APPENDIX: ACTION ITEM TASKS

This Appendix provides a discussion of tasks necessary for accomplishment of each Action Item.

PRIORITY ACTION PLAN TASKS

ACTION ITEM # 1 TASKS

1.a. Clarify and interpret national policy in this area, as necessary.

Lead Stakeholder: FCC

Time Period: through FY '04 (2nd Qtr)

Contributing Stakeholders: NENA, APCO and NASNA

Comment: By legislation, Congress has already established national policy in this area, and the FCC has promulgated rules implementing that policy. Interpretative guidance by the FCC may be appropriate and beneficial, as necessary. The national associations, including NENA's SWAT Initiative, may also help provide coordination in this area.

Critical Factors:

- Implementation of this policy depends upon State and local public policy, and associated implementation approaches.
- Leadership will be critical.

- Further Congressional action may be necessary. Program and project coordination can be provided in many ways.

1.b. Provide technical assistance and guidance to States without coordinating infrastructure or resources.

Lead Stakeholder: NASNA and its membership

Time Period: through FY '04

Contributing Stakeholders: NENA and APCO

Comment: NASNA and its membership are in a position to assist States in establishing legislation and statewide coordinating infrastructure. NASNA should organize itself to provide that kind of support. NENA and APCO can assist in developing, documenting and distributing model efforts, legislation and policy. NENA's SWAT initiative is particularly focused at this effort.

Critical Factors:

- Funding, time and resources

(cannot depend upon solely volunteer effort).

- Leadership will be critical.
- Efforts must be focused to specific situations and locations within the State and local arena.

1.c. Provide leadership to foster new public policy and similar efforts in States without such structure.

Lead Stakeholders: Governors and their offices, State legislatures

Time Period: through FY '04

Contributing Stakeholders: NGA, NCSL, NENA, APCO and NASNA

Comment: All of the above stakeholders have a role to play in this effort. Ultimately the lead role is at the State level. NGA and NCSL can provide guidance, support and encouragement. So can the public safety community, along with State municipal and county associations, APCO, NENA, and NASNA, and the wireless industry.

Critical Factors:

- Experiences and support should be provided State and local governments to help establish appropriate public policy.
- Efforts must be focused to specific needs and situations.
- Additional funding and resources may be required to provide comprehensive and effective support.

1.d. Monitor status and progress of deployment.

Lead Stakeholders: NENA and APCO

Contributing Stakeholder: NASNA

Time Period: through FY '05

Comment: Good public policy and procedure depends upon good descriptive and factual information. Keeping track of deployment characteristics across the country will be essential to proper coordinatiion and management of the implementation process. NENA, along with APCO, with support from a variety of sources, are currently under contract to help perform this function.

Critical Factors:

- Maintaining and updating this resource will be critical. That may require additional resources beyond 2003.
- Self-reporting of status information and data will be helpful.

1.e. Develop white paper on the advantages and disadvantages of Statewide 9-1-1 institutions.

Lead Stakeholders: NASNA and CTIA

Time Period: FY '03 (3rd Qtr)

Contributing Stakeholders NENA, APCO, NGA, NCSL

Comment: While ultimately acknowledging the inherent advantages of Statewide coordination, this paper should also reflect the potential disadvantages of focusing

implementation, coordination and oversight at the State level. Special attention should be specifically focused in the areas of local control and governance, and the distribution of wireless revenues for the purpose of cost recovery. Parochial interests not withstanding, ideally the intent of this action item should be to provide a fair assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of Statewide coordination.

Critical Factors

- Review should not only address coordination options, but implementation and funding options as well.
- Timing will be important.
- NENA's SWAT Initiative will explore advantages and disadvantages of various funding options.

1.f. Educate local stakeholders

Lead Stakeholders: Steering Council

Time Period: through FY '04

Contributing Stakeholders: Steering Council members, Expert Working Group members

Comment: This task involves the products of this "Priority Action Item" and their implementation through member constituencies, State, regional and local memberships, as appropriate. A variety of models may be described, reflecting various approaches to program implementation and coordination. DOT's current contract with NENA and APCO, along with NENA's SWAT Initiative, APCO's Public Safety Foundation,

and other resources can contribute.

Critical Factors:

- To some extent, assistance under this item must be focused to specific States and their local characteristics.
- Additional resources and funding may be required.

ACTION ITEM # 2 TASKS

2.a. Identify leads for convening stakeholders and define roles and responsibilities.

Lead Stakeholders: NASNA and NGA

Time Period: FY '03 (3rd Qtr)

Comment: It is important that appropriate leads for convening stakeholders be identified, and that roles and responsibilities are defined. NASNA and NGA represent State-level organizations that must be part of any implementation process. Other stakeholders will also be identified.

Critical Factors:

- Identify appropriate divisions/ individuals within NASNA and NGA.
- May require additional dedicated resources to support lead stakeholder role (APCO's Public Safety Foundation may be a possible source).

2.b. Develop a mini-plan, including a "roadmap" for stakeholders.

Lead Stakeholders: NENA and APCO

Time Period: FY '03 (3rd Qtr)

Contributing Stakeholders: NGA, NASNA, AHA, and AASHTO

Comment: This mini-plan will guide the work to be accomplished. It will serve as a "roadmap" for all stakeholders that identifies steps to be taken by public and private partners that provide a path to wireless E9-1-1 deployment. It will include a Gantt chart of tasks and milestones, best methods to convene all stakeholders (workshops, summit-type meeting, web conferencing), and target dates that may coincide with DOT schedules for expert committee and steering committee meetings. Parallel efforts by other general public/special interest groups will be recognized and to the extent possible, incorporated into the mini-plan.

Critical Factors:

- NENA will be the lead association for the mini-plan. This is consistent with the DOT project.

2.c. Identify appropriate parties.

Lead Stakeholders: NENA, APCO and NASNA

Time Period: FY '03 (2nd Qtr)

Comment: This task will identify appropriate parties at each governmental level, with the product being a list of organizations and individuals to represent each entity. Private-sector stakeholders will also be identified.

Critical Factors:

- Activities under the DOT Wireless E9-1-1 Initiative have identified stakeholders, which will form the first-cut list of appropriate parties.
- Additional stakeholders may need to be identified.

2.d. Determine method(s) to involve all stakeholders.

Lead Stakeholders: NENA, NGA and NACO

Time Period: FY '03 (3rd Qtr)

Contributing Stakeholders: DOT

Comment: Identify events (e.g. conferences) where we can "piggyback" on attendees already convening. Prepare single guidance document for all States/counties.

Critical Factors:

- Will meet with NGA and NACO to accomplish this task.
- Funding and other resources may be a factor.

2.e. Develop agenda for each event.

Lead Stakeholders: NENA and APCO

Time Period: FY '03 (3rd Qtr)

Comment: Agendas for each event will be targeted to all stakeholders involved, and and be relevant to what needs to be accomplished in each respective region.

Critical Factors: NENA's DOT project staff will lead this effort.

2.f. Schedule meetings and hold events.

Lead Stakeholders: Government agencies and private-sector partners

Time Period: through FY '04

Contributing Stakeholders: NENA, APCO, AASHTO and NASNA

Comment: Events may include meetings, workshops, and web conferences. Following each event, major findings will be documented and distributed to all interested parties.

Critical Factors:

- A detailed calendar of meetings and events will be prepared by NENA's DOT project staff.

2.g. Monitor implementation of stakeholder convening actions.

Lead Stakeholder: NASNA

Time Period: through FY '04

Comment: Over time stakeholders will implement various actions to implement wireless E9-1-1. This subtask entails monitoring those actions and their positive impact on implementation. Progress will be reported back to all stakeholders so that successes can be shared among all parties.

Critical Factors:

- NASNA will appoint a working group to monitor implementtion and will develop a report ing mechanism. May require support from NENA and APCO.

- May require additional funding and resources.

ACTION ITEM # 3 TASKS

3.a. Clarify policy as established by the FCC and by precedent.

Lead Stakeholder: FCC

Contributing Stakeholders: ESIF, NENA, APCO and NASNA

Time Period: FY '04 (2nd Qtr)

Comment: The FCC has ruled that the selective router will be the demarcation point for cost splitting, but this ruling needs to be more specific on certain cost items. How the FCC ruling is applied to the technical or mechanical delivery of a wireless E9-1-1 call (in light of the nature and approach of the ruling) may affect cost recovery responsibility in some States. It is noted that the ESIF is attempting to help address this clarification issue (by clarifying—not developing). Additionally, the issue of only "partial" cost recovery being available to carriers in some States needs to be addressed to prevent this being a roadblock.

Critical Factors:

- More specific FCC rulings/ clarifications as necessary.
- Cost and practice standardization by the industry.

3.b. Provide education to PSAPs on reasonable expense allocation.

Lead Stakeholders: APCO, NASNA, NENA and NARUC

Time Period: FY '04 (3rd Qtr)

Comment: The PSAPs need to know which expenses they can reasonably be expected to cover, which the carriers should cover, and receive guidance that will help them through negotiations with the carriers.

Critical Factors:

- Development of educational material using data from models and successful implementations.
- Establishment of cost models by wireless carriers.
- Development and distribution of upgrade guidelines (equipment needs, software needs, network requirements, cost estimates).
- Cooperative, and coordinated efforts by public safety agencies in providing educational opportunities and materials.
- Funding methods to allow low-cost symposiums/forums for PSAPs to attend.
- Knowledgeable writers to develop articles for publication, to explain technical subject matter in laymen's terms, and wide publication of these articles.

3.c. Educate PSAPs about their responsibilities in Phase II implementation.

Lead Stakeholders: APCO, NENA

Time Period: FY '04 (3rd Qtr)

Comment: Much confusion still exists regarding what actions need

to be taken, which expenses each party may incur, and how much is a reasonable amount to pay.

Critical Factors:

- Cooperative, and coordinated efforts by public safety agencies to provide educational opportunities and materials.
- Funding resources to support low-cost symposiums/ forums for PSAPs to attend.

3.d. Develop guidelines and tools to assist in generating cost estimate analyses.

Lead Stakeholders: APCO, NENA and NARUC

Time Period: FY '04 (1st Qtr)

Comment: Development of a "cookbook" on implementing Phase II will be very beneficial to agencies involved in the learning process.

Critical Factors:

- Development of educational material using data from models and other successful implementations.
- Establishment of cost models by carriers.
- Development of upgrade guidelines.

3.e. Prepare and publish some example cost estimates as guidelines.

Lead Stakeholders: DOT, APCO, AASHTO and NENA

Time Period: FY '04 (1st Qtr)

Comment: As systems are imple-

mented we should gather the actual costs of the various components and make them available to other agencies, identifying, where appropriate, that these may vary with local tariffs.

Critical Factors:

- Development of educational material using data from models and other successful implementations.
- Establishment of cost models by carriers.
- Development of upgrade guidelines.

3.f. Identify potential funding sources and make information available to PSAPs.

Lead Stakeholders: DOT, APCO, AASHTO and NENA

Time Period: FY '04

Comment: From a broad perspective identify potential funding sources (like APCO's Public Safety Foundation, and other public and private sources). Make this information available through Web sites and distribution channels used for all educational information.

Critical Factors:

- Identification of useable information.
- Wide dissemination of this information, particularly to PSAPs outside of the "mainstream."

ACTION ITEM # 4 TASKS

4.a. Determine methods for

knowledge transfer and outreach.

Lead Stakeholders: AASHTO, NENA and APCO

Time Period: FY '03 (1st Qtr)

Comment: Outreach tools may include written "how-to" products similar to those guidelines already prepared by NENA, white papers on key issues, video tapes, and workshops/seminars. A 12-15 month schedule will be developed to specify when and how these tools will be developed.

Critical Factors:

- DOT project staff will determine methods and develop a 12-15 month schedule.
- Funding for widespread distribution of products may become an issue.

4.b. Identify early adopters and document their experiences.

Lead Stakeholders: NASNA, NENA and APCO

Time Period: FY '03 (3rd Qtr)

Comment: Early adopters include the State of Rhode Island, St. Clair County (IL), and those who have already requested Phase II. Their experiences will be documented - what went right, pitfalls to avoid, lessons learned, helpful hints to others.

Critical Factors:

- Ability to identify and contact early adopters. Procedures to do this are already in place with

NASNA members.

- May require support from APCO and NENA.
- May require additional funding and resources.

4.c. Prepare and distribute white papers, videos, and other printed and electronic materials to all stakeholders.

Lead Stakeholders: PSAPs

Time Period: through FY '04

Contributing Stakeholders: NENA, APCO and DOT

Comment: White papers and videos are being prepared by NENA with funding from DOT. These materials will be distributed to PSAPs and other stakeholders from lists developed by NENA and DOT. Outreach to the general public and other special interest groups, such as the American Heart Association (AHA) and the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI), will also be accomplished in this task. Knowledge transfer and outreach will be reviewed on a quarterly basis. This in itself is another form of knowledge transfer important to DOT and other stakeholders.

Critical Factors:

- Timely preparation of white papers.
- Distribution lists will be maintained as part of the DOT project.
- Costs of video distribution need to be determined.

4.d. Produce a "guidebook" on Phase II deployment

Lead Stakeholders: PSAPs

Time Period: FY '03 (3rd Qtr)

Comment: A guidebook for PSAPs and other stakeholders on how to achieve Phase II deployment will be written and distributed under this Action Plan.

Critical Factors

- NENA and APCO will prepare the guidebook, with input and review by approppriate stakeholders.

4.e. Provide expert consulting team to support knowledge transfer and outreach.

Lead Stakeholder: DOT

Time Period: through FY '04

Comment: Expert consultants will be available to assist PSAPs with their readiness for wireless E9-1-1 implementation.

Critical Factors:

- NENA's DOT project staff will be the core of the technical outreach team.
- Will require additional funding and resources.

ACTION ITEM # 5 TASKS

5.a. Develop deployment characteristics.

Lead Stakeholders: NASNA, NGA, and NACO

Time Period: FY '03 (4th Qtr)

Contributing Stakeholders: NENA, APCO, AASHTO and CTIA

Comment: Identify wireless customer quantities and growth rates on a per-county (or equivalent) basis. Include factors for major highway pass-through and commuter movement between rural and metro areas. Identify present county deployment status.

Critical Factors:

- Customer and calling rate information must be developed, by cell tower set associated with counties, from wireless carriers.
- Data on commuter and highway traffic rates.
- Reporting capabilities from the NENA/DOT survey data base.
- Potential additional funding to support above.

5.b. Develop project plans and deployment sequence by State, where they do not currently exist.

Lead Stakeholders: NASNA, NENA, and APCO

Contributing Stakeholders: NCSL, NGA, NACO and CTIA

Time Period: through FY '03

Comment: These plans will guide the work to be accomplished. They will include a Gantt chart of tasks and milestones, best methods to convene government stakeholders (workshops, conference calls, and web-based meetings), and target dates. Convene stakeholders by State, and, where needed, identify

a lead team from the stakeholder groups, who will then define the wireless deployment State project plan and schedule, based on activities below and additions.

Critical Factors:

- Model project plan development.
- Summary of best practices for stakeholder collaboration methods.
- Funding to accomplish above.

5.c .Identify rural area strategies.

Lead Stakeholders: NASNA, NGA, AASHTO and NACO

Time Period: FY '03 (4th Qtr)

Contributing Stakeholders: NENA, APCO, CTIA, and RCA

Comment: Identify strategies for alternate organizational, infrastructure and cost recovery/funding models that can be successfully applied for rural area support.

Critical Factors:

- Modification of model project plans to match rural factors.
- Summary information on best practices for rural stakeholder collaboration methods.
- Funding work required as necessary.

5.d. Identify infrastructure needs, and PSAP operational needs.

Lead Stakeholders: NENA

Time Period: FY '04 (1st Qtr)

Contributing Stakeholders: APCO and NASNA

Comment: Identify carriers and 9-1-1 service system providers by county. Identify PSAP, 9-1-1 system, and carrier capability issues, such as network, switching, and data equipment capability, E 9-1-1 system upgrade requirements, wireless methodology needs, mapping needs, etc. Identify PSAP call-taking requirements, such as staffing and training, and funding impacts and needs, by county. Propose a national policy for call routing, analyze impacts and funding needs for E9-1-1 system upgrade requirements to support call delivery for all service areas (NENA is already working this issue in its Technical Development and SWAT Initiative process).

Critical Factors:

- Survey and evaluation of remaining information needs, as above.
- Funding may be required to accomplish some of the above.
- Results of the NENA SWAT Team project.

5.e. Identify alternative funding sources and strategies (e.g., rural health program grants).

Lead Stakeholders: NASNA, NENA and APCO

Time Period: FY '03 (3rd Qtr)

Contributing Stakeholders: NGA, NACO, NENA, and APCO

Comment: The stakeholders would identify available and applicable funding sources, such as Federal and State monetary sources concerned with national security, public safety, public health, anti-crime, etc. Develop strategies to investigate and apply for funds, prioritizing actions based on deployment sequence. Establish application of funds specifically to wireless E9-1-1 support functions, within any related State law guidelines. The Monitor Group study under NENA's SWAT initiative is directly focused on this issue and task.

Critical Factors:

- Survey of available funding sources, and applicability.
- Develop model grants application package, targeted to 9-1-1 support needs.

5.f. Establish common service agreement/contract.

Lead Stakeholders: NASNA, NENA and APCO

Time Period: FY '04 (1st Qtr)

Contributing Stakeholders: NENA, CTIA, NGA, and NACO

Comment: Coordinate service agreements/contracts across jurisdictions (State-county-municipality).

Critical Factors:

- Develop national wireless readiness evaluation/ communications package (done by ESIF and NENA in Nov 2002).
- Carrier voluntary contributions under FCC enforcement actions shifted to national public safety efforts.

- Complete development of model service agreements and contracts, with in-out and buy-off by all involved parties (started by NENA in 2002).
- Funding as required for above.

ACTION ITEM # 6 TASKS

6.a. Establish criteria for selection of model locations.

Lead Stakeholder: DOT Wireless E 9-1-1 Steering Council

Time Period: FY '03 (3rd Qtr)

Contributing Stakeholder: Expert Working Group

Comment: To achieve maximum effectiveness it is important for the models to be carefully selected based on their demographics and technical sustainability to serve as effective role models. Factors that may be included in the selection criteria include:

1. Leadership
   - Strong Statewide
   - Decentralized
   - Progress
   - Rural/urban – State planning

2. Cost Recovery
   - Collection/disbursement models
   - Cost estimates policy

3. PSAP Readiness
   - Funding
   - Education/technical assistance

4. Political Considerations
   - Federal
   - State
   - Municipal

Critical Factors:

- Find models well positioned for success.
- Model PSAPs, and their carriers, must show a keen interest in being a role model, willing to document and share their process.
- Adequate personnel funded and staffed to accomplish thorough documentation, with acknowledgment and encouragement of this by the implementation team.

6.b. Establish procedures for collecting and analyzing information from the models.

Lead Stakeholder: DOT

Time Period: FY '04 (1st Qtr)

Contributing Stakeholders: APCO, NENA and NASNA

Comment: This task will be critical to the success of this action item, and will require close cooperation among all three stakeholder associations (NENA, APCO and NASNA). Some guidance may be provided by NENA's Strategic Wireless Action Team (SWAT) Initiative.

Critical Factors:

- Identifying critical areas of need by a "high level" team, and conveying this information to the implementation team.
- Creation of an "education attitude" in the implementation team.

6.c. Establish methods of disseminating "lessons learned" to all interested stakeholders.

Lead Stakeholders: DOT

Time Period: FY '04 (1st Qtr)

Contributing Stakeholder: AASHTO, APCO and NENA

Comment: To be effective the information gleaned, and the resulting conclusions, must be promptly distributed to all parties, including PSAPs, public safety associations, wireless carriers, and the FCC.

Critical Factors:

- Cooperative and coordinated efforts by public safety agencies in providing education opportunities and materials.
- Establishing funding methods to allow low-cost symposiums and forums for PSAPs.