



**INITIAL PROPOSAL VOLUME 1**  
**(REQUIREMENTS 3, 5 - 7)**  
**BEAD PROGRAM**

**STATE OF OREGON**  
**OREGON BROADBAND OFFICE**  
**BUSINESS OREGON**

November 10, 2023

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Existing broadband funding (Requirement 3).....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Unserved and underserved locations (Requirement 5).....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 <i>Location IDs of all unserved and underserved locations .....</i>	<i>4</i>
3.2 <i>Publication date of the National Broadband Map used to identify unserved and underserved locations.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<b>4. Community anchor institutions (Requirement 6).....</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1 <i>Definition of “community anchor institution”.....</i>	<i>5</i>
4.2 <i>Connectivity needs of defined CAIs.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<b>5. Challenge process (Requirement 7).....</b>	<b>9</b>
5.1 <i>Modifications to reflect data not present in the National Broadband Map: Types of modifications.....</i>	<i>9</i>
Speed test modification.....	9
5.2 <i>Deduplication of funding: Use of BEAD Planning Toolkit for identifying enforceable commitments .....</i>	<i>10</i>
5.3 <i>Process description .....</i>	<i>10</i>
5.4 <i>List of programs analyzed .....</i>	<i>11</i>
5.5 <i>Challenge process design: Process description .....</i>	<i>11</i>
Permissible challenges.....	11
Permissible challengers .....	11
Challenge process overview .....	11
Evidence and review approach.....	14
Table of challenge types, evidence examples, and permissible rebuttals .....	15
Area challenges.....	23
Speed test requirements.....	23

Transparency plan..... 26

**Appendix 1: Descriptions of existing funding for broadband in Oregon .....28**

**Appendix 2: Location IDs of all unserved locations.....29**

**Appendix 3: Location IDs of all underserved locations.....30**

**Appendix 4: List of eligible CAIs that do not currently have qualifying broadband service (1/1 Gbps).....30**

**Appendix 5: List of federal and state programs analyzed to remove enforceable commitments from the locations eligible for BEAD funding.....31**

## 1. Introduction

The State of Oregon via the Oregon Broadband Office (OBO) submits to NTIA this first volume of the BEAD Initial Proposal. In alignment with NTIA's BEAD challenge guidance, this document seeks to propose how OBO will meet all requirements of Volume I of the Initial Proposal.

This document represents one of four separate reports that OBO is preparing for NTIA in compliance with the BEAD Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO). The other documents include Oregon's Five-Year Action Plan (submitted August 28, 2023), Initial Proposal Volume II, and Final Proposal.

This document includes the following requirements outlined in the BEAD NOFO:

1. Identifying existing efforts funded by the federal government or the State of Oregon within the jurisdiction of the State of Oregon to deploy broadband and close the digital divide (Initial Proposal Requirement 3).
2. Identifying each unserved location and underserved location within Oregon, using the most recently published National Broadband Map as of the date of submission of the Initial Proposal, and identifies the date of publication of the National Broadband Map used for such identification (Initial Proposal Requirement 5).
3. Describing how OBO has applied the statutory definition of the term "community anchor institution" (CAI), identified all eligible CAIs in Oregon, and assessed the needs of eligible CAIs, including what types of CAIs it intends to serve; and which institutions, if any, it considered but declined to classify as CAIs. If OBO proposes service to one or more CAIs in a category not explicitly cited as a type of CAI in Section 60102(a)(2)(E) of the Infrastructure Act, the basis on which OBO determined that such category of CAI facilitates greater use of broadband service by vulnerable populations (Initial Proposal Requirement 6).
4. Proposing a detailed plan as to how OBO will conduct a challenge process consistent with the draft challenge process guidance released by NTIA on June 28, 2023 (Initial Proposal Requirement 7).

OBO intends to run its challenge process after (1) NTIA approves this first volume of the Initial Proposal, and (2) OBO submits the second volume of its Initial Proposal, addressing all remaining requirements of the Initial Proposal as described in NTIA's BEAD Notice of Funding Opportunity. This will enable OBO to maintain the timeline required by NTIA for the BEAD program.

## **2. Existing broadband funding (Requirement 3)**

This first volume of the State of Oregon BEAD Initial Proposal includes, consistent with NTIA requirements, descriptions of existing funding for broadband in Oregon.

Attached as Appendix 1 is a table that identifies:

1. Sources of funding
2. A brief description of the broadband deployment and other broadband-related activities
3. Total funding
4. Funding amount expended
5. Remaining funding amount available

### **3. Unserved and underserved locations (Requirement 5)**

This first volume of the State of Oregon BEAD Initial Proposal includes, consistent with NTIA requirements, a list of all unserved and underserved locations in Oregon.

#### **3.1 Location IDs of all unserved and underserved locations**

Attached as Appendices 2 and 3 are two CSV files with the location IDs of all identified unserved and underserved locations, respectively.

#### **3.2 Publication date of the National Broadband Map used to identify unserved and underserved locations**

The unserved and underserved locations identified in this document and its attachments are based on the August 2023 publication date of the National Broadband Map. Consistent with NTIA guidance, Oregon's actual Challenge Process will use the November 2023 publication of the National Broadband Map (or whichever version is most current as of the time of initiation of the Challenge Process).

## 4. Community anchor institutions (Requirement 6)

This first volume of the State of Oregon BEAD Initial Proposal includes, consistent with NTIA requirements, a definition of “community anchor institution,” a list of community anchor institutions, and an analysis of their connectivity needs.

### 4.1 Definition of “community anchor institution”

Based on the statutory definition of “community anchor institution” as defined in 47 USC 1702 (a)(2)(E), OBO defines “community anchor institution” to mean a school, library, health clinic, health center, hospital or other medical provider, public safety entity, institution of higher education, public housing organization (including any public housing agency and HUD-assisted housing organization), or community support organization that facilitates greater public use of broadband service by vulnerable populations, including, but not limited to, low-income individuals, unemployed individuals, children, the incarcerated, and aged individuals.

Given Oregon’s unique heritage, OBO notes that its definition of “community anchor institution” also includes all facilities OBO defines above owned or operated by Oregon’s federally recognized tribes.

Based on OBO’s definition above, the following criteria were used to determine the inclusion or exclusion of community support organizations not specifically listed in 47 USC 1702(a)(2)(E): Whether the community support organization facilitates greater public use of broadband service by vulnerable populations, including, but not limited to, low-income individuals, unemployed individuals, children, the incarcerated, and aged individuals.

The following definitions and sources were used to identify community anchor institutions:

1. **Schools:** This category includes all K-12 schools participating in the FCC E-Rate program or that have a National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) ID in the categories “public schools” or “private schools.”
2. **Libraries:** The list of libraries includes all those participating in the FCC E-Rate program as well as all member libraries, and their branches, of the American Library Association (ALA).

3. **Health clinic, health center, hospital, or other medical providers:** The list of health clinics, health centers, and hospitals includes all institutions that have a Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) identifier.
4. **Public safety entity:** The list of public safety entities includes fire houses, emergency medical service stations, and police stations, based on records maintained by the State of Oregon, units of local government, and tribal nations. Included in the list of public safety entities is also the list of public safety answering points (PSAP) in the FCC PSAP registry.
5. **Institutions of higher education:** Institutions of higher education include all institutions that have an NCES ID in the category “college,” including junior colleges, community colleges, minority serving institutions, tribal colleges and universities, other universities, and other educational institutions.
6. **Public housing organizations:** Public housing organizations were identified by contacting the Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) for Oregon enumerated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as by contacting nonprofit organizations Public and Affordable Housing Research Corporation (PAHRC) and National Low-Income Housing Coalition, which maintain a database of nationwide public housing units at the National Housing Preservation Database (NHPD).
7. **Community support organizations:** The list includes organizations identified by the OBO, in the context of its multi-year broadband engagement work, that facilitate greater public use of broadband service by vulnerable populations, including low-income individuals, unemployed individuals, and aged individuals. These include community support organizations such as cultural centers that support vulnerable populations.
8. **Other sources of data:** OBO also drew on state, tribal, county, and municipal resources (agency data, as example) to identify additional eligible community anchor institutions that were not contained in the data sources listed above. These institutions include, but are not limited to, trade schools, incarceration facilities, and tribal anchor institutions such as libraries and community centers. In addition, OBO **will use** the Initial Proposal Volume 1

public comment process to ensure that all relevant institutions meeting the CAI criteria are included.

#### 4.2 Connectivity needs of defined CAIs

To assess the network connectivity needs of the types of eligible community anchor institutions listed above, OBO undertook the following activities:

1. **Engaged government agencies.** OBO communicated with relevant state agencies to understand what records they have available regarding relevant community anchor institutions 1 Gbps broadband service availability. Specifically, OBO contacted the following agencies:
  - a. **Oregon Department of Education:** OBO coordinated with the Oregon Department of Education to determine which schools and libraries do not currently have access to 1 Gbps symmetrical broadband service. OBO has determined that these CAIs have the requisite symmetrical broadband speeds as identified by the BEAD NOFO.
  - b. **Oregon Health Authority:** OBO communicated with the Oregon Health Authority to determine which public health facilities lack 1 Gbps symmetrical broadband service. OBO has determined that only some of these CAIs have the requisite symmetrical broadband speeds as identified by the BEAD NOFO and *preliminarily presumes as unserved* any CAI in this category that is in a census block that is 50 percent or more unserved on the Oregon state broadband map.
  - c. **State Library of Oregon:** OBO coordinated with the State Library of Oregon to determine which libraries lack 1 Gbps symmetrical broadband service. OBO has determined that only some of these CAIs have the requisite symmetrical broadband speeds as identified by the BEAD NOFO and *preliminarily presumes as unserved* any CAI in this category that is located in a census block that is 50 percent or more unserved on the Oregon state broadband map.
  - d. **Public safety agencies:** OBO communicated with the Oregon Department of Administrative Services Information Technology (DASIT), the Oregon State Police, and the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training to obtain 1 Gbps broadband service

availability data. OBO has determined that these CAIs (except those as identified in Appendix 4) have the requisite symmetrical broadband speeds as identified by the BEAD NOFO.

- e. **Tribal nations:** OBO engaged with representatives of all nine of Oregon's federally recognized tribal nations to coordinate and obtain 1 Gbps broadband service availability data. OBO has determined that only some of the tribal CAIs have the requisite symmetrical broadband speeds as identified by the BEAD NOFO and *preliminarily presumes as unserved* any CAI in this category that is located in a census block that is 50 percent or more unserved on the Oregon state broadband map.
2. **Engaged relevant umbrella organizations and nonprofits.** OBO engaged with umbrella (as example member organizations) and nonprofit organizations that work with community anchor institutions to coordinate and obtain 1 Gbps broadband service availability data. Specifically, OBO requested information related to availability needs from the member organizations across all geographic regions, including the following organizations: Oregon State Library, Councils of Governments, Broadband Action Teams, Economic Development Associations, Oregon Telecommunications Association, League of Oregon Cities, Association of Oregon Counties, and the Oregon Department of Education.
3. **List of CAIs that do not have adequate broadband service.** Using the responses received, OBO compiled the list of those CAIs that do not have adequate broadband service. Attached as Appendix 4 is a CSV file with the relevant list of eligible community anchor institutions that require qualifying broadband service and do not currently have access to such service, to the best of OBO's knowledge.

## 5. Challenge process (Requirement 7)

This first volume of the State of Oregon BEAD Initial Proposal includes, consistent with NTIA requirements, a detailed and rigorous proposed challenge process for development of the map under which BEAD grants will be evaluated and awarded by OBO. The proposed challenge process, including all required elements, is described in detail below.

### Adoption of NTIA Challenge Model

No

Yes

OBO plans to adopt the NTIA BEAD Model Challenge Process to satisfy Requirement 7 and to ensure that the state has a fair process following federal guidelines. Oregon’s process will not include additional modifications beyond those specified by NTIA. Oregon will also adopt the BEAD Eligible Entity Planning Toolkit.<sup>1</sup>

### 5.1 Modifications to reflect data not present in the National Broadband Map: Types of modifications

OBO proposes the following modification to the National Broadband Map as a basis for the Oregon BEAD Challenge Process and OBO’s BEAD grantmaking.

#### Speed test modification

OBO will treat as “underserved” locations that the National Broadband Map shows to be “served” if rigorous speed test methodologies (i.e., methodologies aligned to the BEAD Model Challenge Process Speed Test Module) demonstrate that the “served” locations actually receive service that is materially below 100 Mbps downstream and 20 Mbps upstream. This modification will better reflect the locations eligible for BEAD funding because it will consider the actual speeds of locations.

---

<sup>1</sup> See [https://www.internetforall.gov/sites/default/files/2023-04/BEAD\\_Model\\_Challenge\\_Process\\_-\\_Public\\_Comment\\_Draft\\_04.24.2023.pdf](https://www.internetforall.gov/sites/default/files/2023-04/BEAD_Model_Challenge_Process_-_Public_Comment_Draft_04.24.2023.pdf).

## 5.2 Deduplication of funding: Use of BEAD Planning Toolkit for identifying enforceable commitments

Yes

No

OBO will use the BEAD Eligible Entity Planning Toolkit to identify existing federal enforceable commitments.

## 5.3 Process description

OBO will identify locations subject to enforceable commitments by using the BEAD Eligible Entity Planning Toolkit, and consult at least the following data sets:

- The Broadband Funding Map published by the FCC pursuant to IIJA § 60105
- OBO will make its best effort to develop a list of broadband serviceable locations (BSLs) subject to enforceable commitments based on state, tribal, and local grants or loans. If necessary, OBO will translate polygons or other geographic designations (e.g., a county or utility district) describing the area to a list of the FCC's Fabric locations. OBO will submit this list, in the format specified by the FCC Broadband Funding Map, to NTIA.

OBO will review its repository of existing state grant programs to validate the upload and download speeds of existing enforceable agreements to deploy broadband infrastructure. In situations in which the program did not specify broadband speeds, or when there was reason to believe a provider deployed higher broadband speeds than required, OBO will contact the provider to verify the deployment speeds of the enforceable commitment. OBO will document this process by requiring providers to sign a binding agreement certifying the actual broadband deployment speeds deployed.

OBO will draw on these provider agreements, along with its existing database on State of Oregon broadband funding programs' binding agreements, to determine the set of State of Oregon enforceable commitments.

#### 5.4 List of programs analyzed

Attached as Appendix 5 is a file with the relevant list of the federal and state programs that will be analyzed to remove enforceable commitments from the set of locations eligible for BEAD funding.

#### 5.5 Challenge process design: Process description

This OBO plan is largely based on the NTIA BEAD Challenge Process Policy Notice and OBO's understanding of the goals of the BEAD program. The full process is designed to ensure a transparent, fair, expeditious, and evidence-based challenge process.

#### Permissible challenges

OBO will allow challenges on the following grounds:

- The identification of eligible community anchor institutions, as defined by OBO in the Initial Proposal Volume 1
- Community anchor institution BEAD eligibility determinations
- BEAD eligibility determinations for existing BSLs included in the FCC's National Broadband Map
- Enforceable commitments
- Planned service

#### Permissible challengers

During the BEAD Challenge Process, OBO will allow challenges from nonprofit organizations, units of local governments, tribal nations, and broadband service providers.

#### Challenge process overview

The challenge process conducted by OBO will include four phases, potentially spanning up to 14 weeks, per the schedule of the NTIA model challenge process:

1. **Publication of Eligible Locations:** Prior to beginning the Challenge Phase, OBO will publish the set of locations eligible for BEAD funding, which consists of the locations resulting from the activities outlined in Sections 5 and 6 of the NTIA BEAD Challenge Process Policy Notice (e.g., administering the deduplication of funding process). OBO will also publish

locations considered served, as they can be challenged. OBO tentatively plans to publish the locations in early 2024, consistent with NTIA approval of the process.

2. **Challenge Phase:** During the Challenge Phase, challengers may submit the challenge through OBO's challenge portal. All challenges will be made visible to the service provider whose service availability and performance is being contested. The portal will notify the provider of the challenge through an automated email, which will include related information about timing for the provider's response. At this time, the location will enter the "challenged" state.

- a. **Minimum Level of Evidence Sufficient to Establish a Challenge:** The challenge portal will verify the following:
  - i. That the address provided in the challenge can be found in the Fabric and is a BSL.
  - ii. That the challenged service is listed in the National Broadband Map and meets the definition of reliable broadband service.
  - iii. That the email address from which the challenge was sent is verifiable and reachable by sending a confirmation message to the listed contact email.
  - iv. For scanned images, the challenge portal will determine whether the quality is sufficient to enable optical character recognition (OCR).
- b. OBO will verify that the evidence submitted falls within the categories stated in the NTIA BEAD Challenge Process Policy Notice and the document is unredacted and dated.
- c. **Timeline:** Challengers will have 30 calendar days to submit a challenge from the time the initial lists of unserved and underserved locations, community anchor institutions, and existing enforceable commitments are posted.

3. **Rebuttal Phase:** Only the challenged service provider may rebut the reclassification of a location or area. Providers must regularly check the challenge portal notification method for notifications of submitted challenges.
  - a. **Provider Options:** Challenged service providers will have the following options for action at this time.
    - i. **Rebut:** Rebuttals must be provided with evidence, at which time the challenged location or locations will enter the “disputed” state.
    - ii. **Leave Unrebutted:** If a challenge that meets the minimum level of evidence is not rebutted, the challenge will be considered conceded and sustained. This will result in transition of the challenged location(s) to the “sustained” state.
    - iii. **Concede the Challenge:** In the event the challenged service provider signals agreement with the challenge, the challenge will be considered conceded and sustained. This will result in transition of the challenged location(s) to the “sustained” state.
  - b. **Timeline:** Providers will have 30 calendar days from notification of a challenge to provide rebuttal information to OBO.
4. **Final Determination Phase:** During the Final Determination phase, OBO will make the final determination of the classification of the location(s) that remain in the disputed state, either declaring the challenge “sustained” or “rejected.”
  - a. **Timeline:** OBO will make a final challenge determination within 60 calendar days of the challenge rebuttal. Reviews will occur on a rolling basis, as challenges and rebuttals are received.

### Evidence and review approach

To ensure that each challenge is reviewed and adjudicated in a way that is fair to all participants and relevant stakeholders, OBO will review all applicable challenge and rebuttal information in detail without bias, before deciding to sustain or reject a challenge. OBO will:

- Document the standards of review to be applied in a Standard Operating Procedure.
- Require reviewers to document their justification for each determination.
- Ensure reviewers have sufficient training to apply the standards of review uniformly to all challenges submitted.
- Require that all reviewers submit affidavits to ensure that there is no conflict of interest in making challenge determinations.

Table of challenge types, evidence examples, and permissible rebuttals

Code	Challenge type	Description	Specific examples of required evidence	Permissible rebuttals
A	Availability	The broadband service identified is not offered at the location, including a unit of a multiple dwelling unit (MDU).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screenshot of provider webpage.</li> <li>• A service request was refused within the last 180 days (e.g., an email or letter from provider).</li> <li>• Lack of suitable infrastructure (e.g., no fiber on pole).</li> <li>• A letter or email dated within the last 365 days that a provider failed to schedule a service installation or offer an installation date within 10 business days of a request.<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• A letter or email dated within the last 365 days</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provider shows that the location subscribes or has subscribed within the past 12 months, e.g., with a copy of a customer bill.</li> <li>• If the evidence was a screenshot and believed to be in error, a screenshot that shows service availability.</li> <li>• The provider submits evidence that service is now available as a standard installation, e.g., via a copy of an offer sent to the location.</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> A standard broadband installation is defined in the Broadband DATA Act (47 U.S.C. § 641(14)) as “[t]he initiation by a provider of fixed broadband internet access service [within 10 business days of a request] in an area in which the provider has not previously offered that service, with no charges or delays attributable to the extension of the network of the provider.”

Code	Challenge type	Description	Specific examples of required evidence	Permissible rebuttals
			<p>indicating that a provider requested more than the standard installation fee to connect this location or that a provider quoted an amount in excess of the provider’s standard installation charge in order to connect service at the location.</p>	
S	Speed	The actual speed of the service tier falls below the unserved or	Speed test by subscriber, showing the insufficient speed and meeting the requirements for speed tests.	Provider has countervailing speed test evidence showing sufficient speed, e.g., from their own network management system. <sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> As described in the NOFO, a provider’s countervailing speed test should show that 80 percent of a provider’s download and upload measurements are at or above 80 percent of the required speed. *See Performance Measures Order*, 33 FCC Rcd at 6528, para. 51. *See* BEAD NOFO at 65, n. 80, Section IV.C.2.a.

Code	Challenge type	Description	Specific examples of required evidence	Permissible rebuttals
		underserved thresholds. <sup>3</sup>		
L	Latency	The round-trip latency of the broadband service exceeds 100 ms. <sup>5</sup>	Speed test by subscriber, showing the excessive latency.	Provider has countervailing speed test evidence showing latency at or below 100 ms, e.g., from their own network management system or the CAF performance measurements. <sup>6</sup>
D	Data cap	The only service plans marketed to consumers impose an unreasonable capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screenshot of provider webpage.</li> <li>• Service description provided to consumer.</li> </ul>	Provider has terms of service showing that it does not impose an unreasonable data cap or offers another plan at the location without an unreasonable cap.

<sup>3</sup> Only locations with a subscribed-to service of 100/20 Mbps or above can challenge locations as underserved, while only locations with a service of 25/3 Mbps or above can challenge locations as unserved. Speed challenges that do not change the status of a location do not need to be considered. For example, a challenge that shows that a location only receives 250 Mbps download speed even though the household has subscribed to gigabit service can be disregarded since it will not change the status of the location to unserved or underserved.

<sup>5</sup> Performance Measures Order, including provisions for providers in non-contiguous areas (§21).

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

Code	Challenge type	Description	Specific examples of required evidence	Permissible rebuttals
		allowance (“data cap”) on the consumer. <sup>7</sup>		
T	Technology	The technology indicated for this location is incorrect.	Manufacturer and model number of residential gateway that demonstrates the service is delivered via a specific technology.	Provider has countervailing evidence from its network management system showing an appropriate residential gateway that matches the provided service.
B	Business service only	The location is residential, but the service offered is marketed or	Screenshot of provider webpage.	Provider has documentation that the service listed in the BDC is available at the location and is marketed to consumers.

---

<sup>7</sup> An unreasonable capacity allowance is defined as a data cap that falls below the capacity allowance of 600 GB listed in the FCC 2023 Urban Rate Survey (FCC Public Notice DA 22-1338, December 16, 2022). Alternative plans without unreasonable data caps cannot be business-oriented plans not commonly sold to residential locations. A successful challenge may not change the status of the location to unserved or underserved if the same provider offers a service plan without an unreasonable capacity allowance or if another provider offers reliable broadband service at that location.

Code	Challenge type	Description	Specific examples of required evidence	Permissible rebuttals
		available only to businesses.		
E	Enforceable commitment	The challenger has knowledge that broadband will be deployed at this location by the date established in the deployment obligation.	Enforceable commitment by service provider (e.g., authorization letter).	Documentation that the provider has defaulted on the commitment or is otherwise unable to meet the commitment.

Code	Challenge type	Description	Specific examples of required evidence	Permissible rebuttals
P	Planned service	The challenger has knowledge that broadband will be deployed at this location by June 30, 2024, without an enforceable commitment or a provider is building out broadband offering performance beyond the requirements of an enforceable commitment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction contracts or similar evidence of on-going deployment, along with evidence that all necessary permits have been applied for or obtained.</li> <li>• Contracts or a similar binding agreement between the state or SBO and the provider committing that planned service will meet the BEAD definition and requirements of reliable and qualifying broadband even if not required by its funding source (i.e., a separate federal grant program), including the expected date deployment will be completed, which must be on or before June 30, 2024.</li> </ul>	Documentation showing that the provider is no longer able to meet the commitment or that the planned deployment does not meet the required technology or performance requirements.

Code	Challenge type	Description	Specific examples of required evidence	Permissible rebuttals
N	Not part of enforceable commitment	This location is in an area that is subject to an enforceable commitment to less than 100% of locations and the location is not covered by that commitment. (See BEAD NOFO at 36, n. 52.)	Declaration by service provider subject to the enforceable commitment.	
C	Location is a CAI	The location should be classified as a CAI.	Evidence that the location falls within the definitions of CAIs set out in section 1.3. <sup>8</sup>	Evidence that the location does not fall within the definitions of CAIs set out in section 1.3 or is no longer in operation.
R	Location is	The location is	Evidence that the location	Evidence that the location

<sup>8</sup> For example, eligibility for FCC E-Rate or Rural Health Care program funding or registration with an appropriate regulatory agency may constitute such evidence, but OBO may rely on other reliable evidence that is verifiable by a third party.

Code	Challenge type	Description	Specific examples of required evidence	Permissible rebuttals
	not a CAI	currently labeled as a CAI but is a residence, a non-CAI business, or is no longer in operation.	does not fall within the definitions of CAIs set out in section 4.1 or is no longer in operation.	falls within the definitions of CAIs set out in section 4.1 or is still operational.

### Area challenges

OBO will administer area challenge types A, S, L, D, and T. An area challenge reverses the burden of proof for availability, speed, latency, data caps, and technology if a defined number of challenges for a particular category, across all challengers, have been submitted for a provider. Thus, the provider receiving an area challenge must demonstrate that they are indeed meeting the availability, speed, latency, data cap and technology requirement, respectively, for all (served) locations within the area. The provider can use any of the permissible rebuttals listed above.

An area challenge is triggered if there are challenges to six or more broadband serviceable locations using a particular technology and a single provider within a census block group.

Each type of challenge and each technology and provider will be considered separately, i.e., an availability challenge (A) does not count toward reaching the area threshold for a speed (S) challenge. If a provider offers multiple technologies, such as DSL and fiber, each will be treated separately because they are likely to have different availability and performance.

Area challenges must be rebutted with evidence that service is available for all BSLs within the census block group, e.g., by network diagrams that show fiber or HFC infrastructure or customer subscribers. For fixed wireless service, the challenge must be rebutted with representative, random, samples of the area in contention, but no fewer than 10 data points in which the provider demonstrates service availability and speed (e.g., with a mobile test unit).<sup>9</sup>

### Speed test requirements

OBO will accept speed tests as evidence for substantiating challenges and rebuttals. Each speed test must consist of three measurements, taken on different days. Speed tests cannot predate the beginning of the challenge period by more than 60 days.

Speed tests can take four forms:

---

<sup>9</sup> A mobile test unit is a testing apparatus that can be easily moved, which simulates the equipment and installation (antenna, antenna mast, subscriber equipment, etc.) that would be used in a typical deployment of fixed wireless access service by the provider.

1. A reading of the physical line speed provided by the residential gateway, (i.e., DSL modem, cable modem (for HFC), ONT (for FTTH), or fixed wireless subscriber module
2. A reading of the speed test available from within the residential gateway web interface
3. A reading of the speed test found on the service provider's web page
4. A speed test performed on a laptop or desktop computer within immediate proximity of the residential gateway, using speedtest.net or other Ookla-powered front ends or M-Lab's speed test services

Each speed test measurement must include:

- The time and date the speed test was conducted
- The provider-assigned internet protocol (IP) address, either version 4 or version 6, identifying the residential gateway conducting the test

Each group of three speed tests must include:

- The name and street address of the customer conducting the speed test
- A certification of the speed tier to which the customer subscribes (e.g., a copy of the customer's last invoice)
- An agreement, using an online form provided by OBO, that grants access to these information elements to OBO, any contractors supporting the challenge process, and the service provider

The IP address and the subscriber's name and street address are considered personally identifiable information (PII) and thus are not disclosed to the public (e.g., as part of a challenge dashboard or open data portal).

Each location must conduct three speed tests on three different days; the days do not have to be adjacent. The median of the three tests (i.e., the second highest [or lowest] speed) is used to trigger a speed-based (S) challenge, for either upload or download. For example, if a location claims a broadband speed of 100 Mbps/25 Mbps and the three speed tests result in download speed measurements of 105, 102 and 98 Mbps, and three upload speed measurements of 18, 26 and 17 Mbps, the

speed tests qualify the location for a challenge, since the measured upload speed marks the location as underserved.

Speed tests may be conducted by subscribers, but speed test challenges must be gathered and submitted by units of local government, nonprofit organizations, or a broadband service provider.

Subscribers submitting a speed test must indicate the speed tier to which they subscribe. If the household subscribes to a speed tier of between 25/3 Mbps and 100/20 Mbps and the speed test results in a speed below 25/3 Mbps, this broadband service will not be considered to determine the status of the location. If the household subscribes to a speed tier of 100/20 Mbps or higher and the speed test yields a speed below 100/20 Mbps, this service offering will not count towards the location being considered served or underserved. However, even if a particular service offering is not meeting the speed threshold, the eligibility status of the location may not change. For example, if a location is served by 100 Mbps licensed fixed wireless and 500 Mbps fiber, conducting a speed test on the fixed wireless network that shows an effective speed of 70 Mbps does not change the status of the location from served to underserved.

A service provider may rebut an area speed test challenge by providing speed tests, in the manner described above, for at least 10% of the customers in the challenged area. The customers must be randomly selected. Providers must apply the 80/80 rule,<sup>10</sup> i.e., 80% of these locations must experience a speed that equals or exceeds 80% of the speed threshold. For example, 80% of these locations must have a download speed of at least 20 Mbps (that is, 80% of 25 Mbps) and an upload speed of at least 2.4 Mbps to meet the 25/3 Mbps threshold and must have a download speed of at least 80 Mbps and an upload speed of 16 Mbps to be meet the 100/20 Mbps speed tier. Only speed tests conducted by the provider between the hours of 7 p.m. and 11 p.m. local time will be considered as evidence for a challenge rebuttal.

---

<sup>10</sup> The 80/80 threshold is drawn from the requirements in the CAF-II and RDOF measurements. *See* BEAD NOFO at 65, n. 80, Section IV.C.2.a.

### Transparency plan

To ensure that the challenge process is transparent and open to public and stakeholder scrutiny, OBO will, upon approval from NTIA, publicly post an overview of the challenge process phases, challenge timelines, and instructions on how to submit and rebut a challenge. This documentation will be posted publicly for at least a week prior to opening the challenge submission window. OBO also plans to actively inform all units of local government of its challenge process and set up regular touchpoints to address any comments, questions, or concerns from local governments, nonprofit organizations, and internet service providers. Relevant stakeholders can sign up on OBO's website at [https://www.oregon.gov/biz/programs/Oregon\\_Broadband\\_Office/Pages/default.aspx](https://www.oregon.gov/biz/programs/Oregon_Broadband_Office/Pages/default.aspx) for challenge process updates and newsletters. They can engage with OBO through a designated email address: [broadband.oregon@biz.oregon.gov](mailto:broadband.oregon@biz.oregon.gov). Providers will be notified of challenges through [broadband.oregon@biz.oregon.gov](mailto:broadband.oregon@biz.oregon.gov).

Beyond actively engaging relevant stakeholders, OBO will also post all submitted challenges and rebuttals before final challenge determinations are made, including:

- The provider, nonprofit, or unit of local government that submitted the challenge
- The census block group containing the challenged broadband serviceable location
- The provider being challenged
- The type of challenge (e.g., availability or speed)
- A summary of the challenge, including whether a provider submitted a rebuttal

OBO will not publicly post any personally identifiable information (PII) or proprietary information, including subscriber names, street addresses, and customer IP addresses. To ensure all PII is protected, OBO will review the basis and summary of all challenges and rebuttals to ensure PII is removed prior to posting them on the website. Additionally, guidance will be provided to all challengers as to which information they submit may be posted publicly.

Proprietary and confidential information submitted by an existing internet service provider will be treated consistently with applicable state and federal law. If responses contain information or data that the submitter deems to be confidential commercial information that should be exempt from disclosure under state open records laws or is protected under applicable state privacy laws, that information should be identified as privileged or confidential. Otherwise, the responses will be made publicly available.

### Appendix 1: Descriptions of existing funding for broadband in Oregon

Source	Purpose	Total	Expended	Available
American Rescue Plan Act	Planning and deployment for broadband infrastructure	\$157,295,418	\$79,208	\$157,216,210

## **Appendix 2: Location IDs of all unserved locations**

This appendix is presented as a separate file.

### **Appendix 3: Location IDs of all underserved locations**

This appendix is presented as a separate file.

**Appendix 4: List of eligible CAIs that do not currently have qualifying broadband service (1/1 Gbps)**

This appendix is presented as a separate file.

**Appendix 5: List of federal and state programs analyzed to remove enforceable commitments from the locations eligible for BEAD funding**

<b>Program name</b>
Rural Digital Opportunity Fund (RDOF)
Tribal Broadband Connectivity Program (TBCP)
Connect America Fund Phase II (CAF-II)
United States Department of Agriculture ReConnect
Community Connect