

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**Performance Progress Report**

2. Award Or Grant Number

16-50-M09014

4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)

04/25/2012

1. Recipient Name

The EdLab Group (fka Puget Sound Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology)

6. Designated Entity On Behalf Of:

Idaho

3. Street Address

19020 33rd Avenue West, Suite 210

8. Final Report?

Yes

No

9. Report Frequency

Quarterly

Semi Annual

Annual

Final

5. City, State, Zip Code

Lynnwood, WA 98036-4754

7. Project / Grant Period  
Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)

11/01/2009

7a. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)

10/30/2014

7b. Reporting Period End Date:

03/31/2012

9a. If Other, please describe:

Quarterly

**10. Broadband Mapping**

10a. Provider Table

Number of Providers Identified	Number of Providers Contacted	Number of Agreements Reached for Data Sharing	Number of Partial Data Sets Received	Number of Complete Data Sets	Number of Data Sets Verified
0	0	0	0	0	0

10b. Are you submitting the required PROVIDER DATA by using the Excel spreadsheet provided by the SBDD grants office?  Yes  No

10c. Have you encountered challenges with any providers that indicate they may refuse to participate in this project?  Yes  No

10d. If so, describe the discussions to date with each of these providers and the current status

The LinkIDAHO team submitted the 5th Round Data to National Telecommunications and Information (NTIA) on March 31, 2012. The following providers have declined to participate in the SBI program.

Cactus International, Inc. BA - Have had telephone and e-mail discussions.

Status: Continue to decline. We will continue to attempt to engage this provider in future rounds.

MicroWave DSL (HIBEK.Net) - Have had telephone and e-mail discussions.

Status: Continue to decline. We will continue to attempt to engage this provider in future rounds.

Sequel Communications LLC (Suddenlink Communications) - Have had telephone and e-mail discussions .

Status: Do not have time or resources to participate. We have estimated their coverage and will continue to attempt to engage them in future rounds.

Red Spectrum Communication - Have had telephone and e-mail discussions to encourage participation.

Status: Do not have time or resources to participate. We have estimated their coverage and will continue to attempt to engage them in future rounds.

The following providers have not declined to participate, but have not responded to requests for data. We will continue to reach out to them in all future data collection rounds. If we are able to estimate their coverage using third-party data, we include it with our submission to NTIA.

- Mud Lake Telephone Cooperative Association, Inc.
- Mullan Cable
- SafeLink Internet
- Intermax Networks
- Stat Network Solutions
- Country Cable Country Cable
- Troy Cable
- Microserv
- LTLINK
- Atlantic Tele-Network

CommWorld  
Craner Technology Services  
NIDAHO.NET  
OneEighty Networks  
Overarch Broadband  
SpeedyQuick Networks  
Ispeed Wireless  
Surf1

10e. If you are collecting data through other means (e.g. data extraction, extrapolation, etc), please describe your progress to date and the relevant activities to be undertaken in the future

The LinkAMERICA team continues to follow similar procedures across all four LinkAMERICA state projects. We augment provider and Community Anchor Institution (CAI) data, when necessary, with coverage and speed information from third-party sources. In general, we do not substitute third-party information for provider-supplied information unless we can independently verify that the provider information is incorrect. Discrepancies between provider and third-party data are used to identify areas where additional investigation is required.

If a provider does not supply coverage information, or it is not sufficiently detailed to complete the required data fields, we use third-party data and/or infrastructure data and common engineering principles to estimate coverage and speed. We also collect the general public's input via location-specific feedback mechanisms on the state interactive map (discussed below in the verification section).

10f. Please describe the verification activities you plan to implement

The processes below have not been implemented to date but they are included in our project plan. In section 10h, we have included the verification process currently being implemented.

**Mobile Wireless Broadband Drive Testing:** This process will use a special device from a vendor to test signal strength and bandwidth/throughput on multiple mobile wireless signals at the same time. This technology will be used in areas where there is a large discrepancy between provider-reported coverage/speed and consumer-reported coverage/speed to determine the actual coverage and speed characteristics. The feasibility and accuracy of this type of testing is currently under review. If approved, a vendor will be selected in 2012.

**Mobile Wireless Crowd Sourced Testing:** This process will use a proprietary smart phone application, provided by an outside vendor, to constantly check signal strength and bandwidth/throughput on users' mobile phones. The application will be available on multiple phone platforms and will be downloadable by consumers in each LinkAMERICA state. It runs in the background on the consumer's phone and does not impact phone performance. Data is sent from the vendor to LinkAMERICA for use in validating provider coverage and speed reports. A vendor will be selected for this effort in 2012.

10g. Have you initiated verification activities?  Yes  No

10h. If yes, please describe the status of your activities

**Third Party Data Comparison:** As data arrives from providers, we compare it to commercial data sources to identify obvious anomalies or areas for further investigation. An example is the comparison of an Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier's (ILEC's) reported coverage area boundaries with legal exchange areas shown in the commercial ExchangeInfo data product. Coverage footprints of wireless providers are compared to purchased AmericanRoamer data files. Cable coverage is compared to purchased data files from MediaPrints. This process occurs with each data collection round.

**Provider Validation:** Check maps and other tools are produced at the beginning of each data collection round based upon prior submissions. LinkAMERICA supplies check maps in GoogleEarth and PDF format to participating providers. This allows providers the option to update coverage boundaries directly within the check map file itself, giving the providers more options and flexibility for submitting coverage and speed updates.

**Data Format Verification:** It is important that data be formatted correctly in order to be properly received by NTIA. Proprietary and NTIA-supplied scripts are therefore run against the final data set prior to submission to ensure the data meets NTIA data model requirements. This process occurs with each data collection round.

In Round 5, we included the NTIA technology/speed trips into our test code to check for provider data that fell outside of the normal range as determined by NTIA. We tested provider data submitted in the previous Round, as well as new data submissions. If the data "tripped" a warning flag, clarification was requested from the provider.

**Consumer Feedback/Verification:** The LinkIDAHO interactive map contains a user feedback mechanism that identifies the precise coordinates of each point of feedback. We use the feedback received from this process to identify and investigate areas where consumer feedback conflicts with provider data.

10i. If verification activities have not been initiated please provide a projected time line for beginning and completing such activities

We are currently following a process for verification in each data collection round and will enhance and update those processes as necessary. As stated above in Section 10f, further verification avenues are being reviewed and may be implemented in years 3 and 4.

## Staffing

10j. How many jobs have been created or retained as a result of this project?

An analysis of actual hours worked in Q1 2012 shows that the project resulted in .77 FTE jobs created/retained at the Sub-recipient level for the quarter. An additional 0.48 FTEs were created/retained at the Prime Recipient level for a grand total of 1.25 FTEs. It should be noted that this figure does not include positions staffed by vendors involved in the project.

10k. Is the project currently fully staffed?  Yes  No

10l. If no, please explain how any lack of staffing may impact the project's time line and when the project will be fully staffed

This project is currently fully staffed.

10m. When fully staffed, how many full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs do you expect to create or retain as a result of this project?

At fully staffed capacity, we expect to create or retain between 1.5 and 1.7 FTEs. Please see 11L for further comments regarding staffing.

10n. Staffing Table

Job Title	FTE %	Date of Hire
Sub Recipient CEO - Supervisory Role	0	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Project Director	7	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Project Manager	25	09/05/2011
Sub Recipient GIS Director	18	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Internal System Support/Architecture	2	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Provider Relations Manager	23	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Executive Director	1	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Operations Manager	23	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Contracts Coordinator	1	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Project Manager	23	11/01/2009
Consulting	2	07/01/2011

Add Row

Remove Row

## Sub Contracts

10o. Subcontracts Table

Name of Subcontractor	Purpose of Subcontract	RFP Issued (Y/N)	Contract Executed (Y/N)	Start Date	End Date	Federal Funds	In-Kind Funds
CostQuest Associates Inc./LinkAMERICA Alliance	Project Management/GIS Programming & Planning Services	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/31/2014	3,008,599	548,665
Region IV Development Association (RIVDA)	Statewide Broadband Coordinator	N	N	01/01/2011	10/31/2014	330,628	82,657
University of Idaho	Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity Building Efforts	Y	N	12/15/2011	10/31/2014	219,327	65,681
VISIONTECH360	Capacity Building	N	N	11/01/2011	10/31/2014	188,743	9,437
To Be Determined	Technical Assistance and Funding Identification	N	N	01/02/2012	10/31/2014	75,000	15,000
To Be Determined	Training of Key Leaders and Stakeholders	N	N	11/01/2011	10/31/2014	40,000	8,000

Fedarra	Federal Reporting	N	N	04/01/2011	10/31/2012	7,578	0
---------	-------------------	---	---	------------	------------	-------	---

Add Row

Remove Row

### Funding

10p. How much Federal funding has been expended as of the end of the last quarter? \$1,634,131      10q. How much Remains? \$2,852,083

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? \$453,519      10s. How much Remains? \$668,111

10t. Budget Worksheet

Mapping Budget Element	Federal Funds Granted	Proposed In-Kind	Total Budget	Federal Funds Expended	Matching Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Personal Salaries	\$346,895	\$287,489	\$634,384	\$72,188	\$169	\$72,357
Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$86,724	\$5,556	\$92,280	\$14,649	\$35	\$14,684
Travel	\$17,920	\$0	\$17,920	\$2,963	\$0	\$2,963
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Materials / Supplies	\$4,225	\$0	\$4,225	\$167	\$133	\$300
Subcontracts Total	\$3,869,875	\$729,440	\$4,599,315	\$1,459,760	\$430,181	\$1,889,941
Subcontract #1	\$3,008,599	\$548,665	\$3,557,264	\$1,425,693	\$428,815	\$1,854,508
Subcontract #2	\$330,628	\$82,657	\$413,285	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #3	\$219,327	\$65,681	\$285,008	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #4	\$188,743	\$9,437	\$198,180	\$30,477	\$1,366	\$31,843
Subcontract #5	\$122,578	\$23,000	\$145,578	\$3,590	\$0	\$3,590
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$16,908	\$0	\$16,908	\$55,963	\$0	\$55,963
Total Direct Costs	\$4,342,547	\$1,022,485	\$5,365,032	\$1,605,690	\$430,518	\$2,036,208
Total Indirect Costs	\$143,667	\$99,145	\$242,812	\$28,441	\$23,001	\$51,442
Total Costs	\$4,486,214	\$1,121,630	\$5,607,844	\$1,634,131	\$453,519	\$2,087,650
% Of Total	80	20	100	78	22	100

### Hardware / Software

10u. Has the project team purchased the software / hardware described in the application?  Yes  No

10v. If yes, please list

No hardware or software was purchased for the program in Q1-2012. Previous purchases comprised:

- 1) Laptop computer and software for Sub-recipient Project Manager (Idaho-allocated portion): \$352.78
- 2) Laptop computer and software for Sub-recipient Vendor Relations Manager (Idaho-allocated portion): \$339.48
- 3) Dell Precision T5500 Workstation w/ArcInfo C (Idaho-allocated portion): \$3,458.59\*

\*The ArcInfo software was a necessary purchase to enable CostQuest to run the validation script on provider data that NTIA & FCC require for the SBDD program. Purchasing the hardware/software bundle was the most cost effective way to acquire the needed software. Without the hardware, the cost for the software alone would have been \$1,000 higher. This expense was allocated evenly to each of the four LinkAMERICA states.

10w. Please note any software / hardware that has yet to be purchased and explain why it has not been purchased

There are funds available in contractor budgets for hardware and software; however, the prime recipient and sub-recipient do not anticipate the purchase of any additional hardware or software for the project.

10x. Has the project team purchased or used any data sets?  Yes  No

10y. If yes, please list

1) American Roamer: Market area boundary and speed data on mobile cellular providers. Q1-2012 purchase - \$625; previous purchases: \$5,147

2) Media Prints: Cable franchise boundary database was purchased in Y2 for a total of \$500. We are reviewing other options for this data in Y3.

3) ExchangeInfo: Legal exchange area boundary database for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers was purchased in Y2 for a total of \$3,805. We are reviewing other options for this data in Y3.

10z. Are there any additional project milestones or information that has not been included?  Yes  No

10aa. If yes, please list

Provider and CAI Data collected in Round 5 was processed and submitted to NTIA on March 31, 2012, meeting the scheduled delivery date of April 1, 2012. Status: Complete

10bb. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing

During Q1-2012, we continued to encounter difficulty in reconciling reported provider speeds for some providers with the NTIA speed range parameters. In Round 5, providers whose reported data fell outside of the speed norms identified by NTIA were contacted for clarification of their submission. In most instances, we found that providers were using enhanced technologies to achieve the speed reported. Supporting documentation was collected, and our findings were included in the methodology document we submitted with the Round 5 data submission.

10cc. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project

We look forward to continued dialog with NTIA regarding the scoring process being used to evaluate SBI data submissions. While we understand and appreciate the need to develop a process that can be used across states to determine the effectiveness of the SBI effort, we are concerned that the complexity of the information being evaluated often makes the validation results difficult to interpret. We have made an effort to develop relationships with the provider community and be transparent in our processes. We will continue working on developing more robust internal mechanisms to better compare Provider submitted data against third-party data sets identified by NTIA for validation purposes. Assistance and direction in this endeavor is appreciated.

## 11. Broadband Planning

11a. Please describe progress made against all goals, objectives, and milestones detailed in the approved Project Plan. Be sure to include a description of each major activity / milestone that you plan to complete and your current status

The following is a summary of the progress and status of key 'planning' activities and objectives described in the original project plan for Q1-2012. (Previously completed milestones and objectives are detailed in earlier PPRs.)

1) Implementation of available broadband adoption and use outreach and engagement modules launched. Activities this quarter included disseminating all modules through meetings with Regional Planning Teams (RPTs), Health Information Technology (HIT) forum, health organizations, conferences, e-mails to RPT members and posting on LinkIDAHO Dashboard. Links were provided to modules in LinkIDAHO presentations and templates for teams to use. Status: Complete

2) Delivery of ongoing training and technical assistance to support broadband adoption and use outreach and engagement initiatives. This quarter we supported RPTs in their outreach and plan-implementation efforts through one-on-one and group meetings and invited some lead RPT members to join the LinkIDAHO Broadband Advisory Team and participate in focus groups to inform the State Broadband Framework. Status: Complete

The following is a summary of the progress and status of key 'capacity building' activities and objectives described in the supplemental project plan for Q1-2012. (Previously completed milestones and objectives are detailed in earlier PPRs.)

Milestone 1: Establish Office of Idaho Statewide Broadband Coordinator

Objective 2: Establish the office of statewide broadband coordinator within the IRP. Activities and accomplishments this quarter included orienting statewide coordinator to grant deliverables, project history and past activities; reviewing past regional planning process; introducing coordinator to key stakeholders and partners; establishing a new Broadband Advisory Team; and holding held two Broadband Advisory Team meetings. Status: Complete

Additional milestones and objectives met or advanced during Q1-2012 are summarized in Attachment 1.

11b. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing

A minor challenge was encountered with Milestone 2 (refine joint partner capacity building work plan) - Objective 2 (refine monitoring and evaluation [M&E] plans for all six Idaho regions, including data collection needs) as defined in our supplemental project plan. Due to a more lengthy procurement process than was anticipated, our M&E partner (a key partner in the development of our capacity building work plan) joined the project during Q1-2012 rather than late Q4-2011. Progress was made, however, toward meeting this

objective. Accomplishments included the capacity building team holding a one-day meeting with the University of Idaho (M&E partner) to discuss logic model, research questions and data collection resources. It is imperative that this framework is in place prior to the development of regional M&E plans. We are currently working on a process to collect M&E data from the regions and anticipate completion of this objective in early Q2-2012.

11c. Does the Project Team anticipate any changes to the project plan for Broadband Planning?  Yes  No

11d. If yes, please describe these anticipated changes. Please note that NTIA will need to approve changes to the Project Plan before they can be implemented

N/A

### Funding

11e. How much Federal funding has been expended as of the end of the last quarter? \$0

11f. How much Remains? \$0

11g. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? \$0

11h. How much Remains? \$0

### 11i. Planning Worksheet

Personal Salaries	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Materials / Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontracts Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #4	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #5	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Direct Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
% Of Total	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Additional Planning Information

11j. Are there any additional project milestones or information that has not been included?

Yes. Please see the attached sheet which provides additional detail regarding the 'capacity building' efforts for Q1-2012.

11k. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the Project Team is employing

We have not experienced challenges in our original or supplemental project plans beyond those defined in Section 11b.

11I. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project  
A change in staffing occurred in Q3 2011 with the Project Manager leaving the program in September. The Provider Relations Manager was promoted to fill the vacancy and steps were taken to backfill that position. There was no impact to the project time-line as the Round 4 data collection period deadline had passed and the staff on hand was able to assist with needed tasks during the short time the position was not staffed. A new Provider Relations Manager was hired and started in Q4. As the program has been fully staffed with the exception of the short interim, described above, we do not expect any changes to the FTEs that have been reported to date. The Date of Hire for the Project Manager and Provider Relations Manager on 10n reflects the date that the positions were originally staffed.

12. Certification: I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that this report is correct and complete for performance of activities for the purpose set forth in the award documents.

12a. Typed or Printed Name and Title of Authorized Certifying Official

12c. Telephone  
(area code, number, and extension)

12d. Email Address

12b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official

12e. Date Report Submitted  
(Month, Day, Year)