



## **Administrative Council for Terminal Attachments (ACTA)**

Thursday, March 13, 2003

Face-to-Face Meeting

### **Draft Meeting Summary**

**Chair: Jimmy Salinas, SBC Corporation**

**9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. ET**

#### **1) Call to Order**

Jimmy Salinas, ACTA Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. ET.

#### **2) Attendance Check-in and Introductions**

Megan Hayes, ACTA Secretariat, performed a roll call of all Council Members. A quorum was reached with 10 Council Members.

<b>ACTA Members</b>	<b>ATIS Staff</b>	<b>Others</b>
Jimmy Salinas	Megan Hayes	Jim Reed, MetLabs
Chuck Bailey	Tim Jeffries	Adrienne Bush
John Bipes	Mark Cassarino	Mark Visbal, SIA
Cliff Chamney	Charles Pyott	Scott Roleson, Hewlett-Packard
Roland Gubisch		
Jim Haynes		
Clint Pinkham		
Jim Reid		
Pat von Preysing		
Billy Johnson		

#### **3) Agenda Review and Approval (ACTA-03-03-13-01)**

Jimmy Salinas introduced the agenda for the meeting (ACTA-03-03-13-01) and asked if there were any modifications. There were none. John Bipes moved to accept the agenda. Jim Haynes seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

***AGREEMENT REACHED: The Draft Agenda (ACTA-03-03-13-01) was accepted as submitted.***

**4) Introduction of Contributions, Numbering, Assignment to Agenda Number  
(Contributions will be numbered as follows ACTA-03-03-13-XX)**

Megan Hayes, ACTA Secretariat, introduced contributions and matched them with appropriate agenda items. She 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/meeting\\_records.cfm](http://www.part68.org/meeting_records.cfm). Contributions were submitted and numbered as follows:

<b>Contribution Number</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Originator</b>
ACTA-03-03-13-01	<b>Agenda</b>	Secretariat
ACTA-03-03-13-02	<b>December 10 Meeting Summary</b>	Secretariat
ACTA-03-03-13-03	<b>OP&amp;P to Draft OP&amp;P Version 1.4</b>	Secretariat
ACTA-03-03-13-04	<b>Custinstadhoc to Proposed New Alarm Dialing Equipment Instructions</b>	Cliff Chamney for ACTA ad hoc Group on Customer Instructions
ACTA-03-03-13-05	<b>FIC/SOC Code Proposals</b>	John Bipes
ACTA-03-03-13-06	<b>Secretariat Report</b>	Secretariat
ACTA-03-03-13-07	<b>Database Structure with Re-Certification Applications</b>	Mark Cassarino
ACTA-03-03-13-07A	<b>Revisions to Guidelines &amp; Procedures, Ver. 2.5</b>	Secretariat
ACTA-03-03-13-07B	<b>Database Issue with Re-Certification Applications</b>	Steve Whitesell
ACTA-03-03-13-08	FCC News Alert IATD	Secretariat

**5) Approve December 10, 2002 Meeting Summary**

Mr. Salinas introduced the Meeting Summary from the December 10, 2002 Meeting (ACTA-03-03-13-02) and asked if there were any suggested modifications or additions.

Roland Gubisch had one correction: his name was misspelled in the Meeting Summary. Chuck Bailey moved to accept the Meeting Summary from the December 10, 2003 meeting as modified. Pat von Preysing seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

***AGREEMENT REACHED: The Draft Meeting Summary (ACTA-03-03-13-02) was accepted as modified.***

**6) Election Update**

Ms. Megan Hayes reported that the nomination period for segment representatives has officially closed. Ballots will be sent out by 3/14/03. The balloting period ends on April 11, 2003. Nominations for chair are due on April 18, 2003. The list of nominees is on the ACTA web site (see [http://www.part68.org/about\\_elections.cfm](http://www.part68.org/about_elections.cfm)). It was noted that there are fewer nominees than there were in 2001, but that the economic situation for the industry is different, and people may become interested in ACTA involvement should the economic outlook improve.

Jim Haynes suggested that the ACTA review the OP&P and solidify ambiguities in the procedures regarding partial terms and elections.

***ACTION ITEM: Jim Haynes will submit a proposal to clarify ambiguities in the OP&P regarding partial terms and elections.***

## **7) Revised Draft Operating Principles & Procedures**

Ms. Hayes reported that all of the proposed changes to the OP&P (made based on recommendations by a few council members) involved changing all references to “Secretariat” to references to “administrative” support. While the nomenclature has changed, the actual nature and degree of support ATIS provides to ACTA has not been changed. In addition, all references to “Director” were changed to “Secretariat.”

It was explained that the impetus for the changes to the OP&P was the division of Tim Jeffries’ basic duties between Megan Hayes and Mark Cassarino. Ms. Hayes is responsible for all administrative duties related to the ACTA, including meeting preparation and elections. Mr. Cassarino is responsible for all technical questions and database development work. Mr. Cassarino stated that all questions should continue to be addressed to the [acta@atis.org](mailto:acta@atis.org) e-mail address, because it is evaluated and forwarded to the appropriate person. AOF filing questions can be sent to [aofquestions@atis.org](mailto:aofquestions@atis.org), and will be addressed by the appropriate staff member.

Mr. Haynes noted that review and approval of this version of the OP&P should not be delayed based upon the action item assigned him earlier. Ms. Hayes expressed that she would rather have the changes that are being proposed approved now so that the ACTA can move forward with its work. She explained that ACTA can postpone an official announcement of the modified OP&P until all changes proposed by Mr. Haynes are made. She also noted that there is no publication of the OP&P in paper, but that new versions are posted to the Web site and a Public Notice is sent regarding any changes made.

John Bipes moves to accept the revised OP&P as submitted. Roland Gubisch seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

***AGREEMENT REACHED: The revised OP&P (ACTA-03-03-13-03) was accepted as submitted.***

## **8) Reports**

### **a) Customer Instructions Ad Hoc Group (Chair: Mr. Chamney) (ACTA-03-03-13-04)**

Cliff Chamney reported that at the very first ACTA meeting, the FCC presented an issue to address alarm dialing customer instructions. ACTA forwarded the request to TR-41 for their input, and TR-41 updated all customer instructions from the FCC application guide before submitting them to ACTA for its adoption.

The following text is taken from the Abstract of the contribution.

“A question was raised to the ACTA secretariat about the ACTA Customer Information Requirements by a responsible party (RP) who was concerned about the instructions in the Alarm Dialing Equipment section, at the end of the document. This RP was concerned that the wording might work to prevent

connection of its alarm dialing equipment to the network. The ad hoc group proposes that ACTA remove the existing Alarm Dialing Equipment instructions and replace them with the language in Annex A. Also, the group proposes the new and old instructions effectiveness' overlap for long enough for RPs to manage their inventories. The original instructions would sunset. In addition, the group proposes that the new instructions and some unresolved issues be offered to the most appropriate SDO for further improvement, should the SDO desire to take such action. A document describing unresolved issues has not been prepared, and the ad hoc group chair offers to take the action item to do that.”

It was asked if the proposal is actually going to diminish the original effort – if the reason for including the alarm dialing instructions is that there had been questions from the alarm dialing industry about physical harm coming to people when they could not get through. It was responded that, yes, it does in a sense, but this is because ACTA went beyond its mandate in the original effort. Roland Gubisch stated that the text of the suggested wording successfully addresses the seriousness of the issue, but does not go beyond the authority of ACTA with respect to the instruction.

Jimmy Salinas noted that due to the fact that there was a lot concern with the issue, the security industry has begun to play the role of an SDO.

It was noted that although the document discusses 3 different types of *equipment*, it really pertains to 3 different types of *installation*. The original customer instructions for alarm dialing equipment were intended only as a stopgap measure. Many issues are not completely understood by ACTA. Issues regarding alarm dialing equipment instructions should be collected and referred to the most appropriate SDO(s). ACTA does not have the expertise to deal with it in the most comprehensive manner.

It was noted that the line seizure capability definition should definitely be changed. Mr. Salinas reported that he had a discussion with the manufacturer around which phrase was used. Mr. Gubisch noted that line pre-emption might be a clearer term. He would support the proposed text, except the text describing line pre-emption. It is important to ensure that there is an 18-month sunset period for the changes.

Mark Visbal, Security Industry Association (SIA) stated that the purpose of the jack is that in case the equipment fails, one can still make a phone call. He would appreciate it if the Secretariat would send him the changes, when they are available. Mr. Salinas stated that ACTA would gladly accept modifications to the document in the form of a contribution from SIA.

Roland Gubisch moved to adopt the contribution, as modified. Cliff Chamney seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

***AGREEMENT REACHED: The changes to the Customer Instructions as presented in the Ad Hoc Group report were accepted as modified (the term “line seizure” shall be replaced by “line pre-emption”).***

**b) Secretariat Report Including Action Items from December 10, 2002 Meeting (ACTA-03-03-13-05)**

Ms. Hayes reported that she had put together (at the request of some ACTA members) an update of significant items to be reviewed. She reported that all the Action Items from the September meeting have been completed.

**Online Filing and TTE Submissions:**

Mr. Cassarino explained that most people are submitting filings via ACTA Online Filing (AOF). The majority of TCBs are using AOF, and only a handful are still submitting their filings manually. The online filing process has been going very well. Currently, the main focus of the Secretariat regarding TTE submissions revolves around the auditing of new AOF submissions to ensure that the integrity of the database remains perfectly intact. Current records submitted to ACTA via the AOF are subject to a 30-day administrative audit by ACTA, or its Secretariat. The submitting party is responsible for correcting any errors identified within 15 days of notification of the error(s).

**TTE Submission Update:**

Mr. Cassarino reported that a working version of the AOF was in effect on October 8, 2002. On January 8, 2003, the Secretariat released public notice PN03-02 notifying interested parties of the release of the AOF. By February 27, 2003, 257 TTE filings had been entered. Of those, 97 were done by Responsible Parties and TCBs using the AOF.

When asked what the review/audit process consisted of, Mr. Cassarino reported that ACTA staff routinely reviews most submissions for inconsistencies. When asked if every line in an AOF has to have an entry, Mr. Cassarino responded that, yes, all form areas that contain information automatically display "N/A," so the user is forced to go in and enter information.

It was asked if all RENs could be displayed for the user to choose from, to which it was responded that it is possible, but the resulting dropdown list would be prohibitively long. It was asked if there is any way to monitor usage of the database to find out the details of which data fields are being searched. It was responded that while users can search by several fields (company name, responsible party code, etc.), it is not possible to track specific fields that a given user is looking at. It is possible, however, to examine how many search iterations a user is performing. Mr. Cassarino noted that it is necessary to track who is and who is not displaying their SDOC on their own web site.

When asked if there are there fields where the user can identify one of 50 dropdown states/country of origin, Mr. Cassarino responded that, yes, for some fields the user can do that (signal code is also a dropdown).

There was a discussion of Agent for Service versus the previous field of U.S. Service Center. A Council Member was concerned that the previous U.S. Service Center contact may not be capable of responding to the types of inquiries that would be addressed to the Agent for Service that is currently required for TTE submissions. Mr. Cassarino responded that the Agent for Service field is very generic right now. If there is a problem of any kind, the Agent of Service is the first person one should contact. A Council Member suggested that the word

“technical” be added in front of the word “Service” for the purpose of clarifying the database field. Mr. Cassarino reported that the change would not be complicated.

A Council Member noted that the “Agent for Service” field was mandated by the FCC and that ACTA would be overstepping its responsibilities if it changed the name of the field. A Council Member suggested that in lieu of changing the field name, that some descriptive text be added to clarify the definition of “Agent for Service.” It was also noted that ACTA needs to ensure that clarifying information includes an explanation of “US Service Center” and documents the date at which the change to “Agent for Service” was made.

John Bipes suggested that Secretariat should collaborate to come up with a written proposal to amend the “Agent for Service” field so that it is more descriptive.

***ACTION ITEM: The Secretariat should collaborate to come up with a written proposal to amend the “Agent for Service” field so that it is more descriptive.***

#### **ACTA Educational/Awareness Initiatives:**

Several trade magazines have published articles on the ACTA.

*Conformity Magazine Annual Guide 2003*, included two items in “The Year in Review” (“ACTA Seeks FCC Enforcement Assistance” and “ACTA Announces Tough Filing Requirements, Surcharges”). In addition, an article by John Bipes entitled “ACTA Takes Charge,” details the history of Part 68 and ACTA, and how ACTA’s role affects the industry.

#### **ACTA 2003 Elections:**

The two-year term for current ACTA Council Members is set to expire on May 2, 2003. Per the Operating Principles & Procedures (OP&P), the ACTA Secretariat is preparing to conduct elections for the next ACTA term, which will be effective May 2, 2003-May 1, 2005.

### **9) Contributions:**

#### **a) FIC/SOC Codes (ACTA-03-03-13-05)**

John Bipes presented his contribution. He stated that the contribution is being offered as something to facilitate further discussion amongst ACTA members. It was stated that one participant supports the proposal to use FIC fields 15 and 17, since all orders that are processed are based on FIC and SOC codes.

It was noted that ACTA could make it so that the user has pages of FIC and SOC codes listed in a dropdown menu. Discussion ensued as to the necessity of including FIC and SOC code information in the ACTA database. It was stated that nobody seems to use the FIC information in ACTA database. It was proposed that ACTA probably does not need to keep this type of information, especially since ACTA is obviously not called upon to be the principal source of this type of information.

John Bipes made a motion to follow the instructions of item two of the contribution 05 and seek input from the SDOs on behalf of ACTA. Jim Haynes seconded the motion.

It was noted that one participant would like to see the contribution amended, in order to get some response out of people who have been unresponsive in the past. The contribution should mention that one of the options is to *eliminate* (or add) items from the database. It was responded that it is not necessary to provide any specific suggestions or recommendations to follow. Jim Haynes seconded the motion. It passed with one nay vote (Mr. Chamney).

***AGREEMENT REACHED: The following resolution text was agreed upon.***

**“ACTA solicits input from all interested SDOs regarding the usefulness and possible overhaul of the FIC/SOC codes in the ACTA database. ACTA will seek recommendations on the continued use of “Equipment Codes” and/or replacement of Equipment Codes with FIC/SOC codes in the ACTA database. SDOs should provide input and recommendations via letter to the ACTA Secretariat. Letters received before June 11, 2003 will be considered by ACTA at their June 11th meeting. ”**

**b) Database Structure with Re-Certification Applications (ACTA-03-03-13-07)**

Mark Cassarino presented his contribution.

Discussion of the issue ensued. Mr. Cassarino noted that while Steve Whitesell made a suggestion of changing the database to follow FCC historical perspective of what a recertification is that proposal would entail a significant amount of work on the part of the ACTA Secretariat.

It was noted that calling the process by the name “re-approval” may be awkward, since it is really a new original filing. Tim Jeffries noted that there are actually some major administrative advantages to classifying it as a re-approval. There was concern from ACTA members regarding the probability of receiving a letter on the letterhead of the original responsible party when that original company no longer exists. It was noted that the major concern is ensuring that the new company accepts the responsibility that for the product. Therefore, the letter should come from the new responsible party.

Jimmy Salinas noted that it should be necessary to have the letter originate from both old and new parties. Pat von Preysing agreed that it would be best to have something in writing from both responsible parties. Jimmy Salinas suggested that ACTA request an interpretation from ATIS Legal. Clint Pinkham agreed that a legal perspective would be appropriate, but noted that the ACTA needs to move forward on this issue.

Clint Pinkham moved to accept the changes to the Guidelines and Procedures as suggested by the ACTA Database Manager. Billy Johnson seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

***AGREEMENT REACHED: The proposed changes to the ACTA Guidelines & Procedures for submittal of information to ACTA for inclusion in the database of approved Telephone Terminal Equipment (“TTE”) were accepted as submitted.***

**10) New Business**

**11)**

Tim Jeffries stated that he wants to present Contribution 8 to the group for general informational purposes: Peyton Wynns was stepping down as Chief of FCC/IATD and that Alan Feldman was named as Acting Chief.

**12) Next Meeting: June 11, 2003**

It was noted that the next meeting would be held on June 11<sup>th</sup> (virtual meeting). Megan Hayes stated that the fact that the meeting is a virtual meeting will make the balloting (secret ballot) for the chair more difficult. She suggested that an email ballot would be more appropriate for the purposes of the ACTA. Nominees for Interest Segment Representatives are currently listed on the ACTA web site: [http://www.part68.org/about\\_nominees.cfm](http://www.part68.org/about_nominees.cfm). Chair nominee information will be posted when the nomination period for chair is closed on April 18, 2003.

**13) Adjournment**

Mr. Salinas adjourned the meeting at 2:30pm ET.