U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE **Performance Progress Report**	2. Award Or Grant Number 24-50-M09019
	4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY) 10-24-2011

1. Recipient Name Maryland Broadband Cooperative, Inc.	6. Designated Entity On Behalf Of: Maryland	
3. Street Address 212 West Main Street, Suite 304,	8. Final Report? ○ Yes ◉ No	9. Report Frequency ◉ Quarterly ○ Semi Annual ○ Annual ○ Final
5. City, State, Zip Code Salisbury, MD 21801		

7. Project / Grant Period Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY) 11-01-2009	7a. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY) 10-31-2014	7b. Reporting Period End Date: 09-30-2011	9a. If Other, please describe: 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 added 8 new providers since the previous 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.

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. We were able to improve data quality on over 1200 CAIs and submitted the largest and most accurate CAI data to date on September 30. In the coming quarter we will re-visit the need for help on CAI reporting with the unresponsive counties.

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 4 and we plan to review, modify, and improve the tests for round 5.

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 4th round of data submissions in October 2011.

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 3Q 2011, we are reporting 14.95 FTEs created or retained using ARRA funds. In addition to our normal staff complement, we hired 6 FTEs of student workers to assist in field verification of wireless coverage areas. This work began in June and continued through the summer. We had hoped to begin hiring State Broadband Capacity Building staff before the end of 3Q 2011; however as discussed later, this has been impossible.

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 be fully staffed, including the Capacity Building staff, by the end of 3Q 2011. Unfortunately, our intended state partners, the Department of Information Technology (DoIT), has not fulfilled their responsibilities to the Capacity Building project making it impossible to proceed with necessary hiring. Although we appreciate that DoIT has been overwhelmed by their responsibilities with the BTOP grant, DoiT's complete lack of attention to Capacity Building forces us to conclude that, for the time being, we need to request a fundamental change in the project. In order to make forward progress, we will be asking the NTIA to relieve us of the grant responsibility of partnering with DoIT until such time that DoIT, or other sutiable state partner, is able to provide the support and focus required of this important effort. At which time, we will hand over the work that has been advanced to the suitable state agency.

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

16

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
GIS Specialist	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	01/02/2012

SBCB Staff Analysts (2)	100	01/02/2012
Field Coverage Area Verification Techs (6)	100	06/01/2011

[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
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 Easter 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	Broadband Planning coordination and management in the 3 counties of Western MD.	N	Y	11/01/2009	10/30/2012	71,613	0
MD Department of Information Technology (DoIT)	State Broadband Capacity Building	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? $1,487,817   10q. How much Remains? $3,267,951

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter? $465,909   10s. How much Remains? $727,257

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	$119,156	$13,063	$132,219
Personnel Fringe Benefits	$89,086	$22,521	$111,607	$47,662	$4,290	$51,952
Travel	$17,619	$0	$17,619	$5,960	$0	$5,960
Equipment	$70,000	$115,811	$185,811	$15,150	$70,811	$85,961
Materials / Supplies	$20,847	$0	$20,847	$4,692	$0	$4,692
Subcontracts Total	$3,992,088	$0	$3,992,088	$1,237,746	$0	$1,237,746
Subcontract #1	$2,121,160	$0	$2,121,160	$578,026	$0	$578,026

Mapping Budget Element	Federal Funds Granted	Proposed In-Kind	Total Budget	Federal Funds Expended	Matching Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Subcontract #2	$1,444,606	$0	$1,444,606	$530,525	$0	$530,525
Subcontract #3	$51,209	$0	$51,209	$0	$0	$0
Subcontract #4	$94,869	$0	$94,869	$27,455	$0	$27,455
Subcontract #5	$280,244	$0	$280,244	$101,741	$0	$101,741
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Other	$343,414	$980,834	$1,324,248	$57,450	$377,745	$435,195
Total Direct Costs	$4,755,768	$1,193,166	$5,948,934	$1,487,817	$465,909	$1,953,726
Total Indirect Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Costs	$4,755,768	$1,193,166	$5,948,934	$1,487,817	$465,909	$1,953,726
% Of Total	80	20	100	31	39	33

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 the Third Quarter.

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 3Q 2011.

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 over 1200 CAI for the September 2011 submission which was our most comprehensive and accurate to date. Last quarter we believed the State Broadband Capacity Building project would get underway as we completed a complicated document negotiation process with our State

of Maryland partners (DoIT). However, it is now clear that DoIT's BTOP commitments and lack of organizational focus on Capacity Building makes it impossible to move forward without a material change to the grant structure. We will request the NTIA to allow us to begin hiring staff and pursuing the goals of the Capacity Building project on our own, even without the official endorsement and support of a specific state department. Our goal is to make sure the work gets accomplished, (due to delays caused by DoIT we are now almost 1 year behind schedule), and when DoIT, or other suitable State department, is ready to participate we will happily bring them on board.

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

On July 12th we hosted a Regional Broadband Mapping Grantee meeting at Towson University. The meeting was attended by delegations from DC, DE, MD, NJ, PA, VA, and WV. Everyone discussed their successes and challenges openly and candidly. We found that there were several best practices we could share on a state-to-state basis to solve individual issues and deficiencies, but even more excitingly, the attendees want to investigate if we can address some issues that have affected us all as a regional block. It was agreed that the regional focus is something we want more of, so we have committed to get together more often, perhaps twice a year on a rotating basis where other states will follow Maryland's lead in playing host. Also, our field verification of 3G and 4G cellular service is providing some astonishing results (Verizon 4G phones in central MD downloading at > 20Mg) and providing excellent maps that are exciting to county planners and economic development folks.

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

Next Three Months:
No meetings are planned. The team is 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. Indeed, the first draft template has been delivered to the stakeholder team in Southern MD.

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
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) 11-22-2011	