



## Administrative Council for Terminal Attachments (ACTA)

December 6, 2001

Virtual meeting

### Draft Agenda

Chair: Jimmy Salinas, SBC Corporation

2:00pm-4:30pm

- 1) Call to Order  
Jimmy Salinas, ACTA Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:09pm.
- 2) Attendance Check-in and Introductions  
Megan Hayes performed a roll call of Council Members. There were 10 Council Members and 1 Alternate on the call. Quorum was reached.
- 3) Agenda Review and Approval  
Mr. Salinas introduced contribution ACTA-01-12-06-01, the agenda for this meeting. He asked if there were any additions or modifications. There were none.

***AGREEMENT REACHED: The agenda was approved as submitted.***

- 4) Introduction of Contributions, Numbering, Assignment to Agenda Number (Contributions will be numbered as follows: ACTA-01-12-06-XX)  
Tim Jeffries introduced the 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:

Number	Contribution
ACTA-01-12-06-01	Agenda
ACTA-01-12-06-02	October 3, 2001 Meeting Summary
ACTA-01-12-06-03	TTE Submission Form edited by Cliff Chamney
ACTA-01-12-06-04	TR41 Letter regarding US Service Center Database Field
ACTA-01-12-06-05	TR41 Letter regarding User Instructions
ACTA-01-12-06-06	Adjustments to ACTA Fees
ACTA-01-12-06-07	TRQ.6 Certification Letter
ACTA-01-12-06-08	T1.TRQ.6-2001
ACTA-01-12-06-09	Change in Filing Procedures on Behalf of Responsible Parties

Anh Nguyen noted that there was no label on the top right corner as was suggested with the contribution template. Mr. Jeffries noted that he will try to ensure the use of the contribution template for future contributions.

***ACTION ITEM: Tim Jeffries, ACTA Director, will communicate the need to use the ACTA contribution template when submitting contributions.***

- 5) Approve October 3rd Meeting Summary

Mr. Salinas introduced Contribution ACTA-01-12-06-02, the October 3, 2001 Meeting Summary, and asked for any modifications. None were submitted. John Bipes moved to accept the summary as submitted. Clint Pinkham seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***AGREEMENT REACHED: The Meeting Summary from October 3, 2001 (Contribution ACTA-01-12-06-02) was accepted as submitted.***

6) Proposed Technical Criteria for adoption

Tim Jeffries introduced Contribution ACTA-01-12-06-07, the Certification Letter from Committee T1, and contribution ACTA-01-12-06-08, the proposed technical criteria from Committee T1E1 for SDSL. Mr. Jeffries recommended the acceptance of the proposed criteria for a 30-day notice.

Steve Whitesell asked for clarification on the Council's procedures for accepting technical criteria for a 30-day notice. Rather than waiting for a regularly scheduled Council meeting to get approval for releasing the criteria for the 30 day notice, whereby potentially delaying the release of the criteria for months, he suggested that the Secretariat inform all Council Members via email when technical criteria is received for a 5 business day review period before posting the document. Barring any administrative discrepancies found by the Council, the 30-day review process would then commence. A Council Member noted that five days seems excessive for completing that type of business. A participant suggested that it would be acceptable for the Council to create a check-list for the ACTA Director to use to ascertain whether the SDO had been certified. The participant noted that such a process would speed-up the acceptance process and, if desired by some Council members, the ability to comment on the criteria using the 30-day public review period.

Roland Gubisch moved that the thirty-day public review period begin upon ACTA's receipt of technical criteria from an SDO. If there are no appeals, then ACTA should publish the criteria. Steve Whitesell seconded the motion. A Council member commented that he does not believe ACTA should take any action to adopt criteria without first taking a vote. Further, the posting of the document for public review would be ill-advised before ACTA members have the opportunity to review the document/letter to ensure that the SDO makes the proper certifications. A Council member noted that he wanted to assure that if a submission comes in administratively incomplete, it should be sent back for resubmission before the 30-day public review. Mr. Gubisch's motion passed with 2 nays, and 1 abstention.

***AGREEMENT REACHED: Upon receipt of technical criteria from an SDO, the ACTA Director shall review the submittal letter to ensure that the required certifications (Appendix A, Operating Principles & Procedures) have been provided. Subsequent to the review of the letter, the thirty-day public review process shall commence. The ACTA membership shall intervene at the end of that thirty-day period, if necessary. Council Members will utilize the same thirty-day review period as the public to make comments. If there are no objections to the criteria as submitted, ACTA shall vote to adopt the document.***

***ACTION ITEM: ATIS Legal will provide ACTA with an interpretation of the R&O in regards to the Council's role after the thirty-day period.***

7) Part 68 Filing Report

a) Terminal Equipment Filings

Mr. Jeffries noted that web-based filing capabilities would not be available until late February (2002). He further noted that there is a decline in filing from last year. Mr. Jeffries reiterated to the attendees that all TTE information must be submitted to the database administrator.

b) Filing Fee Increase & SDoC Posting Fee

Mr. Jeffries introduced Contribution ACTA-01-12-06-06, which outlined the adjustments to ACTA's fees. He noted that the Council Members approved the adjustments during the November 29, 2001 executive session. As outlined, effective January 1, 2002 the new fee for all submissions is \$300.00. In addition, a \$300.00 fee for posting an SDoC to the ACTA Web Site will be implemented, which is also effective January 1, 2002. Mr. Jeffries stated that a public notice would be issued to notify the public of the adjustments. Several Council members noted that they had already received complaints from TCBs on the adjustment.

***ACTION ITEM: The ACTA Director will issue a public notice regarding fee increases.***

c) Other

8) ACTA Submission Form/Revised G&P (ACTA-01-12-06-03, 09)

Mr. Jeffries introduced Contribution ACTA-01-12-06-03, which is from Mr. Chamney and includes changes in the submission form that would impact the guidelines and procedures document. Mr. Chamney asked that this be postponed until the next meeting. He also noted that changes to the US Service center nomenclature are folded into this document.

Milton Bush, The M Company, introduced Contribution ACTA-01-12-06-09, which is a request that ACTA amend its requirements for (non-TCB) testing labs to submit an accreditation certificate instead of testing procedures. Mr. Bush explained that a client feels that the filing of the certificate meets the requirements of the R&O and would streamline the filing process. John Bipes moved that dually accredited telecommunications certification bodies should be allowed to submit a letter of certification. Those taking the SDoC path, however, must have their lab procedures on file with the Council. Mr. Bipes also commented that SDoC submitters should be required to submit actual test results for each filing. Roland Gubisch seconded the motion. A Council member expressed concerns to the part of the motion that test data be included with ACTA filings. Mr. Jeffries clarified ACTA's current requirement that, barring any significant changes to the testing procedures (i.e., test plan) on file, they only needed to be submitted to ACTA one time. Mr. Bush noted that he was satisfied with the discussion and that there was no need for the motion. Based on the discussion, Mr. Bipes also withdrew his motion.

9) Work Items

a) TR41 Update

i) User's Instructions (ACTA-01-12-06-05)

Mr. Whitesell noted that at a previous meeting, ACTA asked TIA-TR41.11 to make recommendations on User Instructions. He introduced Contribution ACTA-01-12-06-05, which is a response to this request. Mr. Whitesell noted that Dan Bart made some editorial changes to the initial document and sent it out to all the Council Members via email. Mr. Jeffries also requested additional time to review the proposed language. John Bipes moved to table the item until an interim meeting on January 10, 2002. The motion passed unanimously.

***AGREEMENT: Action on Contribution ACTA-01-12-06-05 will be tabled until an interim meeting on January 10, 2002.***

***ACTION ITEM: The ACTA Secretariat will post Dan Bart's modifications to Contribution ACTA-01-12-06-05 for review by ACTA Members. ACTA members will review the document and make modifications as needed and submit such modifications as contributions to the January 10, 2002 interim meeting.***

***AGREEMENT: There will be an interim virtual meeting on January 10, 2002 to discuss any suggested modifications to Contribution ACTA-01-12-06-05 and to make recommendations***

*as to how to move forward with the document (e.g., adopt document, send back to TR41.11 for further work, etc.)*

***ACTION ITEM: The ACTA Secretariat will send out instructions for January 10, 2002 Virtual Meeting.***

ii) Clarification on U.S. Service Center (ACTA-01-12-06-04)

Mr. Steve Whitesell introduced Contribution ACTA-01-12-06-04, a proposal to change “US Service Center” to “Agent for Service.” Mr. Whitesell noted that ACTA, in response to the committee’s initial request to delete the item, asked TR41.11 to review the use and definition of the US Service Center field in the database and suggest an alternative term. He explained that TR41.11 had decided that the field name should be changed to “Agent for Service.” Mr. Whitesell explained that the reason for keeping the point of contact in the database was to meet the R&O’s requirement that consumers have a contact for service. Roland Gubisch moved to accept the proposal as submitted. Anh Nguyen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***AGREEMENT REACHED: The US Service Center field in the ACTA database will be changed to Agent for Service.***

iii) RJ-31 update/disposition

Information on RJ-31 jacks is contained in Contribution ACTA-01-12-06-05, and will be discussed during the interim Virtual Meeting on January 10, 2002.

10) ACTA Training Seminar

Tim Jeffries noted that the Council had discussed holding an ACTA educational seminar at several previous meetings, and that it had discussed some specifics during an executive session. He noted that the seminar was tentatively scheduled for May 1-3, 2002 in Crystal City, VA. Mr. Whitesell noted that he had contacted Greg Slingerland to ascertain whether he would be interested in Co-Chairing the seminar with Jimmy Salinas. Mr. Slingerland agreed and requested that the Chair write a letter to his management explaining the responsibilities. Mr. Salinas agreed to write the letter.

A Council Member expressed his enthusiasm for the seminar and noted its importance to the industry. He explained that there would need to be extensive strategizing and coordinating to ensure that all of the stakeholders participate.

11) Next Meeting

- a) January 10, 2002 – Virtual Meeting
- b) February 28, 2002 – Virtual Meeting
- c) May 3, 2002 – Face-to-Face Meeting

12) Adjournment

Jimmy Salinas adjourned the meeting at 4:25pm ET.