

IP Communication Protocol Standard....
and
Contracting Guidelines for Upgrade of DL Services
Comment 2

From: Roger.Hahn@alltel.com
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2003 10:19 AM
To: rbecker@cio.state.ne.us
Cc: trofles@cio.state.ne.us; wfisher@nde.state.ne.us
Subject: Comments due by November 10th



NIN INPUT on
Technicl Standard...

DATE: November 6, 2003

TO: Rick Becker

FROM: Roger Hahn

SUBJECT: Comments for the NITC Technology Panel

My comments are in the attached document. Further comment, for your consumption, on item 2.2 in the "Contracting Guidelines" we support continuing the 45 MBPS Distance Learning Connectivity but the current contracts do not in any way state that the schools / consortiums are paying for 45 MBPS of bandwidth. Major - major - major anti-trust and FCC legal problems for Qwest if they are selling 45MBPS bandwidth at a discount to only a select group of customers.

<<NIN INPUT on Technicl Standards due to NITC Tech Panel by Nov 10th.rtf>>

Jerry Freeberg, here at NIN, is devoted almost full time to running technology and pricing technology for the statewide replacement of the JPEG systems. The Work Group that provides us with direction or reviews our scenarios is comprised of:

- Deb Swanson Qwest Communications
- Roger Adams Qwest Communications
- Steve Edie Alltel Communications
- Mari Sanders Alltel Communications
- Jim Weston Great Plains Communications
- Terry Eriksen Northeast Nebraska Telephone Co.
- Ed Cole Curtis Telephone Co.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Thx Roger

SUBJECT: Comments due to NITC Technology Panel by November 10th

The Nebraska Information Network offers comments on two of the items on the NITC Web Site in the section **"Standards and Guidelines Posted for Comment"**.

The items are:

>>> IP Communication Protocol Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Video Conferencing

>>> Contracting Guidelines for Upgrade of Distance Learning Services

For >>>> IP Communication Protocol Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing:

.... 2.1 Background: Last paragraph >>> capability to multicast is not unique to IP protocol. This feedback in no way suggests that IP should not be approved as the standard, but at the same time there should not be misleading inferences in this document.

.... 2.2 Objective: I believe this statement needs to be expanded to explain that some vendors proprietary versions of IP protocol or at least proprietary versions of the video and audio "standards" that are transported via IP protocol will not permit interoperability between distance learning systems without some version of a gateway. Need to elaborate that proprietary systems will not meet the standards. **This is offered as a mind jogger for your experts to address.**

For >>>> Contracting Guidelines for Upgrades of Distance Learning Services:

.... 1.0 Guidelines: Concerning two options for new contracts Option "A" will likely result in foregoing hundreds of thousands of dollars of E-Rate (Federal USF Funds). With a separate contract for "connective terminal hardware" (CODEC) the schools or consortiums will be submitting a separate request for E-Rate dollars for equipment. The E-Rate program puts request for equipment dollars in the priority two allocation of Federal USF dollars and almost none get funding >>> have to be in the higher free and reduced lunch program percentages, i.e., 90% and above

At the meeting with the Nebraska Public Service Commission I sensed a lack of concern in that the State USF Fund or grant dollars could be used for equipment. Grant dollars are hard to obtain and there are plenty of other excellent uses for the State USF dollars.

..... 1.0 Guidelines: Item "C" (Format point ... options "A" and "B" are choose one or the other. Item "C" is a standalone decision and not an option in place of "A" or "B") Just trying to be helpful in finalizing your excellent work.

I do have a problem with item "C" in that making any new distance learning contracts co-terminus with the *Network Nebraska core transport contracts* will have the providers recovering investments over a very shortened period of time and thus result in higher cost for the distance learning networks. Also there is an issue in that there is no fixed contract terminating date on the *core transport contracts*, i.e., believe the first contract was a five year contract with a possibility of three one year renewals. So is it a five, six, seven or eight year contract.

..... 2.0 Background: "Most recently, the cable-based interconnect systems have upgraded to digital video compression over 100 megabit, flexibly provisioned circuits" gives a direct inference that the telephone company systems are not on digital facilities >>> have been 100 % digital from day one thus the superb quality of video and audio.

Only one of the two cable-based interconnect systems have Changed to digital technology. The other cable system is still using Analog technology.

"Qwest announced that they would no longer support nor install JPEG Technology." Qwest, to the best of my knowledge, never stated they would not support JPEG Technology. I believe they stated it would become increasingly hard to support JPEG Technology >>> there is a night and day difference in these two statements.

Qwest stopped installing JPEG equipment but did not stop placing Into service additional equipment that had already been installed.

Independent telephone companies in Nebraska and most multi State telephone companies in Nebraska have purchased additional JPEG equipment in the last twelve to eighteen months to have equipment on hand to fully support the JPEG Networks through to contract expiration and possibly beyond if issues have not been worked out for funding replacement technology.

.... 2.2 Objective: "The objective of this guideline is to permit users to access all the bandwidth for which they are paying."

The users are not paying for an amount of bandwidth, they are paying for a defined quality of video and audio service regardless of the amount of bandwidth being used. All of the telephone industry contracts are written in terms of a video service being provided for educational use. To interpret this service offering in terms of bandwidth would cause some major legal problems for portions of the telephone industry in Nebraska.

Thx Roger