UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

NATIONAL BROADBAND PLAN WORKSHOP

PROGRAMMATIC EFFORTS TO INCREASE BROADBAND

ADOPTION AND USAGE - WHAT WORKS AND WHAT DOESN'T?

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, August 19, 2009

```
 1     PARTICIPANTS:

 2     ANGIE KRONENBERG, Moderator

 3     KATHRYN FALK
       VP, Public Affairs, Cox Communications, Northern
 4     Virginia

 5     GREG GOLDMAN
       Chief Executive Officer, Digital Impact Group
 6
       HOWIE HODGES, SR.
 7     VP for Business Development & Government Affairs,
       One Economy Corporation
 8
       LAURIE ITKIN
 9     Director of Government Affairs, Cricket
       Communications, Inc./Leap Wireless, Inc.
10
       THOMAS KAMBER
11     Executive Director, Older Adults Technology
       Services (OATS)
12
       MARK MALASPINA
13     Chief Program Officer, Computers for Youth

14     RAQUEL NORIEGA
       Director of Strategic Partnerships, Connected
15     Nation

16

17

18

19

20                      *   *   *   *   *

21

22
```

                    P R O C E E D I N G S

1

2   MS. KRONENBERG: I'm Angie Kronenberg,

3   and I'm Special Counsel in the Wireless

4   Telecommunications Bureau.

5   Welcome to our third panel on Adoption

6   and Utilization Issues. Earlier today, we focused

7   on data, the data that we already have and the

8   data that we need in order to pursue formulating

9   our national broadband plan.

10   And the last panel that you may have

11   heard really focused on the consumer side -- why

12   consumers need it and why all consumers need it.

13   And so this panel we're going to talk

14   more about the actuality of these programs that

15   those representing different organizations are

16   here because they have actively been engaged in

17   focusing on broadband adoption and usage.

18   We have seven distinguished panelists

19   who are joining us. They will each introduce

20   themselves and talk a little bit about their

21   programs. They'll spend five minutes. Then we'll

22   turn to a Q&A session. And for those who are

1   participating here in the room or online, please

2   submit your questions.

3   We have index cards in the room if you'd

4   like to submit a written question, and for those

5   who are online, if you could just submit your

6   questions through WebX.

7   Before I turn it over to our panelists,

8   I would like to take just a moment to introduce --

9   and those who are here from the FCC -- to join me

10   on this panel to ask the questions.

11   Next to me is Brian David. He's

12   Adoption and Usage Director. Across from me is

13   Elise Kohn. She's the Adoption Manager. And they

14   are both on the Omnibus Broadband Team.

15   Also joining me is Nasha Gudlesberger,

16   who's Acting Chief of the Spectrum and Competition

17   Policy Division in the Wireless Telecommunications

18   Bureau, and Nancy Murphy, who is Associate Chief

19   of the Media Bureau.

20   So I'd like to turn it now to Kathryn

21   Falk, who is Vice President of Public Affairs at

22   Cox Communications in Northern Virginia.

1   MS. FALK: Thank you. Thank you so much

2   for having me here today.

3   At Cox, our commitment to our

4   communities goes beyond broadband -- beyond the

5   deployment of broadband to bring the benefits of

6   broadband to all our consumers, specifically those

7   consumers on the other side of the digital divide.

8   As a result of this commitment, Cox has

9   been long and involved in significant adoption

10   efforts through all of its systems, playing to our

11   strengths as a trusted provider of allowable

12   broadband connectivity.

13   For example, we were founding members of

14   Cable in the Classroom, which provided

15   complementary educational programming and online

16   resources to 81,000 public and private schools

17   nationwide.

18   We were also through the federal e-Rate

19   program able to provide Internet access to 93

20   schools -- 93 school districts in 13 states,

21   serving over 1,100 individual schools and

22   libraries.

1   And as early as 1997, we established the

2   Line to Learning Initiative, which has donated

3   Internet access to more than 2,400 schools and

4   libraries and community centers.

5   Drawing on our experiences in attempting

6   to bridge the digital divide, we proposed in our

7   comments on the FCC National Broadband Plan that

8   the FCC adopt 10 pilot projects aimed at

9   low-income households with school age children by

10   2010, and use that experience to launch similar

11   programs by 2012 nationwide.

12   In the paper we submitted, we expanded

13   on the idea of the program that could serve as a

14   template for such adoption programs. We stated

15   that partnerships are the key to success for an

16   adoption program, and that they require at least

17   three elements.

18   One is the organization to identify the

19   target population and administer the program.

20   Two, an organization to provide

21   computers and training on how to use them for the

22   participants.

1   Three, an organization to provide the

2   broadband service.

3   We believe that these three elements can

4   be found in each effective adoption program within

5   our footprint and that they're a key to success.

6   Our recommendation comes from our direct

7   experience. We're a national partner to the Boys

8   and Girls Club of America, and to help bridge the

9   digital divide, we provide them with free or

10   discounted Internet service worth millions of

11   dollars to numerous clubs across the country.

12   In Virginia alone, we partner with 36

13   clubs serving a few thousand children.

14   We also partner with schools on the Take

15   Charge Initiative for Internet safety, and in

16   Virginia, we forged a close partnership with our

17   state on both broadband mapping to identify

18   unserved areas, and we've also developed a program

19   for education access to make education access

20   easier by providing 39 GED prep classes and 20

21   English for All ESL classes on demand to more than

22   a million households in Virginia.

1   In addition, since 2002, Cox has been

2   the broadband partner for a program in Santa

3   Barbara, California called computers for families,

4   targeting low- income children in the fourth to

5   sixth grades.

6   This program provides families in the

7   program with a computer, training on how to use

8   the computer, and Cox's standard broadband

9   service, complete with parental tools, firewalls,

10   and software at a discounted price.

11   Over the past seven years, more than

12   3,500 children have benefited from the program,

13   and our records indicate that more than 70 percent

14   remain Cox Internet customers after the discount

15   period ends.

16   Finally, Cox has also partnered on Lemon

17   Link at the Lemon Grove, California School

18   District since 1997, to launch this innovative

19   partnership to connect children to server-based

20   computing with a Cox Internet connection at no

21   cost to the children. It's provided at a discount

22   rate and bulk to the school.

1   In this community, where 69 percent of

2   the children, are on free and reduced lunch,

3   standardized tests have shown that children

4   involved in the program have shown positive -- a

5   positive upward trend in their testing.

6   While every community may not have

7   exactly the same ingredients that make these

8   programs a success, Cox believes that the basic

9   recipe can be modified to meet the needs of

10   families in many places.

11   We appreciate your allowing us to be

12   here today. Thank you.

13   MR. KRONENBERG: Next we have Greg

14   Goldman, who's CEO of Digital Impact Group.

15   MR. GOLDMAN: Good afternoon, everyone,

16   and thank you so much for having me and our

17   organization represented here today.

18   We are a small Philadelphia-based

19   non-profit organization that provides direct

20   broadband adoption services to low-income families

21   throughout the City of Philadelphia, and we've

22   generated through a lot of trial and error and

1   learning a model that we think is highly

2   replicable and applicable to other communities

3   across the country. I have a couple of quick

4   slides on it.

5   Our model involves a full tech pack that

6   participants can earn without a cash outlay. They

7   can earn the tech pack via a sweat equity

8   approach, by participating in training programs or

9   achieving certain programmatic benchmarks for

10   education, health and welfare, and employment and

11   training.

12   A full tech pack will include a new

13   laptop, home broadband service, customized low

14   literacy training, targeted content that is

15   entry-level and literacy- appropriate, and ongoing

16   local support.

17   This is what we consider to be the

18   comprehensive full package of services that is

19   required to enable a family to overcome the

20   multiple barriers that exist to broadband

21   adoption.

22   We work through the community-based

1   organizations at the local level -- echoing some

2   things that have already been said, that Kathryn

3   already mentioned -- identifying organizations

4   that are directly linked to those individuals and

5   families and households who we're attempting to

6   serve so that we don't have to re-create a

7   qualification or distribution mechanism.

8   In three years of our work, we have

9   provided these tech packs in a fashion that

10   supports other programmatic objectives for

11   low-income families. In the area of jobs, for

12   example, we work with a community group called

13   Metropolitan Career Center.

14   We provide these full tech packs on the

15   basis of participants completing training

16   programs.

17   In the area of education, we work with

18   an organization called Philadelphia Academies,

19   which serves low-income, worthy high school

20   students, and the students earn the full tech pack

21   by achieving certain grade point averages and

22   attendance benchmarks.

1   And our program there supports the use

2   of broadband service for higher education,

3   employment for youth.

4   In the area of economic development, for

5   example, we've worked with an organization called

6   Project Rise, which identifies people coming off

7   welfare who are attempting to start their own

8   small neighborhood businesses.

9   This addresses the digital divide that

10   exists for small business. And so when these

11   individuals complete their training program for

12   business, they then receive an additional package

13   of services, a tech pack, that enables them to

14   become business ready on the web.

15   Let me go to the next slide. Our

16   program has benefited from a formal evaluation

17   that has been conducted by the OMG Center for

18   Collaborative Learning, with funding from the

19   William Penn Foundation.

20   It's a two-year evaluation, and it's

21   shown that participants do learn significant tech

22   skills via the program. They use these services

1   for the goals of employment and education, which,

2   in the BTOP Program, are essential goals.

3   There's effective by focusing on the

4   household. There's effective trickle up in

5   trickle-down. So we really try to focus our work

6   on an entire household versus individuals and

7   really focus our energies to teching up, if you

8   will, a household because the benefits spread out

9   to all the members of the household, even though

10   only one person has to participate in the training

11   program.

12   Packaging services together is a strong

13   enabler, and helps overcome the multiple barriers.

14   Partnerships with other nonprofits that have the

15   connection are very effective, and it does yield

16   sustainable ongoing adoption.

17   And then lastly, looking ahead, we're

18   trying to -- we're obviously, like many other

19   organizations, participating in the BTOP NTIA

20   process. We're involved in a unified application

21   with several City of Philadelphia agencies, large

22   and small. And we're also working with a private

1   small -- a local cable company that serves our

2   housing authority to try to develop, replicate,

3   and expand, this model into new areas.

4   So thank you very much.

5   MSS. KRONENBERG: Next we have Howie

6   Hodges who is Senior Vice President for Business

7   Development Affairs at One Economy Corporation.

8   Thank you, Howie.

9   MR. HODGES: Thank you. Thank you for

10 having me and welcome.

11   One Economy was established in 2000 with

12 four people in the basement here in Washington,

13 D.C. Today, we have over 90 staff. Our work is

14 present all around the United States and in four

15 continents.

16   And we were founded on the premise that

17 there is a nexus between the quality of life and

18 the quality of information, especially for

19 low-income families.

20   We were determined to discover how

21 technology could be used to solve the social

22 problems that affect poor people and their

 1   communities.

 2   What we chose to focus on really are in

 3   three distinct buckets, and they are on the

 4   availability of broadband access services to an

 5   area of affordability of those services, as well

 6   as the provisions of the services, including the

 7   technology and the hardware; and then more

 8   importantly, how is it adopted?

 9   Seeing that -- building these technology

10   conduits to nowhere without adoption is really a

11   failed policy.

12   Next slide, please. When we look at our

13   work, we really looked at it also through the lens

14   of information that came back through the Pew

15   Study that said what were the barriers for

16   adoption and utilization by everyone, but

17   primarily our focus is looking on low- and

18   moderate-income families.

19   And so there are four key barriers to

20   adoption. One was the cost of the hardware; two,

21   the cost of the provisioning or the services;

22   three, the relevancy of Internet information or

1   content on the Internet -- whether it was in

2   multiple languages; and then four, content that

3   really spoke to the needs of low-income families.

4   And so what we've done is we've focus on

5   digital literacy initiatives that really support

6   widespread adoption. And our successes have been

7   in several areas.

8   One, we've connected in terms of the

9   availability of broadband, we've connected more

10   than 350,000 households, primarily in affordable

11   housing communities, with high- speed service

12   since 2005, and we have impacted or changed the

13   housing -- tech policy in our 40 states.

14   Also, we have been able to help more

15   than 7,000 families fill their income taxes online

16   and earn the Earned Income Tax Credit Rebate

17   through our program, our web portal called the Bee

18   Hive during the 2008 season.

19   Over 500,000 kids have received help,

20   homework help, through our homework portal on the

21   Bee Hive website, and then this slide really talks

22   about our primary program, which is called the

1   Digital Connectors Program, where we engage young

2   people and get them in the community as technology

3   ambassadors, young people between the ages of 14

4   and 21 who go out into the community to perform

5   service activities.

6   They are given a laptop as part of their

7   completion, but more importantly as part of their

8   curriculum, they are required to give back

9   community hours to help their -- the relatives and

10   members of the community actually get engaged and

11   involved with broadband.

12   When we talk about content, again, part

13   of our strategy is three-pronged: Access,

14   affordable access; getting youth engaged to be

15   technology ambassadors; and then, three, the

16   relevancy of meaningful online content.

17   Again, as the Pew Survey indicated that

18   there were several barriers to adoption. One was

19   that there's not enough information or content on

20   the Internet that speaks to low- and

21   moderate-income households.

22   The other barrier, again noted in that

1   research, was that the information is not relevant

2   or at least people did not see the relevance in

3   it.

4   And so we've created our broadband

5   portals for public purpose media -- the public

6   Internet Channel, again, and our Bee Hive. We've

7   got a 24/7 town hall. We've got homework

8   informational resources available through the

9   ZipRoad, and then Health Care for You, allowing

10   information at the localized level to have access

11   to experts online with healthcare information.

12   And then we've got a program that brings

13   all the kids together, called the Digital

14   Connectors Program.

15   Lastly, as part of the BTOP Program, One

16   Economy formed a major public-private partnership

17   with all of the leading civil rights

18   organizations, and we call it the Broadband

19   Opportunity Coalition, with the National Urban

20   League, LULAC, the National Council of LaRaza, the

21   Asian- American Pacific Justice Center, and then

22   the Joint Center for Political and Economic

1   Studies.

2   And so with that combined force, we hope

3   to delve deeper into communities, providing on the

4   ground, localized grass-roots information on

5   adoption, content, and access. Thank you.

6   MS. KRONENBERG: Next we have Laurie

7   Itkin. She's Director of Government Affairs of

8   Cricket Communications, which is Leap Wireless

9   Company.

10   MS. ITKIN: Thank you, Angie. I was

11   invited to talk today about a sustainable

12   broadband adoption project called Project Change

13   Access, but before I do that, I want to talk

14   little bit about Cricket. Next slide, please.

15   Cricket is a wireless carrier that

16   really has 10 years of experience facilitating

17   adoption. And when we started a decade ago, it

18   was time when about 50 percent of Americans did

19   not subscribe to wireless voice service.

20   And we all take it for granted today

21   that almost everybody who we deal with on a daily

22   basis has a wireless phone. But 10 years ago that

1   was not the case.

2   And we came in as a new carrier and we

3   thought, "What are the barriers to adoption of

4   wireless voice service?"

5   And we found that people could not pass

6   a credit check. They could not qualify for

7   wireless service from traditional carriers. Maybe

8   they couldn't -- they weren't in a position to

9   sign a two-year contract or face an early

10   termination fee.

11   Maybe they couldn't pass a credit check

12   or make a deposit. So all those things were

13   barriers.

14   So we really broke in that market, and

15   now the wireless adoption rate is very high in

16   this country. But we still find today that our

17   customers are really the underserved when you

18   compare our customers to the customers of the

19   large wireless carriers in this country.

20   We're seventh largest wireless carrier

21   now, and the slide that I have up shows that 50

22   percent -- 56 percent of our customers are

 1   primarily African-American, Hispanic, and from

 2   other ethnic groups as compared to 17 percent of

 3   the industry average.

 4   Our customers tend to be younger, and

 5   most importantly, our customers are lower income

 6   than the rest of the wireless industry average.

 7   Sixty-two percent of our customers earn less than

 8    $50,000 a year, and a very high proportion of our

 9   customers earn much less than that.

10   So recently, within the past year and a

11   half, we decided to bring broadband, wireless

12   broadband, to the underserved. And, today, we

13   have what's called Cricket Broadband, and it's the

14   same model as the voice -- no signed contracts, no

15   credit checks, it's unlimited, it's month -- you

16   just pay by the month, and there are no cables.

17   We think that mobility in wireless

18   broadband access is a key differentiator.

19   We struck us is very interesting. Then

20   we did focus groups of our first round of

21   customers, we do provide service in over 30

22   states, and we just launched in Washington, D.C.,

1   we were really surprised to find that 50 percent

2   of Cricket broadband Internet customers had never

3   subscribed to Internet at home, not even dial-up.

4   So that was quite intriguing to us, and

5   we think one of the reasons they came to Cricket

6   is along with not having these strings attached,

7   we also were pricing our service at about

8   two-thirds of what our large wireless carriers

9   charge for their wireless access.

10   Next slide, please. I will either go

11   little further. We really wanted to start

12   penetrating those folks that still hadn't

13   subscribed to broadband at home, and so we started

14   with one of our joint venture companies, LCW

15   Wireless.

16   In Portland, Oregon, we did a trial of

17   -- called Project Change Access, where we worked

18   with our friends here at One Economy, because One

19   Economy needs to partner with actually providers

20   to actually provide the service. And it's a great

21   partnership.

22   So One Economy identified needy families

1   through their partnerships with various

2   community-based organizations. So in Portland, we

3   had a suite of organizations, but, of course,

4   those will change depending on the locality at

5   question.

6   So what we did is Cricket provided -- we

7   found parties to donate the broadband wireless

8   cards. We donated two years of free wireless

9   service.

10   Cricket employees, in some cases, went

11   to recipients' homes to help them figure out how

12   to launch broadband, how to connect to the

13   Internet.

14   And as Howie discussed, One Economy

15   provided the really crucial relevant content to

16   people, because once you have access to the

17   Internet, how are you going to use it, and how's

18   going to be meaningful to your life?

19   So I know I don't want to get scolded by

20   Brian here, so I will just briefly mention that we

21   did apply for a Sustainable Broadband Adoption

22   grant, in conjunction with One Economy, to expand

1   the program in five cities, to 23,000 families.

2   What will be interesting is that while

3   we provided free service in Portland, we know that

4   in order to really affect sustainable adoption,

5   recipients must have some skin in the game.

6   And, therefore, we're proposing in our

7   application to charge a real -- like a token

8   monthly subscription fee that will stair step up

9   over the year -- over the second year to finally

10   full price.

11   And then we think we'll have some very

12   good data to provide the government on what really

13   -- what the churn rate is -- how many people stuck

14   once they were introduced.

15   So I want to just briefly -- I know I'm

16   out of town, but if you go to the next slide.

17   We did a video. We interviewed some of

18   the recipients of the program, and some of the

19   testimonials were really just, you know, awakening

20   to us. You know, one college student said that

21   "Cricket broadband has helped make my life a lot

22   easier in a lot of different ways, from paying

1   bills to accessing school materials."

2   A single mom said -- who's a college

3   student -- said that she can utilize a lot of

4   scholarly journals online. She's found a lot of

5   help to her peers online. And she's just thrilled

6   to be able to contact them and have a lot of

7   resources using the Internet.

8   So, anyway, it's been a very successful

9   program, and I look forward to discussing it more

10   in the Q&A.

11   Thank you.

12   MS. KRONENBERG: Thank you. Next we

13   have Dr. Thomas Kamber. Dr. Kamber is Executive

14   Director of the Older Adults Technology Services.

15   Welcome.

16   DR. KAMBER: My non-profit is based in

17   New York City, and we are five years old. I'm

18   actually an alumnus of the One Economy system. I

19   was their New York director before I founded One

20   Economy -- before I founded OATS.

21   And I want to just start by calling

22   attention to the critical nature of what I call a

1   crisis in underutilization of technology and

2   broadband services by older adults and senior

3   citizens in the United States.

4   People talk a lot about underserved

5   populations, and there's a lot of data, and there

6   are many groups that are underutilizing or under

7   -- have limited access to broadband services. But

8   statistically, seniors are the group that seem to

9   come out the worst in every survey that I look at.

10   The current Pew numbers are 42 percent

11 of older adults over 65 are using the Internet at

12 all; 30 percent have Internet access at home for

13 senior-headed households, which is about half of

14 the national average.

15   The most recent statistics from New York

16 show a large survey of the housing authority

17 households, which are low-income, have 69 percent

18 utilization at -- for the general population of

19 housing authority households.

20   Senior-headed households are at five

21 percent, which is 12 times lower.

22   So we just have this catastrophically

1   low rates of utilization by seniors, both in terms

2   of use, in terms of skill level with the Internet,

3   in terms of being able to access and work with the

4   programs.

5   And when I started OATS, I went out and

6   did a survey of what was available for seniors,

7   connecting them to the Internet, and I visited

8   dozens of sites around the city, and found that

9   sort of universally sites had some kind of

10   Internet access -- a lot of local community

11   technology centers, but the standard story was,

12   "Well, we've tried this, and it really isn't

13   working." You know, we brought in some guy from

14   the neighborhood to teach a class, and he taught

15   for a few months. And it was really exciting when

16   it started, but then it didn't go anywhere. And

17   now, we're sort of running out of steam and don't

18   know what to do.

19   So when we put together the OATS

20   Program, we tried to adjust for some of the

21   problems that seemed to be existing, and the model

22   that we've developed -- we've been able to train

1   5,000 people now five years later.

2   We've programs operating at 30 locations

3   around New York City. We've never charge the

4   seniors themselves for the services that we

5   provide. They're all free to the end user, but we

6   do a lot of earned income partnerships with local

7   housing groups and recreation centers and things

8   like that that help fund our programs.

9   And our model involves, one, focusing on

10 the specific means that older adults tend to have.

11 Seniors are -- and kind of getting a little bit at

12 the question that came up in Brian's panel earlier

13 -- seniors actually have attitudinal issues

14 associated with technology that are not common to

15 younger populations and to other individuals.

16   So they see themselves as -- from a

17 technology point of view, they see themselves as

18 older people. And that matters. They didn't grow

19 up playing video games.

20   There's a challenge in terms of getting

21 people over the hump of adopting. They have a

22 low-threshold of frustration with technology.

1   So we focus on their needs, their

2   learning needs. We teach shorter classes. We

3   teach longer courses that go on for 10 full weeks.

4   We teach twice a week so that people retain the

5   information.

6   It's incredibly intensive. But it is

7   free, and it is very supportive. It's very

8   collaborative.

9   We always partner. We've never done a

10 class that wasn't a partnership, so we partner

11 exclusively in our model.

12   We also then find that centralizing and

13 professionalizing the services matter. This is

14 not something where you can bring somebody in from

15 the local Craig's list and have them make $10 an

16 hour and come up with a computers for dummies

17 curriculum and get it to work.

18   So we've developed 800 pages of

19 curriculum that focused on seniors, and our top

20 five trainers have all taught more than 700

21 community-based technology classes at this point.

22 We have one guy over 1,000 classes.

1   So we pay people well. We give them

2   health insurance. We treat this as a professional

3   obligation to do it right.

4   We then have integrated a lot of our

5   programs with other services because we have the

6   depth in the community, so we have very intensive

7   inter-generational progress. We have a 54-hour

8   credit bearing class that we provide high school

9   students who then co-train our courses with the

10   seniors.

11   We've taught several hundred students in

12   that class. We have a workforce initiative, where

13   are teach seniors workforce relevant skills. We

14   have a collaboration with a hospital in Brooklyn

15   where we're embarking on a training for their

16   geriatric patients at home, and we're teaching the

17   seniors at home and giving them free Internet

18   access and computers so they can communicate with

19   their doctors and access their health IT records.

20   And now we have a full-scale evaluation

21   of our program underway with a foundation that's

22   funding it, where we've been able to send a value

1   is out to shadow our trainers and visit at home

2   and on the phone with 75 of our participants in a

3   longitudinal way so that we'll know more over what

4   they're doing over a six- to nine-month period

5   than has been known before from this.

6   So our key issues in terms of what we're

7   recommending or what we've learned from this

8   really are one, it is legitimate and important to

9   carve out seniors as a targeted population and

10   dedicate resources to those individuals.

11   Two, it's critical to invest in anchor

12   institutions. This is not something that can be

13   sort of subcontracted out on a happenstance kind

14   of basis where, you know, you just sort of hope

15   the groups figure out a way to carve out

16   somebody's two- or three-hour a week to go teach

17   the classes. That's something that people really

18   need to do, take more seriously.

19   It's critical to integrate programs both

20   in terms of services and other partnerships that

21   are out there. And finally, we feel that it's

22   critical to integrate both a classroom-based

1   training with a home-based training and also a

2   web-based approach, which is something that we

3   stole wholesale from the One Economy approach.

4   So that's sort of our general pattern.

5   MS. KRONENBERG: Okay. Thank you, Dr.

6   Kamber. Next we have Mark Malaspina, who is Chief

7   Program Officer of Computers for Youth.

8   MR. MALASPINA: Hi. Thanks for having

9   us. I wanted to talk a little bit about the

10   approach that Computers for Youth has taken over

11   the last 10 years. We operate in New York City

12   and four other cities around the country, and I

13   think we've taken a particular approach to the

14   same kinds of issues that the other groups have,

15   and maybe there's some interesting lessons that we

16   can share. Next slide, please.

17   So I want to start with Howie's

18   reference to the Pew Study, because that's

19   actually, I think, a starting point for us. And

20   that Pew Study among households of less than

21   $20,000, which are the typical households that

22   Computers for Youth works with, a leading factor

1   in terms of an optical to adoption was this notion

2   of relevance.

3   And what we found at Computers for Youth

4   is that -- is kind of an obvious thing, I would

5   say; that among households with kids, the biggest

6   motivator is the child's success, and the child's

7   success in education.

8   And that's a hook that I think that

9   would be smart to build into federal broadband

10   policy, because it is actually the most natural

11   motivator of them all.

12   And so our angle on this is all focused

13   around the family, around education.

14   And we look at some leading research

15   that's come out both in the United States and

16   Europe around the home learning environment.

17   And what's interesting about this is,

18   you know, as we all imagine, low-income students

19   are doing much worse than other higher-income

20   students in school. Part of the problem is that

21   the home learning environment typically among low

22   income students is deficient in certain ways that

1   are not the fault of the parents, but are really a

2   factor of income and other kinds of training that

3   could be made available to the parents.

4   So from our perspective,

5   broadband-enabled education technology is actually

6   a really powerful change agent for the home

7   learning environment. It brings both cognitive

8   stimulation into the home, and it can empower

9   parents to be learning partners in ways that I

10   think are really surprising and really powerful.

11   Next slide, please. So CFY has

12   developed over the last 10 years a conference of

13   model for family engagement, which now is really

14   -- you know, previously it was focused on the

15   dial- up actually, you know, eight, nine years ago

16   -- is now really focus on broadband; and has a

17   number of different components.

18   So I think like Thomas was saying we're

19   -- you know, I think the notion of any kind of

20   sliver of a program doesn't usually work. It has

21   to be thought of as a comprehensive engagement

22   program.

1   And for us, that has meant working with

2   -- through the school system, because schools are

3   often considered trusted partners by families.

4   So we operate a competitive selection

5   process among low-income schools with 75 percent

6   or more students on free or reduced lunch.

7   Those schools then participate very

8   actively in the outreach process to families, and

9   we typically get 70 to 80 percent of families

10   attending our family learning workshops, which

11   occur on Saturdays, when most families are able to

12   attend.

13   At those learning workshops, a very

14   intensive training around a -- what we call home

15   learning center that is provided free of charge to

16   the family.

17   That home learning center includes not

18   just the hardware, but also software that's

19   installed as well as online subscriptions to

20   educational software that are included free of

21   charge; as well as broadband sign-up information.

22   In cities where we have partnerships or

1   discounts that are available, we make those --

2   make that information known.

3   And then on the back end, we also are

4   providing robust technical support. That includes

5   a help desk, free computer repair services for the

6   life of the computer, et cetera.

7   What ends up happening is that families

8   can become very motivated by the power of

9   educational technology, including broadband.

10   So by hooking into -- you know, what was

11   again consider the most powerful motivator, we're

12   able to engage families in adopting educational

13   technology in the home in a way that I think, you

14   know, can be learned from in terms of national

15   policy.

16   We work also with six affiliates around

17   the country as well. The next page, please.

18   So the scope of what we've done over

19   time has served about 39,000 students, parents,

20   and teachers. We've found both, you know,

21   powerful educational benefits from our program as

22   well as some interesting findings of our own about

1   actual broadband usage among the poorest families,

2   which I think is probably in our sense maybe even,

3   you know, overstated in studies.

4   The low-income households really need

5   help. They need, you know, access as well as

6   relevant content in order to adopt.

7   MS. KRONENBERG: Thank you. So next we

8   have Raquel Noriega. She's Director of Strategic

9   Partnerships at Connected Nation. Welcome,

10   Raquel.

11   MS. NORIEGA: Thank you. Thank you.

12   First of all, thank you very much for inviting

13   Connected Nation to participate in this panel. We

14   exist since 2001, when we were created and we

15   began in the State of Kentucky. We started as a

16   think tank. We started as a think tank to think

17   exactly through the problems that the FCC is

18   currently today thinking about -- how can a

19   governor and the state agencies and platform that

20   it has at his or disposal improve the adoption

21   rates and investment in infrastructure in his or

22   her state?

1   What started as a think tank, as an

2   academic exercise comprised of several

3   universities in the state turned out to be a

4   program called Connect Kentucky, which was created

5   in 2004.

6   And we've learned a few things since

7   then, and a lot of what we've learned is very much

8   consistent with everything we've heard here today.

9   I have a lot of slides, which have a lot

10   of data. I know I can't go through, but I thought

11   that perhaps during the Q&A we might get to.

12   So let me get on with it. Can you go to

13   the next slide? One of the things we learned

14   originally through our academic exercise and since

15   we've now become -- became Connect Kentucky and

16   now Connected Nation program that actually is

17   trying to implement programs at the grassroots

18   level -- is that data matters.

19   And so invest a huge amount of resources

20   to get the data. What I'm going to present here

21   today is mostly survey data to understand drivers

22   and barriers to broadband adoption. There's also

1   been a lot of discussion of late about broadband

2   mapping, which is also something that we pioneered

3   back in 2005 in Kentucky.

4   Here we have some data. This is from

5   our latest survey. We do this periodically in the

6   states where we work. It helps us benchmark our

7   strategies, which is why we invest so much

8   resources in this.

9   And it very much complements a lot of

10   what my co- panelists have been saying. Key

11   drivers to broadband adoption. This is responses

12   from non-adopters of broadband, when they are

13   asked, "Why do you not adopt?"

14   This is from Tennessee, but we've done

15   this across time in various states, and we have

16   very similar results.

17   And so what you see at the top there is

18   I don't own a computer. Computer ownership, and

19   that was discussed today, is a huge barrier.

20   The second point that you see there is

21   one that we call the lack of awareness of need,

22   which, again, a lot of the -- my co-panelists have

1   been addressing. It's got to do with

2   understanding how this technology can affect your

3   life, can affect your business, can affect your

4   children's lives.

5   And secondly, of course, knowing how to

6   use it, which, for a lot of our citizens,

7   particularly poor citizens or poorer citizens,

8   elderly citizens, et cetera, is a huge challenge.

9   There's other barriers to adoption,

10   which is affordability. It's -- I don't -- it

11   doesn't exist in my neighborhood. And a lot of

12   what we do does -- our conference programs that

13   I'm going to talk bit more about here today are

14   about -- address these issues.

15   But let me go on and move on to the

16   sustainable adoption programs, which addresses the

17   top two. Next slide. Next slide. The next one,

18   please.

19   This is -- this comes from the 1930s and

20   '40s. This is from the Rural Electrification Act,

21   where we learned the lessons. Again, much of what

22   has been said here. You must make this technology

1   relevant to the users that are non-adopters, the

2   slow adopters.

3   Can you go -- move on two slides,

4   please? How do we do that? How have we approach

5   this? We came from a different perspective than

6   some of my co-panelists.

7   We started as to build a comprehensive

8   program that can actually reach all communities

9   within the state, not just urban communities were

10   a lot of these great innovations are happening.

11   What we learned is that in order to be

12   effective in those communities, we have to create

13   -- we have to empower local leaders across the

14   sectors that are described in this slide, which

15   are the anchor institutions within a community to

16   become two things: Ambassadors for broadband in

17   their own communities and decision-makers for

18   technology planning in their own communities.

19   What we learned early on is that the

20   state, the federal level, the private sector

21   working in conjunction with public resources can

22   enable change, but change has to happen at the

1   local level and be led by local leaders.

2   And so what we bring together and try to

3   educate through a lot of data that we gather

4   ourselves and through a lot of best practices that

5   we know from folks like the ones in this table and

6   many, many others, we can present to them the

7   benchmark of their community against other similar

8   communities.

9   We can present to them ideas of how your

10   community can take pragmatic steps within six, one

11   year, two years, and three years to accomplish

12   very specific goals, for example, as simple as

13   creating a municipal or county portal that

14   actually provides e-government services that

15   matter to your citizens.

16   Many other examples abound. And I won't

17   go on there at this point.

18   Let me just only say -- can you go a

19   couple of slides -- one more, one more, one more,

20   one more, one more, one more -- also what we do

21   and this is with the generosity of state and

22   private donors, we provide computers to either

     1   children -- families of disadvantaged households

     2   or community institutions.

     3   We've distributed over 5,000 computers

     4   to date. We're hoping to distribute many more.

     5   And the results -- how these -- this is low-income

     6   families. This is a slide from -- some data from

     7   Kentucky in 2007. Low-income families, when

     8   empowered with that very expensive computer, adopt

     9   the service, use it.

    10   In other words, computer -- the computer

    11   ownership barrier really does matter. Thank you.

    12   MR. KRONENBERG: I'm going to start off

    13   the questions, and hit upon a theme that we were

    14   hearing throughout each one of your statements and

    15   that is relevancy to the users.

    16   How do you determine what is relevant to

    17   the user that have not adopted yet, and also once

    18   you determine that, then how do you develop the

    19   content for those of you who have actually been on

    20   the content side of this?

    21   MR. HODGE: Let me just step in and

    22   answer the question about developing the content,

1   we're saying content that makes a difference in

2   people's lives, and, so like many of our panelists

3   here, we focused on those topics around education,

4   health care, money, school, and jobs.

5   And so -- and our -- when you kind of go

6   through our Web portal, we've got content based on

7   those very specific areas.

8   In terms of how we've been able to

9   develop the content, we've gotten support from

10   different funders, from private sector. We work

11   with all of the industry experts to help develop

12   the content. We now have our studio where we've

13   developed and made it, say, user-friendly, in

14   multiple languages, English as well as in Spanish

15   as well as in other languages when we are

16   overseas.

17   We're in Turkey. We're in South Africa

18   -- and native languages there.

19   We hope to bring and add additional

20   languages here in the United States, where we've

21   developed our programming.

22   But more importantly, the content is,

1   again, just moving away from just very static kind

2   of textual-based pages make it more interactive --

3   and so video-based programming and content; you

4   know, You Tube and others are very popular. And

5   so bringing content and kind of an engaging way is

6   another way of kind of making it relevant, making

7   it easy to use, and then making it kind of

8   engaging for people to take action.

9   MR. MALASPINO: I just had two kind of

10   overall thoughts about the question of how to

11   produce the content.

12   CFY does produce some content, which is

13   focused around the training and also the computer

14   interface and portal, but I think there are two

15   lessons that we've learned that I think are worth

16   sharing.

17   One is there's a lot of great content

18   out there, and so it may not be worth really

19   reinventing content but rather organizing it and

20   packaging it for families and students -- both

21   students and parents to use in the right way.

22   And the second lesson I think that we've

1   learned is the value of allowing the participants

2   themselves to participate in the vetting process.

3   So we actually have a team called a

4   student software team, which is a large group of

5   students that we select from our participating

6   schools that are involved in actually reviewing

7   online and CD-ROM software. We also then, you

8   know, take that information and talk to education

9   executives, and then go back to the families to

10   try out the finalists of the software.

11   So I think it's important to build that

12   kind of component into the thinking about content.

13   MS. KRONENBERG: Raquel?

14   MS. NORIEGA: What we -- as we go into

15   these communities and try to reach out to all of

16   these different sectors. We do this in every

17   county. Our job is to figure out what -- how

18   these communities are using currently technology,

19   and how they're not.

20   And so, for example, we're able to

21   understand today have a government portal -- a

22   local government portal -- that actually provides

1   services as opposed to just a nice little brochure

2   that with some basic information.

3   If they don't, then what we -- that, to

4   us, is an immediate potential area where we can

5   try to educate them.

6   And so, our role is to provide to them a

7   couple of things. One of them is how are these

8   serve -- for how much does it cost. Very

9   pragmatic things of how do you develop this? Who

10   develops it, even within your community?

11   But also how is he going to impact your

12   citizens? How is it going to save them money,

13   time, et cetera?

14   And so another example: In the

15   educational systems, when we get to the

16   educational systems, particularly in rural areas,

17   a lot of communities are having a very hard time

18   hiring quality teachers, for example, in sciences.

19   And so that's a deficiency that they

20   currently are hurting from. Well, we can start

21   talking to them about resources within their state

22   that they don't know about or that they kind of

1   knew about, but not how to pull the pieces

2   together and say, well, university so and so is

3   providing tutoring on line, classes on line, and

4   here's how you might want to start thinking about

5   this possibility.

6   And so on and so forth. Similarly, with

7   libraries. A lot of these communities are doing

8   very -- are doing IT literacy programs, but many

9   of them don't -- are not aware that there are

10   actually state and private- level resources or

11   many of the community organizations, such as the

12   ones presented in this panel, who could actually

13   help them do a better job.

14   So, again, you bring that to them. And

15   so in small ways, by identifying what they are

16   lacking, you can really help them push the

17   frontier.

18   Another thing that works is

19   benchmarking, because every community when they

20   see -- so if you benchmark, for example, rural

21   counties against other rural counties, nobody

22   likes to be behind. And so when you start, when

1   county so and so starts seeing three counties over

2   there are doing, they start getting pretty

3   intrigued and want to learn more and become an

4   ambassador and a planner for their own community.

5   DR. KAMBER: Can I throw one more quick

6   thought on that.

7   MS. KRONENBERG: Sure.

8   DR. KAMBER: I think there's a real

9   value. A number of programs when we started out

10   were sort of very digitally run, and so there was

11   this sense that people would kind of by a CD-ROM

12   and learn the computer from that.

13   And I think there's an enormous value to

14   face-to- face time in the classroom, and so I've

15   taught several hundred of our classes. I still

16   teach the classes from time to time to get in

17   there and talk to people.

18   We ask a lot of questions, and we get

19   all sorts of bizarre responses from people that we

20   didn't expect. The workforce classes grew out of

21   us teaching in Bedford Stuyvesant, and we went in

22   with a whole curriculum and people said, you know,

1 yeah, this is useful.

2   And at the end of it, we said, "What did

3 you really want to learn?" And they said, "We

4 need jobs." And I said, "Oh, I didn't realize

5 that."

6   So we went back and built a new 10-week

7 course out of that.

8   So getting in there, face-to-face, and

9 asking people what they need, having them evaluate

10 at the end, and having a lot of open-ended

11 questions is really critical.

12   And then I think the curriculum

13 development and the content development really

14 depends a lot on what they're asking for. It's a

15 lot easier to develop a course on computer basics

16 than it is on, you know, telemedicine and health

17 IT, which is what we're working on this year.

18   MS. KRONENBERG: Greg, I think you had

19 something you wanted to add?

20   MR. GOLDMAN: Building on this and all

21 the comments that have been made, the approach

22 that we take is to tie the content specifically to

1   the programs that the individuals are already

2   participating in.

3   So if they're participating in a

4   workforce or an employment and training program,

5   it's employment and training content. If they're

6   participating in a maternal child health program,

7   it's well-baby content. If they're participating

8   in a mental health program, it's mental health

9   content, and so on.

10   So I think it's very important to build

11   the adoption, the entire adoption program,

12   particularly content, to connect it to programs

13   that folks are already participating in so we're

14   not creating (off mike)

15   Secondly, I think it's very important to

16   consider these kinds of content efforts to be

17   entry level. Our goal is to have people move

18   beyond the content that we're offering at the

19   beginning so that they become fully participating

20   users of all of the stuff that's on the Internet,

21   whether it be, you know, buying and selling things

22   and doing banking and doing all the other things

1   that all of us participate in.

2   So I think it's very important to think

3   of this content effort as entry level.

4   And thirdly, I think it's extremely

5   important now that we begin to think of our

6   participants as content creators themselves. And

7   so now where we're starting to go, although we

8   have not done this as much in the past, but

9   looking ahead, it's to enable participants to use

10   the tools that are available now to create their

11   own content, which really takes it to the next

12   level.

13   MS. KRONENBERG: Kathryn?

14   MS. FALK: Yeah, I just had a brief

15   comment, which is in our examples with the Boys

16   and Girls Clubs and with the Lemon Grove School

17   District and the Santa Barbara School District,

18   they have all created the content for the Boys and

19   Girls Clubs or the school district for their

20   school districts.

21   But it's important that the communities

22   be able to customize that to their local

1   experience, which isn't the same in every

2   different community.

3   So they need to be able to customize

4   that. Nese, would you like to ask a question?

5   MR. GUENDELSBERGER: Actually, I see

6   that there are a number of other programs and

7   (inaudible) at the local levels and grassroots or,

8   you know, community levels, data- gathering first

9   and then coming up with a plan and programs.

10   How can you actually -- how can you

11   learn all those little pockets of experience, and

12   how can we scale this, somehow connect all this

13   knowledge and bring it sort of one step up and

14   have a national or even larger adoption programs?

15   MS. FALK: I'll take a shot at that. I

16   think in our comments we said that we would

17   recommend that the Commission embark on 10 pilot

18   programs, and that they select those programs by

19   2010; that they be targeted at low-income, at-risk

20   students and their families, and that they use

21   that experience to build larger programs that can

22   be implemented through 2012.

1   The different pilot programs will give

2   you an idea of what will work, but it's not so

3   much that you could -- in our experience that you

4   could scale this into one large program, but that

5   you could find many ways -- many different

6   programs that you could plant as seeds in

7   communities. And, with the proper watering and

8   nurturing of the soil, they would grow into the

9   important programs that would be relevant to that

10   community.

11   MR. GOLDMAN: I would just suggest that

12   -- actually listening to everyone, I think there

13   are clearly some things that each panelist has

14   mentioned that come through. Now there are

15   certainly areas where we have program differences,

16   but I'll just take a crack at five that I think I

17   heard every single person say, and see if I'm

18   right.

19   One, I think everyone mentioned that

20   services need to be comprehensive and that there

21   not be one element, but that somehow or other

22   services need to be comprehensive.

1   Everyone mentioned focusing on the

2   household and not just focusing only -- not to

3   take away from institutions -- but they need to

4   focus on the household.

5   Everyone mentioned community-based

6   services related to the actual communities where

7   folks live and the institutions that they relate

8   to.

9   Everyone mentioned in tents of services.

10   It takes time and it takes money, and that is just

11   the reality of what this is.

12   Lastly -- and I'm going to make one more

13   comment -- lastly, it's human. I think Thomas

14   said such an important thing. These programs are

15   strictly technology- based simply do not work for

16   this population.

17   There must be a human element, and all

18   of the trainings have to be introduced by human

19   beings and supported in an ongoing fashion with

20   cumin, ongoing training.

21   MS. KRONENBERG: Raquel.

22   MS. NORIEGA: I would agree with these

1   comments. I think that -- I think it's important

2   to remember that problems -- diagnosing the

3   problem is very important, and as we have done

4   that, as Connected Nation has done that, but we've

5   definitely learned is that every community is

6   different.

7   There's general patterns that have been

8   discussed here today that affect certain parts,

9   certain demographics -- rural, urban, et cetera.

10   But in order to understand what ails a

11   given population or a given community, one needs

12   to focus on a particular community.

13   So a one-size-fits all approach is not

14   really going to work.

15   The other thing we've learned is that by

16   empowering local leadership, by going -- or local

17   leadership which could be at a county, it could be

18   at a neighborhood within a community, that's the

19   way to really empower or effectuate growth.

20   What effectively private corporations as

21   well as state government has done in the past is

22   to try -- is to support that kind of initiative

1   through many of the organizations here represented

2   and many others.

3   So I would encourage federal policy to

4   rely on these kinds of initiatives as opposed to

5   trying to make some kind of a one-size-fits-all

6   model.

7   MR. MALASPINO: Can I follow up on that,

8   on all three of those answers?

9   I think your five themes are helpful,

10   and I actually agree with what you're saying. The

11   problem I think that Nese is pointing out that we

12   face is so what do we do about it; right? What do

13   you need from us?

14   Everyone has got a program that works.

15   Each of you would describe it slightly

16   differently, although there are themes. It's not

17   clear yet how you each measure success in your

18   programs.

19   What I haven't really heard a ton about

20   is dollars per person connected, dollars per

21   increased utilization metric to be determined by

22   some, you know, at some other time.

 1   So what do you need from us? If we're

 2   thinking about a plan, what needs to be

 3   incorporated into the plan that is meaningful,

 4   even if it's all local efforts what can the FCC

 5   and other government agencies do?

 6   And then if the answer is we need money,

 7   which I'm sure that's part of the answer, then I

 8   guess I would test with you this: If you can't

 9   measure and you can't track success, definitively,

10   tell me where to put the money. Tell me how to

11   figure out where to put the money.

12   So.

13   MS. ITKIN: Yeah. I mean I think you're

14   going to say, again not talking about BTOP too

15   much, but I can't avoid it, because I think you're

16   going to see in those applications they ask that

17   very question: What is going to be the cost per

18   user to do whatever your solution is going to be.

19   And there will be some grants awarded.

20   There will be quarterly reporting. I

21   think you're getting a lot of data out of that. I

22   really think so, and I think that I would just

1   recommend that the FCC work arm in arm with NTIA

2   to be analyzing that data and for future rounds

3   and so forth.

4   So I think you're -- I think that's good

5   to be the best information collection that you're

6   going to find over the next year.

7   MS. KRONENBERG: Dr. Kamber?

8   DR. KAMBER: I would just add on there.

9   My impression from doing this work is that there

10   -- I worked in the housing field before I worked

11   doing this, and I've been amazed at the level of

12   transformation that's occurring with the people

13   that we're working with.

14   We've got an outside evaluator right now

15   doing all sorts of evaluation, and we have every

16   one of our seniors do a survey monkey at the end,

17   so we have all sorts of attitudinal data in terms

18   of their confidence living independently, their

19   satisfaction levels with the course, their sense

20   of improvement in their skill level.

21   We've done a little bit of longitudinal

22   surveying with some computers that we gave away

1   1,200 free laptops with a local non-profit called

2   Per Scholas in New York, and we've been surveying

3   some of the seniors and going back to them and

4   seeing how they're using them.

5   I would love to be held to a high

6   standard of program outputs and outcomes that we

7   think are really transformational both in terms of

8   people's utilization rates, the percentage of

9   people who are actively using computers three to

10   six months out, their satisfaction with their

11   experience using the technology, their specific

12   skills in terms of everything from input devices

13   all the way up to workforce skills, and then into

14   things like health IT outcomes in terms of not

15   necessarily costs, but health satisfaction rates

16   and their levels of interaction with their

17   providers and their caregivers.

18   All that data is critical, and I think

19   you're going to see -- I mean we're hearing

20   fantastic results from it so far.

21   So I don't see any problem with that.

22   MS. KRONENBERG: Would you be willing to

1 share your data with us?

2   DR. KAMBER: Of course. Yeah.

3   MS. KRONENBERG: Great.

4   MR. MALASPINO: Could I address both of

5 the questions, because I think that the root of

6 your question is, you know, are the -- what we're

7 talking about here, kind of isolated good stories

8 that can't necessarily be scaled, in which case

9 how could you form a national policy around it?

10   And your questions is, you know, what

11 are the ways in which the federal government could

12 help beyond just money to -- around these issues?

13   And I think what -- our perspective I

14 think maybe it's slightly different than some of

15 the other comments.

16   I think we -- you know, we began in New

17 York City. We felt like we developed a very, you

18 know, solid model there across the different

19 boroughs of New York City, but that's just New

20 York City.

21   So then we took the model and over the

22 last few years have worked now in five different

1   regions, including one very small district in the

2   Bay Area, you know, different sized districts --

3   charter schools.

4   And I would say our -- the lesson we've

5   learned is that the common elements are I would

6   say even stronger than the specific elements. In

7   other words, yes, there are ways in which

8   everything has to be customized to the local --

9   you know, to the local environment.

10   Yes, you have to be -- you know, you

11   have to think about the -- what languages spoken

12   in that community. Yes, you have to think about

13   how the school districts actually operate.

14   But, in fact, if you look -- if you go

15   to any one of our family learning workshops across

16   the country on a given Saturday during the school

17   year, 95 percent of what you would see would be

18   absolutely identical.

19   And I think what -- and I would venture

20   to say that if we actually look at everybody's

21   program here, I think we would find a lot of

22   commonality. Even as you go from rural to

1   suburban to urban, in our experience, the primary

2   motivators for families remain around the child's

3   success.

4   And so I would like to think that you

5   could actually build a policy that celebrates the

6   commonalities rather than shies away from it

7   because of some of the local differences.

8   In terms of what the federal government

9   could do, we do have I think one thing that we've

10   learned that is extremely challenging for us; is

11   in our model we, you know, we provide the home

12   learning Center. We then provide information

13   about broadband adoption and any available dis --

14   you know, broadband discounts that we or other

15   people have made available for those providers.

16   In our experience, the most difficult

17   local issue that we are encountering is how to

18   forge those kinds of partnerships and a robust and

19   meaningful way that lasts over time, and that, you

20   know, that take -- you know, if we're solving the

21   hardware barrier. We're solving the relevance

22   barrier. But the price barrier is still there.

1   And if there was a way for the federal

2   government to step in and say, we're not just

3   going to throw money at this issue, but we're

4   going to, in a very targeted way, create, you

5   know, vouchers or other kinds of programs so that

6   low-income people could in the -- perhaps in the

7   kind of stepped up way that Laurie was talking

8   about -- be able to access those in a way that

9   didn't require so much labor intensive work on the

10 part of local nonprofits to develop those

11 relationships, it would be enormously powerful.

12   I mean I really think that that would

13 change this conversation entirely if there was,

14 you know, some kind of federal program that

15 allowed those kinds of subsidies to be made

16 available more seamlessly and without all the,

17 frankly, overhead that it takes our staff to be,

18 you know, on the street knocking on -- you know,

19 we're having conversations with the providers in

20 New York City.

21   We're doing that in the Bay Area, and

22 it's.

1   MR. DAVID: So what if the --

2   MR. GOLDMAN: Here, here to that.

3   MR. DAVID: So what if the prerequisite

4 to that, just staying on this theme for a second,

5 was, okay, there's a pot of money -- I don't know

6 -- created over here. I have to go ask someone

7 for it.

8   But if the prerequisite was that the

9 community had to get together and create

10 essentially a standard of metrics for defining

11 success across what you do. If you're right and

12 you're right, there are common themes.

13   If those common themes can be drawn down

14 to the level of metrics that can be measured and

15 tracked, you know, in March we won't have answers,

16 but in October we might. And in three years, we

17 certainly will.

18   Is there room -- you know, you're all

19 busy. You all have things to do. Would people

20 come together and create that sort of standards

21 body -- if I want to call it that -- and is it

22 possible? And I'm open to someone saying actually

1   it's not possible to create a metric standard, a

2   measurement standard that can be uniform so that

3   we can figure out if that program makes sense,

4   where -- you know, how to deploy it and where to

5   spend the money.

6   MS. FALK: I would just like to share

7   with you in our Computers for Families Program in

8   Santa Barbara, we were able to measure success,

9   and we think we had tremendous success there.

10   Now that program is for fourth through

11   sixth graders.

12   MR. DAVID: No, I -- I know you all can

13   define and measure your own success. The problem

14   is if we have to put a policy together that speaks

15   to all of you at once without being a single

16   solution to fit all, then the metrics need to be

17   common to everybody.

18   And so I guess I am interested in

19   raising it up, as Nese said, to the next level and

20   saying, okay. Will you get together and create

21   this standards body said that then we have

22   something to measure against across all of you?

1   DR. KAMBER: Having just spent the last

2   two months doing that with the program that we're

3   not allowed to talk about today, my impression is

4   that that is not a major problem. It's a question

5   of having a process that is, you know, you bring

6   in the right -- you bring in a group of people.

7   You can be reasonably inclusive; give it a

8   timeline so it doesn't go on for years; and make

9   sure that there's, you know, an actual award to

10   people coming to some conclusions.

11   I don't think most of this stuff is all

12   that complicated. I really don't. I mean we're

13   all using very similar measures. We're not that

14   far off. I mean, you know, One Economy like we,

15   you know, completely ripped off their model. So,

16   you know, we're going to use their measures.

17   We agree on a lot of this stuff already,

18   so I don't think you have that much conflict over

19   it.

20   MS. NORIEGA: We do have metrics and

21   partly because we have been funded by the state,

22   we had to have some kind of ability to benchmark

1   ourselves; also because we wanted to know how we

2   were doing and if we have to change course.

3   We do that through survey research,

4   periodic survey research. And we benchmark

5   ourselves against national trends, so we have

6   number of computer -- computer growth within the

7   state, adoption growth within the state, et

8   cetera, and by different demographics.

9   And we typically compare that to some of

10   the FCC data, but mostly Pew data because that's

11   the only national source available.

12   So, in a sense that how do you benchmark

13   -- benchmarking against something that is solid

14   and national is, thank God, for Pew. I don't know

15   if Jim -- well, anyway.

16   But I do want to address the earlier

17   question you made, which is how does -- well, what

18   is the FCC roles in it? I would argue that the

19   FCC is already doing a great deal and the fact

20   that we're talking about this here the FCC is a

21   point -- that's a case in point.

22   I think there is increasingly a shift in

1   the perception of what policy makers that are in

2   the telecom and broadband space need to focus on.

3   This used to be this house -- this house

4   here used to be a great deal about many of the

5   important things that it does and should continue

6   to do in our opinion, which is to regulate, is to

7   promote competition; it's to check, you know, all

8   kinds of things that are very technical in the

9   sector.

10   There was universal service, but even

11   that was for infrastructure buildout, the

12   universal service policy that was kind of

13   targeting adoption of the services really link up

14   in lifeline, which is, of course, now being

15   considered for broadband.

16   And we certainly support. But there's

17   what we've -- where I'm getting at is that was the

18   past. What we see today and Connected Nation has

19   been from the very beginning saying that the

20   broadband challenge is not just a supply- side

21   challenge.

22   We do work in many rural communities,

1   where, of course, that supply-side challenge is

2   the most prevalent. But the adoption site -- the

3   demand side problem that all of these

4   organizations are trying to address in different

5   ways is as critical and perhaps even harder to

6   resolve.

7   What we're seeing in Washington -- and

8   we certainly welcome it -- is there's a shift, a

9   paradigm shift of what policy makers need to focus

10   on. And I think that, you know, case in point,

11   we're here talking about this. So that's point

12   number one. The FCC has perhaps a cultural shift

13   to make of what its role is, and it perhaps

14   shouldn't only be the role of the FCC. It should

15   be the role of the Department of Commerce, and the

16   Department of Agriculture, and the Department of

17   Health, and the Department of Education.

18   It's a very holistic approach to get

19   this right. But I -- I mean I'm encouraged -- or

20   we're encouraged, because we do see signs that

21   we're going in that direction.

22   MS. KRONENBERG: Nancy, would you like

1   to ask a question?

2   MS. MURPHY: Brian took my question. So

3   I will build on that, and I will say currently the

4   FCC's focus is very broad -- completely expensive.

5   And we talked about the measurement problem and,

6   you know, all of you have these fabulous programs

7   out there that are really making a very positive

8   difference in the lives of the members that your

9   programs target.

10   But when you have so many different

11   programs out there, measurement is totally

12   inconsistent. I mean you just -- it's almost

13   impossible to have consistent goals and

14   measurement components that we can roll up to a

15   national level and work with.

16   So my question is, should we narrow our

17   focus to a target group or to a few target groups

18   and by way of example we have the e-Rate Program

19   that we already work with.

20   It's currently targeted to phone usage,

21   but could be focused on broadband usage. And so

22   we've got the e-Rate program and I know there --

1   you know, we have Computers with Youth, and, Mark,

2   you've done some tremendous research on the impact

3   that that has not just on the students put on

4   their entire families.

5   One Economy is also similarly focused on

6   the family and many others as well. And then

7   there's Cable in the Classroom that, you know, can

8   maybe help bridge all the components to make sure

9   that we bring together the equipment, the

10   broadband, the training and the technical support

11   that's needed, along with an umbrella project,

12   program, that can pull it all together.

13   And, Mark, I think it was your group

14   that is doing work with ETS to identify the impact

15   that your program is actually having on test

16   scores. And that could be a very concrete way to

17   identify what to measure the success of the

18   program.

19   So I just open it up at that.

20   MR. GOLDMAN: Just to sort of just start

21   the conversation on that, briefly, I think it is

22   important to understand from the policy level at

1   the FCC this is a new area. I mean this is really

2   a new area. And so the question that you have and

3   that you are struggling with makes sense that you

4   have it, and it makes sense that you're struggling

5   with.

6   And I think that the role -- one very

7   important role for the FCC is to help us answer

8   that question. I mean we could, you know, bring

9   -- and in different -- with the same folks coming

10   together in a different kind of working forum

11   instead of a presentation type forum, we could

12   probably come up with, you know, you have national

13   organization -- you have national organization, a

14   local organization, senior organization, and

15   schools organization; right, and corporate

16   entities and governmental entities represented.

17   We could probably in a different kind of

18   working forum these seven people or some versions

19   of us, or avatars maybe, we could -- that's so

20   cheap, because I've never done that -- but, you

21   know, we could probably come up with a working

22   kind of answer, you know, for you where we just

1   start and put all our stuff, you know, out on the

2   table, and kind of hashed it out in a different

3   kind of working session.

4   And then we pitch it to you and you go,

5   this is our policy. This is what -- these are the

6   program elements that need to be in place.

7   MR. DAVID: We accept your offer.

8   MR. GOLDMAN: What's that?

9   MR. DAVID: We accept your offer.

10   MR. GOLDMAN: Great.

11   DR. KAMBER: I mean to piggyback on

12   that, it's just to point out I mean that these

13   scaling questions, you know, are I think very much

14   to the point right now, because the reality is

15   that this problem is such a gigantic problem, but

16   there has not been a major national investment in

17   this. I mean I had back in the late '90s worked

18   on one of those TOP grants.

19   And, you know, that's the last time

20   anybody spent any money on this stuff, and then

21   you sort of got a lot of backwash of CTC is kind

22   of clinging to life for about five or six years,

1   and out of that has grown up some very strong

2   models here that you're hearing around this table.

3   So now, you know, because there hasn't

4   been a major national program, there hasn't really

5   been much of an effort to standardize some of

6   these measures.

7   But I -- honestly, we've never had any

8   trouble with the measures, you know, in terms of

9   figuring out what they should be, and I think --

10   you know, I think there's really been a -- it

11   wouldn't be super hard to come up with them,

12   frankly.

13   MS. NORIEGA: And maybe -- we, as I said

14   earlier, we do invest quite a lot of resources to

15   try to understand where we are and where we need

16   to go.

17   And then we can benchmark our progress

18   through survey research. What we measure is

19   adoption, computer ownership, and through a lot of

20   different demographics.

21   So we can cut the data in many, many

22   ways and compare it to existing national data.

1   That's the way we do it, and, you know, our

2   results indicate that growth in -- across the

3   board is higher than the national average, which,

4   to us, is an objective measure.

5   I think that that's going to be -- that

6   could possibly happen with programs that are

7   targeting specific populations if there is data

8   out there that is -- that provides a national

9   level adoption and computer ownership -- IT

10   literacy, different stats for different

11   demographics.

12   Currently, the FCC doesn't really have

13   much of that going on. The Pew is to our

14   knowledge anyway the best natural resource. That

15   would be actually very useful if the FCC invested

16   in trying to understand not just from the supply

17   side, but from the demand side by different

18   demographics that come you know, urban children,

19   elderly, et cetera.

20   So that's one possibility. I don't --

21   but I would caution against trying to somehow

22   build a metric that applies to everything, because

1   the metric that is going to be a great success for

2   OATS is probably going to be very different than

3   one that is targeting children that -- these are

4   programs that all have different speeds by nature.

5   And so maybe trying to impose a model

6   from above is not the way to go. That being said,

7   national benchmarks to which we could all compare

8   our work would be very useful.

9   MS. ITKIN: I think one of the major

10   issues to focus on is affordability of the

11   broadband service. I mean I know what I pay for a

12   cable modem at home. I know what my wireless

13   competitors charge for coming out, wireless

14   service. I mean we're talking about 60 bucks a

15   month on average, and because of the fact that

16   Cricket has priced under the market, we are

17   showing a direct correlation between, you know,

18   uptake and adoption because of price.

19   So I think it was mentioned, you know,

20   expand the Lifeline Program to include broadband

21   service, although that will have a huge cost. You

22   know, if it's successful, it's going to have a

1   huge cost in our current system.

2   My -- it's so ironic, because my

3   customers are the lowest income, and the USF

4   surcharge rate that's passed through to them

5   increases every quarter. As you know, the FCC

6   contribution rate keeps increasing.

7   So it's sort of a Catch-22 on that, but

8   I do think that making it more affordable for

9   people to access broadband -- because, at some

10   point, prices will go down.

11   But I have to tell you a story. Two

12   weeks ago, I spent the whole day in a Cricket

13   retail store in probably the lowest income area in

14   San Diego, although it's nothing like West Philly,

15   where I went to college. But, you know, I spent

16   the whole day, and people I saw -- it was very

17   interesting. I saw all races, all ages, English

18   and Spanish. The one common -- I saw big families

19   come in together. The one common denominator is

20   they were all poor.

21   And, you know, they all paid with cash,

22   and we have something called Bridge Pay that if

1   you can't pay your monthly service, you can pay

2    $20 to get 10 more days. And people are just

3   living, you know, month to month on this.

4   And broadband is just an afterthought.

5   MR. KOHN: I have two questions, one

6   particularly for Laurie and Thomas, and, Laurie,

7   for Cricket's regular business, not for the

8   Portland program.

9   But how do you go about bringing

10   customers or students into your programs. You

11   know, if somebody doesn't understand why it's

12   relevant, how are they even getting into the

13   class, if it's not tied to another program or

14   education?

15   And then the second one, for the entire

16   panel, whether we are talking about standards or

17   program design, one of the things that I think we

18   are tasked with is making sure that the National

19   Broadband Plan is forward looking.

20   So, as you do in your own programs, and

21   what is your advice to us to make sure that we are

22   laying -- establishing a framework that is not

1   going to be obsolete two years from now when

2   technology changes and digital literacy has a

3   totally different meaning.

4   DR. KAMBER: Thank God, she asked that

5   question. That's a great question.

6   You know, interestingly, the -- that

7   question -- that issue of forward looking

8   flexibility really rarely appears in the RFPs and

9   NOFAs that come out. And it's not a standard that

10   anybody is being held to.

11   We're in the process of redoing all of

12   our workforce books now because the -- you know,

13   programs that we based it on are now becoming a

14   little bit outdated, and the model that we have --

15   we've actually set it up to sort of be able to

16   make those shifts pretty regularly.

17   I think that frankly that it just needs

18   to be one of the criteria for funding, that, you

19   know, how -- what is your plan not just for

20   sustainability, but what's your plan for

21   addressing the likely or reasonably predictable

22   changes in the technology that you're training on

1   or that you're trying to get people to adopt.

2   And I think that's a really important

3   question to have a plan for. I mean we -- with

4   each piece of what we're doing, you know, OATS

5   does -- has a home-based training which we've now

6   foc -- a year ago, we were foc -- two years ago,

7   we were focused on workforce.

8   Now we're shifting it over to health IT,

9   because of the health IT investment of the federal

10   government.

11   And we're doing a lot more training on

12   telemedicine and people utilizing personal health

13   records and electronic health records.

14   And, you know, there's a reason for

15   that, and we constantly have a strategic component

16   to the work that we're doing.

17   I don't know how to -- there's no magic

18   bullet for it, but just to ask people how they

19   have been addressing that issue in the past and

20   what the plan for it is.

21   On the recruitment side for the seniors,

22   we have found that there -- while there are a lot

1   of seniors that say they haven't use -- they

2   haven't adopted broadband because they don't see

3   the use of it, we are not having a problem with

4   people adopting our classes.

5   We can't advertise their classes because

6   we cannot meet the need. We have 500 people on

7   our waiting list right now.

8   We had a Spanish language television

9   commentator mention our classes and give out a

10   couple of our phone numbers a couple years ago.

11   We had 350 calls in two days. The phone lines

12   shut down.

13   We had to shut our main office line

14   down. And it's so much demand for this stuff

15   back, you know, if you're providing good quality

16   courses, and it's really -- and it's free, I mean

17   to the user, we have a lot of demand. That's not

18   a problem.

19   MS. ITKIN: And I'll answer the second

20   part about being forward looking. Please never

21   mandate a minimum speed. I mean, you know, what

22   happens is that with technology evolving, there

1   will be various carriers with different

2   technologies. Some are high-speed. Some are

3   medium speed. Some are low speeds.

4   But what will happen -- I'm very cynical

5   about, you know, the telecom industry. What's

6   going to happen is that if a speed is mandated, I

7   mean competitors will try to leverage that, use it

8   to their advantage to shut out their competitors.

9   So if you keep, you know, even words

10   like broadband, you know, just, you know, even

11   those -- try to avoid definitions that might

12   restrict the players that can come and be partners

13   in the solution. That would be my advice.

14   MR. HODGE: I'd like to add to that and

15   say don't mandate a specific type of technology.

16   And so when One Economy, when we made our comments

17   on the National Broadband Plan to the FCC, we said

18   that we should be very open and forward-looking in

19   terms of technology, because today we're looking

20   at maybe a laptop, but right now we're looking at

21   netbooks; right?

22   What about mobile technology in terms of

1   mobile devices being the actual gateway to

2   broadband for future users. And we're

3   experimenting with that now. We're doing a lot of

4   that work using mobile devices not only here in

5   the U.S., but in our work over in Africa.

6   We're using it in terms of pill

7   notification for those patients who are on chronic

8   diseases like diabetes, using a cell phone and

9   text messaging to basically give them alerts

10   around when to take their medication.

11   And so forward-looking, looking at not

12   only the technology but kind of being open to

13   that. And then lastly that anything that you

14   recommend in your program make it upgradeable.

15   One of the major, say, barriers to

16   adoption is not only if the equipment affordable

17   today, but what happens tomorrow when you say that

18   that technology or the equipment that you used as

19   your gateway device becomes obsolete? And so

20   whatever is introduced should be something that

21   could be upgradeable or scalable for future speed

22   or for future use.

1   I want to just kind of shift the

2   dialogue a little bit to talk about maybe some

3   policy things that, again, here with all of the

4   brilliant lawyers at the FCC in terms of public

5   policy that your role in terms of being kind of

6   really the big guy on the block within the

7   national -- our federal government to change --

8   MR. DAVID: Some of us aren't lawyers.

9   MS. KRONENBERG: And those of us who are

10   thank you for that compliment.

11   MR. HODGE: Right. I'm a reforming

12   lawyer myself.

13   But in terms of just to kind of -- I

14   heard this on the panel a couple of times, and,

15   again, the modernization or the reform of the

16   Universal Service Fund, again for the application

17   of broadband. We made a recommendation in our

18   plan to you that that be kind of revised.

19   Also, when you look at just where do

20   low-income and poor people live, they live in

21   public housing. A majority of them live in public

22   housing and so your role at the FCC in influencing

1   how technology can be improved in public housing

2   through HUD there is a section and I -- you know,

3   policy geeks here -- Section 518 within the

4   Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of

5   1992, which outlines eligible uses for public

6   housing capital funds and operating funds, we're

7   saying -- One Economy is recommending that

8   broadband and network access be included for the

9   cost of any retrofit or new construction for

10   public housing.

11   And again, you can play that role in

12   terms of shaping, making that happen. When you

13   look at, say, the greening efforts that are taking

14   place, why not the modernization through

15   technology in public housing, where you've got a

16   high concentration of low and moderate working

17   families.

18   And then lastly on the tax side at the

19   Department of Treasury, work with the Department

20   of treasury through their various programs to

21   maybe include some tax incentives. And I heard --

22   I'm not certain who was on the panel here who

1   mentioned maybe a tax credit or vouchers or even

2   tax credit for equipment purchase or even the

3   provision of service.

4   It doesn't have to be for the entire

5   service, but it could be for a portion of that

6   service, and we made those recommendations.

7   There's a program at the Department of Treasury

8   called the New Markets Tax Credit Program that

9   basically provides tax credits to developers of

10   affordable housing, but to provide investment in

11   business.

12   And again, that's a program that could

13   easily fit and be melded into kind of a strategy

14   to impact both the provisioning of broadband

15   service as well as the adoption.

16   And so, again, your role again as

17   lawyers and non-lawyers, brilliant people here at

18   the FCC, can use to kind of connect all the dots

19   across all of the federal programs -- Housing and

20   Urban Development, at Treasury, at the NTI, again

21   in terms of -- even looking at the evaluation

22   phase.

1   In our broadband technology grant

2   application, we've included a major component of

3   our application to do an assessment and evaluation

4   of our practices, and we're partnering with the

5   Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies to

6   basically do that benchmarking to see what has

7   actually moved the needle on both the access and

8   availability of broadband, but more importantly on

9   the adoption.

10   MS. KRONENBERG: Thank you. So, I mean

11   this has been quite an education, and I was

12   wondering when you all started -- to -- what

13   programs did you look at to model. I mean we

14   heard from Dr. Kamber that he was looking at One

15   Economy.

16   But did any of you look at other

17   programs that were trying to lead to adoption or

18   something, for example, digital literacy?

19   And should we be taking a look at those

20   programs, not just focusing on telecom and

21   broadband adoption programs, but other types of

22   programs?

1   MR. DAVID: You used -- someone used the

2   Rural Electrification example, right. That's --

3   that would be --

4   MS. KRONENBERG: Absolutely.

5   MR. DAVID: -- an older.

6   MS. NORIEGA: Yeah. I mean -- I was

7   trying to think of specific examples. I wasn't at

8   the inception of all this, but, as I mentioned

9   earlier, this was a think tank first and foremost

10   before it became an actual program.

11   And the concept was very much one that

12   isn't -- really is not new and that is that

13   federal and state government, there's a room for

14   federal and state government to invest in

15   community activism in one way or another to reach

16   out to those low -- slackers in adopting.

17   To answer the pre -- or to link this to

18   the previous question, though, about

19   sustainability and whether or not, you know, we're

20   going to be -- the programs that we may in gauge

21   today might be obsolete in two years.

22   Certainly, I would agree with some of

1   the comments that were said earlier about

2   technology. Technology is a moving target. And,

3   you know, certainly this house knows that.

4   So cautioned there as well, like some of

5   my co- panelists mentioned.

6   But I think that the -- first of all,

7   unfortunately, there's still many millions of

8   Americans that are non-adopters, non-ability to

9   users -- non-users, and these are not -- these are

10   low-income folks. These are elderly folks. These

11   are folks with disabilities. These are rural

12   residents.

13   This is a bigger challenge in rural

14   America across the board than elsewhere, although,

15   of course, low- income urban dwellers also had

16   this problem.

17   So first, unfortunately, we are not

18   going to resolve this in two years. And even if

19   we were to have 100 percent adoption of broadband

20   services were indeed there is a broadband service,

21   the challenge then is to have more applications or

22   to encourage more applications to be used through

 1   those channels.

 2   What -- why are we all so wired up about

 3   these technologies? Because we -- just as the

 4   Electrification Act of America recognized that

 5   this was going to empower -- to build economic

 6   efficiencies and empower the household, this is

 7   what we're about -- what broadband is thought to

 8   be today.

 9   This is the new technology that is going

10   to help us compete, and it's going to help the

11   household increase welfare.

12   But why does it do that? Not because

13   it's a big pipe or a small pipe, but because it's

14   a pipe that is being used in more and more

15   creative ways.

16   And so there's never going to be really

17   -- well, not in the foreseeable future. I mean,

18   of course, eventually this will be -- we will be

19   in the science- fiction, but there's really a lot

20   of work ahead. I don't think anybody in this

21   table would think that our job is going to be --

22   that they're going to be out of a job anytime

1   soon, basically.

2   MR. MALASPINO: Could I make one

3   suggestion? I think another interesting analogous

4   place to look at for solutions is the community

5   development sector around financial services and

6   the low rates of adoption among certain

7   populations of financial services.

8   So the community development credit

9   union movement, for instance, is trying to address

10   a population that I think shares a lot of

11   characteristics and many shared people are the

12   kinds of populations we're working with.

13   And I think there's a couple of lessons

14   that I jus want to stress that come out of that.

15   One is language in really making sure that

16   whatever national policy is adopted, you know,

17   takes into account the barrier that language plays

18   both in terms of English-Spanish, but also the

19   levels of literacy that are involved in the

20   outreach.

21   The second is the real financial

22   constraints that the populations that we work with

1   operate under, and I think this notion of, you

2   know, monthly payments that are not tied to a

3   long-term contract is really a fundamental one.

4   And I think that Laurie has hit on

5   something important that should be considered as

6   part of a national policy. In other words, you

7   know, we work with families that unfortunately,

8   you know, a couple years ago got into an arrears

9   situation with a broadband provider. They then

10   are locked out from going back to that broadband

11   provider unless they repay arrears plus interest.

12   It's really -- it's a cycle situation

13   that I think needs to be taken into account.

14   So there needs to be -- in the same way

15   that I think the community development movement

16   has focused on what are the actual day-to-day

17   decisions that are going on in families' lives and

18   how to motivate them to enter into the banking

19   system where the credit union system. If that

20   kind of careful anthropological look at what

21   motivates low- income families and how to get over

22   these pairs that I think would be worth looking

1   at.

2   MR. GOLDMAN: I don't have an analogous

3   situation per se, but I think something that seems

4   to be coming through in a lot of the comments is

5   that the broadband technology adoption program,

6   whatever it turns out to be and whatever the

7   policy is, it's not about -- I think what's part

8   of what we're all saying is we're not -- it's not

9   -- to stand in isolation. It needs to be

10   integrated.

11   I mean I think that all of us sort of

12   represent different ways and approaches that the

13   technology is integrated, which is a related word

14   to adoption in a certain way. It could be tech --

15   maybe we call it broadband integration, and we

16   could have a different way, you know, of thinking

17   about it.

18   How do we integrate the broadband into

19   our daily lives and the lives of our families and

20   communities? It might be just a different

21   conceptual, you know, concept, because this

22   relates to how to actually create programs that

1   the, you know, at the community level that work,

2   and it also relates to policy and the comments

3   that Howie and others were making about

4   integrating this into the underpinnings of these

5   other things that we're doing, because that is --

6   the technology is -- it's just a tool. It's not

7   an end in itself.

8   A broadband adopted person or household

9   isn't the objective. The objective is the person

10   -- is the utilization, to pick up Raquel's

11   comment, it's what the folks do with it.

12   So it's how does it affect the housing?

13   How does it affect the education? How does it

14   affect the health, et cetera?

15   I don't know if where the analogous,

16   exactly analogous situation is, but I think we

17   need to reconceptualize it a little bit, and make

18   sure that what we're talking about isn't a

19   technology goal in and of itself, but rather how

20   do these things integrate into the other services

21   and other programs that are out there.

22   DR. KAMBER: I'll add one more --

1   continue to beat the dead horse of housing. The

2   -- if you think about the early '70s and the sort

3   of development of the housing programs that

4   existed, the Section 8 Voucher Program emerged in

5   I think '74, which was a demand enhancement. And

6   the logic there was obviously to subsidize demand

7   for people that need it -- that wanted the

8   flexibility and could use the vouchers in the open

9   market.

10   That program is inspirational from my

11   point of view, because I -- you know, we've

12   actually had seniors testifying at City Hall

13   calling for a demand-side voucher for low-income

14   mobility impaired seniors so that people at least

15   we can target the folks for whom technology is

16   absolutely a lifeline, and give them a demand-side

17   voucher, because they're the ones that are most

18   going to benefit immediately from it.

19   But there's an additional component to

20   that in the sense that in 1974 there had already

21   been several waves of public investment into

22   housing, both in the public housing and also

1   through the Section 8 project-based housing,

2   things like Section 236 on the rental side and

3   also a very robust obviously private market set of

4   opportunities for people to invest in their

5   programs.

6   On the technology initiatives that we're

7   looking at now, we're kind of at the beginning of

8   what seems to be a coalescing of models I think in

9   the last few years nationally, where we now have a

10   very developing robust set of places that can

11   provide these services.

12   And so if you can think about the sort

13   of interaction between the demand-side support,

14   some of the nonprofit provision that is now

15   existing through groups like what you're seeing at

16   the table and some of the public and private

17   resources that are out there I think there's a

18   kind of an -- an analogous scenario there, even if

19   it's not exactly a program model that you're

20   looking at.

21   MR. MALASPINO: Just one final point,

22   because my background a long time ago was also in

1   housing, and I think that the notion of using the

2   income qualification process of the public housing

3   both for Section 8 vouchers as well as public

4   housing and marrying that with some kind of

5   demand-side voucher would be a really nice way of

6   allowing families to get access quickly without

7   creating a whole other bureaucratic hurdle.

8   MS. NORIEGA: I want to make a point to

9   complement Greg's comment earlier relating to the

10   rural challenge, adoption, not just availability.

11   We have rural partners, associations

12   that represent farming communities, the National

13   Grange and the American Farm Bureau Association.

14   They're -- well, there's a demographic

15   (inaudible) that's happening across several

16   generations. Rural America is on the demise,

17   economically and demographically. And a lot of

18   these entities, these associations, and a lot of

19   the states that are very rural are very concerned

20   about this.

21   The reason why these associations have

22   partnered with us is because they believe that

1 technology can be a great equalizer. And we

2 believe that as well.

3   And unfortunately, rural America is

4 lagging behind. So I think that to make -- to

5 stress Greg's point, technology has to be part of

6 a bigger picture. Technology can do a great deal

7 for farming communities, and I gave an example

8 earlier about online teaching and where school

9 systems cannot hire a physics teacher.

10   There's a lot of things that can be done

11 through technology in e-healthcare services for

12 citizens living in remote areas or in just the

13 efficiency of agricultural production.

14   And there's a lot of institutions out

15 there that are creating applications that directly

16 address these issues. So, again, to the earlier

17 point about our weekly to be done in two years or

18 is all of this going to be obsolete in two years,

19 deftly not, because just like minority --

20 low-income minority, low education citizens have a

21 challenge adopting because of lack of education

22 and vision of what this technology can do for them

1   or their children, that is also happening across

2   rural communities.

3   The federal government can actually do a

4   great deal, if focusing on the challenge as it is

5   and promoting strategies that are very targeted;

6   and working in conjunction with rural -- with

7   other rule efforts, whether they're educational or

8   medical or health services.

9   Technology has a role to play in all of

10   this.

11   MS. KRONENBERG: And I think this is the

12   perfect segue to one of the online questions that

13   we received from Bubba. "Would the panelists

14   agree that their programs are transferable to

15   rural communities with minimum changes or what

16   specific changes would they have to make for the

17   transfer to rural areas?"

18   I mean I know (inaudible) you have a

19   rural outreach already, but for those of you who

20   are more focused in the urban areas, could you

21   answer this question?

22   MR. HODGE: I'll answer the question for

1   One Economy. Our program is not urban-centric. I

2   mean we operate in Native American communities as

3   well as in rural communities. For example, we

4   have a really successful program in Green County,

5   North Carolina, where tobacco- dependent farmers,

6   through an initiative, work with One Economy and

7   the local school system, the local Chamber of

8   Commerce, we create a very, say, dynamic

9   community, where we've got hotspots. The kids at

10   the school have laptops for classwork.

11   The local Chamber of Commerce is able to

12   help the small business owners kind of -- who are

13   more tobacco- dependent kind of move into more a

14   digital environment, where they're selling their

15   goods and services through web portals that

16   they've created.

17   And so our models are replicable, and

18   we're actually, like Connected Nation, and others

19   doing work both in urban as well as rural

20   communities.

21   MS. KRONENBERG: What about Dr. Kamber

22   and Mr. Goldman?

1   DR. KAMBER: You're going to kill me

2   with this question. This -- you know, we have --

3   because we been so New York-centric, our model

4   really has developed around an urban structure, as

5   it's something that's come up a bit at our board

6   meetings lately because we're -- if we're looking

7   to go to an additional city in the next 12 months

8   and have also had a couple of invitations to look

9   at some rural partnerships.

10   From our point of view, the rural

11   partnership model -- I mean there are a very large

12   number of seniors better living in rural areas. A

13   lot of them are very socially isolated -- I mean

14   have very limited access to services, and, with

15   the healthcare models now shifting into an online

16   provision specifically targeted at those folks and

17   people with chronic illnesses, we really need to

18   come up with a solution fairly quickly.

19   We're -- I would say we're thinking

20   about this, and we're eager to solve that problem.

21   I don't think we know enough about the parameters

22   and the sort of channels to work with out there.

1   So I think in the next year, we're going

2   to spending more time in rural areas to talk to

3   people. I mean obviously the key areas would be

4   to create some more traditional media structures

5   and practices through things like public access TV

6   and regular and phone hotlines and things like

7   that for people to be able to get sort of

8   wraparound services and then occasional

9   face-to-face opportunities, which I think still

10   remain critical for people even if they're very

11   limited in scope, which rural areas are going to

12   require.

13   MR. GOLDMAN: I would echo that, and I

14   think it's a great comment in terms of utilizing

15   existing technology to promote the demand for --

16   you know, the future technology. I think it's an

17   excellent point.

18   But I think -- I think two things. I

19   think the fundamental elements that we've been

20   talking about -- and again not to beat the dead

21   horse -- but, you know, we're talking -- I think

22   we are talking about principles and themes of, you

1   know, comprehensive services that include hardware

2   training support and content.

3   I don't think that changes whether it's

4   in an urban or rural environment. I think that

5   the content itself might change, and the

6   particular program, you know, in the case of --

7   well, the particular program that it might

8   piggyback on or integrate into, you know, maybe a

9   different one. But the fundamental concept of

10   integrating with existing programs I think stays

11   the same.

12   I very, very strongly believe and I

13   think everybody on the panel agrees with me -- I

14   don't want to force that on everybody -- though I

15   think the issue of household adoption is really

16   essential, and we really have to hold onto that.

17   I believe very much that there's a role

18   to play for public centers and for centralized

19   places where people can go, but I really believe

20   that when -- the concept of adoption and

21   integration. You don't adopt a child and put him

22   in a public place and go visit him or her. You

1   adopt a child into your home and you live with

2   that person.

3   That's what adoption is. And so I think

4   it's important to think about -- it's just like we

5   didn't electrify -- we didn't say to people we're

6   going to electrified America, and then put

7   electricity in a faraway place and make people

8   take their horse and buggy to it. We electrified

9   people's homes.

10   It took a while. It was time intensive

11   and money intensive. But I think the household

12   peace is essential.

13   I think it is very interesting -- and

14   I'm sure he is about this -- and maybe someone

15   here can answer -- I think it's fascinating that

16   the rural -- the RUS component of the BTOP Program

17   does not include a broadband adoption element.

18   I was fascinated by that. Whereas, the

19   urban infrastructure element included in adoption

20   element. I don't understand that at all.

21   So I think that one thing that would be

22   very interesting is to piggyback everything that

1   we're discussing here into the RUS element of the

2   BTOP so that there is actually a rural -- an

3   incentive for people to go out and create some

4   rural adoption programs.

5   MR. MALASPINO: Could I just mention one

6   thing? I think that what one element that's

7   interesting that we've learned from talking to

8   affiliated organizations that do work in rural

9   areas is that many school districts in rural areas

10   have actually invested, in some cases sooner than

11   urban areas, in technology-based solutions for

12   communicating with families, for instance.

13   And so actually when we've talked about

14   -- we've implemented our program in one small

15   school district outside of San Jose in California,

16   but we've also talked to a number of organizations

17   about the way we approach the problem. And I

18   think there's actually ways in which rural

19   implementation can work quite well, again with

20   this focus on education that we have the notion of

21   them, you know, basically empowering the

22   technology that the district -- rural districts

1   have already invested in and making that a

2   ubiquitous function, including for the low-income

3   people in those rural areas becomes really

4   powerful. So.

5   MS. FALK: Laurie?

6   MS. ITKIN: I want to just slightly

7   disagree with Greg about the whole focus on the

8   household. I think, you know, down the road, I

9   think most if not everybody's access to broadband

10   is going to be through wireless, you know, just

11   primarily we are seeing that trend today with

12   landline displacement for voice.

13   And so I think an FCC broadband policy

14   must include a data roaming element, and what I

15   mean by that when you talk about rural versus

16   urban I mean that no matter where a person starts

17   with adoption, they will be -- most people at some

18   point traveling around the country to visit

19   family, for jobs, for whatever, and we have so

20   many networks in this country. There is no

21   regulation now that says that my Blackberry or my

22   smart phone has to work on any other network.

1   There's no mandate to do that.

2   And so it's crucial that we have that

3   that all networks that are providing data services

4   they will allow that interoperability, because

5   we're not going to be building 15 networks

6   ubiquitously over the country.

7   So data roaming is a very important

8   component of FCC broadband policy.

9   MS. KRONENBERG: Raquel, did you have

10   something?

11   MS. NORIEGA: Yeah. There's -- well,

12   there's one challenge that rural adoption has that

13   typically, not across the board, but typically

14   urban non-adopters don't have, which is that they

15   don't have broadband available. That is -- in our

16   research, which unfortunately I don't have it in

17   front of me this particular data, but certainly

18   they -- in the earlier slide and put up there

19   there was I don't have broadband available --

20   MS. KRONENBERG: You had 17 percent.

21   MS. NORIEGA: Yeah. I can't remember

22   what it was, but obviously when we look at rural

1   counties, and we provide all this data for

2   counties. This data we gather is statistically

3   significant at the county level so that we can go

4   into counties and describe to them where they are

5   today and benchmark them against other counties.

6   And so obviously that goes up. Still

7   not the main barrier, by the way. The main

8   barrier continues to be a lack of computer

9   ownership, lack of awareness or perceived need,

10   however you want to call it.

11   So that's one item that is an added

12   challenge, if you will. That being said, I would

13   very much think that a lot of the programs that

14   have been described here are very much

15   transferable and that there's a certain amount of

16   increased need, if you will.

17   Once folks actually understand what can

18   happen through these pipes and not just for them

19   but for their children -- we consistently see that

20   families with children have much higher adoption

21   rates unfortunately except for poor families with

22   children, which remain very, very low adopters,

1   which is obviously a huge problem.

2   So what we see -- you know, these folks

3   that -- these are the folks that have historically

4   relied on the Sears catalog, so they're actually

5   used to remote -- obviously, we're using different

6   technology.

7   The challenge is to make them aware of

8   the fact that this technology which yeah, it is

9   expensive. Owning a computer today for a lot of

10   these households is a challenge.

11   But if we are able to showcase to them

12   what it is that they can do -- filing your taxes.

13   How do you do that? Educating your children in

14   various new different ways. They certainly can

15   see the value of that perhaps even more than a

16   household that has, you know, done -- they can

17   take a bus and perhaps get some of those services.

18   So there is -- there's another added --

19   I think an interesting -- and I could be wrong

20   here -- I'd love to hear my co-panelists thoughts

21   about it -- but a rural community is much more

22   definable in terms of what are the key anchor

1   institutions and what are the key anchor decision

2   makers or the key decision-makers.

3   Local government, which, of course, you

4   know, it's county-level or municipal-level, has

5   more of an ability to influence grassroots

6   development. And so the type of approach we've

7   implemented across counties -- of course, we've

8   done it in urban and rural -- but because of the

9   states where we have done these programs have been

10   very rural, we have a lot of experience in rural

11   areas.

12   This kind of approach of taking

13   leadership, it's local, to understand where they

14   are today and give them a vision of where they

15   might be in the future and helping them make

16   decisions that are very pragmatic, that actually

17   is an approach that has very nicely worked in

18   rural areas and perhaps because decision-makers in

19   critical leaders of the community are more

20   identifiable.

21   MS. KRONENBERG: Before I ask any more

22   of the questions that we have and from our online

1   participants are here in the audience, I want to

2   give our FCC panelists an opportunity to ask any

3   additional questions they may have. Nese?

4   MR. GUENDELSBERGER: Actually, I was

5   going -- you know, if we are going to go and

6   definitely local entities and local -- at a local

7   level, there is going to be a huge role based on

8   all those programs you are describing. Currently,

9   if someone wants to bring to their local area or

10   their community some of the programs that you are

11   talking about, where can they go? Is there a

12   dialogue or is there a sort of knowledge deposit

13   somewhere or do you talk to each other were some

14   have -- when you started, for example, you look at

15   other programs?

16   Is it difficult, easy, or is there a

17   mechanism or some kind of way of sort of putting

18   all those ideas, programs somewhere that access to

19   it will be easier?

20   MR. MALASPINO: I mean just speaking for

21   us we have a full-time staff person whose sole

22   role is to connect to like-minded organizations

1   across the country, share best practices, in some

2   cases share deals that we've struck with software

3   providers, including online subscriptions so that

4   we can actually facilitate this kind of work

5   elsewhere.

6   DR.   KAMBER: We field questions like

7   this almost every day, so people can just e-mail

8   them to me directly at info@oatsny.org, which is

9   what everybody does.

10   But also -- there are a couple of good

11   resources. I know in the Bay Area there's the --

12   a thing called CTC net, I believe it's there,

13   which is connecting a lot of the CTCs in the Bay

14   Area.

15   In New York, there's the Advanced

16   Communications and Law Project of the New York Law

17   School, which is putting together a thing called

18   Broadband -- I think Broadband Enhanced, which is

19   going to be a clearinghouse of different programs

20   and referrals and things like this.

21   And I know people typically called One

22   Economy all the time with questions like this as

1   well.

2   MR. HODGE: You know, we -- it's open.

3   We work with anyone, and we -- we come into

4   communities where we are invited, and we're often

5   invited by the housing developer, whether it be

6   from the city, the county, or the state level, and

7   in many cases our partners like Cricket invite us

8   to work with us in different pilot initiatives.

9   Again, we're technology agnostic. We work with

10   anyone that has a desire to really bring

11   affordable broadband into communities that had

12   been underserved or unserved.

13   MS. NORIEGA: I would argue that that

14   could be a role for the FCC to play. I'm not sure

15   it would -- how it would be structured, but that

16   would be an interesting exercise, because, yes,

17   there is, you know, there is a lot of information

18   out there.

19   But perhaps there is a role for a --

20   what's the right term -- amalgamator of --

21   warehouse of different experiences and different

22   best practices.

1   Like my colleagues, we also are invited

2   to come into a state or a community, a County, and

3   we work across the board, and we work with anybody

4   that's wanting to work with us. This is

5   definitely replicable, I think we would all agree

6   with that.

7   I don't think there's -- this is rocket

8   science. It just takes a lot of hard work -- a

9   lot of good organization and a lot of hard work.

10 It's definitely replicable.

11   MS. KRONENBERG: Thank you. Elise, you

12 have a question?

13   MR. GUENDELSBERGER: Yes. So I wanted

14 to follow up on some of the feedback you'd offered

15 earlier both in terms of not establishing a

16 minimum speed and being technology agnostic, which

17 I understand the point of both of those.

18   What -- my question is is if we don't

19 set some sort of floor, whether it's on speed or

20 technology, how do we define our goal to make sure

21 that we are also closing the digital divide?

22 Because without a floor or without some minimum

1   level of literacy or access, and then aren't we

2   just kind of perpetuating the problem potentially?

3   MS. ITKIN: All right. Well, I'll just

4   repeat what I said about speed. You know, there

5   was a lot of talk, you know, with Congress and

6   everything earlier in the year that we're so

7   behind the rest of the world in terms of speeds,

8   but we found in our experience with offering, you

9   know, a speed that's less than one megabit per

10   second where there's some competitors that might

11   be much higher, we still know that the population

12   is able to access the services that are relevant

13   to them.

14   So rather than defining a minimum speed,

15   I would sort of say what are the applications you

16   want people to be able to access? Can they access

17   educational resources, health care resources,

18   social services?

19   Rather than dictating a speed, dictate

20   what the minimum applications you think people

21   should have access to.

22   MS. KRONENBERG: What I heard Elise

1   saying is how to we determine what the percentage

2   of Americans -- what a percentage of consumers

3   that are actually using services online?

4   MR. GUENDELSBERGER: It's both. I mean

5   I think Laurie answered it. I think it's hard to

6   say education, because then, again, there can be a

7   minimum standard that goes with that. I mean you

8   can get educational content that your speed is

9   irrelevant. But if it's video streaming across,

10   you know, there still has to be some sort of

11   standard, and I'm struggling with where you think

12   we land on that?

13   MR. HODGE: Yeah, I think you have a

14   minimum standard now of what? 760 -- 68. And I

15   think that should be the minimum.

16   And then we just escalate from there in

17   terms of just again making speed available based

18   on really demand issues.

19   One of the other recommendations that we

20   made in our comments to the FCC with regard to a

21   National Broadband Plan was really for the

22   establishment or creation of -- and I hope I have

1   this correct -- a broadband commission, an

2   organization, again maybe of like-minded

3   individuals like us here on this panel or some of

4   the other panels that you had that would help kind

5   of do some of that benchmarking for the FCC, again

6   consumer-based, demand-based, provider- based that

7   would really help to kind of shape where the

8   country is going as a whole over specific, you

9   know, periods of time, whether it be three years,

10   four years, or seven years.

11   But that commission again, because it's

12   public citizens participating, would be kind of

13   impartial, be able to help guide you along in

14   terms of just where we are around kind of

15   creating, again, a term that we've talked about --

16   kind of creating this digital ecosystem, where

17   there is availability and adoption in the home

18   through mobile devices in the school, in computer

19   centers or places -- computing centers -- as well

20   as in the workplace; and again, looking at all of

21   those different areas and home being really a

22   critical gauge of where people are with respect to

1   both the availability and the adoption.

2   MS. KRONENBERG: I know Brian had

3   something you wanted to add?

4   MR. DAVID: Yeah, and I know we're

5   running to the end, so a question for Laurie and

6   for Kathryn.

7   So one of the benefits of the stream of

8   work we have to do better worry is that we're

9   trying to expand the pie for you all; right? So

10   there's naked self-interests in it for the private

11   sector, and I think we're seeing that. I mean

12   we're seeing the sort of -- the fact that you all

13   are here and actually participation across these

14   workshops from the private sector has been

15   fantastic.

16   The question for you is at the tops of

17   your organizations what sort of attention is being

18   paid to what we're doing here, and if it's not --

19   if we're not getting the right attention and

20   people don't see this as expanding the pie but as

21   like, oh boy, in six months there's going to be a

22   whole bunch of stuff coming our way that we have

1   to do, right.

2   How do we reframe it for those people,

3   because we want to.

4   MS. ITKIN: I'll take that. I'll tell

5   you that the comments that we filed with the FCC

6   on improving the U.S. broadband experience

7   actually came out of discussions with our CEO,

8   where he laid out his vision. So he's personally

9   invested in this. This is the brain, you know,

10   work of Pat Esser and our entire company.

11   So he's personally invested. The

12   company is personally invested.

13   MS. FALK: You know, it's funny. I mean

14   that's all we do. I mean our whole core mission

15   is providing service to the underserved in this

16   country. So that's an easy answer.

17   But in terms of administrative burdens,

18   that's a serious question because in order for the

19   government to move forward on policy, there will

20   be data collection and all -- you know, there will

21   be things to be done and complied with by

22   companies, and I would just encourage you to

1   remember that not every company has the resources

2   of an AT&T and that, where possible, if you can

3   streamline and just ask for what data is really,

4   really crucial and not just what's nice to have it

5   would be very helpful for getting carriers to

6   participate.

7   MS. KRONENBERG: And then -- and just

8   for the benefit of the (inaudible) to people ask

9   questions, I'm going to combine them.

10   So one last thing: Should we consider

11   using the public libraries as an adoption program

12   and also should we be looking at what's going on

13   -- an international framework in Third World

14   countries dealing with adoption of technology?

15   MS. NORIEGA: Let me take the first part

16   of the question. We've done a lot of work with

17   libraries across the states where we work and

18   beyond.

19   One of the sectors that was up in that

20   bubble -- in that slide that had all these bubbles

21   with the different sectors that we target within

22   each of these counties is the libraries.

1   What we have found is that libraries, as

2   well as other community institutions like

3   community colleges, the school systems, that

4   libraries particularly have a very important role

5   to play particularly for low-income Americans that

6   don't -- can't afford to own a computer or afford

7   the broadband connection or both.

8   So absolutely. I mean I agree with what

9   some of the panelists have said about bringing

10   broadband to the household or better yet to the

11   user, because we do agree that mobility is going

12   to be -- I mean we don't agree -- I think it's a

13   trend that is there, so let's not lock ourselves

14   into assumptions that are going to change very

15   quickly.

16   But libraries are actually a very

17   important component in enriching the technology

18   endowment of a community, particularly in rural

19   communities as well as poorer segments of urban

20   communities.

21   We have worked with the -- the good news

22   is that there's a lot of private institutions that

1   are focusing on that, and we've worked with the

2   Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to help them build

3   more sustainable broadband subsidy programs. They

4   have a number of programs to strengthen technology

5   at the libraries across America.

6   So there's a -- and there are many

7   others that are also -- of course, the American

8   Library Association is very, very invested and

9   hopefully we'll be able to do some good work

10   through the BTOP Program.

11   Absolutely. Libraries are crucial.

12   MS. KRONENBERG: Howie?

13   MR. GOLDMAN: Before you hit the

14   international piece, can I just say about the

15   library that it's absolutely -- I think the

16   concept that you laid out about the ecosystem

17   around is essential, and the library is an

18   essential element of that ecosystem.

19   But it is also -- it can't be that

20   public centers are a be-all, end-all in

21   themselves, because then you don't -- then the

22   digital divide is not close. If one segment of

1   the population only has access to broadband in

2   public places, the digital divide persists; it

3   does not close.

4   MS. KRONENBERG: Howie, I'd like to hear

5   your thoughts on this, especially on the

6   international question.

7   MR. HODGE: On the -- let me start on

8   the library. I think Greg hit it on the head,

9   which is libraries are critical. Public computer

10   centers are important, but it also creates a

11   barrier to adoption. When you look at just the

12   availability, people don't have the availability

13   to have a library in every community, and in terms

14   of times when they're open.

15   When you look at people and families

16   that work at different hours, the library is not

17   the ultimate solution. And then the last part

18   about libraries, while they're great institutions

19   is that you've got limited time to use the

20   technology once you're there.

21   I'm not certain if you've been into a

22   library to use it, you get an egg-timer. You get

1   30 minutes, and if you're looking at sensitive

2   data, particularly if you're looking at private

3   health data or you're looking at some very

4   sensitive information, financial services, you

5   can't really have that experience in a library,

6   because you've got people behind you.

7   And so I'm saying there is some

8   opportunity with libraries or computing centers,

9   but there are some limitations there also.

10   MR. MALASPINO: And could I just say I

11   think the -- before you go to international, I

12   think that this notion of time on task, which a

13   lot of people in education talk about, is really

14   true in Internet usage more generally,

15   specifically around educationally oriented

16   Internet sites.

17   So that we found that both in, you know,

18   school lab settings or in libraries that kids who

19   are just on it temporarily with that kind of

20   constraint seemed much different usage -- you

21   know, long-term adoption patterns than kids that

22   can, you know, actually spend a couple of hours on

1   some really engaging educational experience at

2   home.

3   So it's a good thing, but it's, I think,

4   not enough.

5   MS. NORIEGA: Let me just say I don't

6   disagree with anything that was said. Libraries

7   are a portal for non-adopters to learn what these

8   technologies can do for them. It's also

9   unfortunately for folks that just simply are

10   disadvantaged economically the only source. It's

11   not perfect, and we certainly believe that

12   households or individuals, mobility is the

13   ultimate goal.

14   But libraries, schools, community

15   colleges is a stepping stone to get there.

16   MS. KRONENBERG: And, Howie, did you

17   have something else you wanted to add on the

18   international question?

19   MR. HODGE: On the international

20   question, one of the things that we've seen in our

21   work, and again, we're doing work in Amman,

22   Jordan. We're in Turkey. We're in South Africa

1   and we're in Rwanda. And we're expanding into

2   other areas is that in many of these countries,

3   they've actually leapfrogged us in terms of

4   technology. And I'm saying leapfrogged is that

5   they've gone beyond copper and they've gone beyond

6   fiber in some cases, and they have technology in

7   mobile devices.

8   And so, again, with all of your, you

9   know, great leadership here, let's look at kind of

10   encouraging the utilization again of new

11   technologies and look at those new technologies

12   and look at those new technologies in these

13   unserved areas where we may -- in fact, there's a

14   policy recommendation -- leapfrog and just go to

15   the next generation level of technology which also

16   brings about adoption, because in the countries

17   where we work, again, we go where we're invited.

18   We're partnered with the Clinton Global

19   Initiative.

20   One of our technology partners as Cisco

21   Systems, and we're doing a lot of work utilizing

22   next-generation technology. A lot of our work is

1   done utilizing that mobile technology.

2   MS. KRONENBERG: Great. Well, I see

3   we've already gone a minute over. I just cannot

4   possibly thank you enough, and thank you for all

5   participating. Thank you so much for -- I know so

6   many of you traveled to get here. And your input

7   is absolutely valuable to allow us to formulate

8   the National Broadband Plan. Thanks for everybody

9   who participated online as well.

10   And we hope to see you at the next

11   workshop.

12   (Applause)

13   (Whereupon, the PROCEEDINGS were

14   adjourned.)

15   *   *   *   *   *

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

```
 1              CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

 2              I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby

 3    certify that the forgoing electronic file when

 4    originally transmitted was reduced to text at my

 5    direction; that said transcript is a true record

 6    of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am

 7    neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by

 8    any of the parties to the action in which these

 9    proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I

10    am neither a relative or employee of any attorney

11    or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor

12    financially or otherwise interested in the outcome

13    of this action.

14                   /s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

15

16

17    Notary Public in and for the

18    Commonwealth of Virginia

19    Commission No. 351998

20    Expires: November 30, 2012

21

22
```