***LNP – WG Sub-Committee***

***DEFINITION OF A SIMPLE PORT***

***August 21, 2009 – September 1, 2009 (LNPA Meeting discussion)***

***Chair – Susan Tiffany***

| **DEFINING A SIMPLE PORT SUB-COMMITTEE** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **COMMITTEE MEMBER** | **COMPANY** | **ATTENDANCE** |
| Anna Miller | T-Mobile | X |
| Anthony Hansel | Covad |  |
| Beth O'Donnell | Cox Communication | X |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra Telecom | X |
| Bill Solis | Comcast |  |
| Brad Lerner | Cavalier Telecom |  |
| Carolyn Brown | Qwest | X |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | X |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW | X |
| Cynthia Williamson | Cox Communication |  |
| Dawn Howard | Cox Communication |  |
| Dawn Lawrence | XO | X |
| Deb Tucker | VZ Wireless | X |
| Dennis Rose | TSTCI | X |
| Gary Sacra | Verizon | X |
| Jason Lee | Verizon |  |
| Jan Doell | Qwest |  |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar |  |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar |  |
| Kim Isaacs |  | X |
| Lavinia Rotaru | Sprint |  |
| Linda Birchem | FairPoint |  |
| Linda Peterman | One Communication |  |
| Lonnie Keck | ATT Wireless | X |
| Loriann Burke | XO | X |
| Mark Lancaster | ATT | X |
| Mary Conquest | Nuvox |  |
| Matt Kohly | Sockett Communication |  |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | X |
| Peggy Rubino | Paetec | X |
| Ron Steen | ATT | X |
| Lonnie Keck | ATT | X |
| Shelly Pedersen | TWtelecom |  |
| Steve Addicks | NeuStar |  |
| Sue Tiffany | Sprint/Nextel | X |
| Teresa Patton | ATT Wireless | X |
| Tiki Gaugler | XO | X |
| Tim Kaegle | Comcast | X |
| Tonya Woods | Centurylink |  |
| Tracy Guidotti | ATT |  |
| Vicki Goth | Centurylink | X |

**Sub-team Objective:**

To determine if a recommendation for any changes to the current definition of a Simple Port will be included in the LNPA WG’s work package to be forwarded to the NANC

**Discussion**

Gary Sacra, Verizon and LNPA co-chair, provided what he believed the Simple Port Subteam had reached consensus on to date in terms of recommended added language to the FCC's Simple Port definition, see the following:

**REGARDING THE CRITERIA FOR A SIMPLE PORT:**

**Action: Involve an Account only for a single line.** What are the technical restrictions on porting an entire account? Participants are requested to be prepared to discuss the second non-simple port qualifier.

Consensus reached….

**Involves an account only for a single line, i.e., a ‘simple port’ is for a single TN in a single line account.**

**REGARDING THE CRITERIA ON UNEs:**

CURRENT FCC DEFINITION FOR SIMPLE PORTS:

1. do not involve unbundled network elements;

Consensus reached….

**CLARIFYING LANGUAGE:**

**The LNPA-WG’s understanding of current industry practices regarding UNE involvement in porting a Simple Port is that the UNE’s of Dedicated Transport, 911/E911, or Operational Support Systems are not a factor in determining or executing a Simple Port.**

After discussion there were some minor changes, databases was removed added a comma and changed ‘and’ to ‘or’.

**REGARDING THE CRITERIA ON COMPLEX SWITCH TRANSLATIONS:**

CURRENT FCC DEFINITION FOR SIMPLE PORTS:

(3) do not include complex switch translations (*e.g.*, Centrex, ISDN, AIN services, remote call forwarding, or multiple services on the loop);

CLARIFYING LANGUAGE:

The mere existence of these services cited as examples, or any other service associated with the porting customer's account, does not necessarily constitute complex switch translations or classify the port as Non-Simple.

If the other criteria defining a Simple Port would otherwise lead to classifying a port as Simple, the porting of the customer with any of these services could be classified as Simple.  Note that the porting of telephone number(s) from a multi-telephone number account or group is Non-Simple.

The existence of the cited examples or any other service associated with the porting customer’s account, does not necessarily mean

The team carefully reviewed the Clarifying Language of the above information, and made several suggested changes to the language with the final proposal as follows:

For single TN ports, The services cited as examples are not necessarily provided utilizing complex switch translations. If the other criteria defining a Simple Port as determined by the LNPA WG clarification would otherwise lead to classifying a port as Simple, the porting of the customer/number (9/1) with any of these services should/could be classified as Simple.

If the other current criteria defining a Simple Port

When porting a single TN the services cited as examples are not necessarily provided utilizing complex switch translations.

After some discussion, the team decided to review this language and come to the next meeting with suggestion.

There was a discussion on whether or not the team should continue to clarify the Simple Port definition. After the discussion, the committee chair let everyone know that if they had any comments on this issue they should make them now because we would not be having the discussion again.

**Language agreed to 9/1 in LNPA meeting, as follows:**

**For single TN ports, the services cited as examples are not necessarily provided utilizing complex switch translations.  If the other criteria defining a Simple Port would otherwise lead to classifying a port as Simple, the porting of the customer with any of these services could be classified as Simple.**

ACTION ITEMS:

* Carriers are to determine whether the above language needs to say “services should” or “services could”. Carriers should determine what changes should be made to the paragraph.

* Carriers are to determine what steps are required to port an ISDN BRI customer, i.e., are there any steps besides disconnecting to process a BRI port?
* Each carrier representative should determine whether or not their company considers RCF telephone numbers to be provisioned using “complex translations.”  If not complex, does your company consider porting the RCF number to be Simple or Non-Simple?
* Carriers are to determine if there are any scenarios where a single TN/line, single account number with AIN service would be considered non-simple/complex, i.e., would there be any actions required besides a disconnection?

Carriers reviewed responses to Action Items in 9/1 LNPA meeting, and agreed instead on the above language to describe a simple port.

**OPEN ITEMS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ISSUE NUMBER** | **ISSUE** | **STATUS** |
| SP001 | Simple Port is the “port only”, i.e., Req Type C . Adressed by individual comments. | Closed |
| SP002 | Any changes to the original 07-188 order should be managed through the FNPRM. Further definition of a “simple Port” by this sub-committee does not preclude any FNPRM positions. | Closed |
| SP003 | Parity issue in return of a loop  No consensus reached  Addressed by individual comments | Closed |
| SP004 | Technical/Operational Issues to returning a loop  No consensus reached  Addressed by individual comments | Closed |
| SP005 | Resellers  No consensus reached to change Resellers to simple  Addressed by individual comments | Closed |