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ORDER

**Adopted: December 6, 2013 Released: December 6, 2013**

By the Acting Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau:

1. In this order, the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB) of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC, or Commission), on its own motion, pursuant to delegated authority,[[1]](#footnote-2) modifies the August 13, 2013[[2]](#footnote-3) conditional waiver of the Commission's speed-of-answer (SOA) rule[[3]](#footnote-4) with respect to Internet Protocol (IP) relay service (IP Relay) granted to Purple Communications, Inc. (Purple).[[4]](#footnote-5) CGB modifies the waiver to apply when there is a specified sustained increase in traffic that occurs during any 30-day period that includes the day for which a waiver is needed, rather than being limited to increases sustained over a calendar month.

# THE August 13, 2013 waiver ORDER

1. On July 11, 2013, Purple requested, on an emergency basis, a 120-day waiver of the Commission's SOA rule with respect to its IP Relay service.[[5]](#footnote-6) Purple asserted that such a waiver was necessary in light of traffic surges resulting from the recent cessation of IP Relay service by Sorenson Communications, Inc. (Sorenson), announced July 8, 2013, and effective July 31, 2013.[[6]](#footnote-7) Purple added that the waiver would enable Purple “to quantify the resulting demand, then recruit and train additional IP Relay staff, so that it can comply with the Commission's strict speed-of-answer requirements.”[[7]](#footnote-8)
2. On August 13, 2013, CGB granted Purple a limited waiver of the SOA rule for the period from July 31, 2013, through October 31, 2013. In addition, for a subset of this period, from August 13, 2013,[[8]](#footnote-9) through October 31, 2013, CGB subjected the waiver to certain conditions that were developed in part based on Purple’s forecasts of expected traffic.[[9]](#footnote-10) We found that in light of the cessation of IP Relay service by Sorenson, and the consequent migration of its customers, at short notice, to other providers, Purple had shown justification for a limited waiver of the SOA rule.
3. In placing conditions on the waiver for the period from August 13 through October 31, 2013, we explained that the purpose of the waiver was to allow Purple some flexibility to adjust to a sudden influx of IP Relay customers resulting from Sorenson’s cessation of service after July 31, 2013, but not to excuse Purple for any SOA violations unrelated to the migration of Sorenson customers. We noted that Purple had stated that the influx of Sorenson customers was causing an overall surge in Purple’s IP Relay traffic levels that put a constant strain on Purple’s ability to process calls, independently of day-to-day variations in traffic levels. Therefore, we conditioned the waiver granted to Purple in order to target relief narrowly to the problem as defined.[[10]](#footnote-11)
4. First, we required that, for the SOA waiver to apply to service provided during a given calendar month (or, in the case of August, during the portion of August that remained after release of the order), Purple’s total session minutes for that month, as adjusted (Monthly Adjusted Session Minutes), must exceed a specified percentage of the forecast session minutes for that month (Monthly Forecast Session Minutes). Specifically, CGB directed that: (1) for the period from August 13 through August 31, 2013, Purple’s monthly Adjusted Session Minutes had to be more than *115 percent* of the Monthly Forecast Session Minutes for the same period; (2) for the period from September 1 through September 30, 2013, Purple’s Monthly Adjusted Session Minutes for September 2013 had to be more than *115 percent* of the Monthly Forecast Session Minutes for September 2013; and (3) for the period from October 1 through October 31, 2013, Purple’s Monthly Adjusted Session Minutes for October 2013 had to be more than *125 percent* of the Monthly Forecast Session Minutes for October 2013. [[11]](#footnote-12)
5. Second, to provide assurance that the grant of a waiver did not affect Purple’s ability and incentive to take effective steps to prevent fraud, we required Purple to report the number of calls disenabled by its back-end fraud detection system by day for the 6 months from February through July 2013 and for each day of the period of the waiver.[[12]](#footnote-13)
6. Third, in order to help the Commission monitor the number of unique IP Relay users who were porting from Sorenson to Purple and confirm that only legitimate users were ported, we required Purple to report the total telephone numbers ported and the number of unique users, for each day of the waiver period.[[13]](#footnote-14)

# modification of the Waiver

1. We conclude that the first condition of the waiver granted in the *August 13, 2013 Waiver Order* should be modified in order to more effectively achieve its purpose. In granting the waiver, we sought to exculpate Purple from unavoidable rule violations caused by the influx of Sorenson IP Relay customers. We noted that, based on the facts submitted by Purple, the influx was causing an overall surge in traffic levels that put a *constant* strain on its ability to process calls, independently of *day-to-day* variations in traffic levels.[[14]](#footnote-15) Thus, it was our intent for the waiver to excuse what otherwise would have been violations resulting from increases in traffic that began after Sorenson’s exit and that were sustained over a substantial periods of time, but not to excuse any violations that might occur due to short-lived fluctuations in traffic that would be limited to a particular day or caused by events unrelated to the Sorenson customer influx. Therefore, we conditioned the waiver so that it would apply only where overall actual adjusted traffic levels, measured over the course of a month, proved to be substantially higher than the monthly levels previously forecast by Purple.[[15]](#footnote-16)
2. The conditions imposed, however, addressed only *calendar* months.[[16]](#footnote-17) Those conditions did not account for the possibility that sustained, overall traffic increases caused by the Sorenson customer influx could occur over periods that were 30 days or more in duration but that did not necessarily coincide with the first and last days of the month. In other words, a sustained traffic increase lasting 30 days or more could overlap the end of one month and the beginning of another, without extending to the end of the second month (*e.g.*, because in the later portion of that second month, some of the new customers may have moved to another provider). Such sustained traffic increases would appear to be no less deserving of a waiver than an equivalent traffic increase that included all the days of a particular calendar month.
3. To ensure that SOA violations caused by the Sorenson influx and occurring within the waiver period were appropriately subject to waiver, therefore, we now modify the first waiver condition described above. Specifically, for the SOA waiver to apply to service provided on any particular day between August 13, 2013, and September 30, 2013, we now require that there must be at least one 30-day period that includes that day, for which Purple’s total adjusted session minutes for the period (30-Day Adjusted Session Minutes) exceeded 115 percent of its total forecast session minutes (30-Day Forecast Session Minutes) for the same period.[[17]](#footnote-18) Similarly, for the SOA waiver to apply to service provided on any particular day between October 1, 2013, and October 31, 2013, there must be some 30-day period that includes that day, for which Purple’s 30-Day Adjusted Session Minutes for the period exceeded 125 percent of its 30-Day Forecast Session Minutes for the same period.
4. We find that there is good cause to modify the waiver granted in the *August 13 Waiver Order* as described above.[[18]](#footnote-19) Specifically, we conclude that modifying the first condition of the waiver as described above, so that it can be satisfied over any 30-day period rather than only for a defined calendar month, more effectively reflects the special circumstances that warrant a deviation from the general rule to serve the public interest.[[19]](#footnote-20)

# ordering clauses

1. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 4(i) and 4(j) and 225 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 154(j) and 225, and sections 0.141, 0.361 and 1.3 of the Commission’s rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.141, 0.361 and 1.3, this Order IS ADOPTED.
2. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the waiver granted in the *August 13 Waiver Order* IS MODIFIED to the extent set forth above.
3. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order SHALL BE EFFECTIVE upon release.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Kris Anne Monteith

Acting Chief

Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau
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