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From ACUTA Headquarters

Jeri Semer, CAE
ACUTA Executive Director
jsemer@acuta.org

Legislative/Regulatory Scorecard for 2006

The year isn’t completely over, but with the election coming up in a couple of weeks, and the future control of the U.S. House and Senate in question, I thought it might be helpful to briefly review the major issues we have been following in 2006.

Universal Service: Legislative/Regulatory Affairs Committee Chair Dave Ostrom and I had the opportunity to meet in early October with three legal advisors to FCC Commissioners and the Chief and key staff from the Wireline Competition Bureau, to discuss the proposed changes in the Universal Service collection methodology. We reiterated our concerns about the potential cost of a numbers-based collection method, and presented data showing that the average institution’s USF cost would increase tenfold from just over $1,500 per month to over $15,000 per month if a numbers-based system were introduced. We were assured by nearly everyone we met with that comprehensive USF reform is not likely in the near future, due to other pressing matters before the Commission.

In June, 2006, the FCC adopted several interim changes to the USF program, requiring VoIP providers to contribute and increasing the “safe harbor” (default) percentage that cellular carriers must contribute. In August, DSL providers were exempted from contributing to the fund. No one knows what the long term combined effect of these changes will be, but the required percentage contribution went down slightly for the fourth quarter of 2006. We are hopeful that these changes will mitigate any pressure for near-term implementation of a numbers-based system, although many telecom carriers are urging the FCC to take this approach.

Telecom Reform: No comprehensive telecom reform legislation was passed in 2006, and experts agree that it is unlikely to be adopted during the “lame duck” session at the end of the year. We are carefully monitoring developments and will keep our members informed if this changes.

Net Neutrality: The higher education community has been engaged in an effort to have strong language on net neutrality included in any major telecom reform legislation. ACUTA is supporting this effort, which faces stiff opposition from numerous carriers. It is acknowledged that this issue was key in preventing telecom reform
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legislation from being passed in the Senate thus far. This will continue to be a high priority for
the higher education community in the next session of Congress.

CALEA: In late October, ATIS (The Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions, an industry
standard-setting organization) and TIA (Telecommunications Industry Association) published their
www.atis.org/PRESS/pressreleases2006/100206.htm. Various committees within higher education
plan to analyze the document to ascertain the implications for our institutions.

However, current legal interpretation of CALEA compliance requirements are that the majority
of college and university networks fall within the definition of private networks, and are therefore
exempt from CALEA compliance. ACUTA’s representative on the higher education CALEA Technical
Committee, Walt Magnussen from Texas A&M, will be among those reviewing the new standard
and reporting on technical issues. We will keep you informed as new information becomes available.
Each institution should consult its own legal counsel in reaching a decision as to whether your
institution will be required to comply.

In addition, we will closely watch for any new legislation that is introduced on CALEA, as we
understand that the Dept. of Justice plans to seek legislation that would reduce or eliminate
current CALEA exemptions.

Excise Tax: As previously reported by ACUTA, the IRS has stopped collection of the Federal excise
tax on interstate long distance as of July 31. We are awaiting guidance from the IRS on a simplified
method for businesses to file for refunds of the tax paid for the last three years on their 2006 tax
returns. We will forward this information to our members when it is available. (Nonprofit colleges
and universities were generally exempt from the Federal excise tax. In a 1997 Private Ruling, the
IRS had determined that local and toll services provided to non-profit educational institutions
are generally tax exempt, including local and toll services resold by universities to their residential
students. However, some institutions may have collected and remitted this tax on behalf of
entities operating on their campus.)

This is just a summary of the key issues we have followed this year, and I would like to thank the
members of the Legislative/Regulatory Affairs Committee for their diligence in researching and
advising us on many of these issues. We are also very appreciative of ACUTA Past President
Jeanne Jansenius for keeping us up-to-date in her monthly column in this newsletter. A more
complete Issues Matrix is available at http://www.acuta.org/Relation/
downloadFile.cfm?DocNum=767, updated quarterly.

Audio Seminar

Open-Source
IP Telephony

Thursday
Nov. 9
1:30-3:00 p.m. EST

ACUTA is pleased to offer an audio seminar based on one of the sessions at the 2006 Annual
Conference that event attendees found most informative.

This seminar will discuss open-source IP telephony as a strategic choice. Presenter Jose Valdes
Jr., Associate Director for Telecommunications at Colorado State University, will discuss how this
emerging technology is being applied at CSU as a production voice-mail platform and its potential
for displacing or minimizing reliance on proprietary telephony systems.

ACUTA would like to acknowledge the sponsorship of this audio seminar by 3Com. Visit http://
www.3Com.com/education.

Via convenient conference-call technology, you will be able to listen to the presenter, ask questions,
and interact with ACUTA members at participating sites. All you need is a phone. An unlimited
number of colleagues at your institution may listen in via speakerphone at no extra charge.

Registration fee is $69 for ACUTA members, $109 for nonmembers. Please register no later than

Seminar handouts will be available on the ACUTA website (or delivered as an e-mail attachment)
prior to the seminar. The toll-free dial-in telephone number will be provided in your confirmation
e-mail. (Toll-free dialing is available for U.S. and Canada only. Others will be given a toll number.)

Direct questions regarding content to Donna Hall, ACUTA Manager of Professional Development,
dhall@acuta.org or phone 859/278-3338 x231. Questions regarding registration should be directed
to Amy Burton, aburton@acuta.org, at 859/278-3338 x240.
As regular readers know, this column tries to give you early notice of new technologies and their likely impact on your campus communications networks. Of course, that's when we're not having fun with acronyms, since for some hard-to-fathom reason we find so many of them amusing. But this month's column delivers no entertaining acronyms, instead offering an early heads-up about a development that will probably start to influence your networking in the next 12 to 18 months.

We want to talk this time about “VoIP peering.” Perhaps you’ve heard the term. It describes the effort to make sure that all VoIP traffic, wherever it is generated, stays on a VoIP network for its entire journey, at no time touching the traditional PSTN (Public Switched Telephone Network). The peering payoff is in the form of network efficiencies and cost savings, since carriers can avoid interconnect fees and keep voice call quality high.

The peering comes into play because the carriers involved in this develop relationships in which they agree to exchange VoIP traffic and keep it on IP backbones instead of the PSTN. Thus they become peers, in contrast to the relationships among the carriers of traditional voice traffic.

The more efficient routing inherent in VoIP makes certain interconnections viable that didn't used to be. Traditional carrier interconnections require direct trunks between their switches. But VoIP can leverage the meshed IP networking structure, without requiring switch ports or discrete trunks.

At this point, peering is in an embryonic stage, with peer carriers handling only a tiny fraction of VoIP traffic in the U.S. However, more and more carriers—primarily smaller players—are showing interest. While some carriers are starting to offer end-to-end VoIP services to enterprise customers, it will probably be 12 months or more before the larger carriers get involved and turn this into a big-time trend.

Why should you care? Your bottom line is why. From the perspective of an enterprise organization, such as a college or university, keeping your voice calls on IP networks and backbones can save at least 20 percent in telecommunications and operations costs. However, since the “mainstream” carriers are going to be slow in developing or participating in these kinds of peering relationships, due in part to interconnect revenue and regulatory issues, these are savings you're going to have to be patient for.

It isn't too early, though, to start talking to your service provider representative about this issue, to see where your carrier stands on it. You can also start to ask the carrier how much of its VoIP traffic is currently or will soon be end-to-end IP, terminated either on its own network or through a peering partner, and what that means in cost savings that might be passed along to you.

As always, if there are specific topics you would like to see covered in this space, please let me know via e-mail at kevin@duxpr.com.

Plan Now to Attend the Spring Event
Summit on IP Communications in Higher Education
April 1-4, 2007
Baltimore, Maryland
Marriott Waterfront
Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau Established

Due to the recent events, last year's hurricane season, and 9/11, the FCC announced on 9/26/06 that a new bureau has been established to build on the FCC's commitment to public safety and reliability. The bureau has been designed to provide robust, reliable, and resilient communications service during times of emergency and is responsible for the combined public safety-related functions that were dispersed. The organization's structure is divided into three areas: policy, public communications outreach and operations, and communications system analysis. Commissioner Michael Copps said, "As I have said many times, business as usual is just not acceptable when it comes to public safety. To put it bluntly, I believe this is a step we should have taken more than five years ago in response to the searing lessons of 9/11. ... My hope is that when history looks back on this reorganization, it will be seen as the first step in putting the FCC out front—where it long should have been—in providing communications security for all Americans in this dangerous age." (http://www.fcc.gov/pshs/)

FCC Decision Pushed Back on AT&T-BellSouth Merger

FCC Chairman Kevin Martin has rescheduled an open meeting for 11/3/06 at which the Commission will consider the proposed merger unless the issue has been resolved before then. This will provide a 10-day window for comment addressing the concerns of Democratic commissioners Adelstein and Copps as well as competitive carriers and consumer groups. Senator Patrick Leahy of Vermont, senior Democrat on the House Judiciary Committee, charged, "By approving the merger without any conditions, the administration is avoiding court review, ignoring Congress, and protecting big business at consumers' expense." It is also anticipated that Republican Commissioner Robert McDowell may not participate due to his previous work as a lobbyist for a carrier group. This could lead to a tie vote.

According to Multichannel News, 10/30/06, a coalition funded by Google, Yahoo!, eBay, and Amazon.com has proposed that AT&T be required to not discriminate "in their carriage and treatment of Internet traffic based on the source, destination, or ownership of such traffic." AT&T senior executive vice president Jim Cicconi, in a prepared statement, rejected a proposal requiring AT&T to adhere to Internet-nondiscrimination rules in order to gain FCC approval to merge with BellSouth: "The proper place to be debating the pros and cons of net neutrality is in the U.S. Congress or in an industry-wide proceeding at the FCC." (http://www.multichannel.com/article/CA6386263.html)

Access Solution for Rural America?

Broadband wireless continues to expand. You cannot pick up a magazine or attend a conference where this issue is not a topic. The primary focus continues to be on mobile broadband and its benefits to rural America. The FCC noted in their annual report to Congress (9/26/06) that there is "effective competition" in the wireless marketplace. About 98% of Americans now live in counties where there are at least three wireless providers. Trailing this expansion of wireless availability is wireless broadband for rural America.

The FCC recently approved a new pilot program that will allow assistance to public and nonprofit health-care providers in establishing state and regional broadband networks connecting back to Internet2. Universal Service Funds will be utilized to construct these networks, bringing advanced telehealth and telemedicine services to rural areas of the nation.

New advocacy groups are being formed that will help this effort. According to Chris Putala, executive vice president of public policy EARTHLINK, "the development of secure, ubiquitous, wireless communications and broadband services hinges on a regular supply of licensed spectrum for commercial use." This new advocacy group will focus on spectrum policies to enable improvement of mobile broadband service. Membership includes Verizon Wireless, Qualcomm, Inc., Lucent Technologies, Inc., Nortel Networks Corp., Cingular Wireless LLC, and the CDMA development Group. (Telecommunications Report, 10/15/06).
In the spring of 2006, Student Monitor of Ridgewood, NJ, conducted extensive research into how students are using communications technology on campus today. ACUTA eNews is pleased once again to feature selected results of that survey. We appreciate Student Monitor's assistance as we strive to provide the most useful and up-to-date information.

If you would like to know more about the survey, contact Eric Weil, managing partner at Student Monitor, at well@studentmonitor.com, or visit their website at http://www.studentmonitor.com.

This month, let's look at how students are making calls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling Card</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial direct</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-paid</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Card</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

©2006 Student Monitor LLC. Used with permission

The Board of Directors met by conference call on October 5 and approved the following:

- Module descriptions for 2007 Annual Conference, including topics such as "Managing the Evolution to IP," "Strategic Planning for Communications Technology," "Business and Financial Models in Communications Technology," "Wireless issues," and other topics meeting ACUTA's Strategic Plan and member needs.

- The distribution plans for the new book Campus Communications: Converging Technologies proposed by the Publications Committee, where each voting member will receive two copies (one for member and one for university president or designee).

Regarding other agenda items, Carmine Piscopo, ACUTA President, reported that the one-day workshop in Philadelphia was well received. Mr. Piscopo also recently met with University Business Magazine regarding items of mutual interest.

Ms. Semer will be speaking on regulatory issues at the SUNY Telecommunications Officers' Association Conference in November. Ms. Semer and Mr. Ostrom met with FCC staff and University Federal Relations representatives on October 2-3 and had a chance to brief them on universal service issues. Ms. Semer was a panel member on Federal policy issues including universal service at the EDUCAUSE Annual Conference on October 11. While in attendance, she was also interviewed for an EDUCAUSE podcast about upcoming ACUTA publications and events.

ACUTA and ITERA are looking at possibilities for future collaboration between the two organizations.

There are personnel changes at Wiley, Rein and Fielding, the legal firm retained by ACUTA. Brad Gillen left in September, and Jeff Linder is planning to leave at the end of the year. Brendan Carr and Peter Shields will be assuming responsibility for working with ACUTA.

Respectfully submitted,
Riny Ledgerwood, Director
Communications and Computing Services
San Diego State University
IT Disaster Recovery: Why Plan?

Mike Grunder
Senior Consultant
Vantage Technology Consulting Group

At the Annual Conference in San Diego, Brian Voss, CIO at Louisiana State University, delivered an excellent presentation describing LSU’s response to Hurricane Katrina. The storm didn’t directly hit the LSU campus, but in its aftermath nearby communities experienced an unprecedented and unexpected set of circumstances that had to be dealt with on an emergency basis. The presentation very effectively highlighted the importance of being prepared for the unexpected.

That kind of regional disaster and how an institution prepares for it aren’t quite the same as when the disaster is specifically IT centered, i.e., a massive failure or the destruction of key IT systems and/or infrastructure. In the former, a broad spectrum of functioning university resources is brought to bear on a big problem. In the latter, specific mission-critical systems (systems that the institution relies upon to function and for which you are responsible) are in trouble. Or in the worst case, they’re destroyed and have to be rebuilt, maybe from scratch (or worse because you may have a big mess to clean up, too).

There are several general truths related to planning for such disasters and developing recovery strategies. First among them is wrestling with the enormity of what it is you’re trying to do. These are complex systems you’re managing with complex organizations. The possibilities for trouble are enormous, both in terms of the number of things that can go wrong as well as the fact that small problems can generate tremendous confusion while you’re trying to diagnose and fix them.

Although thinking about all of the negative things that can befall you is not a bad idea, it’s really not possible to create specific and detailed plans for dealing with each and every possibility, so don’t waste your time on that. The bottom line is that the benefit is in the planning, not the specific plan.

Ultimately, any disaster recovery plan is only as good as the knowledgeable people who are available to respond to the disaster. Writing a massive tome that tries to define every potential problem and come up with a specific solution to each may be a worthwhile intellectual exercise, but it is ultimately not the solution. The thought of having to do such a thing can also create gridlock in your mind so nothing gets done.

Disaster planning has to be done in a logical, well-organized manner that looks at each individual part of your systems, your organization, and all of your resources (both internal and external, technical, operational, and administrative). In each case, the strengths and weaknesses of each piece need to be considered. And while that massive tome mentioned above isn’t necessary, you must write things down. Chances are you’ll end up with something massive when done, but the process of creating it will be most useful.

Putting together a team of the right people, sitting down on a regular basis¹, thinking through the issues and writing things down in an organized manner accomplishes a number of really useful things:

1. It establishes a project team of strategic individuals who need to understand the entire picture, big and small, of technology and its critical role on campus.
2. It enforces planning, organized thought, and a common understanding of the entire environment on the part of all that need to know.
3. It identifies problem areas and provides for planning and funding of mitigation efforts that will make you more “disaster proof.”
4. It identifies resources, both inside and outside the organization, and arranges for support in urgent situations.
5. It provides for the development of a single source of organized contact information to be used in an emergency.
6. It provides a single-point repository for critical information that would be needed in an emergency situation and is often useful in day-to-day operations as well.
7. It provides a discussion and training tool for both operational and emergency management, and it’s good for training new staff.

In short, it provides an ongoing process to effectively manage emergency and disaster situations and promotes awareness and responsible management—and it gives you that “plan” that will allow you to sleep better at night.

1 Beware: DR planning is always the first meeting that gets bumped for other, more pressing business. This will happen, and you have to resist it.
Several things have been posted on the website recently that can help you make the most of your ACUTA membership. We continually expand the resources available electronically and welcome your comments at any time.

- **ACUTA Monograph: Campus Emergency 911 Programs.** PDF document, 30 pages. [http://www.acuta.org/doc.cfm?docnum=1627](http://www.acuta.org/doc.cfm?docnum=1627). Resource Library documents require a MY ACUTA account password and are for members only. If you are not sure what your password is, or to create an account, go to [http://www.acuta.org/myacuta](http://www.acuta.org/myacuta).

- **ACUTA Audio Seminar:** “Open Source IP Telephony.” November 9, 2006, 1:30-3:00 p.m. EST. Details and registration at [http://www.acuta.org/?1628](http://www.acuta.org/?1628).

- **ACUTA Winter Seminars.** Austin, TX, January 21 - 24, 2007
  Track 1: Best Practices for Communications Technology Professionals
  Track 2: Convergence and Infrastructure: What it Takes
  Full abstracts of sessions and online registration can be found at [http://www.acuta.org/events/seminars/wse07.cfm](http://www.acuta.org/events/seminars/wse07.cfm). Wondering who will be exhibiting at this seminar? Check out [http://www.acuta.org/members/wse07.cfm](http://www.acuta.org/members/wse07.cfm).

- **ACUTA Summit on IP Communications in Higher Education.** Baltimore, MD, April 1-4, 2007. Call for panelists has been posted at [http://www.acuta.org/?1622](http://www.acuta.org/?1622).


If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at afuehrer@acuta.org.

---

**Info Links**

**Randy Hayes**
University of Northern Iowa
randal.hayes@uni.edu

Frequently, vendors, associations, governmental bodies, and others provide white papers and other informational documents which are announced through a variety of media sources. While some admittedly have a certain slant or opinion, others are quite objective; however, both often contain valuable information. Below are links to selected documents of interest.

- **APCO Revised Training Paper for Public Safety Dispatchers:** [http://www.apcointl.org/documents/P33.pdf](http://www.apcointl.org/documents/P33.pdf)
- **Avoiding Missteps South of the Border (Canada & U.S. Telecom Act):** [http://www.mts.ca/file_source/mts.ca/Static_Files/Raw_PDF/06-08-16_MTS_Allstream_Appendix_A_LSelwyn_P.pdf](http://www.mts.ca/file_source/mts.ca/Static_Files/Raw_PDF/06-08-16_MTS_Allstream_Appendix_A_LSelwyn_P.pdf)
- **Automated Name/Address Database Capture:** [http://www.411xml.com/Automated_NameAddress_Capture.pdf](http://www.411xml.com/Automated_NameAddress_Capture.pdf)
- **Senate Report on HR5252 Broadband Deployment Bill:** [http://commerce.senate.gov/public/_files/SenateCommunicationsBillConferenceReport.pdf](http://commerce.senate.gov/public/_files/SenateCommunicationsBillConferenceReport.pdf)
- **Comments on Reverse Auction for Provision of Universal Service:** [http://www.neca.org/wawatch/wwwpdf/101906_2.pdf](http://www.neca.org/wawatch/wwwpdf/101906_2.pdf)
- **OECD Global Broadband Statistics (Released 10/06):** [http://www.oecd.org/document/9/0,2340,en_2649_37441_37529673_1_1_1_37441,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/9/0,2340,en_2649_37441_37529673_1_1_1_37441,00.html)
IEEE 10 Gb/s Ethernet Standards Approved

Hugo Draye
Fluke Networks, Inc.
hugo.draye@flukenetworks.com
Reprinted with permission from the July/August 2006 issue of BICSI News.

The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) Standards Board on June 8, 2006, approved the 10GBASE-T standard developed by the 902.3an task force. This means it is official; the IEEE has completed the development work of the Ethernet “version” to transmit 10 Gigabits per second over twisted pair copper cabling. We expect the publication of this standard in July 2006.

The IEEE task force must tackle all aspects of such a new network technology including signal encoding on the copper cabling as well as capabilities of the transmitter and receiver. This effort includes definition of the minimum transmission capabilities and characteristics of copper cabling connecting a transmitter to a receiver. IEEE focuses on the connection from transmitter to receiver, called the “channel” in our world of structured cabling.

The IEEE adopted a goal that the signal encoding and capabilities of the transmitter and receiver should be defined in such a way that some existing cabling can support 10 Gb/s Ethernet transmission. Has the task force been successful in this aspect of the development? The answer as is often the case in networking: “It depends.” Installed category 6 cabling is expected to support 10GBASE-T with some limitations.

It became obvious from the earliest days of the investigation and development that the cabling must be able to transmit much higher frequency signals than had ever been considered for any other application over twisted pair copper.

Initially a top frequency of 625 MHz had been considered. As the signal encoding development took shape, this high end frequency was scaled back to 500 MHz in the standard. At these high frequencies the crosstalk coupling between wire pairs of adjacent cabling links can no longer be ignored. As a result, 10GBASE-T introduces a new test parameter called alien crosstalk to measure the crosstalk coupling between wire pairs in adjacent cabling links.

Cabling requirements for 10GBASE-T can be evaluated in two stages:

• All installed links should meet specifications for test parameters that had been defined for category 6, category 5e or 1000BASE-T. Except for the one important distinction in frequency range, all these cabling parameters must meet performance limits over the frequency range from one through 500 MHz established in the 10GBASE-T standard.

• After all links meet the performance limits set for the internal cabling performance, we can evaluate the level of alien crosstalk between links in the same bundle.

The latter requirement will undoubtedly prove the tougher test to meet. Initially, IEEE research seemed to indicate that installed category 6 channels up to 55 m in length would meet the 10 Gb/s requirement for alien crosstalk. In an installed cabling system, that distance is a function of many characteristics such as the bundle size (smaller is better), the physical proximity of the cables in the bundle (looser bundling is better), the number of connectors, and the quality of patch panels and installation workmanship, to name a few.

One way to verify whether an installed category 6 cabling system is ready to support 10 Gb/s Ethernet is to perform the two stages of the test procedure outlined above.

We have no experience with the evaluation of installed category 5e installations, but intuition indicates that the channel length over which such a cabling system can support 10GBASE-T is going to be much shorter than the above mentioned 55 m; maybe 20 m may be an achievable distance.

The Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA) and the International Standards Organization (ISO/IEC) are working on a new cabling type that by design will support 100 m channels for the deployment of 10 Gb/s (TIA augmented category 6 or category 6A-ISO Augmented Class E). A new cabling system requires the development of specifications for cabling, connecting hardware and patch cords. All components must be defined to obtain interoperability. The cabling requirements are usually defined first, but these augmented category 6 systems still have some time to go before a completed standard can be published. The TIA category 6a effort is captured in draft 4 of Amendment 10 to the TIA-568-B.2 standard.

The TIA will publish later in the summer of this year a telecommunication system bulletin (TSB155) that describes the performance requirements established in the IEEE standard for the 10 Gb/s cabling channel and adds specifications for the permanent link model for 10 Gb/s cabling installations.
Welcome New Members

Institutional Members

CUNY Graduate Center, New York, NY, T2
Robert Campbell, Asst. VP for Info Tech; 212/817-7350 .......... rcampbell@gc.cuny.edu

St. John’s College, Santa Fe, NM, T1
Richard Kruempel, College Network Mgr.; 505/984-6094 .......... rkrumpe@nmsu.edu

Corporate Affiliate Members

SILVER MEMBER

HP ProCurve, Roseville, CA ........................................ www.procurve.com
John Halpin, Public Sector Marketing Mgr.; 916/785-0317
The ProCurve Adaptive EDGE Architecture strategy is the industry’s only comprehensive and inclusive network design strategy that is adaptable, scalable, and completely interoperable for achieving command from the center with control to the network edge.

COPPER MEMBER

Nick Olson, Director of Sales; 281/579-0430
GTI is a premier provider of secure infrastructure solutions to the federal government and commercial customers. GTI’s capabilities include assessments, design engineering, systems integration and installation, deployments, transition assistance, and ongoing maintenance.

Committee Profile: Awards Committee

The ACUTA Awards Committee, through a call for nominations to the membership, selects two very important awards each year: The Institutional Excellence in Communications Technology Award and the ACUTA Ruth A. Michalecki Leadership Award.

The Awards Committee can award up to three Institutional Excellence Awards each year, one in each of three enrollment categories. The Award recognizes the communications technology department’s contribution to and support of the mission of their institution. Applications are evaluated on the basis of: scope and complexity of the endeavor, technological leadership, benefit to the institution and key constituents, and demonstration of excellence and professionalism. The endeavor, product, or service should be innovative and exemplary, and provide significant advantage to the institution, faculty, staff, and/or students.

The Awards Committee selects only one recipient per year for the ACUTA Ruth A. Michalecki Leadership Award. This award recognizes a member who engages in activities that have produced firm and formal results directly benefiting the ACUTA organization and/or the broader higher education community.