

Broadband Florida Q3 2014 PPR Report Details

Project Attachment – Broadband Mapping

Question 2: Describe any additional project milestones that have been accomplished over this reporting period (Ex. Updates to state broadband maps and websites, map outreach activities)

During the third quarter of 2014 the mapping project manager focused on contacting the list of providers that was assembled in the previous quarter, collecting data, and preparing it for the October 1, 2014 submission package. The list of providers was updated utilizing the FCC listing of broadband providers, identified Florida Wireless Internet Service Providers and verification of whether these companies provided broadband in Florida. The Department continued work on obtaining Community Anchor Institutions coverage and speeds, identifying additional broadband service providers, outreach, updating provider contact information, and data verification.

Provider Outreach

Provider outreach efforts continued throughout the third quarter of 2014. The Department made every effort to contact the providers regarding data submittals and data verification by providing access to the Provider Portal which allows detailed review by the provider to confirm or correct the coverage maps. Follow-up correspondence, NDA execution, and further outreach added to the quality of the October 2014 data submission with an addition of two providers submitting data for the first time.

- **Non-Participating Providers:** Florida identified three providers that will not participate in the mapping program.
 - Birch Communications maintains their position that participation in the project would violate Homeland Security guidelines and once again declined to participate. The Department sent communication via email.
 - CyberStreet, Inc. previously spoke to the Mapping Project Manager and stated that the company is not interested in participating. The accuracy, use, frequency of collection, and time to prepare the information are viewed as deterrents to the company.
 - Omnispring LLC, which was formerly unresponsive and stated that the company does not participate on a nationwide basis. The accuracy, use, frequency of collection, and time to prepare the information are viewed as deterrents to the company.
- **Non-Responsive Providers:** In addition to the companies listed above, there were 39 providers that were unresponsive to multiple contact attempts in the third quarter of 2014. Several providers are newly identified for this submission and non-responsiveness may be due to incorrect contact information. The following table depicts a list of the non-responsive providers with the corresponding contact attempts made by the Department.

Table 1: Non-Responsive Provider Contact Log

The following providers were emailed and/or called during the process of data collection:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| • airPowered | • NetQuincy |
| • Altitude | • NFBA |
| • Areyouonline.net | • Palm Coast Flagler Internet |
| • ClearSurf International, Inc. | • QxC Communications |
| • CommFunction | • Rapid Systems Corporation |
| • Cspire Wireless | • Sago Networks, Inc. |
| • CyberStreet, Inc. | • SKYNAP |
| • Desoto.Net | • SkyNet 360 |
| • Earthlink | • Smart City |
| • Florida High Speed Internet (FLHSI) | • Southern Light |
| • Georgia Public Web, Inc. | • Starband |
| • GRU.com | • Summit |
| • Harbor Communications, LLC. | • SVIC |
| • Home Town Network | • TerraNova.Net |
| • Hughes | • Tier 3 Communications |
| • Lifestream Holdings, LLC. | • UNSi |
| • Long Hammock Wireless | • Valparaiso |
| • Nature Coast Networks, LLC. | • Wow! Internet, Cable and Phone |
| • NEFCOM | • XO Communications Services, Inc. |

Data Verification

A number of checks and balances must be performed to ensure a reasonable snapshot of the last six months of broadband availability in the state of Florida. These methods include (but are not limited to): provider validation, topological validation, third party data verification, public verification, speed test metrics, and confidence values which occur during the data validation and verification process.

- Broadband Provider Validation –Provider Portal
All participating providers are able to login to the Provider Portal for coverage review and also to make any necessary edits.
- Topological Validation
To further ensure topological validation, Florida conducted peer review on the data for each provider. The team searched for inconsistencies and missing data and performed a thorough review of attributes and geometry. If any issues arise the provider was contacted and the data is verified and/or edited.
- Third-Party Data Verification and Web Surveys
Florida reviewed provider websites and third party data for comparison to what has been submitted to Florida by the providers. For this submission, the third party data reviewed was Media Prints to assess cable boundaries, GeoTel to analyze wireless and wireline coverage areas and fiber locations, and Mobile Pulse was utilized to compare upload and download speeds with coverage areas. Web surveying was completed to ensure the data submitted by the providers agrees with publicly available coverage areas.

- Public Verification, Crowd Sourcing and Speed Test Verification
The broadband interactive map containing feedback and speed test functionality was available to the public. Feedback and speed results were collected from the interactive map and reviewed with the providers.
- Submission Comparison
Florida compared past submission coverages to the current submission coverage by provider and technology of transmission to review changes or updates to these areas. This provided a visual queue to identify geometry changes or possible errors in the data and allows for Florida to contact providers for corrections. Further, the Florida data packages were compared by census block and street segment quantities to identify any major changes with coverages between submissions.
- Confidence Values
All verification, validation and manual quality review results were tracked by provider/technology type and stored and maintained within a validation table. A confidence value was assigned, based on internal assessments of the collected information, to highlight the provider coverage areas and/or attributions that would benefit from further investigation and/or enhancements.