



## Administrative Council for Terminal Attachments (ACTA)

March 6, 2008

General Council Public Meeting

### Meeting Report Summary

Chair: Jim Haynes, Uniden

10:00am-2:00pm ET

#### 1. Call to Order

Mr. Haynes called the meeting to order at 10:00am.

#### 2. Attendance Check-in, Introductions and Administrative Matters

The following ACTA Industry Segment Representatives and general public were present, either in person or on the telephone.

Name	Company/Organization	Representing
Jim Haynes	Uniden	ACTA Chair
Jean-Paul Emard	ATIS	ACTA Director Liaison
Ed Mikoski	TIA	TIA Liaison
Mark Cassarino	ATIS	ACTA Database Manager
Paul Anderson	ATIS	ACTA Administrator
Meisha Goodhue	ATIS	Administrative Assistance
Trone Bishop	Verizon	Service Provider Segment
Sharon Hoffman	Timco Engineering, INC	Testing Labs Segment
Roger Hunt	Thomson	Manufacturer Segment
John Bipes	Mobile Engineering	Other Interested Party
Scott Lambert	Intertek Testing Laboratories	Testing Labs Segment
James Salinas	AT&T	Service Provider Segment
Milton Bush	The M Companies	Other Interested Party
Scott Roleson	HP San Diego	Public
Hazim Dawood	Industry Canada	Public
Claude Beaudoin	Industry Canada	Public

#### 3. Agenda Review and Approval (ACTA-08-001)

1. Mr. Haynes asked for any possible additions to the agenda.
2. Motion was made and seconded for the approval of the agenda by (Trone Bishop/Jimmy Salinas). The agenda was approved without opposition.

#### **4. Introduction of Contributions, Numbering, Assignment to Agenda Number**

3. Participants reviewed Contributions to be discussed later in the meeting.
4. It was noted that the Council need not review the Contributions twice in the course of the same meeting. Contributions should be introduced and discussed under their respective agenda item.
5. It was queried if the Meeting Summary could be available sooner than the review which is performed at the next ACTA meeting. It was responded that the Meeting Summary would be posted not later than three weeks after the close of the meeting to provide a more immediate review of the materials.
6. It was noted that as a best practice, Contributions should be submitted at least 4 weeks prior to the meeting. It was noted that while all Contributions are accepted upon their introduction, the OPP states that Contributions should come in 10 business days before the scheduled meeting.

#### **5. Review and Approval of Meeting Summary from December 6, 2007 General Meeting (ACTA-08-002)**

7. Minor changes were made to the meeting record from the December 6, 2007 meeting.
8. Motion was made and seconded (John Bipes/James Salinas) to approve the meeting summary, ACTA-08-002, which was approved without opposition.

#### **6. Secretariat Update**

##### **Open Interest Segment Representative Positions**

9. The Secretariat made an update of open Interest Segment Representative positions.
10. There are currently two *primary* positions and one *alternate* position open in the Service Provider Segment.
11. There are currently three *primary* positions and one *alternate* position open in the Manufacturer Segment.
12. There is one *alternate* position open in the Other Interested Party Segment.

##### **Elections Procedures**

13. It was noted that there is currently no language included in the ACTA OPP that describes, in detail, the procedures for the election of the ACTA Industry Segment Representatives. **(ACTION ITEM)**
14. It was noted that language could be drafted and circulated for consideration.
15. It was noted that other information regarding Executive Sessions could be included in the next reissue of the ACTA OPP.
16. It was suggested that a general statement be made that if anyone has suggested language for the OPP, it should be submitted to the ACTA Administrator by way of a formal Contribution. **(Agreement Reached)**
17. It was noted that the ACTA website displays materials for discussion at the next meeting.

18. It was noted that Contributions submitted regarding Elections procedures should address only the OPP, and in the form of a formal Contribution.
19. It was noted that the New Numbering System (proposed in ACTA-07-12-06-03) is now in effect.
20. It was noted that changes were made to the Meeting Records Page, so that Contributions that are numbered according to the new system are displayed. Records dated prior to 2008 are archived, and available on the Archives page.
21. It was noted that in accordance with the use of the new numbering system, the Contribution Template posted to the Part 68 website has been updated to reflect the new numbering format. Those using forms from 2007 should download and use only the new form.
22. It was noted that Contributions and Meeting materials should be sent directly to the ACTA Administrator via his ATIS email ([panderson@atis.org](mailto:panderson@atis.org)), or the ACTA email ([acta@atis.org](mailto:acta@atis.org)).
23. A note of appreciation was made regarding the summary of Action Items and Agreements Reached added at the end of Meeting Records of the December of 2007 meeting.
24. It was noted that forthcoming agendas will include a review of Action Items to be performed at the beginning of every meeting to ensure Action Item accountability.  
**(Agreement Reached)**

## **7. Updates from Attending Representatives**

### **ACTA-08-004 -- TIA TR41 (Predominantly SDO TR41.9) Liaison Report**

25. Mr. Bipes reviewed his report to the ACTA focusing on highlighted sections as they appear in Contribution ACTA-08-004.
26. Mr. Hunt noted that TIA 968 B is a combination of many other previous TIA 968 documents, and is restructured from a requirement format to an interface format for the purpose of making the document more accessible and usable for its users.
27. It was queried what the numbering nomenclature of this standard meant. It was responded that the B version is not an addendum, but a revision, which was approved as a new document.
28. Mr. Hunt stated that on item 6 of this Contribution, a letter was drafted by an Ad Hoc group on the TIA Council concerned which reviewed the letter and is ready to proceed if it was not sent out already.
29. It was queried if the TIA 168 B, replacing TIA TSB 168 A, would be forwarded to the ACTA. It was responded that it was not known where the document was in the TIA publishing process.
30. Roger Hunt will confer with TIA to validate the publishing status of TIA 168 B and make sure the document would be brought to the ACTA to adopt once the document is published. **(ACTION ITEM)**
31. Mr. Bipes stated that in the future, suggestions or recommendations based on representations of the ACTA at SDO meetings would be contained in the submission of a formal Contribution.
32. It was noted that modifications or notice of change filings are not affected by the removal of ZZZ AC REN values. The AC REN has no limitations during the filing process. The focus will be on the audits to ensure accuracy.

33. It was queried, with the introduction of the new labeling requirement, at which point the new system would be used? Could parties use the old system for a number of months in transition.
34. It was suggested a transition period procedure be considered.
35. It was queried if there was an effective date, and responded that there is not a stated effective date regarding the TIA standard.
36. It was noted that TIA 1096 is not in effect until the ACTA formally adopts the document as an ACTA technical criteria.
37. It was noted that SDOs were never charged with specifying labeling requirements. The ACTA was asked to do so.
38. It was suggested that when the document is submitted for consideration, it could be in a public comment forum for some time, and during that time an effective date could be considered.
39. It was suggested that a transition period would be necessary for those who have products awaiting labeling.
40. It was noted that at the end of a public comment period, TIA 1096 would become effective.
41. It was noted that in the past, labeling criteria were not open to public comments and this is not required.
42. It was noted that the ACTA is not required to do a thirty day notice, but notice may be beneficial and is not prohibited.
43. It was queried why TIA 1096 has been delayed.
44. It was responded that changes were required after the document had been reviewed by TIA Legal, and then sent back to publication after those changes were completed.
45. It was noted that in the case of many TIA document releases, documents could be used when they are published.
46. It also was noted that ACTA was doing something similar; there is a grace period, and one could opt not to follow a new version of a document during the interim period.
47. It was noted that this is probably not a case where a transition period would be needed.
48. It was noted that the new TIA 1096 document is published already, and would require the 90 day public review period.
49. Roger Hunt will inquire as to the status of TIA 1096, and when it will be forwarded to ACTA. **(ACTION ITEM)**

#### **ACTA-08-005 – Proposal for Connector Attestation**

50. Mr. Bishop reviewed ACTA-08-005.
51. It was noted that this Contribution was an observation presented for informative purposes.
52. It was noted that these suggestions could be drawn up as a proposition, and the ACTA could take it under consideration.
53. It was noted that a standard is provided, but there is no list or trail of attestation to follow.
54. It was noted that the perspectives of other parties is being sought for input into a proposal.
55. It was suggested that an Ad Hoc group meet informally by email or conference call to identify problems and issues.

56. Trone Bishop will chair an Ad Hoc group to form a proposal to the ACTA. **(ACTION ITEM)**
57. The Ad Hoc is to include the following: Roger Hunt, Mark Cassarino, Jimmy Salinas, Milton Bush, and Scott Lambert.
58. It was noted that any and all opposition to the proposal needed to be voiced and discussed once the proposal is authored and published.

**ACTA-08-003 -- *Point-of-Sale Observation – 19 th February, 2008***  
**and ACTA-08-006 -- *Observations of Industry Canada***

59. Mr. Bipes reviewed Contribution ACTA-08-003.
60. It was queried why this artifact was not sent to the FCC, as this seems more of an enforcement issue, which is not under the purview of the ACTA.
61. It was responded that the first artifact, that was discovered in 2006, was sent to the FCC.
62. It was noted that this Contribution was for the information of the ACTA in response to concerns that manufacturers were producing and selling phones but not registering or filing properly.
63. It was noted that these concerns will be discussed at the upcoming ex parte between the ACTA and the FCC.
64. It was noted, as the artifact was passed around the room for members examination, that the phone plugs were obviously out of compliance with established criteria. These observations were made without the use of special equipment.
65. It was noted that two years ago, the approach for handling an artifact of this nature was established as the following: sending the artifact to the FCC along with an explanation cover letter detailing findings of non compliance.
66. It was noted that the problems contained in ACTA-08-003, as submitted by John Bipes are problems in Canada as well.
67. Claude Beaudoin, Industry Canada, reviewed Contribution ACTA-08-006, and noted that the same non compliance concerns exist in Canada.
68. It was emphasized by Mr. Beaudoin that in Canada, one instance of non compliance with any code in a device establishes the device, as a whole, as non compliant.
69. It was noted that Industry Canada has met with the FCC regarding issues of non compliance in devices that may be crossing international borders.
70. It was noted that equipment in non compliance coming into the US is most likely also coming into Canada.
71. It was noted that regarding compliance, the instances reviewed in the past were found to bear labels that look correct, but are falsified, while the phone discussed in ACTA-08-003 and the device found in 2006, fail to follow any recognized format in labeling.
72. It was noted that in cordless telephony, there are those who are failing to comply at least with Part 68, making a profit in a short period of time, then leaving the market altogether.
73. It was queried what “future watch” meant (as the term is used in the context of ACTA-08-006). It was responded that this means there is a follow-up to the issue.
74. It was queried if the follow up was to the product or the company as a whole. It was responded that a history is tracked of the laboratory, the importer, the seller, or wherever the mistake was made.

75. It was queried if Industry Canada does any kind of educational program to encourage compliance. It was responded that this was done some time ago, but not recently.
76. It was noted further that education is performed on the party that did not comply, and education is not performed with the consumer community.
77. It was noted that to explain compliance to a consumer is difficult, as the consumer's perspective is concerned with benefits to themselves, and education focuses on protecting the network, not the consumer per se.
78. Several expressions of thanks were made to Claude Beaudoin and Industry Canada for his Contribution.
79. It was noted by Mr. Salinas that through a personal connection with Hobby Lobby, he discovered that Hobby Lobby received permission to sell the artifact described in ACTA-08-003 as a decoration, and the device was never intended to be used as a phone.
80. It was noted that the device has a jack, and as such, plugs into the PSTN, and therefore could be considered to a phone by the consumer.
81. It was noted by Mr. Beaudoin that a big part of ensuring fair competitive practice is enforcing the rules which are recorded; when rules are not enforced, competition suffers.
82. It was observed, in ACTA-08-006, that enforcement infractions were discovered by Industry Canada through "random compliance checks"; Random checks are not performed in the United States.

## **8. Old/New Business**

83. It was noted that in the process of revising TIA 968B, it was discovered that "component approval" is not mentioned in the technical criteria or procedures of the ACTA. This is something that has aspects in all areas, and TIA TR49 is working on text to include component approval. These changes will need to be incorporated into the ACTA criteria. The ACTA should be aware of this impending work.
84. It was noted that the phrase "component approval" leads to misunderstandings about what exactly "component" means. It was responded that this is a TIA TR49 issue, as TIA TR49 maintains the document regarding component approval.

## **Next Meeting**

85. The next meeting will be held on June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008. This will be a Virtual Meeting.

## **Adjournment**

86. Motion for adjournment was made and seconded by (Roger Hunt/John Bipes). The meeting was adjourned at 1:58pm.

## **Summary of Action Items**

13. It was noted that there is currently no language included in the ACTA OPP that describes, in detail, the procedures for the election of the ACTA Industry Segment Representatives. **(ACTION ITEM)**

- 30. Roger Hunt will confer with TIA to validate the publishing status of TIA 168 B and make sure the document would be brought to the ACTA to adopt once the document is published. **(ACTION ITEM)**
- 49. Roger Hunt will inquire as to the status of TIA 1096, and when it will be forwarded to ACTA. **(ACTION ITEM)**
- 56. Trone Bishop will chair an Ad Hoc group to form a proposal to the ACTA. **(ACTION ITEM)**

#### **Summary of Agreements Reached**

- 16. It was suggested that a general statement be made that if anyone has suggested language for the OPP, it should be submitted to the ACTA Administrator by way of a formal Contribution. **(Agreement Reached)**
- 24. It was noted that forthcoming agendas will include a review of Action Items to be performed at the beginning of every meeting to ensure Action Item accountability. **(Agreement Reached)**