<table>
<tr><td colspan="2" align="center">U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Performance Progress Report</td><td colspan="2">2. Award Or Grant Number
16-50-M09014

4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)
12-20-2011</td></tr>
</table>

1. Recipient Name EdLab Group Foundation - Idaho	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 Lynwood, 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: 12-31-2011	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 following providers have officially declined to participate in the program, we will continue to reach out to these providers in all future data collection rounds. If we can estimate their coverage using 3rd party data we include it with our submission to the National Telecommunications & Information Administration (NTIA).

** Cactus International Inc.: Have had telephone/email discussions to encourage participation. Status: Continue to decline. We will continue to engage in future rounds.
** MicroWave DSL: Have had telephone/email discussions to encourage participation. Status: Continue to decline. We will continue to engage in future rounds.
** Cequel Communications LLC (dba Suddenlink Communications): Have had telephone/email discussions to encourage participation, the say they do not have time/resources to participate. Status: Estimated their coverage. We will continue to engage in future rounds.
** Red Spectrum Communication: Have had telephone/email discussions to encourage participation, they have said that they do not have the resources to participate. Status: Estimated their coverage. We will continue to engage in future rounds.

The following providers have not officially declined to participate, however they have not provided data in any collection round to date. When possible we estimate for these providers using third party data. We will continue to try to engage them in future collection rounds:
Allied Wireless Communications Corporation
**Craner Technology Services
**Microserv
**Elk River TV Cable CompaNy
**Family Friendly Internet Service
**Troy Cable
**Country Cable
**Overarch BroadbaNd
**Mullan Cable
**Safelink Internet
**Surf1
**North Idaho Connection
**Intermax Networks
**Stat Network Solutions
**CommWorld
**SpeedyQuick Networks

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 LinkAMERICA team continues to utilize and improve upon the core verification procedures used in prior data collection rounds. We believe verification can be segmented into four categories/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 would be the comparison of an ILEC's reported coverage area boundaries with the legal exchange areas shown in the commercial ExchangeInfo data product. Coverage footprints of wireless providers are compared against purchased AmericanRoamer data files. Cable coverage is compared against 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. In Q2 2011 LinkAMERICA added the ability to supply check maps in GoogleEarth format, allowing providers to update coverage boundaries directly within the check map file itself. This process gives the providers more options and flexibility for submitting coverage and speed updates. We will continue to offer this option in each round.

** 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.

** Consumer Feedback/Verification: The LinkIDAHO interactive map contains a user feedback mechanism that identifies the precise coordinates of each point of feedback. As user feedback arrives, we are able to identify and investigate areas where consumer feedback conflicts with provider data. In Q4 2011 this feature was enhanced allowing the feedback to be viewed as a display layer on the interactive map.

10g. Have you initiated verification activities? ⦿Yes ◯No

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

All of the above activities are performed in each data collection round. In addition, as explained above, in Q4 an expanded consumer feedback layer was developed and added to the state interactive map. This layer publicly displays the results from all user feedback and incorporates speed testing into the feedback form to help verify provider-reported speeds.

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

Current verification activities will be enhanced over time as follows:

** 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 - plan to start this testing in 2012 once an appropriate vendor is selected.

** 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 - plan to start this testing in 2012 once an appropriate vendor is selected.

Staffing

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

An analysis of actual hours worked in Q4 2011 shows that the project resulted in 0.67 FTE jobs created/retained at the Sub Recipient level for the quarter. An additional 0.49 FTEs were created/retained at the Prime Recipient level for a grand total of 1.16 FTEs.

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	1	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Project Director	13	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Project Manager	31	09/05/2011
Sub Recipient GIS Director	6	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Internal System Support/Architecture	3	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Provider Relations Manager	13	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Executive Director	7	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Operations Manager	20	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Contracts Coordinator	1	11/01/2009
Prime Recipient Project Manager	19	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	11/01/2011	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	11/01/2012	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? $1,459,468   10q. How much Remains? $3,026,746

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? $449,000   10s. How much Remains? $672,630

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	$60,289	$169	$60,458
Personnel Fringe Benefits	$86,724	$5,556	$92,280	$12,388	$35	$12,423
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	$133	$133	$266
Subcontracts Total	$3,869,875	$729,440	$4,599,315	$1,303,128	$428,815	$1,731,943
Subcontract #1	$3,008,599	$548,665	$3,557,264	$1,290,595	$428,815	$1,719,410
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	$9,940	$0	$9,940
Subcontract #5	$122,578	$23,000	$145,578	$2,593	$0	$2,593
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Other	$16,908	$0	$16,908	$55,472	$0	$55,472
Total Direct Costs	$4,342,547	$1,022,485	$5,365,032	$1,434,373	$429,152	$1,863,525
Total Indirect Costs	$143,667	$99,145	$242,812	$25,095	$19,848	$44,943
Total Costs	$4,486,214	$1,121,630	$5,607,844	$1,459,468	$449,000	$1,908,468
% Of Total	100	20	100	76	24	100

Hardware / Software

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

10v. If yes, please list

Laptop computer and software for Sub Recipient Project Manager (Idaho allocated portion): $352.78
Laptop computer and software for Sub Recipient Vendor Relations Manager (Idaho allocated portion): $339.48
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 $1000 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

We do not anticipate the purchase of any additional hardware/software for the project.

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

10y. If yes, please list

**American Roamer: Market area boundary and speed data on mobile cellular providers - $5147
**Media Prints: Cable franchise boundary database - $500
**ExchangeInfo: Legal exchange area boundary database for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers - $3805
The above data sets were purchased for validation purposes in years 1 & 2. LinkAMERICA anticipates purchasing updates for these data sets in January 2011 for validation purposes in year 3.

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 4 was processed and submitted to NTIA on October 1, 2011.   Status: Complete
**Check maps were created for participating providers in preparation of the Round 5 Data Collection.   Status: Complete

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

The move to 2010 Census vintage in Round 4 resulted in a significant change in block counts in the LinkAMERICA states, this change was reflected in the view of provider coverage on the interactive state map. As the National Broadband Map (NBM) still reflects provider coverage using 2000 Census data, providers were confused when comparing their coverage on the two maps. Communication was sent to providers explaining the difference in their coverage as shown on the interactive state map vs the NBM. Additionally, we continue to encounter difficulty in reconciling reported provider speeds for some providers with the NTIA speed range parameters. We have identified providers whose reported data falls outside of the speed norms identified by NTIA, and are working with them on their submissions for Round 5.

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

As reported for all four of the LinkAMERICA Alliance states, consumers and providers are raising concerns about the frequency in which the National Broadband Map (NBM) is updated. Providers are particularly concerned that the recent data has not yet appeared on the NBM and that consumers and policy makers won't be properly informed on their most recent efforts to expand broadband access.

The current Funding Table reflects amended figures as a result of recent approval of our detailed project plan and refinements of the data development and capacity building budgets. Also, we currently have 7 budgeted contracts but the Funding Table only allows us to show 5. Please see the Excel spreadsheet that was submitted as an attachment to this report for a detailed breakdown of the 3 subcontracts that could not be listed in the table.

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 are the key Planning activities/objectives described in the original project plan:

**Key Stakeholder Interviews: Perform interviews with 20+ influential cross-disciplinary stakeholders within the state to determine most critical barriers to broadband expansion and adoption - Due: June 2010 - Status: Complete (Year 1)
**Publish Initial Broadband Vision Summary - publish draft, review with stakeholders and state, and then finalize summary report of emerging state broadband priorities - Due Date: August 2010 - Status: Complete (Year 1)
**Idaho Household Broadband Survey - perform a statistically significant study of household internet usage and attitudes to help direct broadband planning - Due Date: December 2010 - Status: Complete
**Facilitate Regional Planning Teams: Divide the state into appropriate regions and recruit local stakeholders and other in-state partners to draft regionally specific broadband development plans - Due Date: January 2010 - Status: Complete
**Recruit durable in-state sponsor: identify and formalize relationship with educational or economic development entity that can assist in regional plan develop across the state - and who can work to implement plans beyond Year 2 - Due Date: Dec 2010 - Status: Complete (The "Region IV Development Association" agreed to accept this role)
**Publish Regional Broadband Investment Plans: Work with RPTs to identify most productive short-term activities to expand broadband access and adoption in each region. Document steps to implement those activities and release final report to the public - Due Date: Q4 2011. Status: Complete
**Develop prototype design for up to four additional adoption and use outreach and engagement modules. Due Date: Dec. 2011 Status: Complete
**Develop prototype design for up to four additional adoption and use outreach engagement modules. Due date: Dec. 2011: Status: Complete
**ID Statewide Broadband Coordinator. Due Date: Mar. 2012 Status: Complete

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

The Planning team did not experience any significant challenges or obstacles in Q4 2011. The process continues to move forward on schedule in all six Idaho regions.

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

We do not anticipate changes to the project plans.

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?
A Detailed Project Plan filed in Q3 included Details of the Capacity Building and Technical Assistance projects. Key elements are as follows:
Capacity Building Yr 3 (2012):
*Orientation and shift of planning/capacity building efforts to in-state partners
 *Implementation of program to build sustainable broadband development capacity within Idaho
 *Refinement of capacity building work plan and engagement of partners
 *Development and deployment of initial M&E data collection tools
 *First State Broadband Summit
Capacity Building Yr 4 (2013):
*Expanded broadband-related training capacity within Idaho organizational partners
*Social and economic impact analytic framework
*Transfer of data and planning applications to appropriate in-state entity
*Relevant data available to help shape and focus Idaho broadband development priorities
*Completed technical review of M&E processes
*Second State Broadband Summit
Capacity Building Yr 5 (2014):
*Refined support for delivery of sustainable broadband development capacity in Idaho
*Expanded broadband-related training capacity within Idaho organizational partners
*Operationalization of in-state entity use and maintenance of data and planning applications

*Enhanced M&E data and processes, as needed

Technical Assistance Yrs 3-5 (2012-2015)
*Identify Key technical leaders who can inform broadband policy on a state and federal level
*Established group of leading edge technical leaders in Idaho informed on the latest broadband technologies and broadband   policy

change.
*Continued development of technical leaders in Idaho that can affect state/federal policy, as well as be informed on avenues of available funding for broadband projects.
 11k. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the Project Team is employing

No challenges have yet been encountered in promoting the Year 3-5 goals.

 11l. 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.

CostQuest Associates submitted their audit to EdLab Group for review. EdLab Group has worked with CostQuest Associates to ensure the deficiencies identified by the auditor have been remedied. Per federal regulations, the audit was submitted to the Office of Inspector General and the Department of Commerce on June 30, 2011.

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 Kathy Johnson	12c. Telephone (area code, number, and extension)	
	12d. Email Address kjohnson@edlabgroup.org	
12b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official Submitted Electronically	12e. Date Report Submitted (Month, Day, Year) 01-30-2012	