

Use this space to describe other FTTH services the City should consider:

Submitted By	Date	Type	Responses
164724	08/21/02	Survey	On-line school, art, group activities. Medical monitoring for outpatients. Road monitoring with 802.11b links to portables. Virtual tours for the infirm. Narrowcasting: offering ethnic, foreign language, special interest groups a way to show movies, plays, etc.
164723	08/21/02	Survey	FM radio, all local stations in the Bay Area and selected classical music, jazz and news off the web to replace what we lost in the sale of Cable Co-op
164749	08/21/02	Survey	A fiber connection for the TV would be so much better than the AT&T connection. ANYTHING but AT&T.
164764	08/21/02	Survey	I would like to see the TV service expanded.
164744	08/22/02	Survey	Mark Heyer and his group have been awesome.
164751	08/22/02	Survey	Video on demand would be the best offering from the city, like is available in hotels today. This is better than cable's pay per view because the starting times are not set.
164761	08/22/02	Survey	long distance on the phone service would be great. Some people, not necessarily me, would like the digital video.
164771	08/22/02	Survey	Video on demand, either streaming or download would be interesting, if the download servers were local to the fiber (meaning that we didn't have to go out through the Internet gateway). Pay-per-listen music service with the same proviso as above. There are lots of CDs I've bought and listened to only once. I'd gladly pay 50 cents to sample before buying.
164730	08/22/02	Survey	The city could push VPN as one of the major selling points to folks that want to telecommute. They could push the higher resale value of housing connected to a fiber backbone.
164722	08/22/02	Survey	local city counsel meetings; classical music; support establishment of internet adult illiteracy programs using senior citizens in nursing homes as instructors.
164745	08/22/02	Survey	Data: Internet access and a POP3 email account. Video: Replace AT&T, please Voice: Optional
164762	08/23/02	Survey	Direct connection to PAIX, Mae West, USGS, Stanford networks. VPN all Palo Alto schools and municipal bldgs, then provide VPN com'l support. Video conferencing everywhere, Game Central, VoIP domestic and international. Leverage our Intranet capabilities.
164763	08/23/02	Survey	A dial-up service for travel and backup.
164746	08/24/02	Survey	When I say offer a service, I mean; Offer the conduit but have a third party offer the service. Similar to how ViaNet is the ISP for the FTTH project, but the city is the conduit/facilitator.
164757	08/24/02	Survey	home LAN service, and how do I try the TV service? I have never seen it? get a back up to Marconi lined up.
164778	08/26/02	Survey	As options, offer both basic cable TV services as well as an enhanced channel package. Make sure that Fox Sports Net is one of the enhanced channels.
164735	08/26/02	Survey	First, please do not disrupt the service. Second, please expand the service into video broadcasts, and video archives as much as possible.
164737	08/26/02	Survey	sorry, i don't kno what else is possible.
164727	08/27/02	Survey	City should not get into the Internet services business. These are high investment and highly competitive businesses.
164733	08/27/02	Survey	I would continue the service but would feel like I was getting a bit ripped off. The speeds I get aren't worth double what DSL costs, and if there are no other services not sure why I should pay double. The video services would be most important if they were complete, and I have liked having that extra phone.
164731	08/27/02	Survey	Television seems a natural because the available cable services are so bad.
			My opinion is that the Internet service is the primary service. The phone service

164741	08/22/02	Survey	should NOT consider slowing the service as I read somewhere, down to 1.5MB... at that speed,it has no real advantages (for the average user) over DSL. If anything, we should increase the speed to 10MB, making this truly a world class home connection.
164771	08/22/02	Survey	I hope that there is a viable business model for extending this service to the city as a whole. I think the key point for it to achieve its full potential is for the City to continue to own it and treat it as a utility by analogy with power, water and phone service. Don't let commercial interests get control of it. Within a few years, I think people will (or at least should) view Internet connectivity as a basic utility in the same sense that phone service is ('IP dial tone'). A city that owns its IP connectivity service will provide a significant benefit to its residents. Palo Alto has a superb track record in this area with electricity and water. Let's extend it to IP instead of letting the phone company take over. Of course, it has to be financially viable at some level for this to fly. I don't claim to know whether this is possible or not.
164730	08/22/02	Survey	For my purposes and use of the net, the \$85/m is a great buy. But I think the amount is not justifiable to the many users that would find DSL acceptable for their use. And for those that currently accept phone line service - the amount is way too much. By the same token, for anyone that really makes use of the very high speeds, the \$85 could be raised. If you could provide 3 levels of service for the open community \$25 a little above phone line for 100K transfer and always on should win away people from dial up \$40 for 400k up and 800k down should win away the DSL people \$120 for 2mb up and 4mb down Obviously if you can bill and enforces some type of different line value/pricing then you could have even more levels. The icing on the cake would be combining with TV and phone to help payback city costs while providing value to customers. The city should be able to let people change these service levels as the need occurs. Many people over time would jump from the \$25 to the \$40. Then as video cam, gaming and other high bandwidth pursuits become more common, folks might step up to the next level.
164722	08/22/02	Survey	The City should extend this service to all residents. Once a person has experienced the benefits of FTTH they will never want to give it up even at a substantial cost. The City will definitely be able to get back its investment in a short time. Now is the time to further enhance the City's reputation as a technology leader. Other cities look to Palo Alto as a mentor, and FTTH is where we all need to be.
164780	08/22/02	Survey	Use the experience gained through the trial to offer an easy to set up, 'plug and play' service to the extent possible.
164745	08/22/02	Survey	Consider point to point fiber rather than PON. Interconnecting neighborhoods (local traffic) is important, as is having two or more ISPs. On the whole, everyone at the CPAU has done a great job so far!
164762	08/23/02	Survey	Heavily promote Intranet services. We will have speed to burn within Palo Alto. This will demonstrate what real speed can do for you, and entice subscribers to every higher Internet bandwidth tiers. Plan and manage FTTH like an aggressive commercial enterprise using the Hewlett Packard model...plan, execute and prepare for change. Hire great telecom management, supplement with citizen advisory sub-committees. Require pro-active rather than reactive legal support. Get your story straight, then tell it over and over. Position Palo Alto yet again as a world leading city.
164763	08/23/02	Survey	Communicate more often with participants about the city's view of the trial - - it is a success? Will it continue? And look into the cost question -- most of us could get acceptable speeds without need of a separate dial-up ISP at a lower price. (Reliability, however, would not be nearly as good with DSL -- FTTH's reliability is the biggest selling factor for me.)
164746	08/24/02	Survey	Note: My feedback has been chopped off @ 2000 characters. The full feedback can be requested @ ewout at mante.net The CPE: ===== 1) We should use industry standard equipment (i.e. do not lock into proprietary equipment like Marconi) 2) Although eventually everything will travel over IP (e.g VOIP etc.), my personal rule of thumb is that for successful adoption by a wide audience backward compatibility increases chances of success dramatically. (E.g. OS2 although technically great, it failed because it required major new hardware upgrades, whereas windows allowed for a more gradual upgrade path; 802.11a is useless, because it can't interoperate with 802.11b, hence dual system base stations are coming out (i.e. .a and .b are packaged together to make the faster .a backward compatible); My prediction is that 802.11g which is inherently backward compatible will be the one that is adopted by the Early Majority). My point is; In the short to medium term, I think there IS significant value in INTEGRATING legacy protocols/ports (RJ11 phone service, Coax TV into the CPE box. Can requirements 1 and 2 coexist? I think it can. If not, then 1 should prevail, but 2 should be safe guarded by offering packaged combinations of hardware. For example a 'Phone over FTTH' package that integrates the phone

			option (e.g. a CPE unit combined with a Linksys router with the RJ11 port on it.) The Internal distribution of the IP signal/traffic: ===== Philosophically, I think that by and large the responsibility of the utility ends at the CPE. Having grown up under monopoly Telco's where it was a violation of the customer contract even to move/create your own phone extension, I would never want to go back to something similar. (If anything an information utility will help eliminate the yoke of telephone and cable companies who control both the service and the infrastructure. I die for this to be decoupled. With FTTH we not only ha
164757	08/24/02	Survey	improve documentation if you can for common problems. Provide recommendations of service people to help out when system goes down.
164760	08/26/02	Survey	There is no question that this is a tremendously valuable service. I think that the city should endeavor to roll it out to all of our residents as quickly as possible. I'm sure that present participants would be more than happy to discuss any qualms you might have about it's usefulness.
164778	08/26/02	Survey	If future fiber service is maded optional, then you'll likely get users who have appropriate needs. If, however, this service becomes universal, then you'll likely get some folks like us whose needs are somewhere between dial-up and DSL and hence can't justify the added cost. Maybe there is a slower or more limited service than could be marketed at a lower cost? Good luck with this program!
164735	08/26/02	Survey	It should be a standard service for this area. Make the service more accessible to more homeowners and please do not shut it down. The better the speed of the system and expansion into other services, e.g., video, the better. The amount of time I have had to fuss with the system is almost none - what a great change from the dsl and sluggish phone modem world.
164737	08/26/02	Survey	It would be nice if it were possible to not have to use PPPoE. I would pay extra to not have to use PPPoE.
164770	08/27/02	Survey	Keep supporting the project and expand services to more homes.
164727	08/27/02	Survey	The city should: 1. Focus on 'Internet Access' not 'Internet Service'. This is a VERY important distiction to make. 2. providing a fast internet access is paramount for being future-proof. Keeping away from excess technolgy like headends is important. Keep away from equipment that limits speeds and requires widespread truck rolls for upgrades. Marconi a prime example of excess truck rolls. 3. City should keep in mind that the technology is going to change with time. The infrastructure that is laid down should not limit the future. Avoid equipment and topology that forces centralized models and hence are barriers to the future. 4. Strongly avoid mimicing cable TV or allow cable TV like functionality to muddle infrastructure decisions. Cable TV infrastructure and Internet infrastructure are completely opposite to each other.
164733	08/27/02	Survey	I would much rather buy a bundle of services for a set price than have just the internet access.
164783	08/27/02	Survey	We support the use of the fiber Internet connection for telecommuting and doing normal Internet access for a small business. But, there is the potential for someone to use a high share of the capacity. I would favor a surcharge for high usage to cover the extra cost of bandwidth.
164738	08/27/02	Survey	As above, I would really pay attention to the trouble spots, not the working homes with very sophisticated users. If you plan a city wide roll-out, you will need to be able to trouble shoot for your average users that likely understand a fair amount, but can't reconfigure routers.
164736	08/27/02	Survey	The fiber service is fantastic, I would not change a thing. Offering more services would only make it more attractive. Also - I would like to make a personal offer, this is what I do for a living (Design and build data networks). If the City is even considering dumping the service because of the cost to run it, I would (and I know others would) be willing to donate time to help keep the network running for the community. This network would keep Palo Alto on the forefront of technology for it's users. Thanks! Dave Arruda - 650-324-3451. dave@haus-net.com
164779	08/28/02	Survey	Keep it simple.
164756	08/28/02	Survey	I very much agree with the basic principles that are emphasized by the Palo Alto Fiber Network position statements: especially relating to using standard components, and making sure that no commercial interests dominate the system. The latter point means that the City (or a JPA) needs to maintain ownership of the physical plant.
164742	08/30/02	Survey	Please keep moving forward with it.
			I think your FTTH web site should be a lot better and kept up to date. That's how I usually like to find out what I need to know. If you do provide tv, it would be