### Appendix A — Scenarios Considered by the Task Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios Considered by the Task Force</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Full recovery via **Fixed Network Port Access Fee**  
(Current process at Cornell)         | • Operational simplicity  
• Continuity with current practices  
• Fixed port counts provided near term revenue and cost predictability | • Creates economic incentive repeaters (Hublets) and their cost  
• Erodes CIT revenue stream  
• No feedback to customer for consumption  
• Obfuscates relation between needed resource investment  
• Only partially documents and justifies expansion of CIT resources (e.g., purchase Internet bandwidth) |
| Full recovery via **Headcount Tax**  
(Fixed monthly charge to departments based on number of faculty, staff, and students associated with the department) | • Operational simplicity  
• No economic incentive to disconnect ports and thereby fracture the network  
• Provides revenue and cost predictability | • No feedback to customer for consumption  
• Obfuscates relation between needed resource investment  
• Does not document and justifies expansion of CIT resources |
| Full recovery via **Usage-based Billing**  
(Variable charge to departments that is based upon users’ consumption) | • Feedback to customer for excessive consumption  
• No economic incentive to disconnect ports and thereby fracture the network  
• Fully documents higher fees based on use  
• Allows demand to justify expansion of CIT resources | • Unpredictable revenue stream  
• Operationally complex and expensive  
• Limited ability to reduce cost due to decline in consumption in the short term |
| Full recovery via a **Hybrid of the above solutions** | • Provides some revenue stability  
• Minimal economic incentive to disconnect ports and thereby fracture the network  
• Feedback to customer for excessive consumption  
• Mostly documents increased charges based on use  
• Allows demand to justify expansion of CIT resources | • More operationally complex fee or headcount tax based complex than a pure usage-based solution |