

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

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING  
706 Duke Street, Suite 100  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

- 1 PARTICIPANTS:
- 2 ANGIE KRONENBERG, Moderator
- 3 KATHRYN FALK
- 4 VP, Public Affairs, Cox Communications, Northern Virginia
- 5 GREG GOLDMAN
- 6 Chief Executive Officer, Digital Impact Group
- 7 HOWIE HODGES, SR.
- 8 VP for Business Development & Government Affairs, One Economy Corporation
- 9 LAURIE ITKIN
- 10 Director of Government Affairs, Cricket Communications, Inc./Leap Wireless, Inc.
- 11 THOMAS KAMBER
- 12 Executive Director, Older Adults Technology Services (OATS)
- 13 MARK MALASPINA
- 14 Chief Program Officer, Computers for Youth
- 15 RAQUEL NORIEGA
- 16 Director of Strategic Partnerships, Connected Nation

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

\* \* \* \* \*

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

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

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

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 --

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

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

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

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

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING  
706 Duke Street, Suite 100  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

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.

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

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

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

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

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING  
706 Duke Street, Suite 100  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

