



Administrative Council for Terminal Attachments (ACTA)

March 25, 2002

Interim Virtual Meeting

Draft Meeting Summary

Chair: Jimmy Salinas, SBC Corporation

2:00pm-4:30pm

1) Call to Order

Jimmy Salinas, ACTA Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:20pm.

2) Attendance Check-in and Introductions

Megan Hayes, ACTA Secretariat, performed a role call of all Council Members. There were 8 Council members and one Alternate in attendance. Quorum was reached. Tim Jeffries, ACTA Director, noted that there have been some changes in membership. He noted that Maurice Levitt has resigned from the Council. He welcomed Jim Haynes, Uniden, who will be serving as a Network Equipment Manufacturer Primary Representative.

3) Agenda Review and Approval (ACTA-02-03-25-01)

Mr. Salinas introduced Contribution ACTA-02-03-25-01, the agenda for this meeting. He added Item 6a, Database Review. John Bipes moved to accept the agenda as modified. Roland Gubisch seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

AGREEMENT REACHED: *Contribution ACTA-02-03-25-01, the Agenda, was accepted as modified.*

4) Introduction of Contributions, Numbering, Assignment to Agenda Number (Contributions will be numbered as follows: ACTA-02-03-25-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:

Contribution Number	Title
ACTA-02-03-25-01	Draft Agenda
ACTA-02-03-25-02	Draft Meeting Summary 2/28/02
ACTA-02-03-25-03	TEM White Paper
ACTA-02-03-25-04	ACTA References in Part 68
Deferred Contribution	
ACTA-02-02-28-04	ACTA Filing Procedures

5) Approve February 28th Meeting Summary (ACTA-02-03-25-02)

Mr. Salinas introduced Contribution ACTA-02-03-25-02, the Meeting Summary from the February 28, 2002 meeting. Steve Whitesell suggested two changes to Section 9a. Mr. Whitesell moved to accept the Meeting Summary as modified. Clint Pinkham seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

AGREEMENT REACHED: Contribution ACTA-02-03-25-02, the Meeting Summary from the February 28, 2002 meeting was accepted as modified.

6) Work Items

a) (ADDITION TO THE AGENDA) Review of the database system

Mr. Jeffries noted that he would like to initiate an overview of changes made to the database so that all Council Members are up to speed on the progress toward online filing. He introduced Mark Cassarino, the ACTA database manager, and Lee Chen, a consultant working with ATIS to aid in the migration toward online filing. Mr. Jeffries noted that ATIS is working to have the online filing capability up and running by the May Conference meeting. In addition, he noted that changes to the design of the web site will be made so that the site is in compliance with the FCC Report & Order (R&O) as it applies to disability accessibility.

Mark Cassarino identified changes made in the database since it arrived from the FCC. He noted that in talking with those responsible for submitting changes to the database, he has heard many suggestions of what could be done to make the database better. He noted that currently, all submissions are entered into the database by hand, which is a tedious process. In addition, he noted that payment must be done by check, which can be cumbersome for some companies. Mr. Cassarino explained that the objective in database changes is to reduce the time it takes to complete a submission and to make the entire process more streamlined. He further noted that the database inherited from the FCC was not designed to be accessible and viewable by the general public. Under the R&O, ACTA is required to make the database accessible and that is one of the challenges that he is facing. Currently, there are 35,000 records and there is a need to make it so that the database can handle hundreds of thousands of entries.

Mr. Cassarino explained that he is attempting to create a logic tree in the database that will allow for increased integrity when it goes online. He noted that allowing for one "change," as is suggested in Contribution ACTA-02-02-28-04, will make that logic tree nearly impossible at this time.

There was a discussion of the charges for accessing the database and Mr. Cassarino explained that there would be a charge when changes were made to the database or new submissions were entered. There will be no charge for accessing information in the database. Mr. Cassarino also noted that once the designed database was near completion, Council members would be able to preview it and make any additional suggestions before it goes on-line.

There was a discussion of whether submitters would be given a confirmation number or a confirmation of any sort when entering information into the database. Several Council members noted that, while under the FCC, it was important for companies to get confirmation numbers when awaiting approval so that they could track their status. Since ACTA does not approve equipment, it is not necessary for it to give confirmation numbers. Once information is entered into the database, it need not go through further approval. Mark Cassarino noted that there might be a thirty-day period, especially in the beginning of online filing, whereby the submitter can go back and correct any mistakes or inaccuracies in the information entered into the database.

b) ACTA Filing Procedures (ACTA-02-02-28-04)

Mr. Jeffries noted that this contribution is being carried over from the February 28, 2002 meeting. Steve Whitesell explained that it seems that some of the issues are related to Mr. Pinkham's contribution to this meeting and asked if ACTA could make a decision on this contribution without addressing Mr. Pinkham's contribution. Mr. Pinkham noted that he didn't believe that the two were inexorably tied together.

Mr. Whitesell explained that TR41 was suggesting in Contribution ACTA-02-02-28-04, that instead of having the original, modification, notice of change, and recertification, that the database only reflect that there has been a change made. He noted that, in this way, TR41 hoped to simplify the filing procedures. Mr. Jeffries noted that, in some cases, there are different requirements for the different types of changes to the database, and introduced the different types of filings and the requirements for each. He noted that the information is available in the Guidelines and Procedures document on page 16.

Mr. Whitesell explained that the database is in existence to provide information to the FCC, US Customs, carriers and consumers. He asked whether any of those entities were concerned with what kind of change was made to the database as long as the information in the database was up-to-date and accurate. He suggested that there are two kinds of submissions to the database: a new submission and a change. Mark Cassarino explained that from a back-end perspective, the integrity of the information in the database would be better maintained by the status quo. He explained that the different classifications in filings help to ensure that the information being entered into the database is accurate. Mr. Cassarino stressed that when ACTA migrates to online filing and responsible parties are able to enter information for themselves, it will be more difficult for him, as the database manager, to ensure the integrity of the information being entered into the database. By using the logic tree, he explained, ACTA will be able to automatically enter some of the information for the filer, ensuring that the data being entered is accurate.

There was a discussion of why the FCC required the information for making changes. Mr. Whitesell explained that when the FCC managed the database, they were also approving equipment. ACTA is not charged with approving equipment, but is maintaining the database for the use of the FCC, US Customs, carriers and consumers. Therefore, Mr. Whitesell concluded that much of the information that ACTA is requesting is no longer required in the database as it is being maintained by TCBs or responsible parties that file using SDOCs.

A break was taken.

A Council Member explained that part of the concern of the manufacturers was the need to make multiple filings for one product-related change. He noted that manufacturers feel that it is awkward and cumbersome to make multiple database entries for a change that affects one piece of equipment. Beth Wilson, SHHH, expressed her concern that changing the submission classifications would result in loopholes for the manufacturers and make it more difficult for consumers to ascertain the information that they needed from the database. Mr. Whitesell explained that was not the case.

John Bipes proposed that for the time being, and in the interest of placing priority on streamlining the filing process, that ACTA keep the classifications as they are and clarify the nomenclature. The issue of having an original and a change should be revisited at or after the May 3, 2002 meeting. Roland Gubisch seconded the motion. Megan Hayes performed a roll call of the Council members to ensure that there was still quorum. The motion passed with one nay and one abstention.

AGREEMENT REACHED: In the interest of placing priority on the streamlining of the filing process, ACTA will maintain the current classifications and clarify the nomenclature for the different types of changes. The issue of reducing the types of information entered into the database as an original or a change should be revisited by the ACTA at or after the May 3, 2002 meeting (depending upon the roll-out of online filing).

- c) Discussion of the ACTA procedures for equipment with multiple registration numbers
Mr. Jeffries explained that this agenda item came from the discussion from the February 28, 2002 ACTA meeting because no resolution was reached at that meeting on this issue. Mr. Pinkham noted that the question was in regard to a single piece of equipment that may have multiple registration or US numbers should a change be made, should the filer be required to pay a filing fee for each of the registration numbers in the system. Mr. Whitesell noted that there are several products that have different registration numbers because they were made from different factories under the old FCC system. Mr. Pinkham further noted that under the old FCC system there was no problem with this kind of change. A single call to the FCC would take care of changes to a single piece of equipment. Jim Haynes asked if it wasn't true that under the FCC they had to file different applications for each registration number. Clint Pinkham noted that under the MUL (for multiple filings), the product could be built under one registration number in several factories.

Clint Pinkham moved that the system be arranged so that a single piece of equipment that may have multiple registration numbers be charged only a single filing fee for a change to that equipment that affects all registration numbers. Jim Haynes seconded the motion. Mr. Bailey asked whether the database could handle this as it is now. Mr. Jeffries noted that cases like this would be considered special cases and the Secretariat would have to enter these changes manually. The motion passed unanimously.

AGREEMENT REACHED: A Single piece of equipment that may have multiple registration numbers will be charged only a single filing fee for a change to that piece of equipment that affects all registration numbers.

Mr. Jeffries asked that the Council create some parameters that be included in a blanket modification. Mr. Pinkham offered to take the discussion off line.

ACTION ITEM: Tim Jeffries and Clint Pinkham will develop parameters for submittal of "blanket modifications".

7) ACTA Educational Conference—Update

Tim Jeffries explained that not a lot has changed since the meeting in February. He noted a flyer has been inserted into *TR Reports* highlighting the content of the ACTA Educational Conference. A second flyer is scheduled to be inserted in *TR Reports* next week highlighting the speakers. *OSP Magazine* will have an article in the April edition. Mr. Salinas asked whether it would be in *Conformity Magazine*, and Mr. Jeffries noted that he would be following up with them. Mr. Jeffries highlighted some of the speakers that have been confirmed for the Conference and noted that all of the information on the Conference is currently on the ACTA web site and that people should visit <http://www.part68.org> for more information.

There was a discussion of when materials would be sent out to presenters in reference to their presentations. Mr. Jeffries noted that ATIS is working on getting the proper materials together, but that the staff member responsible is currently unavailable due to an emergency. He suspected that the presentation materials would be sent by the end of the week.

8) New Business

- a) Open floor discussion/questions

Clint Pinkham introduced Contribution ACTA-02-03-25-03, a TEM White Paper and explained that he was not necessarily the author of the Contribution, but that it came from the Terminal Equipment Manufacturer (TEM) interest segment. Mr. Pinkham explained that the Contribution

enumerates ACTA's responsibilities per the FCC R&O and identifies where ACTA has not met its responsibility and where ACTA has overstepped its bounds. In addition, the Contribution puts forth some suggestions for ACTA to rectify the situation. Mr. Pinkham encouraged the Council to read the Contribution in preparation for the April 17, 2002 meeting.

9) Next Meetings

- a) April 17, 2002, 2pm, to discuss Contribution ACTA-02-03-25-03
- b) April 22, 2002, 2pm, Executive Session to discuss the Educational Conference
- c) May 3, 2002 – Face-to-Face Meeting
- d) August 8th, Virtual Meeting
- e) December 10th, Face-to-Face

10) Adjournment

Mr. Salinas adjourned the meeting at 4:43 pm.