



Administrative Council for Terminal Attachments (ACTA)

May 3, 2002

Face to Face Meeting

Arlington, VA

Draft Meeting Summary

Chair: Jimmy Salinas, SBC Corporation

9:00am-12:00pm

- 1) Call to Order
Jimmy Salinas, ACTA Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:12 am.
- 2) Attendance Check-in and Introductions
Megan Hayes, ACTA Secretariat, performed a role call of all Council Members. Quorum was reached with 9 Council Members and 2 Alternate Council Members in attendance. All of the participants took the opportunity to introduce themselves.
- 3) Agenda Review and Approval (ACTA-02-05-03-01)
Mr. Salinas introduced Contribution ACTA-02-05-03-01, the Draft Agenda for this meeting. He asked if there were any suggested additions or modifications. There were none. John Bipes moved to accept the agenda as submitted. Roland Gubisch seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

AGREEMENT REACHED: The Draft Agenda (Contribution ACTA-02-05-03-01) was accepted as submitted.

- 4) Introduction of Contributions, Numbering, Assignment to Agenda Number (Contributions will be numbered as follows: ACTA-02-05-03-XX)

Tim Jeffries, ACTA Director, introduced contributions and matched them with appropriate agenda items. He asked if there were any additional contributions. There were none. Please note that all contributions are available on the ACTA Web Site at <http://www.part68.org/records.htm>.

Contributions were submitted and numbered as follows:

Contribution Number	Title
ACTA-02-05-03-01	Draft Agenda
ACTA-02-05-03-02	Draft Meeting Summary, April 17, 2002 Meeting
ACTA-02-05-03-03	Revised Guidelines and Procedures
ACTA-02-05-03-04	TIA/EIA/TSB-129-A
<i>Deferred Contributions</i>	
ACTA-02-04-17-03	ACTA Responsibilities, Per R&O 00-400
ACTA-02-03-25-03	TEM White Paper
ACTA-02-03-25-04	ACTA References in Part 68

- 5) Approve April 17th Meeting Summary (ACTA-02-05-03-02)

Mr. Salinas introduced Contribution ACTA-02-05-03-02, the Draft Meeting Summary for the April 17, 2002 Virtual Meeting and asked if there were any suggested additions or modifications. There were none. Roland Gubisch moved to accept the meeting summary as submitted. Chuck Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

AGREEMENT REACHED: The Meeting Summary from the April 17, 2002 Virtual Meeting (Contribution ACTA-02-05-03-02) was accepted as submitted.

6) Work Items

a) TEM White Paper (ACTA-02-03-25-03, ACTA-02-03-25-04, ACTA-02-04-17-03)

Mr. Pinkham noted that because of the depth of the agenda, he wanted to limit discussion of Contribution-ACTA-02-03-25-03, the TEM White Paper, to the database roll-out, TTE modification filings, and inclusion of [US] Agent for Service. The ACTA Chair suggested that the remainder of the items be discussed during the next executive meeting. No objections were noted.

i) Database Roll-out

Mr. Pinkham explained that the TEM Segment believes that the development of the database and the on-line filing system has occurred without direct input from ACTA members and ACTA should be given the opportunity to contribute their expertise. In particular, the TEM Segment suggests that the Database Working Group be involved in reviewing the database and offering suggestions for improvement.

A Council Member asked for clarification on whether the TEM segment is coupling the database and the on-line filing system or whether they are being treated separately. Mr. Pinkham responded that the on-line filing system is the public manifestation of the database and that they are tied together, thus the need to talk about together.

A Council Member asked Mr. Pinkham if the TEM Segment had reservations about the new public access to the database, which included all fields. Mr. Pinkham responded that he didn't believe that was a problem. He clarified that the TEM Segment's concern was regarding on-line filing. He explained that during the presentation made by Mark Cassarino, ACTA Database Manager, for the Council Members, there were several problems identified by Council Members. Tim Jeffries, ACTA Director, commented that the version of the on-line filing system presented to the members was a "behind-the-scenes" look at a work-in-progress and did not represent a finished product. Mr. Bipes agreed that ACTA should have the chance to review the on-line filing system before going live, and wanted to applaud the Secretariat for their tremendous effort thus far.

Clint Pinkham moved that the on-line filing system will be considered in the alpha stage and not be carried to general availability (GA) until a beta stage is completed. The beta stage should include a review by the Database Working Group and the full ACTA. Cliff Chamney seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

AGREEMENT REACHED: The on-line filing system will be considered in the alpha stage and not be carried to GA until a beta stage is complete. The beta stage should include review by the Database Working Group and the full ACTA.

Beth Wilson noted that she was concerned that the ACTA is micromanaging the Secretariat and wanted to be sure that decisions made by the Council were for the purpose of ensuring that the ACTA mandate, scope and charter are met.

ii) Modification Filings

Mr. Pinkham introduced Item 2c from the TEM White Paper. He noted that ACTA currently requires that entities file a modification notice for TTE changes that are not specifically tracked in the database. He argued that the TEM Segment wants to ensure that filers do not think that ACTA is collecting this information in order to decide whether a piece of equipment is compliant.

Mr. Pinkham moved to remove ACTA filing requirements for TTE changes that do not affect information in an SDoC or data in the ACTA database. Beth Wilson seconded the motion.

Mr. Bailey stated that this motion implied that technical design changes to a product that required a reevaluation to determine whether the product still complied with Part 68 would not be filed. Assuming that such a reevaluation was necessary, he asked Mr. Pinkham if the TCB (or the Responsible Party) would be required to submit a modification filing into the ACTA database. Mr. Pinkham replied that it was his intention, if his motion were to pass, that such a modification filing would not be required.

Mr. Bailey went on to state his concerns about the following type of scenario: A technical change is made to a TTE product, resulting in changes to its technical characteristics. A repeat test is performed on the product to determine Part 68 compliance. The test shows that although the product was modified, and although some of its output characteristics have changed, it still complies with Part 68, and there are apparently no changes to the items that are recorded in the ACTA database. So, there are no entries into the ACTA database to indicate that the product design has changed. Then, after the newly modified product is deployed, something goes wrong. A PSTN provider discovers that apparent harm is being done to the network, and that there is some evidence the product is at fault. When the providers consult the ACTA database to investigate, they will find that the product was apparently tested and approved years ago, and has been functioning well ever since. The fact that technical design changes were recently made will not be observable to the provider. Thus, the providers' follow-up investigations will be much more costly, burdensome, and time-consuming than if the ACTA database were up-to-date. He stated that placing this extra burden on network providers, as opposed to requiring modification filings in such cases seemed to be unfair.

Mr. Bailey moved to amend the motion to add the sentence: "A new SDoC Part 68 compliance test or TCB Part 68 compliance test will be interpreted as requiring a modification filing to the database". John Bipes seconded the amendment.

Mr. Pinkham stated that he was opposed to the amendment, since it completely reversed the intent of the motion.

Mr. Bailey stated that he felt that his amendment would have the effect of clarifying the motion, since it would clarify the conditions under which modification filings would be required. He stated that the current guidelines were somewhat unclear because they imply that modifications are required when component changes are made to a product, when circuit board design changes are made, when software changes are made, etc. He stated that he felt that his amendment would help improve on the current situation.

Mr. Bailey's amendment failed to pass with 4 yea votes, 4 nay votes and one abstention. Mr. Pinkham's original motion passed with 6 yea votes, 2 nay votes and one abstention.

AGREEMENT REACHED: Filing Requirements for changes that do not affect information in an SDoC or data in the ACTA database will be removed.

- iii) Disposition of US Service Center
No discussion, defer to Executive Meeting

- b) Review Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 99-216, FCC 02-103
Megan Campbell, ATIS General Counsel, presented the highlights of the FCC's Order on Reconsideration. She noted that the Commission ruled the following:
- The Council is not required to have a written contract for services with its sponsors.
 - Responsible parties are not required to be located within the U.S.
 - Responsible parties for the SDoC process must designate an Agent for Service that maintains an office within the United States (The Order on Reconsideration is silent on the Agent for Service's location under the TCB process).
 - ANSI must only address petitions that appeals to American National Standards.

Steve Whitesell commented that the rule in the Order on Reconsideration requires that an Agent for Service be physically located in the USA for the SDoC process only, and commented that the requirement should also apply to parties using the TCB process, given the FCC's desire to have access to the responsible party. He believed this was an oversight at the FCC and believed the FCC meant to require an Agent for Service to be physically located in the USA for both the SDoC and TCB process. He asked for advice from the Council on what actions to take to address the discrepancy. Ms. Campbell suggested that ACTA write a letter to the FCC to request clarification on the topic or, alternatively, to provide the FCC with the Council's interpretation. John Bipes moved that ACTA send a letter to the FCC notifying them of the Council's interpretation of the Order on Reconsideration that an Agent for Service must be physically located in the USA for both the SDoC and TCB process, and ask that the Commission let the Council know if its interpretation is wrong. Additionally, the letter should indicate that this is the way the Council will implement the database unless otherwise directed. Steve Whitesell seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention.

AGREEMENT REACHED: ACTA will send a letter to the FCC notifying them of the Council's interpretation of the Order on Reconsideration that an Agent for Service must be physically located in the USA for both the SDoC and TCB process, and ask that the Commission let the Council know if its interpretation is wrong. Additionally, the letter should indicate that this is the way the Council will implement the database.

ACTION ITEM: Megan Campbell will draft the letter to the FCC. Steve Whitesell and John Bipes will review the letter for accuracy.

- c) Issue of Vice Chair
This item will be covered at the next executive meeting.

- 7) Review of ACTA-specified Consumer Information
Tim Jeffries introduced the issue of the ACTA-specified Consumer Information and noted that the ACTA Secretariat received a comment from a large manufacturer requesting authorization to change item 2(g) in the Consumer Information requirement to include a URL to direct consumers to the local store. Mr. Pinkham noted that this is an awkward thing for manufacturers because there is only one field in the database for US Service Center and different equipment might go to different service centers.

Cliff Chamney suggested that a working group be formed to address this issue and bring a recommendation back to the Council. Mr. Chamney will chair the group. Group members will include Steve Whitesell, Jim Haynes, and John Bipes.

ACTION ITEM: A Working Group will be formed to address the issue of the US Service Center and the use of URLs as contact information for Consumer Information. Cliff Chamney will chair the group and Steve Whitesell, Jim Haynes and John Bipes will be its members.

8) Review Guidelines and Procedures, Draft Rev.: 2.1

Mr. Jeffries introduced Contribution ACTA-02-05-03-03, the Revised Guidelines and Procedures. He noted that in light of the agreements reached at today's meeting the document is now out of date. Mr. Jeffries suggested that the ACTA members review the document and provide him with written suggestions on improving the document, and text to address the Council's agreement to change the requirements for modification filings. Mr. Pinkham offered to provide the text to address the new requirements for filing a modification notice.

ACTION ITEM: ACTA members will review the document and provide Tim Jeffries with written suggestions for improvements. Clint Pinkham will provide text to address the new requirements for filing a modification notice.

VACANCIES

9) ACTA Report Card

Several Council Members expressed their appreciation for all in attendance and suggested that some of the participants might like to be more involved by becoming an ACTA member. Ms. Hayes listed those Council positions that are vacant, including LEC Primary and Alternate, IXC Primary and Alternate, and NEM Alternate. Ms. Hayes also announced that the balloting for LAB Alternate Representative had closed and that Sharon Hoffman from Timco Engineering had been elected to the position. Mr. Chamney wanted to know why he hadn't been made aware that there was a ballot. Ms. Hayes explained that ballots were traditionally segment specific and that it was custom to send ballots only to the segment affected. Mr. Chamney asked that in the future, the entire Council be made aware when any nominations were made.

ACTION ITEM: The ACTA Secretariat will notify all Council Members when a nomination for a vacant position is received.

John Bipes explained that because the Conference had been planned for the one-year ACTA birthday, the Council thought it would be helpful to get a report card from the industry. He invited all participants to make comments.

Trone Bishop, Verizon, commented that the streamlined order has been successful. The industry work (including SDOs and ACTA) has resulted in vast improvements in the process. For instance, Mr. Bishop explained that TIA-968 was to be identical to Part 68, but during the editing process, TR41 included several outstanding Erratas, making TIA-968 a superior document. Mr. Bishop further illuminated industry efficiency by noting that the ATIS T1E1 technical requirements for DSL equipment took less than a year, while the FCC process often took 5-10 years to make rules. Mr. Bishop commented that the on-line filing system will greatly improve turn around time for filing. Mr. Bishop wanted to also note that the Educational Conference was well-planned and offered helpful information to the industry. He congratulated the ATIS staff who worked so diligently to ensure the Conference's success.

Henry Mar, Industry Canada commented that so much has been completed in just one year. He expressed his admiration for the efficiency of ACTA and offered his congratulations on its one-year anniversary.

Jimmy Salinas commented that three of the speakers from the FCC had commented that the conversion from FCC to ACTA was a success!

John Bipes noted that the challenge faced by ACTA members is to look beyond one's own vested interest and to work for what's best for the Industry. In the past year, ACTA has focused on that challenge. He also expressed his gratitude to the Secretariat staff for their tireless work in ensuring that ACTA was a success.

Beth Wilson thanked ATIS staff and noted that the Secretariat has faced many challenges over the past year to fulfill the needs of the Council and each time has met the challenge.

10) New Business

a) Open floor discussion/questions

Steve Whitesell, Chair, TR41, introduced TIA/EIA TSB-129A (Contribution ACTA-02-05-03-04). He explained that this document will be published by TR41 and noted that the document will be a good resource booklet in the process of getting equipment approved. Mr. Whitesell further explained that the document contains the information included in the ACTA Guidelines document and, as such, TR41 will be submitting the document to ACTA with the intent to have the document replace the existing ACTA procedures. A Council Member asked what ACTA would do with this document, as it is not technical criteria, and ACTA has no mandate to adopt the document.

Several Council Members expressed their concern that they are often unaware of work ongoing at the SDOs that might affect ACTA. They suggested that the ACTA Secretariat send letters to targeted SDOs asking them to alert ACTA of work that affects it and to allow ACTA to post any relevant documents on its web site.

ACTION ITEM: The ACTA Secretariat will send a letter to targeted SDOs to suggest that they alert the ACTA of ongoing work that affects it and ask for permission to post such information to the ACTA web site.

11) Next Meetings

- a) Executive Session, May 31, 2002, 2-4 pm ET
- b) August 8th, Virtual Meeting
- c) December 10th, Face-to-Face

12) Adjournment

Mr. Salinas adjourned the meeting at 12:10 p.m.