	J.S. DEPARTMENT OF CO	MMERCE	2. Award Or Grant I	Number			
Perform	01-50-M09013 4. Report Date (MM 04-30-2012	4. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)					
Recipient Name Alabama Department of Econom		6. Designated Entity On Behalf Of:					
3. Street Address P.O. Box 5690, 401 Adams Ave	8. Final Report?	9. Report Frequency Quarterly					
5. City, State, Zip Code Montgomery, AL 36104-5690			● No	○ Semi Annual○ Annual○ Final			
7. Project / Grant Period Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY) 11-01-2009 10. Broadband Mapping	9a. If Other, please	e describe:					
Number of Providers Identified 0							
The following providers did not provide data in Round 5, but also have not formally decline to participate. We will continue to reach out to these providers to encourage their participation in future Rounds. Aerowire, Inc. Boondocks Wireless CTSWireless.NET Cable Star Dixie Land Internet Services Gosuto Harbor Communications, LLC HorizonWisp.net JMF Solutions, Inc Professional2-wayradio.com/NetSpeedNow.com Network Solutions Shelby Telecom Traveler Information Services VeriQik WP Media Media3 Mobile Internet Services pcAirLink Wireless Ragland Telephone Company S and V Wireless							

Scottsboro Electric Power Board
SmartResort Co. LLC DBA - Beyond Communications
South Al Communications DBA - Conexus Communications
'Talk America Inc. DBA - Cavalier Telephone
Utopian Wireless Corporation
DSL by Air
InterGlobe Communications
Residential Data Solutions DBA - RDASOL
Telapex, Inc DBA - Cellular South
Knetworx, LLC DBA - Smith Lake Broadband

The following companies are no longer in business:
Cobridge Communication
IBEC
Open Range
Rapid Cable

James Cable - purchased by Charter

10e. If you are collecting data through other means (e.g. data extraction, extrapolation, etc), please describe your progress to date and the relevant activities to be undertaken in the future

As has been previously reported, the LinkAMERICA team verifies and augments provider data with coverage and speed information from third party sources. This activity is repeated in each data collection round. We do not substitute third party information for provider-supplied information unless we can independently verify that the provider information is incorrect. More often we use discrepancies to identify areas where further investigation is required.

If providers do not submit data, but we are able to verify infrastructure information through other sources, we use common engineering principles to estimate coverage and speed. We also collect user feedback via location-specific feedback mechanisms on the state interactive map.

10f. Please describe the verification activities you plan to implement

These verification methods are currently under review and have not been implemented to date. The verification processes being employed are recounted in section 10h.

- ** Mobile Wireless Broadband Drive Testing: This process will use a special device from a vendor to test signal strength and bandwidth/throughput on multiple mobile wireless signals at the same time. This technology will be used in areas where there is a large discrepancy between provider-reported coverage/speed and consumer-reported coverage/speed to determine the actual coverage and speed characteristics The feasibility and accuracy of this type of testing is currently under review. If approved a vendor will be selected in 2012.
- ** Mobile Wireless Crowd Sourced Testing: This process will use a proprietary smart phone app, provided by a vendor, to constantly check signal strength and bandwidth/throughput on the user's mobile phone. The application will be available on multiple phone platforms and will be downloadable by consumers in each LinkAMERICA state. It runs in the background on the consumer's phone and does not impact phone performance. Data is sent from the vendor to LinkAMERICA for use in validating provider coverage and speed reports Targeted date for selecting a vendor for this work is 2012.

10h. If yes, please describe the status of your activities

The LinkAMERICA team uses consistent data verification procedures in each data collection round - adding new procedures after they have been developed and tested. These procedures are common to all four LinkAMERICA states.

- ** Third Party Data Comparison: As data arrives from providers we compare submissions against several commercial data sources to identify obvious anomalies or areas for further investigation. An example would be the comparison of an ILECs reported coverage area boundaries with the legal exchange areas shown in the commercial ExchangeInfo data product. Coverage footprints of wireless providers are compared against AmericanRoamer database. This process occurs with each data collection round
- ** Provider Validation: Check maps and other tools are produced at the beginning of each data collection round based upon prior round coverage reports. We provide the information in both Google Earth and PDF format which gives providers the flexibility of updating their coverage boundaries directly within the check map file itself.
- ** Data Format Verification: Proprietary and NTIA-supplied scripts are run against the dataset prior to submission to ensure the data is properly formatted and will be fully received upon submittal this process occurs with each data collection round. In Round 5 we included the NTIA technology/speed trips into our test code to check for Provider data that fell outside of the normal range as determined by NTIA. Identified providers are contacted for clarification of their submission and supporting documentation is collected when necessary.
- ** Consumer Feedback/Verification: The ConnectingALABAMA interactive map includes a consumer feedback layer that provides an

opportunity for the public to supply information regarding their access to broadband. The information collected can be compared against provider supplied data to identify areas where consumer feedback conflicts with provider information.

10i. If verification activities have not been initiated please provide a projected time line for beginning and completing such activities

Verification activities have been initiated and are on-going. New process are being reviewed for possible implementation in yrs 3 & 4.

Staffing

10j. How many jobs have been created or retained as a result of this project?

An analysis of actual hours worked in Q1 2012 shows that the project resulted in 0.94 FTE jobs created/retained at the Sub Recipient level for the quarter. An additional 2.33 FTEs were created/retained at the Prime Recipient level for a grand total of 3.27 FTEs. It should be noted that this figure does not include positions staffed by vendors involved in the project.

10k. Is the project currently fully staffed?

Yes

No

10l. If no, please explain how any lack of staffing may impact the project's time line and when the project will be fully staffed

The program is fully staffed.

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

A total of 3.5-4.5 FTEs (depending upon number of hours worked by Prime and Sub-Recipient staff members each quarter).

10n. Staffing Table

Job Title	FTE %	Date of Hire
Prime Recipient Regional Coordinator	73	09/07/2010
Prime Recipient Regional Coordinator	78	09/07/2010
Prime Recipient Regional Coordinator	83	08/30/2010
Sub Recipient CEO-Supervisory Role	0	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Project Director	15	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Project Manager	34	09/05/2011
Sub Recipient GIS Director	20	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Internal System Support	1	11/01/2009
Sub Recipient Provider Relations Manager	23	11/01/2009

Add Row

Remove Row

Sub Contracts

10o. Subcontracts Table

Name of Subcontractor	Purpose of Subcontract	RFP Issued (Y/N)	Contract Executed (Y/N)	Start Date	End Date	Federal Funds	In-Kind Funds
	Project Management/GIS Programming & Planning	Υ	Y	11/01/2009	11/08/2012	2,249,424	550,174
University Partner	Measurement and Evaluation	Υ	N	05/01/2012	09/30/2014	1,010,324	420,724

Add Row Remove Row

Funding

10p. How much Federal funding has been expended as of the end of the last quarter? \$1,828,090

828,090 10q. How much Remains?

\$3,046,051

10r. How much matching funds have been expended as of the end of last quarter?

\$599,007

10s. How much Remains?

\$620,475

10t. Budget Worksheet

Mapping Budget Element	Federal Funds Granted	Proposed In-Kind	Total Budget	Federal Funds Expended	Matching Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Personal Salaries	\$884,896	\$228,405	\$1,113,301	\$150,563	\$19,821	\$170,384
Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$427,454	\$85,318	\$512,772	\$74,682	\$7,350	\$82,033
Travel	\$98,715	\$0	\$98,715	\$16,726	\$0	\$16,726
Equipment	\$64,700	\$0	\$64,700	\$0	\$0	\$0
Materials / Supplies	\$19,044	\$0	\$19,044	\$8,472	\$0	\$8,472
Subcontracts Total	\$3,259,748	\$895,752	\$4,155,500	\$1,521,308	\$571,834	\$2,093,143
Subcontract #1	\$2,249,424	\$475,028	\$2,724,452	\$1,521,308	\$550,174	\$2,071,482
Subcontract #2	\$1,010,324	\$420,724	\$1,431,048	\$0	\$21,661	\$21,661
Subcontract #3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #4	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #5	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$15,000	\$0	\$15,000	\$5,664	\$0	\$5,664
Total Direct Costs	\$4,769,557	\$1,209,475	\$5,979,032	\$1,777,416	\$599,007	\$2,376,424
Total Indirect Costs	\$104,585	\$10,008	\$114,593	\$50,673	\$0	\$50,673
Total Costs	\$4,874,142	\$1,219,483	\$6,093,625	\$1,828,090	\$599,007	\$2,427,097
% Of Total	80	20	100	75	25	100

Hardware / Software

10u. Has the project team	purchased the software	/ hardware described ir	n the application?	Yes	(•)N
---------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------	-----	------

No software/hardware was purchased this Quarter. The purchases from prior quarters are listed below:

Laptop computer and software for Sub Recipient Project Manager (AL allocated portion): \$352.78

Laptop computer and software for Sub Recipient Vendor Relations Manager (AL allocated portion): \$339.48

- 2 Desktop PCs: \$2464.00
- 1 Presentation Projector: \$374.00
- 1 Uninterrupted Power Supply: \$121.00
- 1 Printer: \$375.10
- 1 Dell Precision T5500 Workstation w/ArcInfo C (AL allocated portion): \$3,458.59*

*The ArcInfo software was a necessary purchase to enable CostQuest to run the validation script, on provider data, that NTIA & FCC require for the SBDD program. Purchasing the hardware/software bundle was the most cost effective way to acquire the needed software. Without the hardware the cost for the software alone would have been \$1000 higher. This expense was allocated evenly to each of the four LinkAMERICA states.

10w. Please note any software / hardware that has yet to be purchased and explain why it has not been purchased

As previously noted, all software/hardware listed in the budget for Years 1-2 has been purchased. Software and Hardware for transition of the interactive maps to state hosting, in the amount of \$44,700 will be purchased in 2012. This purchase will include a Database Server, Web/GIS Server, and external storage device, and the necessary MS SQL Server and ESRI software licenses.

10v Hacth	e project team	nurchaead	or used any	data cate?	(Van	ONIA
TUX. Has in	ie broiect team	i burchased	or used anv	data sets?	(AY AS	

¹⁰v. If yes, please list

¹⁰y. If yes, please list

^{**}American Roamer: Market area boundary and speed data on mobile cellular providers was purchase in Q1 2012 - \$625

^{**}Media Prints: Cable franchise boundary database was purchased in Yr 2. We are reviewing options for this type of data for Yr 3.

^{**}ExchangeInfo: Legal exchange area boundary database for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers was purchased in Yr 2. We are reviewing options for this data in Yr. 3.

10z. Are there any additional project milestones or information that has not been included? Yes No 10aa. If yes, please list **The Round 5 Data Collection was submitted to NTIA on March 31, 2012, one day prior to the deadline of April 1, 2012. Status: Complete The final transition of the process for CAI data collection and reporting from CostQuest to ADECA was completed in Round 5. The budget numbers included in 10o include both the original award and supplemental award. 10bb. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing We continue to encounter difficulty in reconciling reported provider speeds for some providers with the NTIA speed range parameters. Providers whose reported data falls outside of the speed norms identified by NTIA are contacted for clarification of their submission. In most instances we find that Providers were using enhanced technologies to achieve the speed reported. Supporting documentation is collected in all instances. Our findings were including in the methodology document we submitted with the Round 5 data submission. 10cc. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project We look forward to continued dialog with NTIA regarding the scoring process being used to evaluate SBI data submissions. While we understand and appreciate the need to develop a process that can be used across states to determine the effectiveness of the SBI effort, we are concerned that the complexity of the information being evaluated often makes the validation results difficult to interpret. We have made an effort to develop relationships with the provider community and be transparent in our processes. We are currently working on developing more robust internal mechanisms to better compare provider submitted data against third party data-sets identified by NTIA for validation purposes. Assistance and direction in this endeavor is appreciated. 11.	
**The Round 5 Data Collection was submitted to NTIA on March 31, 2012, one day prior to the deadline of April 1, 2012. Status: Complete The final transition of the process for CAI data collection and reporting from CostQuest to ADECA was completed in Round 5. The budget numbers included in 100 include both the original award and supplemental award. 10bb. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing We continue to encounter difficulty in reconciling reported provider speeds for some providers with the NTIA speed range parameters. Providers whose reported data falls outside of the speed norms identified by NTIA are contacted for clarification of their submission. In most instances we find that Providers were using enhanced technologies to achieve the speed reported. Supporting documentation is collected in all instances. Our findings were including in the methodology document we submitted with the Round 5 data submission. 10cc. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project We look forward to continued dialog with NTIA regarding the scoring process being used to evaluate SBI data submissions. While we understand and appreciate the need to develop a process that can be used across states to determine the effectiveness of the SBI effort, we are concerned that the complexity of the information being evaluated often makes the validation results difficult to interpret. We have made an effort to develop relationships with the provider community and be transparent in our processes. We are currently working on developing more robust internal mechanisms to better compare provider submitted data against third party data-sets identified by NTIA for validation purposes. Assistance and direction in this endeavor is appreciated. 11. Broadband Planning 11a. Please describe progress made against all goals, objectives, and milestones detailed in the approved P	10z. Are there any additional project milestones or information that has not been included? Yes No
The final transition of the process for CAI data collection and reporting from CostQuest to ADECA was completed in Round 5. The budget numbers included in 10o include both the original award and supplemental award. 10bb. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing. We continue to encounter difficulty in reconciling reported provider speeds for some providers with the NTIA speed range parameters. Providers whose reported data falls outside of the speed norms identified by NTIA are contacted for clarification of their submission. In most instances we find that Providers were using enhanced technologies to achieve the speed reported. Supporting documentation is collected in all instances. Our findings were including in the methodology document we submitted with the Round 5 data submission. 10cc. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project. We look forward to continued dialog with NTIA regarding the scoring process being used to evaluate SBI data submissions. While we understand and appreciate the need to develop a process that can be used across states to determine the effectiveness of the SBI effort, we are concerned that the complexity of the information being evaluated often makes the validation results difficult to interpret. We have made an effort to develop relationships with the provider community and be transparent in our processes. We are currently working on developing more robust internal mechanisms to better compare provider submitted data against third party data-sets identified by NTIA for validation purposes. Assistance and direction in this endeavor is appreciated. 11. Broadband Planning 11a. Please describe progress made against all goals, objectives, and milestones detailed in the approved Project Plan. Be sure to include a description of each major activity / milestone that you plan to complete and your current status	10aa. If yes, please list
The budget numbers included in 10o include both the original award and supplemental award. 10bb. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing. We continue to encounter difficulty in reconciling reported provider speeds for some providers with the NTIA speed range parameters. Providers whose reported data falls outside of the speed norms identified by NTIA are contacted for clarification of their submission. In most instances we find that Providers were using enhanced technologies to achieve the speed reported. Supporting documentation is collected in all instances. Our findings were including in the methodology document we submitted with the Round 5 data submission. 10cc. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project. We look forward to continued dialog with NTIA regarding the scoring process being used to evaluate SBI data submissions. While we understand and appreciate the need to develop a process that can be used across states to determine the effectiveness of the SBI effort, we are concerned that the complexity of the information being evaluated often makes the validation results difficult to interpret. We have made an effort to develop relationships with the provider community and be transparent in our processes. We are currently working on developing more robust internal mechanisms to better compare provider submitted data against third party data-sets identified by NTIA for validation purposes. Assistance and direction in this endeavor is appreciated. 11. Broadband Planning 11a. Please describe progress made against all goals, objectives, and milestones detailed in the approved Project Plan. Be sure to include a description of each major activity / milestone that you plan to complete and your current status	
10bb. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing We continue to encounter difficulty in reconciling reported provider speeds for some providers with the NTIA speed range parameters. Providers whose reported data falls outside of the speed norms identified by NTIA are contacted for clarification of their submission. In most instances we find that Providers were using enhanced technologies to achieve the speed reported. Supporting documentation is collected in all instances. Our findings were including in the methodology document we submitted with the Round 5 data submission. 10cc. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project We look forward to continued dialog with NTIA regarding the scoring process being used to evaluate SBI data submissions. While we understand and appreciate the need to develop a process that can be used across states to determine the effectiveness of the SBI effort, we are concerned that the complexity of the information being evaluated often makes the validation results difficult to interpret. We have made an effort to develop relationships with the provider community and be transparent in our processes. We are currently working on developing more robust internal mechanisms to better compare provider submitted data against third party data-sets identified by NTIA for validation purposes. Assistance and direction in this endeavor is appreciated. 11. Broadband Planning 11a. Please describe progress made against all goals, objectives, and milestones detailed in the approved Project Plan. Be sure to include a description of each major activity / milestone that you plan to complete and your current status	The final transition of the process for CAI data collection and reporting from CostQuest to ADECA was completed in Round 5.
Providers whose reported data falls outside of the speed norms identified by NTIA are contacted for clarification of their submission. In most instances we find that Providers were using enhanced technologies to achieve the speed reported. Supporting documentation is collected in all instances. Our findings were including in the methodology document we submitted with the Round 5 data submission. 10cc. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project We look forward to continued dialog with NTIA regarding the scoring process being used to evaluate SBI data submissions. While we understand and appreciate the need to develop a process that can be used across states to determine the effectiveness of the SBI effort, we are concerned that the complexity of the information being evaluated often makes the validation results difficult to interpret. We have made an effort to develop relationships with the provider community and be transparent in our processes. We are currently working on developing more robust internal mechanisms to better compare provider submitted data against third party data-sets identified by NTIA for validation purposes. Assistance and direction in this endeavor is appreciated. 11. Broadband Planning 11a. Please describe progress made against all goals, objectives, and milestones detailed in the approved Project Plan. Be sure to include a description of each major activity / milestone that you plan to complete and your current status	
We look forward to continued dialog with NTIA regarding the scoring process being used to evaluate SBI data submissions. While we understand and appreciate the need to develop a process that can be used across states to determine the effectiveness of the SBI effort, we are concerned that the complexity of the information being evaluated often makes the validation results difficult to interpret. We have made an effort to develop relationships with the provider community and be transparent in our processes. We are currently working on developing more robust internal mechanisms to better compare provider submitted data against third party data-sets identified by NTIA for validation purposes. Assistance and direction in this endeavor is appreciated. 11. Broadband Planning 11a. Please describe progress made against all goals, objectives, and milestones detailed in the approved Project Plan. Be sure to include a description of each major activity / milestone that you plan to complete and your current status	Providers whose reported data falls outside of the speed norms identified by NTIA are contacted for clarification of their submission. In most instances we find that Providers were using enhanced technologies to achieve the speed reported. Supporting documentation is
11a. Please describe progress made against all goals, objectives, and milestones detailed in the approved Project Plan. Be sure to include a description of each major activity / milestone that you plan to complete and your current status	We look forward to continued dialog with NTIA regarding the scoring process being used to evaluate SBI data submissions. While we understand and appreciate the need to develop a process that can be used across states to determine the effectiveness of the SBI effort, we are concerned that the complexity of the information being evaluated often makes the validation results difficult to interpret. We have made an effort to develop relationships with the provider community and be transparent in our processes. We are currently working on developing more robust internal mechanisms to better compare provider submitted data against third party data-sets identified by NTIA for validation purposes. Assistance and direction in this endeavor is appreciated.
description of each major activity / milestone that you plan to complete and your current status	11. Broadband Planning
Pending Task: Publish FINAL regional investment plans STATUS: Complete Pending Task: Selection of University Partner Status: RFP issued with responses due early April. Selection will follow shortly after. Q1 Milestones: (see attached detail for activities/accomplishments) Milestone 1: Completion of the development of a database/list of technical leaders across the state. Task 1: Work with the broadband provider community and Regional Planning Teams to identify key resources whom might benefit from training in technology and policy change STATUS: Pending - Initial information gathering and assembling of leadership database is complete. One Regional implementation meeting pending. Task 2: Develop preliminary database of technology leaders and confirm their interest in attending events. STATUS: Preliminary database of regional leaders complete. Task 3: Finalize database/list of technology leaders. STATUS: This objective is on-going, with the database to be expanded as the regional leadership with the facilitation of ADECA/ConnectingALABAMA staff continue to meet. Milestone 2: Begin Planning of Broadband Summit Task 1: Identify and contact ARRA applicants and awardees regarding Summit. STATUS: ARRA applicants will be contacted in the 2nd Quarter of 2012. Task 2: Identify and contact potential exhibitors. Potential exhibitors will be contacted in the 2nd Quarter of 2012 Task 3: Identify ALBI board members, Regional Broadband Action team members and others to participate on Summit planning committee. STATUS: ALBI board members, Regional Broadband Action team members and other leaders will be contacted in the 2nd Quarter of 2012. Milestone 3 & 4: Refine Regional Broadband Investment Priority M&E and Training Needs for all 12 regions. Finalize Joint Partner Plan Status: Tasks associated with this effort are pending the selection of a university partner which should occur in Q2.	description of each major activity / milestone that you plan to complete and your current status. Pending from Q4, 2011 Pending Task: Publish FINAL regional investment plans STATUS: Complete Pending Task: Selection of University Partner Status: RFP issued with responses due early April. Selection will follow shortly after. Q1 Milestones: (see attached detail for activities/accomplishments) Milestone 1: Completion of the development of a database/list of technical leaders across the state. Task 1: Work with the broadband provider community and Regional Planning Teams to identify key resources whom might benefit from training in technology and policy change STATUS: Pending - Initial information gathering and assembling of leadership database is complete. One Regional implementation meeting pending. Task 2: Develop preliminary database of technology leaders and confirm their interest in attending events. STATUS: Preliminary database of regional leaders complete. Task 3: Finalize database/list of technology leaders. STATUS: This objective is on-going, with the database to be expanded as the regional leadership with the facilitation of ADECA/ConnectingALABAMA staff continue to meet. Milestone 2: Begin Planning of Broadband Summit Task 1: Identify and contact ARRA applicants and awardees regarding Summit. STATUS: ARRA applicants will be contacted in the 2nd Quarter of 2012. Task 2: Identify and contact potential exhibitors. Potential exhibitors will be contacted in the 2nd Quarter of 2012 Task 3: Identify ALBI board members, Regional Broadband Action team members and others to participate on Summit planning committee. STATUS: ALBI board members, Regional Broadband Action team members and other leaders will be contacted in the 2nd Quarter of 2012. Milestone 3 & 4: Refine Regional Broadband Investment Priority M&E and Training Needs for all 12 regions. Finalize Joint Partner
11b. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the project team is employing Regarding Milestone 2: Contacts with potential broadband Summit participants has been delayed to the 2nd Quarter to better align the Summit activity with on-going discussions of the state broadband plan and regional plan implementation decisions currently underway. Delaying contacts to the second quarter will not cause interruption to the accomplishment of the planned Summit activity as the Broadband Summit is not intended to be implemented until September of 2012. Regarding Milestone 3 & 4: A delay in selecting a university partner may have an impact on the current M&E schedule. It is our	Regarding Milestone 2: Contacts with potential broadband Summit participants has been delayed to the 2nd Quarter to better align the Summit activity with on-going discussions of the state broadband plan and regional plan implementation decisions currently underway. Delaying contacts to the second quarter will not cause interruption to the accomplishment of the planned Summit activity as the Broadband Summit is not intended to be implemented until September of 2012.

11c. Does the Project Team anticipate any changes to the project plan for Broadband Planning?

11d. If yes, please describe these anticipated changes. Please note that NTIA will need to approve changes to the Project Plan before they can be implemented

There are no changes to report at this time.

Funding

11e. How much Federal fu) 11f.	How much Remains?	? \$0			
11g. How much matching f	0 11h.	. How much Remains	? \$0			
11i. Planning Worksheet						
Personal Salaries	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Materials / Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontracts Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #4	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subcontract #5	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Direct Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
% Of Total	0	0	0	0	0	0

Additional Planning Information

11j. Are there any additional project milestones or information that has not been included?

Regional planning has progressed the investment plans have been released and work has begun. we anticipate a provider workshop in Q2

Completion of the development of a database/list of technical leaders across the state--under development

- Ongoing- Planning of Broadband Summit--Statewide Coordinator has begun planning and developing draft agenda
- University Partner for M & E RFP has been issued, pending contract approval at ADECA, award should be made May 2012
- Planned a provider workshop to inform the group of technical leaders in Alabama on the latest broadband technologies and broadband policy change, on the latest developments with Universal Service Funding and the CAF.
- Regional Teams have begun meeting to implement the plans
- Finalize Planning of Broadband Summit
- Design initial broadband capacity building training content and delivery plan- under development
- Implement capacity building training in support of M&E field data collection, utilization of results and other issues
- First State Broadband Summit
- Have technical leaders in Alabama well informed on avenues of available funding for broadband projects.
- Begin Planning of Second Annual Broadband Summit
- Design and test prototype social and economic impact model
- Expand Alabama Broadband development capacity training portfolio
- Implement appropriate public outreach and engagement supporting participation in capacity training activities

 Apply social and economic impact model to conduct preliminary assessment for additional broadband investment cases Launch delivery of year 4 capacity training programs Inform the technical leaders of the results of the Alabama Statewide Cost Model-delivered in Q2 2012 Prepare initial report on broadband investment and social and economic implact model
 Comprehensive technical review of M&E processes 11k. Please describe any challenge or obstacle that you have encountered and detail the mitigation strategies the Project Team is employing
No obstacles have occurred.
11l. Please provide any other information that you think would be useful to NTIA as it assesses your Broadband Mapping Project Attached to this PPR are one page overviews of the priorities identified by Alabama citizens, these project teams have begun meeting and preparing to take action on these initiatives. In response to the overmatch stated in Question 10t Subcontract #1CostQuest Associates has provided additional match in the form of additional work hours contributed through CostQuest Vendors. This contribution of work hours were not invoiced for reimbursement through the federal grant program. These vendors contributed the hours for the benefit of the State of Alabama, which has experienced financial proration during the Recession. Note: Explanation of Proration: "MONTGOMERY – Governor Robert Bentley on Friday declared 10.6 percent proration on the state's General Fund Budget for the remainder of fiscal year 2012, which ends September 30.Alabama's General Fund has been impacted by several major factors that make proration necessary. The largest factors include tens of millions of dollars in state funding required for tornado recovery. Also, stock market conditions during the fourth quarter of fiscal 2011 were among the worst in the last 60 years, directly affecting revenues to the General Fund. Upon the declaration of proration, state agencies that are financed by the General Fund must reduce expenses through the current fiscal year." (Link to the announcement from the Governor's Office- http://governor.alabama.gov/news/news_detail.aspx?ID=6269)

12. Certification: I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that this report is correct and complete for performance of activities for the purpose set forth in the award documents.					
12a. Typed or Printed Name and Title of Authorized Certifying Official	12c. Telephone (area code, number, and extension)				
Jessica Dent					
	12d. Email Address				
	jessica.dent@adeca.alabama.gov				
12b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official	12e. Date Report Submitted (Month, Day, Year)				
Submitted Electronically	05-31-2012				