U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE	2. Award Or Grant Number
Performance Progress Report	24-50-M09019
	4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)
	07-25-2012

1. Recipient Name	6. Designated Entity On Behalf Of:	
Maryland Broadband Cooperative, Inc.	Maryland	

3. Street Address	8. Final Report?	9. Report Frequency
212 West Main Street, Suite 304,	⚪ Yes ◉ No	◉ Quarterly ⚪ Semi Annual ⚪ Annual ⚪ Final

5. City, State, Zip Code		
Salisbury, MD 21801		

7. Project / Grant Period Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	7a. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	7b. Reporting Period End Date:	9a. If Other, please describe:
11-01-2009	10-31-2014	06-30-2012	NA

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

We continue to enjoy generally excellent support from the provider community, indeed we are now up to 50 providers in this submission. However, there are providers that have been difficult and others that have been utterly unresponsive. We continue to make attempts to gain their participation. Several resellers have said because they are not facilities based they have no reporting responsibility in the SBI or, that their NDA with the ILEC, forbid their participation even if advantageous to do so. The following 11 providers continue to refuse participation: Airespring, BullsEye, CONXX, Frontier Communications/Global Crossings, Global Crossing Telecommunications, LightEdge Solutions, Metropolitan Telecommunications Holding Company, Qwest Communications Company, RapidDSL & Wireless, Southwest Wireless Group/Transcend Broadband, Transbeam. One Communications is not only refusing to participate with us, but with all SBI programs across the country.

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

In order to support the NTIA's and FCC's focus on community anchor institution (CAI) data collection, we have re-doubled our efforts to collect comprehensive and accurate data by working directly with the Counties. We sent letters to each County Executive articulating the need for the CAI data requested and explaining the potential opportunity costs to the County from not being fully represented in the CAI census. This effort received excellent support from several counties; however, are now re-visiting the need for help on CAI reporting with the unresponsive counties as well as over 70 municipalities, which we are concerned may be under-represented.

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

A maximum of fifteen data checks are conducted on each of the provider-submitted broadband availability data, as listed below. Different versions of data verification tests are conducted on submissions from wireline broadband providers versus wireless providers, because of the differing submission geometry. Those tests listed in bold below have the greatest explanatory value.

1) Maximum down/upload speeds reported by provider
2) Typical down/upload speeds reported by provider
3) Typical down/upload speed from 2010 speed test
4) Speed tests match reported typical speeds or are within 1 speed tier
5) Census blocks/coverage areas verified by 2010 FCC and MBBMI speed tests
6) Census blocks/coverage area reported to project, but no tract reported directly to FCC
7) Tracts reported directly to FCC, but no census blocks/coverage area reported to project
8) Census blocks/coverage areas versus unserved area locations reported
9) Total number of unserved area locations reported per provider
10) Of census blocks reported as served, how many have zero population based on 2000 census data?
11) Web search verification
12) Census blocks that are outside Cable Franchise Boundary
13) Census blocks that are outside DSL boundary

14) Wireless broadband presence and speed systematic field sampling
15) Map review via web conference with broadband service provider

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

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

We have completed the verification tests as noted in the Submission Summary Whitepaper for round 5 and we plan to review, modify, and improve the tests for round 6.

The ESRGC, in partnership with the Center for GIS at Towson University and as a subcontract to the SBI grantee in Maryland, the Maryland Broadband Cooperative, conducted a number of verification and validation tests on the provider-submitted broadband availability data. In the event that inconsistencies or errors were found, any changes were made to the provider-submitted data during this data delivery round were noted in the "Read Me" text file. As expected, we were able to continue modifying provider-submitted data as a result of our testing/research during the 5th round of data submissions in April 2012.

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

NA

Staffing

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

For 2Q 2012, we are reporting 8.95 FTEs created or retained using ARRA funds. We had hoped to begin hiring State Broadband Capacity Building staff before the end of 2Q 2012; however as discussed later, we expect to begin hiring regional Capacity Building staff during 3Q 2012.

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

We had hoped that the project would have been able to begin the hiring process for Capacity Building staff by the end of 2Q 2012. Unfortunately, our intended state partners, the Department of Information Technology (DoIT), has not completed the necessary steps toward transferring their responsibilities for the Capacity Building project making it impossible to proceed with necessary hiring. Although, as of the end of 2Q 2012, we have been unable to complete the documentation, we see no impediments that would hinder us for beginning to hire regional Capacity Building staff during 3Q 2012.

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

11.95

10n. Staffing Table

Job Title	FTE %	Date of Hire
GIS Manager	75	11/09/2009
Senior GIS Specialist	100	12/01/2009
GIS Analyst	100	11/09/2009
IT Tech/Specialist/Web	70	11/09/2009
Programmer	60	11/09/2009
Project Manager	80	11/09/2009
Director	60	11/09/2009
Writer/Research Assistant	50	11/09/2009
SBCB PM	100	10/01/2012
SBCB Staff Analysts (2)	100	10/01/2012

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
Salisbury University	Overall Project technical lead, provide all GIS services, Broadband Demand Forecasting.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/31/2014	2,121,160	0
Towson University	Support data development, verification, and application development.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/31/2014	1,444,606	0
TCC Lower Eastern Shore	Broadband Planning coordination and management in the 4 counties of the Lower Eastern Shore.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/30/2012	94,869	0
TCC MidShore	Broadband Planning coordination and management in the 5 counties of the Mid and Upper Eastern Shore.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/30/2012	113,069	0
TCC Southern MD	Broadband Planning coordination and management in the 3 counties of Southern MD.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/30/2012	87,311	0
TCC Western MD	Broadband Planning coordination and management in the 3 counties of Western MD.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/30/2012	71,603	0
MD Department of Information Technology (DoIT)	State Broadband Capacity Building Support	N	N	09/28/2010	10/31/2014	51,209	0

Add Row	Remove Row

Funding

10p. How much Federal funding has been expended as of the end of the last quarter? $2,116,008   10q. How much Remains? $2,639,760

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? $612,268   10s. How much Remains? $580,898

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	$222,714	$74,000	$296,714	$165,479	$13,063	$178,542
Personnel Fringe Benefits	$89,086	$22,521	$111,607	$65,791	$4,290	$70,081
Travel	$17,619	$0	$17,619	$9,806	$0	$9,806
Equipment	$70,000	$115,811	$185,811	$16,204	$70,811	$87,015
Materials / Supplies	$20,847	$0	$20,847	$7,808	$0	$7,808
Subcontracts Total	$3,992,088	$0	$3,992,088	$1,779,541	$0	$1,779,541
Subcontract #1	$2,121,160	$0	$2,121,160	$721,138	$0	$721,138
Subcontract #2	$1,444,606	$0	$1,444,606	$860,803	$0	$860,803
Subcontract #3	$51,209	$0	$51,209	$0	$0	$0
Subcontract #4	$94,869	$0	$94,869	$27,455	$0	$27,455
Subcontract #5	$271,983	$0	$271,983	$170,145	$0	$170,145
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0

Mapping Budget Element	Federal Funds Granted	Proposed In-Kind	Total Budget	Federal Funds Expended	Matching Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Other	$351,565	$980,834	$1,332,509	$71,380	$524,104	$595,484
Total Direct Costs	$4,755,768	$1,193,166	$5,948,934	$2,116,008	$612,268	$2,728,276
Total Indirect Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Costs	$4,755,768	$1,193,166	$5,948,934	$2,116,008	$612,268	$2,728,276
% 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

We purchased the Dell Workstation and the ESRI ArcInfo Software in a previous quarter. There were no additional hardware purchases in 4Q 2011.

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

We have not purchased the servers, licenses or additional storage, because the project schedule does not call for their acquisition as yet.

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

10y. If yes, please list

We had originally planned to purchase wireless coverage areas from a vendor. We have not purchased this data and do not plan to as we have received that information from the providers themselves. We have purchased other data sets that we did not realize that we would need when the proposal was submitted. One example is the Maryland Property View data set which provides a centroid location for every property in Maryland. This has aided in the accuracy of our geocoding and assigning end users to the correct block. We have also acquired historical speed test sample information for the state of Maryland for 2009. In 2Q 2011, we purchased additional data from DirectMail.com, focused on government service providers. We did not make any additional data purchases in 2Q 2012.

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

10aa. If yes, please list

NA

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

The data validation and verification process listed above does an admirable job of mitigating obstacles by triangulating the data accuracy and completeness in many indirect ways, thus gaining a good sense of data confidence, or not. Collecting community anchor data has presented several obstacles. 1) Confirming participation is often problematic because many CAIs do not feel comfortable providing the requested data. This is the lesser obstacle, as the team strategy is to communicate the purpose and value of participating in the project. 2) We are often unable to identify the contact that has access to the requested data. This is the larger obstacle due to the specific technical of the information we are seeking, and the large number of facilities targeted for data collection. Our revised strategy has been to contact County Executives directly and communicate the opportunity costs in terms of lost federal funding if the CAI are not counted in the census. The results have been encouraging. We have improved data quality for the March 2012 submission of CAI data, which was our most comprehensive and accurate to date. In the second quarter we made a breakthrough in the State Broadband Capacity Building project. DoIT has agreed to transfer its Capacity Building project commitments and responsibilities to Salisbury University. Through Salisbury University and the Tri-County Councils we are implementing a decentralized Capacity Building program that will leverage previous planning work to coordinate stakeholder in the regions to develop actionable solutions to identified Broadband needs. We expect to begin work, hiring staff and pursuing the goals of the regionally focused State Capacity Building project during 3Q 2012.

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

We completed negotiations to allow start of Capacity Building project focused on regional broadband implementations and problem solving. Attended two national conferences, the Broadband Communities meeting in Dallas, and the SHLB Conference in Arlington, Virginia. Completed re-design of the Interactive Mapping site with a successful public launch on July 23rd. Expanded participation in

State Broadband Initiative Network. Coordinated with Colorado Governor's Office to review structures and approached to addressing the expansion of Broadband in rural and underserved areas.

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

Completed:
• Initial Meetings with Regional Council Leadership
• Format Design for the Stakeholder Meetings
• Format Design for the Summit Meetings (General Public Meeting)
• First Stakeholder Meeting for Southern Maryland
• First Stakeholder Meetings for Lower and Upper Eastern Shore
• Second Stakeholder Meeting for Southern Maryland
• First General Public Meeting for Southern Maryland
Second General Public Meeting for Southern Maryland
• First General Public Meeting for The Lower and Upper Eastern Shore Scheduled
• Second Stakeholder Meetings for Lower and Upper Eastern Shore Scheduled
• Third Stakeholder Meeting for Southern Maryland
• First Stakeholder Meeting for Western Maryland
• Fourth Stakeholder Meeting for Southern Maryland
• First General Public Meeting for Western Maryland
• Second Stakeholder Meeting for Western Maryland
• Third Stakeholder Meeting for Lower Eastern Shore of Maryland
• Preliminary Draft of Regional Plan Template
• Third Stakeholder Meeting for Western Maryland
• Fourth Stakeholder Meeting for Lower Eastern Shore of Maryland
• Second Stakeholder Meeting for Upper Eastern Shore of Maryland
• The All-Region Online Survey of Stakeholders (Replaced with Google Docs)
• The Preliminary Draft of Regional Plan Template Circulated to All Regions
• Fifth Stakeholder Meeting for Southern Maryland
• Sixth Stakeholder Meeting for Southern Maryland to Review Preliminary Report Draft
• Fifth Stakeholder Meeting for Lower Eastern Shore of Maryland
• Seventh Stakeholder Meeting for Southern Maryland to Review Intermediate Report Draft
• Eighth Stakeholder Meeting for Southern Maryland to Review Final Report Draft

Next Three Months:
Meetings are planned on the Eastern Shore, Western MD and Southern MD. The team is also utilizing Google Docs to conduct the collaborative writing process with all four Regional Planning teams.

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

As previously reported, we are advancing with an outline that is acceptable to the regional teams.

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

NA

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

11i. Planning Worksheet						
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?

No.

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

Not at this time.

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

Not 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
 	
Andrew Van Dopp
	12c. Telephone
	   (area code, number, and extension)
	
	     410-341-6322

	12d. Email Address dvandopp@mdbc.us
12b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official Submitted Electronically	12e. Date Report Submitted (Month, Day, Year) 08-28-2012