

Telcom Act as Part of Larger ET Strategy

Gergory G. Nadeau (gnadeau@doe.mass.edu)

Wed, 28 Aug 1996 17:45:34 -0400

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Bill Cosh: "Definition of "Education""
 - **Previous message:** Rex Buddenberg: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"
-

We in Massachusetts are trying to develop a comprehensive strategy to educational technology. We see the Universal Service provision of the Telecommunications Act as one piece of the solution, but clearly not the entire solution.

To that end, I am interested in narrowing the scope of the subsidy to focus on inter-district connectivity, but deepen the level of subsidy. In other words, I would hope that we could achieve free internet access at escalating transmission speeds to all schools that have put in place the local area network, workstations, training, and support that they need.

I am concerned that broadening the focus will make the impact too diffuse and complicate the integration of universal service with other funding initiatives.

g.

- **Next message:** Bill Cosh: "Definition of "Education""
- **Previous message:** Rex Buddenberg: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"

Re: universal service vs. public sector service

Rex Buddenberg (budden@nps.navy.mil)

Wed, 28 Aug 96 14:30:32 -0700

- Messages sorted by: [[date](#)] [[thread](#)] [[subject](#)] [[author](#)]
 - Next message: [Gergory G. Nadeau: "Telcom Act as Part of Larger ET Strategy"](#)
 - Previous message: [Technology Task Force: "Topic Suggestions"](#)
 - In reply to: [Sally Hawkes: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"](#)
 - Next in thread: [Steve Kohn: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"](#)
-

>
> Also I haven't noticed a difference when referring to the ISPs and the
> telephone company connections. My understanding is that while the telcos
> are regulated by the FCC, an ISP that isn't a telco company doesn't have
> any regulatory agency at all.
>
> Sally Hawkes shawkes@comp.uark.edu

Sally,

This is an important distinction in the discussion.

The telcos are indeed regulated ... at least some of them are. MCI and Sprint don't fall under the same set of rules as AT&T does ... that's one level of complexity.

Worse, just because things get deregulated at the federal level (and there's some debate whether the Act does/will indeed do that) doesn't have any effect whatever on the 51 state PUCs that set rates for the RBOCs.

Now, a bunch of extra-telco externalities that have everything to do with the issue of getting economical internet access widely proliferated:

- ISPs are indeed unregulated and the Dereg Act doesn't change that at all. ISPs resell telco connectivity plus a bunch of other services. Most of the RBOCs now have ISP subsidiaries, but they are set up as separate corporate entities outside the regulatory PUC framework. So they are free to compete with the independent ISPs (that shakeout is going to be bloody and it's not at all clear who will win out).

- technologically, cable TV is likely to be a major competitor for Internet access. With the exception of @Home, none of the CATV companies that I've seen have a clue on what internet services are. Access yes, services ... hardly. The federal regulatory structure for CATV regulates television provision rates, not 'value added services' which is where Internet access would fall.

- terrestrial wireless providers like Metricom appear to be focussed on urban markets (which are the easiest places to get copper or fiber to), so their value for applications not specifically mobile aren't clear. But these are entirely unregulated industries (aside from the issue of FCC providing some unlicensed spectrum).

- a whole bunch of Internet infrastructure for school, library, ... and commercial installations ... is owned by the user. LAN cabling, usually the router, local management, ... and all the services you hang off your local network (WWW servers,

for instance). None of this part is regulated ... this is the product end of a highly competitive industry.

All this makes me wonder at how much leverage we think we can get by diddling with the tariffs. No amount of fiddling within the Telecom Dereg Act can have any effect on the discounts we might get for routers or domain name service from an ISP or Cat5 cable we get from an electrical contractor.

And the leverage decreases as we get rural. Radio-WAN service from the likes of Low Earth Orbit satellite vendors will be reality in a couple years as Loral, Motorola and TRW bring their systems on line ... and very practically within 5 as Teledesic comes up. These guys are already bandying about their rates and their marketing departments are busily undercutting each other -- as long as there are >2 vendors out there they won't ever get regulated in the tariff notion like the existing common carrier telcos (and also INMARSAT). In short, the regulatory lever simply has no purchase on some of the larger running costs.

What does appear doable within the latitude of the Act is a transfer payment scheme whereby one component service (common carrier tariffs) subsidizes other unregulated parts. Not exactly what Judge Green had in mind when he ordered the telcos to stop subsidizing local service with long distance rates.

So this leads me to this question (for which the WWW pages we've got on this 'seminar' seem to be of no help):

Is our effort

- 1) an attempt to put an economic foundation under Internet services to schools (et al) or
- 2) an attempt to provide some social engineering regulations as fine print for the Telecom Deregulation Act?

Rex Buddenberg

-
- Next message: Gergory G. Nadeau: "Telcom Act as Part of Larger ET Strategy"
 - Previous message: Technology Task Force: "Topic Suggestions"
 - In reply to: Sally Hawkes: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"
 - Next in thread: Steve Kohn: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"

Definition of "Education"

Bill Cosh (bcosh@wasb.org)

Wed, 28 Aug 1996 20:39:43 -0700

- Messages sorted by: [date] [thread] [subject] [author]
 - Next message: Bill Cosh: "Universal Service Rules"
 - Previous message: Gergory G. Nadeau: "Telcom Act as Part of Larger ET Strategy"
 - Next in thread: Jim Callahan: "Re: Definition of "Education"'"
-

I just got e-mail access, and signing up for the Universal Service on line seminar was the first thing I've done. I hope this message works ok.

While going through the messages that I received today, I noticed the comments from Jan Bolluyt and Link Shadley. Excellent points. I just wanted to pass on to participants that the issues you both raised are things that Wisconsin's Universal Service Fund Advisory Council is struggling with as they revise the first set of Universal Service Rules. Currently, Wisconsin's Public Service Commission has chosen to define education institution very narrowly. There is also significant debate over how to approach the goal of "Universal Service."

Providing access to schools in some cases may take away the critical mass needed in a local community to make it profitable for a local telephone company to provide Internet access. In Wisconsin we currently have 92 phone companies. Under Wisconsin's Telecommunication's law their monopolies are protected for 5 years unless they choose to deregulate. If they deregulate they need to specify at that point in time what they intend to do for all of the schools, libraries and health care facilities in their service area.

So far, Wisconsin's experience has not been good. Each phone company that has deregulated has promised the school's in its area a different level of service and discount.

Combine this with the very weak Universal Service Fund rules that we have and schools are really struggling.

Bill Cosh
Wisconsin Association of School Boards
bcosh@wasb.org

- Next message: Bill Cosh: "Universal Service Rules"
- Previous message: Gergory G. Nadeau: "Telcom Act as Part of Larger ET Strategy"
- Next in thread: Jim Callahan: "Re: Definition of "Education"'"

Universal Service Rules

Bill Cosh (bcosh@wasb.org)

Wed, 28 Aug 1996 21:11:03 -0700

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Bill Cosh: "Universal Service Cheap!!!"
 - **Previous message:** Bill Cosh: "Definition of "Education""
-

Greetings again!

As I'm reading through my 29 e-mail messages from today's discussion group, I've been reminded of an experience I had with a lobbyist from our State's Telephone Association earlier this summer.

I was told at that point (by this telecommunications lobbyist) that the Universal Service provisions in the Federal Telecommunications Bill requiring discounts for schools were "meaningless." The reason he gave, was that in states like Wisconsin, state law prohibits telecommunications companies from charging different rates for the same service to different customers. Further, he commented that Wisconsin's telecommunications industry didn't care what federal law said, because their intention was to follow strictly state law.

Have any of the other participants heard similar things from the telecommunications representatives in their state?

Bill Cosh
Wisconsin Association of School Boards
bcosh@wasb.org

- **Next message:** Bill Cosh: "Universal Service Cheap!!!"
- **Previous message:** Bill Cosh: "Definition of "Education""

Universal Service Cheap!!!

Bill Cosh (bcosh@wasb.org)

Wed, 28 Aug 1996 21:14:22 -0700

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Steve Kohn: "Re: A teachers perspective initially"
 - **Previous message:** Bill Cosh: "Universal Service Rules"
-

Just a quick follow up to Miles Fidelman's comment that Universal Service is relatively cheap.

In 1994 when Wisconsin was considering it's telecommunications deregulation bill, the "rough" cost estimates that I received for what "high quality Universal Service" would cost Wisconsin were in excess of \$500 million. Wisconsin's Universal Service Fund currently has a budget of \$6-\$8 million per year.

- **Next message:** Steve Kohn: "Re: A teachers perspective initially"
- **Previous message:** Bill Cosh: "Universal Service Rules"

Re: A teachers perspective initially

Steve Kohn (NOTES.SKOHN@A50VM1.trg.nynex.COM)
28 Aug 1996 22:02:22 GMT

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Steve Kohn: "Re: A teachers perspective initially"
 - **Previous message:** Bill Cosh: "Universal Service Cheap!!!"
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Jan Bolluyt: "A teachers perspective initially"
 - **Next in thread:** Steve Kohn: "Re: A teachers perspective initially"
-

Hi,

I agree that universal service should cover a whole host of telecommunication services and not get defined as a specific set of services.

I think telecommunication companies would be very happy to deal with the concept of shared use or aggregated facilities for schools and libraries.

Bye,
Steve

- **Next message:** Steve Kohn: "Re: A teachers perspective initially"
- **Previous message:** Bill Cosh: "Universal Service Cheap!!!"
- **Maybe in reply to:** Jan Bolluyt: "A teachers perspective initially"
- **Next in thread:** Steve Kohn: "Re: A teachers perspective initially"

Re: A teachers perspective initially

Steve Kohn (NOTES.SKOHN@A50VM1.trg.nynex.COM)
28 Aug 1996 22:24:22 GMT

- Messages sorted by: [date || thread || subject || author]
- Next message: Steve Kohn: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"
- Previous message: Steve Kohn: "Re: A teachers perspective initially"
- Maybe in reply to: Jan Bolluyt: "A teachers perspective initially"

> Message-Id: <322447F5.59C5@sccoast.net>
> Date: Wed, 28 Aug 1996 06:21:57 -0700
> From: Marty Tennant <marty@sccoast.net>
> Organization: Low Tech Designs, Inc.
> To: Jan Bolluyt <jbolluyt@spirit-lake.k12.ia.us>
> Cc: us-nd@info-ren.pitt.edu
> Subject: Re: A teachers perspective initially
> References: <2.2.32.19960828035650.006c0cc0@socrates.spirit-lake.k12.ia.us>

> ...

> Flexibility is needed in the ability of schools to deploy the technology.

> For this reason, and until I see the discount levels involved, I am thinking
> that school districts may well want to consider the option of declaring
> themselves to be a reseller of telecommunications services under the new
> law. This provides discounts off retail along with freedom and flexibility.
> It will not initially make your local telco happy.

There is specific language in the Universal Service legislation that prohibits schools from reselling any service they receive via Universal Service.

Steve

> Marty Tennant
> President
> Low Tech Designs, Inc.
> "Bringing Technology Down to Earth"™
> "Common Sense Computer and Communications Solutions"™

-
- Next message: Steve Kohn: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"
 - Previous message: Steve Kohn: "Re: A teachers perspective initially"
 - Maybe in reply to: Jan Bolluyt: "A teachers perspective initially"

Re: universal service vs. public sector service

Steve Kohn (NOTES.SKOHN@A50VM1.trg.nynex.COM)

28 Aug 1996 22:24:22 GMT

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Steve Kohn: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - **Previous message:** Steve Kohn: "Re: A teachers perspective initially"
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Miles R Fidelman: "universal service vs. public sector service"
 - **Next in thread:** Travis Thompson: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"
-

> Date: Wed, 28 Aug 1996 12:05:06 -0700
> From: Marty Tennant <marty@sccoast.net>
> Organization: Low Tech Designs, Inc.
> Subject: Tech Support and Long Term Funding

> ...
> If you think about the efficient flow of funds, the service providers
> that will be offering you discounted services will have to make this
> up somewhere. That somewhere will be in your local phone bill.

Hi

As I'm sure you are aware, the Universal Service legislation establishes a Universal Service Fund from which telecommunication carriers will be able to be made whole for whatever discounts are legislated. The fund will be generated by a surcharge on customers telecommunication bills.

> Why not get telecom service at a discount yourself, for your own
> needs, and be able to offer phone service to your student's families
> too, at a profit? That way, the money flows are direct and not dependant
> upon Federal boards and individual PSC decisions.

I'm past chairperson for a local school technology committee. I can't imagine any school having the time to turn itself into a telecommunication carrier. Most schools are having a hard time dealing with all the educational issues. Plus this method would not be any more direct or reliable than Universal Service.

Steve

> This is of course, all hinging on the discount levels established for
> educational, library and medical users. This is similar to the problem
> the FCC had to go thru on the wholesale discount for local exchange
> service. It will be interesting to see how this discount level for
> schools/library/medical users will be set.

> Marty Tennant
> President
> Low Tech Designs, Inc.
> "Bringing Technology Down to Earth"™
> "Common Sense Computer and Communications Solutions"™

- **Next message:** Steve Kohn: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
- **Previous message:** Steve Kohn: "Re: A teachers perspective initially"
- **Maybe in reply to:** Miles R. Fiedelman: "universal service vs. public sector service"
- **Next in thread:** Travis Thompson: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"

Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding

Steve Kohn (NOTES.SKOHN@A50VM1.trg.nynex.COM)

28 Aug 1996 22:24:22 GMT

- Messages sorted by: [date || thread || subject || author]
 - Next message: Steve Kohn: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - Previous message: Steve Kohn: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"
 - Maybe in reply to: Marty Tennant: "Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - Next in thread: Steve Kohn: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
-

> Date: Wed, 28 Aug 1996 09:21:24 -0400 (EDT)
> From: Miles R Fidelman <fidelman@civicnet.org>
> X-Sender: fidelman@world.std.com
> Subject: universal service vs. public sector service
> Message-Id: <Pine.SGI.3.93.960828091514.12774B-100000@world.std.com>
>

> Just a quick comment to note that there is a big difference between
> universal service and service for libraries, PEG stations, schools, etc.
>

> Universal service is like the telephone: everyone has it and it's
> relatively cheap. The best model for universal advanced service is a
> university or corporate campus, where there is a "data wall plug" next to
> every telephone jack. On the MIT campus, for example, a 24-hour, high
> speed connection to the campus network (and through it to the Internet)
> costs around \$25/mo. -- That's the kind of service I'd like to my home
> office (or classroom, or library).
>

> For this kind of universal service to exist, at modest cost, economies of
> scale have to be exploited -- we're talking about building network
> utilities akin to telephone, water, sewer, electric systems - i.e.
> infrastructure.
>

> By contrast, much of the talk about free (subsidized) access for schools,
> etc., implies that the commercial vendors will focus their efforts on the
> largest, most profitable markets (i.e. "cream skimming"), and throw a bone
> to the rest of us in the way of free service in a few locations.

This is an excellent point. If telecommunication carriers reimbursement is below costs, schools and libraries will not be perceived as attractive markets. BUT, if telecommunications carriers are reimbursed to a cost+ level, schools and libraries will be seen as an attractive market to participate in.

Steve

> Don't get fooled by what looks like a good deal. Cream skimming plus free
> service for schools and libraries translates to not very much service for
> homes, small businesses, small non-profits, etc.
>

> *****
> Miles R. Fidelman mfidelman@civicnet.org
> President & 91 Baldwin St. Charlestown MA 02129
> Director of Civic Networking Systems 617-241-9205 fax: 617-241-5064
> The Center for Civic Networking <http://civic.net/ccn.html>

>
> Information Infrastructure: Public Spaces for the 21st Century
> Let's Start With: Internet Wall-Plugs Everywhere
> Say It Often, Say It Loud: "I Want My Internet!"
> *****

-
- **Next message:** Steve Kohn: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - **Previous message:** Steve Kohn: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Marty Tennant: "Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - **Next in thread:** Steve Kohn: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"

Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding

Steve Kohn (NOTES.SKOHN@A50VM1.trg.nynex.COM)

28 Aug 1996 22:24:22 GMT

- Messages sorted by: [date || thread || subject || author]
 - Next message: Hossain Samei: "Re: Questions to be answered"
 - Previous message: Steve Kohn: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - Maybe in reply to: Marty Tennant: "Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - Next in thread: Marty Tennant: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
-

> Message-ID: <3223D8AD.467F@seasurf.com>
> Date: Tue, 27 Aug 1996 22:27:16 -0700
> From: Link Shadley <lshadley@seasurf.com>
> Organization: Ecotrust - LANCE - Clatsop Community College
> Subject: Re: A teachers perspective initially
> References: <2.2.32.19960828035650.006c0cc0@socrates.spirit-lake.k12.ia.us>
>
> Jan Bolluyt wrote:
> >
> > When do "students" stop their "studenthood". At what point do we deny
> > subsidized access. College? Junior College? Early graduates? Adult
> > education? GED students? "life-long" learners?
> >
> > Jan
>
> Excellent point. If we subsidize educational institutions, does this mean
> only those within the bricks and mortar buildings, or does it apply to
> students doing homework, or home schooling, or teachers from home? An
> interesting debate has been going on here in Oregon where a school
> consortium is building out an Internet access network for 'education
> only'. In the urban areas, that works fine. But in the rural and
> remote areas, their 'educational only' network is causing a real
> problem. Many small communities in rural Oregon are working toward
> either funding a POP for local access or enticing an ISP to come in
> based upon some guaranteed number of accounts. Along comes the school
> with their 'education only' network and insists the school connect
> through them. That takes away potential accounts in the community,
> requires duplicate POP hardware and lines, and ends up taking away from
> community resources.
>
> I prefer to view our communities as just that, communities. In our
> region (northwest Oregon) we are promoting infrastructure, training and
> access across all facets of the community including schools, business,
> government, agencies, private citizens, libraries and organizations.

The issue of how the prices for services associated with Universal Service are developed is very important to the concept of community networks. If Universal Service prices are based on anything other than competitive bids, community networks loose. If competitive bids are used, schools, business, government, agencies and such could aggregate demand - drive prices down for all participants - and then schools and libraries would get discounts from this price. If prices were based on TELRIC or national benchmarks - schools and libraries could not be added to the aggregated numbers.

Steve

> ...
>
> * * * * *
> * In Balance, Link Shadley *
> * LANCE - Ecotrust - Clatsop Community College *
> * (503) 325-9657 lshadley@orednet.org *
> * lshadley@seasurf.com *
> * * * * *

-
- **Next message:** Hossain Samei: "Re: Questions to be answered"
 - **Previous message:** Steve Kohn: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Marty Tennant: "Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - **Next in thread:** Marty Tennant: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"

Re: Questions to be answered

Hossain Samei (samei@central.murdoch.edu.au)

Thu, 29 Aug 1996 10:12:49 +0800

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Jim Callahan: "Re: Definition of "Education""
 - **Previous message:** Steve Kohn: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Sylvia Nespoli: "Questions to be answered"
-

Hi All,

Just as a suggestion, I thought it would be easier if we could adopt a standard "subject" for all the email exchanged. This will make it easier to differentiate the "Universal Service" mails between many other messages we receive everyday. Please advise.

Many Thanks,
Hossain.

[Moderator's Note: I could set things up so that every subject line is prefixed by something like "US-ND:". The problem with this is that it reduces the amount of other information that people can see when looking at the subject lines in their in-box. If people want to suggest changes of this sort, please write to info@info-ren.pitt.edu

If there is enough sentiment for a change, we can make it. Initially I'm just trying to get all the message headers right and to contact people whose mailers are mis-addressing replies. This is not a completely trivial task, and I'm disinclined to make other changes until all the essential parts of the mailing list are working smoothly.]

- **Next message:** Jim Callahan: "Re: Definition of "Education""
- **Previous message:** Steve Kohn: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
- **Maybe in reply to:** Sylvia Nespoli: "Questions to be answered"

Re: Definition of "Education"

Jim Callahan (jcalhan@sundial.sundial.net)

Wed, 28 Aug 1996 23:24:30 -0700

- **Messages sorted by:** [date] [thread] [subject] [author]
- **Next message:** Jim Callahan: "Re: Definition of "Education""
- **Previous message:** Hossain Samei: "Re: Questions to be answered"
- **Maybe in reply to:** Bill Cosh: "Definition of "Education""
- **Next in thread:** Jim Callahan: "Re: Definition of "Education""

Bill Cosh wrote:

>

> While going through the messages that I received today, I noticed the
> comments from Jan Bolluyt and Link Shadley. Excellent points. I just
> wanted to pass on to participants that the issues you both raised are
> things that Wisconsin's Universal Service Fund Advisory Council is
> struggling with as they revise the first set of Universal Service Rules.
> Currently, Wisconsin's Public Service Commission has chosen to define
> education institution very narrowly.

For the benefit of our discussion I wanted to quote one of the definitions of education I found -- none of this is intended to take away from Link Shadley's thought provoking comments -- in the "Useful Documents" section of this seminar there is the FCC's "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" (NOPR):

<http://info-ren.pitt.edu/universal-service/documents.html>

[QUOTE]

3. Who Is Eligible for Support

87. The term "elementary and secondary schools" is defined for purposes of Section 254 by reference to the definition found in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.[184] The term "elementary school" is defined there to be "a nonprofit institutional day or residential school that provides elementary education, as determined under State law." [185] The term secondary school means "a nonprofit institutional day or residential school that provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that such term does not include any education beyond grade 12." [186] Consortia of educational institutions providing distance learning to elementary and secondary schools are considered as educational providers eligible for universal service support. [187] Section 254(h)(4) denies eligibility for discounts to any school or library that "operates as a for-profit business." In addition, the discounts are not available to any elementary and secondary school having an "endowment of more than \$50,000,000" or library that is "not eligible for participation in State-based" applications for library services and technology funds under Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act. [188] To help ensure that these conditions are met, we propose to require that any certification address these eligibility requirements.

[End Quote]

Jim Callahan

Well-Connected Community of Central FL, Inc.

-
- **Next message:** Jim Callahan: "Re: Definition of "Education""
 - **Previous message:** Hossain Samei: "Re: Questions to be answered"
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Bill Cosh: "Definition of "Education""
 - **Next in thread:** Jim Callahan: "Re: Definition of "Education""

Re: Definition of "Education"

Jim Callahan (jcalhan@sundial.sundial.net)

Wed, 28 Aug 1996 23:37:24 -0700

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
- **Next message:** Travis Thompson: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"
- **Previous message:** Jim Callahan: "Re: Definition of "Education""
- **Maybe in reply to:** Bill Cosh: "Definition of "Education""
- **Next in thread:** Link Shadley: "Re: Definition of "Education""

A minor correction, the correct name and abbreviation of the FCC document I referred to is:

Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) .

Jim Callahan
Well-Connected Community of Central FL, Inc.

-
- **Next message:** Travis Thompson: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"
 - **Previous message:** Jim Callahan: "Re: Definition of "Education""
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Bill Cosh: "Definition of "Education""
 - **Next in thread:** Link Shadley: "Re: Definition of "Education""

Re: universal service vs. public sector service

Travis Thompson (etechojt@juno.com)

Wed, 28 Aug 1996 22:12:23 EDT

- **Messages sorted by:** [date | thread | subject | author]
 - **Next message:** Kevin Rocap: "Reply to Gergory G. Nadeau"
 - **Previous message:** Jim Callahan: "Re: Definition of "Education""
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Miles R Fidelman: "universal service vs. public sector service"
-

On Wed, 28 Aug 1996 14:51:13 -0400 (EDT) fidelman@civicnet.org writes:

>From: Miles R Fidelman <fidelman@civicnet.org>
>Date: Wed, 28 Aug 1996 09:21:24 -0400 (EDT)
>Subject: universal service vs. public sector service
>
>Universal service is like the telephone: everyone has it and it's
>relatively cheap. The best model for universal advanced service is a
>university or corporate campus, where there is a "data wall plug" next
>to
>every telephone jack. On the MIT campus, for example, a 24-hour, high
>speed connection to the campus network (and through it to the
>Internet)
>costs around \$25/mo. -- That's the kind of service I'd like to my home
>office (or classroom, or library).

Absolutely, and this model is economically achievable right now.

>For this kind of universal service to exist, at modest cost, economies
>of
>scale have to be exploited -- we're talking about building network
>utilities akin to telephone, water, sewer, electric systems - i.e.
>infrastructure.

ADSL and new wireless technology will eliminate capital equipment costs associated with building costly wired and fiber optic telecoms infrastructure.

Adapting wireless technology also eliminates telephone costs so this is not a solution promoted by equipment manufacturers or telephone companies.

>By contrast, much of the talk about free (subsidized) access for
>schools,
>etc., implies that the commercial vendors will focus their efforts on
>the
>largest, most profitable markets (i.e. "cream skimming), and throw a
>bone
>to the rest of us in the way of free service in a few locations.
>

The current model being promoted by most vendors is designed to preserve and/or increase profits - not to provide universal service economically.

>Don't get fooled by what looks like a good deal. Cream skimming plus
>free
>service for schools and libraries translates to not very much service
>for
>homes, small businesses, small non-profits, etc.
>

Exactly.

>
>*****
>Miles R. Fidelman mfidelman@civicnet.org
>President & 91 Baldwin St. Charlestown MA
>02129
>Director of Civic Networking Systems 617-241-9205 fax: 617-241-5064
>The Center for Civic Networking <http://civic.net/ccn.html>
>
>Information Infrastructure: Public Spaces for the 21st Century
>Let's Start With: Internet Wall-Plugs Everywhere
>Say It Often, Say It Loud: "I Want My Internet!"
>*****

Regards,
Travis
National eTechOJT Coordinator

-
- **Next message:** Kevin Rocap: "Reply to Gergory G. Nadeau"
 - **Previous message:** Jim Callahan: "Re: Definition of "Education""
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Miles R Fidelman: "universal service vs. public sector service"

Reply to Gergory G. Nadeau

Kevin Rocap (*krocap@csulb.edu*)
Wed, 28 Aug 1996 20:59:48 -0700

- **Messages sorted by:** [date [thread [subject [author]
- **Next message:** Bill Cosh: "Equity"
- **Previous message:** Travis Thompson: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"

Dear friends,

I've not yet introduced myself or made a substantial statement, but would like to put forth a modest reply...

Gergory G. Nadeau (*gnadeau@doe.mass.edu*)
Wed, 28 Aug 1996 17:45:34 -0400 wrote:

I would hope that we could achieve free internet access at escalating transmission speeds to all schools that have put in place the local area network, workstations, training, and support that they need.

Perhaps this begs a question of equity and access? The financially well-endowed, early adopting school districts would also get the benefits of free or subsidized infrastructure??

In Peace,
Kevin Rocap

-
- **Next message:** Bill Cosh: "Equity"
 - **Previous message:** Travis Thompson: "Re: universal service vs. public sector service"

Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding

Marty Tennant (marty@sccoast.net)

Thu, 29 Aug 1996 09:20:39 -0700

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Mario Zinga: "Educational Value"
 - **Previous message:** Bill Cosh: "Equity"
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Marty Tennant: "Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - **Next in thread:** Steve Kohn: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
-

Steve Kohn wrote:

> There is specific language in the Universal Service legislation that
> prohibits schools from reselling any service they receive via Universal
> Service.
>

I realize this. But if the discount levels are not on par with the discount level for resellers, why go for the Universal Service bait to begin with? As a resale based carrier, you have no restrictions like this.

As far as technical feasibility, I see school districts, not individual schools, as the initiators of this kind of effort. Their DP resources would be needed for billing.

>From a student perspective, if we are suppose to be educating kids for the future, what better way for them to learn that by being in the middle of the biggest technological shift of the modern age?

>From a marketing perspective, you are selling a service that people already have installed in their homes. You are going to charge them the same amount they are already paying for dialtone from the incumbent. They will be aware that by getting their service from the school district reseller, they will be assisting schools tremendously. If you throw in long distance resale too, the profit picture increases dramatically. Why do you think the telcos were so willing to sell their network soul to get into long distance to begin with?

Of course, all profits go into infrastructure, so tax exempt status is preserved.

One other thing I like about this approach is that it short circuits the huge corporations from the equation. I have numerous real world examples of telcos and cable tv companies "efforts" to "help" education. No thanks!! I say this also as a former Bell System employee for many years.

As other commentators have said, the Telcos look like they might ignore the whole USF issue for schools anyway. I am seeing cynical interpretations of the law like this in my negotiations with the telcos now.

Always best to know your options so you can choose accordingly.

This is just one way of proceeding. Might not be appropriate for all. Could make a lot of sense for some.

Steve, I realize you work for NYNEX. I don't mean any of this personally, but I am increasingly wary of big corporations in this current environment.

Marty Tennant

President

Low Tech Designs, Inc.

"Bringing Technology Down to Earth"™

"Common Sense Computer and Communications Solutions"™

-
- **Next message:** Mario Zinga: "Educational Value"
 - **Previous message:** Bill Cosh: "Equity"
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Marty Tennant: "Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - **Next in thread:** Steve Kohn: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"

Equity

Bill Cosh (bcosh@wasb.org)

Thu, 29 Aug 1996 08:30:52 -0700

- **Messages sorted by:** [date | thread | subject | author]
 - **Next message:** Marty Tennant: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - **Previous message:** Kevin Rocap: "Reply to Gergory G. Nadeau"
-

Just a quick reply to Kevin Rocap's comment on how the most advanced schools could benefit even more depending on how universal service is structured, and the concerns over equity that he raised.

Excellent point!! This is exactly what has resulted in Wisconsin. The way Wisconsin's Universal Service rules are structured they actually increase the disparity between the "technology haves" and the "technology have nots". There is no universal service funding available in Wisconsin to bring advanced telecommunications services to schools that do not have them.

The only funds available are a 3-tiered structure set up that offers a discount for the purchase of new services. Schools that were ahead of the curve and already have made the commitments to such investments are left out in the cold. They receive nothing, and are not eligible for the discounts.

Even worse, schools that do not have the infrastructure can not benefit from Wisconsin's Universal Service program, because they can not even access the discount since they can't get the service.

Bill Cosh

Wisconsin Association of School Boards

- **Next message:** Marty Tennant: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
- **Previous message:** Kevin Rocap: "Reply to Gergory G. Nadeau"

Educational Value

Mario Zinga (zinga@pps.pgh.pa.us)

Thu, 29 Aug 1996 09:47:07 -0400 (EDT)

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Robert Mammel: "If libraries sold books would there be any book stores?"
 - **Previous message:** Marty Tennant: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
 - **In reply to:** Rick Valley: "Access issue"
 - **Next in thread:** KIETH WRIGHT: "Re: Educational Value"
-

I've been reading the various postings and there seems to be something missing from the discussion. There is talk about standards, configurations, software and training, but no discussion about the educational use of access. There's more of a feel that if the access is there, teachers and students will use it. I find that argument weak, and suggest that until we define the educational uses of this technology, and how it'll be used in the K12 environment it'll be difficult to define the setup or make the argument that schools and libraries are ready for the investment.

It may be that the purpose of this forum is not to consider educational considerations, but to understand the legislation. However, it seems to me that if we had a set of educational objectives in mind, then the discussion could match legislative issues with K12/Library goals.

-mario zinga

- **Next message:** Robert Mammel: "If libraries sold books would there be any book stores?"
- **Previous message:** Marty Tennant: "Re: Tech Support and Long Term Funding"
- **In reply to:** Rick Valley: "Access issue"
- **Next in thread:** KIETH WRIGHT: "Re: Educational Value"