

CDTV:

CDTV does not feel that E-VSB, as currently proposed, meets the defined Broadcaster Requirements established by the ATSC DTV Task Force on RF System Requirements. Further, CDTV does not support the amendment suggesting E-VSB limited use in "priority programming."

CDTV urges ATSC to continue its efforts to explore further enhancements to the standard with the object of better meeting the Broadcaster Requirements. An ultimate objective of improving the robustness of the complete ATSC stream with minimum impact to the bit-rate payload is highly desired.

CEA:

This should be a candidate standard at this time, and defeating this ballot appears to be the only procedural method to do so. (Also, additional comments submitted earlier.)

CRC:

CRC strongly encourages the ATSC to keep working on the DTV enhancement, to further improve system performance.

NBC:

E-VSB standardization should wait for an accompanying application that has strong inter-industry consensus.

News Corp.:

News Corp. feels that if EVSB was proposed in response to a perceived deficiency in 8-VSB to enable robust reception in mobile and portable applications, that it seems to address only a single aspect of signal impairments found in that application area: carrier to noise performance at the expense of program content payload both in the main service and the enhanced service. EVSB has not been demonstrated to perform similar improvements in robustness in Doppler shifted signals, rapidly varying multipath, and burst error robustness in the presence of carrier and clock loss due to a dynamic signal loss and re-acquisition. Adoption of such a proposal without significant improvements in these other areas would seem to us to report an endorsement of an incomplete solution.

Nielsen:

Performance questions, such as those outlined by CBS, have not been adequately addressed. Newer receiver technology and other reception improvement concepts may obsolete the E-VSB approach. Therefore, the costs to consumers and the television industry are not justified.

Samsung:

Samsung (votes NO) objects this Annex D (Zenith/ATI EVSB, RF section) because (a) there are serious technical concerns of its performance for needed and expected enhancements. These aspects as well as this Annex D including related transport (T3/S8) changes and advanced codecs should be tested as a complete system BEFORE it should become an ATSC Standard. (b) With the missing Enhancement Signaling, any future enhancements can be jeopardized (64 out of 100 RESERVED bits in the DFS used up by this EVSB.)

Sinclair:

The entirety of section 5.6.1 should be removed from future revisions. It is unenforceable based upon subjective text and wording, and is inappropriate for inclusion in a technical document. It provides no guidance for broadcaster implementation based on objective, identifiable technical parameters.

Texas Instruments:

Our reasoning is that the proposed is not providing a good enough solution to the stated problem.