QUESTION: Can you confirm preregistration and application dates?
ANSWER: Answered in a previous FAQs, preregistration along with the application portal will be open until December 5, 2024.

QUESTION: Can ISPs submit multiple applications for the same PFA using different technology solutions?
ANSWER: Yes. ISPs can submit multiple applications for the same PFA using different technology solutions. Each application should specify distinct solutions and demonstrate how they meet program objectives. Source: Project-Application-GuideKOBD, Page 9

QUESTION: Is the scoring rubric for pricing (below $90 for 1 Gig and below $60 for 100 Mbps) intended just for residential pricing, or is it intended to include business pricing as well? Volume 2 info says "all customers within the entire proposed Project Funding Area," which we interpret as including residential and business customers. However, this scoring requirement is listed under the Middle-Class Affordability priority, which implies it is intended for only residential subscribers.
ANSWER: The Affordability scoring category only applies to residential pricing, not commercial or business pricing. According to the BEAD NOFO, the Affordability subsection under the Service Obligations section states:

> *In determining whether to approve an Eligible Entity's proposed definition of "low-cost broadband service option," the Assistant Secretary will consider, among other factors, (1) whether prospective subgrantees will be required to participate in the Affordable Connectivity Program, any successor program, and/or any other household broadband subsidy programs; (2) the expected cost (both monthly and non-recurring charges) to an Eligible Subscriber for a typical broadband internet access service plan after the application of any subsidies; and (3) the performance characteristics of the proposed options, including download and upload speeds, latency, data caps, and reliability commitments.* (pg. 67)

As factor (2) states the "…expected cost (both monthly and non-recurring charges) to an Eligible Subscriber…", we must look at the definition of "Eligible Subscriber".

According to the BEAD NOFO, "[t]he term "Eligible Subscriber" means any **household** seeking to subscribe to broadband internet access service that (1) qualifies for the Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP) or any successor program, or (2) is a member of a household that meets any of the following criteria:…"(**emphasis** added, pg. 12-13). The criteria provided (i.e., A) through G)) all describe a form a residential household, with none describing a commercial business. Thus, pursuant to the BEAD NOFO, KOBD determines the Affordability scoring category only applies to residential pricing.

QUESTION: Can you clarify how we need to approach the Affordability scoring category to maximize the scoring on pricing?
ANSWER: To maximize scoring on pricing, ensure your pricing model adheres to residential affordability targets set by KOBD. The applicant would have to answer "Yes" to the minimum requirements (#155a. seq.) of the Recommended Service Plan, and the applicant would have to upload the #155f. Recommended Service Plan. Applicants would then also have to align their pricing strategies with the affordability benchmarks outlined by the BEAD program, ensuring that proposed services meet or fall below specific price points for residential subscribers. The

subscriptions, and the price benchmarks, depend on the technology proposed, and each is described in #151-154. Source: Project-Application-GuideKOBD, Page 20-22

QUESTION: In the case of rare outlier locations in a PFA (e.g., when KOBD Final Locations mapping reveals a single BSL in a PFA that is 15 miles away from the rest of the BSLs, which are clustered together), will there be flexibility in serving all locations except for that one outlier? Or potentially bundling that single BSL within another PFA that it is much closer to?

ANSWER: All BSLs in a PFA must be served unless the applicant documents them as non-BSLs in #134-134d. Additionally, as indicated in 02.04.01 Subgrantee Selection Process Integrity, applicants are only required to fully serve a minimum of one PFA, and additional BSLs may be served in other PFAs without fully serving the additional PFA once that minimum threshold is met. Source: Project-Application-GuideKOBD, Page 8-9

QUESTION: How does deconfliction occur? Is each PFA evaluated against each overlapping PFA, and then conditionally awarded on a per-PFA basis, or is an applicant's full application evaluated as part of the deconfliction analysis?

ANSWER: For overlapping proposals, the same Scoring Criteria for Priority Broadband Projects and Other Last-Mile Broadband Deployment Projects will be employed. The Minimum BEAD Outlay category is one of several categories scored. Only proposals with like-projects, for example two Priority Broadband Projects, that happen to get the same score would then be evaluated at the PFA level for the most cost-efficient project. Post-application negotiations are included in the selection process as a means to ensure that ultimately all funding is exhausted or universal service is achieved. *This answer is intended to address the general nature of the question and should not be considered specific guidance as many factors would impact any number of similar scenarios during subgrantee selection.*Source: Initial Proposal Volume 2 section 2.4 (page 18)

QUESTION: How does project separability work? Will applicants be given the choice to revise costs or matches in case of overlapping proposals? Will there be a dialogue between the provider and the state?

ANSWER: The same Scoring Criteria for Priority Broadband Projects and Other Last-Mile Broadband Deployment Projects will be employed for all proposals respectively. The Minimum BEAD Outlay category is one of several categories scored. Only proposals with like-projects, for example two Priority Broadband Projects, that happen to get the same score would then be evaluated at the PFA level for the most cost-efficient project. Post-application negotiations are included in the selection process to ensure that ultimately all funding is exhausted or universal service is achieved. Source: Initial Proposal Volume 2 section 2.4 (page 18)

QUESTION: With regards to the 1G symmetrical pricing as the scoring criteria for Affordability, how does promotional pricing factor into the scoring tiers?

ANSWER: The prices entered in #151.seq. are non-promotional, which would also be subject to the #155.seq. Service Compliance elements, if the applicant intends to maximize Affordability scoring. Source: Project-Application-GuideKOBD, Page 21

QUESTION: With regards to the 1G symmetrical pricing, is the guidance with respect to a base price, or does it need to be inclusive of all fees and one-time charges?
ANSWER: All prices entered in #151.seq. are inclusive of all taxes, fees, and monthly charges billed to the subscriber, as noted at the bottom of page 21. [Source: Project-Application-GuideKOBD, Page 21](#)

QUESTION: Following the guidance provided during the last office hours and 10-30 FAQ:
"QUESTION: On one Project Funding Area (PFA), we have found that there are 79 served locations of the 270 total locations, meaning it is 29% served. Is this area still eligible for BEAD?
ANSWER: PFAs are only made up of eligible (unserved/underserved) locations. There may be non-eligible (served) locations nearby, but they are technically not considered part of the PFA but may be included in your application. The NTIA 80/20 rule only applies to non-eligible locations you are proposing to serve alongside those eligible within the PFA. If you were planning to apply for locations in a PFA and passed locations that were already served, and your organization wanted to offer service to them the number of locations you offered service could not be more than 20 percent of the total locations you were proposing to serve. For example, if there are 80 [eligible] locations in the PFA that you will be serving, plus an additional 20 that are already served, that meets the 80%/20% rule. You could not serve 21 non-eligible locations in your application without violating that rule. "

QUESTION: The Location Template asks for CAI_FRN – do we need to source this? This is not in the existing reference file for CAIs provided by Kansas.
ANSWER: If the location is a CAI, then enter the FRN for the service provider at that location; known FRNs are included in the CAI List available on the KOBD website:
[Final_approved_Kansas_cai_09_26_24](#)

- If the applicant proposes service to the location, then the applicant's FRN can be entered for any CAI location without an FRN in the CAI List available on the KOBD website: [Final_approved_Kansas_cai_09_26_24](#)

QUESTION: What is "CMS Number" in the Locations Template?
ANSWER: A **CMS Number** refers to an identifier used by the **Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services**. In the context of the BEAD (Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment) grant application, a **CMS number** would typically be associated with health care institutions, such as clinics, hospitals, or other medical providers that are being counted as **Community Anchor Institutions (CAIs)**. These institutions, when identified in a BEAD project application, should have a CMS identifier to demonstrate they qualify as CAIs. Known CMS Numbers are included in the CAI List available on the KOBD website: [Final_approved_Kansas_cai_09_26_24](#)

QUESTION: Our assumption is that entity name and number refer to the applicant in Location Template. Is this true?
ANSWER: In the Location List template, the Entity Name is the official name of the CAI. This is only required if the location is a CAI. The Entity Number is the USAC assigned unique identifier for schools or libraries that participate in the E-Rate program. This is only required if the location is a

CAI that participates in the E-Rate program. Known Entity Names and Entity Numbers are included in the CAI List available on the KOBD website: Final_approved_Kansas_cai_09_26_24

QUESTION: The application asks the provider to report available speeds for BSLs. Our assumption is that 0s and 1s are all eligible, so we can report 0s as < 25/3 and 1s as < 100/20. Is this acceptable?
ANSWER: For #134, in the Project Funding Area window, the applicant is required to enter the total number of locations in each classification box. While Unserved Locations only have access to service speeds less than 25/3mbps, the entered number should total the number of these locations in the specific PFA. If the question relates to another application item, please contact us with that detail. Source: Project-Application-GuideKOBD, Page 8-9.

QUESTION: For X locations (B & R), should they be counted under residential or business when reporting PFAs?
ANSWER: The application will allow for the separate input of residential and business BSLs. Please see pg. 10 of the application user guide for more information.

QUESTION: Assume we have the following 3 applications for 2 PFAs (assume all non-Outlay scoring criteria are equivalent):

- Application A: Serves PFA 1 with $50 requested outlay
- Application B: Serves PFA 2 with $40 requested outlay
- Application C: Serves PFAs 1 and 2 with $100 total outlay ($70 allocated to A, $30 allocated to B)

In this scenario, is it correct to assume that the following awards will be made:

- PFA 1 will be awarded to Application A
- PFA 2 will be awarded to Application C only if the PFAs are marked as separable; otherwise, it will be awarded to Application B (not kicked to Round 2)

ANSWER: In this situation, will Application C be able to indicate that it would be willing to accept PFA 2 standalone at a higher outlay (e.g., $35) in the application to indicate loss of cost efficiency from combined build? Or would there be opportunity to directly negotiate for PFA 2 prior to it being awarded to Application B?

This answer is intended to address the general nature of the question and should not be considered specific guidance as many factors would impact any number of similar scenarios during subgrantee selection. The same Scoring Criteria for Priority Broadband Projects and Other Last-Mile Broadband Deployment Projects will be employed for all proposals respectively. The Minimum BEAD Outlay category is one of several categories scored. Only proposals with like-projects, for example two Priority Broadband Projects, that happen to get the same score would then be evaluated at the PFA level for the most cost-efficient project.

Post-application negotiations are included in the selection process as a means to ensure that ultimately all funding is exhausted or universal service is achieved. Under these scenarios, Application A for PFA 1 would receive a higher score for Minimal BEAD Outlay than Application C

for PFA 1. Through post-application negotiations, Application C for PFA 2 could be asked to revise their application. There is no "separable" requirement in Kansas' initial proposal, therefore in this hypothetical, likely PFA 2 would likely also be part of post-application negotiations. Post-application negotiations are included in the selection process as a means to ensure that ultimately all funding is exhausted or universal service is achieved.

- Source: Initial Proposal Volume 2 section 2.4

QUESTION: 149F in the application.... capital costs of existing infrastructure i-vi - are we to provide the cost of existing non-BEAD plant infrastructure?
ANSWER: In accordance with 2.10.1 of the Kansas Initial Proposal Volume 2, KOBD will require prospective subgrantees to submit the capital costs of existing infrastructure used for the proposed project. #149f. relates to all Capital Costs of Existing Infrastructure. Source: Project-Application-GuideKOBD, Page 19.

QUESTION: Do we need to report CAI's that are already served, or just the un and underserved. Additionally, how do we address CAI's that are improperly marked as CAI's, or have improper locations (see below).
Do we need to report the CAI Types for all CAI's or just for the un/underserved Cai's (i.e. one that doesn't have any service and one that don't get a Gig)???
ANSWER: An applicant should only report CAIs (and their types) that are un(der)served. Any location not included on the post-challenge process list has been determined ineligible for BEAD funds by KOBD. *As a reminder, not all CAIs are eligible BSLs and those CAIs that are eligible must receive 1 Gig symmetrical service.*

QUESTION: Following the guidance provided during the last office hours and 10-30 FAQ:

"**QUESTION:** On one Project Funding Area (PFA), we have found that there are 79 served locations of the 270 total locations, meaning it is 29% served. Is this area still eligible for BEAD?
***ANSWER:** PFAs are only made up of eligible (unserved/underserved) locations. There may be non-eligible (served) locations nearby, but they are technically not considered part of the PFA but may be included in your application. The NTIA 80/20 rule only applies to non-eligible locations you are proposing to serve alongside those eligible within the PFA. If you were planning to apply for locations in a PFA and passed locations that were already served, and your organization wanted to offer service to them the number of locations you offered service could not be more than 20 percent of the total locations you were proposing to serve. For example, if there are 80 [eligible] locations in the PFA that you will be serving, plus an additional 20 that are already served, that meets the 80%/20% rule. You could not serve 21 non-eligible locations in your application without violating that rule. "*

QUESTION: Would the KOBD team provide the language and document for where NTIA states BEAD Funding can be used to fund served locations?
ANSWER: BEAD funding is not allowed to connect served locations ("non-eligible locations"). The NTIA 80/20 rule only applies to the construction of "projects" as defined in the BEAD NOFO. Therefore, applicants can propose to include no more than 20% non-eligible locations within a "project" to serve alongside eligible BSLs. Yet, BEAD funds can only be used to connect

un(der)served BSLs as determined by KOBD in the [Final   Approved Kansas Locations   09_26_24v](#).

The NTIA 80/20 rule is derived from the BEAD's NOFO definition of "project", which states "[a] 'project' may constitute a single unserved or underserved broadband-serviceable location, or a grouping of broadband-serviceable locations in which not less than 80 percent of broadband-serviceable locations served by the project are unserved locations or underserved locations." (pg. 14).

QUESTION: We need the link to the bead application for LEO?
ANSWER: Low earth orbit (LEO) technology is considered an alternative broadband technology under the BEAD program. The application portal is the same for all technology. The applicant will need to register and then apply for the project funding areas and describe technology used as "other." [Source: Project-Application-GuideKOBD, Page 17.](#)

QUESTION: Regarding the BEAD Letter of Credit Waiver document from NTIA, in section 2.2 it states that 100% of the award amount is required to be bonded. However, in 2.4 it states:
2.4 Subgrantee Option for Alternative Initial LOC or Performance Bond Percentage

The requirement that the initial letter of credit be for 25% of the subaward amount, or in the case where a subgrantee chooses to utilize a performance bond consistent with section 2.2 above, allow the initial amount of the performance bond to be lower than 100% of the subaward amount, where:

(a) The Eligible Entity issues funding on a reimbursable basis consistent with Section IV.C.1.b of the NOFO;

(b) Reimbursement is for periods of no more than six months; and

(c) The subgrantee commits to maintain a letter of credit or performance bond in the amount of 10% of the subaward until it has demonstrated to satisfaction of the Eligible Entity that it has completed the buildout of 100 percent of locations to be served by the project or until the period of performance of the subaward has ended, whichever occurs first.

In your FAQ stated 11/6/2024 the following is stated:

QUESTION: Can you confirm that a performance bond in lieu of a LOC must be for the amount of the grant portion of the project?

ANSWER: As prescribed by the NTIA in the BEAD Letter of Credit Waiver: (2.2b)

https://broadbandusa.ntia.gov/funding-programs/policies-waivers/BEAD-Letter-of-Credit-Waiver:

The performance bond must be in a value of no less than 100 percent of the subaward amount.

Therefore, our question is the following: Is Kansas reimbursing for no more than 6 months thereby allowing a 10% of project to be bonded?
ANSWER: No. The performance bond must be in a value of *no less* than 100 percent of the subaward amount. Section 2.4 of the BEAD Letter of Credit Waiver document from NTIA does not

apply as subsections (a) and (b) are not met by the KOBD BEAD program.

QUESTION: I've tried to ask this question a few times but haven't done so in a way that it's been understood. On multiple KOBD calls, it has been shared that providers should look at the portal dashboard for the status of their pre-registration applications. It will be listed as either "Submitted," "In Review," "Requested Revisions," "Accepted," or "Denied." My question is this, once a provider's application has been listed as "accepted," will it remain that way?
ANSWER: The status of these applications will not change without manual input by KOBD. Once a registration has been accepted that will not change.

QUESTION: Is there a kmz file that shows underserved locations by county? I'm looking at the state map (by county) that shows each county (looking at Lyon and Chase) and the number of BEAD locations. I can't find anywhere close to the same number of underserved locations in the map I'm looking at compared to the map of the county locations.
ANSWER: The location list *must be opened in a database software* to review completely. There are 1,201,044 records. If you are unable to see that many records, the file hasn't opened completely. The block_geoid field in the "All_Kansas_BSLs_Final_09_26_24" file does contain county information. The Census code is a set of numbers that represent the State|County|Census Tract|Census Block Group|Census Block. The code for Kansas is '20' and the next three digits represent the county. For example, Chase County locations would begin with "20017…" and Lyon County would begin with "20111…"

QUESTION: What sources are allowed for the matching funds by co-investors? Or maybe the better question is what sources are disallowed to be used for co-investing?
ANSWER: According to the BEAD NOFO (page 20) sources allowed to provide the match are; the subgrantee, philanthropic organizations, unit of local government, utility company, non-profit organization, the eligible entity, federal regional commission or authority, for-profit company, regional planning/government organization, cooperative or any combination of those listed above.

QUESTION: In previous NTIA grants, there were no restrictions on fiber size during the grant process for serving customers. The goal was to provide companies with opportunities to expand in those regions and to ensure they could accommodate future growth in those areas. Is there a reason Kansas has put these restrictions on the fiber size?

ANSWER: While there may be tension between project cost and technical capability of the network proposed, there is no restriction on fiber size. Applicants should balance the minimum BEAD outlay amounts with the technical capability categories, for the most competitive applications possible.