

60001355643.txt

A lot of cellular data companies claim they want to be able to offer ?broadband? service to people with a low income.

In reality, there is no cellular company in the US that delivers a feasible wireless broadband option.

When a plan with just a few GB monthly allowance is suggested as a broadband solution, just the updates for the OS and security software can already use more data than the total monthly data allowance contains .

<http://www.zdnet.com/article/windows-10-churning-through-bandwidth-blowing-data-caps/>

<http://www.techrepublic.com/article/windows-10-updates-potentially-costing-users-on-data-capped-internet-plans/>

<http://motherboard.vic.com/read/automatic-windows-10-updates-chewing-through-data-caps>

The examples above, proof that in reality a minimum acceptable data allowance will be needed for service to be defined as broadband.

To me personally, browsing through the FCC documents, it?s not clear what the legal definition of broadband is, the FCC announced earlier this year, the speed definition changed to 25/3 but I have been unable to find a clear check sheet that lists all the relevant specifications of broadband.

- Minimum Speed Thresholds (25/3 Mbps)
- Minimum Monthly Data Allowance (?)
- Max Latency (?)

The need for broadband is real, this argument is strong, a lot of the solutions and technologies offered in name of this need, are answered with an insufficient service, that can not be considered broadband, since it can?t be used as such.

Besides the quality of the broadband service itself, other important technical factors that need to be clear for service to qualify for lifeline are:

- Can the connection be shared to other devices (tethered) and to what extent.
- What will happen after monthly data usage is used (Verizon, AT&T and Vi aSat consider \$10 per GB to be reasonable on their regular plans)

Collective funding for broadband should NOT be used for services that can?t be used as such.