

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Request for Review of the)	
Decision of the)	
Universal Service Administrator by)	
)	
Hood River County School District)	File No. SLD-148907
Hood River, Oregon)	
)	
Federal-State Joint Board on)	CC Docket No. 96-45
Universal Service)	
)	
Changes to the Board of Directors of the)	CC Docket No. 97-21
National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc.)	

ORDER

Adopted: April 4, 2001

Released: April 5, 2001

By the Accounting Policy Division, Common Carrier Bureau:

1. The Accounting Policy Division has under consideration an appeal filed by Hood River County School District (Hood River), Hood River, Oregon, seeking review of a decision issued by the Schools and Libraries Division (SLD) of the Universal Service Administrative Company (Administrator).¹ Hood River seeks review of a funding commitment decision issued by SLD, pursuant to a funding request that included a particular type of router.² For the reasons set forth below, we remand Hood River’s funding application to SLD for further determination in accordance with this Order.

2. Under the schools and libraries universal support mechanism, eligible schools,

¹ Letter from Robert “Jake” Freeman, District Technology Specialist, Hood River County School District, Hood River, Oregon, to the Federal Communications Commission, filed May 25, 2000 (Request for Review). Section 54.719 (c) of the Commission’s rules provides that any person aggrieved by an action taken by a division of the Administrator may seek review from the Commission. 47 C.F.R. § 54.719(c).

² See Letter from Schools and Libraries Division, Universal Service Administrative Company to Robert Jake Freeman, Hood River County School District, Hood River, Oregon, issued October 12, 1999 (Funding Commitment Decision Letter); Letter from Schools and Libraries Division, Universal Service Administrative Company, to Robert “Jake” Freeman, Hood River County School District, Hood River, Oregon, issued April 27, 2000 (Administrator’s Decision on Appeal).

libraries, and consortia that include eligible schools and libraries, may apply for discounts for eligible telecommunications services, Internet access, and internal connections.³

3. By a letter dated October 12, 1999, SLD denied funding for funding request number (FRN) 248349 of Hood River's application for discount funding.⁴ SLD explained that the request was denied because more than 30 percent of the components of the request included support for ineligible Cisco 2500 series remote access routers.⁵

4. On November 12, 1999, Hood River filed an appeal with SLD claiming that the schools and libraries eligibility list identifies routers as eligible services.⁶ SLD denied Hood River's appeal, stating that Cisco 2500 series routers are remote access routers, which are ineligible.⁷ On appeal to the Commission, Hood River asserts that it does not provide remote access, and its use of the router in question is solely for eligible services.⁸

5. Consistent with our decision in *White Sulphur Springs*, we remand Hood River's application to SLD for further review to determine whether the remote access routers will be used to support remote access connections.⁹ In *White Sulphur Springs*, the Common Carrier Bureau

³ 47 U.S.C. § 254(h); 47 C.F.R. §§ 54.502, 54.503.

⁴ See Funding Commitment Decision Letter at 6.

⁵ The "30-percent policy" is not a Commission rule, but rather is an SLD operating procedure established pursuant to FCC policy. See *Changes to the Board of Directors of the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc., Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, CC Docket Nos. 97-21 and 96-45, Third Report and Order in CC Docket No. 97-21 and Fourth Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 97-21 and Eighth Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 96-45, 13 FCC Rcd 25058 (1998). This operating procedure, used during SLD's application review process, enables SLD to efficiently process requests for funding for services that are eligible for discounts but that also include some ineligible components. If 30 percent or less of the request is for funding of ineligible services, SLD normally will consider the application and issue a funding commitment for the eligible services. If more than 30 percent of the request is for funding of ineligible services, SLD will deny the funding request in its entirety. The 30 percent policy allows SLD to efficiently process requests for funding that contain only a small amount of ineligible services without expending significant fund resources working with applicants that are requesting funding of ineligible services.

⁶ See Letter from Robert "Jake" Freeman, Hood River County School District, Hood River, Oregon, to Schools and Libraries Division, Universal Service Administrative Company, filed November 12, 1999, at 2.

⁷ Remote access routers allow access to the Internet from any location by any individual knowing the dial-in telephone number. Access routers, with no remote capabilities, cannot provide dial-in access to the Internet from remote locations.

⁸ See Request for Review at 1.

⁹ *Request for Review of the Decision by the Universal Service Fund Administrator by White Sulphur Springs School District, White Sulphur Springs, Montana*, CC Docket Nos. 96-45 and 97-21, Order, 15 FCC Rcd 3396, 3398, para. 7 (Common Carrier Bur. 1999) (*White Sulphur Springs*). Under section 54.500 of the Commission's rules, a wide area network is defined as "a voice or data network that provides connections from one or more computers within an eligible school . . . to one or more computers or networks that are external to such eligible school." 47 C.F.R. § 54.500(l). Section 54.518 of the Commission's rules states that "[t]o the extent that states [or] schools . . . build or purchase a wide area network to provide telecommunications services, the cost of such (continued....)

(Bureau) found that, although White Sulphur Springs' remote access router was capable of supporting wide area network (WAN) connections, White Sulphur Springs was not using the router to connect to any facilities other than to its Internet service provider in order to receive Internet access.¹⁰ Accordingly, the Bureau granted White Sulphur Springs' appeal and remanded White Sulphur Springs' funding application to SLD for further determination. Applying *White Sulphur Springs* to the instant situation, remote access routers may be considered for discounts if they are not being used to provide remote access.¹¹ In the appeal before us, Hood River asserts that the Cisco 2514 routers, as used by Hood River, do not perform remote access functions.¹² In light of our decision in *White Sulphur Springs*, we conclude that it is appropriate to remand Hood River's application to SLD for further review.¹³ We direct SLD to review Hood River's use of its remote access routers to determine whether such use is eligible for discounts.

6. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to authority delegated under sections 0.91, 0.291, and 54.722(a) of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.91, 0.291, and 54.722(a), that the Request for Review filed by Hood River County School District on May 25, 2000, IS GRANTED to the extent provided herein. We direct the Administrator to review Hood

(Continued from previous page) _____
wide area networks shall not be eligible for universal service discounts." 47 C.F.R. § 54.518. *See also Request for Review by the Department of Education of the State of Tennessee of the Decision of the Universal Service Administrator, Request for Review by Integrated Systems and Internet Solutions, Inc., of the Decision of the Universal Service Administrator, Request for Review by Education Networks of America of the Decision of the Universal Service Administrator, Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Changes to the Board of Directors of the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc.*, CC Docket Nos. 96-45 and 97-21, Order, 14 FCC Rcd 13734, para. 28 (1999) (discussing the Commission's rules regarding the eligibility of internal connections for discount funding, and the ineligibility of wide area network facilities for discount funding).

¹⁰ *See White Sulphur Springs* at 3398, para. 7.

¹¹ *See* SLD website, <http://www.sl.universalservice.org/whatsnew/052000.asp#052500_2>, clarifying SLD's policy regarding the eligibility of remote access routers. Applicants must certify that the requested remote access routers will not be used to provide remote access in the funding year or, if the product is to be used remotely, applicants must ensure that only entities eligible for support under the Schools and Libraries program have the capability to access it. If a router is to be used for remote access, such access must only be from sites for which services would be eligible for discount under the program.

¹² *See* Request for Review at 1.

¹³ Hood River submitted its FCC Form 471 before SLD changed its remote access router eligibility policy. Thus Hood River's application did not include information or certifications regarding the use of the Cisco 2500 series routers which SLD could have relied on to determine whether the applicant's request for discount on the purchase and installation of Cisco 2500 series routers was consistent with its new policy.

Federal Communications Commission

River's funding application and, if warranted, issue a revised Funding Commitment Decision Letter in accordance with the above-stated decision.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mark G. Seifert
Deputy Chief, Accounting Policy Division
Common Carrier Bureau