



Administrative Council for Terminal Attachments (ACTA)

December 10, 2002

Virtual Meeting

Draft Meeting Summary

Chair: Jimmy Salinas, SBC Corporation

2:00pm-5:00pm

1) Call to Order

Jimmy Salinas, ACTA Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:10pm ET.

2) Attendance Check-in and Introductions

Megan Hayes, ACTA Secretariat, performed a roll call and announced that quorum was reached with 10 Primary Representatives and 2 Alternate Representatives in attendance. All other participants took the opportunity to introduce themselves.

3) Agenda Review and Approval

Mr. Salinas reviewed the Draft Agenda (Contribution ACTA-02-12-10-01) and asked for any suggested modifications. There were none. Clint Pinkham moved to accept the agenda as submitted. A second to the motion was received. The motion passed unanimously.

AGREEMENT REACHED: The Draft Agenda (Contribution ACTA-01-12-10-01) was accepted as submitted.

4) Introduction of Contributions, Numbering, Assignment to Agenda Number (Contributions will be numbered as follows: ACTA-02-12-10-XX)

Jimmy Salinas, ACTA Chair, 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-02-12-10-01	Draft Agenda
ACTA-02-12-10-02	Draft Meeting Summary from August 8, 2002
ACTA-02-12-10-03	Test Procedure Filing Requirements for RPs using SDoC
ACTA-02-12-10-04	TEM Concerns about PN02-04
ACTA-02-12-10-05	ACTA Secretariat Report
ACTA-02-12-10-06	Technical Criteria Submission – TIA-968-A

5) Approve August 8, 2002 Meeting Summary

Mr. Salinas introduced Contribution ACTA-02-12-10-02, the Meeting Summary from the August 8, 2002 ACTA Meeting and asked if there were any suggested modifications. There were none. Roland Gubisch moved to accept the Meeting Summary as submitted. Clint Pinkham seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

AGREEMENT REACHED: The Meeting Summary from the August 8, 2002 ACTA Meeting (Contribution ACTA-02-12-10-02) was accepted as submitted.

6) Report(s):

a) Consumer Information Ad-Hoc Group (Chair: Mr. Chamney)

Cliff Chamney reported that the Consumer Information ad hoc group is continuing its discussions regarding information for end-users of alarm dialing equipment and that another revision of the text is under development. The revised text should be available shortly for Council review.

b) ACTA Ad-Hoc Group on submittal of non-technical criteria (Chair: Mr. Gubisch)

Roland Gubisch reported that the ad hoc group on submittal of non-technical criteria met via conference call and developed a number of proposals that were sent to the Secretariat. Mr. Gubisch noted that each of the proposals requires changes to the OP&P, and that the full ACTA should endorse the thrust of the proposals before draft modifications are made to the OP&P. The proposed modifications indicate that ACTA has the authority to define and establish informational documents.

The ad hoc group decided to use the lexicon of “informational documents” to ensure that such documents were not confused with standards or technical criteria. In addition, the group thought it appropriate to limit the submitters of such documents to SDOs. Part of the group’s proposal is the establishment of a process for accepting such documents, including a 30-day public review period. In addition, the group defined some parameters for SDOs submitting informational documents. Namely: (1) informational documents should relate to terminal equipment; (2) the purpose and intent of the documents should fall within the mission, scope and responsibilities of ACTA; (3) the documents should not conflict with existing Part 68 rules or ACTA technical criteria; and, (4) documents should be informational or informative in nature and should not include technical requirements or the terms “shall” or “must” so they are not confused with technical criteria.

c) Review of comments on TSB-129-A (Mr. Whitesell)

Mr. Whitesell reported that, although the Council had taken an action item to send comments on TSB-129 to him after their last meeting, he had received very few comments. He asked if Council Members would be interested in participating in a joint conference call between TR41.11 and ACTA to discuss the document. Roland Gubisch, Trone Bishop, John Bipes, Chuck Bailey and Cliff Chamney expressed their interest.

Trone Bishop noted that before ACTA could submit any constructive comments on the document, ACTA should first decide what the procedure should be for establishing informational documents. Also, the ad hoc group on submittal of non-technical criteria found that the TSB-129-A did not meet the criteria set forth by the ad hoc group; such as the fact that it conflicts with ACTA procedures in some cases. Mr. Bishop suggested that ACTA obtain consensus on the suggested modifications to the OP&P before a joint conference call so that TR41.11 could move forward with TSB-129-A. Mr. Salinas suggested that the Council wait for Roland Gubisch to make the changes to the OP&P and have an email vote on the revised document.

ACTION ITEM: Mr. Gubisch will develop a contribution for the suggested changes to the OP&P that are necessitated by the ad hoc group’s proposals regarding informational documents. Once the contribution is completed, ACTA will have an email ballot on proposed changes.

d) Secretariat Report incl./Action Items from August 8th meeting (ACTA-02-12-10-05)

Tim Jeffries introduced Contribution ACTA-02-12-10-05, the Secretariat Report and indicated that the contribution is, in part, a response to the action items from the last ACTA meeting.

Mark Cassarino, the ACTA Database Manager, explained that he has been migrating TCBs over to AOF and the majority of the TCBs have been using AOF since November 15, 2002. He noted that TCBs have made approximately 50 submissions. Also, some changes have been made to the system based on TCB suggestions. Once TCBs are on-line, responsible parties representing the majority of the SDoCs filed with ACTA will be given access to the AOF. The general public will be given access once the major submitters are on-line.

Mr. Jeffries reported that overall submissions for this year (2002) are down 17% from last year. During the second half of 2002, however, submissions have increased 22% compared to the second half of last year. Part of the increase has to do, in part, with ongoing ACTA education and awareness activities. Several trade magazines have been covering ACTA within the past few months, leading to a wider awareness of the Council's role in the industry. For instance, Conformity Magazine has had ACTA in every edition for the past 3 or 4 editions. Mr. Bipes wrote a feature story for Conformity Magazine's November issue. And Compliance Engineering provided an ACTA update in their December issue. Mr. Jeffries also indicated that Mr. Cassarino attended a TCB Council meeting to present AOF and to answer questions. After the meeting, the TCB Council requested a formal liaison with ACTA. Mr. Gubisch has agreed to work as the formal liaison to the TCB Council.

Mr. Jeffries also reported that the Secretariat has received two technical inquiries regarding: (1) the status of technical criteria for VDSL equipment, and (2) IP terminals. Mr. Jeffries reported that several entities had emailed or called the Secretariat to inquire as to whether ACTA had technical criteria for VDSL equipment and, if not, when such criteria could be expected. In addition, there have been several requests for information regarding IP equipment. Mr. Jeffries sent the inquiries regarding IP equipment to the Council via email. Mr. Whitesell reported that, in response to Mr. Jeffries' request, he sent out information to the Council outlining work ongoing in TIA regarding IP equipment. Mr. Whitesell requested that Council Members reflect on the email discussion because there is an issue regarding gateway terminals and how the industry should implement technical criteria.

There was a discussion of the need for a more formal process whereby the appropriate standards body could get notified of inquiries pertaining to future or on-going standards development. It was suggested that the Secretariat copy the chairs of T1E1 and TR41 standards bodies on responses to such email requests. Mr. Jeffries commented that should ACTA send or forward these types of emails, they should be sent to all SDOs potentially impacted and not a select few. It was suggested that Mr. Jeffries attempt to contact the appropriate SDO in all cases, but if the SDO is not identified, then Mr. Jeffries should contact T1E1 and TR41.

ACTION ITEM: The Secretariat will copy the appropriate SDO on inquiries regarding future or on-going technical criteria. If contact information for the appropriate SDO is not available, or, if the Secretariat is unsure of the appropriate SDO, the chairs of T1E1 and TR41 should be contacted.

7) Contributions:

a) Test Procedure Filing requirement for RPs using SDoC (ACTA-02-12-10-03)

Mr. Pinkham explained that this contribution was developed based upon a discussion at TR41, whereby a manufacturer that filed using the SDoC process complained that he had to submit all test procedures to ACTA, regardless of their propriety or intellectual property. Several ACTA members assured him that ACTA had no intent of spreading the intellectual property and that test information would be kept confidential unless the FCC asks for it. Mr. Pinkham noted that after review of the Part 68 rules, he determined that any information that ACTA collects shall be made available to the public. This puts ACTA in an awkward position, where they are

keeping the information from the public in violation of Part 68 or making it public and violating the privacy and IP rights of the entity submitting the test procedures. The simple solution is not to bother collecting the test procedures. Mr. Pinkham proposed that the requirement be eliminated (that those filing via the SDoC method not be required to submit test procedures to ACTA). A Council Member commented that the existing requirement ensured a certain level of integrity of the information sent to ACTA. Further, even though ACTA doesn't take out the test procedures and review them, it has the effect of granting a degree of greater credibility in the interest of ACTA, the industry and the public. Several Council Members asked whether ACTA should request that the FCC clarify the privacy issue based upon the rule. Clint Pinkham noted that ACTA has no business collecting this information, and it has no need for it.

To make the changes that Mr. Pinkham suggested, the *Guidelines and Procedures for Submittal of Information to ACTA* would need to be changed. Clint Pinkham moved that ACTA remove Section 5.3, Item 6 from the requirements for SDoC filings in the *Guidelines and Procedures for Submittal of Information to ACTA*. Pat Von Preysing seconded the motion. Mr. Bailey asked to amend the motion to have it voted via email ballot. Mr. Pinkham declined to amend the motion. The motion passed with 4 yeas, 2 nays and 4 abstentions. (Yeas: Pat von Preysing, Clint Pinkham, Steve Whitesell and Beth Wilson, Nays: John Bipes and Roland Gubisch, Abstains: Chuck Bailey, Cliff Chamney, Trone Bishop and Jim Haynes)

AGREEMENT REACHED: ACTA will remove Section 5.3, Item 6 from the requirements for SDoC filings in the Guidelines and Procedures for Submittal of Information to ACTA.

b) TEM Concerns about PN02-04 (ACTA-02-12-10-04)

Steve Whitesell reported that after the Public Notice (PN) regarding the timeliness of filing was issued, members of the Terminal Equipment Manufacturing (TEM) segment expressed concerns about its wording. Contribution ACTA-02-12-10-04 is being submitted in response to those concerns. Many of the TEM members felt as though ACTA had overstepped its bounds by creating new filing requirements with authority that it does not have. Mr. Whitesell noted that the PN was released based upon agreement reached during the July 12, 2002 Executive Session, and that all ACTA Members had a chance to review the PN before it was released to the public. The Contribution requests that the PN-02-04 be rescinded and replaced with the text in Contribution ACTA-02-12-10-03 that better summarizes the discussion during the executive meeting.

Steve Whitesell moved that ACTA replace PN02-04 with the text provided in Appendix A of Contribution ACTA-02-12-10-03. Also, ACTA shall follow its procedures for issuing a PN and send an email to its mailing list indicating that PN02-04A is replacing PN02-04. Beth Wilson seconded the motion. The motion passed with 6 yeas, 2 nays and 1 abstention (Yeas: Steve Whitesell, Beth Wilson, Clint Pinkham, Jim Haynes, Pat von Preysing, Roland Gubisch; Nays: Cliff Chamney, Chuck Bailey; Abstain: Trone Bishop).

AGREEMENT REACHED/ACTION ITEM: ACTA will replace PN02-04 with the text provided in Appendix A of Contribution ACTA-02-12-10-03. ACTA shall follow its procedures for issuing a PN and send an email to its mailing list indicating that PN02-04A is replacing PN02-04.

c) Notice of Technical Criteria, ANSI/TIA-968-A (ACTA-02-12-10-06)

Mr. Jeffries reported that ACTA received technical criteria from TIA that was placed on public notice on November 7, 2002 for the 30-day public comment period, which closed on December 6,

2002. There has been one opposition to the adoption of the criteria in addition to a request for deferral from the TIA, the SDO that authored the criteria.

Bobbie Breden, TIA, reported that in discussions with Mr. Jeffries and others, it had been brought to ACTA and TR41's attention that the FCC had customarily included a transition period with its technical changes. The technical criteria in question, 968-A, replaces both 968 and 883 and makes technical changes that relax some requirements but also imposes other more stringent requirements. As such, a transitional period to the new criteria may be necessary. Mr. Whitesell, TR41 Chair, reported that TR41 overlooked the transitional period by accident. There were several conversations about how this should be handled and whether this is an administrative issue that is ACTA's prerogative to set, or whether the submitting SDO should set the transition period. Mr. Whitesell proposed that one solution would be to have TR41.9 make a recommendation to ACTA on the transition period and have ACTA accept it. Mr. Whitesell noted that a TR41.9 committee conference call is scheduled for 2pm ET on Monday, December 16, 2002 to resolve the issue. Dial-in information is available on the TIA web site (<http://www.tiaonline.org>). Mr. Whitesell requested that Mr. Jeffries have information regarding the conference call placed on the ACTA web site.

ACTION ITEM: The ACTA Secretariat will post the TR41.11 conference call dial-in information to the ACTA Web site.

There is little in the OP&P regarding how ACTA should deal with technical criteria when an objection occurs. An ad hoc group has been put together to review the guidelines for the submission of technical criteria. The ad hoc group will consist of Trone Bishop, Jim Haynes, Steve Whitesell, and Cliff Chamney. Jimmy Salinas will serve as the chair.

d) Others:

- i) None

8) New Business

a) Open floor discussion/questions

There was a short discussion on the end of the two year term for those Council Members who were elected during the spring of 2001, when the Council was first convened. Mr. Jeffries explained that the Secretariat would work on the issue and information on elections is forthcoming.

9) Proposed General Meeting Schedule for 2003:

- a) March 11, 2003 (Face-to-face)
- b) June 11, 2003 (Virtual Meeting)
- c) September 11, 2003 (Face-to-face) (Please note that this date may have to be changed for the sake of sensitivity.)
- d) December 11, 2003 (Virtual Meeting)

10) Proposed Executive Session Meeting Schedule for 2003 (Virtual Meetings):

- a) February 13, 2003
- b) August 7, 2003
- c) December 4, 2003

11) Adjournment

Mr. Salinas adjourned the meeting at 4:50pm ET.