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Highlighted Information (During Joint Presentation)

After a welcome and introductions from David Jones, president of NENA, Bob Cobb, development director of NENA, and Rick Jones, chair of the Operations Roundtable, two invited speakers related hurricane events in Louisiana. The participants were asked to listen to the information, tracking relevant issues, and drilling down the data in order to pinpoint action items that may assist their needs. It was noted that events in Louisiana could potentially impact the concept and design of the NG 9-1-1 system.

• Jim Coleman, 9-1-1 board chair, presented the background on Washington Parish, Louisiana, the impact of Hurricane Katrina and subsequently Hurricane Rita, and the challenges faced by the 9-1-1 system. He stressed the importance of communications as the number one priority in any disaster and his desire for NENA to provide input on its work on the NG 9-1-1 system prior to rebuilding the 9-1-1 system in Washington Parish. Federal funding has created an opportunity to develop a system, with suitable backups, to minimize the impact Washington Parish suffered during the storms. (As reference, the management team committed assistance on Oct. 5 in potentially developing Gulf Coast guidelines that would create a working NG 9-1-1 model.)

• For a more complete overview of the presentation, please see working draft notes.

• Woody Glover, director of St. Tammany Parish Communications, presented the background on Tammany Parish, Louisiana, the impact of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita, and the challenges faced by their 9-1-1 system. He offered to make his presentation available for the NENA Website. In sum, he stressed that NENA has an opportunity to assist the area in developing a NG 9-1-1 system that could work, perhaps under such extreme circumstances. There was a request made that they continue the work, complete the work, and allow this parish and other parishes to use it a model for the next system they develop.

Highlighted Discussion Points Raised (Excluding Action Points)

• There was discussion on the immediate need to put a working NG 9-1-1 model in the Gulf Coast. There was general acceptance that any system developed should consider the challenges faced by these parishes in terms of available accessibility. Both presenters had also requested that NENA not alter its existing plans to fit their unique circumstances, but rather to develop and share what NENA thought was the ideal model so they could then attempt to implement that model using federal funds that have been committed as part of federal disaster relief.

• There was discussion on which levels of government are best approached in developing a NG 9-1-1 system. The questions raised indicate a need to establish a priority in working with local, state, and federal governments. Since each region of the United States operates 9-1-1 services differently, it is often difficult to prioritize which government level is most important. In general, NENA has taken
the position that the NG 9-1-1 system could be funded by the federal government, managed by the states, and operated by local governments.
• There was stated concern that if NENA does not act at the local levels, it creates an opportunity for vendors to develop independent systems with local government. Some felt that such outcomes could be better managed if NENA could encourage vendors to move forward on their own, and then use NENA as their review process.
• Some expressed concern that program partners did not always have an understanding of the entire Emergency Communication system and where NG 9-1-1 fits in with that system. As a result, some felt this makes it difficult to define the purpose of the group, and subsequently, the direction it should be moving in. As a resolution, Guy Roe offered to share a white paper (and design model) that has already been written. It was also established that the roundtable could take a second look at the one-page Tech Roundtable Purpose Draft submitted by Roger Hixson.
• There was disagreement on whether the NG 9-1-1 design should include legacy systems or not. As reference: It has been generally agreed in prior discussions that the NG 9-1-1 system move to i3 in terms of concept and design, and that legacy systems, those that cannot meet NG 9-1-1 standards, be provided workaround solutions as needed or until they can meet NG 9-1-1 compliance.
• There was clarification discussion as to the status of i3 and if that would provide the model for NG 9-1-1. It was clarified that i3 requirements and basic design is close to completion, but several steps still need to be taken, including an outside review process. It was agreed that the NENA-VoIP-LTD-i3 solution be disseminated on the NENA Website.
• Several program partners expressed a need to have better communicated goals, objectives, and messages so they can bring their respective companies up to speed and value participation in the various roundtables.
• There was consensus that NENA will write and distribute a personalized half-page acknowledgement letter that thanked the program partner, the company, and include roundtable accomplishments that resulted from such involvement. It is critical that this letter be sent out in October, no later than November, when many program partners must submit their budgets for the next fiscal year.

Afternoon Session

• The participants returned to review the purpose of the NG E9-1-1 Roundtable, its action items, and then prioritize those action items.
• There was general discussion about the purpose of the roundtable and the scope of the NG 9-1-1. There seems to be some confusion among some partners as to whether NG 9-1-1 encompasses the entire Emergency Communications system or its traditional role in terms of enabling PSAPs to receive calls and data. It was clarified that the NG 9-1-1 system has an impact on Emergency Communications as a critical component of that system. As a result, it was later established that NENA should make contact with all Emergency Communications stakeholders to ensure the end NG 9-1-1 system can be
successfully integrated. It was suggested, but no consensus was reached, that NENA should be considered the lead organization on all Emergency Communications tech, operations, and policy.

- There was a general consensus that the Tech Roundtable purpose draft needed to be re-reviewed and then tightened into a 2- to 3-line purpose statement.
- In addition to the purpose statement, there was general consensus that it would be worthwhile to draft diagrams that illustrated the NG 9-1-1 system. Guy Roe offered to lead a small team in accomplishing this goal (see action items for specifics).
- After the meeting, it was decided that a small team would pull together a summary of the overall Emergency Communications and NG9-1-1 concepts from the i3, NRIC 1B and 1D and other available documents to generate an educational overview of intent and interrelationships. This meeting was scheduled for Nov 16 in DC, with the intent of a final document by Dec 15.
- There was a call for NENA to host a summit that included all Emergency Communications stakeholders in an effort to prevent these various organizations from following parallel or divergent work paths. The result of such a summit could help the federal government clarify its focus in how to best proceed in supporting the development and design of a consistent national system.
- Some members of the group questioned the viability of working with the National 9-1-1 Program Office as it remains unfunded (or underfunded). It was generally agreed that while NENA cannot currently rely on this office, it would continue to work with various government agencies while taking care to never exclude this developing office.
- A cost study of current E9-1-1 system is needed to support NG9-1-1 cost benefit claims.
- The participants continued to review various action items and discussed which items were beyond the roundtable’s scope, which were to be referred, and which required priority to ensure they could be included in the NG 9-1-1 annual report.

Additional comments:
- There was some question on the change of NG E9-1-1 program structure and whether or not the change in format next year invalidates some of the work that will continue through to the end of this year. NENA is working to ensure a smooth transition.
- Throughout many discussions, program partners feel NENA must take the lead on the development of the NG 9-1-1 solution and, perhaps, any national Emergency Communications system.
- There was some concern that the Tech Roundtable seems to move forward, except when some participants question the purpose of the roundtable. Several participants cautioned that reacting to every comment impedes the group’s ability to move forward. There was an observation that revisiting the purpose of the roundtable is the result of participants that are generally selective in participation, and miss decisions that were made during previous meetings and conference calls.
• For the communication team to effectively communicate the Tech Roundtable message, the Tech Roundtable will have to solidify its message, and then allow the communication team to best disseminate that message.

**Action Items  (Numbering is off)**

Finalize the Tech Roundtable purpose statement (see draft **NG E9-1-1 Technical Roundtable Purpose**).

• We need to establish the scope of the end product, what the Tech Roundtable will do to accomplish it, and who are the stakeholders (PSAPs or all emergency providers). The purpose should include plans to collaborate with other groups.

**Status** - The purpose draft was reissued to the Tech Roundtable members for comment (track change edits) due by Oct. 14.

**No comments were received**

1. Review NG9-1-1 concepts and design to date and provide feedback from industry and program partners.
   • Summarize description of NG9-1-1 to clarify all major features and their intended applications. This includes all possible points of interest in the subject. (What will have to be in place to actualize NG 9-1-1?)
   **Status** – Requested Tech Roundtable leaders to accomplish this by Oct. 21 via Issue Request Form (this will include Roe WP.)
   • Provide primary concept flow diagram, add other interfaces in sequential diagram and flow, as well as basic transition steps. (Show what is ‘in’ and ‘out’ of NG9-1-1).
   **Status** – Guy Roe will lead a small group via conference call to review and refine existing drafts. Must coordinate with the content of the Emergency Communications Summary document which will result from a Nov 16 meeting in DC.
   • Basic start for the public knowledge transfer effort of NG9-1-1 objectives.

**Emergency Communications Summary document will be complete in December, includes sequential diagrams for NG9-1-1 Summary feature description planned for January**

2. Identify and prioritize the Tech Roundtable objectives for 2006.
   • Identify steps to move E9-1-1 evolution forward, more quickly, and in a coordinated approach. There are several interests to consider, including commercial and service interests, and FCC migratory approaches.
   **Status** – To be addressed with next conference call, tentative Oct 28.
   **It was subsequently determined that the conference call would have to be moved to a new date and time.**
3. Public knowledge communications package development.
   • This was determined to be part of the overall communication plan for
     the program. Include timeline.
   **Status** – Request communication plan timeline; communication
     materials are urgent, with a request to have such materials by Dec. 1.  
   **To be provided in conjunction with 2006 Program Plan**

5. Identify groups and entities that are most active in E9-1-1 or related
   development or that impact activity.
   • ICO, ATIS (and ESIF), NRIC, APCO, IEEE, IETF, NARUC, NASNA,
     ANSI, TIA, ITU, NTIA, DoT, DOJ, DHS, COMCARE
   • Potentially hold a summit with all stakeholders.
   **Status** – Refer to management team to bring these groups into the NG
     E9-1-1 program to aid in developing a convergent approach.
   • Need to get the national 9-1-1 ICO involved in NG E9-1-1 program, to
     begin overseeing the architecture development and overall convergence
     (including within federal government) of NG 9-1-1. This should be a joint
     effort of all three roundtables and the management team, with NENA.
     Need federal and state endorsement of the effort and program.
   • Need more VSP and IP industry involvement (may be difficult given the
     FCC Order short-term effort). Bring VON Coalition into contact with the
     NG program.
   • Involve FCC to coordinate future path to NG9-1-1 with interim rules
     development.
   **Part of 2006 Program Plan**

6. Develop an NG educational program for the 9-1-1 industry, which includes
   informing businesses of the direction and how it will impact them.
   **Status** – Request a variation of the communication plan with support from
     management team and NENA staff, ie. Roger Hixson and Billy Ragsdale.

7. We need to develop a PowerPoint-based timeline of events for this
   `project` for NG9-1-1 and Tech Roundtable work.
   **Status** – This has been delegated to program staff as part of the 2006
     Plan definition. One suggested resource is NHTSA and the ENHANCE
     911 Act, which are related to a 3-5 year timeline)
   **NHTSA information has been brought into contact with NG Program
     work**
   **Timeline to be developed to start 2006 Program**

8. Identify preferred transition plan.
   • Note use of default backup methods until full infrastructure is in place.
     Discourage ineffective transition paths.
   • Development of implementation plan vs. varying current systems design.
   **Status** - Refer to joint Tech/Operations Committees, and needs to be part
     of Summary NG9-1-1 description (item 2).
   **No action on this to date**
9. Define NENAs’ role in coordinating any trials. Does an RFI approach apply? How does trial acceptability and success get evaluated and identified?
   To management team?
   • Recommend NENA to drive different levels of technical support for trial evaluation, depending on approach
     **NENA is connected to both the 'Texas A&M trial' and the pending Northern Virginia IP network trial, both of which include NG9-1-1**

10. Develop criteria to evaluate 9-1-1 industry compliance for NG9-1-1 solutions. Encourage industry use of the compliance process.
    FPP compliance becomes NG compliance with additions?
    • Need to establish who will do this, and if NENA does this, it will require a review process and resources as well as a cost basis.
    **Status** - Provide FPP compliance documentation to partners for review
    **Not yet done**

11. Define the acceptable minimum capabilities for solutions that do not initially meet NG9-1-1 solution requirements. (Also relates to NG9-1-1 trial and pilot project direction and evaluation.)
    **Status** - Currently considering a ‘meet all requirements’ and ‘should meet all recommendations’ approach to full compliance.

12. Determine acceptability of PSAP 10-digit numbers for outage conditions and as a backup.
    • Will this work under NG9-1-1? Will PSAPs maintain such numbers?
    Operations Committee issue – best approach for backup access to PSAPs under NG (see NG9-1-1 definition to crosscheck)
    **Status** - Tabled for future discussion.

---

**Referral Items**

1. Can we use existing wireless VPC datalinks for VoIP (re FCC Order)?
   a. States where cost recovery limits use
      **Referred to Policy and NENA Reg/Leg Committee**
      **Status** - No results to date [not in NG scope]

2. Allocations of fees and surcharges, and cost recovery – impacts on providing the infrastructure or its use for VoIP application.
   **Referred to Policy and NENA Reg/Leg Committee**
   **Status** - No results to date [not in NG scope]

3. Administration of pANI codes nationally and establishment of administrator. Official support of ESIF issue
Referred to Policy and NENA Reg/Leg Committee
**Status** – This has been completed.

4. Identification of current E9-1-1 operation rules and validate which apply or don't apply to VoIP services.

**Referred to NENA 9-1-1 Center Operations Committee**

**Status** - In progress in the NENA 9-1-1 Center Operations Committee, per Rick Jones, this needs to be a joint Operations and Technical Committee effort within NENA (it's not just a PSAP or Public Safety Authority-oriented need)

5. Recommend to the Policy Roundtable that they plan and get federal and state endorsements. Buy-in from both levels to raise NG effectiveness.

**Referred to Policy and NENA Reg/Leg Committee**

**Status** - No results to date

**Action Items Deemed Out of NG Scope**

1. Distinguish use of various codes – CoID, ESQK, ESRNs, and standard methods and responsible party. May be in current standard. Document as guideline paper. Need to define by network protocol MF, SS7, etc. Code administration question.
   In progress, through NENA ESQK and ESRN work groups – TID pending
   CoID is available to VSPs – further advertising pending
2. Wireless infrastructure applications for VoIP – NCAS versus hybrid impacts for PSAP and SSPs.
3. Identify the roadblocks, obstacles, timeline and recommend how to solve them. Also provide to the FCC. (re: the 120-day time limit).
4. Develop LERG content list of selective routers from current NENA database. Identify current NENA workgroup schedule.
   Original plan impacted by state and congressional perspectives, re: FCC focus. Current work effort of NENA and Intrado (meeting Friday, Oct 7)
5. How do we accomplish tracking of Interim Solution Compliance?
6. Allocations of fees and surcharges, and cost recovery – impacts on providing the infrastructure or its use for VoIP application
7. Administration of pANI codes nationally and establishment of administrator. Official support of ESIF issue
8. Identification of current E9-1-1 operation rules and validate which apply or don't apply to VoIP services.