of 0.5%.

Does not make any difference how you penalize, people will be still making mistakes. Some more, some less, the only difference it will make will be the competitive stations with close scores and they should be trying to be accurate. If penalty points makes you lose the game, then try do better next time, me thinks

A call sign error will be a penalty itself because that QSO will be invalid. No matter how many of these are in the log. That's enough. It's not fair that 3 good QSOs get invalid for each error.

Unique callsigns will very probably be a copying error but there's always a possibility of the contrary. Should these unique callsign be too many and these stations don't send the log, I would give this operator the highest penalty. Disqualification

Removing Uniques without penalty will make it less attractive to add fake connections. I would recommend removing Uniques in case of failing checklog

An error in a logged call sign should result in the deletion of that QSO only. A unique call sign should be allowed unless it can be proven erroneous.

There should be no penalty as the station is already being penalized by getting ZERO points for that QSO.

I agree that uniques should be LOW. However, especially for, a rare DX station running lots of stations they are going to have uniques by those stations coming out just to work them. I of course will never have that problem with my logs !! (who is going to make an effort to work another W6 from LAX)

Penalties are fine, and I've been hit! ;-) But there should be standards for correct copying of calls.

The contact could have been with a station that stumbled in to the contest and made no more contacts. I've done that before I started seriously operating contests.

Identifying cheaters is important in order to maintain the integrity of the contest. More effort should be spent in identifying and DQing/suspending cheaters.

A sort after entity may get callers who make only 1 call during a contest because they need that entity/band-filler/mode-filler. Therefore the unique calls should not be to the detriment of the contest.

There are award chasers that just make one QSO just to get the needed DXCC and do not bother to submit log

removing unique calls due to errors makes sense, but some non-contesting DXers might chase one station during the contest or a casual operator only succeed in making 1 QSO.

As an AK station I frequently work 'unique' stations who only work me because they need AK for their WAS award. I know many of these are not typos, because I get their QSL cards in the mail shortly after the contest. I feel it unfair to penalize me because I worked a station that is 'unique'. Should I start asking if they intend to work someone else in the contest too before working them so I don't lose both the time and the points?

A double point reduction is probably enough for callsign errors.

We are a remote country from the more active parts of the world and we always work a number from our continent quite often uniques.

Uniques are tough - I was operating a rare callsign ZC4BS and had several uniques that were not contesting but wanting to work me for the new country. I was penalized quite heavily - but I accepted that as I understood the system.

NIL penalty is too severe since operating conditions/congestion can be extreme on mult. frequencies (and they mustn't split). I think a smaller penalty would make sense.

Removing all uniques would be ok with me since everyone has some of them - luck, personal mates etc - and any cheating that exists inside this envelope can be cut dramatically if they don't count.

Adjudication of uniques can be cleverer than that: if GOABB is a unique and GOABE is active, that's almost certainly a bust. If there are no similar callsigns to GOABB, it's likely it's not a bust. Calculate distance from other active callsigns and set some boundary?

Depend of number of unique QSO...

ABSOLUTELY NOT! I have locals call me to provide a contact, and may not work others. Some hear me, look me up, and call b/c I am local to them. One was newly licensed. If they are valid calls, [check QRZ!] they should count full credit.

If your competition takes your QSO out of his log, you lose 3 QSO points, and he loses 1 QSO points!

Treat them as busted QSOs if the unique call has not been reported by a set number of other stations.

If I work single band 3.7 MHz at day time I have possibility to work many local stations in Eastern Europe...at night time this stations go to sleep.

I always felt it is unfair for me to be penalized because the other station didn't copy my call correctly.

Only if the error % of unique calls is very high, like over 80%. If you change the editing rule, make sure it's widely known before the next contest.

Penalties are fine, if you don't log the station right then you have no valid contact. Contest QSOs are already just shadows of what we normally define a 'QSO' to be, so accepting errors seems over the edge to me.

I've made only a few QSOs in some contests, don't assume those unique QSOs are errors.

The only problem would be a rare DX station that may have lots of uniques from stations not in the contest working them and no one else.

Zero points for error or not in log would be ok

I think there should be penalties. If you make an error you have to pay ...that is the only way you can keep a level playing field. My idea of the contest is to improve operator skills and accuracy is one of the skills that is very important.

Clearing just the wrong QSO would be enough. With this approach there is no chance of cheating. If somebody puts lots of bad calls, these recognized and are simply deleted.

Unique calls: would limit number of acknowledged in terms of % of all QSOs. Baseline would be some average % of all logs.

The penalty should be that the QSO is deleted from the log.
I know I have entered a contest just to put my call in for 3-4 minutes so someone will get credit but I don't have time to participate (I'm a Dr & can't always be available). I worked them & they got a Q but if they are the only person submitting with my call, should they be docked?
during some contests time to time i give a call to only one guy (for new prefix, or the guy had a good operating and a low rate ...)
Hay que tener en cuenta, que mucha gente hace el contacto con una estación por que le interesa el prefijo o país en esa banda y luego no manda las listas (yo los llamo los piratas, hacen perder puntos). Gracias
How do you handle the exception of a submission from rare DX?
I guess committee has good statistics about this and impose penalty if excess NIL are found.
As I get older, I have trouble getting calls 100%. I feel like I'm considered a criminal when I'm penalized for making 'old codger' errors. Just my opinion..... worth twice what you paid for it.
as long as it's the same rules that apply to ALL participants it's fair and OK
Seemingly deliberate dupes by serious contesters have been increasing. It may be because the key-in errors on the other side can only be found by calling him again.
Sometimes stations only make 1 or 2 QSOs in order to get a new country/state, whatever they are looking for. Requiring everyone to enter the contest to get a point is unreasonable.
I don't have that much concern with the current penalty for call sign error. Some major contest ops are so quick to complete a contact that you are left wondering if they have received you call sign correctly before moving on.
Most unique calls may be copying errors, but not all. Further verification should be made before a unique is removed.
Most contests removed 'dupe' penalties so the unique calls should be treated the same way. Remove the 'only one station unique call' and you will 'level the playing field.
Many times I've just made one or two contacts during a contest for the fun. Should those not count? Why not? Perhaps counting them separately - but for those of us who are in it for the fun - seems too harsh.
Uniques are often caused by friends who try to do you a favour and by DX chasers not taking part in the contest serious
I feel that contesting is becoming dominated by those who have the money to 'buy success.' those of us who cannot afford \$10,000 antennas and full power stations will suffer by being weak signals with callsigns that will not be copied correctly. This will inevitably result in the decline of average hams participating in future contests, leaving contesting to be the sport of the wealthy.
I worry that removing uniques from the score would discourage casual dabbling in the contest, where people only make a few Q's. I don't know what percentage of station logs get submitted.
How can you prove your: 'Most unique calls are copying errors.' I have a lot of EU calls in contest that only check their equipment with such a call - should I say: NO QSO WITH YOU UNIQUE CALL SUSPECT HANDS UP! ? Thats is USA style.
If you are in a rare DXCC country you have a lot of uniques by DXer's not being involved in the contest. Other whilst some friends want to give you a point not being active in the contest.
The scoring penalties are fine. They motivated me to invest into copying more accurately, so they should not be relaxed. Increasing the penalties would be over the top though.

While occasionally the copying error comes from the transmitting station, most are rx and therefore the penalties are appropriate.
Yes, they might be copying errors, but sometimes not - I've worked a few new hams who were at the edges of the fray who didn't have a clue as to what a contest was, let alone what to exchange for that particular contest - they were scared off!
How would an operator know that he 'worked' a unique call to allow him to remove it from the log?
If i have logged really a station i will get the points! Some 'unique' stations are really QSO in Contest and no error.
the 3 points penalty is too hard while the actual log checking methods
As a tester on a small island i have a number callers calling only ME and nobody else. I would lose all those contacts including the QSOs with my very few partners on the island, who definitely only call me to provide a contact with my own country. Just leave it as it is.
Unique could be genuine !! Then would lose a dx contact and mult
Penalising only the copying station does not incentivise the transmitting station to ensure information is copied correctly. This should be considered.
I absolutely HATE the 3x penalty for busted call signs however it is an integral part of this contest!! It teaches some very important skills - especially for my new team members that simply click on spots and hope for the best - that's why I say keep it the way it is. The unique QSOs....on DX-peditions we get a lot of these and I did not think most were busted call signs.....
Also I worked uniques ... and lost the points. With many of my uniques I am sure I logged correctly because these were existing calls ... but lost the points. Uniques can be recognized during logging in most cases I would say. Serious testers work with a computer and use the call sign database. If I work a unique I ask again for the call to be sure I log correctly. If it is an existing call there should be no penalty.
Rare stations sometimes get several unique QSOs
As long as penalties are applied the same for every log, then I don't see a problem. CQ WW has a reputation for rigor which I think is good.
Scoring penalties for copying a call incorrectly are appropriate.
While I agree that a lot of times uniques are copying errors but several times they are good QSOs too. I've been dinged a few times in the past for what was good QSO but CQWW judging decided it wasn't good. Basically a ham friend in another country would find and work me in the contest then not work anyone else. He doesn't understand the unique callsign concept.
I always check my uniques. I get confirmations for most of the uniques. With a stronger signal the the other participants you will collect more uniques. Removing them will punish the people who spend energy and money in good equipment.
I operate a lot of SOSB 20 Meters and have a very large antenna with a great location. At the end of the day I can sit and work all the wet-string G's for hours after most have gone to the lower bands. I have a lot of uniques and 'almost' all are correct. I get quite a few 'Thanks for first USA.'
NILs are often the other station's fault. 3x is too heavy. Please make it 2x.
After so much effort it is easy for inexperienced operators and partially deaf ops (like me). To make mistakes. Penalties deter operating.
Penalties frequently 'hurt' the non-guilty party - most stations never give callsigns of stations they are working, so you often never 'really' know who you have worked.

Maybe a check of the validity of the callsign, qrz.com or other databases? Or a maximum number of 'unique calls'? We should trust each participant that the logged QSOs are actually made. The answer is not found in more checks and control measures.

If you don't copy the call correct points should be taken away! If a person has more than 4 calls wrong take more points away!!

Regarding 'busted calls,' I will leave this up to you folks. I have busted plenty of my own and have worked to improve. During a test, I work plenty of people who do not identify often enough, and sometimes people who won't acknowledge receipt in their quest for rate. Tough question!

Regarding unique calls, in Oregon/Pacific Northwest, there are often Ops who get on for just a QSO or 2 on a contest weekend. I report all of my contest QSOs-Others may not. This is especially true in VHF contests. I would oppose a rule to eliminate uniques if they are valid calls. Invalid calls (Un-issued)? Maybe.

Penalties for bad listening are very important! The effort to get the communication successful and without communication errors VIA THE RADIO LINK is the point that should be honored in the contest. Penalties do ensure the sportsmanlike operation techniques within the contest.

'Most unique calls are copying errors.' That is a broad, and perhaps incorrect, assumption.

The equal treatment unique removed punishes the work after a multiplier. I understand that some are luckier than the others. Almost a rule break is to ask a friend to give a point/mult.

I think for those stations that score in the top ten should have the call signs checked. Send a email if possible to station to see if they were on and made a contact.

In my very early contesting/dx'ing days I might only work one station for a new country. There are also friends who work only me to give me a point.

But penalty if there are significant high percentage of uniques in one log !

We all make mistakes so no problem

I like to go trolling for 'not in the contest folks' by setting up high in the band and slowing down to 22-24 wpm.

Log checking technology makes it possible to identify unique/NIL at no incremental cost so it would be better to simply delete the offending QSO.

Many times I have made only 1 QSO in a contest. Isn't the goal to work stations that others don't?

Many young people see in amateur contest the possibility of contacting a new one. If during the contest they work (with only one contact) a new country, with the cancellation their work will be wasted

It should be sufficient to remove score and multiplier credit to errors. To remove multiples of points for errors seems to be making contesting elitist. Question 2 appears to contradict Question 1.

Duplicate QSOs--the source of lots of penalty points in the paper era--are no longer an issue. The entry should lose the defective QSO and whatever points it's worth and have done with it.

Come on, you want to take a machete-approach to all the 'unique' callsigns in a log? How does anyone win, then? If it's a mistake, remove the QSO; if you can't prove that, then just maybe the winner worked one guy that no one else did--that should be taken away from him? No!

On SSB, it is very difficult to copy some foreign calls, plus with my lengthy call, many stations with a poor grasp of English struggle with it. The penalties are really hurting those whose command of English isn't that good or who have phonetically challenging calls.

Treat errors, NILs, and uniques the same.

If your rate is fast sometimes it is possible to make typo errors too. Not everyone is key board efficient. So I don't think it is always not copying the callsign correctly.

If it's a copying error that can typically be cross checked through unique +1 type checks. If there is nothing close then it truly may be a unique.

While rare, there are instances where valid uniques occur. Why be penalized because your non-contesting friend who happens to work or live in another country drops by to give you some points but has no interest in working anyone else?

There are many reasons a NIL can occur ... most of them legit ... but dunno how to treat this one.
Replace 3X with 2X

If there are more than 3 logs with the same call it shouldn't be unique

Strange as it may seem there are a few guys who will only make one contact for whatever reason.

Please, don't ever do like RDXC, who penalize a station even for the errors made only by the correspondent. That's silly!

A checklog is needed from the 1 station otherwise delete.

The penalty promotes operator diligence

Mis-copied call not as bad as N-I-L. Should have lesser penalty.

Many uniques are valid. Sponsors' log checking S/W works OK to find uniques that are actually busted calls

I think that each error should result in the loss of 3 points only.

Many folks drop by and give one QSO. I've done it myself. Unless the callsign is unassigned, or outside the 'license' frequencies, I would not remove any unique calls.

I feel 2x is more consistent. And as for unique call signs, current technology seems to be able to differentiate unique vs. broken calls. Possibly looking to track and study the number of uniques by participating stations, and consider a maximum threshold might be in order, but might prove invalid and not worth the time.

The penalty is a leveling technique for all operators. The goal is accuracy in the log. I would rather reduce my rate/hour for a more accurate log. If I am successful, then I don't lose QSOs.

As for unique calls, This takes away the motivation for a club member to get on the air and work one of their members that may be on a DX-pedition. The goal is to get people on the air.

Not getting the exchange correct, to be fixed later is not proper. Picking up a handful of Qs, on the 'local' rag chew net is just stretching the rules, and not proper either.

This is just wrong headed. I get on in lots of contests and work 1 or 2 stations in the weekend. If only 1 of those stations turns in a log, I count as a unique call and a legitimate QSO gets deleted penalized? If you want perfect scoring then just create a rule that only scores only QSOs between submitted logs. Scores would be smaller but you will have the 'perfectly scored contest' you are seeking.

Why do you really want to make the rules more and more complex just to catch the few cheaters? How will you ever catch the low power cheaters running 800w? Or QRP entrants running 50w? Set a few boundaries and let the fun begin. Just use some clever techniques to catch the blatant cheaters and make a BIG example by banning them in print for 5 or 10 years.

SDRs are cheap now. With big hard drives and fast PCs you can actually record entire RF band segments , play back the SDR's recording and actually 'tune around' within the playback band segment. How many volunteer monitoring stns worldwide would be needed to 'referee' a contest with this method? You might have a cadre of people who would enjoy running a referee station more than contesting! Issue them certificates too!

If unique means no log received from that station AND the call is in no other logs.

ABSOLUTELY NOT !!! There are casual operators and there are folks who may hear a fellow countryman or similar accent and make a contact. We need to encourage these casual contacts, not penalize them and make testers into even more unfriendly operators. I know of operations that had a large amount of actual QSLs for the supposed UBNs. There REALLY IS A PROBLEM if you are penalizing contestants for contacts that are verified by actual QSL cards.

call sign error or not in log is not always own fault. if the op on the other end forgets to log a QSO, it should not be punished by 3 x QSO points. just remove the QSOs and multis. It's just a hobby and no business.

2 x seems about right for NIL. Guessing needs to be discouraged.

While most Uniques are possibly busted, some are without a doubt legitimate. We have to recognize this and only penalize for clear busts.

Many of my unique callsigns are from stations working me for DXCC or IOTA or other awards, WAZ, etc

Listening to foreign hams with accents makes for easy error possibility. On CW in qrm it just happens.

Just remove the contact and its associated points/mult.

Not all unique calls are copying errors. if you cannot prove that call is incorrect, you cannot remove it from the score. Penalty should be given for willful violations and not for mistakes.

During the contest sometimes the call is copied wrong because QRM, etc. These contacts will no count and deleted with no penalty.

I have two friends who are non-testers (and that's putting it politely) who get on for a few minutes and work maybe 2 or 3 guys they need for awards or if they see me spotted running somewhere to give me a point, where applicable. I could see a maximum threshold for uniques as acceptable, with that number greater than a certain percentage of total QSOs. 1% maybe? 1.5%?

I have been a unique call sign, by working only one Q in a contest. Others might do the same.

Boy! This is a tough one - I have had several contest QSOs with local operators who just wanted to say hi. However, I'll have to admit that the majority of my unique calls are miscopies.

A call sign error should just not count, no need to make it worse.

Most are non-tester friends

I am OK with not counting unique calls, but sometimes error is not with reporting station but the other station that did not send their call correctly. Same goes about NIL. Just do not count the QSO

Double points penalty should be enough.

If you operate fm rare country probably 20% of your log will be Nr.001'ers. Why do penalize DX operator for that?

What percentage is most? I mainly run in contests and feel that many of my uniques in CW contests are due to missent or badly sent calls.

Maybe impose some limit to the number of unique call signs allowed in a given log, and then remove, without penalty, any that are above that.

Calls that are good in my ears become dyslexic by my fingers - but that is my problem.

Some uniques calls are legitimate contacts from people who become intimidated and don't make another contact. If there is no cross check that says a missed call occurred then dropping the QSO is appropriate

For years, even before becoming a tester, I would make just a few Q's while working in the shack while a contest is going on. Figured it helped a few. Now I know not everyone turns a log in. Seems a shame to penalize some by taking a multiplier away because I only felt like talking to a couple people. But, don't feel strongly enough about it to really object as seems a good way to reduce cheats. Now that I'm a better tester and can get a thousand Q's in a weekend I'd do better by throwing out uniques. Guess it doesn't matter a lot.

Many uniques are valid, for example, operating from 3DA0 and working stations in ZS nets on 40M daytime. What's wrong with that?

Maybe we could create a new 'Q' signal, QWC?, meaning are you working other contest stations or just me?

The penalty helps assure that stations work a bit harder to confirm the correct call sign before moving to the next contact.

I have a problem with penalties being assessed on me for what the other operator did - copied incorrectly or a typo. I work unique calls every contest I am in, some are special event stations or special calls and others are casual and perhaps first time testers.

It is very common to work stations not in other people's logs so don't penalize uniques.

It penalizes people who work a person who worked one station in the contest. That is not really fair.

Unique calls are a tough one. While it's certainly possible that one worked a unique, or worked someone that only made a few contacts and none of the others contacted submitted a log. I still think that's a long shot and removal of legitimate uniques would be very rare.

One method of eliminating this problem would be the contest exchange would require that the transmitting station include his call sign as part of the exchange. Failing to accurately copy the exchange then would become the basis of the error penalty.

If they are copying errors they should be removed.

Things are OK the way they are.

If operators were encouraged (via a large penalty) to actually copy the call off the air using true operator skill instead of letting their computer robot enter a spotted call there would be fewer errors resulting in a higher quality contest where winners can be proud of THEIR achievement, not the computer's. Operators should be rewarded for their testing skill, not just getting a high robotic score.

I know people that do not operate contests but will come on just to give me a point ... what's wrong with that?

DX stations are more likely to be worked by non-testers, just because the entity is needed for DXCC, making a unique call. This should not be a disadvantage for the DX station.

In regard to penalty/no penalty for uniques; there should be some cap on the percentage of uniques allowed and then penalize. This should be based upon some formula devised from prior logs submitted.

There should be penalty. Some stations are logging stations with unknown call signs just to get higher scores. Unique call signs 3 x QSO points - at least - in reduction. More than 10 Unique call signs equal disqualification - RED card!

This penalty made sense back in the days of paper logs. But if the contest scorers are using computers, which they are, what difference does it make? It's enough of a penalty to have wasted the time on a QSO that didn't count.

I think that unique call signs can be part of a log, there should be other ways to detect badly copied callsigns (easy if the other station also sends the log, but not sure if it is possible in other cases)

I would hate for the casual operator who makes one contact in the contest to be discounted. I have not thought this through, but what about no points for uniques over some threshold - so we encourage a sloppy operator to improve, without penalizing the enterprising multi-op guy stuck on Sunday morning 160 m from checking into a Canadian net for some extra points

I sometimes will only work 1 contest QSO in one of the smaller contests if i hear a station i know or is in a rare spot.

The contest organization could try to contact unique calls to verify. Some people answer one station only. For instance to get a new country, new IOTA etc

The bad Qs should be deducted from the score. The resultant score should be the actual points scored, with no penalty.

Uniques are not bad callsigns. They should be deducted.

The penalty is correct if I had received false the call sign. If my partner had received wrong my call sign this is his problem only.

Q9. Should stations in Caribbean/Central America receive 3 points for working other North American stations?

Current rule: "For North American stations only, contacts between stations within the North American boundaries count two (2) points."

Should stations in Caribbean/Central America receive 3 points for working other North American stations?

Change: "For North American stations, contacts made between stations in zones 1-5 and stations in zones 6,7,8 count three (3) points each. All other contacts between stations within the North American boundaries count two (2) points each." [Contacts with own country remain zero (0) points.]

Yes	1549	31.9%
No	1270	26.2%
No opinion	2029	41.9%
Total	4848	

Comments:

Encourage more Carib is good

they are dx give me the credit

You can't level the playing field entirely... this isn't broke, don't fix it.

I've been on a Caribbean end of that rule and we got beat by a station in Curacao and an arbitrary geographical boundary. Frankly guys who go to the Caribbean to operate the CQ WW have to be doing it for love because they know going in there's no way, for EQUAL EFFORT, that they have a chance in hell of winning. Under the current rule, there is no equal credit for equal effort.

you should consider contacts of the same country but different zone some points (1) possible

This will encourage more contacts between Carib/CA and other NA stations.

The path between the Caribbean and the populous east coast US is less difficult than a lot of contacts between US / VE and Central Amer. No reason for them to receive 3 points. However, I would like to see all Q's between VE and W/K not count for any points but only for mult credit.

Rather than increasing the intra-NA points, apply the NA rule to Europe. Contacts within the boundaries of zones 14-16 and 20 should count 2 points each.

Interesting. In general I'm against rule changes that change the scoring dramatically (because then the records are rather meaningless). But this one makes sense and seems to be in the spirit of the contest.

Make it 3 points for all NA contacts.

There are regions in the US that are at a disadvantage for dx such as the midwest. Caribbean stations are in demand during contests but still manage to work many us stations.

Not hard over. It would probably add a few Carib DXpeditions but the old records would be meaningless. Georgens has won from 8P so it's not hopeless.

Why should they get additional credit for shooting fish in a barrel? If you want to make it fair it should be scored according to distance like the stew perry top band challenge.

Keep it simple!

Yes. They are often hard to get and 3 points are appropriate. Also include Zones 1 and 2 in the 3-point category.

Would be great to see if 40/80/160 winners could be outside zone 8 with such rule !

Gives incentive for ops to go to Carib/CA.

Excellent change!!

This would certainly help V3 operations to be more competitive.

Segmentation is not a good idea. NA doesn't really need the boost anyway.

Keep the 2 point rule but make it only 1 point for US to VE contacts.

I believe NA to NA should be 1 point for other countries within NA just like the rest of the world has in their continents. We have a situation in India - the two largest populations are EU & JA. EU nets 3 points but JA gets 1 point - some form of distance based scoring within a continent would be useful to level the field when competing from here :)

I have no problem leaving this one as is

No strong feelings. I imagine some in NA-Caribbean feel otherwise. I might support this if it would encourage more countries to be active, but I'm not sure that it really would. It always seemed like there was pretty good representation in CQWW.

The proposed new rule is confusing and not easily understood. Leave it as it is.

1 point for contacts between USA stations... so many 'new' stations call that don't read the rules and they are worth 0 points, give us some incentive to work 'everyone' it would help rates and pick up the pace...

The concern would be for EU stations that would suffer the two point deal with other EU.

Changing the scoring would make old scores tough to compare to.

Scoring in this area should remain the same, if only to keep continuity from year to year. Many contest stations have been set up specifically tailored to contest rules and they have spent big bucks doing so. They should not have the scoring rules changed in the middle of the game.

Guys working from the Caribbean and central America usually have excellent propagation. At least it's better than the rest of us have. So why give them a point advantage when they already have a MUF advantage? If anything, just lump North and Central America together as 2-point contacts with each other. Draw the line north of the Panama canal somewhere.

While 2 vs 3 points in the Caribbean seems arbitrary, changing the rules makes it difficult to compare scores with previous years. It is what it is; in rules, consistency is important.

This was a good compromise - it pales in comparison to the lack of short skip on 15 and 10 meters, anyway. No change required.

The Europeans will probably not like this but my opinion is that there is an imbalance in their favor now. Europe's has more countries closer together making it easier for them to accumulate pts and mults. This would help even things out a little.

this would radically change the focus of where to operate and make CQWW more like ARRL DX with too many Carib stations and not enough real DX.

Not needed - NA has very few opportunities for mults. Zones 7 & 8 have many entities to work for mults so no need for extra points for working those countries. Maybe include zone 6 in the NA 2x. Besides, Caribbean stations seem to do OK.

Yes! The point is to give us incentives to work stations outside of N.A. boundaries. We might be less-inclined to work so many N.A. stations if others were worth more.

The fact of the matter is that NA stations get preferred status under the scoring system, so any move to level the playing field is good.

A problem for the event is that only a very few people can ever win, even if they are the best in the field, due to an imbalanced scoring system that favours a very few parts of the world - sooner or later, some people MAY get tired of not being competitive through no fault of their own.

You need to adopt a new 'internationally level playing field' scoring regimen proactively - not when it's too late.

Here, in the bottom of the world is not the same between NA and EU. people not bearing the antenna to SA, because we have more stations in NA y EU

Do NOT understand explanation of change. For me, Zone 2 is harder than zone 31.

Contacts between stations on the same continent (North America or any other continent) should be 2 points (diff. countries) and 1 point (same country, even the USA).

Contacts between diff. continents should remain 3 points.

Contacts between Caribbean/Central America and North America should be 3 points.

Come on, a 2000 mile radius around Anchorage results in 4 DXCC countries to work and one is KL7! Do the same for the Caribbean and they have 100 DXCC to work. This rule would be unfair to KL7 and it would make me not work the CQWW contests. If zone 1 was included with zones 6, 7, 8 then it would be more fair.

Would decimate the record books.

It is very hard to compete against the European stations who have many countries nearby from here in NA. More like impossible.

Long overdue!

Aruba gets 3 points (W2GD) and T&C gets 2 points (VP5T & VP5DX)

The Caribbean seem to have good propagation, but I don't know how the scoring affects them.

West African stations would probably still win because there are more active multipliers in Europe than any other continent.

Scoring system already too complex way. Make it even more complex. Frankly I didn't start operating CQ contests until computer logging due to the complexity of the scoring.

Modify and remove zone 6:

"For North American stations, contacts made between stations in zones 1-6 and stations in zones 7 and 8 count three (3) points each."

I think points should be awarded based on distance. All 40 zones are roughly the same size, and points for same zone should = 0, adjacent zones = 2, other = 3. The current scoring system biases strongly toward Europe and Caribbean.

This would remove the advantage of pj2, pj4, 9y stations that although they are in the Caribbean they get an extra point per QSO and that puts other zone 8 stations at a disadvantage

Better: count 3 points for any QSO outside of your zone. Much simpler and fairer to those of us on the wrong coast.

Especially when running QRP power, Central America is DX and should be worth 3 points.

Instead consider counting the islands near Venezuela like Aruba Bonaire etc as s america

Can't understand why the whole world isn't on the same scoring base.

Levels the playing field for DXpeditions.

The zero points for own country makes it hard to get the multiplier (stations do not want to bother putting you in their log). I have had considerable trouble getting the different zones in the USA for this contest.

This doesn't really help the W/K guys. It does give the zones 6, 7 and 8 an artificial boost. My guess is someone who goes down to those zones brought this one up. You don't like 2 pointers, go to some place where they are 3 pointers.

It will promote more activity from Central America. It will be needed in the not too distant future.

Your own county should be a 'given' on each band you have minimum of 1 valid 'DX' QSO with. This puts the operator who is the only entrant from his country on an even keel with everyone else.

It's too easy for us in the USA to work the Caribbean.

Great idea--3 pointers for 1-5 to 6-8 and vice versa would increase QSO rates and numbers for all, and lead to yet more fun and more participants.

Only Caribbean stations would care.

I will not compete for high score because it is too easy to BUY high scores -- by going to Carib, or by other gimmicks available to the super-motivated ops and not the regular testers. One should not have to work hard for personal satisfaction only! Even the field!

1 point might be considered for stations within one's own country. 2 points for countries on the same continent (except the Caribbean which should be 2 points for NA/SA, and 3 points between continents).

East coast has Europe, and west coast has Asia. Sure every location has it advantages and disadvantages, but that would be true regardless.

US likes this rule, then go on. like to change ? then do it.

The zone 8/9 gap would be gone. This way more Caribbean / Central American stations can directly compete.

This would give too much of an advantage to the Caribbean operations.

I also believe the scoring system is weighed heavily in favor of EU. Changes to level the playing field would certainly have my support.

Its too easy for them

They have an enormous advantage...in the Caribbean sea in front of US and Canada...

I think this change would give Central American and Caribbean stations an unfair point advantage over other North American stations.

US contacts between different zones should be worth three points.

Fine the way it is.

Maybe take zone 1 out of the mix? 3 pts for all

Changing this rule will be good for the contest.

This would create even more activity in zone 6,7,8 and give them a chance to compete with zone 9 and 33,34

This change might help the west coast guys a little.....they can't compete to EU on 160 and 80 and even 40 very well with the east coast guys. But it is not a big deal.....we can't win anyway.

NA already has an advantage compared to EU to EU, etc.

If you make that change, kiss European participation goodbye.

They are part of North America aren't they.

I think a better plan is to remove zero point QSOs. Or more exactly, don't allow multiple credit for zero point QSOs. I have personally watched top ten ops fail to log zero pointers and laugh about it. I have personally lost multipliers because 40 meter phone ops at KC1XX that were too lazy to log US contacts. The overzealous log checking by CQWW is responsible.

Why is the rule applied to only North Americans? The rule should be reviewed in all of the world.

Well, not really 'no opinion', but if the playing field is level, what difference? Yes, to zero for in country QSOs.

No strong opinion on this but would put them on a more even footing with stations in Africa and the mid-East who get 3 points for working Europe which seems reasonable.

This addresses one scoring inequity, that between NA and SA stations in the Caribbean area. There are similarly large inequities between east and west coast. Alaska and other northern latitudes have it even worse.

N-S propagation is often open when other modes are not, especially on the higher frequencies. These contacts are easy compared to other paths, and should not be given extra credit.

Remove the rule about contacts within your own country being zero points. If the zone is different there should be some points.

Further, I would like to see the contacts made between stations in zones 3, 4, 5 and stations in zones 1,2,6,7,8 count 3 points each. Zones 1 and 2 are unrepresented perhaps because they are only worth 2 points. And they are at a disadvantage being located near the auroral zone.

We know very well the propagation in some bands between Caribbean and North America is much better than from south america and north america and other parts of the world. Stations on this places will normally contactar much more than south america or europeans for example. So, considering this propagation/distance info you have, i think is better mantains or to keep the actually 2 points rule.

Zones 1 & 3 are at a disadvantage with those in zone 5 and the south end of 4. They have a pile of stations in 8 that are easy pickings while 1 & 3 have to plow thru them if we're lucky to make contacts in zone 8.

I think that the game score should be the same for all regions.

No. Two points is enough of an advantage over the rest of the world which is one point intrazone.

It would be more encouraging for us in the Caribbean to participate in the CQWW.

Why should they get an advantage over the rest of the world?

Asian stations in zones 20, 21 and 17 should be getting 2 points for QSOs with stations in zones 19, 23, 24, 25 and 26. The distances are over 5000 km!!!

KL7 and KH6 etc are both North American or is KH6 DX but not KL7?

Contacts between stations on the same continent but different countries, one (1) point.

No Exception: For North American stations.

Hard to say. As I am in VE7 I am not sure who this would benefit...perhaps better scores or perhaps a bigger wall to try to work through...I would say no. I believe that to really be fair that all QSOs should be based on distance

I leave this question to our NA/SA colleagues.

This is a good idea that will make the zone 8 stations more competitive with the zone 9 guys. It has a good chance of getting more zone 8 countries active during CQWW.

It is a long haul from the Caribbean to the Mountain and Pacific time zones, especially for 100w stations. If the points are weighted for distance/difficulty, making these 3 points makes sense.

This appears to support east coast stations into the Caribbean/Central America. It makes it just that more difficult for West Coast stations.

If you want to change scoring for North America you should do the same for Asia (e.g. contacts between 20/21 and 19 zones) or Oceania (e.g. contacts between zones 29/30 and far east parts of zone 32)

Why make changes to something that has been working for so long?

The Caribbean and Central America are far easier to contact than other regions...

I cannot give the answer to this question without the serious analysis of results of several contests

All this proposed rule does is provide big scores for hams wealthy enough to build, travel to, and operate at these places. It does nothing to make the contest better for 99.9% of participants.

You could consider making states mults to even things up??

I'd rather take this in the other direction, and not have North America be treated differently than the rest of the world. Contacts between countries in North America should count one point. The proposed change goes in the wrong direction, by giving even more points to stations in North America that stations in Europe and the other continents don't get. The scoring system is never going to eliminate geographic disparities, but the scoring idiosyncrasies like the current two point rule make it that much harder to compare scores with stations on other continents.

I think since KL and KH are used for WAS 160 meter they should have a mult of state and DX. If not the award would read WAS top 48

Suggest points for wkg stations in a different zone, even if in same country. E.g. If a station in California (zone 3) works a station in Florida (zone 5), QSO points should be awarded. This would help, but still not eliminate the advantage European stations have in this contest.

Went back and forth on this one, but at the end of the day, the EA8, CT3, CU and D4 ops have an unfair advantage over Caribbean/Central America. If this one doesn't go through, then at least make 8P part of South America!

Recommend simply one(1) points each within any North American station. Just as other continent does. Because this is a worldwide contest, there should NOT make this exception only for North American benefit.

Changing the points to me is like comparing the difference between 4 quarters and a 1 dollar bill. I won't work anymore QSOs, just get a higher score. But so will everyone else in those zones.

Caribbean stations already have a geographical advantage

Contact between North America in zone 1-8 to Caribbean should 1 point, just because not far away. Therefore if same all-time records stns in Caribbean is always a winner.

This would give an advantage to testers in zones 6, 7 & 8 as there are far more contacts to be made with zones 1-5, so they will make far more 3 pt contacts than ops in US/Canada, who will make more 2 pt contacts. The current rule is more balanced for the area.

Will be great to count each one of Mexican States as multiplier, just as ARRL's 10 meter contest

As a different but related point... I like the way WPX contests double the points on the low bands. This is a very interesting twist and turns the 'game within the game' into a lot of fun.

I've never understood the NA bias - How come a station 100s of km away gets 2 points when they are on the same continent - and I, living in OC, with the nearest DXCC entity with humans on it is ~2000km away get 1 point per QSO??? I can work VK6 - 11,000km away, in OC, and get 1 point, While a Miami station can work Cuba (200km away) and get 2?

Stations in EU can catch a lot of country credits within a couple hundred km, and they only get 1 point...

I would propose that '2. Contacts between stations on the same continent but different countries, one (1) point.' end of story.

Yes, that means that scores for NA stations will be lower - but - they've been artificially high, and it doesn't affect continent based standings.

Again, you make the rules...

I think that the thing should be fair

America is America, Asia is Asia (biggest)...what's the difference?

The same rules must be changing for some countries (zones) between AS and EU.

This rule change would surely promote more activity from Caribbean/Central America.

Same rules for every country.

I think it is better when the rule is very simple.

Same country contacts should be 1 point maybe... not two. This will only further draw activity away from areas central to VO1 (EU and NA centric)

Why special rules for NA? This is CQ 'Worldwide' . Same rules for all - would be best

only 1 point instead of 2 points

Even today, I think the scoring system is bad and gives advantage no USA/CAN specially.

Wouldn't this just push every Zn 1-5 and 6-8 scores up? Possibly encourage Caribbean stations to just run US/VE after picking up mults in EU/ROW

All stns must be in same ' field'. In final score north Americans are in separate class (category), so other stns feeling this one 'very little', especially DX? who did few QSO. The contest is WORLD competition. All must be same.

I think it should be the same as in other continents: ONE point within your own continent.

Sorry, I am out of NA, having no opinion.

Just don't make rule changes that cause program changes.

This change is more justice but it will reduce all those go to Caribbean Islands. Less stations from Caribbean, less fun. Better leave it as is

I hear the Caribbean stations work USA like they were next door in contests. Makes it very hard for stations to get a competitive score against anywhere on the American continent

It is always difficult to draw a line but it would be more fair this way. You have other examples where the rules plays into hands of other continent even more, i.e. IH9 or IG9.

Please no rule changes on scoring

For the Europeans it's easier to work different countries in the neighborhood, so let the rule as it is.

You are far too NA centered - remember there is world out there for World Wide contest. Many geographical considerations are lot more unfair than your own interest region.

Why north America must be different? Also contacts between Europe receive 2 point instead or clear and count normally point between same country...

The current rule should be fixed; otherwise also JAs could demand to get more points for QSOs with the Asian continent. The distances would be very similar!

That change would give even more advantage to the Caribbean stations. They already have single or double hop to the major hulk of ham population in the States and Canada apart from the benefits of being a rare country and enjoying of the tropical propagation.

This will help zone 6 7 8 expeditions be more competitive with zone 9 33 and 34. For us in 1-5, a rising tide lifts all boats.

Why is there a different rule for NA compared to all other continents? To do a global comparison is now difficult.

This 2 point rule is SIMPLY UNFAIR and only supports Caribbean tourism. Take a look at CR2X scores WITHOUT a 2 point rule to support scores. A continent is a continent is a continent!!!! Much better and more fair would be to get rid of the continent rule altogether. 1 point own country, 4 points other country. CQWW would have way more people in it if this would be so.

Instead, European stations should also be given 2 points for contacts within European boundaries. Or 1 point for Caribbean/Central American stations for working other NA stations (like in Europe).

I don't care - those who are in the respective areas should have an opinion. Try to maximize the fun for them. If that is by increasing points, that is fine with me.

It is logical and normal current situation. Any changes complicate competition.

Caribbean to U.S. QSOs already dominate the bands - leave the scoring as is, please.

What do you think about same scoring for NA stations as all other 1 point into NA and 3 points for outside of NA?

It is a good idea to promote Central America and north Caribbean stations to participate.

Contacts for own country should be 1 point, but only for those contacts that are multipliers. That is work your own country for the country mult on a band, get 1 point, but no more just for points.

Why is NA better continent than EU or ASIA???!!!

It should be 1 point same as everywhere else.

Contest rule should keep simple for those participants who join the contest.

*Contact with the same continent: 1point

*Contact with different continent: 3points

Equality between North American stations and Caribbean/Central American stations are desired.

Absolutely not. This would make the currently unfair rule even worse. One point for intra-continent contacts, no exceptions for NA. I wonder how this blatant injustice was ever approved into the rules text in the first place?

The contest should focus on the world, not only on the US. It's called the CQ WORLD WIDE Contest. Same rules for everyone. Too bad the US is such a big country. I live in a country that nobody wants to contact (Spain). Too bad for me too. Life is like this.

Intra-NA contacts should be 1 point like the rest of the world.

The more help for the West Coast would be great

WHY NA Privilege???? That's why we lost JA's , DL's , UA3 & maybe some others.....RULE POINTS HAVE TO BE SAME FOR ALL ! By Me BEST Solution: QSO with own Continent 1 pointsOther continent 2points on each band 160-10m then will be NOT that much important that You are PJ2, YV, 9Y,EA8,CN,3V.... etc.... Operators skills will SHOW UP on higher level

There shouldn't be a difference between participants of contest. Rules have to be same for all. The American stations shouldn't get advantage.

However, this will trigger also discussion for other region. Practice is also that contest station will develop their strategy based on the (new) rules and therefor you can question what the new rule will bring. Again some station take a position that gives them the most benefits where others will complain that they suffer an imbalance in the rules/location.

We are talking about a WORLD WIDE contest and a DX contest. Caribbean and Central American stations are not DX to USA and Canada, just as Italy or Gibraltar DX to Scandinavia. Giving 3 points for Caribbean stations to contact the abundance of US stations will permanently shift the global contest leadership to the Caribbean.

I think one (1) point for contact between North American stations , two (2) between Caribbean/Central American with North American

there is no difference between Caribbean to US and Europe to Europe (sometimes the distance within Europe is even more)

I cannot see why NA stations are treated differently in the first place! Asian area is larger than NA but get only one point. Caribbean area is as dense of prefixes as Central Europe. Station in Morocco working EU's is well positioned. Any change will cause more complaints and reasoning. Contesters have accepted the original rules, why change?

1/3 points for all QSO

YES DEFINETLY.

No. Why NA stations should get more points for having QSO-s within their own country or close neighbours? Let's make Europe and South-East Asia like this. And Africa and Australia+surroundings, too. Still, this is just a pointless game with points. I would like that every participant has exactly the same rules.

If that is passed those of us in the South Pacific who can only dream of propagation like Caribbean to US want special privileges too - 5 points per QSO sounds reasonable!!??

Please stop with a nonsense scoring continent wise! This should be either zone related, QTH Loc related, or better yet QRB related. Do you want all European reside on Atlantic coast, and all W/VE hams move to PEI? Tribander in Brest France at 40ft tower is killing tons of aluminum and huge towers in Zagreb Cro, or Sofia Bulgaria! What is your agenda here?

Contests are generally won from the Caribbean. I therefore do not agree to any improvement in the scoring for Caribbean to US/VE QSOs.

that way you make it an all-american contest

It should be a balance with the same situations, but for other continents

That change would give a huge advantage to Caribbean/Central America stations.

Have never operated from NA in CQ WW (or any other contest for that matter) so my view would be based on ignorance and thus of no use.

'should stations in North Europe receive 3 points for working Southern Europe stations' I think it's the 'same' thing.

Contacts for North America must count the same as in Eu and in the other part of the World: 1 and 3 points.

i don't see the need for change but i live in Europe anyway

Not fair to other continents

It does seem unfair for such 'local' stations to gain extra points in the same way as someone in EU. I also think that stations in Cyprus and the 'Middle East' countries adjacent to the Mediterranean should also get 2 points for EU countries as they are so close to many Southern EU countries. I can work 4X or Cyprus as easily as working LZ or SV and I have a 'bit of wet string' in a tiny garden and 80W O/P.

whatever you do there will never be perfect equality

Scoring from Caribbean and European stations would not be comparable any longer

Why not the same procedure as for the other continents but on basis of the zones in W/VE?

Same scoring rule for everyone! 1 point for contact within same continent and 3 for outside of own continent! Contacts within own country should also be 1 point.

As a European, I'd be worried that this would cause the Caribbean stations to predominantly beam North, which could reduce the WW aspect of CQWW.

Some distance based scoring will equalize stations. This will even give more advantage to zone 6-8.

NA to NA should be 1 point, (same as EU to EU)

Caribbean definitely shouldn't. It is no different than a station in NY working one in CA. A Caribbean station gains an advantage merely by working the whole of the southern states which they can easily do almost NVIS on 40 and 80m for example.

I have no experience of operating in North America so don't know how these two scoring options compare.

If 1 point for QSO within Europe or Asia, why more than 1 point for the US? It is unfair, the distance between Turkey and Japan is multiple times longer than from East Coast-West Coast US.

A North America gets a way higher score than the average EU score with same amount of QSO. Very strange.

This mean that stations outside NA can barely win the CQ DX ore get a high ranking.

But if yes take look to EU to

This may have been relevant some years ago, but with the state of modern stations that is no longer the case. A reduction is required to 2 points

For USA stations, VEs would now be worth 2 pts, and all other countries would be worth 3 pts. This would change the game- the Caribbean would now be the place to be if you want to win, instead of the place to be to just have a good time. It would take some of the bloom off the EA8 and D4 locations. I think it would be a good change.

Same scoring as in Europe or Asia. From Rovaniemi, Finland to Roma Italy is quite long way and no extra scores for that. I don't really understand why there must different scoring in different continents.

Rules should be the same for all participants! Why should NA stations have advantages over EU stations (or stations in any other continent for that matter)?

No, Caribbean stations have the advantage in propagation. Keep the point system as it is.

Caribbean and Europe count same points with N.America. NOT OK!

Propagation from Caribbean to US is about the same as US to US propagation - no reason to give more points to NA QSOs to Caribbean stations if not giving it to stations from say Florida.

Being in EU not competing with NA so let NA stations decide

seems fair

If you change this, you have to change in other areas too with high station density, e.g. JA, DL, F, G, I....

You will need to better define North America. Central America and the Caribbean is usually considered North America and hence would be within the 'North American boundaries'. If you are defining it by Zone you should do so the throughout the rule, not mixing Zones and geographic areas.

I don't think there are really enough Central and Caribbean stations operating to make much of a difference either way, but sure why not.

Don't make too many small parts, winning loses attraction...

Huge advantage for zones 6,7&8 especially on low bands.

Is the goal of this merely to make stations in Caribbean DX entities like KP2 and C6A more competitive with North Africans?

Will destroy historical comparisons.

The stations of a same country should have the same point, regardless of region.

Looking across the board, European stations, which are closer together in distance, get 3 points per contact, so why penalize NA stations.

Car/Cen Am is NO continent. Not here. Not anywhere. Follow what the world map tells, please. That is what it is all about, isn't it?

This is too major of a change.

good idea

I would take zones 1 and 2 out too - they should be 3 pointers. While we are at it, why not make all contacts the same point (s) - of course keeping the 0 point for same country rule.

There seems to be a small (magic) dividing line between NA and SA in the Caribbean. This would help even things up for those folks. Good idea.

Removes an unfair point advantage of SA stations over those relatively close by in the Caribbean.

CQWW DX has turned too much into a sweepstakes contest and has lost much of its DXing appeal. I would propose changes that promote DXing, maybe making all DX Q's count one point, or giving bonus points for working 50, 100, 150 countries on each band.

This would foster contest DXpeditions to additional Caribbean countries other than the current Zone 9 areas.

Contacts within your own country should stay the same or be at less 1 point.

The scoring should be based on distance

Working C6A is like working Florida. I don't see the need for point changes, especially since the awards typically are segregated sufficiently that US stations compete with each other.

I like this change. Something needs to be done to make NA/CA on a more level scoring field with EU

If you are going to change it, simply make it contacts between different countries in North America receive 3 points. (North America of course includes Caribbean/Central America)

Points should be distance based not zone or country based.

The world is bigger than America.

So you want to make the Caribbean a second 'Africa'? Which will make it much easier to win the Contest from Caribbean compared to northern Africa? Looks like a pure 'American' benefit.... Definitely: NO

If contacts within European countries are 2 points then keep it at 2. If contacts within them are 3 points then make it 3.

Then the Caribbean stations will win everything by default.

Too complex-the current system is clear and simple

why not

I could agree with the proposed change if VP9 was moved out of zone 5.

Does not affect me and I can't work out the implication for how the rule change would affect NA scores vs Rest of the World

I never understood this scoring rule... but it may trace back to the early beginnings...

The rules are clear as to the boundaries of the North American zone. The contest should not be modified.

I am not sure this is the answer. It doesn't seem like the zero points is fair for big land masses like the US. Maybe you should get points for different zones in the same country.

The rules must be equal to all DXCC entities

The NA should not be treated differently than other continents. It's well known that you cannot win from Z8.

Seems to me it should be the same as QSOs between EU zone boundary countries like 16-17 etc. When China is fully geared up I can envision some big scores from zones 24/25, seemingly a similar situation.

Levels the playing field with us vs. Europeans - a bit. I'd like to see more ways to level it - esp for us guys on the West Coast.

This would be drastically different from the 1 point allowed for within EU and AS QSOs. I don't exactly understand why. Don't forget that much of zone 40 is also NA.

I'm sure others are passionate about this. I'm indifferent.

I'd like to see the Caribbean/Central American advantage preserved (remain at 2 pts), but Canadian advantage removed. I don't see why VE stations should be able to work US stations for credit, not to mention getting 2 points for each contact. At best, they should get 1 point. This is how I would re-phrase the rule: 'For North American stations only, contacts between stations within the North American boundaries count two (2) points. Contacts with a different country within zones 3,4,5 count for 1 point.'

Equal points for all competitors worldwide

It seems that participation by big Caribbean contest stations are down from what my memory says used to be in the 1980's and 90's. But I don't know that for a fact.

It seems to me that they get such a high number of QSOs that this would not be necessary. However, I have not operated from the Caribbean or Central America, so my opinion is perhaps not worth much.

I agree with the wording of the proposed change (paragraph three), BUT, the wording in paragraph two above suggests that the rule would apply only to stations working NA and not the reverse? This is confusing.

I would like to see contact made with the same country count as 1 point instead of just the multiplier only.

The QSO points should be reciprocal so that both parties to the QSO get the same points. I don't think there should be special rules for North American stations. I suggest the same points for any DX QSO irrespective of zone.

I only get one point for working a remote EU that might be further away than some of those 2-point contacts.

I suggest counting 1 point for QSO within the same country but with the correspondents in different WAZ areas.

Caribbean/SA stations already have a huge advantage to NA...let's not skew it further. My XYL and I have operated from Aruba so have some experience in this matter.

Being outside NA I feel that I'm not involved

Any station that counts as DX to the operating station should count 3 points. If I am in the US does Mexico not count for your CQ DX awards>

own country QSOs should also count 1 point, same condx for all, independently on the size of own country

I'm biased, but it looks like as more operators enter from Europe, it getting harder and harder to win from NA, in fact you've had wins from inside Europe, which was unheard off before. Perhaps something less standard like 2.5pts per na to na or 3 points on 40,80 and 160

These zones are more or less in the backyard of NA. Leave it as it is.

It should become no too difficult. Keep it easy. Every QSO counts (also with the own country) one point, for dx three points.

Paris and Rome are the same distance apart as Chicago and New York, the points should be the same....

Keep the rule simple. (a) There is no significant difference in terms of distance between the Caribbean and other places in North America. (b) Signals on all bands are usually quite strong between the Caribbean (etc) and the rest of North America and thus easy to work. (c) Current rule would encourage more contacts between non-US/VE North American stations and the rest of the world. (d) Changing the rules might give incentive to Caribbean (etc) stations to run US stations instead of making effort to make contacts with the rest of the world.

The Caribbean/Central America should receive 3 points. The US should receive 1 Point within the same zone and 2 points for QSOs with a different US-zone

As is our history, changing the basic structure of CQ WW is not a good idea. More reporting options are better.

But, it should be 3 points for Zones 3-5 with 1,2 and 6-8. If XE or V3 is 3 points, why shouldn't KL7 and VO2 also be 3 points?

Same continent counts 1 pts like in other world!!!! Same state 0 pts.

A continent is a continent. I see no reason for even two points.

The Caribbean or Central American station have a short distance with the USA station.. Surely, they can copy QRP or weak signal that I can't copy.

Please only one point for QSOs between North American countries as for other WAC-continent.

I think that would boost participation from that region.

You should maintain to separate NA and World in the results.

I would handle them similar as in all other places in the world. The CQWW contests are CQ zones oriented. The geography of the countries should not be further involved in the score.

Like the idea. Not fair where places like Europe who are surrounded by countries have the advantage, particularly at night for low bands. Would increase activities and scores and help equalize the playing field geographically.

US-US - 1 point, US-NA - 2 points, DX-NA - 3 points. This is the only right decision!

I see no point in changing the scoring and upsetting contest records.

It does not seem fair that in past years, QSOs between P40 and USA are worth more points than for QSOs between PJ2 and USA, between J6 and USA, etc. So, perhaps this suggested change would be good.;

I've never understood the reason behind NA stations getting two points per QSO. What makes them different from Oceania stations, Asian stations or European stations? Think same rule should apply to all QSOs within a continent.

Every country circumventing that contiguous USA can receive additional points that US stations can't. It's not a level playing field for the US stations to receive only 2 points when the contact from the other direction garners 3 points. Not much logic here in my opinion.

No, that would be equal that I as Scandinavian should receive 3 points for working southern Europe. So definitely NO

Yes, but the South American state such as Florida have an advantage being in zone 5

Distance-based scoring would be fairer.

But all-time records should indicate the change in scoring.

Contacts with own country 1 points.

I think this rule is NA centric and does not make sense. You should get 2 points for working countries within your continent (i.e. SA?). I see EU as being a problem however in that respect mainly due to density. So Stations in Asia, NA, SA, Ant, AF, OC, ME)

It seems reasonable.

I cannot answer yes or no to this question. The rule should be made consistent across all continents. If NA-NA contacts are two points then EU-EU contacts should also be two points, AS-AS contacts should be two points, etc. etc.

Right now biggest advantage is from zone 8

This is a DX contest. Why isn't the scoring based on 'Distance' in the first place? Isn't it about time that this aspect be reevaluated. I can understand in the old days where computing scores based on distance would be a nightmare. That is not the case any longer. The cell phone in your pocket has more CPU capacity than what was used to land on the moon!

The exception for North American stations should be removed at all. All participants should have the same rules.

The present scoring system is a mess, heavily weighted in favor of Atlantic rim stations. Rather than changing points per QSO, I'd prefer to see changes in the multipliers. Possibly count individual JA prefectures and perhaps US states and Canadian provinces as multipliers -- anything to balance out the huge advantage presently enjoyed by anybody geographically favored with the ability to work Europe on six bands.

No this would give an unfair advantage to North American stations, the current rules are fair

The goal in my mind should be giving equally skilled operators equal chances, minimizing location advantage.

Drop even the exception for North American stations. The same rules for all stations.

I'm European station, so I can't give my opinion

Further modification:

QSOs between zones 1, 7, and 8 and zones 3, 4, and 5 are worth 3 points.

QSOs between zones 6, 3,4, and 5 are worth one point. Why should Canada and Mexico receive 2 points each for W2s? Heck might as well give 1 point for US to US QSOs and JA to JA QSOs. Also, make all Asian QSOs with other Asian QSOs worth 3 points each.

This will increase the score only of North American stations, especially all contest expeditions in Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean, equalizing their conditions with Madeira, Canary Isl., Cyprus, Asiatic Turkey, zone 17 in Asian Russia and Ex-Soviet republics neighbors to EU but getting DX credits.

What about all EU stations ? No chance for them at all ...

There are different solutions based on different math models. The easiest of them is :

1 point for QSO with same continent*;

*Exception - For NA stations only, contacts between stations within the NA boundaries count 2 points;

*Exception - For EU stations only, contacts between stations in CQ zone 40 count 2 points;

*Exception - QSO with own DXCC - count multiplier but no points;

3 points for QSO with other continent **;

** Exception - 2 points for QSO between EU stations and CQ zones : 17, 20(outside EU) and 33;

** Exception - 2 points for QSO between NA stations and CQ zone 9;

USA to USA QSOs should count for 1 point. There are times I need a zone 3, 4, or 5 contact and I call a Big Gun calling CQ CONTEST. Sometimes they refuse to log me even if I tell them I need their MULT. I try to work VE stations for my zone 3, 4, and 5 MULTS but sometimes on 160, 15, and 10 I don't hear any VE's and so call a USA station for the MULT.

In my opinion contacts with own country in all cases should be 1 point, other countries in same continent 2 points and other continents 3 points but this not only for North America but universal

A good idea. This has been a glaring inequity for way too long. P4/PJ2/PJ4 have had an unfair advantage over the rest of the region.

I presume that people will complain about fairness and why not do it for other regions? This misses the point. It is not about equalizing the score, it is about measuring operating ability. If a station makes more Q's, more mults and has a longer average QSO distance, it should produce a winning score. The current scheme does not always produce that outcome. It diminishes the competition when only a few locations can win, and can do so with lesser operating results.

Making scores with lower Q's and mults equal to those with more, is not the intent. This is merely score equalization and is not the same as rewarding the best contest efforts. The latter is the rationale for this change.

It will also encourage more DXpeditions. I think that is a good thing as well

I think it's fine the way it is

Personally, I would like this, but I will respect those who have records and have made significant investments based on the current rules. What exactly is the motivation for such a change? Seems fine the way it is to me.

ABSOLUTELY!!!

This would put the Caribbean on an equal footing with North Africa and give us a fighting chance to win something. You could even make the Caribbean its own 'continent' like Oceania.

Of course, this would sure piss off those guys in the South American section of the Caribbean who have enjoyed an unfair advantage all these years, but it would be worth it.

Divide the scores up into longitudes on the globes and zones

'3-point land' is much further from the US Population centers than '2-point land', so the scoring difference seems well justified.

No, because the logging program I have will be wrong, again!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Is the contest broken? I didn't think so.

I have no problem with the way the mults are assigned.

You're making it too easy for NA stations, they should try being a DX station and trying to cope with band conditions.

Contacts between stations in the same country should always score.

Zones 6, 7, and 8 enjoy a considerable advantage already owing to the coincidence of time zones. With 2 points it's already nearly impossible to compete with them.

Better you set an exclusion zone, i.e. no extra points unless 'x' miles from U.S. border, or distance between countries. Would be hard to administer, best just leave it alone.

No, because a Caribbean station already has the advantage of reflecting their signals over salt water, which is a propagation advantage over land-locked stations, who reflect off of soil and cities.

Can the logging programs handle this? How will the logging program know the K2 in Nevada is not in New York. Require /7.

Again, leave the contest rules alone!

This would help equalize the EU/AF advantage.

All NA countries should count three (3) points. Contacts with own country should count as one (1) point.

Contacts between EU countries are all worth 1 point. Not fair to make it 3 points for Caribbean to US/VE.

Contacts made between North American stations in zones 1- 8 should be ONE(1), which is the same point of the other continent.

I'm in ZL3... _Everything_ is DX from here. :-)

My proposals:

- a) for North American station, contacts between station within the North American boundaries count one point
- b) contacts with own country count one point

yes, get rid of the stupid difference between Zone 8 and 9

How about zone 28? Not so many stations over here, it should be little bit more score

Can't oversee the impact for the NA stations

Absolutely NOT. The rest of the world might as well give up!

Why not the same (2 points) for contacts between Europe and stations in zone 33 and 17? Too easy to work these zones, even on 160m.

Europe actually has an advantage with so many countries in a small area

Why to focus to NA only??

We are dealing with an INTERNATIONAL contest. This question should be extended to a global scale. Why a 5B4 or OD5 gets just one point from a JA pileup ?? Changing rules for a 'benefit' of just on geographic area would certainly prompt bad feeling elsewhere in the World. An approach to this question should be GLOBAL before making fundamental changes in the point per QSO system.

Stations in Caribbean and Central America already have a great advantage of being close not only to U.S.A., but to Europe and Africa. In our case CX, almost all South America and even boundaries stations as Brazilians are much far away and we get only one point.

NA-NA QSOs should be scored as EU-EU QSOs are scored. So an EU station in Z14 working an EU station in Z16 gets the same points as an NA Z5 station gets working an NA Z7 station.

No, they should receive 1 point for intra cont QSO. I have never understood why they get extra bonus for these contacts.

Takes away advantage Z9 ops have over nearby Z8 ops.

This would open up a lot more locations for competitive operation in the Caribbean.

In Russia distances are even larger

The rules must be equal for all participants

Should allow us to count 1 point is kind of what I am thinking but not sure if this would be a good thing

It's not ARRL DX its CW World Wide!!!!

Depends on the goals for the contest. Giving more points for stations in the Caribbean/Central America working NA stations would make the contest more like ARRL DX.

In-country contacts between North American countries should be 1 point to equalize scoring with other continents.

I think this rule is fair.

Wouldn't this change PO the Europeans and JA's? It should probably stay as it is. I like the CQWW as it is and so do most testers.

Alternately, if you had to change things, you could go to using grid squares with the more distant g.s. getting more points. It gets a little more complicated for contest software but it would be the best 'points for distance' calculation. The ARRL DX Contest should definitely adopt using grid squares for its distance calculations.

ONE point. Or give TWO points in for all intra-continent contacts (EU, AS, etc.).

Would not affect me based on operating strategy, not sure how it would affect others

The problem is the zones. Zone 8 includes VP5 and C6 and VP9 which are very close to the USA while J3 and 8P6 are much further. Would the close in countries have advantages over the outlying. If you give Mexico zone 6 this advantage why not Canada?

I understand that is inherently not fair for J6, J3, 8P to be effectively penalized because they are just a few hundred miles from the zone 9 border.

Does this impact activity from the Zone 8 Caribbean area? Probably. We would have been better off going to J6M for the ARRL DX than CQ WW CW but the timing was better for us for CQ WW.

I could buy into zones 7 and 8 being 3 pointers but not 6.

Zero (0) is totally stupid!

The playing field in this contest has never been level and never will be, so changes of this type will make no difference. It's all about location, location, location. Some areas have significant advantages... Others are significantly handicapped.

This would equilibrate the Huge zone33 advantage

I checked no opinion because I am conflicted over this. As much as I would LOVE to see this (V26B) it really changes the dynamic of past records and that is the side of me that says leave it where it is. At V26B, we are automatically non-competitive because of this.

The station from Caribbean/Central America are most wanted and very closed to USA/Canada. Why this favor, the 2 points are not normal and should be only 1 point like in Europe when contact with same continent. Is the committee want to reserve the first 10 place to Caribbean/Central America stations? The European stations desire also the first's place and with the 2 points rules, it's just impossible so with 3.....

The rules should be the same for all and the actual rules is inequitable.

Contacts in the own Country should count at least 1 Point!

Contacts between different zones should get QSO points

I definitely disagree with this idea! The East coast should get only 1 point because they are geographically closer to the islands. Those of us on the West coast have a much harder time breaking through the HUGE pile-up of highly populated East coast hams who are shaking hands with their next-door neighbor islands.

It's not normal, in Europe it's only one point.

This seems a major change. I have not followed the discussion on the CQ Contest reflector, so I haven't seen pros and cons. I would like to see the result of rescoring a sample of past logs. Of course, that would not reflect the impact on where people go for expedition operations, and that could be major.

Contacts with own country remain one (1) points.

Why should NA stations be given special status if this is really a 'worldwide' contest.

Caribbean/CA stations already have major advantages. I vote 'no' even after an experience from a MOST team from VP5 in CQDXSSB year 2000, where we came WW#3 only because a PY and a P3 got 3 points per NA and EU, while we had higher number of QSOs and mults, but lower in QSO points.

If you want to change, you have to change scoring in Europe as well....

This does nothing to address the problem of stations from Bermuda in zone 5! If Bermuda were <400 miles farther South like the Bahamas all contacts with US/VE stations would be 3 pointers? This rule change would disenfranchise Bermuda stations. I think Bermuda should be included in the zone 6.7.8 group as an exception to zone 5.

Scoring should be uniform worldwide.

Make all contacts count - even inside the same country. This 0 points rule is outdated.

Sure. Provides more Islands a chance to compete with Aruba and Curaçao. Hurry up and make up your mind before I buy some land in Curaçao!

Not sure what will be the effect, maybe the organizer should enlarge this point of view in a 'public' forum!

Would this change in pointing put some areas of the world in disadvantage??? For instance will stations in EU be at disadvantage in comparison with stations in NA? If this is the case, expect to lose some participants that will be disappointed by rules advantages!!!!

1 Points same country
2 Points same continent (NA, SA, AF, EU, OC,AS)
3 points for DX QSO (NA-SA =3 EU-NA=3 etc)

No need to change this that I'm aware of but there might be a good reason.

It's a DX contest.

I'm against any scoring changes because that would make previous records meaningless.

Not sure on the reasoning behind this question (I am not in NA). I would have thought it wouldn't make much difference, at the end of the day.

The extra points per QSO for inter-continental QSOs is a strong incentive for operations from South America and Africa. Raising these intra-continental points per QSO will likely reduce the number of Contest-peditions. The HC8 station would never have existed without the extra points per QSO. That's probably true of many other stations.

If you want to change scoring to be more equitable, treat the US just like Europe - Each state is a multiplier and point scoring the same as in EU. Of course, this would totally screw up the QSO exchange

Contact between Las Vegas and Washington 5?!!?

Yes - I think this would help to equalize the scoring advantages in EU or for stations that are close and work mostly EU.

For all there should be equal conditions! Between UA0 and UA9 from 4 to 7 thousand kilometres, but we receive only 1 point for QSO. Asia on many more than the North America if you делатете such conditions for the North America, but change conditions for Asia.

I believe this is consistent with 3-point distances for contacts in the rest of the world.

Caribbean results will rise up. Isn't it? So it can make dead all competition. There will be only two divisions:

1. Top ten (Caribbean).
2. Rest of world.

For the time being, subject to revision if we have a major blossoming in say XE. Not likely, but we can dream.

Tilts existing records. You know the point structure before the contest starts, you want to operate from 3 point land - go there.

Because the US is so big, this unique rule change probably makes sense. But hopefully we are not doing it just to placate Americans operating in the Caribbean. D4 and others will always have an advantage.

Jeepers, Their propagation is so good they should all have to run QRP.

All NA count 2 and own country count 1

Basic rule: 1 point for a contact within a continent and 3 points for a dx contact should not have ANY exceptions

I have no opinion as I do not know what the impact would be on scoring or the background to the suggested change.

It's an idea that will really pump up the Caribbean scores. They already have a big advantage over US stations, but if the points were raised, it will give both US and Central American/Caribbean a similar advantage.

Very difficult to judge these local issues from Europe, should Nordic countries like Finland Island, Greenland also should have more points they are far away from DM and G, UA,,,,,

The idea should be to even the playing field not make it more tilted in favour of those areas where there are more contest ops with access to better stations. It makes winning from geographically & propagationally challenged areas all the more impossible and drive away potential newcomers. For e.g stations from zones 20, 21, 22, 24, 26

Why not give them 10 points per QSO ? Strangely stations in West indies are from N/A... Special us rules once more? You'll sure that activity in Europe will decrease more and more... Here continent QSOs are '1' points who complain?

Must will be same for Europeans. All QSO between EU stations to be count for 2points/exclude own country/
left 2 points

They should count 1 point like same continent QSOs count on any other continent than North America.

No, no, no! Why? Only US guys operate from these QTH... This will be an American rule for American ham only, not very fair! And why 2 pts for NA to NA QSO??? Should be 1pt, as for Europeans.

Too big advantage due to short distance to an area with big activity (USA).

WPX is the best Scoring.

I don't know why this rule exists; but, changing it would sure mess up and records.

They are outside the US and are considered DX, so I think they should be treated as DX contacts

It's a 'world wide' contest. You should get something for working any station.

Suspect far easier for someone in southeastern US to contact Caribbean stations than Alaska/Yukon/NWT/Nunavut stations.

I wish people would go ahead and make the contacts for zone mults anyway. No need for points in country. Central American/Caribbean should get 3 points as well for their contacts (except for own country) and count the mults.

Keep it the same to keep all records intact. Changing the scoring process would cause extreme damage to the many years of this contest.

NA (stateside) to NA(Canadian) should be 2 pts.
NA(stateside) to (caribbean & SA) should be 3pts.
NA(stateside) to NA(stateside) should be 0 pts.

But does it really matter that much? Jeesh, I would love to operate in a tropical paradise for a DX contest. Would the extra point really make a difference?

If you do change, the existing records should be left standing, and the new records to be started when you've changed the points for entities.

It would not affect my result.

I think the scoring system is fine as it is. So the big question how does the scoring system for DX work. Is it the same?

Run simulations to see how this would change the scoring. Probably not much would be my bet -- so why bother.

The way things are now, I don't understand why there's this restriction for the Caribbean and not for Europe (zone 14/15).

Station on zone 8 have to receive 3 points, zone 9 have much better opportunity than zone 8, all stations need to have same opportunity in the contest

This would encourage more contest operations from the Caribbean.

Another way to favour North Americans to get world records. Do you like to win easy? South Americans are growing in number, you already have a good number of 3 pointers. Low angle antennas are not necessary to win if you enter this new rule so it is not right against those operators that work all year to put stacks and towers as high as possible.

Leave it alone!

Reduction in scoring advantages by those with obvious location advantages (Caribbean / Central America) should be eliminated.

guys play fair - avoid double standards

If you do that... what about VP9, CY9, CY0, FP, KL7 >??

Give 0.5 points for contacts within one's own country. A contact should be worth SOMETHING---

Good equalizer!!

From my QTH in AK it is tough enough being at the back of the pack in a pile up trying to break through the East Coast curtain to work zones 6, 7 and 8. This scoring change would help the East Coast/Midwest stations a lot on their scores, but do zilch for my situation. The East Coast already has a lock on EU. Now they are to get more points for locking up zones 6, 7 and 8 too?

I can't see why US-US QSOs attract 2 points. Contacts within own country is 0 points for all others.

In my opinion is the same problem with EU-EU because here in EU to gimem more interest and competitive the Contest is necessary that the contact EU-EU count 2 points, I can't understand why at moment EU-EU is different to NA, As or Caribbean.

Seems likely this will shift the majority of beam headings from NA to Caribbean rather than going for transatlantic DX.

2 pts are enough

Scoring method according continent borders is totally unfair! The distance between correspondents is ONLY fair criteria for scoring a contact. This includes Q's within same DXCC entity. Some entities are too small but some is more 5000 km wide and still zero point???? It just reduce activity from farthest areas.

What is the objective of current rule? What is the objective of the proposed rule? Let's define and agree on the objectives first before reviewing the language of the rules.

Please analyze who is the winners in CQ WW DX and from what areas. Why you propose changes only for North America. For example Middle East... and Europe...

That proposed change's language needs to incorporate the part about one's own country. If I understand correctly, W/K stns working XE or VE would count 2, but W/K to W/K, VE to VE, and XE to XE would still count 0.

Contact with own country 1 point

For N & S America

contact Stns in your own country	0 points
contact zones 1-5 ----	1 '
contact zones 6 7 8 9 ---	2 '
contact all others -----	3 '

For Stns. in Zones 6 7 8 9

contacts in zones 6 7 8 9 -----	0 points
contacts in zones 1 2 3 4 5 10 11 -	2 '
contacts all others -----	3 '

for stns in zones 10 11 12 13

contacts in 10 11 12 13 -----	0 points
contacts in 6 7 8 9 -----	2 '
contacts in all others -----	3 '

Or something like this would be more equitable. As in the last contest as QRP , I do not stand a hope in competing with stns from the east coast as long as NA contact are worth 2 points. Due to operator population distribution and proximity to the Caribbean.

Why, same should be then valid for Sicily, Hong Kong, CT3,...? Even two points is too much. Are we not all playing on the same rules?

I think without increasing intra NA points, there are enough activities from CA petition. Increase is not necessary.

It'll be easy for the organizer to recalculate the score according to the changed rule. Won't the Caribbean be the only region to be the world champion in the new rule? If so, west African activities may be discouraged.

Nothing wrong with the way it is.

This can maybe increase some activity from zones 6,7,8.

Doesn't make sense to me...why not extend it to SA stations, too? Where do you stop when trying to balance the scores...

make own country contact count 1pt

Contacts for same-zone within same country, for zone credit, should count as two points ... with a one-such-contact limit. How ELSE do you get the zone? This is THE #1 most common question I hear, and is an off-putting issue for new participants in this contest.

Long overdue

At the end of the day - Bermuda is just as hard as Venezuela - why count it differently?

more activity from caribic

There should be an incentive for DXpeditions to the Caribbean. Should it be 3 points? I am not sure but rather not. They are competitive as it is.

The US States are most as big as a EU-Country. Why not count every US-State as a Multiplier, treat it similar as with the WAE-List. More Multis = more Fun. Contacts with own country or state should give 1 or 0.5 points

I operated as TG9IDX in CQWW CW 2012 and think that this is a disadvantage for zone 6, 7, 8. Especially islands in zone 9 have a big advantage by getting 3 points/QSO and having almost the same distance to the U.S. and the same multiplier status.

And how to deal with CU2 or SV9 or even GD then?

That would help to equalize the EU advantage of many countries in a small geographic area. Even better would be intra country as 1 point but I'm OK with 0 as it is a 'DX' contest.

Aren't the rules complicated enough?? Egads, you need a computer to figure it all out!!

I love to have an advantage being in Zone 9 ;-)

I believe intent is to allow US and Canada stations 3 points for other NA Qs. I would modify to include other NA for 3 points, i.e., FP, VP9 and perhaps KL7.

I usually operate in western Europe. My expectation is that this would disincentivise such stations from making QSOs with western Europe - it would as a result be likely substantially more difficult to sustain a run at times of days when the path to the Americas is wide open.

Whoa!!! As a V26B alumni and now TI5W enthusiast looking at CQWW, the first thing my group talked about was never being able to win the contest since we are always at 2 point countries. Change this rule and all of us that participate in North American DX locations are going to LOVE IT and my guess is you'll get some negative feedback from the South American crew!

I think that contacts between stations in North America should be worth 1 point, just like all other continents. Why single out one continent to make it uneven worldwide? If you want a North American contest only, specify it like that.

Helps equalize NA and Europe

It gives the guys a chance that that don't go the the ABC's but still invest a lot of time and money to travel to a DX location in the Caribbean. I'd love to see a guy in C6A be able to clean a guy's clock down in P4.

Zones 6 to 8 already have tremendous geographic advantages... not sure where the benefit lies for giving them even more points.

Alaska to New York is 2 points but Texas to Mexico is 3 points? Don't be silly--you can't equalize everything--leave it like it is. The current scoring only affects DXpeditions to the Caribbean who want to 'win.' For most operators, it makes no difference at all--its life.

WHY ? ? ?

YES a BIG YES we are in a complete disadvantage no doubt about it, it has to be a 3 points!

This would mean that less understanding of propagation (to actually find 'real' 3-pointers further away), and therefore less planning and skill, were necessary. I am against this.

The rule works fine; the rules were changed to the present system to promote activity in the Caribbean and Central America. Move to SA if you want a 3 point QTH.

Yes. This would encourage other contesting sites in the Caribbean and Central America.

This has all the makings of a 'can of worms'

Caribbean stations already have an advantage.

I have contested extensively in the Caribbean and it seems fine the way it is.

Why would you suggest this?

It boils down to the definition of North America. If Caribbean/Central America is outside the definition of North America then yes.

I don't see the need to make a change, but I am okay with whatever is decided in this regard.

If there's some overriding need for this change, I can't see it...

I do not see any reason to change the current rule(s).

I've never understood the handicap...J3 is just as far as PJ2/4 but only gets 2 points per q? Most all of the Caribbean have a similarly low ham population.

The 2 point thing has long outlived its original purpose, but it's so ingrained now it probably doesn't need to change.

Keep changing the point scoring and the contest base will finally be destroyed ... leave it as it is!

Scoring should be the same as in the rest of the world. US operators get an advantage with the higher scoring compared to EU operators.

Don't get the question, I thought NA to zones 6/7/8 were 3 pts already, but being in Asia my comment would not be of much use anyway.

Some of us have gone to great expense and difficulty to locate in 3-point nations. It would be tragic for us if this advantage were to be legislated away.

from my operating station PJ2T without 3 point rule EU would be impossible to run against

The NA stations are already favoured heavily with the current rules over Europeans and others. Please don't make it even worse.

USA/USA should equal 1 point per QSO, if you give more points the contest turns out to be a stateside one.

Has the effect of the change been analyzed using past logs?

I feel that VE's and other NA countries have an unfair advantage over USA stations in the point structure. Same goes for EU's who can work each other all day and night long. You need to find a way to level the playing field. If the proposed scoring change does this, then fine.

3p rule would make the contest less interesting, intra 'Las Americas'. OR - maybe the rest of the world (excl. US/CAN/Caribbean) would gain more prestige being the competition among equals...

Though voting YES, I really have no strong opinion about 2 vs. 3.

The current rule allows emphasis on Central and Caribbean participation. The proposed rule would seem to help.

Go the other way: Every contact with another country counts 3 points. Every contact with another zone counts 3 points unless its within your country which would count 1 point. Then that zone 3 Multi-Multi would be more interested in giving me zone 3 on 80m if I'm running 100 watts and a low dipole.

Wouldn't it be more equitable for 3 point QSOs between zones 1, 6, 7, 8 and the USA and Canada and QSOs between stations in the US/Canada and station in US/Canada = 0 points.

I wish the point factor by continents be removed completely, ie, make every QSO the same point. Every continent is different in shape and population and this point factor is a big source contributing to inequality in scoring and thus lack of participation from geographically disadvantaged areas.

A little US centric? What about Europe?

They should only receive 1 point or stations on other continents should receive the same advantage.

There is plenty of activity from 6,7 & 8 right now. It ain't broke so does not require a fix. There will always be zone borders and stations that are close to the borders. 'fixing' these borders will lead to the next 'unfair' situation of geography.

Another consideration is the matter of contest records which will become meaningless in the historical context.

Apply similar rule for European stations.

Having operated from both Zone 8 and 9, as well as 6, 7, 11, 13, 36, 37, and perhaps others, I understand the issue and inequities. But it will appear as a 'gift' to the USA hams, and you will have the whole world angry with the USA community.

Need to give West Coast stations an opportunity to compete. EU mults for the NA East coast FAR outweigh what we have on the West coast

I'm torn. I've operated a number of times from two-point Caribbean countries. It's frustrating to have essentially no chance to win. This change, however, would quite possible mean that the Netherland Antilles would never win. It would also make the contest more like ARRL DX for Caribbean stations. Why bother with EU and JA once you get the mults?

I prefer the status quo for the sake of being able to compare station performance over time including historical records.

This is a clear discrimination with respect to stations in other areas, like Pacific, Asia (Far East) etc.

In this case, will necessary: Contacts with PP8, PW8, etc. will count 3 points. The same case in some countries. My opinion is no changes rules.

Absolutely 100% behind this. It would increase DXpedition activity to the Caribbean dramatically, which would benefit worldwide activity (more J6s and FJs and C6s for everybody to work, and a greater incentive for guys like me to activate a J6, FJ or C6 who couldn't otherwise afford to go to D4, EA8 or 8P.

We in the NE have Canada. Those on the Gulf have the carrib.

It would certainly help level the field with the PJs & 9Y.

It is well-known that the stations in the Caribbean have the best location possible in the world for this contest. Why let them pad their scores more?

I am OK either way. The more points the merrier

This would give stations in the Caribbean a non justifiable advantage.

would encourage equality for MMs who are just outside that dreaded SA border

Currently mainland EU stations cannot compete with nearby stations operating countries such as the Azores or Morocco. It is difficult and costly to mount 'off shore' efforts such as EA8BH or CN8WW especially for NA operators/teams. However, since it is difficult for main land NA stations to compete with the European 'off shore' stations, expanding the 3 point zone into the Caribbean/Central America would make it easier and more cost effective for NA operators and teams to mount effective challenges for the overall top scores and might tend to even the competition at that level. It would put mainland NA operators in the same position as EU operators - competing for country and state awards - but that is more or less where we are at the present.

That change would put all winners in Northern Caribbean. Better change to 1 point inside NA, like inside all other continents. Be careful to make changes that favour NA-stations or else we non-NA would not bother any more. Better modify the 0-point rule to be inside US/VE-state or call area to match us in EU, but don't forget VK and UA in that case.

Never felt they should. They are too much like being in the same continent.

I support worldwide participation and adding points for NA to work NA might regionalize operating time and harm the international DX flavor of the contest.

I think this change would actually encourage more contest expeditions in NA and relieve some of the pressure on the popular but limited SA sites. More expeditions would certainly be a boon to the contest in general.

The rule for points should be the same world-wide. Currently, the point rule prevents an unfair advantage over Europe & the rest of the world.

If this change takes place, it should be applicable to all continents.

The change would encourage small 'vacation' DXpeditions to zones 6,7, & 8, and would help balance the scoring differential the EU hams now enjoy over NA hams by having so many different EU entities nearby as multipliers not easily available to NA (especially to W6 & W7 areas).

I am in zone 14 and will not deal with that problem.

At some point you gotta give credit for DX.

Keep things the way they are

If the own country rule applies it should be the same like for everybody else working his own country. DL, G, I, UA have all huge disadvantages over USA stations.

The only way to install a rule with same results for all is by acknowledging distance of a contact. If central America or Caribbean get 3 points (with 1000-3000 km) what would I get from New Zealand (12000-15500 km) for working USA? 15 points?

This would have been a great idea when the contest was started, but changing it now would make historical records less interesting.

They should count 1 point like everywhere else in the world. The stupidest rule in the book IMO.

Talk about a USA biased rule change. This will set a bad precedent. If I was a UA9, after this proposed change, I would propose that everything in zones 24, 25, 26 and Asians in 27 and 28 should count three points because they are far away.

Within NA boundaries but different countries: 2points.

Otherwise a contact between Miami and Orlando would be two points, that is a joke!

Stations in central/south America are already geographically advantaged compared to many other parts of the world. There's no reason to increase their advantage by increasing points for contacts with other NA stations.

Q10. Should the rules add a new scoring exception for Asia?

Should the rules add a new scoring exception for Asia?

Add: "Exception: For Asian stations, all contacts between Asia and Japan should count (3) points."

Yes	1350	27.7%
No	1608	32.9%
No opinion	1924	39.4%
Total	4882	

Comments:

Japan IS Asia.....

This would encourage Japanese stations to work voluminous Indonesians, Asiatic Russians, etc.

Same reasoning. Why should Asia / JA be worth more than Italy to Sweden? Too much tinkering is not a good thing --- gets too gimmicky and starts to feel like the lawyers are writing the rules creating more unfairness than they correct.

same as NA-carib

Or at least two. NA 2 point rule makes it hard not to support.

If this boosts JA activity, it would probably be worthwhile.

Distance scoring makes this point mute.

Seems to me that there should be exceptions for distance, not specific countries.

KISS

We down south of South America, have a permanent handicap against the northern hemisphere due to propagation pattern..

* Asian counties exist in wide range between West to East. This makes various handicap like propagation limit and others.

* If 'CQ' hopes more competitor and participants from Asian countries (include JA), should to consider more points weighting for inter Asian contacts.

* Under the rule in recent, some countries nearby high radio population like Cyprus (5B4) may boost their score more times than other Asian countries and they sweeps most records and plaques.

* In my opinion, contact between Asia to Asia should to adjust point two or more..!

Segmentation is a bad idea. Maybe Qs between W2 and VE2 should count for 3 points too. A very slippery slope.

Yes, this will be a leveler.

Japan operators have a big advantages compare to other countries operators since almost all VE/W station beaming to japan, so easily got a big 3 point from NA

Not sure why this is needed. That's like giving US stations an extra point for contacting Canada or Mexico.

Suggest splitting Asia down the middle and having a two-point structure. Contacts between Asian stations in zones 18-19-23-24-25 and zones 17-20-21-22-26-27 count two points. Or some variation thereof. What you do NOT want is China-Japan counting three points due to the large numbers of hams involved. If you do try this, try it for a fixed period (three years, maybe?) and then re-evaluate.

Asia and Japan are at the same disadvantage as North America relative to Europe (see my previous comments). Now, what to do for Oceania and the lads down under?

Don't have enough data to have an opinion.

2 points?

If N. Af./EU get 3, and Carrib./NA get 3, then JA/BY should also get 3...

I don't think so. JA's & BY's should not get bonuses for working JA's and BY's. We don't get bonuses for working W/K and VE. If you want to give Asians 3 points for working Asians other than their own country, that would be OK.

why? Japan are a lot of Operators.

Not sure, would be curious what effect this has on past results.

Same situation as Caribbean and NA.

I agree only if this rule should be valid for far away countries like Japan, South Korea. Not for 5B (as P33W) or some other near EU.

This would make Asian Turkey, Cyprus, or the Middle East more interesting to operate from.

That would effectively be the case with 3 points for any QSO outside of your own zone. Again, rule simplicity is good.

It would inflate Japan and Asia scores, especially on 40, 80 meters---3 points for working a station 100 miles away? Definitely NO.

Add one point in same country each others.

Why just Asia? Give 3 points to everyone, so QSO distance is not part of the game anymore.

I hardly ever hear JA's

same as adding the US exception

Strange question between Asia and the US or Europe, or Asia to Asia, or Pacific?

Why? A station in the SE US only gets 2 points for AK? The guys in TA only get 2 for Asians.

I am divided but we need to increase activity in non-JA countries.

My argument is the same as I've given for North American stations working each other.

Will defer to the JA's for this question, but it may also increase participation.

Asians can run JAs all day and night. That's as bad, or worse, than allowing 3 points for certain Caribbean locations!!! DON'T DO IT.

We have ALL JA contest. If I need points working JA, I will do it. Like Q between JA's, any domestic Q's are zero, then OK. If JA's=0 but between BY's are 1 (or 3) I will NEVER do such contest.

YES - At removal from Japan more than 3000 km.

This would give too much of an advantage to the Asian stations.

Anything that stimulates more participation from Asia, especially JA, would be good for the contest.

This needs more thought - could it add to volume inter Asia making rest of World to have less Q's with Asia...

If you count Australia VK in this rule.

If you change scoring for zones 1-5 to 6-8 then this seems fair

2 points.

Would you look at that. You read my mind. I'm only 58% done with this questionnaire. Now I wonder what else is in store.

Yes, if it would generate more activity on countries outside of Japan

This would help the JA guys I think. Why not?

Asia is Asia

I thought Japan was part of Asia. Sure is awfully close. If you do that, how about making all contacts with VE stations worth 3 points for USA stations?

I am casual tester, I don't really care for points since I will never be competitive in the field (I have to work on weekends).

There must have been some input from Japan or (other) Asia for this to have come up. From my (W9 & HR) areas I do not see why this should be done, But, I do not operate from Asia/Japan.

I'm inclined to say no. Other Asian stations will have less incentive to work NA stations since they can work JAs at a faster rate.

It make increasing participant from ASIA and Japan. I think, I hope.

Same idea described on last question if the propagation issue are the same. Also we know there are a lot of Japanese stations on the air and this part of the world will have more benefits from the rules than other areas. If you do 3 points between na and Caribbean, i think you must be the same between Asia and Japan. But what will be the benefits form higher distances with those countries with higher ham operators?

MOST DEFINITELY! It's a long way from Japan to SW Asia...

Yep that could help balance the disadvantage 1&3 have in making contacts in 8. While the Multipliers are not here the number of JA's working contest make up for that.

I think points rules should remain as it is

No. Make it 2 points as it is for NA contacts.

each prefecture in japan should be treated as a separate 'country'. this will give the west coast a fair chance against the east coast euro advantage

I am sure we would see more JA stations again.

Why should they have an advantage?

Either it is DX or not. Shouldn't a DX entity be counted as such?

What would be the scoring for a 4X4 and UA0 ?? or JA and 4X ? , much more difficult than 4X and DL

No too sure what the purpose here....perhaps then all points between USA and Canada 3 points? Is this to promote activity? As a west coaster I count on the Japanese stations for 3 point QSOs

Although I am a Japanese, I don't see why this change is necessary.

That could balance it out a bit, but there are so many more European Zones that it really may not help much. Good try though.

I cannot give the answer to this question without the serious analysis of several contests

Good politics

Yes, but FAR more is needed. Each JA prefecture and each VK call area should be a multipliers to partially compensate for the huge scoring advantage of stations in zone 2, 4, 5 7, 8, 9 due to their proximity to EU multipliers in EU.

NO, however, zone 21 and 20 are too far.

I don't think there should be any scoring exceptions.

Inner-Continent is inner-continent, ok that sounds unfair, e.g. IG9 to I is DX, but that's the way. If you start exceptions, everyone would ask... VE8 to YV0 is NA to NA even when it's much more DX as IG9 to 9H, but where draw the line...

I don't know this issue, but seems to me it's similar to the previous question. Maybe more points will encourage more Chinese stations to get on.

If numerical scores for Asian stations is a motivator for them, then this would make Asian stations more likely to participate, rather than making North America the center of the universe, and others don't count much. I have not really thought this out much.

Should be the same as united states 2 points

Consider Asia is wide enough and Japan is the far east edge, almost in Pacific Ocean.

Since I don't participate from there, I'll leave it to them to argue *their* point question.

YES - for South East Asia, NO - for Cyprus and Middle East

Don't really have an opinion. I would like it if the opinions of JA's and others in Asia were strongly considered here.

What is the reason for putting in scoring exceptions??? This sounds like pandering to scoring ego issues..... or score inflation :-)

Only if the previous Caribbean/South American scoring change is made as well. Either make BOTH or leave as is.

NO,NO,NO...

On the basis of zones would be much better which would be conceptually the same as the suggested North American points for QSOs with the Caribbean.

That will be great !

Same rules for 'world wide'

Most mults are single hop from JA. This would encourage rarer AS stns to just run JA

Why JA is better of HS? (or JT), (OR 4x jr 4J)

Sounds great. Far west (from JA) station focuses to EU instead of JA with current rule. This will change the situation.

It would be nice to have more chances to win from places we couldn't until now. Same applies to Greece for example. It is far from USA (in comparison to CT for example) and far from JA (in comparison to UA). So even you do it better for JA it will not be fairly for others. It is better to change points between USA and Caribbean and not between JA and Asia. More fair for JA in comparison with USA but those differences less fair in comparison with others

Seems like for these questions the rationale behind them would be helpful.

It would only be fair.

All contacts between Asia and Japan are very light...

I do not know why such change is necessary.

Again - remember the world - not just fixing one-off matters.

2 points instead?

why on earth is Japan special.....

I think this is a good thing.

Always thought JAs have a big geographical disadvantage. That he'll would encourage more of them to make a contest entry.

It makes big difference to me! If the non-JA stations can make easy 3s working JA they will have less incentive to work US once they have five NA zones ticked.

(2)points is OK

It would be mor fair if all continents have similar rules.

1p between mainland stations within a cointinent

2p between islands counting for own DXCC entities and all other stations within the continent. Contacts between New Zealand and Australia should maby be an exception and counts for 1p.

3p Between continents

This will stimulate testers to activate smaller DXCC entities

This is a much better idea than any NA related changes. It would be really good to rekindle interest in CQWW in Japan and this is a good move in that direction.

Japan is in Asia! If you open the door to such exceptions, you don't know where you will end!

Same as with changing the scoring system for NA / Caraibbean. If it's more fun for them, do it.

No, no way It is a shame to complicate things. And disadvantaged others.

I don't think this would encourage more activity from JA - if that is what is intended.

We have an rapidly rising amateur population in China and that would very soon lead to atrocious logs.

The advantage of the QSOs between Asia and Japan should be increased. Excited!

All countries same rules.

Three points for many Japanese stations will provide a major advantage to Asian stations.

Not sure. Interesting concept but what is the danger of CQWW becoming a BY-JA fest?

Two comments.

a) Living in Cyprus, Japan is a long way away, and justifies 3 points.

b) Because of the current scoring, once I have the mult, I tend to ignore Japanese callers in a pile-up situation. The new scoring exception would eliminate this, and would be fairer for the JA stations.

If Caribbean - USA 3 points, why not Asia - Japan 3 points?

Why? And why not i.e. between Asia and Phillipines? Or other?

Only when same applies to Africa, Oceania, Australia, and Europe, too.

Better to split East Asia/ West asia or swome such using perhaps CQ zones?

Forget about continent related scoring, use different scoring system that would bring more fun for those who do not operate from continent edges. It should be distance that matters, and not proximity to either specific country. However, given these Qs in this survey seems as you already feel uncomfortable about current scoring, and try to set better scoring for poor Japanese who are away from everybody. Make it distance related.

only 2 points

Not unless you include VK or Oceania?

Not fair to other continents

What about EU scoring?!?! Why 3 point only for NA-CA and Asia -Japan QSO's?

Would that really make much difference??? exceptions never help to reinforce rules...

If there would be new rules for North America and Asia, then we would like to have also a new rule for Germany. Somme 100 QSOs with zero points is a pain in the ass. Possible Solution: Just allow QSOs with own land like it is scored in WPX with 1 point and you don't need any exceptions for North America, Asia or so.

Given the relative lack of activity in Asia outside Japan, this would seem sensible.

Any change in scoring should try to equalize competitors

Again, I have no experience of operating in Asia, but I accept that a small continent like Europe currently has an advantage over large continents.

Should all contacts between EU and GB and EI count 3 points?

if yes look to change EUs points as well

While we're at it, why not make all contacts between Asian countries be worth 2 pts? But, where do we stop? Will Europe be next for 2 pts between all countries? And why not more points for Low Band operations?

Same scoring for everyone.

Maybe consider distance based scores on zones for all participants?

Why? TA with JA 3 points, but SV NOT 3 points. What is different-100 km!!

Asia is far from EU, AF, NA and SA so there should be 3 points for QSO between AS and JA

Would be OK, when you add this change for Europe (DL, F, G) too....

I don't enough about that situation in order to comment.

This additional rule should make the contest poorer, and cheaper, I believe.

If this helps making the contest more attractive for JA stations, then I think it would be a good idea. Another idea would be to change the scoring altogether, more similar like in WPX contest where own country is one point. Or like in other contests where there are even 1/2/3/4/5 points regarding to distance. I know this would be a serious change and all the old records would become obsolete. But this would also be a new chance.

Why?

the rules must be the same for all continents

Japan is in Asia, right? Japan isn't in Oceania, right? World map rules.

This kind of new implementation (and the other thingy about Car/Cen Am) would leave EU out more and more.

Contest committee: PLEASE DO NOT MAKE THE SAME FAULT IN WW AS WITH THE WPX AND NA.

A JA-to-4X4 contact is only two points because of a cartographer's convention? Sounds silly.

Same continent.

Actually I would like to see point values for all contacts in this contest become predicated on grid square distances. This would make greater distances more valuable for everyone.

Asia is a pretty big territory. What would this be trying to accomplish? I don't understand... not an issue for me.

Is another chance for more Asian stations on the air.

I like to say Yes, but No.

I have operated from 9M2, VS6 and from there you can have JA-pile 24h... But from HZ and A61 it is the opposite, JA-piles just give 1p.... Extremely unfair in such a wide continent.

I rather suggest:

Divide AS: Present U EU/AS border, or in more detail:

West Asia: 20 AS part, 21,22,26, 28 9M2, 9V1

East Asia: 17,18,19,24,25, 23 except R0y, 27 BS7, JD1o.

My experience im 9M2 can not count as not practical to form an unfair area in SE Asia!

Yes. I have operated CQWW from 9M2 many times. Being so far away from EU and NA this rule would increase participation from AS and JA

Points should be distance based, not country based.

I assume that this is also vice versa? So a significant advantage especially for the eastern Asian countries...
DEFINETELY: NO

This would be more competitive for JA and ASIA stations, since they have just a couple of station on the air in ASIA and a lot in JA. Is like to South America Stations to NA station. A lot in US and a few in SA.

Finally it's time for sanity.

Welcome! This helps us, JAs, called by other Asian nations.

Asia is HUGE--eastern Turkey to JA. Why not 3 points for all Asia to Asia QSOs? Why should just JA get special treatment?

I have operated CQ WW from BY often. Propagation there is tough so anything like his that would help scores ...

As for NA change

What is the thinking here? Too large an area?

I have not studied this enough to make an informed decision.

Making JA <--> Asia worth 2 points instead of 1 would be more consistent with the historical NA exception. Perhaps I would go for that.

I'd suggest a change if it encourages overall additional activity. I generally would suggest limiting exceptions, particularly those that apply to one specific country.

Asian and particularly Japanese activity should be encouraged.

I suppose Japan is like our Caribbean. If it's worth more, more stations trying to win will go there.

They're still too close to the rest of Asia.

See above. QSO points should be reciprocal. Sam points for every DX QSO.

Japan = Asia = same continent!

Why select only Japan it will be same continent of Asia or before change rule and become Japanese to Oceania, I not understand this thing...

Only if the USA gets the same consideration.

that would bring more operators, from Asia for sure.

IF - Then: The same should apply for European Stations

Should encourage more JA activity but will they spend more time working Asia and less on ROW?

This will give JA's a big help. I think it's unfair for us Europeans.

It's time to give the Japanese a fair chance

Again, a continent is a continent. The top Japanese have for long travelled to Pacific if they want higher scores.

Only 2 points for the proximity between Asia and JA stations

If 2 points are for NA then 2 points should be for AS-JA.

Why single out JA? BY activity is increasing.

Should work both ways. This may change the winning location to middle east from West Africa/Caribbean.

I would handle them similar as in all other places in the world. The CQWW contest are CQ zones oriented. The geography of the countries should not be further involved in the score. This is similar as the question before, about the Americans.

Not sure what the issue is here.

This is new to me. I don't understand why.

Why, distance becomes a paramount issue. Japan and most Asian stations have less distance to make contacts and of course the issue of the best natural ground plane on earth. And now you want to give another advantage.

Yes, but not for zone 24

Distance based scoring would be fairer.

No, it's the same rules like north America, I think, and see like this !

Japan belongs to Asia.

Japan should especially count for 3 points. They have been through a lot and deserve to get some recognition. Some of us don't want to contact them because they don't really count for anything. It does not seem fair. Asia is another one. I enjoy acknowledging them no matter what.

Why? Is it too big? I think no.

The same rules for all stations.

No, but count them as 2 points each as is done for North American stations. And count each JA prefecture as a separate multiplier.

The current system is fair

In that case maybe all contacts between continental EU and overseas should count also 3 points, or?

Asia = Europa

I guess the whole 2-points NA/1-point EU and now 3-points Asia rules are debatable. Continents are just not comparable regarding distances and population. To be fair to everybody, the only way to go is measure WWL.

No comment, there are not too many Asian stations. Japan belong to Asia ...

Why?

This sounds like a way to encourage participation (good) but could also be a way to equalize scores (i. e. enable a higher score with the same number of contacts). Other than participation, all scoring changes should be focused on rewarding the best contesting efforts

Yes a thousand times yes. Also, JA should have its own continent label because now JA dominates Asia, and believe me, Asia is lots larger than just JA.

Most contests run in America display a very American-centered mind-set that can't be seen until one ops from some other place. I am not in service to USA ops and want a level playing field for others.

This would be great for them and unlike the previous question, JA participation is in the toilet and needs a fix. If this helps it, wonderful.

I don't know the conditions JA-AS

Unlike NA, Asia is huge. Getting only two points when someone in A7 or 4X works a JA seems incredibly unfair, especially if a nearby VK/ZL/KH2 gets 3 points for working JA. However, BY to JA seems like it is too easy (too close). Some kind of minimum distance formula needs to be considered before a QSO should count as 3 points, for all continents.

No! Again, I just got a new logging program to update it for contest, all these rule changes just keep non computer experts buying new software!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! If you can up-date my software that may make a difference...

Like saying all contacts between Ohio and Florida count three.

I have no idea why this is necessary, I am not a DX'er.

And again, leave the contest rules alone!

It should be 2 points like VE to US or Caribbean to US

I'm used to it and it's what I expect.

I appreciate simple rule, 1point for same continent and 3point for different continent.

I strongly hope this change, and also all contacts between JA should count 3 points. The probability for many JA to join will be increased if so.

ITS 3 TIMES THE DISTANCE AS BETWEN Israel and Europe.....

good idea

2 points, same as North America rule

Outside zone 18,19,23,24,25,26 count (3) points.

It is also hard from EU to reach all States.

In JA there are so many hams and so less multipliers, so there is a drawback to be in japan. not only you are no multiplier but also QSOs with own country count 0 points. There is a similar situation in Germany compared to countries next to Germany (Iz, 9a, for example). Maybe a better aproach would be to count (1) point for QSOs within the same country.

I already sort of sort of answered this question before.... QSOs within Asia could be 2 points.

And what about Europe? QSOs within Europe could be 2 points, too.

The scoring principle should be standardized throughout the world, not different for different continents.

I believe this situation is similar to the Caribbean stations and U.S.A.

Somehow stations from Japan should be motivated to participate more, not sure of the right way

should be the same for Asia as in US

The rules must be equal for all participants

With my little pistol station, I need all the help I can get with contacts to these countries.

maybe that would create more activity, don't see any down side from here in middle Alabama

I have no interest in this.

Wow, now that would be REALLY out of whack!!

Yes because it will improve Asian and ja participation

I'm not sure the rule for the Europeans, but the Asians should have the same scoring methodology as EU. NA should be the same for EU and Asia.

If it's not that way, then you should consider going to the grid square approach.

Ridiculous. Intra-continent contacts must be worth SAME POINTS in every continent

Japan is extreme east to most of the Asian countries.

Am in 2 land and see this benefitting west coast and their perceived disadvantage regarding east coast to EU so perhaps this would be seen as leveling the playing field somewhat

Only if you change it for NA too.

Why now a favor for the AS station?

This change would have no direct effect on my scores. Again, I would like to see an analysis of its impact from rescoring past logs.

Why exceptions for Asia, and not for Europe, Africa etc. ???

Why?

Unless you change the rules for Europe as well...

Japan is in Asia

Scoring should be uniform worldwide.

no, make it all the same: same continent 1 point, other continent 3 points. same country = 1 point.

2 points QSO with other countries in Asia, but only 1 points with JA to JA QSO

So what you will do with Europe?

Again, not sure on the rationale behind this.

I'm not sure that this should apply to stations in Korea, China and Taiwan, but definitely yes for other Asian stations.

Between UA0 and UA9 from 4 to 7 thousand kilometres, but we receive only 1 point for QSO.
Please give 3 points to a zone 19 for QSO c zones 18 and 17.

It looks attractive for me. But if You do not make change for NA You do not have a reason do it for Asia.

We have such short openings to Asia, it would leave sections of South Eastern US with little chance of landing some areas of Asia, ever. Tough enough now.

Wow - this is new. Japan can just work the tons of new BY hams and make a killing! Actually the whole points scoring system needs to be overhauled. Why even bother with extra points (essentially based on distance)?

Leave the UA9F in Asia

From OH point of view DX 's to Japan sometimes opens, mostly bands to Japan is not open, without good beams. Why not 3points, like in Caribbean, if I understood the meaning of this question.

When I was in Singapore (as 9V1OE) I contacted Japanese stations easily.

For Eu-EU contact will count ??? As ever 1? 2?

must be same like North Americans

1 point for same continent QSOs should be applied all over. Or everyone should get the same 2 points for own continent QSOs as NA is getting. Doesn't really matter how many points per QSO as long as it's equal to all.

I think this would increase participation from that part of the world. I've never been there and never operated from there so it's just an opinion.

Contacts between eastern Asia and Japan similar difficulty to cross-North America, or Alaska to California?

Keep it the same to keep all records intact. Changing the scoring process would cause extreme damage to the many years of this contest.

Japan vs Asia is similar to NA(stateside) vs (Caribbean)

Again, does it really matter? We take these things way too seriously.

what about Indonesia / Papua New Guinea ?

See earlier comment -- run simulations and see how this would change scoring. This one would seem to have more impact.

Definitely!!

only if Caribbean stations move to 3 points for USA QSOs

If you do it for the Caribbean you should do it for Japan.

Oh, my God! Please add that contacts between Europe and Asia count 5 points! And please, contacts with antipodes count 2 points as there are some advantage to work the antipodes...but on high bands only please! :-)

the amount of Asians and Japanese is declining, if this will boost the # of contenders, by all means

Leave it alone!

It would be nice if we could re-ignite the JA contest enthusiasm of the 80's.

This is comparable to the proposed 3-points between The Caribbean and other N/A stations.
Do both.

Given the large ham population in Japan they should be afforded the same consideration that USA has.

What is the reason of exception?

In recent years it seems the number of JA stations in the WW DX contests has declined. This may be a way to rekindle interest by JA ops if they feel they will have a way to boost their scores. It should benefit all participants to have more JA's 'in the hunt'.

What was the original system? 2 points?

Same than EU-EU, why EU-EU can't count 2 points?

Why only Japan then?

not too many JA's in the contest currently, need more

This new exception create only new injustice.

What is the objective?

This may increase JA activity but may dramatically reduce incentives of other east Asians to work EU/NA!

This might encourage more JA participation.

You may also say: between Asia and Asiatic Russia, Japan,...

If Japan got 3 points for China the Canada should get 3 points for USA

Again, the rules should be pretty simple and as much as possible equal for all. There will always be highly desired and punished places.

Not sure what this is solving for.

I do not see this change encourage more JA participants. If this is the purpose of change, then best way is to give away lots of plaque/trophies to JA participants

Increasing the exceptions doesn't seem a good idea. How about changing general rules: same zone/ctry=0, same zone different ctry=different zone/same ctry=1, different zone/same continent=2, different continent=3, etc.

Shouldn't we just move Japan?

If you want to give JAs an advantage, make all QSOs with JAs 3 pointers. That would also boost the depressed west coast US scores since stations here cannot easily reach all the MULTs in Europe that east coast stations can. In fact, why not convert the contest to Stew Perry Contest-type format? Have someone put in all the MULTs in the world as against all participating stations' distance from them, then give 'score leveling' points based on an inverse fudge factor based on the station's distance from the MULT centers of the world. This would level out the US East Coast and EU advantages, and give other areas of the world a better chance to succeed.

Anything to get more JA's in the contest!

less effort in JA to work EU

Something could be done making Asia more attractive - but should it be only Japan. Maybe 2 points for contacts between different countries in Asia, like for NA?

Where is the end here? VKs would deserve 5 points?

Again, how complicated do you want to make this? (Being a 'little pistol' in eastern North American, I don't even *hear* JA's, let alone work them, so it doesn't affect me personally, but...)

Then all contacts between europe and the UK should also count 3 points :-)

What about to score 1 point for contacts inside the own country inside Europe ?

This rule wording needs amending to clarify that contacts within Japan would not also count as three points. I have little opinion otherwise.

I'm going to leave this one to your best judgment along with the JA/Asians you are surveying.

Same reason as before

Helps equalize JA and Europe

No. Again, you can't equalize everything. How about all contacts between stations in Europe count a half a point since it's like NY working NJ.

WHY ? ? ?

Why will they have the advantage within their same continent if in North America we don't have it !

It's about time!

NA to JA contacts should have higher points, ie 5

Anything to increase participation in that part of the world is a good thing....

It has the same implications as the North America/South America question.

No. However, I would support distance scoring of some sort.

I don't see the need - but then I never operated from Asia so am not really qualified to have any strong opinion.

Did Japan become NOT part of Asia somewhere in there?

I suppose this becomes the equivalent of the US running EU.

If it would help get JAs back into the contest in the numbers of 30 years ago, it's worth considering.

Soon too also China

At high bands Asian stations have enough advantage against others so no reason to do that

As an Asian stn and being located equidistant between JA and east coast USA I am bound to say 'Yes', JA is tough on 40 and below.

It is necessary to consider balance with other area.

Yes, if that would increase the participation of JA stations.

Although it would benefit me keep it as it is.

Again, no strong opinion.

Applied to low bands of 160 - 40. NOT for high bands.

No change in the ratio will solve the inequality in the scoring system, period.

This will lead to why just JA - what about HL and then BY? I doubt that the reduction in JA activity is in any way related to 1 vs 3 points. JA activity is down due to license numbers and not points incentive in this particular contest. JA activity is down in all contests as near as I can tell.

this will seem as favoritism to JA amateurs

Yes, on the provision that NA and the Caribbean count the same--and for the same reasons. Rich JAs going off to activate HS0 or BY or XX9 means more mults and more interesting DX for all.

Long overdue.

Only DX contacts should count 3 points. Same issue applies to EA8 and CT3. For EA8 and CT3 contacts with EU count three points although its no DX. Basically these are local QSOs.

If you start that kind of exceptions, every other country would like to have it too.

Provided Caribbean stations stay at 3 pts to NA. If NA to Caribbean drops to 2 pts, then no, don't add the exception.

If we allow zones 20, 21 and even 17 get 3 points for JA they will be in a very favorable condition compared to the rest of AS 'cos they will still have vy easy 3 pts EU Q's

I have nothing against this. Sorry, but I just don't understand the reasoning behind it to make a decision.

If this change takes place, it should be applicable to all continents.

Same standards ought to apply fo Asia to JA as applies for W4 to KP4

not really sure about why this change would be needed/wanted

Keep things the way they are

Why not Koreans too?

I don't understand this concept. The entire continent rule should be eliminated - Asia is a HUGE continent and no way for HS(me) or JA to compete with 5B, 4X, UP etc. The continent rule gives unfair advantage to lucky geopolitical locations on the edge of large continents.

May be it's good idea

Equally stupid as the prior suggested change.

Exceptions to the scoring rules are a bad idea, all around. If you grant one, where does it stop? What about ZL, for example, out in the middle of nowhere? The existing one for NA is also a bad idea. See my previous comment: contesting does not take place on a level playing field.

Same as I just commented for NA

NO! Do not treat Japan separately. How about contacts in different ZONES but same CONTINENT are worth 2 points (independent of country).

One country - 1 point.

The same comment as to NA.

We must just acknowledge that the scoring system is not perfect. Changing it would not change that fact, but make old results not comparable with the new ones.

If You operate from the middle of Iowa, You will within a radius of 200 miles have Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska and South Dakota to operate, in other words 7 states. To work these on 160, 80 and 40 meters is no problem. To do the same trick from northern Scandinavia for instance Luleå, Sweden, You must operate 600 miles to reach Finland, Norway, Denmark, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland. Within 200 miles You have Finland, barely Norway, and the Aurora oval in the sky...

That is just how it is. The JA hams understand this. That is life. In real life, You just have to like the deal. The answer in Scandinavia is more aluminum in the air :-)

Q11. Should it be possible for the CQ WW Committee to disqualify stations with wide signals

Should it be possible for the CQ WW Committee to disqualify stations with wide signals (e.g., splatter, key clicks) based on SDR recordings or other observations?

Yes	3112	63.5%
No	1174	23.9%
No opinion	619	12.6%
Total	4905	

Comments:

The bands are crowded enough during major contest, it would be best if stations have as clean a signal as possible. _HOWEVER_, this needs to be applied very carefully and within a specific technical framework so that everyone knows the rules and they are applied across the board - fairly

Would an email / letter / radiogram etc not be sufficient to alert the offending operator?

Spectral purity is a goal we must all seek to attain. It is part of good sportsmanship.

Absolutely! With warning for first time. Or at least score reduction by 20..30%.

One needs to be VERY careful in interpreting these recordings. For example, SDR have such excellent dynamic range that stations can appear to be wide even when operated within specifications AND meeting FCC/manufacture specs. How do you insure that such operation doesn't unfairly get punished?

Yes, deliberate unsportsmanlike conduct must be addressed. Mistakes should be notified, so that the operator

can make a correction. Deliberate wide signals should be punished with yellow and red card. We can no more accept strong signals wide as a barn door on the bands. The offenders are often not only wide, but also very strong, implying use of too much power (far beyond 1,5 kW).

Advise them of the problem, but it's not fair to have put in a good effort just to be eliminated in the end.

There needs to be some warning mechanism. Notification after the test that future technical issues will be possible ground for dq.

Only if there are many complaints

Q12. Should the 275 km distance limit be changed?

The Club Competition requires all club members to reside or operate from within a 275 km circle (except DXpeditions). Should the 275 km distance limit be changed?

No change	1908	39.2%
Increase to 500 km	548	11.2%
Remove limit	806	16.5%
No opinion	1401	28.8%
Other	210	4.3%
Total	4873	

Comments:

if you do not have a limit it will be a who knows who club

100 mile limit

The wider the limit, the less meaningful is the club.

Rules should be governed by amateur population density. 500 miles in the Great Plains MIGHT be able to achieve parity with the East Coast.

Circles are not always the most appropriate way to limit territory, such as for Florida. Square miles or another measure might be more appropriate.

within a city is enough

all club members in same state/province in NA and Russia; others -same country

Suggest to cut the distance by half at least

275km is too wide for Japanese. Decrease to e.g. 100km, 50km, 10km, ...

I personally think (OK, I live in VK!) the club scoring regimen is a bit of a giggle. You can't stop people being members of a club simply because they don't all live in each other's shadow.

Change to same rules as WPX

That seems too large an area to me.

Need exceptions for states like Florida

What is "CLUB"? yes 500Km

Reduce it. No real club can exist within 275 km. PVRC is a perfect example. I don't know or ever see most of our members. It's a charade to call this a club.

Eliminate club scores

Assume this is to help more rural areas. Yes.

only for less dense population areas perhaps

decrease

Remove exception or remove requirement

100 km

shorten

smaller radius

Reduces limit to 100 km.

Change to within same entity.

The boundaries should have reasonable restraints. One good example- Florida Contest Group. This is well defined- Florida. Some similar reasonable constraint that is well defined and approved on a case by case basis by the Committee is a better choice.

Decrease the limit. Pretty biased set of answers to choose from, don't you think?

Any contiguous 60K square km (~the area of the 275km circle)

Make it 75 km

I guess I'm a purist, but I believe the circle should be increased some and all stations operate inside the circle (i.e. not on a Caribbean island). Also need to consider remote operation. Maybe the rules already cover this; I haven't had to look into this possibility (so far).

100 km

50 km limit

By country. Here in PY we have Araucaria with member from different Brazilian states. And our distances are big as you know. In some remote áreas, in the north for example, that is no clubs. So, considering 275kms, they can't join Araucaria for example, because the headquarter are in the southern part of the country.

Must be all in same country.

inside continents

reduce to 200 km

Allow "grandfathered in" status for guys that move out of their area.

Club members should be in one DXCC country or territory

I like the idea I saw proposed on the contesting reflector about making it some number of contiguous grid squares, so that folks in narrow, long states could include more folks from across the state.

More than 275 but less than 500. 500 is huge.

reduce the limit

Decrease to 80 or 100km

Give the chance to make teams with members located on different DXCC entities

The whole world, why not!

Allow alternate geometries for club territory, e.g. ## contiguous grid squares

limit 100 km

150KM

DECREASE

I chose other because you didn't allow for comments. REMOVE THE LIMIT! This is simply an arbitrary rule that has no merit. Please, REMOVE THE LIMIT!

You might have several categories of club... Some friends of mine who all used to live close together, now live scattered across the globe - might be fun to have a "(up to) 10 person international club" category :-) :-) that said, it isn't going to affect my operating... (Probably) :-)

Or - have club categories and circle sizes appropriate. Large 500KM, Medium 275KM and small 160 KM?

Remove this competition

within boundary of country in Europe

275 km to what? limited within 1 DXCC country

More club categories

10 km

I'm member of some clubs which are far from my home, more than 1000 Km and it's not fair that I cannot help the club

Members must live in one province.

I think it is next to impossible to solve this problem.

organizer decides

Very few from some countries. rule should be re-worked

Collection of contiguous grid squares to equal the area of a 275 mile circle.

It is very difficult to solve this problem.

Should be decreased.

same zone

50 km

Club members should be from the same DXCC entity.

more than 500 km

100 km

change to 100km

Reduce this limit, to 100km

Reduce to 100 kms

100 km

A club should be in a single area.

Decrease it!!! max 100 km

Yes it should be made smaller, to say 50km, I guess it's how to define a club member.

much smaller like 25 miles or so

reduce the distance to 175 km

made smaller

decrease to 50 km

I think the 275 km is too restrictive but at this time, I'm not sure what is fair.

Decrease to 200km

much smaller circle

Consider X contiguous grid squares, where X=the number of grid squares necessary to equal the area of the 275km circle. I would love to see the rule changes, but don't want to remove the circle requirement altogether.

reduce radius to 75 KM

change limit to same province or state

Remove distance limit but create a member limit. This could level the playing fields between clubs.

assessment should be made to fit geographies of clubs with odd features - e.g., Tennessee

limit to 50km

grid squares. I'd like to see an increase but no limit I don't think works.

decrease to 30km

who cares.

reduce limit 100km

No change km? m?

As you know, this is a difficult issue for the FCG due to the shape of the FL peninsula. Not sure what the answer is, but there should be some dispensation for this.

Should be reduced to 50 miles

Circles don't reflect the reality of club territory. How about 275 Km., or single state? That would allow i.e. FCG to include all of FL.

Maybe some exception for states like ME in YCCC, include the whole state.

100 km

Raise it. How far, TBD by you. Our contest club in CO is affected by present too-small limit. Not many testers out here.

Decrease to about 25 miles.

This hurts us more in the midwest than those clubs on the left or right coasts.

300 km

275 km is quite generous as it is. It is not clear why "club" DXpeditions should be included.

should be shorter (less)

200km

Remove distance limit, but require members to be in the same DXCC entity. Do not allow stations using remote operation between separate DXCC entities to be included in the same club entry.

for others countries with limited ham population YES, remove the limit

Same geographic location 275 meters not KM

250km

Keep the 275 km distance, but exclude the DXpedition exception

200 km

I live near Las Vegas. When I lived in Southern CA I was a member of the SCCC. But now I am too far away. But yet stations in Northern NV can have their scores counted by the NCCC. Not fair.

No distance limit (our country is too big, we are new testers)

Keep the limit but provide exceptions for natural boundaries like state or country boundaries.

Eliminate club competition.

How about square miles of land instead to accommodate coastal clubs

Peninsulas suffer from this too rigid rule and deserve case-by-case consideration.

A 280 km limit would be closer to ARRL limit of 175 miles, allowing almost everyone to submit for the same club for both ARRL and CQ contests.

100-150 km

seems to work to me.

in state of club no out.

Yes change, but not necessary a circle, but to conform to the shape of the State. For example KY. Consider Grid Squares.

Lower it. 100 KM makes sense.

Works fine for East coast. Not well for southwest

275 is okay, but, other alternative could be added.

If it is a club station all the operators will be at the station so why does it matter where the live?

Smaller circle!

Too arbitrary, why not 250 km or 300 km? Any limit at all would seem to favor the east coast vs clubs in the wide open western states.

you guys don't check it anyway so you can remove it as well

change to 100 km

The limit should be at the club home country,

Less than 100m

Basically OK now, but if changed should be increased only in sparsely populated areas.

I'm surprised it's so large! I think we have a limit of 100 KM for UK AFS

Increase to 350 km then all PA stations are in one club (VERON or VRZA)

500 miles. Kansas is 450 mi. east to west, and CO is 340 miles E to W. - Also, I like the NA team approach where you can have 5 or 10 guys per team anywhere in the country. We need more team contesting which is a real activity improvement device for a contest club.

Limit = DXCC country

It is reasonable to re-examine this rule. Please start with a statement of what the current rule actually is. As I understand it, a club member who resides in the club's circle and operate anywhere and have his/her score count toward the club's score. The statement in this question can be read as different from that. It's closer to the rule in ARRL DX.

decrease limit

I am a member of PVRC. We struggle with the circle but making the clubs even larger and more spread out is not, IMHO, going to improve the effectiveness of the contest clubs. PLEASE don't make us go through determining another new center! :-)

maybe reduce

Western geography is not New England.

decrease to 100 km

Remove, but in same country

within the same DXCC entity

Limit club members to operation from the same country as here in VK with our small population our VK Contest Club members are spread all around Australia

It should be national border of DXCC entity. No foreign call into a national club, except portable operations eg. DL/K5ZD.

reduce to 1 km

decrease to 100 km

be reduced to 100 km

Club count as country boundaries

should depend on the surface of the entity to which they belong

if changed, same as other changes, previous records stand, start anew after the change

Leave it as it is... what is a 'club'? national, local or international... you would have to make different scoring system for all the clubs then

smaller

50 km

Be within the same entity in which this club

decrease to 100 km

0,5 km

Decrease to an "hours travel one way".

The clubs must be from one area

Reduce the limit to 100 kms.

No change. Sometimes it looks as BCC is worldwide infection, not a club.

Reduce the limit, it gives an unfair advantage.

Increase the limit to the territory normally covered by the majority of the club members.

Base it on distance or a political boundary

Increase to 500KM because in the some western states we have a lot of miles between stations that are in our club but who don't send in scores because of the limitation

If it is a club it should be driveable distance 25 miles.

use recognized political boundaries: countries, provinces, oblasts, etc.

Consider an alternate means like maidenhead squares. The circle method causes many stations to be left out in states like Florida or where states border the ocean or other large bodies of water.

Be honest - This rule is not Policed already - do you have the will or resources. Leave 'As Is' and rely on some integrity to avoid poaching of top guns.

275KM radius from a central point

Should all operate from one station.

decrease the circle size

Grid squares

Here's another idea: how about removing the limit for club membership, but require that each club entry should include stations that are located within the 275km circle. Larger clubs with members over a wide area could have several entries, all of which comply with that rule (this would give ops who want to compete but live outside one circle the ability to compete in a club entry if they wish).

significantly reduced to make it a real club and not a virtual club

increase to 325 km

Own country

or decrease - removing the limit would allow gaming of the contests by those with deep pockets

lot of geographical issues to think about - distance limits in the west are different than those in the northeast - maybe we need to have a rule dependent on population density.

Use specified area like 15 contiguous grid squares so it doesn't have to be a circle.

Maybe 350 km? But 500 km is way too much.

smaller distance

A club is NOT like the ARRL. A club's membership and operation should be "local" to generate camaraderie. Smaller circles may create more club entries and more spirited competition between many smaller groups instead of megaclubs.

Reduce limit ;-)

Maybe 350 km.... but 500 km is too much

Allow real club members to have their scores continue to count, if they move beyond the limit.

Reduce it to 225 km

This limit may work for densely populated regions like the Atlantic corridor. It is patently unfair for the rest of us.

Lower limit. Circle is too large.

I don't participate in or like this Club feature

1000 km

Q13. Have you visited the www.CQWW.com web site?

Have you visited the www.CQWW.com web site?

Yes	4536	93.1%
No	334	6.9%
Total	4870	

Comments:

Great site. I also like pileup.ru - very much a handy tool too.

Good. Searchable data base is outstanding.

Really great that there is now more information available about the contest. Keep up the good work to increase 'transparency'.

The online score database is a great resource. I would like to see all years' scores added to it, although I realize that is a massive amount of work

I like being able to print a certificate.

Well put together easy to surf

Great site and it's good that it is in line with the features on the WPX website which I always admired - the Randy effect I believe :)

I'm not a heavy user, but I like what I see.

I like your pages better than ARRL.org. :-)

Glad to see the program vigorous and looking to the future.

Love the online score database.

Love the Log Check page!

Don't visit often except to read the rules. I like having the line scores published in CQ. I miss that about QST. I always turn to the score pages to see my call...

There should be instant access to ALL log reports - but especially for all major category winners. As well as their logs being open.

After all, if you can 'SEE' what's going on, confidence in the proprietary nature of the event is greatly enhanced.

It's a very good information place. Please, keep it simple (like it is). Don't add any fancy designer stuff.

You're doing a real good job on getting claimed scores, and other info out in a timely manner.

Overall, a well-laid out website, and easy to navigate.

Suggest much expanded Certificate Awards for 1, 2, 3 in each state.

I love the site!

I don't know what it adds to the magazine (to which I subscribe)?

Really a good website. Very useful. Please keep up the good work.

NOT a user friendly place!

This is one of my favorite contests. As a low power station with limited real estate for antennas, it seems to be one that I can actually be competitive in.

The site continues to evolve and improve. I appreciate these efforts.

the publics logs is great knowledge

I really like that it posts claimed scores as well as historical scores.

The CQWW.com web site is excellent database for the contest. It is easy to search own or other stations' scores/orders.

It's OK....I can figure out how to use it. It's hard to find, though.

It's a great site. Thanks.

I appreciate the efforts of the CQWW committee very much.

I seldom check such sites. The only reason I am doing this survey is because it came to me via email. Had it been on the website I would not have known of it. See comment about limited allowance. Also, even though I am retired, I don't have that kind of time. I don't even go there to check scores.

Would like to see all contest results available by state or ARRL section.

I just discovered it in doing this survey. I had previously always used the cq-amateur-radio.com link to CQ Contests for the information I needed (rules primarily).

Much improved and getting better. Thanks!

I usually read the rules enough to get the date/time, exchange, how to submit my log. Not going to read pages and pages of rules for a little pistol entry that I'm entering for fun and not a chance of being a serious competitor.

Very useful page it is bookmarked and I visit it daily.

The site is great. Thanks for all the information.

Been too busy and I have not been real active in the CQWW as of late, but once I am built back at my old QTH, I am sure I will again be.

Great site now! Big job being done! Thank you very much!

Keep up the good work!!

Web site getting better and better. MUCH more relevant. Easier to find what you want, and much more content. A pat on the back to all involved.

You do a very nice job having all this available. I know much of this is new. Again, kudos.

I think it has greatly improved in the last year, with more information about submitted logs and claimed scores.

You know what to do: upgrade the site to the same level of service as the CQ WPX site. I can't recall what state the online database is in, and the site is down at the moment (!), but I think the last time I was there it had only a few years of records (or it didn't exist at all). It needs to be loaded up with as much history as you can get in there.

It is adequate for my intended purposes. It evidences a lot of hard work, and carefully thought out content and organization.

I would like to read the blog, but my knowledge of English is poor

Awesome!

I highly encourage publicizing logs and LCR's.

I like it - basic - has the needed information, and easy to find and figure out...

I look for reconfirmation

I love the data available on the site and use it both before and after contests. It allows me to 'target' bands/modes for increasing current records or past local/regional scores!

Online score database with records were only available on WPX. It now extends to WW DX. This is really fantastic to have. Thanks

Public logs are wonderful. It would be nice to see records as they stood at dates in the past.

I like the simplicity and that is similar to WPX site

Invite all participants to download the certificate in .pdf format - as in CQ WPX or EU HF Championship and in others contests...

A very nice and easy to use website

I don't submit on line but I DO visit the received logs page

I think there is no problem at present.

cqwpw.com has a better results and records searching engine, despite a very similar design of the web site.

Propose to introduce results, record, information from the beginning (first edition) to existing ones.

I particularly liked the log submission page which reassured me that my log was basically OK before submission.

You should add a place where we could upload photo, comments...

I hope that cCQWW DX web in the future will have same possibilities as CQWW WPX for downloads award for any place into the CQ WW DX contest.

Easy and simple. Good web site !

It is useful. The efforts of staffs are appreciated.

I think this is a great resource

The new site is excellent, thanks for your good work!

You do a really fine job with the records section.

The blog should have at least an entry per week. I suggest you invite a team of bloggers to the blog under your guide

Log submission function is very wonderful. Thank You!

You are doing a fine job!!

Great improvement over the last year!

I like it. Thanks

Rules from magazines.

Easy to navigate, has all the info that I require. Keep up the good work.

It would be useful, for research purposes, if the on-line results went further back in time.

It is a nice website. But the records page is not ok. In the 80's I used 100W max (I've never owned an amplifier) but it is a mix from low and high power station. So please make a split, also for the log entries in the 80's

Much better with searchable databases, thank you.

The Database function is very useful, but there are differences between the WPX site and the SSB site. It would be useful to have the same functionality on both sites.

I'd like to see antenna/setup specs for winning stations. Even some images. Band by band breakdown could include ant descriptions. Not sure for the radios though, to avoid free advertising for the already popular brands, but guess ant description would not hurt marketing. 4el35ftY@90ft tells a lot. Or similar code structure description. 4Y35@90, 6/6/6Y60@200/150/50. Back in 1995 I was operating K2TR 15m stn using 7/5/5 and KC1XX still beat us with 5el@60ft. Isn't it good to know what systems are used at winning stations at that particular contest entry?

Pse do the same with the CQWW-RTTY, it takes too long to see scores or claimed scores.

I visit the site not just before the contest

Thank you very much for this site. It works perfectly.

It is much better than before. Congratulations!

Very useful learning tool to analyse other logs and operating procedure

Call sign errors should be removed from the log I have used the sections showing header templates and examples of log s/w. Some of this is out of date and should also have a page of its own covering a review of the s/w available and some screen shots / youtube vids of how to generate the logs and submit via the bot. This would be a proper thing to do if the log deadline is shortened to 3 days.

Most important source of relevant information concerning the CQWW contest...

Publication of results should the same time in Web and CQ magazine. Don't let none CQ readers wait.

Great improvements lately, thanks!

Congratulations on the simplicity of the site also very good update, as well as for full transparency and inseparable. Perhaps it is one of the largest national competitions with such a large turnout, and this is due to the good work you. Thank you very much

Excellent contest, and it's great to see the committee starting to engage with operators more.

The target shall be to publish results next week. Fast feedback will add interest in competitions.

Very nice web site with all information needed

When will the results be done, you want our longs in 5 days why not get the results in 5 days

Lots of good information here!

If it is possible, like the Russians do, the results by DXCC Entities and entries.

Keep up the good work and good luck to next contest.

Nice and simple, easy to use.

It's a very good and useful site that I use quite regularly.

The web-site is easy to handling.

I operate CW. I don't operate SSB contests. I pretty much like the contest rules and point system the way it is.

All necessary information of the contest is there.

I like the new updated layout and information presented

Great resource. As a low power operator, the records don't mean much to me.

I spend a fair amount of time on the site, both preparing for contests and studying the results afterwards.

As a new Ham and very excited about participating in contests I have found your operation to be great for all levels and I really enjoy the fact you allow certificates to be printed for those who have not reached the top.. Keep up the GREAT work. I do really look forward to your magazine and contests.

More news and info would be useful in the Blog.

I appreciate all the time that has gone into the online database and per country records. The country records increase CQWW participation.

Best contest, but needs to get better by eliminating the US East Coast to EU and the African NW coast to EU advantages.

Good DB functionality

The page has become much more useful.

Getting better all the time, well done.

all the ww (cw, rtty, etc..) sites are very good!!!

A great resource

Glad to know it exists!

However, I did just look now and was VERY impressed with the resources and information that are available. I have 'bookmarked' it for future reference. Thanks!!!

Great resource... keep it up.

Not Internet at home. Just get happy when I get the certificate from you (if I'm that good!!!)

Despite busted antennas- working around the world is ALWAYS Special- Thanks to CQWW. 2013 is the year to FIX the antennas! After 57 years in Ham Radio - it's still fun to give out contacts to others around the world!!

Really improved during the past few years.

Congrats for new RAW SCORE site

Add breakdown by contest club in the online results if it's not there already

I use the CQWW.com site to check rules, results and general info for submitting my logs.

It is very useful when trying to be prepared for contests. It is nice to see your call sign in print showing how much fun you are having. Even though you can't compete with the big guns.

Your website for CQ contests is outstanding. Easy to navigate, colorful to separate different events, etc. Great job!

enjoy looking up current scores (mainly cqwpix op here) nice to see where to possibly go to and gain a win lol

You set the standards! Really great tool.

If I go straight to CQWW.com all is OK but trying to find the info by starting at <http://www.cq-amateur-radio.com/> then the CQ CONTEST link can be confusing

Claimed scores when avail.

Would like to see the preliminary results sooner.

Happy to find everything in 1 place

The website is thorough and informative. I wish other contest websites were as complete.

It's been a great advance the new web site, where you can search scores, results and records.

Site contains very interesting and useful information

I take CQ magazine, thats where I get most of my info.

Fantastic, made by people who love amateur radio.

Easy to use. Thanks from an old man.

I love the contests the CQWW runs.

easy to access and use

I was only there because of trying to send in a contest log. Should I be spending more time there? Are there contest hints/strategies there? I just have never thought of going there. Give me reasons.

How about showing the graph based on the database? That would be very helpful for developing the strategy. Also it'd be much helpful to have function for export the database.

Especially like the search by call feature that lists all the scores that a station has produced over the years and the raw score database that shows how you stand in the latest contests vs others.

599+++

Thanks for the hard work maintaining the site - easy to access and the log submission - in my experience works very well.

I seem to remember that the information was helpful. I also like the feedback reports we get for the contests.

I prefer a printed magazine.

Getting better from year to year, all CQ contest pages should be the same as this one

Link to public logs is missing or very obscure.

I am glad it is there. Not being a serious tester going all out for top score I do not use all it offers.

I have noticed an * by some calls. What does it mean? Is it QRP? How about a footnote to indicate that station used QRP power. Unless I am overlooking that explanation, I am missing it.

nice web site, keep it going

As I remember, the site is perfectly accessible and easy to use.

How about real-time reporting during the event from international sources. Its viewing might be deemed assistance, but it would add a new dimension to the event.

Excellent site. The blog area is always entertaining. Just like a 'fishing camp' after the day's fishing is done!!

I also like to use pileup.ru

Congrats it is a good and useful WEB site.

much better than before

The records don't tell me a lot since it's usually the same old, same old ops/stations that set a new record. But, I would like to see more on club competitions and, if you go that way, team contesting which could be on the website rather than in CQ mag.

Thanks for check possible modifications of the rules with the testers..!! Good chance..!

Good, clean website that works consistently

A very valuable resource!

It's good! Thank you for the good work! But I miss earlier publication of results (even if I understand CQ magazine's wish to print if first).

Make it like cqwpw.com and searchable. Make all logs 100% available.

I really like the new website, everything the CQWW entrant or potential entrant might need. One thing that would be nice is an early preview of the contest results for entrants prior to CQ magazine coming out. Entrants could use their UBN report password to access it.

All information I need is there.

I would love to see things like best hour rates, and other stats to show great ops even if they did not win for overall points. Stats galore.

RECORDS are a fundamental part of planning our next CQWW every year and so we are doubly glad that results are now being brought forward in time. Thanks!

I check rules often as I'm a CQ awards checkpoint and I want to do things right.

One of my favorites, maybe my favorite DX CW contest

Great job!!! I hope that more past years will appear in score database.

Include a section on CQWW history, especially notable wins. Provide audio and video tutorials as well as technical write-ups.

I think both CQWW and WPX have very good pages about the contests containing more or less all the information needed. One thing that could be a fun treat would be even more specs as for old results and records (seeing bandwise QSO:s (how many 1 or 3 point QSOs), multipliers and zones.

It may be nice to have all scores in case 'result' as it exist for WPX

It's a great website. The database is excellent.

I like the fact that all of the contests are listed in the top, the ones I really care about anyway. I have never looked at the blog until I saw it listed here in the survey.

Great job on the Scores Database

Fantastic page, I'm OK-OM DX Contest Director and webmaster, so I have to make my pages much more professional in CQWW style!

Great website, simple to use, keep it this way!

Very happy with the website. Well done to the webmaster!

Please upload older results.

In addition to a searchable score database it would be nice to have a complete contest csv database for downloading. This would be similar to the Public Logs tab only with all the submitted logs data merged into a single file.

I want possibility to put online commentary of the people, possible on Blog site, to give opinion.

Like the site to compare my efforts, and analyze the techniques used by others. I also screen scrape station participants, to add to my MASTER.DTA file. Big help. If the call does not show up in Check Partial, I ask for verification of the call. MANY stations have a strong accent on certain letters and numbers that is hard for me to understand even listening to many CQ's and his QSOs.

Long time to know the results of contests

Thanks for ease of log submission, and availability of results

One complaint: There are no coupons in the CQWW website for a free lunch.

Make as much data available as possible. CQWW is leading the charge on transparency. Keep it up!

It would be nice to get results article published same time as cq-amateur-radio.com

Thanks for your exceptional work and for keeping the site up and running with useful information. TU!!

Well done web site. It's a major plus for the contest.

Overall I really appreciate the efforts of all that contribute to CQWW.com.

Some of the records need updating.

Well done...!!!

excellent improvement, good structure - I don't have complaints

Reasonably clear and uncluttered.

It's good! Just please get the results out faster!

Thank you for continuing to improve your web capabilities.

It is an interesting web site with a lot of information about all the CQ-Contests! Thank you for the good work!!

A valuable asset to prepare for the next contest!

Would be great to have All-Time Top 10 scores per category again!

What more could we ask for?

The page is excellent and very useful.

Log submission function is very innovative -- best one have ever seen in that it allows the user to create and review user-designed categories,.

Raw scores should show also at least QSOs and multipliers numbers, not only score - the best being full breakdowns.

Thank you for making so many improvements.

I'd like to use it to improve my score with analysis.

Nothing spectacular there.

I would like to see records broken down by state. There is no way for stations outside the northeast to compete on an even handed basis with stations in the northeast. You should recognize quality efforts wherever they occur.

Both the amount of available information and the appearance of the site have improved considerably. High marks to those involved.

I am happy with a renewed interest in playing fair. But I am very concerned that many of the changes will prove to be unfair to amateurs operating from the poorest of the developing countries.

It's functional. I'd prefer a FB group and a Twitter stream instead. I don't need to go back there all the time, but would like to know on FB/Twitter when something important is going on.

My favorite contest. New technologies have been incorporated into the rules which cut down on the deliberate rule-breakers. As much as i dislike poor audio it shouldn't be grounds for disqualification.

It has improved the last years and is quite good now.

great website, especially after the restyling

Please never do away with POP e-mail log submittal as an option. For IT security reasons, including risk of ID Theft (it happened to me), not everyone is comfortable using hackable on-line web pages in the clouds. For those other contests that have converted to cloud submittal 'only', I don't submit a log any more.

Good site and nice to see the score database coming on.

Please implement some of the searchable score/record database from CQ WPX - that is great and would be nice here also! IE - country records and points; Zone record and points - but as a search!

perfectly fine for me

Keep going guys and Thanks for asking for our opinion

Very good resource. I was impressed with the webinar presentation.

Good site, very fine service - Online score database (presence of the field 'club' - excellent!!)

Pretty intuitive, not much needs altering.

I think that if the database is implemented it should be possible to download a certificate on any score that has been databased and deserves a certificate no matter what year.

Looks great. Keep up the good work!

It would be nice and state of the art to accept ADIF-Files !!!!!

The site is very useful for contest planning and 'lessons learned' assessments.

Keep up the good work, lads and bonnies!

Q14. What features of the CQWW.com site have you used?

What features of the CQWW.com site have you used?

Rules	4023	25.02%
Results	3959	24.62%
Records	2266	14.09%
Online score database	2369	14.73%
Log submission page	2791	17.36%
Blog	559	3.48%
Other	111	0.69%
Total	16078	

Other (comments):

certificate printing

Rules, exchanges etc.

hints and kinks

post key blog info on cq-contest.com

Station Logs

Online Scoreboard, please!!!

certificates

plaques

Logs

public logs

Every little pixel of it!

also looking up dates and submission information...

DX QSO

public logs

QRM

Photo

All

resources

public logs

twitter

every participant need to submit photo of operators in action...for blog

Resources

contest dates

Printed certificates

tech articles

page

Resources

Public logs

Public logs and UBN reports! (duh)

Have not visited the web site this year.

FAQ

all of the above

contest calendar

i have looked at it but not used it much

email address how to send in log

Plaques

LOG of other station

Log Checking Rpts

plaque sponsoring

use all sites

Resources

Public logs

all of these

CQ mag links - for all the goodies there!

Q15. Which modes did you operate the CQ WW Contest in 2012?

Which modes did you operate the CQ WW Contest in 2012?

CW	3337	48.5%
SSB	3360	48.7%
Did not operate in 2012	193	2.8%
Total	6912	

Q16. Which is your favorite mode for DX contesting?

Which is your favorite mode for DX contesting?

CW	2853	59.0%
SSB	1544	32.0%
RTTY	434	9.0%
Total	4831	

Any comments or suggestions you would like to make to the CQ WW Committee?

It's still the best!

I think you guys are heading in the right direction; it's the BIG contest so care must be taken not to break it!

Thanks for good work

I enjoy the SSB and RTTY contests very much.

Thanks for asking for input!

Keep up the good and thankless work and keeping the hobby up to current tech standards

If Mexico is DX for USA - Why not Canada??

Combining S/O non and assisted into one category is one of the stupidest ideas I have seen in a LONG TIME! Simply STUPID!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Take some time to pat yourselves on the back. Great contests and great job

Many, many thanks for all you do...great contest!

You are doing a good job communicating to those that participate.

Need to make provision for US to US contacts for zone multipliers. Either make them 1 point or 0 points but automatically get credit for the zone you are working from

Is there a way to put an end to the practice of failing to ID? With the increased use of assisted mode it becomes more productive for DX stations to ID more infrequently -- which forces unassisted entrants to waste more and more time waiting. (or working dupes so they can ask for their call...)

In the distant past, these contests were a measure of INDIVIDUAL operating skill.

With all the Multi-Multi and Multi-Single stations, the INDIVIDUAL operators have dwindled dramatically.

It would be nice to return to the contests which required EACH station to be operated ONLY by the licensee as a single-operator station.

Keep up the good work!

WHY WOULD THE COMMITTEE NOT CONSIDER MAKING THE SO1R AND SO2R SEPARATE CATEGORIES?? HERE'S WHAT HAPPENS - I CALL A STATION, WHO DOESN'T IMMEDIATELY COME BACK TO ANYONE (HE'S WORKING SOMEONE ON ANOTHER BAND), THEN HE DOES COME BACK TO ME AND I SEND THE REPORT - NO ACKNOWLEDGEMENT - I WAIT. THEN HE COMES BACK, AS HE WAS WORKING YET ANOTHER STATION ON THAT OTHER BAND....I MADE ONE CONTACT - HE MADE TWO OR PROBABLY THREE....HOW CAN I COMPETE...I WOULD HAVE WON A LOT OF CONTEST WHERE I PLACED DOWN IN THE PACK..BECAUSE ALL OF THE STATIONS ABOVE ME, WITHOUT EXCEPTION, WERE SO2R....I'M 75 YEARS OLD AND LIKE TRYING TO COMPETE BUT AT A LEVEL THE PLAYING FIELD?? I DON'T THINK SO....SO2R'S SHOULD NOT OBJECT EXCEPT THEY KNOW AND I KNOW, THEY HAVE AN ADVANTAGE...

Please consider those of us in the midwest... w0-land. What can be done to adjust scoring & the system such that we have a fighting chance to compete in this contest?

It's a fun contest. I wouldn't change too much.

Regarding the bad signal DQ: I applaud efforts to discourage bad signals. You might reserve DQs for repeat offenders. Don't (necessarily) penalize a station for a failure during the contest, but make sure he is motivated to fix the problem after the contest. The rule could be more stringent for multi-ops, but they generally have clean signals.

It was great fun for being my first not sure what I am doing but still having fun. Thanks for being there.

1) Keep up the great work. Thanks!

2) I miss Gene, W3ZZ...RIP

I have no another suggestion, I enjoy the contesting every times and I say many thanks for you.

The CQ 160 SSB contest is one of my favorites. Each year I help hams who have never operated 160 get on and make some contacts. They are always amazed how well they can do with makeshift antennas and 100 watts on SSB. This is a far better introduction to 160 than other 160 contests.

CQ has the best contests available to the amateur radio community, hands down!!!

I'm not a huge fan of zero point QSOs with your own country for zone and country.

You have one of the major contests that I enjoy. Keep up the good work.

Use online scoring like cqcontest.ru. No exceptions for those who wants to send the log after deadline. Write about highest rates in the contests as well - source: <http://rate.pileup.ru/>

Great contest. Don't screw it up. If you're going to fix things have a high bar for the problem, don't just tinker for the sake of it.

Keep up the great work and make the contest better.

Thanks for operating a great contest. I am a fairly new contester and CQWW is one my favourites.

We really need to crack down on the rampant law breaking. No station transmitting out of band (often deliberately) should be allowed to compete. They should be immediately disqualified. As contesters we already have a reputation for being a menace on the bands, why give the anti-contesters another reason to criticize us?

For most of us this contests are 'fun' events. Please don't try to over-manage them. It is understandable that there need to be rules, and they need to be enforced, for the top competitors which are about 2% of the total entries.

Might as well combine SO and SOA since I'm sure a lot of SO are using spotting nets anyway. That should be the only 'assistance' allowed however.

Thank You first of all for taking on such a task of sponsoring this popular contest. I truly believe that distance scoring would change the entire strategy of many of the big stations. If you would not allow assisted categories that would certainly move the focus from the multiplier hunt to actual search and pounce activity.

You guys do a great job! Please keep up the good work!

I said that I participate to give points to others, not to qualify for awards. This may seem strange when looking at my log, given the number of contacts and multipliers. What frequently happens is that I am the only Peruvian station in the contest. So I sit in one place on each band and let them call me since they need my multiplier!

I wish there were some way to suggest to CW operators that they NOT zero beat a DX station when he or she is under a pile-up. I have a narrow filter in my TS-140/S but when all sigs are S9+ on the meter and exactly on the same frequency (maybe to the 'cycle'), it is impossible to separate them. If I go split and say 'up 5', they ALL go up EXACTLY 5.000 KHz so that problem persists.

Another question comes to mind. Is it necessary or even helpful to include a signal report in the exchange? I could count the times someone has given me less than 59 or 599 on the fingers of one hand! It would seem that it slows things down needlessly. If you want more than the zone in the exchange, maybe the operator's age could be included, but then again... the YL's would probably protest! Well, maybe the number of years licensed could be used. You know, I had not thought about that possibility, but now that I do think about it, I think that we ops would enjoy it and it would add another dimension to the contests: knowing for how many years people had been 'hams'.

This being a DX contest, it might be interesting to give a multiplier for distance of each contact in addition to just contacts and countries.

Lots of fun in the CQWW contest. Am a new contester and operate QRP from a condo using an end fed wire antenna and am very surprised at how well it does, how much fun it is and how well attended the CW contest is.

I think the rules committee should be able to disqualify stations that disregard ANY FCC (or whatever) regulations.

For instance this past weekend, there was one VERY well-known MM station that is constantly sending spots that was operating at the EXACT band edge. No way that station was legal in doing so. He was certainly audible well beyond the band edge and he wasn't even strong here. Those kinds of infractions need to be dealt with.

Your survey question asked if I operated CQWW 2012 but only gave SSB and CW as a choice. I also operated CQWW RTTY which is my favorite contest of them all.

Presently your rules are notably simpler than ARRL contest rules, keep it that way!

Thanks for organizing this great contest.

Change rules to encourage neophyte operators at Multi-ops without reducing club score percentages.

I would like to see differentiation between QRP operators using simple wire antennas and those using directional gain antennas.

My radio time is limited so I have applied a selection-and-concentration approach to contesting. CQ WW is one of the contests I participate in. I enjoy it and make every effort to make time for it. Thanks for all the hard work that is involved behind the scenes.

It would be more fun and give us energy to keep operate on contest if any prize for Island Operators or Clubs.

Absolutely disqualify stations operating outside the band plans. Allow for spot checks when stations are suspected of running illegal power. Use grid squares as multipliers as a true measure of distances covered and rare stations worked. Discount scores of US East Coast stations because of their proximity to Europe, and vice versa. Discount W6/W7 stations for proximity to Asia, and vice versa.

Would like to see the contest results come out a little faster. CQWW Committee could charge a small fee for certificates, something payable through paypal. Monies could be reinvested to further promote contesting.

Keep the good job!

Thanks for sponsoring CQ WW DX 'CW'

I would like to see separate categories for SO1R and SO2R. Some of us don't have the desire and/or the resources to set up a SO2R station putting us at a distinct disadvantage.

My approach to contesting is very casual. I might make 600 Q's in one contest and 25 in the next. Depends on my mood and available time. That's why I don't have strong opinions on rules issues. They just don't matter that much to me.

I fully enjoy contesting as single operator and also very involved in Club station contesting as field operation with our Radio Club CE6TC and XR6T call sing for contesting in the south of Chile.

Why change the most popular DX Contest in the world? Only the penalties should be reduced especially, if there is no appreciable score accuracy improvement over the past 10 years...

As we get older, our hearing, sight and stamina and word recognition decreases...If you penalize us, too much, we will tend to not participate...There is nothing wrong with penalties, but yours are excessive...

Separate SO2R category

The world is becoming energy saving.

If it inquires towards a contest contesting below by LOW Power from high power, how is it?

For example, it is High 100W, Low 50W, and QRP 5W.

Please inquire over time.

I really enjoy the contest each year as a casual entry. Not a computer person and difficult to contribute my log, but will if I can.

I like this large contests as it gives newer HAMs like me a better chance at DX contacts

I appreciate your looking into the geographic limit for operating in a contest club. I'm in South Dakota but am a member of the GMCC contest club in Colorado but can't work in CQ contests or most ARRL contests as part of the club. Not sure what the rules should be but I'd be very willing to work with a group to figure out a good way to manage it. I have NO option to be part of a contest club that I can actively participate in CQ contests with.

Been off the air for about 20 years. Back now to DX and a few contests. This pair seem like the best thought out. Keep fine tuning....

As you know, this is the most enjoyable contest. Strongly suggest the point change for Caribbean station contacts and would like to see an article on remote station design. Thanks for listening.

Seeing some pretty incredible QRP scores with respect to number of countries worked on 160m and number of Q's when conditions are like pulling teeth. Any way of verifying 5 watt inputs? I can't hold a run freq with 100 watts most times, so how do they do it QRP? Sorry, sounds like I ate some sour grapes.....Hi.

Since the skimmers arrived, I stopped submitting CQWW CW scores because I feel strongly that it's not good sportsmanship competition, and encourages a lack of operating ability. The spotting networks were bad enough. Contests should not involve any type of assistance online, like the only true DX contest, WRTC. There is a reason WRTC doesn't allow spotting networks! True competition was lost when the spotting networks began, and the skimmers were the last nail in the coffin.

Make scores and logs consistently searchable across CQWW and CQWPX contests. I'd like to be able to search the results/logs for rarest prefixes (e.g., AB5 has 676 possible call signs, how many AB5 stations actually participated?)

Allowing U.S. stations to claim two points for QSOs with non-contest participants in Canada has distorted multi-operator and single band competition on 160, 80 and 40 meters in CQ WW SSB contest and discouraged U.S. competitors from entering those categories if they are not located within a few hundred miles of the Quebec and Ontario borders. Multi-operator and single band SSB stations within a few hundred miles of the Quebec and Ontario have an unreasonable advantage on 160, 80 and 40 meters from working hundreds of Canadian non-contest participants during daylight hours.

A simple correction would be to disallow point credit for SSB QSOs on 160, 80 and 40 meters between the U.S. and Canada between the competitor's hours of sunrise and sunset.

Require running stations to identify in EVERY QSO.

Require US (and other) stations to send their portable designations if they operate outside the call area that their license suggests; if N2UN operates in CT, I must sign N2UN/1, etc.

Consider raising the LP limit to 200 watts and provide a point incentive for running LP.

I appreciate all the hard work that is involved in compiling of contest scores and look forward to seeing the results in CQ Magazine. The certificates are nicely done and look great in the shack.

Keep up the good work - nice to see the potential for change to make this great contest double even better. Is the highlight of the contest season.

Keep up the good work and thanks for taking the time to get input from the contest participants.

Ham radio contests are chances to compete with myself for me. So in my side, that the rule is stayed unchanged is favorite to compare the score with my past scores.

Thanks for providing the survey

On the East Coast, this was a kick-ass super fun contest that I did every year in a multi-op. On the West Coast, this is more like watching paint dry at certain times. 48 hours of S&P with a few JA runs? I don't think so. Just can't get worked up for it. Don't need the DX Q's. Worked most of them. I'm a serious tester and this one ain't my thing on the West Coast. Give me WPX, SS, NAQP, etc., and I'm in these as a serious player. Change the rules to give the West Coast a better chance to score points, or maybe compete for unique awards, and I'm back in it. Three points for Caribbean is a start. (I appreciate the chance to give input, Randy)

Can you somehow make people sign at least every 3 QSOs? Please?

The packet people claim that they listen for the call sign. Sure...and you will also believe that the next Pope will be Jewish.

Great contest! Great time of year! Thanx!

Certainly the best contest ever and as Contest Manager for ARSI I have been working with folks here to increase participation and have Zone 22 more available. Good to see the certificates also pay attention to detail in terms of positions. SO good compared to when I had a World win for 20M SSB Low Power in 1991 for which I got only a #1 India certificate though the CQ Magazine article said #1 World. The only time ever that I will probably get a #1 World in CQWW :) Must have been a one off, but this is the best contest - no doubt.

Thanks for putting on a challenging and fun contest!

Keep up the good work! Thank you for soliciting our opinions.

Thanks for all the hard work and fun contests!

Have separate club competitions for cw, SSB, and rtty, instead of combining cw and SSB.

You're doing great. Good to see the xtreme category, even though I don't use it. While I do try to run the entire contest period in some domestic contests, because of my 'wires only' station, there really is no point trying to compete with the big boys. That's ok, this is one of my fun contests, rather than competitive contests.

日本語でのアンケートも作って欲しい、微妙なニュアンスがわからない質問があったので是非そうして欲しい

Keep up the good work! Thanks.

I would like to see a more democratic process when handing out DQ's or any other type of violation. Additionally, if a number of stations are found to be violating a rule whether intentionally or not, ALL stations must be handed the same violation. This should NOT be limited to top 10 finishes.

Great questions and thanks for asking our thoughts

I love this contest!

CQ WW contests are my favorites - keep up the good work!

Many thanks for the excellent work the committee does. Appreciate also the help when my N1MM log has a problem! Enjoy the write ups in CQ Magazine too. You list all the CQ contest scores which is great....ARRL does not.

Hams like to see their calls listed and how they compare with others in score.

Your contests are some of the best around and helped me greatly to DXCC with a very modest station. I also appreciate listening and interacting with expert testers, and you attract a lot of them. I would like it if contests in general would also upload contact logs to online logging services. With your partnering with LOTW, this should not be too hard and would provide higher match rates if it was easy to upload the log to both the contest and LOTW in one step.

Keep up the good work!

Keep going! You guys have the most fun contests.

I lied on SOME of my answers. It's your job to figure out which ones. ;-p

I have problem with stations that make 20 or 25 contacts in a row without giving a call sign. If you do not run assisted it may take 5 minutes to find out what the call is. How about punishing those stations since they did not give a proper response. Or just make the rules say you must stay on one freq per band and use spotting and be spotted. Then no one running a frequency will ever have to give a call sign. Also giving a signal report is a JOKE. Everyone is 59 even when they are 2X2.

Shorter duration. Sitting for 48 hours could be dangerous for the operators.

Great contest. Even for small stations with wire antennas.

Thank you for all the hard work you do. The two CQ WW contests are my favorites.

Great job and a great contest. My favorite.

Thanks for all the hard work.

Thank you for your work. Please continue to reduce cheating. Please continue the emphasis on fair play and integrity.

It is my favorite SSB contest and I am planning to operate as a DX station in 2013 and 2014 if possible.

If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

I've run the gamut with CQWW -- winning in the 1970's setting records, being part of M/M, etc. It's a great contest. If there is anything I would change it's the single op 1 radio and single op 2 radio. In the early days, the 2 radio guys got a little benefit from the 2nd rig but today, the practice has been perfected to the point where those without it don't stand a chance. I would be going to serious competition if I could but I can't put in the time anymore and I don't need the stress. One other item to consider -- how do we get everyone to stop calling all the time? This is a bad practice and it really takes the fun out of operating.

Congratulations on operating the most popular contest in the world. Many thanks for providing CQ WW and CQ WPX to the community!

I enjoy your contests immensely and appreciate the hard work it takes to run and score these huge events. Kudos to all of you for making this aspect of our hobby more fun. I've been a ham since 1964 (licensed at age 12) and have seen so many changes over the years but the challenge I put to you is to keep the skill and thrill of contesting while dealing with the changes in technology.

when one operates multiband , can they have the bandwise rating on the certificates . eg

10m 1st in VU 4 th Asia 10 world

20m 1st in VU 6th in Asai 257 world etc

40m

80.....

160.....

this would not take much space all, All data is available in the computer database!!!

Keep up the good work! I enjoy the contest - it's fast paced and fun. Even S&Ping the rate meter runs high. Thank you for your efforts!

Since virtually everyone uses electronic logs I think they should be submitted ASAP unless the robot can't handle it. There should either be a bonus for very early submission or a daily % of total score decrease after the first 24 hours to keep the big stations from correcting their logs. It would really be cool to have a huge server that would allow big time competitors to put logs in live!

Good contest, I wish the US stations would not 'camp out' on frequencies.

Do not change anything!

Stick to the KISS formula.

I think that the 160m band should be removed from the contest because there is a contest only for this band. No need to repeat it in the CQWW. The contest would be much better if it was only 80 to 10m

You didn't ask a Question about station identification.

One of my biggest beefs are stations who make a dozen or more QSOs w/o ID. With an ID I can determine in advance whether it is a DUP QSO so I don't have to WASTE time waiting for an ID only to find out that it is a DUP.

Last I checked, a proper QSO (whether made in a contest or not) is for me to reference YOUR call, some sort of information, and then my call. To not ID at the end technically makes it an invalid contact. What is so difficult about saying 'Thank You. WQ6X - QRZ?'. While it is true that NOT ID'ing saves time - it is done at the inconvenience of other operators, which violates the spirit of being courteous when making QSOs. Being courteous will make it more likely for non-contesters to tolerate us.

Thank You for this Survey! It has been WORTH my time.

Cheating has become a major issue that I notice is not mentioned in this survey. There are some stations that are known and frequent cheaters. I don't have the answer for that either but while I would not disqualify someone over signal quality, I would use skimmers to prove that some single operator stations have multiple transmitters on the air. Not sure how to catch the guys who say they are unassisted but show up very quickly after someone spots a rare one.

Self spotters and spotters with 'friends'/cheerleaders should be looked into as well.

I think if you could get a sponsor for it, recognizing stations with wires only in CQ WW would be a good thing. I have beams on most bands so I would not be in this category but some contests do give awards to wires only stations, and I believe it would provide a bit more incentive for guys with wires to get on or get on more than they already do. As for disqualifying a station with a poor quality signal, I remember one year an EA9 got on the air with a chirpy signal, he gave out the multiplier, was not exactly able to run down to an electronics store to get the parts to fix the rig, he did everyone a favor by getting on and disqualifying someone who may even be using a borrowed radio would punish a guy who was trying to give out a mult. I was a multi where we were told we had clix on a higher band (not 160) . our scope did not show it, there was no RBN at that time, tests after contest showed nothing either. Some stations are just ungodly loud for an hour or so when the band peaks. If someone is a repeat offender year after year that's another problem.

In summary, you need to create a scoring regimen that does not favour any QTH to any significant degree.

Yes, it is an American contest - and so far it has favoured Americans - but these days the contest really belongs to the world, and will only continue to develop if the world gets treated equally. That will be a very hard job - and will only ever be carried through by the Contest Committee being truly visionary (and having 'balls' to boot). But that's my biggest 'wish' for all the CQ contests.

As an aside, you have done a great job on moving on the cheats in the event.

Note I don't enter to win, I am in fact a small bit player. I enter to have fun, pick up fills for any number of awards - but I do believe what I wrote above.

Remove 3 QSO penalty, just remove bad QSOs. Count each QSO 3 points, even own country.

SDR recordings and log checks make the archaic, discriminating rules obsolete.

Have a low power (500Watt limit) or limited antenna height/size contest. It was rather discouraging to be run over by Arizona Outlaws with the super power, super antennas and nasty remarks. Also, on a more positive note, since logs are cross checked, allow any verified contacts to be used toward the DX and WAZ awards (WAS would not work for US to US contacts for this contest, but might be nice for DX stations!)

I would like you to seriously consider the idea of bandwidth / splatter. Contesting in eu even with the best filtered rxers has become so difficult with so many high power wideband signals and phase noise. Power limits of 500w is more than enough power for anyone to use. videos of the tx power meters stns accomaning high scoring logs would be another good idea

Congratulations and thank you for your great work!

KEEP UP AND BEST REGARDS TO ALL THERE IN CQWW Committee.

Please do not combine the assisted and non-assisted categories. This could destroy the contest.

In terms of remote DXCC (2000 mile radius centered on the DXCC country) KL7 is one of the remotest. I have always felt KL7 to the rest of NA should be 3 points.

Thank you for your contributions and effort in making this a fun contest. But I sure do like 12 hour formats better :-)

It's time to rethink the huge inequities and lopsided advantage the E coast has in the WW. There are many quality contest stations here in the PNW that have just given up because of this.

PERHAPS it's time for TOP TEN BOXES by REGION/AREA etc. Just look at past top 10 boxes and you see why anyone in the West just gives up. Most people are in the contest because of the competitive nature of contesting. Take away the equity and you don't have a real competition.

* THIS IS THE MOST URGENT MATTER FOR THE COMMITTEE, imho.

This year I heard of many west coast stations boycotting the CQWW, or claiming to just be 'playing around'. This I believe is basically because they DONT HAVE A CHANCE TO WIN.

Perhaps the easy answer is to make EU count as one mult. Think JA as one, and EU as one. This might just be the ticket to make this a equitable race.

73 to the Committee... you folks work tirelessly as it is... so take suggestions with a grain of salt, but please realize the west coast viewpoint has and is getting quite sour.

I will never win a plaque in the CQWW with my small antennas, but I still give it my best shot. The CQWW CW contest is the best of any contest!! Phone is great too.

I think you guys do a good job.

Would it be possible to move the CQWW CW contest so that it falls around the 9-10th of November (2nd weekend in November). Having it on the last weekend of November is a problem for me, as it is Thanksgiving Weekend, and am away from my radio at that time.

If membership area limit is eliminated, you should go back to the requirement for clubs to provide membership lists. Then only count scores from those on the list. I know it didn't work well when last used. With current IT capabilities, it should be quite doable now.

I want to know the result early

Great contest. Just keep everything as is.

Don't stop.

Always have enjoyed the contest. Am HOA restricted on antennas so use a vertical. Nothing I can do about it so plug away anyway. Serial numbers give me fits on CW because the hearing isn't like it used to be. Non-serial number contests (CW) are best for me.

You are doing a great job, keep it up!

keep up with the good work and excellent contest, for me the best of all

Stop worrying so much about everyone potentially cheating. Instead, look at where most of the cheating comes from (Eastern EU Operators) and issue some strong DQ's.

I think that the committee is doing fine.

Need to lighten up, all this persecuting people to the extreme is taking the fun out of contesting. Yes it is good to check logs and do some penalties to keep people honest, but most people will be honest with what they report. It is the small minority that will break the rules, typically with minor impact in the results. So don't persecute the honest person in attempt to catching the dishonest person.

I think that SO2R operations should be a separate category, as an operator using a single radio is at distinct disadvantage, as much or more than being assisted.

Keep up the good work. I would like to see CQWW scoring to be leveled better and reduce the bias toward EU and Caribbean.

Simply the most important contest of the year. Can't wait for 2013!!!

I would recommend to get scores sooner

Keep up all the good work. The CQ contests are my favorite, especially the WPX contests because for a little pistol station, being able to work other US stations gives me something to do while the DX is working all the big guns.

I'm strongly in favor of 3 points for any QSO outside of your own zone.

Great contest as it is

Great contest. Keep up the good work. Glad to see you're at least exploring the possibility of allowing use of packet/RBN for all single ops. It's time to allow full use of all the tools available to hams these days in the single-op category. I'm not sure some 'single-ops' aren't already cheating by obtaining spots against the rules, so let's just force everyone into the 'assisted' category and ensure that everyone is on the same level playing field.

NEW RULE: NO SPLIT RX/TX FREQUENCY OPERATING. Disqualify any station operating 'split.' A few DX island stations operated split (CW), which gave them an unfair advantage over everyone else who must listen to a pileup on ONE freq!

Thanks for running such a enjoyable contests! 73

You guys doing great job! Thanks for the survey. Thanks for making CQ WW the best contest!!

You're doing a tough job well.

Beside plaque and certificate to the winners, please give also the eCertificate to all participants who joint in this contest.

I note one question asks which mode s do you operate for contest and lists only CW and SSB. I do many contests in CW and RTTY. RTTY/Digital should be an option and allow more than one to be checked. I do about 40% CW and 60% RTTY.

I know you have heard it before but it would be nice to have a ww dx contest with low power only. The big guns are dominant for the first 12 hours or so and it is rough for us little guys to compete like we want to.

I operate QRP. I feel that stations that work me should earn more points. Often I have to repeat my call...I hear NQ2?...in the time the station works me, that station could have made 1 or 2 more contacts. Working a QRP station should give the QRO station maybe double point value for the QSO.

Thanks for a well run contest - it would be better if 'assisted' went the way of quill pens - time to move with technology.

Have not been on much the last few years. Hoping that will now change!!

Thank you for all you do for contesting. This is the most important contest each year. I never miss it.

I operated in the CQWW contests for the first time in 20 years this year. I had a great time! It does feel like the 3x penalty is pretty harsh - I know I will do better with time, but it is tough when other stations don't tell you that you copied them wrong. I guess that's the way the ball bounces. Congratulations on operating the biggest contest I've ever been in.

Keep whacking away on the ones who bend the rules, or break them. Do everything you can to make as many classes. Big guns like me can always find a category to win paper. However, the little guy with a GP on 40 really gets a kick out of finishing Nr3 in the fourth call area LP. Without them we big guns would work each other out in a couple of hours.

Thanks for all the work. CQWW DX contests are the premier contests in ham radio. Keep up the good work!!!

I general use contest to help me with my awards and get new countries. Also, I have develop a liking for these types of contests. I feel kind of sad when they are finished. I am looking forward to the next one.

I would really like to see a 'Just Tribander' group, 10, 15 and 20 meters. Nice for those of us who have no room for 40 and 75 meters. Please!

I'm pleased because (I think) you publish results sooner now.

I am pleased that you publish logs, so I can see whether you have scored my log correctly. I am not pleased when I find that you have NOT scored my log correctly.

AFAIK, you do not publish corrections to your errors. I can live with this because I am a little pistol who's never gonna win anything anyway, but your errors and your apparent lack of concern with accuracy still piss me off.

Your software checking program with 3x error penalty is too strict. It can make mistakes too, I think. When I see how many points our group lost makes me want to not enter CQ contests as they seem to be too strict with the logging program.

I like computer logging. I am not fond of the internet spotting. I am even less fond of the reverse beacons. I think assisted contesting is making it less of a skill than it was. I am not being nostalgic, it is literally possible to automate the whole experience. I would not go back to check sheets, but using too much tech spoils the intent of contesting.

I love this contest!!!

Let's keep the contest interesting. Reward innovation.

The CQ WW Committee does a great job running the WW contests. I applaud their very hard work to continue to increase the adjudication of contest results. While I usually do not go for a certificate, there are certainly those that do and that is very important to them. Also, on SSB in particular, too many stations operate too close to band edges (e.g. 14.150.5 on 20m). They are technically out of band with a 2.4 khz signal bandwidth. Those QSOs should be removed from their scores. Harsh? Well, in the USA those are the regulations.

Keep up the good work, we really all do appreciate it.

I am still VERY angry about the exceedingly shabby treatment CQ showed toward the Diamond Jubilee WAZ contest participants. With so FEW people able to complete this activity the scores of ALL the participants SHOULD HAVE BEEN LISTED, rather than the HALF PAGE results two years AFTER the event! My friend and I accounted for 20% of the Fourth Area contestants, yet didn't get a mention! This was extremely bad handling of an event SOME people were capable of achieving -- obviously not many COULD get it done! So they deserve the recognition. SHAME!

CQ WW DX CONTEST is fun to do, feel great to win awards/certificates. High/Low/QRP, TB-Wires, Assisted/Non Assisted categories are reasonable, provide good chance to try. Barefoot stn has small chance to beat kW's but between similarly powered stn's competition is fare. Same is true for antenna size or internet helps.

police the lousy signals

Quick sent the certificate for the winner....

The evolution path appears in the right direction. I am appreciative of all the volunteer efforts which contribute toward the 'BEST' DX contest on the planet.

Thanks for asking about the splatter and clicks. These are mostly relevant to 160m contest.

thumbs up for the active work to clean the contests from unsportsmanlike behaviour

Good fair contest - I do appreciate that you are trying to find ways to improve, but I think you're already pretty close to perfection.

Limit SO, SO2R, SOA to max 36 hours with minimum off times of 30min. Separate SO2R from SOA.

Very much enjoy these contests. Thanks!

I appreciate your willingness to improve the quality of this activity. More surveys certainly would help.

It's a great contest, but at this age I can't even think about 48 hours.... wish it was 36 or 40 out of 48 hours... could use the sleep

Categories for novices should be increased!

SO2R should be a different category...

Very enjoyable operating times for me when I have the time to spare. Let's try to keep it going.

Keep on doing what you are doing, the CQ series of Contests are top class. Participation numbers do not lie.. Keep it up, good job!

Remind everyone that THIS IS A HOBBY!

During very busy band conditions Hams should not be allowed to operate split frequencies(ie..40m) as this takes 2x the bandwidth and it leaves lower power stations at a disadvantage..

Because of Australia's geographic location you should consider the 2 points for in country contacts VK to VK

I'd like to see:

- 1) A Tribander and Single Wire category like you have in WPX.
- 2) For single-ops I'd like to see both 18 and 36 hour categories. The new 18-hour category would allow a lot more people to have a competitive chance to win.

Thank You for asking for our comments!

Single and urban stations can't be in the same category with a big contest station. We need a new category for big stations or for a home or urban stations. Is disappointed run on same category single operator in a single station and one operator stay on same category in a big contest station with phased antenna system and other with power more than the usual 1kw..

Other point is about power, in brazil limited power is 1 kw, but much stations put more than 3 kw. Pay attention.

You all need to rein in INTENTIONAL piss-poor operating practices.

Thanks for soliciting opinions.

Thank you for all the work that the committee puts into making the contest possible. It is very much appreciated.

I think some awards based on operating (log) time and points should be considered.

Please consider about limited operating period category (e.g. 36 hours or 40 hours) for single operator.

You guys do a great job putting on the contests, scoring, etc..tnx for all your efforts.

Overall, I think the WW is in good shape and you're asking the right questions. A plug to the CQ WPX folks: The WPX CW contest is always later in the year where conditions are less, especially on the low bands. Alternating years would be a fair way to balance this out.

See you next year and hopefully I will have less errors, hi

I'm too casual an operator to have any suggestions.

Tnx for the wonderful party is the CQWW. Hope to see everyone in the QRG again in 2013.

Consider a point incentive for working QRP/LP stations - this might spread the pileups and encourage more DX ops with limited resources to participate.

Somewhat solve the Zero Pointer problem. Give credit for your own country as a band mult when you work at least 1 DX QSO on each band. I just hate making those zero point QSOs, and the K3LR's and W3LPLs are not amused.

It's truly bizarre to work another station in the USA to get the multiplier, and yet it counts for zero QSO points. If a guy in Florida works a Cuban that's 'DX', but if he works a guy in Western Washington it isn't? Score QSO points like WPX.

There should be a CQ Magazine sponsored contest for USA county hunting.

I love the WW contests and look forward to them each year. Also like the DX before and after as an added benefit.

don't fiddle with success TOO much

Благодарю за титаническую работу,пожелаю счастья,здоровья и успехов в нашем радиолюбительском деле! СПАСИБО TKS!!!

I respectfully request that the Committee not enact a rule requiring exact frequency logging like the Russians have enacted. Such a rule is absurd, and requires everyone have much more sophisticated capability than is either needed or desired just to engage in a contest.

it is the best contest, even though, I never have won a plaque, and never will hi...still enjoy it, however when it is during thanksgiving weekend, very tuff to find time to operate...keep up the good work..

CQ WW CW is my #1 or #2 favorite operating activity (ARRL CW is the other). But if you can't get the BIG GUNS to clean up their signals, I just won't operate any more. It's inexcusable and, as I said in a previous answer, it totally nullifies the benefits of all the wonderful technology we now have at our disposal. It turns a potentially exciting, wonderful event into a headache -- both literally and figuratively. And it's no respecter of geographical boundaries. Many of us work hard to be sure we have clean signals; the really BIG GUNS should do no less! Penalize the crap out of them! Completely DQ them! You have the receiving and recording technology in hand to do it uniformly and fairly. DO IT NOW! You have my total support.

Good approach as we move into a new era with new technologies.

Keep up the great job you are doing.

There should be a rule change that requires all stations to give their call sign at least once during a contact. QRZ is not a call sign. It is very difficult for S&P operators to make contacts when you have to wait 4 or 5 contacts to get a call sign. Contacts without both call signs should not be counted!!!! I have had to ask repeatedly for a call sign just to find out that I have already worked them.

Current rules make it impossible for west coast stations to be serious competitors. The playing field needs to be leveled by either counting all EU stations as being in the same country for multipliers, or alternatively, count each JA prefecture as a multiplier.

Also, SO2R stations should compete in their own category, or single ops not using SO2R should be allowed to use assistance (spotting, skimmers, etc.).

Australia (VK) has a lot of added difficulties because of distances and needs assistance to become competitive.

Well, I really like the contests, and thank you for sponsoring them. How to improve? Beats me. But, please don't 'Balkanize' the categories too much.

I know it raises all kinds of howls when mentioned but I would like to see a time limit on single ops. Many of my friends say they will never again enter a 48 hour contest seriously. It is not good for your health. It isn't good for family relationships. Fatigue causes more errors and quite honestly reduces the fun. You can argue limiting the time to 36 hours rewards operating strategy more than no time limit as off times have to be carefully chosen. I truly believe a 36 hour time limit would result in a significant increase in serious entries.

CQ has the best contests. The ARRL contests are good but the CQ contests are the best.

I would like to see the double QSO points for 160, 80, and 40 that the WPX has brought over to the CQ WW DX contests. Contacts within the same country but different zone should be worth a point. That will make things more interesting for those who are in large countries.

I know it's a DX contest and the fact that it is a dx contest is a good reason not to do it, but I still would like to see it done. DX means distance, it's doesn't necessarily mean a different country.

For an overlay category I'd like to see a 'wires only' overlay category in contests that have overly categories. TB Wires implies a tri-band Yagi. Yes, I read Randy's explanation that TB-wires includes people running only wire but I still think that a wires only overlay category would be a good idea. I apologize if the WW DX contests do not have overlay categories. I can't remember. It's not an overly important issue. However, I think that for contests that have overlay categories, one for wires only would be a nice touch.

I appreciate your efforts to cut down on cheating. Not everyone is going to like them but that doesn't matter. It needs to be done.

DQing people with poor signals, in the US signals that would likely be illegal, is a good idea. I hope you do it.

Thank you for sending me this survey.

Very interesting survey!

Swap the phone and CW weekends every year.

Hats off to all the log checkers, award sponsors and hard work being done by the Committee members. We would not have, in my opinion, the *best* DX contest without their efforts. Thank you!

Keep them honest!

Should CQWW committee analyze the possibility to include some antennas subcategories for monoband stations? This is also related with money, investment and etc. Also i know is difficult to check, diferentes than assisted or not because ip etc.... But we have stations running with, for example, two towers, four monobander on each and two amplifiers, one per tower. This conditions we can't compare with one single monobander for example. Should these sub categories be, for example: stacked monobander and single monobander? Let's think on that! Thanks for this nice survey, it helps a lot to each one share ideas and ways into think.

IN CQ WW RTTY CONTEST must be also 160 m bands!

Thank you for all your hard work and efforts to make the CQ WW contest the BEST contest in the contesting world!

Keep it fun and work for the greater interests of the majority, not narrow interests of a significant minority. Basic simple rules are best.

I THINK YOU FOLKS DO A GOOD JOB AND I ENJOY THE CONTEST VERY MUCH.

I will suggest a new category: 24 hours competition. Those who cannot operate the whole contest (48 hours) , would compete in this new category. The operating time would be defined by the first QSO logged + 24 consecutive hours. I.E.: First QSO logged @ 03:16 PM on Saturday determines that the end of the operating time would be 03:16 PM of Sunday. Each op will make its own strategy. 73

Maybe it's time to rethink the penalty system. There is a huge difference between the casual operator in a contest, and the folks who win the awards. Is it really necessary to have draconian point losses to the guy who has 100 to 200 QSOs as opposed to 4000? Yes, errors need to be removed, but is a 17% score reduction as a result of 3 not in the log QSOs a reasonable penalty?? This actually happened to me.

I suspect most of the questions in this survey are of interest to a small segment of the contest entrants.

For my part, I don't care about single assisted versus non-assisted (I'm not sure I have a clear understanding of the difference anyway). Or Japan working Asia (I can't work either place). Or penalties for bad calls (I don't have a clue what my score was).

I work who I can with my mediocre antenna, don't lose any sleep over who I couldn't work, send in my log at the end and don't look back.

Don't mean to belittle your efforts to fine tune the contest, it's just that most of these issues won't make any difference to me. Thanks for sponsoring the contest and 73.

Give more attention to the low power stations. Anyone can run up a high score with several towers, amplifiers and beams, but the real operators use 100w, wires and verticals! I expect this is where the majority of the testers are.

High scoring female contestants should be recognized.

Make CQWW CW always off a Thanksgiving Weekend like this year, 2013.

Most time I hunt and pounce and it bugs the hell out of me when a DX or any station running a pile up won't ID for a long long time. Not fair to us hunt and pounce group we waste a lot of time waiting for them to ID. Then when they do it is a race to see how fast they can spit out there call. If they are a DX with a heavy accent you have to sit and wait out numerous calls to make sure you have the right call. For us the chance of us ever winning anything will never materialize. I THINK IDing EACH TIME WOULD HELP A LOT. It would allow us hunt and pounce guys to make more contacts and maybe even be competitive.

Every time thanks for the nice contest. I had very enjoyed contest. But now too old, and don't get good result. HI

China to participate in amateur radio contests number is increasing every year, I hoping to the CQWW able to do more promotion activities in China.

Might consider a 24 hour entry for those who cannot devote the full amount of time. The 24 hours should be with a limited amount of time offs. Might consider a 'Masters' class for those who have one a particular entry class within the last 3 years.

This survey took longer than five minutes. :-) I am happy with the rules as they are. I would like to see SO2R, SO1R, and SOA separated for the score report but not necessarily for awards.

Live scoring is fun. Fun for watching and better understanding of the differences in propagation conditions depended on geographical and other means. Pay attention to this. We soon might have it as the only way of scoring...

Contests should be rewarding and thus require stringent rules. If you make them too easy even though more participants will be active, there is no sense of accomplishment.

Because of the loss of my total station 5 years ago, I have been less active, but I am working at getting the station rebuilt, after I rebuild my home. I have been trying to think of a way to encourage 'newbie' CW operators to get into contesting, like maybe a class for stations with 24 hours of operating.

I'd like to explain why I marked SSB as my favorite mode. Cuz CW nowadays with all the skimmer like technologies is becoming a competition between computer skills rather than operator's ones. I can tell it by instant huge progress of the results of my local rivals who were normally showing noticeably lower scores than mines. Some of them even think that it is OK to use local skimmer and still claim no assistance. So, SSB so far is the only mode where the operating skills are still of a high value. Otherwise I love CW.

Any additions to the rules on that we need to give his call after each QSO. It is very irritating with the stations which perhaps gives its call every five minutes, and then see that it has already had QSO.

No comments other than 'Favorite contest of the year. Nothing gets in the way of it (CW).'

Thanks for keeping this contest running...I look forward every year. I would like to see a rule to force stations to identify their station. I strongly oppose changing single operator to only one category as I enjoy the challenge of competing without spotting. If I single operator is running unassisted he will be more likely to improve his / her station and listening skills imo... See you in the fall!

I like your contests. Thank you for organizing them.

Having VE6 in Zone 4 to compete against other Zone 4 stations 2000 miles closer to Europe is very much not a 'even playing field'. Given other Zone 4 stations are closer to Europe than we are to them!

Please address these potential problems:

(1) 'Superstations' which obviously operate well above the legal power levels. The competition is meaningless when a large multi-op is running at 7KW. Some of the former Yugoslav stations are audible far after the openings should close.

(2) Multioperator 'multiplier' stations who pounce on a new multiplier and call repeatedly, often not even listening to the station they are trying to work. (i.e. brute force operating.)

(3) Audio recording software costs much less than most highly competitive stations. I believe that the leading stations should be required to audio record their entire operation.

Change? Why change? Is it broke?

CQWW should incorporate an additional element to the contest exchange such as a serial number or power level. The logging programs and CTY files currently in use have reduced CQWW to a callsign copying event with little or no value to exchanging zone numbers.

Still my favorite and from a casual contester's perspective, the best contest of the year.

Managing the biggest contest in the hobby is obviously a big job. Thanks for continuing to publish all the scores in the magazine, keeping a website up that captures all the statistics and records, and actively rooting out cheaters that diminish the accomplishments of those who play fair and work hard. The job must seem thankless at times--but know that those efforts are appreciated. Thank you.

Thanks to all the checkers and processes you have set up to make content entry smooth as possible.

I want to attend the contests when I have enough time. I think the rule is simple as usually.

I have made a permanent change to SOHP assisted class for all contests. I would never enter a self-reported, unverifiable entry class such as QRP or low power or unassisted. I take my contesting seriously, and haven't spent 10's of thousands of \$\$\$ to be beaten by a cheater (we on the west coast can barely compete with a W1-2-3 with a tribander, much less a W1-2-3 with a \$600 local skimmer and a tribander)

73! Very good job CQWW team

Implement distance base scoring. Shift the start time to 0300z

This Survey can be very useful for perfection of rules CQ WW DX Contests and I wish you success!

As a resident of Hawaii, I enjoy these contests. Don't mess it up.

I always look forward to your contest. Mainly I compete against myself because I know of operators who cheat to win. The time may come when I simply had out a few points and call it a contest.

Would like a Rookie class for us new to contesting. :)

Thanx for a very nice contest with great service and nice web site etc. 1000% sure I will be back 2013 with better antennas etc. Do hope for better conds though :)

Results announcement is too late. Please make it within 3 month.

West coast has a real problem, especially as the cycle moves toward the next minimum. We cannot reach the European mults and all JAs are one mult. Perhaps making JA call areas mults or just making the States as mults with one point per Q?

Your contest is my favorite. I take the Friday before just to be rested. Great job!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Change the club boundary rule from a radius to a Square Mile area with a maximum L:W ratio to avoid long chains. Too often a radius takes in unpopulated areas like water. High club participation really drives the activity up, look what happened to ARRL-SS this past year with one major club dropping out for the year, everyone noticed.

If u are going to make any changes u might want to think about an OLD Timers Class. It's very hard for us Old Timers (soon to be 72) to RUN with the younger crowd, especially for 48 hours.

I think the contest is pretty much fine the way it is. Don't mess it up!

A major reworking of scoring rules is needed to bring this contest (and most DX contests) into the 21st century. Existing rules are based on simple pencil and paper arithmetic, but all of us do our logging using computers capable of figuring contact points based on formulas that can make contests much more fun for all participants, not only the favored few who live around the Atlantic basin. There are many possible ways to do that. Two that come to mind are distance-based scoring, assignment of multipliers that allow stations around the world to be more competitive, and to WANT to work each other. I can run JAs for about as long as Zone 5 stations can run EU, but I get one multiplier per band and they get 40 or 50. That doesn't give me much incentive for staying up all night to do it.

Another is additional QSO points for working a station running LP and QRP. It takes a better station and more time to pull a weaker signal out of the noise, but the station who has paid his dues to do that, and spends the extra seconds to do it, gets the same credit as for working a guy 20dB over 9.

Two of these scoring methods were developed and implemented by N6TR for the contest he 'invented' -- the Stew Perry. And since he's the guy who log checks a bunch of our biggest contests, it should be obvious that he doesn't think it makes it too complex to score.

How would Zone 5 stations feel if the entire European Union was a single multiplier? That's exactly what we face in Zone 3 -- the only major ham population center in Asia is JA, and it's one multiplier. VK, an entire continent the size of Europe, is one multiplier.

More points for NA QSOs to Zone 6, 7, 8? Again that favors Zone 4 and 5 -- they are half the distance as compared to Zone 3 to these stations.

Ham DX contests are broken. The only incentive hams in most parts of the world have to operate is to work a few DXpeditions to rare spots.

A great contest. Is it totally fair to all geographic locations? No. No matter how many times you adjust the rules, there will always be somewhere in the world that is at a disadvantage. Does it get very old getting beat by a small station on the east coast when you live on the west coast and you've put a huge effort into building a competitive station? Of course. My personal feeling is that no matter where you build your station, there will always be someone willing to make the effort to build a bigger, better one. Not sure there are enough hours in the year to figure out how to make any of our contest totally fair to all who participate.

Great contest. You guys should be congratulated for all your hard work. Thanks, from an old timer...

Thank you for all the great work you do!!!

I look forward to the CQ WW events. I have operated from TI5N in 2006 for the Cq WW CW, and it was a blast. Thanks for taking on this huge task.

Need new so2r category!!!!

I love CQ WW Contest.

Please consider the scoring of this contest in Distance. The west coast stations are not participating like they used to due to the lack of Japan presents and the East Coast taking the US every year. A distance scoring would even the playing field a bit. A distance calculator would not be that difficult to set into programs, it already tells us how far the DX is from us.

Love the contest and will continue to play.

Continued success and fruitful work! God bless you!

Great job. Keep up the good work! I appreciate all the hard work, and it is work, that you guys, and so many others do to make Ham Radio the best hobby there is!

I think the Committee should take steps to discourage stations from not IDing for a long time. It really screws things up. You could easily DQ people for flagrant violations. I'd say going more than five QSOs without IDing is obnoxious.

Use EIRP as a power calculation and not output power of IR

You didn't ask about CQ WW RTTY 2012 participation, but you did put RTTY in preferred mode question (?) I was active in CQ WW RTTY contest as well.

Newcomer invitation. If big gun always wins, no interest in the contest.

First and foremost, the CQ World Wide Contest is my most favorite of all. I have more CQ certificates proudly displayed on my wall than any other organization. I'm a small station with a small signal and I always enter SO/Unassisted. I hope this category remains. Maybe add a Tribander/Wires category like in the WPX contest? I can't say enough how much I personally appreciate CQ and all those that make the biggest contest of the year the success that it is. Survey's like these are great and I always appreciate being able to voice my opinion. Thanks!

Something needs to be done about zero-point QSOs!

Q penalty is too high. Tonight talking to a casual tester who got his LCR was just amazed how his score was reduced by the penalty points.

I started ham radio in 1963 when contesting was interesting and it is still interesting. The study about antennas and modern electronics that contesting has caused has kept me abreast of modern times.

do little time for consider result before 6 months

I think contacts within a country but from a different zone should count 1 point. There is a practical penalty for the stations with big signals who are frequently called for zone multipliers but get no points for the contact.

You do a fine job & make only the changes that are needed to keep the activity at a high level. I am a retired repairman--IF IT ISN'T BROKE DON'T TRY & FIX IT.

I operated single operator, single band (10M, non-assisted. Worked a station in Europe who logged me as working me on 20M, I logged him on 10M where I worked him. Your log checked claims you have recording (from Europe) of me on 20M. Impossible as my log shows me in a run during that time frame, but your log checker accused me of being wrong. I changed my log submission to a check log because I am not going to argue. History shows that the cheaters come out of Europe because they 'just have to win'. I do it to have fun, I don't cheat, never have, never will and will not submit a log in the future. May get on to work some, but will not submit a log.

Thanks for a great event

Thanks for a great contest and your continued efforts to improve things. Keep up the good work!

The rule about 0 pints for QSO inside country is not fair. The contact is made anyway, at least for multiplier. Why not change this to 1 point which could be OK and fair from my opinion. What was a reason this rule was implemented, I do not know, but if there is an exception for NA stations, why others could not get points for inside country contacts?

TNX for the question...it's very important for me.73!

Use common sense in all decisions. Look at all the options. Move towards what will make the contest more interesting for all operators in all locations.

Quite satisfied with most of the things.

I would LOVE to see CQWW moved to weekends that a family person can easily make. As it is, CQWW falls on two of the bigger US family holidays and that really screws up the possibilities for those of us with families. PLEASE consider moving them out of the window of major holidays - I think this would greatly increase DXpedition participation, as well as US-based participation.

I'd also like to see more statistics out of the log data. pileup.ru is doing great work on this front, but CQ could do it also, and perhaps even base records on some of the statistics, like rate, mult counts, etc.

You are doing a great job! Thanks

Keep up the good work! I enjoy the CQ contests (WW and WPX) a lot.

I think the contest rules need to specify not to venture into other portions of the bands. Every weekend there is a contest it interferes in the JT65 segment of the band slots. The contest rules should specify freq and if they are in the digital portion they should be disqualified. JT65 is almost 99.9% 1 or 2 freq per band slot and we have to contend with RTTY, CW when there are contest or like me don't turn radio on that weekend because the contesters are interfering with my QSO.

Publish results quickly, after three months!

Good luck in create new rules

Thanks for survey!

Congrats for the recent rule change

Thanks for the supporting the contest for long time. I enjoy every times for the contest.

I truly appreciate the time and effort CQ takes to ensure the highest standards within its contesting arena! Rules need to be straight forward and tight. Simple rules with consequences.

The number of certificates CQ awards within their contesting program keeps the little guy competing each year! A simple e-mail to the certificate winners with a link to the certificate pdf would be fine and cut down on the printing/mailling expense incurred by CQ.

Also, the log check summaries performed and results sent to stations are very constructive. They help to show individual operators, teams, and clubs where improvements can be made.

CQWW.com is the standard for each of the other CQ contests sites/links.

Why fix what is not broken. When rules start to get complex I tend to drop out. Thanks for a great set of contests.

I'D LIKE A SCORE 'AD HANDICAP' BUT TOO HARD TO APPLY

Keep up the good work. It is much appreciated!!

I enjoy the contest though I can operate only certain time as I have my work during the weekends. I appreciate your assistance in submitting my log. Now I can submit by myself and will go for the contest more. I have not done RTTY contest, so next target is to go for this mode.

Recommend adding a Cabrillo line 'YES' or 'NO' for certificates - with downloadable certificates as an option. I know W5GN pays postage now, but this may not be sustainable.

take control on BIG power 10 KW and more and make them DQ

Think about inner-entity points like in CQ WPX. Countries with a big ham population as USA and Germany miss many QSOs.

Penalties are too high, some dialects are hard to catch in one short contact. I understand this part of the contest but nailing you 3 point is to high, just loss of the contact should be enough.

These are the best contests of the year, thank you.

Sorry, my bad English. Want - more information abt contest, results, winners in World TV or so. We are biggest community, but few people know about us. More inform! Activate it. TKS for one of BEST contest! 73!

Glad you took this over Randy

Would like to have a two operator – single band category, so an operator and a friend could work the contest on one band.

I always thank to the effort of contest committee and various infrastructure for that. Thank you.

Thanks for asking about meaningful changes and considering ways to generate more activity.

I would like to see a local club category.

It is strange that the condition is up at the CQWW. Is it an illusion?

I want to see official results more latter if it possible.

Too old to take full part in the contest, but remember well those old days when you were up for 48 hours.....

The issue about which I have the strongest opinion is the long-standing policy of NOT penalizing mislogged zones. It makes no sense. The rules say that an exchange is to be copied. Having secret rules (in this case: the zone does not have to be copied) that are unknown to most participants cheapens the contest. I stopped taking CQ WW seriously once I learned of that policy.

I would like to see RTTY section to be implemented with same rules and same committee under CQWW

West Coast stations suffer from a big disadvantage compared to the East Coast ones. If we draw a circle with a radius of 3000 miles how many countries do we cover? Not very many. I believe that should be taken into consideration when it comes to scoring and having a chance towards awards. So far it's not a 'fair' fight. 73.

I thanks to all members of Committee for hard and very good work. We all have to do something to improve contests, to keep Ham spirit and Ham codex and respect the rules. Let us give the equal conditions to all operators to be winner. I never take part in contest primary to win but to test myself what can I do the best in band conditions with my very simple working conditions.

I am very grateful to all members of Committee for a hard work and your effort by submitting to improve the rules and to make contest more human and equitable.

I am very satisfied with quality improvement of CQWW DX Contest Committee activity. Keep up a good work and Best 73'ss

Take all measures to avoid MO entry operate from different locations in distance of several hundred miles with different TX

Very happy to see improvements in score checking and addressing the issues that were kind of taboo for a period of time. It is difficult to balance between making the contest even more popular - certificates, scoring where everyone can 'see' him/herself as a winner :) - and making sure the rules are respected.

The two most notorious ones these days are of course assisted or non-assisted and one that pops up even more is the use of powers beyond 1.5KW. With the flooding of amps that can easily deliver anything up to 3.5KW this is virtually impossible. If you check the selling numbers for, let say OM Power, you will see that without home brew products you may have thousands of people who for sure don't drive the amps down to what is stated in the rules. Difficult to enforce, or measure. Possibly educating people what the difference in dB means is a way forward, but I'm less than optimistic this would work. Perhaps one single unlimited category is a way to go, but I guess that is then a bit too radical :) Good luck and thanks for making the playing field more equal than ever before.

Club competition is my main interest

Certificate for all participants! 73!

Thank you very much for running the best contest of all, which I cannot even imagine to miss!

Thanks for the inquiry form! nice job contest committee

This was the first corner I've ever entered and I've got to say that I found your site and instructions very unsuited to newcomers. The whole thing feels a bit 'by testers for testers' and doesn't help encourage new people into the fold. Luckily I'm stubborn enough that I worked it out but I'd love to see better explanations of the rules, operating practice and the submission/scoring system. A video would go a long way to help I think.

Anyway, thanks so much for organising all of this - it was great fun and next time I'll have a score to beat!

Thank you guys, you are doing a very nice job.

CQWW is my favourite contest and any improvements are appreciated. I like the survey and the way you integrate us - the participants - to ask for these improvements.

I think that is the right way - Thank you !!

Did you thought about cq ww cw/SSB/rtty (3 modes) competition - to give award to the best operator in all 3 modes - for all CQ WW categories?

Many thanks for your great efforts. Always happy to participate in the CQWWDX Contest!

- 1) Remove 5 days limit
- 2) remove club competition limit (but must be in the same entity)
- 3) split single operator assisted in two category (low power/high power)

Good luck! CQ WW contest - is best and interesting contest with one line of other WPX, ARRL contest!

Beware this traditional, good competition as long as possible!!

This contest is very meaningful, we expect that to continue.

I have only two comments - remove non assisted category (only category to assisted) and remove all penalties. Sorry for my English :-))

I think many testers are idiot, if you go at 45 WPM in CW , you have to repeat several times the score ; and after you call 10 times cq contest ! ! ! I think a minimum of polite as GM and GL is appreciable; we are not machine but human persons. Sorry my English language is not complete, hi hi

I didn't participate since 1998, and enjoyed the feeling once again. Next year will try to repeat

Closer look at multi single entries. Some teams use two signals on the same band

The less rules/limits, the more competitors. Give the people possibility to enjoy contesting. The winner wins being at exotic place (score rule). It is related to their money and not related to their skills. (I've been WPX CW winner @ C4I in 2010)

Keep up the good work. Seek support when you need it.

Thank you for the best contest. Why is held only once a year? ;)

there should be TB-WIRES category for us, small pistols :) and independently categorized, not like in CQ WPX together with others

The idea to make the results available as quick as possible is very good. The faster the better.

I had not thought about the differences between scoring within continents

Thanks for running a great contest! Bravo!

Thank YOU very much for the great CQ WW-Contests!

Remove category SO and leave category only SO (A).

Wish no machine used during CW contests

Thank you for the nice contest and web (www.cqww.com).

I really like this race! I am convinced that one of the biggest tournaments in the world! And I am confident that it will continue to do so! Although there are many questions you answered that no opinion. This is because it will only accept competition as the Committee shall decide. No matter how busy I am this race is always time to stop! (And, of course, the HA-DX.

My only issue with the rules is separate category for assisted and non-assisted SO. Time to combine them!

CQWW is one of my favorite contests. I have operated from the US and also as DX. Thanks to the contest organizers for all you do to make the contest possible. /73

Strongly encourage to remove 'assisted' categories and shorten the log submission period to 24 -48 hours.

Hats off to all those in charge of making the CQWW the best contest there is. I admire your dedication and the countless hours you spend behind the scenes for other hams (like me) to have fun.

Guys, tnx for nice job! Its best ever sex...

CQ WW contest is most appreciated. Most DXpeditions financial and material efforts have been made to operate in the CQ WW. It's a tradition. Is history. It is true that society (man) evolves. It is normal to occur techniques. But implementation of the 'new' is up to each of us. Must start from the idea that we are all 'amateurs'. And each is preparing to participate in the CQ WW can (material) or how to understand (propagation, antennas, software, hardware, tactics ... etc)..

I know it's easy to organize a competition of this level. For the effort, know that you are appreciated. Perhaps not everyone is manifested by positive feedback. That's society... Everyone is entitled to an opinion. Eventually, the organizer decides.

Thanks to the team doing a big work and an excellent job for such a high number of hams around the world!

Please persevere with recent efforts to reduce cheating.

In 1998 CQ WW SSB, as GM8V I was cheated out of 1st place Europe 20m SOSB Unassisted by DJ7AA, who used the DX Cluster. When I complained to CQ WW, I was told 'he's just a better operator' - er no - he was a cheat. We tried to submit evidence again in 1999 about DJ7AA from our M/M GM7V entry but this was ignored.

This made me lose some confidence about how committed the CQ WW Committee was at actually tackling cheats, instead of worrying about whether they would lose entries.

I am very pleased that things are changing.

Thanks for the organization and refereeing of fine contest! To in total you kind!

A penalty for not signing!! As of now, you can listen to a station running minutes without signing, because the 'assisted' guys know who he is.

The contest is seriously biased toward East Coast stations. It is impossible to compete from the West Coast. An East Coast station may tally 40 or 50 multipliers on 80 and 160. A West Coast station is lucky to work a few EU on those bands. The ARRL DX contests are even more biased, WPX is the only fair contest with a DX component from the West Coast.

Good luck and thank you for your work;

Please do not join both single op categories, it is totally different to operate under assistance; where for me there will be less pleasure and I will not be able to continue to score in the top5 Europe

Lot of fun and thanks for keep going with the contest.

It should be mandatory to follow the IARU Band Plan, i.e. never work SSB in the CW part of bands. Violation of that rule should as far as possible be reported by monitoring stations.

Thank you for all the hard work

you are BIG

Define Yellow Card/Red Card scenarios.

Thanks for good organisation and checking correct all log's. Thanks because you exist !

I think that single and single assisted are joinable. What do you think about low power and QRP and mentality in former communism countries to use these for records? How check it? For multi operators only one category-extrem - HI.

Thank you very much to ask my opinion on this wonderful great contest...

I generally like starting in the contests and I must say that CQWW is my favourite one. Starting in it gives me a lot of pleasure. It also gives me the possibility of making contacts with new stations all over the world.

Implement 24 hour category! OM's should use first 24 hours or last 24 hours.

the race and always a pleasure

Thanks for your hard work, ufb!

Do not gained first places in the CQ WW, because I always work accordance with the terms of the license / 500W max /

Here in Russia we like your contest very much. We call it-'double-double' It sounds in Russian as in your language. The end of November is the most convenient time for us as we finish with our gardens and other odd jobs. It is winter at this time and the propagation is usually very nice. So thank you for the contest and good luck!

Put SO2R entrants into a separate category.

Thank you for a big contest and for the opportunity to contact many new country. so I have 5bDXCC.

I do understand why 2 pts NA rule was created in the past, but to make this 3 points is outrageous. To make a similar thing in ASIA is even worse. Why JA why not BY. the amount of BY goes up 50%/year. The time there is more BY than JA is not far ahead.

Out of band operation which is quite usual on 7200 to 7300 where EU stns call NA should be banned. The operation of US-Big guns in SSB below 7050 (I heard KC1XX and many others on 7017 cllg in SSB) should also be prohibited.

Please more enforcement about stations running pile up in the contest and who never give their call. We lose too much time waiting to know their call.

Maybe we should have SO '3 band / single wire' as they have in WPX? Just a suggestion. :)

Congratulations with Great Job! My lovely Contest's since 1952

Thanks for that you make CQ WW Contest possible - keep up the good work!!

The CQ WW Contest has a long history. Since I got my first license in 1977, it was already existed. I always enjoy the CQ WW Contest. Thank you very much for your contribution.

Very impressed with your efforts. Keep up the good work. Only real issue is please get rid of stations running excessively high power with bad signals.

I appreciate the way you are organizing CQWW contests. The best is to adopt and keep the rules up to date. We are living in 21st century, clusters/skimers/SDRs are wide used and should be accepted, the average age of participants is going higher and SO time to operate should be adopted to 36 hrs like in other contests.

Include following IARU band plans in the SSB part of this contest!

There should be some center point for the contest. Like a page where you can see who will complete. Especially all the big stations should be listed for contesting. Also it would be nice if it was possible to push live logs to a page, to view the current score during the contest. Maybe also links to all the stations who has live feeds from places like ustream.tv. etc etc. Making contesting an event for all to see.

Thank you so much for organizing this great contest! Per

Danke schön für das Contest, und meine Station Beschreibung.

Add psk to the contest.

I hope that you can get the citation can be printed on the Web as WPX Contest.

The log upload page, the robot, is a good innovation. TKS FOR ALL UFB WORK!

Congratulations for your big big work every time and to propose this Survey to improve the contest rules. Please, remember that there are many 'little pistols', like me, that try to operate during the contest with 100W and simple antenna system and going up & down with my VFO to find other stations, WITHOUT the cluster.

We need to find a way to reduce the advantage that E coast USA has over W coast. My path to EU is right thru the Auroral zone. I'm at 40 deg N Lat. Working EU is tough - especially since I run 5w.

Keep up the good work! Interact more with the testers,

Great contests - best contests of the year

DONT FAVOIZE ANYBODY , make RULE CLEAR & SAME FOR ALL !

CQ WW for HAMs like Christmas/Easter for believers.

You should forbid use of CW Skimmer. CW Skimmer is not CW but personal computer communications.

I look forward with much interest each year to your contests and reviewing your web site.

For SO it is necessary to change operating time. Not 48 hours, and at most 40-42. Or as in WPX - 36. It is more physiologic.

And once again. The American stations shouldn't have advantage before European due to cunnings in rules. In general it is better to cancel division into continents. For example. Two points for any QSO for all, multipliers - countries and zones. Then we will do some fighting!

We have to limit or control the output power in the contest

Just keep it going.

Thank you for your kind assistance!

You're doing great job!

Thanks for bringing CQWW back to normal world, with solid log verification and clear rules. My pleasure to operate and participate!

Would you have technologies available to monitor excessive power use?

Be the first to 'step up' and create a category for SO1R!! Many 'casual, just having fun' participants are SO1R! Without our participation, all contests would become very boring, very soon!

The popularity of the CQ WW DX Contest calls for some corrective measures, particularly on stations trying too hard to get a good result. Too many transmit too bad signals, creating too much interference, and showing bad behaviour. Competitiveness should not include dirty tricks, egoism, or massive breaches of band plans, particularly by transmitting phone signals in non-phone segments, or inviting such transmissions by 'listening 3585/7035' etc. This should lead to instant disqualification.

The big challenge that I see is addressing the power arms-race with Europe. I don't know how to fix it because peer pressure won't work in many parts of the continent (and not just in the East..) and taking direct action is so hard, but - right now I feel like we're half-pregnant. There's good warnings posturing threatening action, but I'm completely un-convinced that (just maybe apart from the top of the SO section), all the other sections suffer from widespread very high power levels. I'm part of a team considering a return to competitive multi-op contesting, but frankly right now I don't like either the option of putting in all the effort of re-building the station just to get taken to pieces by the competition running super power (which has got way worse in the past 10 years), or the option of running high-power myself and it just dissuades me from making the effort.

Being a tester from Europe, it has become virtually impossible to reach a winning score in Zone 14 or 15 without breaking the rules. Most of my fellow testers vastly exceed the power limits using up to three amps with multiple kws per amp on their running freq

For me the CQWWCW is a personal challenge to beat my previous score. I have participated since 1963 and have now 12 certificates to be the best in my category in my country (OH and EA).

The contest as it is at the moment is absolutely 'delicious'. I suppose whatever changes you may make, will not kill the excitement in my veins.

Considering that the CQ Magazine is the host of the most attractive contests in amateur radio in the world, I would look forward to more contest-related articles in the CQ Magazine, in particular regarding hardware. With more contest-related material in your magazine, it should definitively have a potential to become the focal Center of the contesting world. With a few changes, I think it should be easy for your magazine to compete favorably with the NCJ, for example. :-)

Ham radio is the best scientific hobby of 21st century and so promote Expert class more!

I like all CQ WW CONTESTS! Thanks! 73!

CQ WW CW and RTTY are my favourite contests, however it would be nice to have a reduced time category for single ops as unable to operate for 48 hours due lack of sleep and family commitments.

CQWW is still one of the best contests for having fun, whether making a serious effort or making a casual entry. Thanks!

Thank you for your hard work in putting on a fantastic contest. See you at Dayton.

Spectral purity of transmitted signal is a parameter that is not possible to be rejected by best receivers. Wide signal station makes QRM and takes a lot of place on band. Often distorted signals are heard during contests, probably local power limits are far behind. It should be prohibited.

Do NOT touch the M/S category and ruin it like in WPX. Also, do not touch SOAB unass, they are both perfect

Have you ever considered an age categories like over 70 or 80 ?

Thank you all for your hard work! CQ contests are always the best and we all appreciate the efforts put forward the committee!

Strict disqualification of cheating and listing the cheaters in the results! Other than that, don't change a running system.

It is a very nice contest. Mni tnx for this great happening. Most of the time I'm using just one band (entry). 48 hours is too long for a single operator hihi.

Try TO encourage mannerly operating practice, maybe through advertising maybe with points deducted. A lot of people seem to think it is a free for all, no rules competition.

Thank you very much to all those involved in organising and helping run the contest.

Please, please keep assisted separate from not assisted, great contest.

I think the new version of CQWW (2012) is very good. Very quickly recalculate log and giving pre-official scores are good idea. I think also the connection SO categories in one (non- assisted and assisted) will be more fair-minded, because I know few station which working in contest using cluster and next declare non-assisted categorie. Another thing which I suggest to improve is check and analyze the signals of any station (especially in top of lists) if power category which was declare is correct (for example: station declare QRP but during the contest working with power 100W or more). It is difficult case but now when on the world are many sdr receivers I think it is possible. Thank you for trying improving the CQWW contest I wish you good work and very good results.

Try to use all SDR capabilities to make people obey the rules, especially power output rule. It is so obvious, especially in QRP category, that people cheat, big time. Thank you for all your time, and effort. CQ WW is my favorite contest, my Tour de France :-)

COMPULSORY should be introduced a separate category for the station emitting megawatts and using sets of antennas on masts reaching to the sky. The current situation - where in one bag - are participants using standard equipment with 100-150W and multiband antenna is totally demotivating. Not to mention about participants just beginning their adventure with the competition.

Very useful Contest. Thanks!

I think that is about time to change report (599 or 59) to something else! I.e. Two or three letters code showing entrant category i.e. MOS, MOM, LP, HP, LPA, HPA, SB, SBA... This will help to recognizes cheating entrant much easily.

To make things even better, please apply some kind of power limit checking. SDR recordings?

Watch out for lobbies that don't work. I remember the way WPX was increased in operating time to suit DXpeditioners but did not result in more DXpeditioners just in disadvantage to those already disadvantaged by distance.

Operating skills have to give way for physical fitness / endurance for many enthusiastic single ops. Add a category for maximum combined 24 hour operating over the available 48 hours. It's OK if this new class would be regarded as the B-league by many fanatics. But, it would even the playing field (worldwide especially with a 3-point system for JAs), increase the enjoyment for many skilled hams who are chanceless today because of a practical or personal handicap and would reward operating skills rather than the ability to endure no sleep for two days.

Count QSOs with own country, perhaps 1 point, and 2 points for the same continent and 3 points for dx.

Thanks for putting on the contests. I would say keep the rules simple. There can never be an absolutely level playing field between all participants so where would you stop in trying to achieve one? These contests are for fun, not life, and I fear that some see winning as more a matter of life and death.

Bad signals are a big problem and should not be allowed. If possible these stations should be stopped during the contest (by email or other). Really a big problem in EU

The World Wide participation shows that all is OK, so better touch nothing! Rules will never be perfect. There will always be people who don't like rules, so when you make change there will be people again to complain.

It is always wonderful to take part of CQ WW Contests. Ciao!!

Change the scoring, make it distance related. DQ wide dirty signals. DQ those who cheat. Do not use your own excessive power amps, hey you need to set good example!

More attention to DX Cluster for use and abuse of 'friends' and call camouflaged. Greater publicity to those who are affected ... 'terrorize (hihi)' people think of abuse.

As we all get older, and 48 hours single op becomes harder, how about reducing contest length? Either to the WPX format (48/36) or to 24 hours for all? Personally I like the contests that run 12.00 Saturday to 12.00 Sunday. It is more Eco-friendly, more 'gray generation' friendly, and responds to the regular shouts from non-contesters of 'every weekend a contest'

Very good to invite stations outside US to participate in this survey. Thanks!

Only says ¡Thanks! to keep this great contest every year and wish good luck to your new director Randy K5ZD who started his acting nicely with this survey.

Keep up with your good work-thank you!

Great contest that sets the standard for all worldwide contests.

Thank you for possibility to change control with dx stn and dxpeditions. I will be right every time in your contest, because is seriously and give me chance to contact many stns.

In my few QSO I noticed that the errors were not caused by me but by the correspondent. Some NOT LOG IN are sure to have them connected as in a hundred contacts this is easy to verify. So many mistakes I certainly defendants were copa correspondents. How do you judge?

Also many stations now operate with WebSDR on another continent, it is very easy to make and impossible to verify, just to get more score, however, impossible to verify. For example I know many OM worldwide operating the contest with very high power, up to 10kw!! and perhaps operate as a single operator. How do I check it is impossible but it is not right, however, which is why the ranking is not worthwhile for people like me who only makes a few hundred links for fun. Thank you for your professionalism!

Please do not combine non-assisted and assisted!

Keep up the good work chasing cheaters. Don't hesitate to DQ stations who don't follow the rules. Use the recordings to identify rotten signals and rotten operating habits.

Again, keep the original concept - unassisted as a separate category.

As an addition to single band operation how about a 'Low Band' category which would be single op 40, 80 and 160 meter operation. It would promote low band DXing and increase activity on the low bands

A rule that say that spilt operation must respect band plans in other regions. In the 2012 CQ WW a number of US stations chose a up-frequency in the region 2 CW band

Great work and glad to see all those changes in the CQWW website. Keep up the good work.

That the rules contain a rule that US stations adhere to IARU bandplans. Eg. In the SSB contest xmit on the high end of 40 meters and listening below 7040 which is the exclusive CW portion. This provokes negative comment and unnecessary QRM.

Eliminate the single operator non assisted category.

Waiting too long for the final results.

solo 2 categoriesingola banda e all

CQ WW is one of best contest in the world, and my favourite! Congratulations. Thank you for your efforts!

What is done to promote the competitions outside of ham radio circles?

Quite happy as things are thanks.

Online sdr web is an issue. I suspect there's a large use. Skimmer also helps too much. A contest without any assistance is my ideal, but i know i am a dreamer!

Keep up the good work - and questionnaires such as this are a GOOD THING!

Many station declared low power 100w and use over 1kw.....with 100w is impossible running on 40m and to have pile-up!!!(for Italian station)

Disqualify more stations for bad operating practices.

A downloadable PDF certificate for every participant indicating his/her score

Think about the exchange definition. I don't have a proposal myself...

What about part time category (6, 12, 24 hours)?

I think you run a great contest but some form of penalty needs to be taken against wide signals mentioned previously.

Just keep a great Contest going as long as possible. The rest is up to you guys.

Sorry, but again the same sentence 'Indiscriminate penalty' for most stations the High Powered, Splatter makers and wide band transmit stations are the worst on the contest

Contest favorite for me, because a huge number of stations around the world are QRV!

At last, you react to all complaints about key clicks and splatter!

A splattering/clicking station

- *gets an advantage by making it impossible to use the adjacent space,
- *thereby it becomes very hard to find a clear space for others to call CQ;
- *is easier to find by following the splatter/clicks to his 'actual' frequency;
- *makes other hams wonder if they want to continue to operate in contests;
- *is only interested in winning - doesn't know what ham-spirit means

Keep up the good work!

There is limited publicity of the contest. E-mailing stations 2/3 times might help. Countries with limited participation need to be encouraged.

Please read my comment earlier about 4L5O's first harmonic on 7 MHz.

Thanks for your efforts to keep this contests running!

PSE continue doing this great job. Suggestion: Increase the number of awards. For instance, 2d place, 3d place, etc As they would be available on the site it does not cost anything for you and it would be a great souvenir for the participants.

Please consider to reduce the log deadline to 3 days

Please consider to add a page with 'how to' text and video on using the top 10 most popular logging s/w (another survey?) to generate a log and submit it within a new deadline.

Please consider the penalty scale as per my comments earlier, happy to debate it a bit more.

A warning system for stations that splatter or occupy more than +20% of a nominal BW for the mode in use based on a SDR/SW solution standardised by the committee to give repeatable results and measurements. Measurements would also probably need a front end attenuator so that all measurements are taken at a specific input power level. This needs very careful use and deployment but I gave up spots more than once in last CQWW RTTY WPX due to use of excessive power, some so bad you could have seen the mains hum and power ripple of the cooling fans as they were so loud on the carrier. noise floor to peak level was very small.

Allowing continents, countries with clear paths multiplier points as suggested will only leave the dominant scores to those with the most population and less land mass. Not an easy decision i know but your high scores are so far above what is attainable in other countries giving NA/SA and Asia the ability to bring that level up further, i strongly believe will make contesting less attractive to newbs.

Still favouring WPX over WWDX as it is (IMHO) more of a challenge with copying real exchanges and having more of the little 'strategic' decisions to make with QSO-point-value and op-time. WWDX - for me - lives more from its activity level and the many countries active. Also the necessity to operate more than 40 hours excludes it from allowing a serious entry nine times during a decade.

A huge thank you for all the time and effort you invest in helping to make our hobby so enjoyable.

There should be a penalty for stations that do not sign their callsign for every QSO.

I'd like to thank CQ and its staff (and volunteers, of course) for 58 years of pleasure in my favourite DX contest... hoping to be able to carry on for a few more years

Change scoring system to something more fair.

I enjoy your contest... keep going! And THANKS

Thanks for organizing these great contests. Best 73!!

Thank're trying to do our best for amateur radio, something that we love very much. God bless you Best 73

You guys are doing fine!

Do not change too much, it works fine

Your contest the best.

It would be nice to get certificates a bit earlier if possible.

Leave UA9F, G UA9X in Asia

As competition is in Oct and Nov, Scandinavian stations are particularly disfavored when it comes to high bands. Especially CW in Nov when we have daylight for only a few hours. I guess this is similar for other DXCC like Iceland, parts of Russia and North America. While conds are good in other European countries, conds in northern part of Scandinavia is dead.

Why not make a rule change that split Europe in south and north, north being Norway, Sweden, Finland and Iceland, Greenland etc? Like you wanna do with central america and caribbean getting 3 points with NA contacts. Contacts between North/South Europe gives 2 points.

And why not every second year move the competition to summer time? I.e oct, nov every 2nd year, and april/jun every 2nd year.

If this isn't the case already, I think that SO2R operations should be put in the category of 'assisted' or have their own separate class.

Faster turnaround, results next week.

The basic concept is good, don't change it.

Punish those who violate the rules.

For me the biggest problem is the the contest is too long. 24h would be better. But maybe I am too old.

Don't make too many changes !

I like the Contest just the way it is.

I missed the discussion about the points for innercounty QSOs... dl-dl. For DL is sometimes harder...because in my log more then 120 DL on 80m SB.... if I were from OZ it bring rd. 10 OZ and maybe 80 DLs... so maybe that gives a way to get one point for DL-DL and for DL-EU 3? DL-DX 6? Or look on EA8 or EA9 that's so easy to work EU and that gives full points for DX. Thinkable this rule? Best 73 es mni tnx for giving me the possibility to bring my own opinion to you!

I really like the new direction CQWW is taking. You will make a good example for others to follow. Continue to discuss openly with you audience!

Be careful when choosing members of the Advisory Committee. Sometimes it's hard to have confidence in some of the members when talking about fair contesting, when the rumors may be in the opposite direction. Still, it's good to have ambassadors spread around the continents, that you actually can meet, see and hear on ham fests etc.

Keep it up. It's my favourite contest.

Obviously the 'points policy' is unfair. Take a look at the map and see that some contesters move across the border into other continent and automatically make 3 points. Contesters in huge continents like Asia or South America get only 1 point for QSOs with stations with 6,000 miles distance. Therefore, the best solution will be the points (1-3) to be assigned in correspondence with the actual distance. The new LOG programs allow such calculation.

Diploma to pilot stations that do not take part in the contest, but that send check lists. For example to the one that more entities works for continent

I compare my results only to own country/class and with cautiousness. I used all times (and will use in future) real low power of 80 Watts to a dipole up 10 meters. There is neither a PA nor a beam at my station.

I sure wish you guys would improve the propagation on 28 MHz!

Change certificate design or color every year!

Add a limit to the duration of each run - force stations to alternate periods of running and search/pouncing - this will be huge in freeing up run frequencies that are currently dominated by a small number of powerful stations

I am glad the committee takes time to give answers to questions. I had 1 zone more on 40m then after precheck, with an e-mail this was corrected. Now at final result i found out, some op at KL7RA did not put me in log. So even if you have a positive response it is al depending on the human behind the keyboard.

For unique i would make the rule that if the call does not exist teh be removed from log, but no removing only because they are unique. It happened to me once 1 got called by a DX station from A3 in a (local) contest but he did not work any others in this contest, should that not be granted? He probably checked propagation and then go qsy to clear freq to have pile up.

Please remain persistent in disqualification and elimination of those calls that have a very wide range of the signals, those calls that have two or more signals on the band. Because calls that operate with low power impossible to operate freely and are forced to flee to the ends of the range to be able to call the CQ. I wish you much success

Thank you for your efforts in sponsoring very fb contests. I have gotten many new band countries using contests. Some ops take the contest a lot more serious than this old man. I enjoy helping other ops with Q's and multipliers. It is a hobby not a vocation.

I repeat once more... I want single op category without any help, dx clusters or others like in the good old time... Anyway, Tks a lot for wonderful competition... 73

Please start looking into the 1500w/power rule. There are many stations on the air with 5 KW and more scoring the top ranks.

I think SO2R should be a different category,

Thanks for the well organized contest, keep up the good work. It shows professionalism..

Нет замечаний.

Thanks for exellent contest! I like it!

cq ww cw is for me _the_ contest of the year. Mni tnx for your job!

I would like if you can change the design of the contest certificates (more colors and modern design). Some looks very cheap like (WPX or 160m). The CQWW contests are the real fun each year and for me like a World championship.

Thank you for soliciting contester input with this survey! It's exciting to note that the little pistol's voice can be heard in the decision-making process.

Don't change the rules too much but do clamp down more on the cheats.

Keep up the good work, and thanks for the chance to have input on rules and changes.

Please think about some kind of distance scoring.....there is not only problem with JAs or Caribbean and Central America. There is no chance for central and east EU station to compete against west EU stations, just imagine LZ needs to compete against EI, F, CT or even CU! It's clear that most of activity is coming from EU and US so station on other continent being very close to EU or US are automatically winners. Is this fair play?!

So if you are talking about fair play, why don't you change to distance scoring from zone to zone for example! Otherwise all world records gonna be in West Africa, all EU records on Azores all NA America records in Caribbean.....there is only local/regional competition left? Is this something what we need for biggest WW contest?!

All rules you can have in order to promote correct behaviour on the bands are valuable. In all, very fine contests and perfect and fast help when problems occur!

so2r not equal with so1r

1kw not equal with 10kw

In my opinion the current rules of CQ WW are ok. It was very good change the log submission to 5 days. I have my license only since 2009, and participate in CQ WW since 2010. Since then I participate every years. I participate always in non-assisted category, because gives me more pleasure to search in band for rare stations during contest. Adding assisted category with non-assisted is not fair, I think. For me the CQ WW contest is my favourite contest.

Appreciate all the efforts of those who host and make this contest possible. Nice work, easy submission, and great contest. 73

Even though I can and do operate high power at times, I think ALL contests should limit power to no more than 250 watts. This would create a more even playing field for all operators and clean up a lot of the deliberate overdriving of KW amplifiers and make the copying of DX signals much better.

tnx fer your great work!

Wide signals should really be banned. I take care to produce a clean signal. I have old sdr recordings of a Russian station needing 30khz on 20m. These 30khz were only used by this station. What a terrible signal and not fair for all other stations in the eu.

I would like to see some bonuses or benefits for simplicity. Not everyone has Yagis or high power or even logging programs. Also, if accuracy counts, why is the exchange such a farce, i.e. a constant 599 signal report. I sometimes feel that people who work me during contests are linked into a program where they get my info brought up BEFORE I have had the opportunity to send it therefore did they really work me, totally?

CQWW is a great contest without any changes. I would caution the committee to be careful about unintended consequences with changes. Making Asian contacts with JA being worth 3 pts each- that might piss off many Europeans. Making US/Caribbean contacts worth 3 pts each- only do it if it would make great Caribbean scores more competitive for top awards. Tweak slowly and carefully.

You would not listen anyway...

Just my thanks for a great way to get across the pond with my simple wire antennas and 100 watts.

Thank you for making contests where everyone can work everyone. I hate contest where you have to work only one country!

I enjoy this contest and appreciate all the work the Committee does.

I know it's hard to catch the cheater. But as we know them are very close and are always the same. Thank you for your work, which is already hard, and hopefully the next contest we are in the air.

For some stations it is very hard to hear that other Stations in other lands work areas that are not possible to work from their own QTH. (For example in LX you hear stations from USA that they work southern Europe (south France or Spain but you here nothing or you have no chance) Because of Propagation. To find a rule that these will be managed would be great.

CQWW CW is my favorite contest in the world.

I think that antenna system must be limited. The antennas set up is 100% proportional as your financial capacity. Can be a way to have many more ham ready to set up a contest station, multi operator or single.

Simply keep up the good work and don't make rules and scoring too complicated. I think that same scoring for everyone would make point comparing easier and would put all stations into same line.

Thank you again and good luck!

I operate as single and multi op and would have liked an option for any type rather than one type.

Also, I would have liked a 'No opinion' option for the merging of assisted and non-assisted.

Why only once a year?

Exceptions in point calculation make the results no longer comparable. Why don't you take the same calculation as in WPX? Getting at least 1 Point for a QSO with the own land would be a great advantage over some 100 QSOs with 'zero' points.

Please don't create exceptions for North America and Asia. Others like Europe (Germany) would feel getting handled unfair.

Five days to send the log is enough, optimal tip

Ending the assisted category, 95% use the cluster think half of that use send the log as seen, most are dishonest. The result could be anticipated if positive. Very grateful to participate in the research initiative otima

I appreciate the efforts of the contest committee in seeking fairness from all participants and promoting the Extreme category. Rules are more clearly defined than before and I hope the committee continues to refine them for clarity to eliminate 'assumptions and liberties' taken by some.

It is a serious committee, just stay like that. Congratulations

Getting 0 points for working the own country is a PENALTY for a German as we have a big contester-community in Germany. Scoring the own country should be same as scoring the own continent (1 point). Same applies for other big HAM-populations.

Thank you for the survey!

Tnx for nice contests. More support for small gun stations

Thanks for hosting a great contest!

Just to keep up the good work. The major issue I have is the abuse by high-power stations that routinely run up to 5KW. I don't have a problem with the 1.5KW rule but there should be rigorous enforcement of that rule. I would say that a number of EU and SA stations routinely run power that is way over 1.5KW. I do not know the solution but this is a big problem. There have also been situations where when I see the results, I am thinking a number of low power entrants have been running KW+. From time to time I've run low-power and know how difficult it is to maintain a frequency on 20, 40 and 80m especially. In the ARRL contest, giving your power helps to eliminate such persons but I don't know what can be done in the CQWW.

Thanks for a great contest that I look forward to every year.

I would also like to see your committee apply the same principles to the RTTY contests. Having access to the scoring and records databases etc. would be very useful in planning my annual efforts.

A limit no to work own DXCC here in EU favor station from semi rare DXCC, that means HB0 or 9A, UR, HA etc etc. will work at least 100 DL on 80m but DL stations=> DL STN are 0 points. DXCC Countries with a lot of stations on the same bands are less favored than DXCC with just several station on the air during the contest.

Club competition: current rule is a 175 km circle. Some clubs are on the coast, so a circle is and unreasonable way to measure. Why not use square area? That way ALL clubs can compete on the same playing field.

In the contests have the opportunity to work with a large number of countries even QRP. Thank you for it.

You guys do a great job. By and large, I think the rules are fine. I am opposed to the CQ WW Contest committee taking on the role of FCC. Stay focused cheating for those in the top 10 of each category. Otherwise, I feel that the casual testers are starting to feel intimidated by an overzealous application of rules.

I am opposed to allowing remote contesting, it's difficult to enforce. What I mean by that is the technology is such that people can use remote receivers. Enforcing this becomes rather dicey. Certainly looking at the log, and comparing to other stations in the area will illuminate such cheating, but it's hard to develop FACTS that the op was using a remote receiver. My point is, the rule about remote operating should be simple and clear. NO REMOTE OPERATION.

DX Contesting from Texas sucks these days. I look at guys like K5GN who are exceptional ops, operating from top tier stations like W5KU and struggle to make 'The Box' because we give up so much on 160/80/40 to the East Coast. To put it succinctly, DX contests have become an 'East Coast' contest. I have the utmost respect for guys like N9RV, W9RE, K5GN, K5WA for sticking with it as single-ops in the DX Contest over the years, but look at the hardware investment it takes compared to stations on the East Coast. I think the West Coast guys have given up on DX Contests. How do you resolve this problem?

Self-spotting! Put some rare call sign on freq. and when I coming on freq. is station who is spotting ??????? RA,UR....

Cheating really only impacts less than 1% of contest entrants. Please do not make rule changes in the name of reducing cheating that impact the fun of the contest for the other 99%.

QSOs between same country shouldn't count 0 Points

It's nice that the results are available earlier.

No you guys do a good job. In fact contest is so popular that bands are too crowded at peak times.

It would be helpful if the high power section could across the board be limited to say 500 watts. It's very hard for hams in the lower power section to squeeze into space to get a frequency. 20m is a rat race. At least there is room on 15 and 10m to spread out a bit. What about a ban on amplifiers on 20m. It would give the small guns a chance. It's hard to compete with someone running 1.5Kw who is 2 or 3 khz away. Other than that the contests are excellent and I enjoy operating in them. Keep up the good work

It would be fine, if you add some contest free segments in the rules...

Thank you for the survey. It certainly demonstrates that the Committee is interested in operator opinions and wants to keep the contest relevant. One area I would like you to consider would be to take Canadians station out of Zones 3,4 and 5 and merging them with Zone 1 or 2. There are so many US stations and the Canadians are so few that the Canadians get over looked/irrelevant as they are in very common Zones. Bermuda should go into Zone 8 for the same reason.

Contest rules should encourage: (1) more people to participate, (2) participants to operate longer and make more contacts, and (3) participants to submit their log.

I dip in and out of the contest every decade or so! If the rules change too much I get confused.

It is pretty good as it is. I have no strong opinions, but I enter to enjoy the contest. With only 80watts to a half G5RV and a noisy environment I stand no chance of making a high score. This does not prevent me from enjoying the event, though! Long may it continue.

Thank you for all the hard work. Due to work commitment, currently CQWW CW is the ONLY time in the year when I get to operate a radio, and I enjoy it very much. Call me old-fashioned but I don't like the trend that radio contesting becomes more and more a computer game. For me the evermore continuing integration of computer elements into our hobby slowly but surely removes the excitement and skills that once were needed, and with that it removes the fun. I vote for keeping contesting more purely radio related and less computer related. At least, please keep a category for those who think like me.

If you want to combine SO and SOA into one group, then my suggestion is to create a new 'gentlemen' category where the entrant is allowed to operate only 36 out of 48 hours AND is not allowed to use any assistance AND can only use low power = 100W . That way, the 'serious' guys can compete in the 48 hour class with high power and assistance, and those old fashioned people like me can play like in the old days..

RESULTS ARE SHOWED TOO LATE

On-line scoring is a great addition and its use should be encouraged, if not established as a necessary part.

Congratulations for the work that has been done!! Always is time to do better and better and you are doing that.

Simple rule is good, especially WW DX contest.

Why not more points when you work a QRP station? I don't know how you can check it, but QRPer's are the greatest operators!

Love to play in the contests!

Nice of you to ask the participants for opinions via this survey. I don't recall ever being asked about other contests.

Sportsmanship by the big guns should be taken into account. Or reversely, unsportive behaviour should be reported.

Generally speaking I think that if a rule cannot be enforced it should be removed. Since the proliferation of SDRs and radios with built in pan adaptors It has become extremely to determine if a station is assisted or not assisted. This rule cannot be enforced with a great deal of accuracy. It is time to remove the distinction between these two categories.

Bonus points for up loading logs to LOTW.

Thank you!! You people do lots of work to make this contest the best.

I believe the CW DX contest is the best of the year and a great way to pick up rare countries.

Many thanks for sponsoring fantastic contests and for your interest in participant feedback.

Reading a question asking if I am in favor of putting all SO stations together, would it be assisted or not, was a big surprise for me and a deception. I will not run the contest if I compete against skimmer, internet or whatever else. What about those operating portable with no internet access? Please, do not make this an internet contest. I'll certainly quit in this case and won't be alone.

Not addressing the length of the contests. For many reasons, shorter contest periods are desirable. The non-contesting community would appreciate it. In the long term, so would the addicts.

A time limited portable category would be nice or all CQ contests such as the VHF/UHF contest hilltopper category. This might encourage more participation from part time operators who like to get out and operate portable on weekends. When I get out to do some portable operations the various QSO parties and contests make for an interesting twist to just getting out, operating and making a few contacts.

Perhaps a 12 hour category for us seniors that need frequent naps.

I would like to see results sorted by ARRL sections. I want to see my score compared with others in my section.

I think you are doing an excellent job in organizing. It gives me lots of fun.

Thx for all the time and effort you guys spend to enable us to have an excellent contest. 73

I look on the CQWW as the Premium DX contest, as it's the opportunity for everyone to work everyone. I'm just a casual S&P tester anymore, but the CQWW contests are the ones I look for every year. I appreciate the efforts of the volunteers who manage these events and oversee the log checking. What a job!!

IX. AWARDS: First-place certificates will be awarded in each category listed under Sec.IV in every participating country and in each call area of the United States, Canada and Japan. Is Japan larger in size of Russia? Is USA or Canada are larger?

CQ WW DX Contest is always fun very much and it is good opportunity to get us to meet new stations in the world.

appreciate your efforts for improving

In my opinion QSOs between stations in the same country should count points: 0.5 or 1 point.

This is the best contest of the year. I look forward to operating each and every year. Haven't missed it in over 20 years. Please do not get rid of unassisted class for those of us who like to 'hunt for them'!

It is such a great happening!!! I even tremble the week before!!! It is of my opinion that you, the committee, is doing a GREAT job and I do hope you will never ever stop that!

The new tools of using RBN, computer databases, and contest software give the best edge to those who use it wisely. Changing rules to alter the final scores would create the inability to make comparisons year to year. I have always strongly believed that serious testers have to optimize their stations and skills of operating.

TNX for sponsoring the contests! 73

I feel that the penalties for coping/logging errors are too strict. With computer logging, many of the errors found were typing errors. When you are at the receiving end of a pile-up, it's human to make errors. Obviously you want to remove them from the score/multipliers then CQWW needs to consider a sliding scale or reduce the penalties. What un-written message are you sending that will affect future behavior?

Thank you for your hard work, As a new operator and now looking forward to contests, I know there is a lot of work to prep and execute each one. I look forward to competing with the 'big Guns' with my 100w. I would like to ask if there is a way to have a story written how an operator with 100w can get millions of points even though I did not take break and can only end up with a few 100,000. I am not sure how you can write it but I think it would be very interesting to both the novice and expert tester... Thanks again for your great contests and magazine.

I am not a hardcore tester and only operate when I can find time. Since I use DX cluster I am put in the unlimited group. I can never ever hope with my small station and antennas to compete with the high dollar pro contest stations. That is why over the years I never sent in a log. Some of the pro stations do take up too much bandwidth with their overdriven signals, and some EU stations are over powered I fear. I use and have used the contests to add to my country totals or find a station on a new band. I enjoy 80 meters single band mostly CW, but I did work a few SSB just to test a new wire antenna I put up.

I have a 55 ft tower with a medium sized 5 band Yagi and wire antennas for 40/80. I can run the legal limit, but most of the time I use a 600W amp if needed when on CW. In the last contest i went for multipliers an not Qs. I had fun and that's the name of the game for me! 73 and thanks for a great test. The WW brings out more DX stations than the ARRL DX .

Oh yeah, bonus points for a rare/semi rare station would be nice to bring some of them on board. In order to get the points they would need to operate the full contest. I have never heard an FJ station on in a contest. Extra points might just bring them out.

Change CW weekend to not fall on thanksgiving holiday weekend.

give plaque to each DXCC new record

CQWW continues to be the BEST DX Contest! That is in no small part due to the work of committee and the log checking integrity!

Perhaps someday 30, 17 and 12 meters could be considered - mixed feelings about it - they do remain a haven for the non-testers during a contest - but in the lower solar times - we could use the extra bands - hmmm - maybe a trial run some year?

Re-look at the interlock rule; if hw or sw existed to make this work that would be one thing. But I have four stations that go to multiple bands during a m2 CQWW contest. 2 run & two mult. A M2 station with only two radios doesn't place very well as you can't use your band changes. Therefore most serious M2 stations have three or more radios. Now as you change bands with different radio the locks need to be able to change with them (which radios are interlocked to the other). I'm an EE and it's still not an easy problem to solve. Additionally, based on differences in radios keying in CW and SSB (footswitch-SSB and keyboard or key in CW) you need a different solution for CW then SSB. The big MM don't have this problem as their configuration of radio set-ups are very different (one or two radios per band with a simple lockout) So my W4RM team only works CQWW SSB as a MM now and that not what I think you wanted the rule to achieve... is it? Please understand what you are asking the tester or in this case 6-8 testers to do before you make rule changes. Contact me if you would like to understand what we have done to try to operate M2 but still need to operate MM because of this one rule. Thanks for your time 73

Big effort to find every one not legal with the rules: QRP with QRO, and not assisted with cluster on; if we stopped this bad boys, will be a better contest

This survey is a great initiative and most likely will help CQ sponsored contests to remain the best contests one can enter. Way to go!

The CQ contests are the definitive amateur competition events. Thank you for your hard work.

The committee does a very good job! Please continue the good work. Congrats

If there will be changes for points like suggested for American stations or Japanese station then there should also a change for European stations: contacts with own country should worth more than 0 points - like WPX-rules.....

I want to try next CQ WW which is my favorite contest.

Would like a contest with the following

12 hours CW

12 hours SSB

12 hours RTTY

12 hours any mode your choice

Would refine the OP's skills in all mode

How about adding PSK31.

The scoring should be based on QRB (miles, km , grid square..)

It remains the best contest of the year with good reason. Thanks!

Thank you for letting us participate in this survey

My only complaint is the short time period required to submit your logs. I have been participating in the CQWW DX contests for 20-25 years and look forward to them each year.

Keep up the good work putting on the largest on air event in the world!

Thanks for the great job CQWW is the best contest!

Yes, I am sick and tired of having CQ report my call as N3TG/4. My license is issued as N3TG with a Virginia address I have held since being awarded that callsign in 1996. Get modern and use a different sort mechanism to group your competitors and report results.

Also, the type in the results column in CQ has grown so small that I have to use a magnifying glass to read it. Perhaps you should consider reducing the results reported in the magazine and put the individual standings online only and keep the type size larger.

The discussion of JA shows the problem of large HAM-countries (like W, UA, JA, DL...). No multi for many others and you lose a lot of time (and points) by callers from your own country. Better way would be a solution like 1 point for your own country, 2 points for the own continent and not your own country (like in NA and you don't need an exception for NA!) and 3 points for DX. This would be a fair and comparable solution. Or you use the same Contact Point scheme like in the WPX (also there makes the NA-exception no sense in my opinion, you only avoid the WW-competition)

In general the contest is run well from my perspective. It would be nice to have a more level scoring field with EU for world standings.

It's a great contest to participate in, i made a lot of nice QSOs and even worked some new prefix. I want to thank the CQ WW Committee for organising this contest!

Please pay any attention for stations claiming to be QRP and his signal is over S9 around the world! Some station log contacts that I can't with my 2 - 5 ele. yagi. SDR recording is wonderful!

Take care for the participation of 'little pistols', there isn't winner without the 'looser'! The races improve the race.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and keep up the GREAT work.

CQWW is my favourite contest of the year.

I held a license first in 1955 but only started operating contests a few years ago. The CQWW CW contest is my favorite. I was unable to operate it in 2012 due to a conflict. I'm looking forward to it in 2013.

Getting old, 70 or older, really puts a strain on working long hours in a contest.... how about some kind of break for us old codgers over 70. Higher points per QSO etc???

Keep it going! #1 contests.

Try to short time again between log submission dead line and results publishing.

Thanks for hosting the premier amateur radio contests.

Require stations to identify at least every third contact - repeated violations, recorded say at least 10 times should cause score reduction of 10%; 25 times - disqualification

I always enjoy participating in the CQ-WW contests and would like to pass on my thanks and appreciation for all the effort that the team put in.

Great format. Thanks to the committee for their hard work.

Keep up the good work guys - this is the top contesting series, and one I aim to work as often as I'm able.

Congratulations and mini tnx for this survey

I enjoy so much this contest, good job.

SDR check, output power control and 'un-assisted' (connected) operators are the keys where to work. Post contest logs changes i another problem, the 5 days rule are OK, 5 days is enough FOR EVERYBODY no EXCEPTIONS.

As a South American station, out of the axis NA - EU - JA, it would be vy nice a bonus to contact stations from SA. Maybe so, a few should turn the beams and pay attention to us.

Disallow CW machines where the operator is not decoding and/or encoding the CW.

You gentlemen do great job. I think it must be difficult to evaluate changes in contesting methods, catagories, etc., today, as contesting has changed so much over the years with the use of computers, to say nothing about the technology built into the rigs.... The old days of paper logs only are long gone..... Keep up the good work!

work on rule changes to make contest more attractive with fair equal chance to win Ocean coast based stations and land stations etc , qrb calculate etc

Possibly add a 24 hour short version (Only for SINGLE OPs) for those who do not want to spend the entire two days in the chair.

Wonderful contest. Keep up the good work that you do.

I am sorry to see the log error/score penalties so high. Seems like this is unnecessary and discouraging. Big guns and DXpeditions are in a whole different category from the average participant.

QSOs with the Same country should count by One point

None. Your contests are very popular not only in the Netherlands but international. I wouldn't change a winning concept too easily!

CQ WW CW is one of the best contests period! WPX is the very best with ARRL 10M being 3rd.

I strongly suggest some commentary on operating technique best practices. I continue to encounter many stations running 15-20 Q's without signing their call. It's common to hear '?' on CW and 'what's your call' on phone. This creates even more QRM.

Again, stop the nonsense about getting SO and SOA into a single group. Please.

Too many rules limiting fun in contesting.

Assisted category is one of them. Personally I do not use any spotting except setting memories in my radio or using the band map. My internet computer is off during the contest. I love to be surprise with working new country like it was years ago. But I do not have any problem that someone else is using the technology. It is like using small, medium size and big antenna.

Should that be different category? Using paper log versus computer logging. Should that be different category. Make contacts and have fun. Work new points and give the points to the others. Less restrictions would bring more participants to the contest.

It's my most favorite contest. I wish this contest will flourish any more.

Thanks for Committee. CQ WW is my favorite contest ever. I want to work without linear amplifier with not colossal antennas, GP only. My using power is 100W max. See you in next contest again!

Better check on legal power... and splatterings.

The CQ WW DX Contests are outstanding contests!

Continue doing the great work you do to catch the cheaters..... :-)

I no longer operate 48 hour long contests seriously. My personal limit is 24 hour contests for serious competition.

замечаний и предложений ----нет

Look for cheaters and be very hard with them !!!! no red nor yellow cards, disqualify the for the next contest, K5ZD you are a very respectable ham and contest operator, you always do a good job on every work you do, so...look for a more trusted contest, that is what we need. Many thanks for all cq ww's crew work

We need a new class... over 70... with medically deficient hearing and bad typing I know that my personal hearing is a problem and sometimes I do hit the wrong key... we need some penalty leeway for us old guys!! HI....

Keep up the good work!

Thanks for doing such a great job.

Personally...I think it would be nice for all stations to be recognized with a paper participation certificate.

Keep this contest as great as it was until now. Just one complaint. I am for shortening from 48h to 24h where one can operate whole 24h. We all getting older. 48h is not any good for health. If one can win in 48h, I am sure he can do it in 24h too. And if we will have less time, that would make champion even greater. Why force our bodies to stay up 48h? If this is, who is stronger and can drink more coffee makes the winner, where is than operator skill? Let's make winners in 24h!

Try and make the contest such that one location does not have a huge advantage over another in scoring. It would be nice to have a level playing field from anywhere. (I know this is a pipe dream!)

How about comments in the write ups that suggests that stations should identify themselves very frequently.

Thanks for super world-wide DX Contest!

Great contests...much better than brand xx...Keep up good work..nice to see some active changes being made....don't forget the little guy...tri-band/wires etc..

Always a joy to operate the CQ contests. Thanks!

Thanks for your investment in to ham radio, and the art of those willing I to try their luck at contesting skills.

Thanks for all you do. I really enjoy your contest.

Make penalty assessments the same as those used by the ARRL.

Consider a new category 'Indoor/Limited antennas' . Many hams now live in CC&R restricted communities and it might give them an extra incentive to operate in contests. The Tribander-Wires category still assumes more antennas than indoor ops typically have available.

Thank you for being there and doing the often thankless work. The CQWW contests clearly (among) the best there are.

The WW is the best contest. There is no GOOD reason to change it except to keep updated with technology. I've just done WWCW followed by ARRL CW from NP2N. Both were a great deal of fun, but working DX is just more exciting even if I did place in the top ten for ARRL.

I'm looking forward to the future of this RadioSport event. It is the best of the best.

Keep up the good work!

Ugly, wide signals are an increasing issue. Needs to stop. Like many in my age group we don't stay up the full 48. My limit these days is about 30 hrs a weekend. I'm just competing against my own previous scores. How about a 'Seniors Tournament', no hired guns, as in other sports, single op only.

Though it only let me choose one favorite mode for contesting, I enjoy CW & RTTY equally. There are several questions on this survey that should allow multiple answers - more than one answer applied on several questions. The other one that comes to mind is that I enjoy multi-op and single op both.

CQWW & CQ WPX are the best contests there are IMHO.

SURVEY appreciated - why doesn't ARRL do it too?

Thanks to the people that put it on.

lots of fun for my 5W and all band dipole (from my valley location with hills blocking East and West) + new band countries for awards

I'd like to thank you all for the hard work you do, and the slings and arrows you endure on our behalf. My very best regards.

Thank you for administering, scoring, and publishing the results of these popular contests. I look forward, with eager enthusiasm, to reading the published results.

Glad to see you are looking for community feedback with an eye toward making positive change(s). Keep up the good work.

Thanks for your effort and for nice contest.

Just enjoy getting on. I don't have the 4 acres and 6 towers anymore. just a g5rv in a tree but still have fun

I am quite happy with the way the contest is operated at this time. I do feel that since Canada and US are rather large that dividing them into two areas, (East/West) and having those who work East from West get more points and vice versa.

As well since Northern Canada have very few Amateurs, Maybe there should be bonus points for those working from the North (Yukon, NWT and NU) and those three territories along with Alaska maybe should be worth 4 or 5 points when worked. And consideration given to even higher points for 40/80 & 160 mtrs. This might encourage more Northern operators to get on the air.

I have worked from the Yukon for the past 4 summers (2009 - 2012) and it was very difficult to make contacts to the south from there even during this time in the cycle.

lot of station break the rules because where is 1500 watts limit all big gun have start from minimum 2000w or more and many others problems i start for results in past but now after experience i know so about 90 % station is laying for example where is QRP had 100 w where is low power had 300 w ms station few signals on one band all together i start plays tennis and soccer contest is like a big theater of layers

Don't make NA stations working NA stations MORE points.

Leave the rules as they are except to punish wide and distorted signals reported by more than one observer.

Make MORE TIME TO SUBMIT LOGS!! Some of us are NOT retired and do NOT have all the time in the world to check our logs.

Change zero point rule for own country! One point, like in CQ WPX would be good decision.

The 48h contests are too long for single operators

Please, NEVER place SO with SOA....

My most significant bitch about some contesters is their insistence upon not giving their calls with some degree of frequency, causing long waits and dupes.

Also there a few that don't give the required message in order save time.

Is it time to give consideration to shortening the duration of the contest to say 36 out of 48 hours? Doing so may give some operators more of an opportunity to find clear frequencies on 20 and 40 to do running. Some of the big stations simply sit on frequencies for long periods of time.

I really enjoy the CQ contests - SSB and RTTY - and want to take this opportunity to thank the CQ contest committee for their hard work in making the CQ contests so enjoyable. I am also impressed with your initiative in seeking feedback from contestants through these on line questionnaires. THANKS!!!!!!

Recognized participant operating in 3 to 5 years consecutively as to ensure those not winning any plaque or certificate got acknowledge for participating actively... there will be a circle of participants substantially in any particular year.

None that I can think of. Be aware, you can't please everyone, and there are too many variables to make it a truly level playing field. For me it is more about having FUN and competing against myself and providing some input for my club (PVRG). When contesting stops being fun, you won't see me for a few years, as has happened in past.

I would like to see a new category for stations that are handicapped by indoor antennas!

Regarding combining single op and assisted - I typically enter as un-assisted. Though in the later stages of a contest it is really tempting to look at a cluster for spots I haven't worked (I don't though!). It would be nice to have that option without feeling I'm breaking the rules. And, as someone trying to increase my DX country count, having an option of accessing a cluster to look for needed entities (be they new countries or band/mode new ones) is enticing.

Please don't change the rules or the scoring system. It's great as it is.

Cheaters should be handled merciless. Dirty signals should be exposed and asked to tweak.

Thanks to all involved, your work is greatly appreciated!

You have started a very good control of logs and I'm especially glad to find what errors I made. That is the only way to improve yourself. Let us have those of us have an own class/section who feel that those who have cheated on power or assisted section. This means better control but I think you are on right way! Thanks for keeping the ham spirit flag high (which means honest reporting of everything).

I am not able to get award or plaque from my station, but I like to have an award even a very low score. Please make all of us possible to print an award from my PC. I believe this cost you nothing.

Allow stations to get points for QSOs in their own country.

Thank you for your time and work! Lots of people around the world have a lot of fun because of the work you do.

Suggestion to make online real time scoring mandatory. If a station is capable of receiving spots it can send an hourly score update ... Especially for multi events , competing against other teams is fun and knowing how you are doing would add to that

Keep up the good work.

set a power limit of 100watts

Thanks, Randy, for asking. It seems good efforts from your side to make WW DX Contest more fair and popular. I always enjoyed to take part in.

If not already, please allow remote operation to allow someone in an apartment to use the better antennas somewhere else (in the same state, country, etc). I think there is a short distance limit now....

The LOG Checking report was extremely beneficial for me to REVIEW my contact 'errors!!' CQ Mag should do a 'feature' on Ham Radio LOG programs....my LogEQF is old- what else is out there for us old timers and WHAT DO YOU recommend for CQWWDX runs????? ...also- Log UPDATES is a good suggestion - if available BEFORE a contest! Also - CHECK the time 'on your computer' so your log is not several minutes OFF!! Don't forget to change the 'band' on the logging program when you change bands! (reminder). Awesome contest(s).

Thank you for asking operator opinions and allowing for our input. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in your survey as well as your contests.

Thanks for the Contest and for the Certificates

I enjoy the contests and am trying to get my CW back up to speed. With all the electronic enhancements available I wonder who can actually copy cw at some of the speeds I hear.

My work seems to get in the way during contest weekends. Wish I could operate more time.

QSOs with own country should count also one point, its always difficult to explain calling stations that they count nothing....73 ben

To run a test contest outside of the traditional rules to test its outcome. I'm pretty sure that people would get involved and you can see a real time impact of the proposed changes without affecting records.

The only comment that I have is do not change the requirement for log submission to less than 30 days following the contest.

Tough job done well

Great contest. Look forward to it every Fall. Thank you for making it happen.

In your last question Which modes did you operate the CQ WW Contest in 2012? Why don't you mention RTTY? Could it be that there was no CQWW in RTTY in 2012, although we were world winner again (CR3L). Or should it be regarded as stop gap if one has nothing else to do. Many DXpeditions might think so. No RTTY, it does not bring the rate (ZL9HR). Think about it. We all become older.

Thank you and keep up doing good work Randy. Already many good changes completed. More plaques for assisted categories or combine single op categories.

Don't lose the 'everyone works everyone' its one reason I work your tests. Great job over all, but the points from the far west to the rest of the world makes 'winning' the over all, impossible!

I appreciate all the work the Committee has done. CQ continues to lead contesting integrity world-wide. Keep it up!

I find the CQ WW DX contests to be the highlight of the year. My primary objective each year is to improve my score from the prior contests. It be nice to add awards (even if they could only be printed or downloaded from the CQ WW website) for a larger number of categories e.x. top 10 per call zone etc. These additional awards would give the casual or little pistol testers the opportunity to earn certificates even though we are unlikely to be competitive for the current categories that earn certificates.

About the Club Competition, I believe is necessary to remove the current limit and the explanation is simple. Some DX and contest Clubs like Araucaria DX Group, Potomac Valley, Southern California, Bavarian DX Club among many other have members all over the world. So I think if you want to submit your log you just choose your preferred club and send your log. In other words, is not necessary to be within the geographical limits.

About the single operators category, nowadays is very rare to find someone that cannot have access to the internet, so if you consider all competitors using the internet, this decision will be very close to the real truth. Unfortunately, some fellows don't declare themselves as using this tool and for me this is not honest and they are playing 'under the table'.

I wish the certificates would come faster. I'm missing 3 as far back as 2010

Thanks for your good work, and for your efforts to chase cheaters and to modernize CQWW.

Keep on using the latest available SDR-technology to find out the 'black sheep' and try to change their cheating behaviour. If that is not successful, ban them from participating in CQWW.

The CQWW is just pure FUN still! Please do all you can, to keep it like this !!!

I would like to see a separate category for operators using high power with a non-directional antenna, (i.e. vertical)

Highlight results by active zones. That is the only real measure for EU and NA that matters

Super FB contest. Continue like that. I appreciated the web seminar with the new rules very much! Thank you for all effort.

j Add M/S low power category! Like ARRL does in their contests.

Eliminate or modify rules on self-posting. If skimmer spots are allowed, why not let people post themselves once an hour max. That would eliminate inequity in current spotting practices. People tend to spot loud stations but what about weak ones like me who need it more?

A 12 hour category would be great. Many times I would like to spend 10 to 12 hours on a contest but don't care to or am not able to devote an entire weekend to a contest.

Thank you for all of your hard work! CQ WW is a quality contest that I look forward to operating each year.

I love this game!

When making rules, do not listen to anyone on top ten. In fact, do the complete opposite compared to what they want, and you will be serving the little pistols, who are the ones who actually make the contest happen.

Control the output power, the splatter, recordings, etc.. With more control and more transparency, many fans will surely return to contesting..

CQ WW DX CW is very nice test.

Make the new rules very fair and balanced for the little pistol

The CQWW contests are the best. Keep up the good work. Thank you!

I want to thank you for your effort making this contest the best of all.

I truly enjoy these contests and feel that for the most part you should not make many changes to a contest that goes so well. I do have a couple suggestions or thoughts. I suggest that the really slow operators should operate on the high end of the band and the really fast operators should operate on the low end of the band, I do not have the patience for either.

Consider what is the real goal for these contests. Consider what is best for the ordinary people, not just for those who will be in the winning edge regardless. And make the rule changes if any to their best.

Please continue your work I am not a big tester, but like especially CQWW contests. A lot of fun and the experience, that also low-power-stations can be heard on any band.

CQ WW DX CONTEST is excellent contest!

The CQWWDX CW Contest are the only one I do since a couple of years. I spend a lot of time and money to make it possible to do it. Some hams did not understand anything about ham-spirit. They uses amps with a couple of KW's even there is a Limit - uses frequencies out of the rules and produces signals the consumes a couple of khz. This must be sanctioned and the Technologie (SDR) makes it possible. But, nevertheless, i enjoy the 36h Operation time every year and will do it as Long as it possible for me. Thanks for the test and all of the members who support it.

My favorite contest. Don't fiddle with the rules too much. Move away from Thanksgiving weekend in US if possible - often limits my operating time with family etc. However, I know that is a lot to ask.

With the 5 days submission rule you should be able to provide final scores much faster

You guys are doing a great job. Keep it up!

Try to identify who exceed the power! Thank you for the great contest and you big work!

Always fun to be part of this contest enjoyment! Thanks for facilitating.

Give added multiplier for low power stations (<100w)

CQWW DX is far and away my all-time favorite contest. I have a small station, but I have fun competing and getting as many points as possible for my club. It's great as it is and really needs no changing. Thank you Randy and your staff for all your efforts.

Keep improving check log and disqualify the cheaters.

CQ WW DX CW is definitely a premier DX contest, but it has been frustrating for me for many years. The CW event almost always falls adjacent the Thanksgiving weekend, and it conflicts with family get togethers. Because of this, I seldom can even consider putting in a 'serious' long effort in CQ WW DX CW. It ends up being part time and sometimes just late at night, or maybe not at all.

Since this contest is sponsored by a USA organization, why did they ever schedule it to be adjacent to a USA holiday? Very poor planning. The phone version seemed to get better billing with its timing. I have similar feelings and comments regarding CQ WPX CW scheduling!!

CQ WW DX Contest is a great test. I wish you all good luck and see you.

Create a new short DX 'no skimmer' contest with a QSY rule similar to NCJ Sprint. The QSY should greatly reduce the usefulness of the skimmer network

I usually enter just the RTTY version. That's a WW contest too.

For all single op categories should be limited time of operation to a 36 hours, (like WPX) it is enough. On Monday, we have to go to work.

Again, I thought my stations score was effected by other station's mistakes as well as my own mistakes. So much so that I felt that I probably wouldn't want to participate in a CQ WW event again. To be penalized for someone else's mistakes is a little harsh. I do contesting for reasons only to me. I don't need to be told how bad of an operator or tester I am. It is so very belittling.

I WOULD SPECIAL PUNTUATION FOR QRP STATIONS IN LOW BANDS (40, 80, 160)

Follow complains related to constant cheating participation from several operators what only want to get a plaque or a paper cheating with power, using the cluster, fixing the log after the LOTW upload and the most important violating the rules from their own country or the country where they operate, making a illegal operation the ones in the past the CQ WW just keep their records on display reached making illegal operations, that can make a real change of the new CQ WW, make the full change not just make up after make up above the same errors, from my point of view if you run the most important contest you must be focused in the contest not in to leave happy your friend customers when they operate and win illegally in others countries or zones

maybe you can give us a participation download certificate like DARC all participants can download his own Score and printing his Certificate why not on CQ contests

This is the true premier contest of the year and it is appreciated. Your soliciting comments, etc. from the contesting community is certainly a difference from other contest organizers and must be applauded! I do hope that a separate SO2R category will be considered, as was done with Assisted operating.

Thanks for your job and new ideas in CQ WW rules.

Radio contesting is inherently geographically unfair. Listing a 'USA' winner is misleading at best. Winners should *only* be recognized within smaller geographic areas, e.g. zones, call areas, states. Contests are also too long. Reducing the maximum number of hours or allowing an entrant to choose the best X hours out of Y total operating time would be better. Making log check software open source would be good for transparency and would likely result in better software. Finally, contest rules must be allowed to change over time. Keeping things the same forever and ever is boring.

Thank you for your work!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Don't make changes to satisfy primarily the 'big guns' else you will lose favor with the masses.

The only thing that i would like to see would be a rule stating that 50kc's at the bottom and the top of the band to be left free for non-contest stations.

Add a category (similar to WPX-TB/WIRES) for those of us that are limited to both LOW POWER and compromise antennas. I only have a vertical and a wire doublet. With limited antennas, it is difficult to compete with the guys with an aluminum farm in the air.

SOAB excellent category. Establish a powerful barrier from penetration of infringers into this category.

Keep up the good work. Continue your practical approach to resolving issues.

China's growing number of radio amateurs, many HAM do not understand English or English is poor (my English is very poor) consequently does not participate in the CQWW contest, I hope CQWW.COM circulars and rules of the game of Chinese competition results page so that China's HAM browsing. Thank you!

中国的无线电爱好者越来越多，很多HAM因为不懂英文或是英文很差（我英文是很差的）所以不能参加CQWW竞赛活动，我希望CQWW.COM能有中文的比赛通告和规则以及比赛结果页面让中国的HAM浏览。谢谢！

I've always enjoyed every contest I've participated, congratulations for such nice work.

You are all doing a great job. You try to respond and answer our requests and questions. Thank you for being there for ALL of us.

Helping young people to grow in the world of amateur radio contest, congratulations and good luck!!

I think that clusters, spots and the like are nonsense. They must be completely forbidden: use only headphones to find stations. If not, we can use the cellular phone to make contests.

More categories instead of less would make it more fun for those trying to win a certificate. The less amount of categories there are the less the chance of someone winning a certificate because the smaller stations will have to compete on the same playing field/rules with much larger stations. I know it is impossible to have a category for every type of station but a ham with a tribander on a 50ft tower should not be in the same class as one who has five 120ft towers covered with stacked mono-banders.

BEFORE THE PRINTING OF DIPLOMAS , PLEASE CALIBRATE YOUR PRINTER !!! Printed callsign and score of the operator, are not centered and unsightly. Also, signatures of contest Director and Editor CQ, in all editions of diploma are the same. My friend (not ham), joked that the diplomas are fake ... It is not worthy for such a prestigious contest as the CQ WW and CQ WPX.

Please also, do not change time for single operator competition (like CQ WPX). Full time (48h) is OK. Stations that are less well equipped, can improve results, thanks to the strength and consistency.

With all my heart thank you for such a wonderful contest such as the CQ WW and CQ WPX.

PLEASE take measures entrants do observe BAND PLANS. As there are contests every weekend other hams are forced to move or switch off. Others call us the 59ers - they don't understand rude behaviour in the heat of the battle. Don't misunderstand me - I still like contesting and will join the next one.

Thanks to committee for all changes and fights against cheaters!

How about a 'Sprint' subcategory for those of us who can't get a full weekend away from the family, especially on Thanksgiving weekend? Rules could allow 'Sprint' contestants to work any six continuous hours within the 48 hour contest period. Sprinters would compete for awards only against other sprinters. To keep the number of subcategory awards down, perhaps have only one power category - 100 w limit, but I would like to see both all-band and single band awards.

For the single operator the 36 hours limit as a new class or new rule. I think this would keep Asia stations longer on the air and more stations in general operating to finish first by states/province and country.

First of all, thank you for making this big contest project every year. I enjoy very much. Also I thank your effort of making this survey to improve the quality of contest. Good luck and cheers mate!

I think the survey is a good idea.

The results of wwdx is becoming more and more reliable. Keep it on! There have to be split between assisted and single op categories. Contesting with no assistance is much more interesting. CU there!

Stations in Expeditions DX must repeat frequently his own call.

For me the CQWW is one of best contests and it always fun to see if you can make all zones. Keep up the contest.

Carry on with an excellent set of contests.

I would have liked to rank the operating modes: RTTY 1, CW 2, SSB 3.

Even with its flaws, CQ WW DX still is the most fun of the DX contests.

Have a rule that contestants are restricted to a portion of the band usually used for the mode in use, for example I see SSB all over the CW end in some contests, and various modes wiping out WSPR and other low signal modes in others. This would allow non contestants some space for normal communication in contest weekends.

Thank you for all your hard work in providing the world's best contests. The CQWW Contest are the highlight of my amateur radio year 73's & good DX

High power. USA + others 1.5 kw, UK high power only 400w, don't really have a chance to win high power section maybe QRP (10 & under) , Low (100 & under) Med (500 & under) High 1.5k. Whatever outcome many thanks for all the work you do, mainly WPX tester here

The committee are doing very good job, and i thank them so much for helping me first time in cq ww thank you again

I would vote for similar rest periods than in the WAEDC in CQ contests, too.

Thank you for arranging these great contests! I am also impressed with your log checking efforts. Keep up the good work.

The same rules for all stations.

CQWW should be put in combination with other important Contest (as ARRL, CQ WPX, All Asian) with necessary 'weight' in scoring to make a World Championship Classifics of stations participating. It should be necessary to take part at least to 2/3 contest to have a valid entry in such classifics. This could increase world-wide participations in this Contest and also generate much more fun!

The West Coast is at a disadvantage compared to the East Coast. An East Coast Station can easily get many European countries, those on the West Coast have many less options to Asia.

You need to find a way to may this fairer.

I just want to give you an big THANKS for all work you do in order to promote and improve this nice contest

My mas congratulation is honest for the members of the committee, graces for giving me the opportunity to be able to work the contest though it is modestly. 73c to all the members.

36 hrs of run for all SO categories

more plaque and prize

Don't combine the SO and SOA categories. Please. Really.

Disqualifications should also be made for stations operating outside the band edges.

I would very much like to see the CQWW add a TB-WIRES category as the CQ-WPX has.

Contest Time Periods are to long a change of categories; such as, 1-12 hours 13-24 hours 25-36 hours and 37 to 48 Hour categories would allow for additional opportunities to truly measure an operator's ability to manage his time, power, speed and propagation to compete within the 48 hours allotted.

Also the entry power requirements should look like this, QRP 1-5 Low power 5-100 Intermediate Power 100-500 and high power 500 and above. This would open up new areas to compete in adding to more participation.

Try to invent ways to catch cheaters. QRB-bonuses for points by QTH locator.

Low bands category & high bands cat. might be nice like ARRL once had

You are doing a good job. Tnx.

I would like to see the one-element antenna low-power category. There are plenty of OMs like me who can never have a decent antenna owing to the location/restrictions etc., and we wish to be able to compete on an equal footing with each other rather than with the fortunate ones who own a beam or a 4-square. WPX has something similar (dipole+tribander), why shouldn't CQ DX have a category like that?

Publish allowed band-segments widely and maintain separation CW-SSB parts.

I believe in ham spirit but i think the new rules of 5 days are important for who use sdr reciver for improve her score.... good choice.....

Continue the great work!

Keep the contest great

This is a good contest. Don't try to fix a perceived problem that does not exist.

Thank you for providing a great contest like CQWW. I can imagine it is lots of work for CQWWCC, especially to control the compliance with the rules. It is absolutely the right intention of the new contest director to act more strictly towards the achievement of a fair game for all contesters. The Committee expects fair action by the contesters, but the contesters also expect fair and transparent actions by the Committee.

Measurements would be much more transparent and comparable if they get specifically named in the rules (which violation leads to what action). Besides that I think the fairest "carding" system would be: For the first violation (no matter what kind) issue a yellow card, for the second violation (no matter what kind) in a certain time period issue a red card. A yellow card is a warning and gives a chance to learn a lesson.

Keep on going...

Show claimed scores on the website after submission deadline

Thank you for all the work to keep this great contest alive.

Take some action (rule change) regarding 'extreme' M/S operation involving several simultaneous separate stations on the run band. Disallow that kind of operation under this category, if demanded, create a new category M/S Unlimited

Send the Certificate in a good envelope.

I would have a look at the entries from the Netherlands. Does anyone realize that a PD (all PD are novices) licensee has a 25 watt power limit and limit band access? Yes, also the ones who always get 59+40 reports and end in the top segment of the 'low power' class. I am sorry but some of these guys even made it to the record list. That is simply impossible and they are notorious cheaters. I am sorry but that's the way it is. It is ruining the fun for contesters who do work within the legal limits of their license.

Felicitar al equipo organizador por su trabajo y entusiasmo.

In many ways, contesting sets standards for ham radio operating and aspirations generally, but the injection of vast automation into ham radio (Skimmer, SDR, etc.) contests has blunted the essence of ham radio... which is an OPERATOR (human being) OPERATING his radio, not his computer or worldwide network of remote stations via Internet. Real radio operating skills are lost and the fun of radio adventure is blunted. But, the computer cat is out of the bag, sadly.

I suggest any use of non-human functions be put in an overall category of 'data' and then have sub-categories within Data like today. Then, also, Data scores should be de-valorized and treated a lot like check logs.

About the distance in the club competitions rule. Particularly here in Argentina distances are long and there are a few clubs, so the rule is not good for us. For example, my club has members in all over the country. I think that the rule could tell: Participation is limited to club members living within the same country' Excuse my poor English.

Consider separate categories, or at minimum delineate scores with an asterisk, SO2R versus single radio.

The goal of the contest needs to be understood for these things to be looked at. A 'popular vote' concept when virtually 80% are not joining the contest to truly compete on any semblance of a competition but rather to 'have fun' should not taint the competitive class group. Take a look at the results and every year, there are maybe a couple hundred stations, honestly, out of 4000 entries, really competing. Force that group to take responsibility to protect what they love and have invested in.

The equivalent would be if MIT has on line classes and over the years a million people are auditing them vs the few thousand actually enrolled. Then by popular vote, the classes are changed because of the million on line want some changes and the actual enrolled get consumed down.

I would also like to see opinion asked of my early comment: If you routinely put in 35 hours per 48 hour contest or are actively part of serious multi-op or do single band and only sleep with the band is absolutely dead - would you rather accept the best efforts of well-motivated and committed judging but preserving current power/assisted/station set up rules? Or would you like to see that anything not felt to be truly enforced be changed to that which can? That, gentlemen is really the question here.

Keep contest fair on so power categories otherwise a so QRP fellow like me won't have a chance ever to achieve anything. Most LP guys won't either.

At some point, as we all get older, I believe you will have to think about making it a 36 hour contest for single ops as you did for WPX. First, this would lessen the torture and severe health risks of 48+ hours of sleep deprivation. More importantly, if operating the entire contest was actually achievable for more ops, then you would see a higher level of participation as more guys who were just doing 20 -30 hours would push just a bit harder to be in the running for a win.

I, for one, gave up single op competition in CQWW several years ago, and this year was my last SO in the ARRL DX.

48 hours is too much for single operations

The contest of 2012 was, as always, very excited and I hope that he will continue with ever greater number of participants than the previous year.

The competition results came in and were published much earlier than before so that is very good. Just some info for you. My mother came 2nd in CQWW in 1960 with a point score of 411334 Points in all band category, Winner in 1961 with 337176 points all band and winner in 1963 with 226227 points all band with call sign VQ2WZ. She is still around but no longer active

Thank you all for your effort giving us the contest. Please punish the wide signals.

I applaud your efforts to make the CQ WW competition more secure. Log submission deadlines have been shortened. SDR monitoring is in place to help resolve issues. This all helps to level the playing field. Thank you.

Get rid of the 'multiplier station' concept for multi-single. 'Single transmitter' should mean ONE transmitted signal at a time, at all times, not two. Require interlocks for multi-singles and some type of band change limits to discourage octopus stations from dominating the category.

Sorry about my confusing call (RA/KE5JA), but that is what the RF assigned me. Please help ensure that all my contest results are properly listed under ASIATIC RUSSIA. Thanks for organizing a great contest, definitely my favorite!

Always SOABLP LP one radio - anymore, I put my goal up on card at the start and forget about the rest-geography, local line noise, less \$ than others - sometimes it's like bringing a penknife to a Tank Fight.

A Certification of Participation that could be made available for printing from on line with verification of a certain number of contacts might encourage others to participate.

Keep up the good work. But please don't forget it is a hobby! And volunteers should not be placed on the seat of maintainers of the law.

I simply can't believe you would consider combining SO and SOA. Why don't you combine all categories into one? Make QRP compete with the Multi-Multis.

Unfortunately not one CA station in top scores in 2011 CW results. Maybe the scoring system should be changed?

Still the biggest and best with enforced integrity. I like the many awards that are possible including certificates. They keep the humble operator like me, motivated.

Thanks to all who make it possible, including when the contest is over.

A really great contest that I had NOT competed in before. I will try to do much better this year. and Put more time into the contest.

Better write-ups. One would think the US 'winner' was the best US station, but only East Coast stations can do this. The scoring (with many EU mults) heavily favors the East Coast.

Thanks for doing a great job!

THE contest. Love it and please keep it up. Thank you for sponsoring it.

Nothing I can add to what I consider to be an enjoyable contest other than the sometimes lousy band conditions, but that is part of amateur radio and I hope to keep playing for many more years.

I believe we must continue to adapt the contest with the times, thinking that we are in the XXI century.

It would be interesting to exploit new technology, were granted licenses to more operators, such as the champions of each country, each country per band, category, etc. .. these certificates being granted via email in PDF format, which does not would represent an additional cost to the organization of the competition and increase the level of competition.

This question is made by you several years ago, we wondered if we would be willing to receive certificates through email, and I wonder. Is not everything and should be sent via Internet?, You can always print the certificate in high quality and enjoy it if we have it in our shack.

Thank you for this wonderful contest. I congratulate you on your excellent work.

I think you are doing an excellent job organizing the contests. This survey shows you are trying to improve.

CONGRATULATION .ALWAYS BETTER THINGS FOR AMATEUR RADIO THANKS AND 73.

Just keep up the fantastic work that the Committee does for us all.

Any efforts you make to 'level' the playing field make sense. We have too many 'professional' testers who ought to compete with each other but not the vast majority of operators. Entirely different class of station. I realize it's damn near impossible to do. Not sure where you would even start.

Long live QRP, Low Power, and High Power classifications. 5 w to 150 w is about a 15 dB jump (?), 150 W to 1,500 W is a 10 dB jump. It seems fair to continue to group us separately. Thanks for asking via this survey.

Make allowances for hard of hearing, cramping fingers, poor eyesight and butt pain when checking logs. Hi

By far the best DX contest in the world!

Again, please leave the rules alone. I enjoy contests but when the rules keep getting changes, it makes it difficult on the log programmers which in the end causes problems with me the tester. I use a program that you do not have to ever change anything within the program. It does it all and accurately. The program I use also does the Cabrillo format and makes it very easy to submit. It is not a free program but because I don't have to change anything within the program it is easy to use. I DO NOT LIKE the so called free programs out there. They are not worth the trouble to use.

keep the ham spirit and motivate the young operators to join the contest's.

I enjoy the contest weekends. Keep up the good work.

Thanks for helping to keep our hobby one of the best!

Just congratulate the organizers for providing every year, lots of fun for all of us.

Subdivide the results in the US by States to allow part-timers and little pistols to have a higher ranking in their class. Similar to what ARRL does in it's SS and DX contests.

Keep up the great work!!

Keep it about like it is. With 100W and an end fed wire for an antenna, the present system isn't bad allowing me to have a few hours of enjoyment every Fall or two.

My call sign is very difficult for some DX stations to copy. Would appreciate more leniency.

I have been known to only make a few contacts in a contest. I hope those don't show up as a single call sign and penalize someone.

I like the contests as they are now. I participate in the SSB, CW and now RTTY tests.

Be nice to the software writers and don't change the rules very often. I have read that some of them would rather stop the contest software rather than change the programming every time a small change is made in the contest rules.

I enjoy the CQWW and will be participating in them as long as I am able to.

SO activity should be limited to 36 hours.

Consider the issuance of online certificates like CQ WPX does.

Good Contest , I hope i will get USA stations on 20 mtr SSB

The 5B - Cyprus, and TA-Turkey should be remove from ASIA and include to EUROPA. This is European countries, from European Union.

I find that the post contest reports are always informative and useful. My thanks for all your efforts!

I would like to see a 24 hour category where you can only operate one of the two days. Also I would like to see a separate category for SO2R.

My great pleasure to meet WW Test one time in every year.

I would like to see NO ASSISTED category. Let everyone S & P like I do.

I want to attend church on Sunday, so I miss a day of the contest. I wish it could also be like in the middle of the week for two days or stretched out for two Saturdays. Anyway, I really appreciate you sponsoring the contests and I do enjoy them and think that they do make for a better Ham Experience. Thanks

Test time work for the SO, only 36 hours

I have said it before. I believe for a category option to choose any two bands to use. Like 15 meters and 20 meters. Or 15 and 40 meters. I've had a band die on me and wanted to go to another band because I was still 'up' for the contest but that would place me in 'ALL BAND' status. Having fought the good fight in all band efforts and wore myself out in them I like to put my efforts in single band efforts now. I don't expect to pick up a 'new one' except on 40/80/160 meters....Not chasing new countries in contest anymore except the lower bands. But when a band dies and I know I could get another 30-50 mults on a second band it bugs me that I would then be competing with the ALL BAND EFFORT crowd. A two band effort or a main band with second multiplier band I think would add some spice to contesting...and new strategy efforts.

I appreciate your committee to send these survey to DX station. This is my first experience in my HAM life. GW and 73.

A band changing time (QSY) for single operators should be restricted, i.e. 5 minutes.

I appreciate all effort for improving the contest.

I was shocked to see that the magazine write-up of the results of the CQ WPX contest of 2012 included only the world results. It took me quite a while to figure out that the US results were buried on a very hard to find page on the CQ magazine site and NOT the WPX web site.

I hope that the CQ WW results do not follow this path. 99% of the US operators in these contests compete for awards and recognition against each other NOT against world contestants.

Please keep the US results on the magazine page, not buried on some hard to find web page.

I am participating in the CQWW contest for 35 years and enjoyed it very much.

I suggest strongly to create a new category 'high band Tribander' (10,15,20). The reason is simple. Most of the hams that live in cities WORLD WIDE are unable to erect low band antennas so they are obliged to work only single band category.

If this category will be included you will see much more activity on the bands, I am sure. Several countries adopted this category (YODX) that will create more activity in the contest.

Yes. I want to say thank you all for the nice and real job in ham community. Thank you for giving us the chance participating and receiving Awards. It is message of love and peace you are doing as a committee.

I thank the CQ WW Committee for the professionalism and the passion and commitment that makes us amateur radio, keep it up.....

Please consider about the scoring:

YB-land is not so many stations will take apart this event.

it is on equator line too much noise in low band

it is too far from NA/SA/EU/ north AF (there is many stations there)

The CQWW contest and one of the most good throughout the year participated with great pleasure

Improve the cross check of log with SDR.

Add a rule to sync clocks of PC with a unique server, to avoid 1 min difference in log that could generate issues into the 10min rules.

OR remove 10min rules for MS and add 10 band change as WPX.

Entrant with Contest Committee member operator must be scored separately not listed with the other participant, this leave more transparency to the community.

OR Entrant with Contest Committee member operator are not legitimate for Award, are listed in the score list, marked with asterisk, but to eligible for any award. Top Scores with CC Members are only listed but not claimed as winner.

Thank you for your commitment

Fair play rules: Great! I've learned from them. Question: Does "13. Post-contest correcting of call signs by using any database, recordings or confirming QSOs is not allowed (Rule XII.2 always applies)." mean that one is allowed to do all this DURING the contest?

Please, I know to be very difficult, check the force of signals, with SDR programs, of some winners, because many, many stations work with higher power than that permitted by own country.

I think all QSOs must be charged (1point for QSO with Your own country like in CQ WPX CONTESTS)

Punish stations operate outside recommended parts of the band. E.g. (not the same problem nowadays) when us stations on 40 meters SSB ask Europeans to answer in the CW portion (to go against their recommended band plan) but the us stations did not go down under 7100 to work Europeans which means it is ok to try to make other stations violate their band plans but not break your own.

I enjoy participating on CQ DX Contest because of the rules and for fun of meeting other rare stations otherwise impossible to work on normal conditions.

Many thanks for your job.

I LIKE THIS CONTEST! IT BROUGHT ME MANY NEW ONES IN THE PAST

Still not understand why a single operator WITHOUT ANY HELP, can be less than 10minutes maximal in the full contest, for eating, toilet etc... TOP SCORES had to be revised more carefully, especially if they don't do the contest at they own home.

Maybe I still missing something on my tryning.... or I am wrong....

Great Work done by the CQ WW Committee, Very nice Log check report received, Quick results.

Thank you for doing a great job!

To add tribander/wire category. To Rename High power to no limit (it means bigger antennas than tribander 10-20m or wire for 40-160m and high power). Cancel 160m band. To add 16 hours operation category for one operator.

Great contests but some poor operating these days (mainly from Europe I am sorry to say)

My dream: no DXcluster during CQWW Contests!

Thank you for the excellent contest. real treat to participate in this test

Thank you for the great Contest - it makes a lot of Fun.

Keep up the good work. Perhaps it would be worth a look at a CQWW PSK contest. I enter contests purely for fun and to work new DXCC and WPX. As a busy QRP person the only way I can work any new ones is by entering contests.

I believe that we need an ERP category. ERP is more realistic of the stations capabilities than just power

The contest feedback E-mails are good and of great value.

Remind stations to always give their call at regular intervals. Sometimes you can wait 10 minutes to get a call. The people calling have obviously got it from a skimmer or the cluster.

European scoring system should change a bit in favor of east European stations because all the main DX activity is North America (back in the past there was noticeable number of JA station which is now gone) and therefore west European stations have big advantage.

Participating stations should transmit their proper call sign at least in every third QSO

Too many rules. The more rules, the more people cheat on them. Human nature.

Try to think about solving of 'for assisted only' stations problem (1 own call sign per long minutes of 40 WPM or more). No chance to know who is CQ for long time (the reason to thinking about breaking rules of non additional DX cluster / skimmer help...)

For multi-multi stations there should be a limit of around 50 km distance for the stations taking part en one effort. With today's rules you have to build a big expensive station at one single location to have fun and together in a club take part in a multi-multi effort. I cannot understand why you force participants to spend lots of money to have a fun time together.

Great contest. Mni tnx !!

LIKE THIS SURVEY, IT IS VERY GOOD.

Keep up the good work, and give penalty for those how spot them self during contest, record the cluster as well, I saw several on the cluster during CQWW 2012 SSB contest.

I think the committee does a fair job of trying to achieve a level playing field, which is imperative, or as it states, I won't play.

It would be nice to see the results and revised records out sooner, though I understand how the results adjudication is a mammoth task. You have my thanks for your tireless work over the years.

Too many of the Blg Guns in Europe using output power much above 1.5 KW..... I would like to see more checks on that issue.

More transparency / publicity of its work. Perhaps the Committee has not wanted publicity in fear of cheaters discovering the log checking algorithms. CQ WW Contest Committee should have a 'spokesman' who would periodically appear in public.

The write-up of the CQ WW Results should be a little bit more 'journalistic'. Avoid comments like 'XX9XX walked away with the trophy, with YY6YY as a runner up, and MM0MM is ther third place'. This is exactly what we already see in the Box scores, no need to just repeat it in the text.

Unfortunately think that there is a lot of cheating that makes the competition unfair. Stations entering in LP with KW, stations entering HP with 8 KW. SO entering non-assisted and clearly being assisted in many ways (not just the use of cluster), but using 2 stations, more than one operator (when one is tired the other takes the operation to run 48 hrs), etc.

One way to reduce cheating would be to put all SO in one category and with 24Hs maximum of operation. In that case most of the cheating would be reduced to transmission power.

Thanks for your efforts. They enable us to enjoy a great contest.

I appreciate the effort put forth by the members of the CQ WW Committee.

Please change the rules for Inside-QSOs like 1 Point for QSO with the same Country.

QSO Asia-Japan = 3 Points. It's good.

i can't get cq amateur magazine from zino.com directly. make it more convenient for Chinese readers. Thank you.

It would be great if you could do something to penalize stations that deliberately crowd out a running station for the purposes of stealing a frequency that is in use.

I would like to see the high power class power limit reduced to 500 watts. 1.5 KW is overkill and produces unneeded QRM between contest stations and also interferes with non-contest stations.

More granularity in the awards! HP/LP/QRP by zone!!! Everyone deserves recognition, especially when comparing apples to apples. I'll never make the top 10 LP in the USA, but can almost always be in the top 5 in Zone 4. That is a worthy accomplishment that goes unrecognized. There will be some zones with so little participation that this may not be practical, but a good start would be to list the zone with the scores. Perhaps scores should be reported on a spread sheet so that scores can be sorted by numerous means, such as zone, antenna types, etc.

Thanks for all your hard work and concern for the future of contesting.

For all contests, favor rules that are enforceable over those that are unenforceable. For example, there is a rule that self-spotting is not allowed. CW Skimmer now spots everyone. Maybe self-spotting should be allowed for SSB & RTTY.

Consider ways to encourage more real-time score reporting. At all levels, it increases the competitiveness. A good place to start would be in multi-single/2/Multi.

Would love to see a 24 hour category. I missed 2012 for family reasons but usually work Single Band to minimize the operating time.

Rules leading to violations should clearly mention boundary, and the tolerance.

In case of very tight tolerance, specify to the user to have their clocks sync, at least 1min difference should be allowed

An alternate scoring system based on distance (still with same multipliers), in the form of QSO Points = $1+(D/K)$ where D=distance between zone centers and K=appropriate constant. I.e., 1 point for same zone QSOs (still zero for same country), 3 or more to the antipodes, and non-integer values in between.

For now, keep awards and primary reporting based on traditional scoring. New awards should this prove popular.

I think you guys do a super job. I would like to see more information put out about the DX code of honor and how to do operate in a contest for beginners to maybe stop some of the interference caused by folks that call stations, give a signal report exchange and then ask for a call sign, working a station direct when he say up and so forth. I think some penalties for the big offenders causing interference is needed.

Please pursue swapping the cw and fone weekends every other year. Thanksgiving (in the US) is a huge issue for folks with families and who only operate cw (and rtty). What would it hurt?

I wish good luck to Randy and WW Committee. Try to support HAM SPIRIT in the best contest.

Gosh, 48 hours is a long time to work a contest, and I am not as young as I used to be. I wish the contest was several hours shorter in length.

I really enjoy contesting but time is taking a toll, I can for see that my level of activity will be falling off. Plus the storms two years ago pretty well destroyed my big setup, now only back with a tribander and wires. I do miss my 10 mtr stack!!!

If CQWW CC is going to change scoring system than make it right this time for whole world. Make scoring system based on distance between zones which will favor real DX QSOs. For example, now I get the same points working TA2 and JA while I should get, let's say, 2 points for neighboring zone 20 but, let's say, 7 points for zone 25 which is 6 zones away. Former ANARTS RTTY Contest had similar scoring system which can be adapted for CQWW.

Keep up the excellent work. WW and WPX are my favourite contests.

What?!?!? You asked about operating CW or SSB but not RTTY?!?!?! There is a CQWW RTTY contest!!!!

I think that the CQWW committee must be more strict about the too much output power that using some stations especially during the contests. I suggest also a medium power category for all contests that not exceed the 500w and also the single tribander and wires category to become separately.

Don't envy you the criticism and grouching that I hear on e-mail. The CQ contests are great fun.

CQ WW DX are premiere events in my ham radio year. The team's efforts to put on these events go a long way toward improving worldwide station and operator capabilities.

I don't operate all the time and every year due to work, but I always enjoy the CQ WW contest and have a lot of fun setting self goals. Keeping the 'single unassisted and single assisted' gives me hope that one day I might get into the top ten in my call area and it will be 'unassisted'!

I started contesting just after completing 50 years of ham license, no contests before. I highly appreciate this new hobby in the hobby for me and thank you guys for all your efforts!!

New class for restricted antennas (like wire)

Limit the amount of time a station can CQ on a single frequency, many large stations don't listen enough and just cause QRM. Also remember the old 5-6 contacts per country on a band rule (1960's), made the contest more of a challenge.

- 1) Members of the CQWW contest committee must be out of the game or at least ineligible for any certificates or WRTC credits.
- 2) A red card must be send only after a yellow card. This means that you will not receive a red card at your first entry in the CQWW.
- 3) UBN, penalties, violations and all the recordings and data used to prove these violations must be public on CQWW web site.

I think that you can keep the essential rules like today... Thanks, we love CQWW contest

Ich bedanke mich bei Euch für die von Euch geleistete Arbeit. Es macht immer wieder Spaß am Cotest teilnehmen zu dürfen. Bis bald mal wieder auf einen der QRG's.

The CW WW Contests are the best and it seems to bring out a lot of worldwide ops and stations. So, you are doing a lot correct. I think a majority of regular and casual testers are happy with the contest.

I've heard about cheating by folks using skimmers, and the clusters during the contests and then claiming SO non-assisted. You could ignore the cheating and just ask people to be honest; if you find them to be cheating, then ban them for 3 years. Alternately, you could ask either the clusters and skimmers to shut down for the CQ WW, or you could ask for all the call signs of people who accessed the websites during the contest. All of those would be considered as 'Assisted'.

Tough deal but you're not going to make everyone happy.

Now I can see more seriousness in the committee, effort and adaptation to the new tools that give us new technologies like SDR and others to control the testers follow the rules...I think that is the way to do better prestige in CQWW.

Thanks for your job..!!!

Let destroy cheating. Or cheating will destroy contesting, earlier or later.

Although not a serious contender, I enjoy the CQ contests and appreciate the effort you guys put into them.

You have done well with the contest and it seems to me that there is no changes to make.

Very good competition in which I enjoy to participate when I do not work, thank you for your devotion.

No any award or certificate should be given if QSOs are logged by band, not in frequency.

Tnx for your action in developing CQ contest

It's good the way it is! Leave it alone.

All of the Caribbean should be zone 9.

Thanks for your work and time in providing an excellent contest.

Try and get a many sub categories for the little guy to at least be able to work for something.

The test a very long time 48 h. Many hams are old man. May be doing 36 h and 12 h for rest!?

I've been a serious tester for over 30 years, but I rarely put many hours into CQWW anymore. Why: I'm a W7... just another Zone 3 stateside station that nobody really needs to work. Propagation always favors the East Coast. The only legitimate goals I can really set are maybe trying to outscore one of my local friends who enter the same category.... or try to improve over my previous personal best score. I prefer the ARRL DX contest because in that situation I'm a relatively rare western state mult, and can easily generate good European runs and pileups, which I simply cannot do in CQWW.

Please ensure that Connected stations are classified separately from those who are Unconnected. Please also consider introducing Unconnected categories for MO.

I would really appreciate a 36h category.

For years I seriously participate to the WPX CW and CQ160, never except 2013 the CQWW. The reason: I know that I will never be able to work enough hours and I loss all the pleasure of contesting when I have to fight too deeply against sleeping.

Just keep the contest alive and strong until I can start doing them again seriously..

Contest period 24 hours instead of 48 hours would make it better to my mind.

Thanks for all your hard work. Relax a bit though, this is a hobby and is supposed to be fun.

I would ask that they continue doing the sterling job, as before...

Great event great organization the Nr1 Contest thanks for all the work behind the scene!!!!!!

Just to do something about the excess of zero point Q's for those looking for zones. In the US they take up lots of time with no gain.

Make any QSO between different zones at least 2 points, more as set by other rules.

I think for Single operator an 36 hours of operating limit is good as in WPX contest with 30 hours in RTTY.
Other idea, why not to add a new category with a limited operating time for single operators.

Ideally I would like to:

1. Consensus in understanding the contesting and fair scoring both in America and in Europe and Asia.
2. Transparent and fair judging, to avoid cases of missing LOGs.
3. Great desire of all the radio amateurs work in this contest.
4. Increase penalties for violations of the excess power.

Keep up the good work... I enjoy all the CQ WW contests, and am an online subscriber to CQ magazine.

Thanks for organizing this contest. The CQWW contest is one of my favorite ones.

Take the necessary care in managing penalties. As in laws, rules that can result in penalties, must be absolutely detailed, clear and unique. Too much 'power' to individual human opinions, having so big strength to radically modify the future of a contest, can drive the contest to be considered as managed by a sort of 'family'. I hope it will never happen for CQ's contests!

I am a little pistol getting old. I take pleasure in giving out my call to other seriously competing stations and, if this is the case, work a new country, which is quite feasible as I am at 175 countries.

Nice contest, and I enjoy to make some contacts with my friends

Make the exchange much, much harder so it can't be guessed. I had several instances where by the time I had finished sending my report, the station I was 'working' was already working someone else. I still got logged so they must have just filled in 59-14 without waiting for me to send it.

I'm qrv since 1966 when I was 14 years old. From this time I took part on several contests. Of all contests the WWDX is my favorite over the whole time. I like the feeling on band when hams from all over the world works friendly around. That's HAM RADIO live. Thank you for the organisation.

My suggestion is to use a softer approach to the introduced changes (which are mainly positive changes).

Moreover, the committee members should not be allowed to participate to the contest: they should choose to be testers or committee members before the contest starts. This would guarantee all the participants that the judges are absolutely fair, unbiased and impartial.

Keep up the good work, in particularly on fighting cheating.

Please address contest free segments in the rules!!!!

For 'little guns' like me, it would be an improvement to be able to work West Coast (different zone) in the US and have it count. Currently I opt to join a Multi-Op team since I like to win, and have no chance to be competitive from a small station in CQWW.

Find a way to disqualify those whom are running well beyond the licensed power limit.

CQWW has always been my favorite contest. It is the largest most popular contest on the planet! I especially like the DXpedition aspect having been on both sides of it now.

Fun contest. I don't think I would change much, however, serious testers might have a different opinion.

I really like your fine contest! I have operated from both coasts, EU, etc. and only offer the following suggestions: (1) Is there a way to even up the various zones. I suggest that QSOs between zones should be given some credit (1 point/QSO).

I like CQ WW SSB contest. Whenever I can, I participate in the contest and I have fun despite my modest station of radio amateur. I like to do QSO with other countries and give points. See you in the next contest.

Thanks for a really good annual contest. I've been entering semi-seriously for many years and only wish the scores I get could be matched by the sunspot numbers!

CQ WW is the best contest of all. None are perfect. No attempt to make it perfect or fair will be successful. Changes in scoring are likely to bring attention to many perceived unfair aspects. Probably best to leave scoring as it is.

Please never allow contacts with same country except for multiplier credit.

Please preserve the ability for ones to compete with each other without necessity of having assistance from worldwide skimmer and packet networks as long as there are hundreds of entrants who choose to not use those 'clusters'

I'm Contesting from 1964, really appreciate the work of the Committee

Keep it up. I have been unable to convince ARRL to join you in the 'Single Op - Assisted' category but you have it exactly correct. Thanks and 73.

Please retain the distinction between Single Operator and Single Operator Assisted. The fact that you cannot detect ALL of the cheaters does NOT justify forcing any Single Operator who wants to be competitive to use assistance. The RBN is a DEFINITE game changer in CW and we need a category for those who, like myself, enjoy spinning the VFO knob and finding stations to work.

Thanks for your tremendous work!

Exact rules for club competition.

I find them very valuable these surveys. Thank you.

As I commented b4, i would penalize also running stations that do not give their call signs.

Is a frustration being in a contest and not using 'spotting/cluster' and needing to wait sometime 5min for instance, to find out the call of a station! Something should be done to force people to avoid this practice!

24-hour subcontests starting at (a) 0000Z on Day 1 and (b) 0000Z on Day 2 (not _any_ 24-consecutive-hour periods). Competitor could optionally operate up to full 48-hours, but submit log for either subcontest a or b.

2 transceiver should be a separate category.

I would like to see a rule change. Now the winners of this contest are predominantly east coast operators. I'm a Midwest op and can't compete with the east coast condx to EU. Maybe the rules could be changed to give all ops a chance to win. Like higher point value for QSOs that are farther away. I understand that we all can't have the same propagation but something needs to be changed.

If you change the points it will be more fun to operate in the WW contest, and not all have to fly to ea8, ct3, p4, pj, fj zf, etc etc to get super points and always win.

Please keep together and thanks for stay there in CQWW Committee, congratulations and thanks for the contest. For me is 20 years participating over there, from 1993!!!! 18 years old

How 'bout encouraging more club competition?

Keep up the good work. The committee is doing a great job. I appreciate the outreach.

I appreciate your effort to think about changes in the rules. It is not an easy job and there will always people who do not like the changes. Good luck!

Living just one mile south of W3LPL makes contesting Hard! I favor CW as the crud from his station is easier to manage on that mode. No hard feelings with Frank as I helped Build his station. And Still help out when asked.

Great job guys! One thing I'd love to see is more emphasis on operator stats, particularly those that help drive skill improvement.

I love the thing that the guy who wrote pileup.ru created to highlight 'best hour' stats in WPX. It would be great to make that sort of thing a bigger part of the official results. It would be nice to see things like 'best hour', 'best 5 hours', and also some more variations on golden logs... not just 100% golden but stats to give recognition to the ops who turn in big scores and also have above average accuracy.

I think with more micro level stats like the ones I'm describing, we'd see bigger efforts from ops who might not have the full bore effort in them but do have a few hours to try to make the top ten in one of the other stats. I would also like to read about what various ops are doing to improve after getting the log check results from last year (personally I did analysis on calls I busted and found that I mostly busted 2x1s b/c of the high probability of an SCP match).

Also, it would be great to promote multi single efforts and award recognition to stations that invite new contesters to participate in a multi effort and put them in the chair.

Enforcement of power limits and keeping stations from causing 30 kHz or more of unusable spectrum would be very nice. The call sign databases should not be allowed unless their own from previous contest or they have to be made available to everyone for log checking. This makes a big difference in the error rate. I turn my log in as copied and it represents my accuracy and I often get a few penalties in contrast to one station who I have recorded that gave me two different call signs and I wonder how many of us got penalized for that.

Good job at this moment, we should use new technology.

My worries are abt age of contesters - what is the way, what are the methods to interest young people to contesting and DX-ing when youngsters looking all their free time into computer, TV or cellphone ipods and tablets with small value of content.

Even though my scores don't reflect it, I'm an avid unassisted low-power contester. The two things that bother me most and drove me to discontinue my participation in contests that I enjoyed are, first having to compete with assisted ops (i.e. no more WAE contests for me), second having to compete with high-power ops (i.e. no more BARTG contests for me). I just hope the CQ WW ones don't follow the same trend.

First of all THANKS to all of the guys behind the scenes that make this the biggest on the air event every year. THANKS to Randy for publicly reminding us all that this is about having fun (as did K1AR, for many years). Many of us take this too seriously.

Even though it's fun, it IS important that the CC is seen to take measures against cheaters and I think a lot has been done in the last 2 or 3 years in that respect. It will be great once someone figures out how to crack down on excessive power, there is a worrying tendency towards using more and more power in an effort to 'keep up with the Joneses'.

To me, CQWW has all the right ingredients to make it a great contest, but I applaud efforts made to try to make it even better for everyone, by making it more fun, and by providing more stimulation for more people all over the globe to try to win a meaningful prize.

Think very carefully before changing any of the rules. Consider inputs from serious contesters from lots of areas around the world. Give more weight to inputs from the serious operators than from casual operators.

No matter what you do or adjust, you can't level the playing field. There are very few stations that can compete on a global or even regional level. Most of us don't have the luxury of locating our stations in geographically advantageous locations. Probably 95% of 'competition' is totally local although maybe not all of those competitors truly realize that. This leads to frustration on the part of those who have become good enough to actually compete on a national or global level, but are limited by QTH or financial resources. Too bad. That's the reality of life. There are enough entry classes and categories available so that almost anyone can select one that allows them to be 'competitive'. Again, it's all local.

Keep up the good work and don't let a vocal minority stampede you into combining SO and SOA. A lot of us still do not have or want Internet in our shacks and believe that mouse clicking is not radio operating.

no tengo experiencia en este concurso,por lo cual no puedo hacer ninguna sugerencia . Cuando sea mas experto ,hare sugerencias . saludos

I very much enjoy participating in your contests. Thank you for a great job putting them together.

Still the best contest...

maybe it would be time to modernize the diploma, or update existing one

1. It is necessary to increase cost QSO on low ranges, especially on 160m.
2. The quantity of nominations, encouragements very small, is not present chances for encouragement of several operators in one nomination. The quantity of prizes will increase interest of participants.
3. Many stations work as DXpedition, when not a house stationary place, and the visitor or in Area. It is necessary to make a separate category for DXpeditions then chances more competition or an incentive Plaque will win against usual stations in NA and EU.
4. Much my friends do not understand, why the European country Cyprus concerns in DXCC Asia? It is the high-grade European country!

Thank you for all the hard work. I hope to do more contesting now that I've finally reached Honor Roll and lack only about 13 zones for 5BWAZ...plus I recently retired! And for the record: I just barely turned 65 (grin).

Thanks for the survey and keep up the good work.

Randy, thank you for heavy and hard job. First was marked after your taking the contest was real whole checking the logs. Numbers was checked first time at history. Isn't it?

Do more for the LP and QRP operators; they are the bread and butter of the contests. I realize the big guns put a ton of money into their efforts, but I'm more interested in how someone with a station like mine, or less advantaged makes it happen.

Great idea about changing to one single op category....all for it.

Also like 3 points for Caribbean.

All though Europe is going to want to increase to points except in their own zone one point.

I like things the way they are. However as I mainly use 100 watts or less and compromised antennas, wires, short verticals and such. From antenna restricted locations. It would be nice to compete against others with similar setups. Not against beams and towers.

So how about a low power, wires and verticals, no towers or beams category.

The rules are much too involved, and obviously written by a group of attorneys. (I am in the legal business and I find it comically annoying that going through the rules is like being at work. This is a hobby, simplify the whole thing. thanks! and of course, 73!!

I enjoy the fun of operating with so much activity, though I have only attempted to submit a log. It's a great contest with lots of great activity.

Great contest. Am glad to see the survey. Am glad to see the new hope and attitude. Hope the Committee will take steps on the rules to ding those who pushed the envelope too far. Wish I knew how you could handle the power issues - one almost has to drop in for a visit during the contest - which I think is proper. There are conditions that will play into signal strength but let's call a spade a spade, if one is burning a 2x8877 amp and think the rest of the world doesn't know, one would be mistaken.....

Only some words about blog on CQWW.com, that called as 'The Special Case of UA', 2/03/13..

I think, You should Know...

You have to remember, - all begins in sept.2011 from the big lie of Roman Tomas R5AA (ex RZ3AA), - He say (see <http://www.arrl.org/news/new-russian-prefix-system-in-use>), that moving of UA9F & e.s. from Asia to Europe - is the idea of 'Russian telecommunication authorities'...

But this is the LIE... 'Russian telecommunication authorities' are not interesting about amateur EU/AS-dividing at all... It is only The Tomas' personal revenge... Tomas wants to punish Perm amateurs for their disagreement with some points of the internal policy of SRR-guide in Moscow...

It is no any changes In the call-system of Russia, except adding of some prefixes... (like number '8' - 'UA8' is the same with 'ua9' now)

The CQWW contests are an institution that should be preserved and promoted. Please do not do too much tinkering.

I offer:

1. To allocate in a separate category of station - Expeditions.
2. To allocate in a separate category of station SO2R or to limit quantity of transitions from a band on a band.

Load in the site all previous contest results.

Keep up the good work. This survey shows your dedication in preserving and improving the WW contests.

Get rid of the Single Operator assisted vs non-assisted category.

Thank you for this great events each year. Thank you for your work

Allowance of cluster use for SO is a good one. I normally operate low power, and with RBN it is easier to get attention. But all stations should be allowed to use RBN to find the weak stations. This brings more action and spreads out the traffic.

QSOs between EU stations can worth 2 points and Q's between same country 1 point- with exceptions for NA, Caribbean-NA and Asia-Japan (2 and 3 points).

Keep doing what you are doing guys. Great steps forward were made since change of the contest director.

I prefer the CQ WW contests over other major contest sponsors, mainly because I can work North American stations. As a small station operator, working DX is a challenge at the best of times. I particularly enjoy the WPX contests due to virtually unlimited number of multi's.

This is selfish I know, but .. SO2R .. should be separate category, or be classed as Multi-Op somehow. Contesting from a non-ideal QTH's is tough enough, our windows are short to the east (where most of the volume originates). Trying to compete with an East Coast SO station (assisted or otherwise) that can work the EU on 2 and sometimes 3 bands at a time makes it nearly impossible to overcome from a west central / western state QTH.

Suggestion: The Stew Perry contest is, in my opinion, the most fare contest we have, with respect to scoring. It's based on pure distance, grid to grid. Judging from the participation and comments I've seen in past years, I think a CQ contest based on distance would be well received by the contesting community.

Thanks for all the great contests, look for to running more this fall.

Get OUT QRP category from the contest!

I think in Europe there are too many stations who lie about the real power. It started long time ago with soviet stations who had easy access to QRO tubes and spread out across the continent.

Some time ago I was looking for information on Internet and followed a link on Italian ARI web site. Found an article about how involving in amateur radio. It was written that a QRO of 1kw is mandatory for a beginner!!! Of course there are too much amateurs who could not afford a QRO (like myself) but it's an attitude you can consider.

At least you should conduct an experiment with some trusted hams on every continent during your contests and find how many contacts they can get with real QRP power on very good antennas on full time operating and then compare with declared QRP results from others. Then you may reconsider QRP cat.

I enjoy participating in CW and RTTY contests even though I stand little chance of an outright win from the southern tip of Africa :-)

Think about HF (10,15,20) and LF (40,80,160) category. Short say 2x 12 hours category maybe nice in SOSB classes

Increase presence or focus more towards Asia. There is an increasing presence of new licensees with age on their side but are getting lured by EmComm and VHF mobile. Don't have all the answers right now but will get back with ideas.

Thanks for this nice contest, the final results take a long time, it's possible we have the results earlier?

The new faster results service is great!

Hi! First of all thanks for the survey! My comments –

1 - separate SO categories to SO1R (without cluster) and SO2R (with cluster)

2 - set operating time for SO 44-45 hours - take care of the testers health !

Members of the CQWW contest committee are not eligible as entrant or operator in any contest organized by CQ

In the 20m low-power section, one JA station got an extraordinary high score. Recently, this station has set new records one after another in many major DX contests although the propagation conditions were poor. There is a bad rumor going around about this station for several years. (Although this station has an upper class license allowed high-power output, the operator participates in a low power section. It is like that an adult is playing baseball among boys in the little league tournament.) You should announce all participants an update on restriction of power that the upper limit for the low-power section is '100 watts', and ask them to submit a 'declaration' about their equipment used in the contest. All the participants should clarify their rig (out-put power) and antenna which they used.

Maybe for station in us/ve use as in stew perry something like multiplier in final score . I think station in w6/7,ve5,6,7,kl7 will appreciate that because they are so far to Europe , middle east! It would may competition better for thes, as the ones who ever won in East Coast in VY2,W1,2,3,4

The best contest ever --- please keep it that way...

If is possible make UBN files also public, like LOGs. May be after some years-3 or 5.

Nice contest to have lots of cw fun in!!

Always a pleasure to boil in that soup!

I think y'all have a good thing going. It's the King Contest and continues to demonstrate that year after year. My only complaint may be the excessive proliferation of categories - although I'm opposed to the merging of assisted and non-assisted. Perhaps for single band? SOAB should remain a 'pure' category.

I feel that the 5 day log submission time is too short. I always have to go straight to work after a contest and I need at least one weekend to be happy with the log before submission.

The CQ WW contests (SSB & CW) are the premier contests for us for working rare DX. We find them very enjoyable. We like very much that they are 48 hours long. We hope that you will not change that.

I don't have the answer but something needs to be incorporated that encourages participants to submit logs. I have a number of friends who participate but don't submit logs because of the 'what's the point' attitude with all the big guns taking all the top spots.

Maybe there would be some way to have an Open Unlimited category for multiple tower entries vs single (or NO) tower entries.

Thanks for sponsoring a very good contest. I do appreciate all of your work.

Only operate Search and Pounce in contests. Hence contest entries are infrequent. But enjoy the thrill of seeing my score rise and working new ones etc. Very much appreciate all work done by those involved in organisation/scoring etc. Thanks

No comment, only THANK YOU

I suggest to create a rule which obligate all stations to show your online score via cqcontest.ru or other sites. This is real competition! And the end of online score must be the same as published by the station. Maybe you can create another category like assisted but named: published real time score or something. In the future, I hope all operators put their real time scores online.

Thanks for keeping a good job in the contest, and surveys.

Keep on the good work and congrats for the vy fb contest.

CQWW is by far the most popular contest in the world as it is now. Therefore any changes should be taken carefully

It is a great job that the committee is going...I like most of the new rules..73 Mike

It will be good that is not allowed to use the remote control from another dx zone. For example: Work in Finland use the antennas situated in São Miguel Island Azores. for example ... Arcala OH2BH and Radio Company...

Thank you.

Get the CW contest off of the Thanksgiving weekend.

Maybe a category for us old bastards who can't see, pee or hear well anymore!

I like the 5 day rule for submissions of logs. Since I operate SOLP non assisted, it would be nice if stations would ID more. I don't know who is on frequency when I come across a pile up. I know it's for pileup control but I understand. I DO understand not identifying as much in the last hour. Still at least every 2 minutes would not waste too much of my time.

I do like the implications of a rule on splatter. There is no reason I should hear a station splatter on voice or CW on my FT450D for over 50kHz either way. It's hard enough for me to copy CW without additional clicks in there.

Please consider the question of the division of categories 'no assistance' (the use of the Internet for the DX cluster, etc.) And the categories 'assistance' (using skimmer, etc.)

I think the penalties are too high. We all make mistakes...and as long as the error rates are below 3%...eliminating the QSO seems penalty enough. I constantly have problems with my callsign...and although I correct stations...most QSOs are so quick...you are never sure the station corrected, my call.

Love the contest, 99% of the contestants are pleasant to work, thank you for having the contest.

Thanks for the great contest and the effort shown by the cq ww committee and team. god bless you all and keep it up.

I entered my first CQWW CW contest in 1958 and as a novice in the game I came second G to the well-known and experienced G2DC. I have missed some of the contests over the years although even then put in small appearances. So you see I hold my own personal competitions against other UK stations, only having modest facilities myself, and derive great pleasure from the CQWW. Thus the only suggestion I make is to keep up the good work and don't make it any harder for me - think about those with no chance of winning but continue to enter.

I think the committee over all does a pretty decent job. The only comment I have is with the scoring and penalties for wrong calls, I feel is pretty steep. However, if everyone is treated equally by it all, then why make changes.

In my opinion i make the contest for my personal score and after that also for the overall score.

The committee should be more attentive to the power of the stations but I know that it is very difficult to see it. In general is all ok.

Well i have one suggestion. Why don't create award for Overlay-Category as WPX done. Also create table records for Overlay-Category. These is my only suggestion.

Import CQ contest results into the CQ award databases, much like RSGBIOTA does.

Please have the 2 and 4 to NA change tp 3 and 6 we like to have same opportunity that zone 9

Thanks for doing an outstanding job!

Like to see QRP assisted all band and single band :)

Do not disqualify any one, as most stations have been awake a long time, and tape or video only shows up for a small time. maybe heavy penalize them,

It remains the highlight in the contest season for me - - - hate to miss it

Thank you for organizing these great contests. They improve my equipment, antennas and operating practice. And supply a great deal of joy, both SO and with friends in MS class.

The goal from CQ should be to encourage as many people as possible to get on, operate a little, and submit logs. The answer to each and every question should be, 'Does this encourage or discourage more operating?'

Since, let's be honest, most hams have a modest 100 watt station, often using wire antennas, the contest should be such that these people are encouraged to operate and submit logs. Frankly, most operators realize they are not going to 'win' the contest, yet these operators still participate. It should be discovered why, and encourage more of these 100 watt wire antenna guys to operate. As you know, the contest is nothing without these small stations participating. Well, and, of course, enough DX to work, which makes it exciting for the small station operator.

Ban the cluster and skimmers! Go back to proper operating! Keep the good work!

I love this contest. Due to family reasons I had no chance to be in it for full this time. Will be back for more fun later.

Thank you for your efforts and work to provide the best ham radio contest in the world. I have enjoyed the contest several years and so will do in the future, I hope...

Extend Log submission time to 8-days.

Love the CQWW DX Contests. Hats off to the volunteers who have the hard task of checking the logs and determining who the winners are.

Seems to me that publishing results quickly and online scores while the contest is going on make it much more fun and appealing to the new generations.

Many overpowered stations don't let place to listen the other week or far stations. If you admit 3 class of power output, It should better almost to reserve in each band a portion of frequency for the QRP station.

Send via eMail in PDF to all participants the article published in CQ magazine with the results in the same month that is published. The email of participants is included in the Cabrillo file.

Keep up the good work. Your contest is great.

Thanks for your hard work. No one will ever be happy regardless of what rules are changed. Just be pragmatic and progressive as you go forward. The world would probably not come to an end with 1 single op category, and it will happen eventually. Ultimately, one wants to see the best operators win, not just the best 'machines' win.

To declare the yellow/red card disqualification rules or parameter applied.

I would like to hear fellows give their calls more often.

This survey is great tool and congratulate you for an excellent way to gather feedback!

Keep up the good work in supporting amateur radio by sponsoring contests.

I love contesting but it is pretty much an old-man leisure class sport. Who has time to commit 48 hours to any of this, especially at the height of one's career? Does this system really select people who are likely to be the best operators, or is it something that you can just dominate if you have money to put into a station and 48 hours to spend in a chair (plus a large fraction of a work week to recover)?

Of course, all sports require a real time commitment from their top performers, but I'm not convinced that the contest community as a whole is finding ways to detect and develop talent, especially among younger operators. The Eastern and Central Europeans seem to be doing a great job of this, while everyone else seems oblivious to the demographic crisis.

If NA have 2 points with NA contacts, the other big continents AS, SA, AF and EU need the same with contacts in his continent, or eliminate 2 pints in NA and all same continents give only 1 points.

Muchas gracias por darnos a todos los radioaficionados la posibilidad de divertirnos en nuestro hobby y la ayuda prestada por todo el comite del cq ww dx a los que no sabemos aveces como realizar los log's. Lo mejor de lo mejor para toda la gran familia del cq ww y espero poder seguir participando en este gran concurso, aunque la finalidad es ganar lo importante es participar y disfrutar de este hermoso hobby 73'S

I am strongly in favour of random sampling from SDRs. All of the work you're doing to drive down cheating is hugely appreciated. The contest is only fun if it's fair.

Please carry on with your good work! You appear to lead the rest of the world with your software to check and adjudicate the entries.

Increase the number of DQ! and red card is for all people for at least 5 years! If no one observes the rules, then it will be chaos.

Think about SOAB divided in SO1R and SO2R. That would make contesting more fair for those with only 1 radio. I think it will be the best category (with like 10 minute rule to change bands)

Just want again tell you about fair scoring method for all continents. Any QSO scoring methods according continental borders will be not fair. Even within Europe we have big difference in results only because some west EU stations much closer to NA and get a SAME points for contact that much harder to make from East EU. The main strategy is to be closer to NA and EU!!! That's why so poor activity from far east, japan, Oceania.

I think good scoring method for QSOs is created by N0HR http://www.n0hr.com/n0hr_dxtest_scoring.xls

I think we can try an alternative scoring only for web-results for the first time. It will be not to hard to add some other scoring methods to the judging program.

Keep up the good work

If you can make another class for stations that don't have only say 1 or 2 towers?? There is no way my station can win over another ham in same class that runs 4 over 4 on all bands in the same category.

Consider changing the exchange. Nobody needs 599. Zones are predictable, think of something unique that requires skills. How about grid (this also opens up the possibility of changing the way points are being assigned to each QSO)? Or take a look at the LZ Open exchange format.

the score for Europeans and too great a disadvantage compared to non-European

Thank for having interest to be better, only one thing , please short time to give contest results, sorry about my English.

Thanks for all the help I know it is a huge undertaking and thank those committed to do this they are special thanks.

Single op - limit as WPX 36 hours

For us in DL it would be great to get also a point for same country...

Don't like the zero points for QSOs with your own country. If you give every QSO some point value it will force people to log each and every QSO accurately to avoid penalties. How about 1pt for QSO with own country in same zone and 2 pts for QSO with own country in different zone?

Always a great contest, and a real help for those going for DXCC upgrades.

Thank you for making it easy to convert adif to Cabrillo and enter logs on the computer.

Hope all this will improve fairness in contests.

The rules should be as simple as possible, but fair. There is no need that rules are very, very static. The life is dynamic, the rules should be constantly adapting as well. I think that deleting non-assisted category would be a decent step forward.

Keep on going

Llevo años acaeciendole y estoy orgulloso de el, cuando comencé en la radio fue el primero que hice en concursos internacionales con listas de papel que no sabia ni como se hacían y me propuse que cada año que le hiciera tenia que ir a ganar, en mi categoría y poco a poco aprendió a conocer la educación en la radio y eso me enseñó, a ser un buen operador. Gracias a su equipo que organiza todos los años este evento. Ahora fallo algún año, mi enfermedad maldita, no me deja hacer lo que quiero(CANCER) gracias por todo y muy agradecido desde España, el tiempo que dure estaré hay espero que este año pueda acompañaros, repito gracias por enseñarme a respetar la radio.

Thanks for doing this. Great idea. Keep up the leadership!

Contest exchange becomes useless except certain zones. 001 format generates more challenging environment.

Our contest group seems to get 'band change' violations each year, even though we are very careful. We think this may be related to our use of a 'mult' station. Are we doing something wrong?

Please have a look to Stations which working outside the Bandplan eg. SSB - Stations deep in the CW - Segment, especially in the CQWW 160!!!

Thanks for all your efforts. I enjoy the contests and hope I can continue until I'm planted.

Keep fighting cheaters and DQ those with wide or clicky signals. Occupied bandwidth is one of the signs of excessive output power.

Keep up the fight against cheaters. Don't struggle to disqualify strange signals recorded on hard disk or bother to put SO and SOA into one category. Eliminate the radius-rule for a club entry. Thanks.

I appreciate your efforts to maintain and change the major contest more interesting.

I know you can't regulate CW speeds, but I think a lot more people would enter a CW contest if the speeds were 25 wpm or less. I think some of those 'speed demon' operators miss a lot of S&P Qs because they can't be copied. Just my humble opinion.

You guys are doing a great job with a very difficult task!

Playing field is even-enough as it is, IMHO. If things start changing, your job would be harder as all the software programs would have to update.

I just wish to thanks to the CQ WW Committee for all the work that goes into to making the WW a great contest. Having been revitalized back into the hobby the last two years, I'm really having a blast enjoying the contest.
'73

Keep up the good work and thanks.

It's great for 'casual testers' like me to be able to improve our skills and stations competing with the top-tier ... and CQ fosters this growth in the hobby very well. Kudos for a terrific job, to all involved.

Consider referees for those SO registering as 'serious competitors' before the contest. And enforce. First time DQ, banned from log submittal for one year. If DQ a second time, banned for life. Station hosts of DQ operator also banned as above.

DO NOT COMBINE ASSISTED WITH UNASSISTED. It will be the end of any meaningful competition.

The rules and penalties should be easily defined and understood. In the past I had sent an email requesting a clarification on the penalty rules and received no answer. Not sure why. All requests should be answered. I asked for directions to the rules for my question. A simple answer would have been easy, but no answer was provided. Not a good policy!!! Hope new management is better.

Keep it as simple as possible and encourage fun.

'If it ain't broke....'

Thanks for running a great contest!

CQWW is a great contest, please keep it up! What I'd like to see is contacts within the same country to count for one point. I know the contest is about DXing, but it sure would be nice to be able to help the 'locals' just a little with their score.

Great to see this survey. It's nice to know our opinions count!!! Keep up the good work.

If you want change the points in/from Asia and US, please think also about 1 point for QSO with the own country!

There must be some 'control' for out frequency operators...it's not fair to be operating out of band, and it must be banned

The geographical size of a contest team is a hot topic here. The 275 km rule is too small because it does not even encompass our entire area (Bavaria).

I also feel strongly that contest teams should only be allowed to submit logs of 'members', not logs from friends of members. To control that, the teams should be required to submit a members list. My only concern here is data security.

Tnx for organizing the world's best contests.

To think about ethics especially on 160m, operators should describe the important facts of working conditions. For example not:

FT1000 MP special edition plus gala antenna switcher plus modified schurr paddle plus PA.

Better: trcvr, hmebrew pa 2 x 3cx3000 / 5000 V.

Make rules that will make me joy to take part in contest. That is not Olympics, not work, not a trial, that's hobby and should make fun and not stress.

Keep up the good work. CQWW CW is my favourite contest.

Calibrate the SDRs to estimate the used power in WWDX. In normal times my FT1000MP S-meter is never showing more than S9 plus 40. In WWDX it is often driven to the end of scale by mostly formerly east and southeastern stns. Most former UA-Ops now living in DL reporting that they used former military high power PAs in WWDX. I heard the same fm former YU and LZ Ops.
Add a bonus of 10db to the SDR indication and see what happens.....

Thanks for the service! Hope we can do more fair contesting in the future...

You are doing a good job...!!!. Stay tuned in the same way.

Very good work so far.

CQWW is a simple contest and that's one of the reasons for the high participation.

Please continue discovering rule violations

Please do not change to much (points..) at the end also this contest is real live with real mistakes and advantages to some. If you give JAs more points, how about reducing them for 5B and 4X?

great contests, my favorite
excellent opportunity for QRP operation
a lot of good operators and DXpeditions
enjoy much

Please don't 'rock the boat' with a change to the SO rule. Sure, there are cheaters, but most SO are honest about spotting and don't want to be lumped in with assisted, particular with the extreme value of skimmer which I've experienced in M/2 participation. My contesting is split between team op in M/2 (assisted, obviously) and SOLP. Like 'em both and we need to keep the difference.

Keep up the good work! I've been a ham since 1968, and hold a BSEE and am retired from the computer industry (UNIX s/w). I'm very impressed with the systems that have evolved for contest logging (for users/operators) AND for the contest organizers (contest log ingestion and correlation, etc.), but the blog about the use of SDR and other techniques to, um, resolve problems with certain operators is quite amazing. In 20 years, we'll get an e-mail 12 hours after a contest asking us for final corrections and confirmation of our logs that were generated by the automatic monitoring systems so that we can excise dupes lest we suffer a 3 QSO penalty !

Make a stand on power output and condemn those stations who blatantly disregard the rules. Use a world network of SDRs to compare signal strengths.

I think that proposing new rules to fight the sad habit of cheating is great and IMHO welcomed, but it should exist the chance to give the station the possibility to defend its score, let's say when there NIL and other similar things. I wrote before what did happen to me last CQWW CW (2011) ES9C NIL for me: lost Mult and got penalties, just to see that QSO confirmed by LOTW. I had also an audio recording of QSO (I record always all the events) but I knew that my recording was useless to Committee, what about a LOTW confirmed QSO against a NIL... ;-)

Club Scores are important to increase activity, this helps all competitors, therefore everything that increases activity shall be done

Disqualify stations that ignore the band plan!

The Certificate is a proof of my hard work during a contest. Apparently, somewhere along the way through the mail, good handling is never guaranteed and if the Certificate arrives in a bad state is beyond your control. I receive my Certificates sometimes folded in half if not a bit crumpled. ARRL sends its certificates with a cardboard, preserving the certificate as much as possible. Of course I understand limited funds for extra materials like it. I hope with my annual subscription renewal of the magazine makes me feel less guilty of my inability to contribute for such purposes. Thank you CQ for the untiring effort for the radio sport to improve through the years. 73

my points:

- 1 point for a QSO inside the own country
- put SOA and SO in one class
- penalties are not up to date

I think members which are in charge to judge other testers, should not to participate in the competition, to prevent any conflict of interest. As the same when there is a lottery, the organizers did not participate to it. Anyway, the CQWW is for me a great Contest and I'll keep to participate.

Thank you for all your work in keeping CQWW as the premier contest.

I should write this in more detail, but I feel strongly that CQ WW should eliminate its RS(T) exchange. Although I am the author of the alternative CS (Copyability & Strength) signal reporting system, please don't use any signal report, including CS, in the exchange. One option is simply to drop RS(T) or make it optional and leave everything else the same. Another option is to replace RS(T) with the Maidenhead Field (the first two letters of a Maidenhead coordinate), which would considerably enhance the CQ DX Field Award and make beam-heading adjustments easy. The Maidenhead Field in the exchange would also open up the possibility for a new scoring system which includes the Maidenhead Field as a multiplier.

Thank you for your continued efforts in arranging the contests, which are much appreciated.

biggest and most important HF contest in the world

Thanks for the contest!

I am VERY enthusiastic to see Randy K5ZD leading the charge in this event!! CQWW - is the best attended DX contest out there. Really great that you are taking all this time to survey folks. Thanks for your hard work.

I would like a limit on single operator hours. It was a lot easier to stay awake for 48 hours when I was 25 but now at 64 it's impossible.

The club competition distance limit is onerous to me. There are very very few other testers within 275 km of my QTH. Distance limits favor, as do most things in this country, urban areas. I am a member of the Minnesota Wireless Assn and there is no chance of winning a certificate from the middle of the continent. My points don't even count for my club. Why should I bother operating when my participation is so limited? Of course I enjoy operating, but ham radio is a social, not a loner activity.

I really like the idea of making all of the Caribbean 3 point land with respect to NA.

The 5 day log submission period is way too short for those of us that are still working and have other things going on in our lives besides ham radio. Give us at least the following weekend to get down into our shacks and submit the log.

When I have the time to operate a contest for the full period I will try to win an award. When I only have time to operate on a part time basis I try to make a large of a score as possible for my club in the shortest amount of time. This usually means working spots on the bandmap and being in the assisted category like most of us that are part time op for that contest. I'm still the only person physically in my shack contesting and I really don't like it when a contest sponsor's rules put me in a multi-op category when I'm still the only person in my shack operating the radio and not able to be relieved by another human while I go get some rest as a 'real' multi-op effort does. I hope the last couple of sentences make sense...lol.

Put a larger emphasis on the regional award winners vs overall winners. A guy in W8 doesn't have a snowballs chance in hell of winning the world but has a good chance of winning his geographic area.

I'd like to thank all of you guys that volunteer many hours of your time to put on the best DX CW contest of the year! I'm always excited when CQWW CW rolls around.

Congratulations on your solicitation of comments. Thank you and thank you for your work in keeping the WWs the number one contest.

Publish the results earlier.

I run a club station and use contests to help newcomers to the hobby learn about callsigns, propagation and, importantly for the younger members, to get over 'mike shyness'. It is also a way for young newcomers to operate without 'abuse' from older licensed hams who seem to enjoy 'putting down' people with less experience. As such contesting is a tremendous asset to the hobby and I personally cannot thank all the contest committees enough for the hard work they do.

I'm a fun of the CQ WW Contest than any contests.

The contests are for all hams that operate. Stop trying to change things so that the 'professional' hams can maximize their scores. It's a hobby, for God's sake, and the prize money isn't worth getting upset about.

Too much regulation here is just as bad as too much regulation in Washington. Change for change sake makes NO SENSE.

Thanks for consider our point of view to make this an even more greater contest that already is, well done and congratulations!!!

create another category WITH SIMPLE ANTENNA (VERTICAL / DIPOLE) low power and high power

I'd just like to thank you guys for all you do. It's a lot of work, and we really appreciate it!

I would like to see a 24 or 12 Hour category, (some of us oldens can't stick the 48Hrs now)

Best contest ever. Have operated in West Africa for 8 straight years in CW contest. Will move to SA next. Caribbean too crowded already.

At ZL2J, ZL2JU & I (Tony, ZL2AGY), share the operating, and we enjoy the challenge of staying on air for the full 48 hours. However, we are 'penalised' in a way, because there isn't a section that allows more than one operator at just one transmitter. We are put in the class of those who have the second multiplier seeking transmitter. We believe there should be a separate section for multi-op single transmitter. There's no way - for the sake of our health - that we can man a second transmitter as well. We generally operate about 4 hours about for the entire 48 hours. Not that we expect to win anything, but our score is up against the 2 transmitter teams, so we're sunk before we begin.

Again I would like to see CQ WW seriously consider a low power contest only, maximum of 100 watts, put everyone on the same playing field and let the antennas do the work, this would make a more enjoyable contest on the crowded bands where now those who use the very high power stations with the wide bandwidth etc ruin the fun of contesting. I fully support a CQ WW low power contest.

Thank you for facilitating the contests! A great challenge, but a good chance to work DX stations around the world. Started to participate last year, but it's (apart from the Dutch PACC as I am Dutch) on the top of my favorite list!

Start a new contest for psk31 for a 24-48 hour period no more than 50 watts input!!!& you must use wire antennas only as in the DX marathon!!!

There is a significant difference between SO and SO Assisted; there is a greater difference between MS and MS with access to Skimmer and Internet. In 2011 as ZD8W, OH2KI and I operated without access to internet and found that we could not compete for multiplier counts with those on internet. Please think hard about any changes to the existing rules.

The popularity of the contests is reflected by the high scores of entrants, this seems to be at a high considering the state of conditions in general at this moment in time.

Thanks for sending out the survey!

I still think it would be nice to have a separate category for SO2R, SO3R etc. Thanks for a chance to give input.
73

Has anyone ever conceived a handicap system for US geography? The east coast has such an advantage when competing for the top awards. This wasn't the case many years ago when there were plenty of JA's on HF

GOOD JOB MANY THANKS FOR YOUR INTEREST AND MANY THANKS FOR THE SURVEY

Don't get me wrong. . . I LOVE computers and technology. I love N1MM etc. ... but the use of skimmers in the assisted category has reduced my enjoyment of contesting. I have operated many times from M/M and know what it's like to hop from one skimmer pile up to the next. And I have operated as DX and I know how lame the skimmer pile ups are from that end.

With each passing year I get the feeling that we are becoming more and more robotic. . . . that we human operators are merging into this worldwide network of computers. . . . with less and less skill required. And with less and less skill required there is less strategy, skill, talent and brains involved. I don't begrudge anyone who wants to use skimmers and be part of a worldwide multi-multi type operation. Let them do it and have their own category. It is legitimate. But by the same token, SINGLE OP UNASSISTED remains a very personally challenging category.

Combining the two categories would be the same as eliminating SO unassisted.

I am actually shocked that there would even be a suggestion of combining SO and SO(A). I have heard no rank and file testers even casually mention such a thing. If the CQ WW had a merger of SO and SO(A) I would seriously reexamine my involvement in what has been the best contested all.

The splatter DQ is a good idea, tough to implement. I mean every once in a while every operator has experienced a slip up, particularly with voice keyers etc. Usually if, informed, the op will clean it up. So, it would have to be supported with evidence across a few bands and with evidence that they were made aware of this problem in the real time and decided to take no action.

Please, please do NOT combine assisted and non-assisted classes.

The CQWW still is the definitive RADIO contest and it has always been it. For me and for many other operators, the attraction of radio contesting is getting the complete information of a QSO - that is also exploring the bands and recovering a station - done only by radio technologies. Today, the internet has involved all areas of life and that is the way it is OK.

By having two separate classes assisted/not assisted, both groups of enthusiasts can have much fun side by side in only one event - and I think that is great!

If you want to encourage more serious operations, other than the Sunday afternoon 'fodder', you need to separate SO1R and SO2,3,4R. I operate SO2R but would love to enter a SO1R if it were available. Only reason I can see for no distinction is the 'egos' of the SO'M'R group. If they were competing against only multiple radio ops, they would not be almost guaranteed of finishing in the top 20% in every contest. Polls have consistently showed the vast majority of testers favor separating multiple radios from SO1R.

Maybe a category of 24 or 36 hour test run, so old and busy people have a chance to participate the test, that will give some good planning on what time to be on air and what time you will get the best score. Maybe it could be fine to give some handicap multiplier score on how high you are on earth latitude. Maybe 10 extra multiplier per 10 degrees north or south. As we know the radio condition in the south is better then there are in north, and really depending on the aurora activity. That's my idea to something new on the time setting and score option.

Please shorten the 48 h operating time to 36 h for single op. The 48 h is dangerous for a human. I speak of my own experience and following fellow testers becoming zombies.

Increase at least ten days would be ideal to send log, because even happened to me because of the work I had no time to send in the term, the remaining organizers and Director Randy Thompson, K5ZD are to be congratulated, thanks for your research.

CQWW has a flavor of its own. Some of the quirks set it apart from ARRL and other contest. Even the loud/wide crappie signals from Italy and Eastern Europe can be worked around. I'm a dedicated Low Power operator on the DXCC Honor Roll who avoids the bone crushing signals in the pile ups, while search and pouncing for new bands, modes and whatever. My P3 guides me through the valley of the band width Hogs. Thanks for the great contest and magazine. Please don't go digital.

Many thanks for the efforts you folks put in to giving so much pleasure and enjoyment to so many people.

This is my favorite test! Always glad to be working, only transceiver homemade, so I cannot speak in full force! Many thanks to your committee for organizing such a respected test in the world!

Keep the CW DX contest on other than Thanksgiving weekend. I missed it in 2012.

The widespread participation in the CQ WW contests offers an opportunity for CQ to make a commitment to leading the way in the adoption of new technologies in contest operations. While contesting is sometimes burdened by the need to be 'backward compatible' to absorb legacy technologies, the entire hobby will be better off if contesting at the bleeding edge can lead the way, and perhaps accelerate the process of bringing new technologies to amateur radio.

After 46 years of experience in radio, after connecting almost all the entities and largest known DXer by Don Miller until today, the contest remains the ultimate test of my capabilities as operator. Thank you to organize what for me is a joy.

Buscar una forma de verificar la potencia utilizada de las estaciones en los concurso.

Keep SOAB separate from assisted.

Continue the good work and long live contesting!

Eliminating the SOAB category is the surest way I can think of to shoot yourselves--and your contests--in the foot. The time may come for that, but the numbers say it's surely not here yet. For now, can we give it a rest, already?

None specifically. I like the current format and would prefer to keep SO as assisted and non-assisted. They both have their place today. I do believe the penalties are a bit severe and perhaps that should be revisited. Some are simply careless errors, but some are due to difficult conditions and both operators are diligently working together the best they can. It's a great contest and hope to participate for many years in the future.

Consider limiting the operating time for Single Ops to something reasonable like 30 hours.

For reference, I've won my category on multiple occasions in both the CQ160 CW and SSB tests in the past. Therefore, I probably have a fairly good idea on how this all works. And, have participated in the CQW DX test on occasions.

I believe there is too much criticism by a few people who want the rules to be altered to accommodate their personal situation. This is a hobby and some people take this MUCH too seriously. They constantly whine and complain about anything and everything particularly on the contest reflector. And, it really becomes quite tiresome. However, it is their right to do so.

I appreciate the opportunity to participate in a survey such as this one. And, I think it should continue. The existing contest rules have been quite effective over the years and I believe any change should be carefully considered. Only a consensus of a vast majority should be seriously considered, I believe, in changing any rules.

I gave up operating and entering WAE when they failed to distinguish between assisted and unassisted. I don't want to operate CQWW if you abolish the unassisted category. Please don't do it.

As a QRP SO station, I spend most of my time in S&P. I would LOVE to see a rule change to require stations to sign their call EVERY contact. I spend almost as much time waiting for stations to ID as I do turning the knob on the Rx!

I personally think RBN and spotting have just about ruined contesting.

New testers have no idea about propagation, LP vs SP, which band to start on, which way should I point my antenna to work an XV station. Just click on a spot and let someone else do all the thinking for you.

I think you guys are doing an excellent job. Thanks

Keep up the good work and keep the majority of participants engaged.

CQWW is the biggest and the best. Any potential rule changes should be carefully evaluated to make sure that the overall product is not diminished in any way.

assisted does not = non assisted

I don't know why you can't look at the Cabrillo location header and see where a station is operating from instead of requiring the /7 (for instance) be on the call. If we don't do this we get listed in the wrong section of the results (with those in the basic call number).

Not to use the whole time limit for the contests which last 24 or more hours. A good example is WPX. SO work 36 hours out of 48 and it is fine. Everybody can have a rest when gets tired (or has a poor antenna at one band). Why not count 18 hours out of 24 at every contest? Of course it's the matter of the organizers but when the most contests have this they will come to it sooner or later.

The change at the top has, and continues to, brought transparency and a willingness to tackle difficult issues. The true and honest participants wish you well with your endeavors.

Keep up the good work, and i will come back for the next CQWW contest.

Just want to say BIG THANKS to every past, current and future CQ WW Committee members for everything they have done and are doing today. No questions or mistakes if you are doing nothing :) Once again - THANK YOU!

Thanks for asking!

Make the CQWW contest duration 24 hour or change the possible operation time 30 hours (not in multi categories). 48 hours is physically dangerous to everybody.

That would be nice to disqualify the stations using over legal limit power. This could be a routine to check the top 10 stations on each category using reverse beacon/SDR technologies to find the cheaters.

Go slow. Many changes are not necessarily good changes...

Now you (or we) are on the right track. Keep up the good work.

Thanks for organizing this great contest. See you in 2013...

I strongly think SO2R should be in a separate category. I'm all for using every bit of new technology but 2 guns against 1 gun just doesn't seem like fair competition.

Thank you for making this contest the best event of the year. Please do not merge assisted and non-assisted SO AB entries into one category.

I would like to ask the CQWW contest committee to have same criteria to all stations when issuing yellow and red cards, and if a station receive penalty, the penalty to be only for the single contest when rules was broken, and not to continue for the upcoming CQ magazine contests within one year.

In general, I think the assistance now realized from RBN is only going to grow. Even if there doesn't seem to be much of a difference between the SOAB and Assisted categories now, that could change very quickly and then force every competitive person to use assistance. Leave the categories alone for now.

Thanks for sponsoring these contests and thanks for requesting our input.

Your 'Test seems to be the most popular, but I prefer contests where you actually have to copy something (e.g., SS, WAE). In CQWW, merely copying call sign is enough -- and with 'assisted' and all the SCP databases, you hardly have to do that.

CQWW 160 contests. I suggest a new time limit for multi-op. The current time is 40 / 48. I suggest 36/48. Daylight in the USA is not a great time for 160 operating. It would give the teams a better chance to quit early on Sunday.

Make ALL lower power categories (in CQWW / CQWW160 etc.) to have 100W power limit. 150W limit is absurd, cannot be controlled and gives a 'little finger' to Yaesu 200W rig owners just to run 'full legal power'. Thank you so much.

Your hard work and continued efforts to better contesting is appreciated. Even if you may often not hear from the silent majority.

Don't mess too much with a good thing, it's not broke!

Excellent melding of excellent minds. Consideration of the little guy is appreciated. Steam rollovers are also noted, but happen infrequently. Thank you for a good job.

Move it from Thanksgiving weekend! Some of us have families that we actually care more about than the damned contest!!!

The contest could be enhanced by reviewing editorial policies regarding results.

Loosen up, change the scoring so that old records mean nothing. Everybody gets to start anew and set new records.

Look for ways to get more participation and more submitted logs by recognizing the people who are just 'playing around in the contest' and don't have time or energy to devote the whole weekend to it. Examples: Award for 'casual' entries working all continents in 6 minutes or less, as confirmed by submitted crosschecked digital logs. Make the award self printed pdf (check how the ARRL lets you generate your own Membership certificate/card) generated on the CQ website (drive traffic to the CQ Website) but mention the calls of everybody that does it in CQ mag. (most people want their call in print for posterity, might even subscribe for a year or buy the back issue).

Other self printed awards might be: WAZ in A Weekend (all bands or single bands), Zone Sprint award for working various levels of Zones quickly.... 20 zones in 20 minutes or 20 hours. or ad-hoc awards - Congratulations , you worked 33 zones in a weekend on 10m. All self printed certificates for the casual operator. You could even try to tie the CW and SSB contests together by allowing the casual awards to span SSB and cw contest logs...i.e. WAZ Mixed in 2 weekends. This can't be too hard to do. You are already verifying everybody's logs. So if a log is deemed accepted then issue the claimed self printed certificate based on the accepted log....easily automated. You will see a large increase in casual logs submitted (more check logs) , stir up the contest clique and bring in new testers who don't like a full weekend grind but might have fun trying to win a self printed award way before the published results. You could even allow a 'tentative award' be printed from submitted logs a few days after a contest log is submitted. The PDF would be watermarked as 'unverified' or something similar for instant gratification and to incentivize quick log submission. You would also need to 'push' information to entrants about when data is available for their log (log has been verified, go print your certificate, you qualified for X, Y and Z awards.) OK, does this get anybody's juices flowing yet?

A difficult option would be to run a separate CQWW DX contest with ALL assistance (packet, skimmers, etc.) turned off. Probably too much work, but I can dream...

Thanks for all the hard work the committee is doing to try to work on this difficult situation.

Log checking is too extensive and has become an obsession for CQWW and many competitive entrants. This entire process tends to detract from the overall enjoyment of the contest, and also detracts from the camaraderie of testers. The emphasis currently is more on winning than on having fun. The testers are not to blame.... this is a worldwide obsession in every endeavor. I think it is societal sickness that will backfire in the end.

Taking part for many years now. I noticed that in central Europe the multi-multi stations blocking the narrow 40 m band by continuous CQ calling with extreme signals, but on Sunday the number of contacts going down. My question: is it fair to block many frequencies for many operators without having a decent number of QSOs?

CQWW CW/SSB are my favorite contests...Don't change the rules that have existed for years. Continue the great effort to find cheaters and expose them.

Find a way to disqualify stations using excess power. Some seem to be running 10x or more their legal limits. This should be possible to detect with reasonable accuracy using RBN and spotters.

The director should get an immediate salary increase. I would not be opposed to 10X!

Make arrangements for #2 World Trophy in each category.

I like these contests but do not have adequate antenna system for good DXing. I prefer the ARRL DX CW test when everyone else's antenna is pointing toward me!!

Keep traditions as they are. Most testers are old farts like me, and we get upset when things change too much! :) Other than that, you all do a great job and we out here appreciate it!

You included RTTY in the choices of favorite DX contest mode, but only asked about CW and SSB for 2012 contests. Is there a reason for this (I operated all three modes in 2012, although SSB operation was very minimal)?

Scoring structure doesn't provide any category which makes sense for me...West Coast- Tribander, tower, wires SO1R or SO2R, LP or HP.

A rule change to give 3 points for any QSO outside of your own zone rather than outside of your country/continent. 3 points for NA to Caribbean QSOs is a much more mild change. Personally, I don't think that would make much difference for us here on the NA West coast. West coast stations can't be serious, not into 46 hours of S&P and 2 hours of running JA's...

SO1R and SO2R need 2 separate categories.

Ideas talked about during social hour at Redwood Empire DX Association (REDXA) meetings are that we either count all EU countries as a single entity -or- we allow each JA prefecture to count as a multiplier. Most of the population lives in three of the prefectures, however, a change like this might encourage operation in the more obscure locations, especially if Asian stations could count each US state and VE province as a multiplier, giving JA's a real shot at winning in the contest.

Require all stations to give call sign each QSO. You can see the ones who don't by # of dupes they generate.

Thanks for all you do, guys. You're on the right track. Ignore the nut jobs.

I am still interested in distance based scoring. Current scoring is biased in favor of the NE US stations.

God, what an awful job you have hi hi

Please pass on my thanks to the Committee and all of its associates for running the tests, for collecting and proofing the logs, for reporting to the web, and for composing the CQ magazine print and web versions of the results, soapbox, and pix. A huge job that few recognize.

Takes way too long to receive awards. Typically 2-3 years is the norm

Great contest. I know KB1H loses points for 'not in log' when it's obvious the other station just miscopied (k6jh, kb1s, etc.) Tnx fer the survey

Thanks for all your hard work and for dodging the arrows aimed at you--but please don't merge SO and SO-Assisted.

Thanks for the nice CQ WW Contest. I am enjoying every years CQ WW CW.

I only S&P, and it would be nice if I could compete with others who only S&P. N1MM shows my frequency, and could verify that I do so.

Harmonize logging penalty rules with ARRL rules.

These 2 contests are basically the amateur radio Super Bowl Weekend(s). Lots of fun for sure.

Consider maybe awards for stations worked all 40 zones in the contest. That would be cool.

Further address cheating.

Thanks for the unsung hard work and helping keep the shady guys honest. While it's great to see the M/M and iron man SOAB guys setting records, it's nice to be able to think a guy with a simple 1 kW and tribander at 50' has a shot at a certificate in a certain category. There absolutely needs to be better enforcement of power rules (I wish I knew how to do it effectively, of course) as there is currently for time violations.

I like the 5 day deadline, with the proviso that I'd hate to see a major effort screwed over by a bounced email sent just before the team's boat leaves harbor to the DX destination or a country-wide Internet outage occurs unexpectedly where they're staying, etc. With all that in mind, finding a way to encourage a 30-minute post-contest upload or even a 15 minute upload would help an awful lot.

Count me 100% behind any effort to increase the number of stations on the air from both the Caribbean and mainland Asia with your proposed rules changes. Count me 100% against keeping Skimmer lumped in with spot-stream Assisted--the two are NOT comparable technologies, where the former has a massive operational advantage over the latter, and likewise merging Assisted with conventional SOAB would be disastrous. I could see even *adding* a category for SO2R; that requires a unique skillset and an investment in amps/radios/antennae that given an unfair advantage over single-radio stations.

Once again, THANK YOU for your tireless efforts at keeping CQWW the premiere operating event in all of amateur radio. Your work is tremendously appreciated by this little pistol.

You are doing a great job, thanks and please keep up the good work. Please don't let the luddites rule the day, eh!

Thanks for making the hobby even more fun!

Please don't combine the SOA & SO. I've personally worked very hard to support the SOA category long before it was an official entry category.

I would like to see the Committee look into Distance-based scoring for one or more CQ-sponsored contests. I just isn't fair for East Coast stations to reap the benefits of their advantageous location in respect of Europe. Nor is it fair for West Coast stations to profit from proximity to Asia. If one works a station 9,000 km away, he earn more points than if he works a station 2,000 km away. The Makrothen Contest illustrates this clearly. It would be interesting to re-score a contest based on this much fairer scoring system and see how midwestern stations are able to improve their rankings. Same would be true for many other stations in other less advantageous locations. It's time to reexamine the heavily-tilted playing field. Just a suggestion.

The day SO1R and SO2R will have separate categories will be one of the brightest days in CQWW history but I am not holding my breath.

Shorten the 48 hours operation for SO categories

10 days for submissions and keep up the good work

Best contest over the World!!!!.....And many thank for doing this job!

Just thanks for running great contests and trying to improve them even more.

Keep up the good working making this the premier operating event of every year!

All my comments are favorable. As far as opinions go I would like the exchanges to be constructed better to eliminate errors, not the least of which is operating under or near another station who is working the people you think you are working. An exchange system whereby the station calling is answered with his call and your exchange and is required to answer with my call and his exchange. while that may be a proper way to do it, if there is no rule for it everyone will gravitate to shortening what they send, brevity means speed and that means more score, but in this case it leads to a lot of penalties, some of which may not be warranted.

Downloadable certificates like in CQ WPX would be cool in my opinion. It will also increase 'part-time' contest operations due to this possibility to have an achievement even if not scoring first.

i do like to operate in test. just for the fun of competing against myself, to try to make it better compared to earlier test.

ADD some new contest, short time...abt 24 hrs on mid of the year, to attract new novice hams, to contesting. New hams, think, 48 hrs it is too long. best 73 to all committee!

Thanks for all the great work done by the CQ WW Committee!! I've always enjoyed CQ contests. But, there has been a big decline in enjoyment as CQ keeps handing out more and more points to 'winner' operators who claim, 'My robot worked more stations than your robot!' This is sad when you consider that a very large number of the call signs are never copied off the air by the 'winner' operator, thus it's not a true contact per the Rules, yet the Q is not rejected. Why not go back to using a unique exchange to force a real contact, such as a QSO serial number? That would inject skill back into the contest and separate true radio operators from appliance operators.

Great contest but I think the exchange should include a serial just the zone is too easy.

Make results available faster. Update records faster.

Thanks for all your work and efforts making CQWW the world's best contesting event!

YES. Abbreviations on CW. I am a proff. radio opr. and radio tech. It is frustrating to hear new stations (I mean Young new operators that want to save a millisecond in TX and most of them are = according themselves smart guys) using a V for 4. You should clearly note in the contest rules that following abbreviations are allowed in CW: example: T = 0 A = 1 and N = 9 and NO further!! There is too much question marks (?) from a lot of stations if they really hear what is being transmitting. Stations NOT using 'normal' abbreviations should be deleted from the scoring list. - Your remote RX during the contest can verify that.

Please continue to have the 'Mother Of All Contests' running!

Thanks guys for your hard work. Appreciated, disregarding what changes you will make. :-)

Not to make too radical changes that would totally change the spirit of the CQWW; but for the future the SO classes could also have 36 hours operating limit as in WPX - to save our health! :)

Yes, I have several for consideration:

Although technology is moving ahead very rapidly, basic human skills are pretty much stagnate with regard to contesting. Over the years, I have found contesting to be LESS rewarding than in the past. One of the primary reasons is the onslaught of technology. Two items come to mind - the DX Spotting Network and Skimmers, to include reverse skimmer/beacons.

No more is the skill of the operator being measured by participation in the CQ WW Contest. Now, it is all about how much technology can be linked to the station in the form of: 2nd, 3rd or more receivers for the single operator in the in single transmitter class; access to the DX Spotting Network; use of on site Skimmer programs/equipment; addition of skimmer & reverse beacon networks added to the DX Spotting Network.

My perception of the reason for the contest is to measure the operators skills within the rules of the specific contest. My desire is to complete with other operators. As more and more technology is introduced and embraced when operating the CQ WW Contests, operator skills become less and less part of the equation.

Therefore, from my perspective, especially with regard to digital based contest - such as the CQ WW CW & CQ WW RTTY, the use of technology for automation, directly makes these contest less desirable to me. With regard to the CQ WW Phone contest, there is much less intrusion of technology as computer processing power for voice recognition has not reached a point of useful application. Nevertheless, unless the CQ WW Contest Committee takes positive actions to control and in some cases eliminate the increasing use of technology what will be left is computers competing against computers.

The length of the contest - 48 hours, while may be useful to give all parts of the world opportunities to access other parts, in reality, it is beyond the physical capability of most operators. While not eliminating the opportunity for some who are superhuman to operate the full 48 hour contest. Creation of a shorter time lengths within the 48 hours of 6, 12, & 24 hours will not only give those who for whatever the reason cannot devote 48 hours to operating - an incentive to receive recognition for their operating skills. While this may have been an obstacle in the past for the contest committee to manage the data and logs - use of computers have eliminate that hurdle.

My suggestions:

1. Eliminate the use of skimmer programs (other than local based skimmer software - as it is not feasible to enforce the rule without a referee in every stations) placing output from the skimmer to any DX Spotting Network. This would include the so called Reverse Beacon Network (RBN) doing the same thing. The RBN in effect causes any station utilizing it in the multi-operator category.
2. Create additional operating categories within the contest such as 12 & 24 periods.
3. Eliminate the Single Operator Assisted category into Single Operator. Effecting the elimination of skimmer and RBN spotting will remove the significant potential for cheating - where now no means, other than operator honesty, exists to ensure compliance. The reality is allowing the use of a spotting network - devoid of automated skimmer spots and RBN spots will level this category.
4. More clearly define what a single operator is. A single operator must be defined not only that it is one person, one transmitter, but must include the definition of one receiver, one antenna but also that these items are employed for the period of the contest. Those who choose to employ multiple receivers – e.g., SO2r, SO3r etc, those that use diversity antenna systems spread over tens of acres or more are not truly single operators and must not be in the SO category. Create a specific category for them.

Lastly, the issue of what is a contact. The number of unique callsigns in the submitted logs clearly indicate that the callsigns are not actual stations but in fact the result of errors in reception, and in some cases errors in transmission. The solution to this can be simple implementation to the exchange to require that the transmission of the exchange include the call sign of the transmitting station and replacement of the signal report with a sequential serial number.

For example: x1x contacts z2z and give the exchange of “z2z 0123 33 x1x” herein, the serial number, the zone and the transmitting station’s call is the exchange. This will clearly demonstrate the exchange of information and to establish that a valid contact was made.

Penalties for inaccurate reports, call signs can continue as is the intent of the loss of 3xQSO credit for errors.

Many thanks for nice organization and support!

It would be nice to promote some more participation into CQWW, as one of the biggest annual contests... it's a bit a shame in some countries where there are very few participants (according to the claimed score list on CQWW.com for CQWW cw 2012, I would be 1st in HB9 with only 116,164 points... and only 3 callsigns listed).

Thank you for dedicating so much of your time to this! I know it is not always a thankfully undertaking. I know with the rules as they are or will be we have never a chance to come near a top score from New Zeland but we join anyhow! Will see you on the bands!

I am impressed with the work done to maintain/increase the integrity of the competition. I am just getting back into contesting after a long break and things have changed since my first one in the early 70s. Please get rid of the 2nd simultaneous transmitter exception for new multipliers for M/S class in the WW - not really much different from M2 and requires a completely different station design than conventional M/S class to be competitive. 73 and thanks for your work.

I wish you success in the development of the contest, a quick and accurate judging.

No, you guys do a pretty good job, and it shows in the number taking part. 73

The time before the results are available should be shorter!!!

Thank you for your work! Please do not sub combines SO and SO Assisted.

I would like to see a 24 hour category in more major contests. I love the IARU format. Just wish there was a contest like it when the band conditions are good.

You guys are running fun competitive contests. Please keep up the good work. Surveys like this are a great way to get the pulse of testers. I like the idea of yellow cards and red cards for bad ops.

To be more consistent in cheater punishment.

CQ WW DX Contest is the most popular contest has had very long time, we want to continue to be so. I believe that this popular achieved by the minimum number of constraints (penalty, complex scoring, complex rules). I hope that in future the CQ WW Contest Committee shall confess such simple and clear principles RADIO!

P.S. Radio communication is considered by many people today, a dinosaur (an endangered species), but unlike many of the people I think ham radio - an easy way of communication between people without intermediaries (commercial service). We believe it will last forever!

Keep it simple boys. Rules may need some tweaking? OK, do if it is really necessary but commit yourselves to stick to that change for a long time.

Love the idea for this survey. Great work!

I would like to see the final results much faster! If you want operators to improve their stations then they need feedback on their performance as soon as possible. If you want the logs to be received in 5 days, Also make sure you have the results available within 2 weeks!

It is well past time to ease away from the long standing bias that this contest (among others) has favoring stations along the Atlantic Ocean, specifically the North Atlantic. Distance based scoring is one such improvement. Recognizing the EU as ONE country is another.

How about limiting the time any station may infest a frequency to no more than 5 hours? How many times do we tune through the M/M robots CQing on 14.15x, getting no response yet preventing anyone else from using 'their' frequency? Either N hours or M CQs without a response REQUIRES a QSY of no less than 50kHz (SSB) or 10kHz (CW) before calling CQ again. Better yet, make 10 valid S&P QSOs before calling CQ again on that band!

How about DQing stations that do not ID for 5 QSOs or 2 minutes? Not all of us use packet (really!), nor are mind readers.

It would be a HUGE change, but what about a larger number of zones?

Drop the power category too (impossible to enforce).

Increase the enforcement of the Single Op category rule violation (2nd operator help).

Increase the enforcement of the ban on remote receivers use.

For big countries like DL it is very sad that contacts with own country do not count. In our M/M log we have every year > 300 DL contacts without any value. Participants from smaller countries contribute from the high potential of DL's but don't have so much 0 point contacts due to the lack of more operators from their own country. A contact with own country is same difficult or easy like any other contact in the same CQ zone.

Thanks for nudging me to submit a late log that unfortunately became only a check log. I enjoyed the contest!

I really appreciate the recent improvements in rules, log posting, error analysis and content in CQ magazine. Keep up the world class work guys!

I do believe You are doing a very good work. The most important thing is to bring order in the lines, to come back to sound practices among the participants. Unsportsmanlike conduct, even though only practiced by a little minority, can ruin the whole contest and must therefore be addressed. If a unique call in the log is accepted or not is of minor interest. Hitting down on stations running 5 kW and occupying 10 KHz is more important.

Keep up the good work. Your efforts to level the playing field are appreciated.

All entry logs should be required to upload to LOTW. This would get more people to participate!!