

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Performance Progress Report

2. Award Or Grant Number
40-50-M09059

4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)
10-08-2010

1. Recipient Name
State of Oklahoma

6. Designated Entity On Behalf Of:
N/A

3. Street Address
2300 N Lincoln Boulevard,

8. Final Report? Yes No
9. Report Frequency
 Quarterly
 Semi Annual
 Annual
 Final

5. City, State, Zip Code
Oklahoma City, OK 73105-4801

7. Project / Grant Period
Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)
01-01-2010

7a. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)
12-31-2014

8. Reporting Period End Date:
(MM/DD/YYYY)
09-30-2010

9a. If Other, please describe:
N/A

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
123	123	78	1	64	65

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

Terral, Wavelinx, Grandlinx, and Whitespace – All are owned by the same company. They were contacted in July by Sanborn. They did NOT respond to our request to participate in submission 2. They have been categorized 'Not Participating'.
Ozark Telephone Company - they are a rural provider, we have contacted their rural lawyer and have never received a response back after multiple contacts.
Seneca Telephone Company –They are a part of Ozark and have been unresponsive – non- trusting of government.
Chickasaw Telephone Company – they are a rural provider, we have contacted their rural lawyer and have never received a response back after multiple contacts.
Oklahoma Western Telephone Company - they are a rural provider, we have contacted their rural lawyer and have never received a response back after multiple contacts.
Pine Telephone Company - they are a rural provider, we have contacted their rural lawyer and have never received a response back after multiple contacts. We talked directly to Lee at Pine. He seemed responsive – the NDA and Data Specifications Document were emailed to him. He then became unresponsive and did not respond to multiple follow-up requests.
WEHCO Video, Inc. – responsive and then they became unresponsive in submission 1. We sent multiple requests for submission 2 but WEHCO was unresponsive. We will try again when we start Submission 3.

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

For the rural TELCOS/ILECs, Sanborn derived data from legal descriptions, FCC Form 477 data provided by the providers and other available information along with support from those providers in submission 1. This was a very time-consuming activity but Sanborn was successful in compiling the information for the majority of these providers. On submission 2, we did NOT receive any FCC Form 477 data. Providers that previously provided FCC Form 477 used the Provider Portal website to make edits to their data or they noticed that the data wasn't as granular as they liked so they provided more detailed data that further refined their data in submission 2.

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

- i. Preliminary QC of the data provided by the provider to make sure all relevant data are provided
- ii. QC of the data after data processing – this involves standard checks to ensure that values in fields are valid, spatial checks to make sure data are in the right locations and processed correctly, etc.
- iii. Providing check-plots/maps/web application to broadband providers with their data mapped.
- iv. Comparison of the data to publicly and commercially available broadband dataset – Exchange boundaries for DSL, MediaPrints for Cable and Fiber and others as deemed necessary. We are also using Speedtest.net data for some speed validations.
- v. Web Surveys
- vi. Speed Tests

The University of Oklahoma Center for Spatial Analysis, a member of the State Broadband Mapping Project team, will also undertake independent verification, which includes working with state GIS staff from across the state to do data validation.

10g. Have you initiated verification activities? Yes No

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

Sanborn performs preliminary QC checks on the data from the time it arrives to when the data is processed and put through final QC. This continues through various checkpoints during the process (such as looking for the maximum and minimum values, averages of fields, determining what percentage of a field is populated and whether null values are allowed, visual and spatial checks, etc.). This process has been applied to all datasets received from providers. Due to broadband data varying widely in completeness and formats from individual providers, these checks have been challenging to keep consistent and uniform without additional and repeated checks by Sanborn.

When data submitted has been incomplete, Sanborn has made efforts to get correct data by going back to the providers. Some providers have given an explanation of missing data, or resubmitted data. Others have responded that they provided what they could, or have not responded at all. As mentioned in the section on data collection, Sanborn has had a hard time collecting all the data from broadband providers even after multiple contacts with each provider. Consequently, some of the information submitted to NTIA includes incomplete data where certain fields of information were not filled in by the providers. For the next few submissions, we are requesting guidance from NTIA about which datasets are more critical than others and which fields we need to improve data collection efforts. We are hoping in the next submission we will be able to improve the data collected for each provider either because we will be asking for less data, or we will have additional sources of information available to us such as our speed tests, etc.

The processed data has been mapped and was made available to the Providers through the Provider Portal whereby providers used an online interactive mapping application to see their data and make corrections using redlining tools provided in the application.

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

N/A

Staffing

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

.5 FTE

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

N/A

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

N/A

10n. Staffing Table

Job Title	FTE %	Date of Hire
Broadband Mapping Project Coordinator	50	04/01/2009
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
The Sanborn Map Company, Inc.	Mapping vendor data gathering for NTIA & State	Y	Y	01/28/2010	12/31/2011	\$2,761,129	\$154,460
Add Row						Remove Row	

Funding

10p. How much Federal funding has been expended as of the end of the last quarter? \$928,149 10q. How much Remains? \$2,394,236

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? \$201,821 10s. How much Remains? \$905,052

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	\$144,750	\$383,773	\$528,523	\$5,824	\$24,878	\$30,702
Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$43,500	\$144,869	\$188,369	\$2,496	\$9,951	\$12,447
Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Materials / Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontracts Total	\$2,761,129	\$578,231	\$3,339,360	\$757,829	\$166,992	\$924,821
Subcontract #1	\$2,761,129	\$578,231	\$3,339,360	\$757,829	\$166,992	\$924,821
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	\$324,000	\$0	\$324,000	\$162,000	\$0	\$162,000
Total Direct Costs	\$3,273,379	\$1,106,873	\$4,380,252	\$928,149	\$201,821	\$1,129,970
Total Indirect Costs	\$49,006	\$0	\$49,006	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Costs	\$3,322,385	\$1,106,873	\$4,429,258	\$928,149	\$201,821	\$1,129,970
% Of Total	75	25	100	82	18	100

Hardware / Software

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

10v. If yes, please list

N/A

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

N/A

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

10y. If yes, please list

NAVTEQ Address Database - Enterprise wide license for the State of Oklahoma.

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

10aa. If yes, please list

The Community Anchor Institution survey web site continues in production and we have now collected broadband survey information from 208 CAI's. A new public survey web site has been launched and thus far we have collected 1,832 surveys and speed tests.

10bb. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing
Sanborn has faced minor challenges working with Rural Telcos and satellite companies. They have been able to mitigate them through discussions with the State and NTIA. Other issues and challenges have been the time taken to deal with providers, getting data from them in the correct format (or any usable format), making them understand the benefits of the program, etc. Sanborn has been able to do this through sheer persistence and tracking providers diligently in their Provider Tracker application.

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

None at this time.

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

No work has begun on the Broadband Planning project.

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

N/A

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? \$492,800

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

11h. How much Remains? \$0

11i. Planning Worksheet

Planning Budget Element	Federal Funds Granted	Proposed In-Kind	Total Budget	Federal Funds Expended	Matching Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Personal Salaries	\$196,000	\$0	\$196,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$58,800	\$0	\$58,800	\$0	\$0	\$0
Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Materials / Supplies	\$48,000	\$0	\$48,000	\$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	\$190,000	\$0	\$190,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Direct Costs	\$492,800	\$0	\$492,800	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Costs	\$492,800	\$0	\$492,800	\$0	\$0	\$0
% Of Total	100	0	100	0	0	0

Additional Planning Information

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

No.

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

None. The project has not been started.

11l. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project

None at this time.

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

Richard Clark

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

4055224971

12d. Email Address

richard.clark@osf.ok.gov

12b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official

Submitted Electronically

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

10-20-2010

Performance Progress Report
OMB Approval Number: 0660-0034
Expiration Date: 08/31/2010