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### Assessing Feasibility

1. **Document Community Needs**
   - Businesses
   - Infrastructure
   - Initial engagement

2. **Identify Existing Assets**
   - Utilities etc.

3. **Identify Public Policy Tools**
   - All levels

4. **Define Business Models & Partners**

5. **Develop Technical Design**

6. **Develop Financial & Funding Plan**

7. **Develop Action Plan & Timeline**
Existing Fiber Business Models

1. Partner, No Assets
2. Dark Fiber, Leased to Service Provider(s)
3. Lit Fiber, Enables Community infrastructure, Leased to Service provider(s)
4. Lit Fiber, Leased to Single service provider
5. Direct Provider ISP Retail

More: Community Benefit, Investment, Risk & Return
Less: Community Benefit, Investment, Risk & Return

Community Benefit, Investment, Risk & Return
Model 1: Partner, No Assets

Community is a partner, owns no assets

- Less investment
- Less risk
- Less return
- Low political risk
- Less community benefit
Model 1: Partner No Assets cont.

Communities who have taken this approach:

- Nanton, Vulcan, and Nobleford - Axia*
- Taber, Edmonton, Vancouver, Creston, Cranbrook, Kimberley, and Fernie - Telus**

* Open network, retail pricing
** Proprietary network for the near term
Model 2: Dark Fiber Leased to Service Providers

Community owns asset, leases the ‘highway’

• Own the asset (fiber in the ground)
• Can start small
• Lease to service providers (revenue)
• Some political risk
• Requires moderate investment
Model 2: Dark Fiber Leased to Service Providers

Communities who have taken this approach:

- Cardston County & CCI are exploring this
- US- many more examples
- Southbend, IN & Chelan County, WA
  - Carrier grade network 50 miles
  - Vendor neutral
  - 10 year prepaid leases (7) (non-retail)
  - cash flow positive since inception
Model 3: Lit Fiber, Enables Community Infrastructure, Leased to Service Providers

Characteristics:

• Owns the fiber asset
• Leases excess capacity to service provider(s)
• Leverage civil works
• Moderate political risk
• Broad community benefit
Model 3: Lit Fiber, Enables Community Infrastructure, Leased to Service Providers

Communities who have taken this approach:

– Q-Net- Coquitlam, B.C.

• Multiple service providers lease their fiber
Model 4: Lit Fiber Single Service Provider

Characteristics:

• Owns the fiber asset
• Pay service provider to offer services
• Leverage civil works
• Moderate political risk
• Broad community benefit
Model 4: Lit Fiber Leased to Single Service Provider

Communities who have taken this approach:

- Waterton Community Broadband Network
- RS Fiber Co-Op, MN

10 towns, 17 townships + HBC + Calix

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HKRiy-UsM&feature=youtu.be
Model 5: Direct Provider

Community or community organization owns and operates the network

- Greater community benefit
- High investment
- More risk
- Greater return- community engagement/development
- More political risk
Model 5: Direct Provider

Community or community organization owns and operates the network

Communities who have taken this approach:
• O-Net- Olds, AB
• Sandy, OR
Self-Assessment

Community Inventory (Steps 1 & 2 of Feasibility Process)

- Leadership?
- Existing Utility?
- Major Civil works?
- Businesses threaten to leave?
- P2 or P3 partnerships with existing ISP or WISP?
- Cooperative potential?

What model works best for your community?

*Key question for panel participants in Austin - what keeps you awake at night? (in reference to broadband build outs.)*