

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL FOR TERMINAL ATTACHMENTS (ACTA)

MEETING DATE: 13th March, '03

TITLE: FIC/SOC Code Proposal(s)

SOURCE*: John Bipes, ACTA OIP-Primary

PURPOSE: Discussion and Decision

DISTRIBUTION TO: The ACTA – Agenda Item for 13th March, '03

ABSTRACT

On 28th Jan., '03, I raised a vigorous electronic discussion amongst the ACTA members on the subject "FIC/SOC Codes", sent to <acta-isreps@lists.atis.org>.

Having participated in this discussion and having learned much both of the import of FIC/SOC Codes, attitudes towards their use and disuse, and many of the reasons for confusion throughout the industry on them, now I propose action in the ACTA predicated upon that discussion.

NOTICE

This is a draft document and thus, is dynamic in nature. It does not reflect a consensus of ACTA and it may be changed or modified. ACTA makes no representation or warranty, express or implied, with respect to the sufficiency, accuracy or utility of the information or opinion contained or reflected in the material utilized ACTA further expressly advises that any use of or reliance upon the material in question is at your risk ACTA shall be liable for no damage or injury, of whatever nature, incurred by any person arising out of any utilization of the material. It is possible that this material will at some future date be included in a copyrighted work by ACTA.

* CONTACT:

From the 28th Jan., '03, e-mail to acta-isreps@lists.atis.org:

Dear fellow ACTA Members - particularly Network people,

A comment and four questions:

Working today with a client who has terminal equipment nationwide, I find them struggling to cooperate with but not able to understand the interest ACTA/FCC has in FIC/SOC Codes. After doing my best to explain the reason for the codes - and their importance - they come back to me with, "But the telephone company only wants to know 'RJ-11', 'RJ-45', etc. Even the phone company can't provide us with FIC/SOC numbers, and we've been using their facilities for years!"

- 1) While this seems to be a very descriptive 'language', who 'speaks it' and where?
- 2) Is there a 'language school' for people like my client...?
- 3) Or, is it a language which, in the telecom world, is going the same route of the Latin mass in the church?
- 4) Should this - in some way - become an action item for we on the ACTA, perhaps to encourage in understanding or drop reference to it? (Ref. Administrative Council for Terminal Attachments [ACTA] Customer Information, Revision: March 2002, p.4.)

Thanks for your consideration,

John Bipes, ACTA OIP-Primary

Having been a participant in the electronic discussions, learned much about FIC/SOC Codes in at least partial answers to my questions, and becoming acquainted – at least partially – with a host of arguments on the issue, I propose the following:

That the ACTA encourage understanding and use of the FIC/SOC Codes through,

- 1). The mandated use of FIC/SOC Code information in fields 15 and 17 of **TELEPHONE TERMINAL EQUIPMENT (TTE) SUBMISSION FORM Ver. 1.05** in submissions to the ACTA after a sufficient time of notice to the industry and a specific date. Thereafter the ACTA would not accept filings without clearly FIC/SOC info. (matching/taken directly from those listed in the ACTA's **Customer Information, Revision: March 2002**, p.4.) in these fields;
- 2.) Requests to SDOs (ex. TR41.9 and TR41.11) for an industry discussion on the FIC/SOC usefulness and a possible overhaul and recommendation to the ACTA on the continued use of the "Equipment Codes" (Ref., Annex A of TIA's TSB168 – Labeling Requirements) and/or replacement of Equipment Codes with FIC/SOC Coding.

