Transcript

FirstNet Board of Directors Webcast, Sacramento, CA, December 13-14, 2016

Joint Meeting of All Committees: Governance and Personnel; Technology; Consultation and Outreach; Finance

Board Meeting Day 1

SUE SWENSON: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to our December Board meeting here in the beautiful state of California and the city of Sacramento. This is my home state, so it was actually quite nice to have a meeting in my home state, and so welcome, welcome all to the meeting.

(Operator giving instructions for callers taking part in meeting.)

So just a quick overview of today, we will have our committee meetings today and our Board and PSAC meeting tomorrow.

OPERATOR: Welcome and thank you for standing by. This call is being recorded. If you have any objections, please disconnect at this time. Participants are in a listen-only mode for the duration of today's conference.

SUE SWENSON: Okay, so I guess I can go now. Okay.

So welcome, again, to the December Board meeting of FirstNet. We are going to do committee meetings today and some presentations by the Chief Executives within the FirstNet organization to bring everybody up to speed on the committee work.

Tomorrow we'll have our Board meeting and Public Safety Advisory Council meeting in the afternoon.

At today's meetings, we'll do the annual reviews of the Board committee activities and bring everybody up to speed on that. We'll do charter reviews, which we do on an annual basis. And, as I said, we'll have updates from the leaders of the relevant organizations, from the CCO organization, the CTO organization, CFO, and a new acronym to add to the list, NPO. So we'll have that today as well.

The logistics of today will be that we'll have a roll call at the beginning of each committee and open each of the meetings right at the beginning.

We'll have a conflicts notification, which is traditional now at our meetings. At some point I assume we'll be able to not have to do that at some point in the not-too-distant future I hope.

We'll have committee reports. And then we'll finish the committee reports around 10:00, depending on how it goes today, and then the Board is going to go into closed session to review procurement and acquisition-sensitive matters. We believe that that meeting could go as long as five hours or longer, so there will not be a report out after that. So if you're waiting around for us to report out at the end of the day, I thought it would be nice for you to know that there will not be a report out today, and we will do any of that tomorrow.

So I think with that I think we're ready to begin. So Madam Secretary, would you take the roll?

MADAM SECRETARY: Yes, thank you. I'm going to take the roll for each committee.

Sue Swenson?

SUE SWENSON: Present.

MADAM SECRETARY: Barry Boniface?

Jeff Johnson?

JEFF JOHNSON: I'm here.

MADAM SECRETARY: TerI Takai?

TERI TAKAI: Here.

MADAM SECRETARY: Ed Horowitz

ED HOROWITZ: Here.

MADAM SECRETARY: Neil Cox?

NEIL COX: Here.

MADAM SECRETARY: Kevin McGinnis

KEVIN MCGINNIS: Here.

MADAM SECRETARY: Ed Reynolds

Suzanne Spaulding

SUZANNE SPAULDING: Here.

MADAM SECRETARY: Chris Burbank

Christopher Piehota

CHRISTOPHER PIEHOTA: Here.

MADAM SECRETARY: Richard Stanek

James Douglas

JAMES DOUGLAS: Here.

MADAM SECRETARY: Annise Parker

ANNISE PARKER: Here.

MADAM SECRETARY: David Mader

Madam Chair, we have a quorum for each committee.

SUE SWENSON: Excellent. Excellent. Now if you could be so kind as to do the conflicts notification.

MADAM SECRETARY: Yes.

In advance of FirstNet's December 2016 committee and Board meetings, the management team has provided the Board and committee members with an agenda outlining each of the items that will be discussed and decided during the committee meetings and the Board meeting. The members were also provided with a conflicts of interest assessment, which was produced jointly by the Commerce Department Office of General Counsel and FirstNet's Office of Chief Counsel. Providing these documents in advance to the Board members allows them to identify potential conflicts of interest and to recuse themselves from participation if required.

We will, prior to these committee meetings and the full Board meeting, remind all Board members of their obligations relating to the conflicts of interest and ask them to identify whether any recusals from deliberations or voting are necessary.

In consideration of the joint meeting today, each member should consider his or her obligations with respect to the appropriate committees, and for some of you that might mean more than one. Just to be clear, we are only doing one conflict notification for all committee meetings. With that said, if any Board members believe that they must now recuse themselves from either or both meetings, please so state for the record.

Seeing none, we are ready to proceed, Madam Chair.

SUE SWENSON: Great. And before we begin I wanted to officially welcome Chris Piehota, Chris, to the Board. Chris now is our federal representative from the Department of Justice. So Chris, just wanted to welcome you officially to the FirstNet Board. And we'll enjoy your participation and contributions.

I'm going to move us on to the Governance Committee. The Governance and Personnel Committee, I think you know, its role and oversight is really around governance policy and procedures. We also look at employee hiring and performance evaluations. In the past year we took a look at two resolutions, and those were really kind of routine modifications and amendment to create conformance with the Board Charter. And so we actually reviewed two resolutions this past year, Resolution Seven, where we revised and amended the Charter as recommended by Management, again for conformance. We also took a look at Resolution Eight, which was the PSAC Charter, again for conformance with the Board, and that was actually reviewed and that was recommended by Management so the Governance Committee actually reviewed and approved that.

As far as activities of the Governance Committee this past year, we were involved in the annual process of reviewing nominations for the Board. And this particular year we had several Board terms coming due, and in fact myself and Vice Chair Johnson were two of those people, so it was an interesting process being involved in those terms that were expiring. But we worked with Larry Strickling, at NTIA, and his staff to conduct the annual process and review, and we're happy to say that we were able to be reappointed to the Board and I know that we're looking forward to that as well. And also, and Teri Takai as well, right. So there were three of us coming up for reappointment. So we didn't need to add any new members.

We are in the process right now of looking for a replacement for Barry Boniface. He did not stand for reappointment, and so we are in the process of looking to replace Barry Boniface. And the Governance Committee is very involved in that activity as well.

We also worked with Management to review and establish the Network Program Office, and you'll hear more about that today from James Mitchell.

And we also created the Chief Customer Office for FirstNet, and so that was a fairly significant activity for the Governance Committee.

And we did various other personnel and performance review evaluations this past year.

So that was the activity. Does anyone from the Governance Committee want to add anything to that, or did I cover pretty much what we did primarily? Chief, anything from your side?

JEFF JOHNSON: No.

SUE SWENSON: Okay, great.

On the charter review, we have reviewed and reassessed the adequacy of the current charter. And we have no proposed changes to make to the FirstNet Board on the charter. We think it's adequate for the current state of the committee, and so I believe that the committee members are in agreement with that proposal. Correct?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Correct.

SUE SWENSON: Okay, great.

And before turning the meeting over to Neil, who is now the Chair of the Technology Committee, we'll do this more formally tomorrow, but I just want to thank Barry Boniface for his service to the FirstNet Board. I'm trying to remember when Barry joined us. It was a couple of years ago, I think. And Barry brings a wealth of experience, both in the telecom sector and, you know, just in financing and just all appropriate and relevant topics. And Barry is not only a subject matter expert on those things, but just a terrific and involved and engaged Board member. So we are going to miss Barry tremendously, but I can assure you, since we've gotten to know him pretty well, I am sure that we will maintain our relationship.

For some of you who never saw the interaction between Barry Boniface and Tim Brian when Tim Brian was on the Board, we'll miss the bantering that goes back and forth between those two. But I just want you to know that they are, on occasion, with us, and I want to assure you that that bantering continues. They have quite a bit of fun with each other.

So, Barry, thanks for everything you've done, and we look forward to staying in touch with you.

But with that I'm going to turn the meeting over to Neil.

NEIL COX: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I just want to review about the Technology Committee and what our role is. The Technology Committee of the Board is responsible to review and oversee and recommend actions related to the FirstNet's medium and long-term strategies associated with technologies, the plans, and research and development activities.

We had two resolutions that we worked on this year. One of them was reviewed and recommended the approval of the revised and amended Technology Committee Charter as presented by management to the board.

We also reviewed and recommended the approval of a proposed RFP and directed management to take all actions necessary to release the RFP in accordance with the principles as presented to the Board.

We also had some other activities. We did an overview of the Identity and Credential and Access Management System, which is really key for this network. And this is where – how the network will be used, how people get accredited, and the Technology team did an excellent job outlining this. And just as important is the whole ecosystem that we looked at and the strategy around that ecosystem because as (inaudible) to the RFP, that ecosystem will make every first responder's life better, and it will make their jobs easier to do, safer, and it really will actually make all of our lives safer as they perform their duties for society.

We had some demonstrations of some of the prototypes and some of the prototype applications that will be used on the network.

And we also got feedback from some of the Early Builder programs which were really key to see how this technology, how this spectrum, could be used in the hands of really the people that will benefit the most from it.

We also had one major event. And the major event took place last month. The Committee members visited the Boulder technology headquarters on November 9 for the FirstNet Innovation Lab ribbon cutting. And while we were there we also got educated on some of the device and testing certifications, how that's going to be done, the rooms that were built to avoid RF interference. And, again, some more feedback on this application ecosystem that's going on right now and how those items that were listed will really help and where we stand on each of those. And we also got an update on some of the Early Builder updates.

So in the Charter review, pursuant to the Committee's Charter, the Technology Committee has reviewed and assessed, and does not recommend any proposals to the proposed Charter for the FirstNet Board.

Can I take any comments from people on the Committee?

Okay, hearing none, I'm going to turn it over to a presentation from our Chief Technology Officer, Jeff Bratcher, who's going to talk a little bit about some of the technology updates. Jeff?

JEFF BRATCHER: Great. A little hot, Mike. Sorry.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

JEFF BRATCHER: Absolutely.

I want to start off by saying I'm very happy to be here today. There were a couple of days last week when I wasn't sure I would actually be here in person. My father suffered a massive heart attack two weeks ago tomorrow, and it required me to be down in southeast New Mexico. But I did want to take a few minutes and just publicly thank the first responding emergency medical technicians that actually saved his life two weeks ago. Without their actions, he would not be here. He is well on his way to recovery after double bypass, and I got a note from him last night. He's home with his cats, so he's very happy now.

So I just wanted to say that. Very glad to be here. It also drives home – and my mom. Yeah, I should thank my mom. She's got a long three months ahead of her, so Mom, I know you're watching. Have fun with that.

But I'm glad to be out of the hospitals and back here with you and be able to present on what's going on here. Again, some of the interaction they had with my mom when that was happening with those first responders just drives home why we're here, what we want to do, and what we want to bring to them to move forward.

So with that I'd also like to thank Barry Boniface for his past support as well. Look forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman, moving forward into the next year, and working on those going forward.

Today I'd like to touch on a few topic areas. The FirstNet Innovation and Test Lab that Chairman Cox mentioned earlier.

Our network policies development and a status update on those.

The Early Builder projects that we've been working on.

As well as wrapping up with some very recent developments on the PSER Public Safety Innovation Accelerator Program.

So here's our ribbon-cutting picture from the lab on October 9. Well-attended event. We were very happy and pleased with the response and who showed up for that event. We had some VIPs from the surrounding community also in attendance. You see pictured there is Mayor Jones from the City of Boulder. She was there with us to celebrate the ribbon cutting.

We also had Fire Chief Richard Carrizo, Yuma County Sheriff Chad Day, Copper Mountain Fire Chief Gary Curmode, Boulder Police Chief Greg Testa, the Lake Dillon Fire Chief Bruce Farrell, along with our esteemed Board members and CEO you see here as well in the picture for the ribbon cutting.

I've got a few slides I'll go through here to kind of share with the Committee and the Board what's involved with our Innovation and Test lab. We have approximately 4,600 square feet for the lab. Thirty-four hundred square feet of this is dedicated to our network equipment, and we've got approximately 1,200 square feet for the user testing area.

This has been built to demanding mission critical standards required for our lab and the testing that we envision happening here to validate some of the key features for the nationwide public safety broadband network.

What you see here is our network server room, the network cabinets, RF cabling. You'll notice at the top of the picture the three-tiered system. We're separating RF, power and small signal cables from each other to not – to – this is a really great implementation to keep interference from your power cabling into the RF cabling and your network cabling.

This is a shot of that screen room you saw on the previous slide. This is an RF isolation room. And what this does, I like to go in this room and shut the door quite often when I know Mike or TJ's trying to call me.

This actually shuts out all external RF interference. You cannot receive phone calls. What we use this room for is to do those low-level analysis of the signals for LTE on the devices and what we are going to be using on the network going forward. So this room provides that capability, blocks out all the external interference.

Next slide we have here is our device testing room. So we've actually already procured device testing equipment. We are ready with the equipment now to do that testing as we move forward for our Band 4 LTE equipment. We've got the flexibility to add features to these test capabilities as the new features are developed and standards and come out of the (inaudible) specifications, notably mission critical push-to-talk, mission critical data, and mission critical video that standards are being worked on now.

This slide shows a shot of our user test area. We have 15 benches that have been set up and cabled to all of the eNodeBs that we will have installed in the laboratory portion of this. You can see our PSAC Chairman McEwen (sp) engaging in some of our augmented reality demonstrations that we had available during the ribbon-cutting ceremony. All of the benches have the capability to connect any sector of any of

the eNodeBs in the test lab so that we can do application, development, invite the community in to also prototype devices and applications for that as well.

Here you see a shot of our battery backup in the power distribution system. A really good shot of the cabling and the level of detail that was put in by the contracting team that installed this. We often get questioned, well, why do you need batteries?... and this is our generator backup. A lot of the testing that we do runs multiple days to do validation. And we actually have had a couple of power hits on our building over the last two years that we've been there. So we now have the capability to not have any outage in the lab or testing areas as we move forward with our validation activities.

This shot here is of the external northern side of the building. And these – we worked closely, followed all Boulder city policies and procedures, to mount some external RF antennas. It took three or four attempts, if I recall correctly, to make sure we were meeting all the standards for the city of Boulder to mount these antennas.

So this will enable us to do some over-the-air testing as needed, obviously with impacts to the nationwide network once that's deployed in the area in close coordination.

So moving on – I'm sorry, one slide was out. Before I move on, one thing I would like to reiterate that we have mentioned, fantastic work by the team that worked 12 months prior to the actual construction of this to actually bring it in within a four-month build time and under budget. So very happy with the team to do that, and the results show the commitment and dedication, not only of the FirstNet staff, but the GSA team that helped with the procurement and also the contractors that actually executed and built the lab for us. Very pleased with their efforts, and I can't say enough for the dedication they had. We invited them to the ribbon cutting as well. Several of them who do a lot of commercial work said that was the first time they had been invited to an event that showed their work and capabilities, so they were very happy to be invited for that. Again, thanks to them.

So moving on I'd like to talk about our Network Policies effort. So as we briefed last committee meeting, and I believe the one before that as well, within the legislation that created FirstNet, we're required to establish our network policies. And that's basically what it says on the legislation.

What we've put that to include our Core and RAN technical operational requirements, the Network Management Standards, back office and user requirements, monitoring and compliance requirements for Network Management operation and use, and public safety and user training.

The internal policy set is set to be released with conjunction of the delivery of State Plans. So we look to have these ready to go once State Plans are ready for delivery as well.

What's the foundation for this? These constitute the basis for network interoperability. They reflect Early Builders, Public Safety, and PSAC learning and input that we've done over the last three years. They were going to provide the development and operations framework for the network partner. And also establish the criteria for the FCC and NTIA to evaluate the opt-out states' alternative RAN plants.

Quick status update on where we are today.

So we've established the criteria to define whether a policy document is needed, and whether these apply to stakeholders or other network partners, i.e., -deployed RANs, the public safety entities, users, even application developers.

We've analyzed the candidate policies to determine which should be developed. We initially started out with a list of approximately 150 policies. We've combined and reassessed some of those down to about 40 as of today. We've removed some of those that we believe would be implemented as a natural progression of the official contract once that's awarded. And, again, merged some of the similar ones across the working groups.

The policies are currently in development and review. We've assessed which stakeholders have been affected by the policies and conducted some of the initial assessments of how these will align to the requirements of the Act.

We've also identified some of our supporting documents in terms of service that will be required to implement these policies.

So the draft Network Policies were completed and reviewed with Mike and TJ on December 9. The Technology Committee briefing Chairman Cox, we look to have that in the near future as well. We'd like to start that schedule process as soon as we can.

And then one thing I want to leave on is the Network Policies won't be finalized until after post-award discussions. We obviously need our nationwide partner to help solidify and finalize a lot of those policies.

So a quick update on our Early Builder projects.

So there are five projects. We're continuing active engagement with all of the projects. Technical consultation, documenting the lessons learned, continuing to share internally with the FirstNet team and for our future awardees.

The LA-Ricks project has nearly 600 devices installed in vehicles. They're working on their plans now to document some of the key lessons learned that we've been working on closely with them.

We had an Early Builder Working Group meeting prior to the SPOCFest as well, and one thing that the team on my side is going to be working closely on is to document all the capabilities that they have in place now, infrastructure, etc., for those post-award discussions with our partner as well.

New Mexico and ADCOM have validated some of their remote core connectivity. And it's been operated and maintaining that going forward. They're working with agency adoption concerns and getting users on that system.

The Adams County ADCOM system, 20 sites now. We continue to leverage them for some of our device testing, prototype device efforts that we have in place. They've been to our lab as well. And they've also hosted several demonstrations.

Harris County – so Texas and Harris County have acquired significant LD expertise and deployment with their system and capabilities. We work closely with Shin Lin (sp) and Jim on the team there as well as Todd Early, in working through the issues they are having with their system and learning how the users are actually using that system and some of the hand-over capabilities they have there. They're also going to be hosting an identity credential and access management proof of concept here in the short term as well on that system.

New Jersey continues with their 32 sites on their deployable assets. A lot of disaster recovery and training exercises that have been put in place with that. They have a new leadership team now and they continue to support the project. And I believe there are over 500 active users using that system now.

So before I move on, I mentioned I had a quick update on the Public Safety Innovation and Accelerator Program out of the PSCR effort. So last week they received approval for their federal fund opportunity. So they're going to be making available $30 million for grants in cooperative agreement in the very near future for a two-year period of performance. Three years for academic proposals that are led by PhD students. This is open to all non-federal entities. You can go to grants.gov or the pscr.gov website for the full details on how to apply. And this is open to all non-federal entities and will close on February 28, 2017.

So I thought I'd share that with the public and the committee today as well since that happened just last week.

And with that, Chairman, I'm finished with my update. I'll take any questions.

NEIL COX: Yeah, any questions for Jeff?

ED HOROWITZ: This is Ed. So it's not a question so much as a comment on the quality of the facility that has been built out in Boulder. It's just quite extraordinary. And I tested the screen room to see if the Faraday cage actually worked, and it does work without question. No matter what I took in there, I couldn't get a signal out of there.

Also I want to compliment Jeff and the team on just staying the course. You know, just steady – I won't say slow and steady, just steady progress. And in the briefing that we had under Neil at that opening ceremony, just goes to say how many things are under consideration. Information brought in by the PSAC is a critical component of this. And how one-by-one we are just kind of going through and trying to anticipate what the needs might be of the special communities that we're looking to serve.

So I just wanted to compliment Jeff on that. Thank you.

JEFF BRATCHER: Thank you, Ed.

SUE SWENSON: Yeah, thank you, Neil.

Thank you, Jeff. First best wishes to your dad for a speedy recovery.

JEFF BRATCHER: Thank you.

SUE SWENSON: Thank you for sharing that story. Congratulations on the Innovation Lab.

You know, FirstNet has taken really significant steps to ensure the cyber security of the network.

JEFF BRATCHER: Absolutely.

SUE SWENSON: And I'm wondering if you could talk about the steps that are being taken or contemplated to ensure the cyber security of devices and applications that will ride on that network?

JEFF BRATCHER: Absolutely.

So- fantastic question. We have hired dedicated security focus staff under our Technology Planning and Development Group. Glenn Zimmerman, who joins us with 30 years of federal and private-sector cyber security background, has been focused on this. We also have application security engineers as well that have developed in the private sector for security on applications side of the network. And also within our Devices team we have a device engineer that has a security-focus background as well. So we've, I think, fulfilled all the key elements within an LTE network, focused on security within each of those different branches of an LTE network, Core, devices, applications, and, as you're aware, put in the RFP.

Cyber security will be built in up front. We're not going to tack it on later, try and bolt it on later. And we're pleased with how that's worked so far and look forward to getting to the final details later this year, or next year, I should say.

NEIL COX: Kevin.

KEVIN MCGINNIS: Thanks.

Well, Jeff, I'm glad we could be of service.

JEFF BRATCHER: I appreciate it. I knew you'd like that story, Kevin.

KEVIN MCGINNIS: I'm glad everything turned out well.

JEFF BRATCHER: It did.

KEVIN MCGINNIS: I just wanted to thank you as well. During the week of the ribbon cutting, you afforded me the opportunity to meet with your staff, particularly the Applications and Devices folks. In the course of doing a lot of outreach work in the EMS community in particular, but tribal as well, and elsewhere, you get asked lots of questions. And I pretty much know the limits on my knowledge, and I don't get down in the weeds and pretend to know more than I do.

But nonetheless, I'm, as you know, convinced that applications are going to be vital. They're going to make or break us in the future as well as the devices that our colleagues get to use in the field.

So a year ago I had an opportunity to talk with the applications folks, and I just wanted an update. And I've got to tell you, it was one of the most productive conversations I've had in a long time. I think it was a two-way thing. It wasn't just them spouting at me on progress. And, you know, they were really excited to hear about some of the discussions that we talked about at the Board level. And so I just wanted to thank you and your staff for the time that they devoted to that part of the day.

JEFF BRATCHER: Absolutely. And it's a testament to them as well, they want to learn all they can from those that are out in the field doing it. A lot of them sign up for the Boulder Police Academy and get any type of the hands-on first responder experience they can get. And I know they very much enjoyed those discussions as well because it helps them see things in different perspectives that engineers aren't want to do at times, so I appreciate you doing that and taking the time as well.

NEIL COX: Yes, Sue.

SUE SWENSON: So, Jeff, first of all I want to thank you and your team as the rest of the team taking my word seriously from Chicago because I said, look, we've done enough planning here to choke a horse. It's now time to really think about how to really operationalize the organization. And it's evident with the lab and all the work that you've been doing on all the elements, whether it's cyber security or whatever the topic is, it really shows the readiness of the organization, and yours, you know, will be the beginning of that discussion. So thank you for getting us ready. I think we're just at the starting gate ready to have the checkered flag go. And I appreciate you making sure that we're ready so that we can move quickly to deploy this network. So please make sure your staff knows how much we appreciate that.

JEFF BRATCHER: Absolutely will do. And I think you'll hear later today from our Network Program Office and Chief Customer Office the other activities we've been engaged in. I didn't go into depth here –

SUE SWENSON: Right.

JEFF BRATCHER: Because I knew we'd hear more about it later.

SUE SWENSON: Exactly. So like I said, you're just the first of many presentations today that shows our readiness for operating.

Secondly, you talk about PSCR. PSCR has been a great partner of ours since the beginning.

JEFF BRATCHER: Absolutely.

SUE SWENSON: And we depended on them quite a bit and then as being part of ready and being independent as an organization, we've taken on some of the things that they did for us initially. So I guess my question is, what exactly, I mean I know they're doing these other programs around innovation and things, but what do we depend on them today for?

JEFF BRATCHER: So great question. In the past we had actually dedicated funding for a lot of the validation of some of the key features for the nationwide network, quality of service, priority preemption. They are transitioning now to the execution of their $300 million grant program. But they've also set aside some of that funding for topics that we know will need continued research on. So we're working closely with them to develop that list of topics. It's a smaller amount of funding that what we were providing in the past, but we're also working closely as they move forward with the innovation accelerator and the potential prototypes and things that will be coming in. They look to our lab over at the FirstNet offices now as well for some of that network validation and some of the things that can be done in concert with public safety that we'd love to have – participate actively in there as well.

SUE SWENSON: That's great, and, you know, let me just take an opportunity, because I have to say that Derrick has been – Derrick Orr and the staff at PSCR have been terrific. In fact I remember in the early days Jeff and I were trying to get something done, and because we didn't have any staff or resources, Derrick and his staff stepped in and said we can help with that. And so I just really want to thank publicly Derrick and his staff, not only for helping us from the beginning, but continuing to be, I think, great partners, and I'm glad to hear that they will continue to work side by side with us. And I think it just reinforced the decision about putting the technology group in Boulder next to PSCR. I think that's been a great advantage for us.

JEFF BRATCHER: I could not agree more.

SUE SWENSON: Great. Thank you.

JEFF BRATCHER: Thank you.

NEIL COX: Any other questions?

Jeff, thank you very much. I know myself and the committee are looking forward to next year, with working with you and your team. As I'll echo what Ed said about the innovation and test lab: it's outstanding. I know it's going to get very busy very soon. And I really do appreciate everything you've done… you and your team.

With that, I'm going to now go to the next committee, which is the Consultation and Outreach Committee, which is chaired by Vice Chair Johnson, so Jeff, the floor is yours.

JEFF JOHNSON: Thank you, sir.

Well, good morning. The Consultation and Outreach Committee, as I – with the broad stroke, we're responsible for all outbound messaging and communications, the strategy and the plans associated with everything related to that. And, of course, our in-house lead is our Chief Customer Officer Rich Reed, who we'll hear from in a moment. And, of course, that's inclusive of the states, Public Safety, the tribal community, etc., etc. So basically this is the funnel through which all of our messaging and communications passes in terms of the overall strategy.

Madam Chair, as it relates to the Charter review, we do not see any need to amend the Charter. We do not see any meaningful changes that need to occur in that.

And as I look back over this last year at the Resolutions, we essentially – we reviewed and recommended the approval of the current revised and amended Consultation and Outreach Charter as presented to the

Board by management in Committee Resolution Eight. So that was probably the biggest thing we did during the year, Madam Chair.

We also received briefings and provided advice and guidance on a number of things including the creation of the Chief Customer Officer, the Office of the Chief Customer Officer transferring from the User Advocacy position.

The 2016 Strategic Plan, including the SPOC meetings, the quality of service priority and preemption, the Consultation Task teams, I mean, really all of those things are very meaningful.

The PSAC tasking. I have the pleasure of working very closely with Chief Harlin McEwen, who is the Chair of our Public Safety Advisory Committee. And we work on making sure that the taskings provided to the PSAC Committee are detailed, address not only technical issues but outreach and communications issues. And Harlin, I know we'll have lots of opportunity to say thank you to you, Tom, and the team, but you guys have done a fantastic job. Whoever the crafters were of this specific provision of the law, I think they were insightful and it has certainly yielded an abundance of fruit on the tree. You guys have done an amazing job.

We've also received plenty of briefings on the RFP, the process and the timelines. Just making sure that we stay in step.

And then in terms of airline miles, mentioning airline miles, geez, we did what? Sixty-five outreach engagements, and that is in excess, or in addition to, the state consultation meetings. You know, I can't tell you how many times during the year I run into a fire chief who says, "Well I've seen you three times this year, and that's because we're talking about FirstNet, and we're talking about its effect on public safety and how the public safety community can engage us."

We have broadened our strategy this year to move from just the Association, the trade association, outreach to actually pushing the messages down. We were having – and I think we did the right things at the right time, but we were having the Association leadership understand who FirstNet is and what our goals are and what we are doing. But you would run into very influential and insightful fire chiefs that did not know where we were at. So we morphed our strategy. We grew it as we matured. And now we're starting to make a dent there.

We did participate in two national single-point-of-contact meetings in addition to participating in quarterly meetings. And, of course, I participate on the PSAC executive calls, which are a monthly occurrence.

So I think that just wraps up the work of the Consultation and Outreach Committee, Madam Chair. I'd like, at this point, to turn it over to Rich Reed, our CCO. Rich?

RICH REED: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The transition from User Advocacy to Chief Customer Office has been an interesting one, as you mentioned. We went from a planning organization that was really focused on getting the information from the states and the stakeholders within the states into the RFP to an organization that's staffed and prepared to execute the operational role with our partner and ensure an outstanding customer experience.

We expanded the responsibilities under the CCO to include product management, product marketing. We brought communications under the CCO role, as well as, obviously, working very closely with the NPO and the CTO to make sure that network policies and all of the information that needs to go into the State Plan is included.

It's been an interesting role. I can tell you that we are at this point fully staffed, aside from a specific gap in product marketing – product marketing and product management. We are waiting until we get the full

product marketing and management plan completely agreed to before we start hiring those positions, but other than that we are operational and ready to execute once the partnership is awarded.

I have Dave Buchanan and Brian Hobson here to talk about their specific areas, but I wanted to spend a few moments just going through some FY16 highlights.

As you can see, and Chairman Johnson mentioned, we've been really aggressive in going out and expanding outreach while focusing consultation. And that was one of the statements that Chairman Johnson made last year at this time. He wanted to expand outreach and focus consultation. I feel like we've been very successful in doing that. We've executed, as you can see, several, several meetings, and Chairman Johnson mentioned them, but we've engaged over 75,000 stakeholders. We have executed over 1,500 meetings at the federal, state, local, and tribal level. Incredible effort by my team over the last couple of years.

I don't think you go around the states anymore and hear, what is FirstNet? Not only are we engaging on a one-on-one basis and having this dialogue, we have a tremendous online effort, we have a website, Twitter feeds, Facebook interactions. We have movies that we're making. So these are tools that not only FirstNet's using to get the message out, but the states are leveraging to get the message out, and we're very, very proud of it.

Chairman Johnson mentioned the annual SPOCFest. We just held the Fourth Annual SPOCFest. And I want to take a moment to mention Amanda Hilliard. We did this absent one of our key planners who was an absolutely instrumental individual for the first three that we did. And I want to thank the team for really stepping up and filling in the gap while Amanda was out on maternity leave. And we're very much looking forward to Amanda getting back in late February. She leaves a huge gap.

But the team did a great job filling in for her while she was out. I want to mention Kenzie. She really did a fine job stepping into the role, executing all the planning. Dave, Jeremy, Brian Hobson, all stepped in to make sure the content was right.

And we transitioned from an organization that was really putting out information and educating stakeholders to having a dialogue, where we're having a conversation with them. And the team put together an agenda that allowed us to take the conversations that we all know are important, the conversations that happen in the hall, and we brought them in and formalized it. And we had this really incredible interaction with stakeholders. It wasn't pushing information, it was a true dialogue. And we didn't leave until we were satisfied that their questions were answered. And that's how we're addressing this conversation we're having from here forward where we're having a dialogue and we're ensuring that their questions are answered.

I want to thank all the Board members who came and participated in that meeting. We had, obviously, Jeff Johnson there. We had Governor Douglas. We had Kevin McGinnis. All participating. We had Mike, TJ, Jeff Bratcher. As well as a lot of my team and Jeff's team there. And we just sat around tables and answered questions and had a dialogue, and I thought it was very, very powerful.

I wanted to thank everyone for participating, both at the Board level, the Executive level, and obviously our stakeholders at the state level. Very, very powerful engagement.

So with that I'm going to turn it over to Brian Hobson to talk about the additional data collection we've done. And then he'll hand it off to Dave Buchanan. And then I'll be available for questions.

BRIAN HOBSON: Thanks, Rich.

So, as Rich mentioned, we wanted to give a brief update on our respective areas. So on the State Plan side, one of the things we've been working on, certainly, is the processing the revised data sets that we received from states in 2016. As many of you know, we had the big, massive data collection in 2015,

which fed into the RFP. But there was a lot of opportunity that states wanted to take advantage of to continue to engage their stakeholders, really gather more data, which really provided depth and fidelity to the information that we have. And we saw that come through with the 2016 data submission. You can see there just some of the (inaudible) metrics. Thirty-one states and territories submitted revised or updated data representing over 1,500 surveys and another 180,000 personnel, for a total of over 12,000 total public safety entities surveyed, and nearly 1.8 million personnel represented across the country.

And what we really saw… it was not so much of we didn't ask for enough the first go round. Maybe we should have asked for more. It was really, going in, engaging stakeholders, identifying where is the need within that public safety community which will help us be prepared as we plan for State Plans. It will help the states be informed as we engage and have those discussions.

And as promised, we fully intend to take that information that we've got from 2015, from 2016, and carry that forward into the State Plan development and to share with our partner.

RICH REED: Hey, Brian. I think it's important to note that we did not ask for the secondary data collection. It was voluntary. And the states really asked us to do it. They asked us to continue to listen, and we accommodated that.

We had a really good data set that we put forth in the RFP, but they asked us to continue to allow them to refine their data set, and we allowed that, so I think it was a really good way to engage.

BRIAN HOBSON: So one of the other activities that the State Plans team has been evolving where we were with the information that we provided in the RFP. And as you may recall, there were two key documents that we included in the RFP to really articulate what the objectives were for state planning. One identified the overall objective for a State Plans portal recognizing that we intended the best way to deliver that State Plan content was through an interactive portal.

The other one was the State Plan template, we refer to, which really identified the content that we would expect to be incorporated into a portal. One of the confusions that we continue to address through consultation is that it was not really intended to be a template that would be populated with information and then uploaded to a portal. It was really intended to be defining the content that would reside in an interactive website.

So this is that evolution of taking that content, doing independent work through the State Plans Team, through the CCO Team as a whole, really looking at how do we take that content, if we were kind of looking at this from our own independent perspective, start to work out what would that statement portal look like. And this is kind of what this represents.

And in doing that we've continued to evolve this notion, too, that we recognize there are really kind of two distinct audiences for the State Plan content or the State Plan portal. One you can kind of see down in the green area is the type of content that we expect will really be critical for stakeholders to be informed when making a decision around adoption. Is this a service that they feel will be appropriate for them? Common questions that we all hear, coverage, cost, service plan, devices, all those types of things really get geared towards what we call the public side of the portal. And we envision that being, obviously, the long term – this will represent the products and services that FirstNet will provide.

Separately, and a much different audience oftentimes, is what will go into that governors' side of the portal that will really help make an informed decision for stakeholders to let their governor know whether they should proceed with the FirstNet plan or decide to opt out and take on the responsibility of the RAN.

So as we kind of continued to parse out the audiences in that way, that's the way we've really looked at kind of going into additional depth and really looking at the portal and the content associated with it.

So that's what we have broken down here between the green and the blue. And I know it's a busy chart. It shows kind of how we are currently thinking, but I can break it down, I think, into a little bit simpler layout.

So first and foremost, we know we want, as we engage with the governors, the team, and those that will be involved in that decision-making process, we want to provide kind of what is that executive summary. What is the value proposition to the Governor and to that state? And recognizing that every state is different, every territory is different. We hear a lot of unique needs. We want to make sure that's represented and reflected right up front. So as we learn those things that notionally could be included, and highlighted and brought to attention from the initial get-go, knowing that there's a lot of data behind that and that users may not necessarily want to wade through all that information. They get to the information that's relevant to them.

So looking after that breakdown, we kind of broke this into five high-level sections. First, FirstNet background. We know that as we engage more stakeholders, more people are brought into this. They may not have the same level of information and background on FirstNet, and we want to make sure that is provided in the State Plan portal.

Secondly, consultation. We know we have learned a great deal from states as we've gone through this consultation process, dating back from initial consultation, to the public notice process, consultation task teams, executive consultation. We want to make sure that's reflected back to the states and they see that work that's been done reflected in the portal.

The third section is the RAN deployment. We know this is a critical area. What does that RAN deployment look like in the state? What is the service? What's the timeline? What are the levels of capacity? How do we do the coverage, the predictions? That type of information is really a little bit more detailed (inaudible) represent that RAN deployment section.

The next section, FirstNet Operations and Network Policies. We know that even though the Core deployment is our responsibility, to provide a nationwide interoperable network, there's a lot of information we want to share with stakeholders to make sure they're informed and they understand. And similarly, what are those associated network policies that go with it to ensure that interoperability and cyber security levels are met. All that information would be included in that section.

And then lastly the Governor's decision. What does that process look like? What are the different steps that would need to be taken? What are all the responsibilities that need to be made aware of up front to ensure that they can make an informed decision when it's assessing this information?

So those are really the kind of five big buckets. We know that this is information that we're doing kind of just from a planning standpoint. Want to make sure that we're ready to hit the ground running when we go into that State Plan development knowing that those are Day 1 task orders. And this is a lot of the work we've been working on, and there's a lot more details that kind of reside under that.

The last thing I want to point out here is you can just see that the color coding kind of represents – we get a lot of questions on, from a State Plan perspective, what would be customized or tailored for a State Plan versus what would be kind of consistent. So the red represents the areas that we believe would really be customized or tailored on a state-by-state basis. Versus the blue areas that are kind of standard information that we know would kind of be consistent from State Plan to State Plan. Knowing that this is a standard approach for all states and territories, that we expect that the level of detail for a State Plan will be consistent for all our stakeholders.

RICH REED: Before you move on, Brian.

BRIAN HOBSON: Yep.

RICH REED: Just a couple of things. Obviously, you can see the amount of work that's gone into going from a very abstract topic into a very structured topic, and I want to thank Brian for that leadership.

What he didn't speak to is the level of coordination that's happening, not just amongst the State Plans team, but the CT organization, the NPO organization, Legal, everyone's collaborating on this. We're briefing it on a regular basis. Tremendous amount of cross-divisional coordination going on. The goal is, and this is obviously a notional site map, but what it does, it brings structure to the conversation. Once a partner is selected, once an award is made, this will bring structure to the conversation and allow us to really be aggressive in terms of getting that content put into the ultimate portal. And it really gives us the ability to have a very, very structured conversation, which should speed things up, and I know speed is of the essence.

Lastly I'll say that we hired literally the best and brightest minds we could find. We have a great, great team. Brian's got an outstanding team put together to execute this mission for you.

BRIAN HOBSON: Yeah, and that structure of this, we actually unveiled this at the SPOC meeting a couple of weeks ago, and it created a great way to have a structured dialogue with that community as well where they could really kind of take that, again, kind of get a sense of what this might look like at a high level, and start to form the teams around how they would review and distribute this information. So it's been a proven benefit in many facets.

Lastly, again, in looking at the audiences and the way they tend to engage, we certainly know the expansion of who we engage for State Plan delivery will continue to grow, and Dave will talk about that. And it's important to understand that as we continue to engage stakeholders, understanding and setting expectations for State Plan delivery, the State Plan decision versus adoption, is critically important. So that when we get feedback in engaging our stakeholders, we want to understand is this something that would feed into State Plan modifications or revisions or something we can take into consideration from that perspective? Or is this something that really will drive adoption and we need to potentially look at where the strengths are with what we're proposing to use as well as maybe assess where there could be areas to reassess. To really give us a jumpstart and where we can be from looking at it from an adoption standpoint.

RICH REED: And clearly with the goal of being able to articulate the highest level of value for opposition. Obviously, the folks who are going to make purchasing decisions vary greatly, whether it's urban and metropolitan areas verse the rural or individual users. They're all going to have different value propositions. We're going to need to account for them all as well as have the tools and the vehicles for them to buy services, devices, equipment. It's a complex issue, and we're looking at it.

DAVE BUCHANAN: So I'm going to take the last two slides to walk you through some of the activities we're going to be involved in this year and how the Consultation Team is really going to help us achieve these goals for the State Plans.

Our primary and immediate focus is on activities and consultation events that will drive an effective and efficient State Plans delivery. And you see a number of those activities and events listed here, which are really continuation activities from 2016. We're going to continue to educate and engage the people who are important to the review process. Spent a lot of time over the last year working with the SPOCs, and working with the states, and working with governance bodies to understand who those people are, who's going to be involved in this review, what new people need to be brought into the process, and what additional folks inside governors' offices and inside state government are important to reviewing the State Plan to make a recommendation to the governor.

And we'll continue, in 2017, to have individual meetings with those SPOCs, with those leaders, with those executives. We'll have regional meetings, state meetings, and nationwide meetings as well to help us do that task.

We're also going to continue to explain the State Plan delivery process. You saw the last couple of slides Brian just did. We spent a lot of time at the SPOCFest last month explaining that process and making sure that the people who are going to be involved really understand what this process is, understand what the content of the State Plan is going to be, understand what part of the State Plan they might be most interested in. A CIO might have interest in an aspect of the State Plan that's very specific but not necessarily be interested in the entire scope of the plan.

And we spent a lot of time at the SPOCFest walking them through the content, walking them through the layout and the way that the State Plan is going to come to them in the form of the portal and the use of the personas in order to bring them into that planning process.

That dialogue, that conversation will continue in 2017. I think one of the things we discovered from the SPOCFest is states are still figuring out what their process is. Not every state has a well-formed path to the governor. And we'll be working in facilitated dialogue, in one-on-one meetings, specific meetings, taking advantage of the Government Affairs Team to help us get to those people and the governor. They are going to be most important to that process. Helping states document that process, articulate and document that process, so it's clear to all those involved what steps need to take place in order to get the Plan in front of the governor.

And lastly, continue to work to make sure that we're capturing and reflecting the state's priorities in the State Plan. You saw Brian's description of the landing page and other aspects of the State Plan. We want to make sure that as we continue this dialogue, we continue to have engagements with senior leaders in state government, and with governors themselves, with public safety executives at the state and local level, and we're capturing those priorities, and we're able to reflect those priorities so they can see their value proposition in that State Plan.

I think the most important theme for us, as we look ahead to 2017, is that states will – and we conveyed this at the SPOC meeting – states will continue to have the opportunity to influence the State Plan going into 2017. Their role in this is critically important. We've articulated that to them. I think I can say that having met with most of those states at the SPOCFest, they get that, and they understand that this 2017 consultation process we're going to go through with them will be extraordinarily beneficial to them as they think about what kind of State Plan is ultimately going to come to their governor.

So to take a closer look at the people and process we think states may involve in their decision-making process, you see a number of the folks here we've been talking about for some time. On the left-hand side you see SPOCs and SPOC teams, you see public safety executives. You see governance bodies. These are teams of people we've been engaging for over three years. Educating, engaging, conducting outreach with, the conferences that you heard described earlier, the consultation we've been doing for almost three years. These folks are well known to us and have been heavily involved in our consultation process.

You see names in the center of the chart there. People we've also been engaged with for a very long time, but people who we really have systematically and strategically conducted education, outreach and consultation with over the last 12 to 18 months; folks like CIOs, attorneys general, budget directors, superintendents of state police, and folks inside the Governor's office. And again, the work that Ed Parkinson and his team are doing to educate and inform those decision makers inside the Governor's office. We know that both of those folks, the people we've been working with deliberately and constructively for three years and those who we've been most recently engaged with, are very important to these final steps of the State Plan consideration process.

We're going to continue as State Plans go forward. Continue to use SPOCs and governance bodies. They will be the, in most cases, about every case, the entry point for getting State Plans into the right hands into the governor's office.

We'll be looking and continuing to work with public safety executives at the local level because we know governors will be looking to big city fire chiefs and big city police chiefs, and small county sheriffs and others, for their inputs to make sure that they've been part of the process.

We also know that there are folks inside the state government whose governors will be looking too… both on the public safety side, like superintendents of state police and Homeland Security Directors, bring their perspective about what this public safety broadband network is going to mean for them as executives.

We also know there are folks inside the state government who have a management or a business perspective, and their issues need to be considered as well. Folks like, again, CIOs, budget directors, and others, who are influential to governors. The Governor, we know, will be looking to for their inputs on this.

And finally we know that governors have chiefs of staff, and policy directors, and chief counsels. They will be part of this process.

In total, these are the people we are going to continue to consult with. We'll continue to use the programs and activities and events to engage them at the right level. We articulated, again, at the SPOCFest and everywhere that we go, that we, and people have heard me say this over and over again, we don't want to get to the eve of the State Plan to discover one more person should have been consulted with or one more issue should have been considered. We want to do that now, in advance of the drafting of the State Plan. And states I think have bought into that, agree with that, and look forward to the continued partnership with us as we go forward to delivering the State Plans.

RICH REED: Thanks. Just a couple more, and I know I'm taking a little longer than I should. So, we're really focused on making sure that the staff understand what their responsibilities are in terms of getting content process into the State Plan. We want to make sure everyone understands their role, their responsibilities, and what content they're responsible for and what information they're responsible for.

So we've never been more integrated in terms of consultation, outreach, understanding what they are doing to feed the State Plan. We want to make sure that everyone appreciates that in that focusing of consultation, we're engaging federal agencies at a much lower level, down to the field office level. We're engaging tribes now at a far more granular level. Engaging tribes very robustly.

We're also in the process of developing a tribal consultation policy, expanding it from just a consultation guide to a consultation policy. So we're engaged very heavily to make sure everyone understands and has the right information to make a good decision once that State Plan is delivered.

NEIL COX: Thank you, Rich, and the entire team.

So I think at this point we'll be rather expeditious in handing off the meeting.

SUE SWENSON: Sure.

NEIL COX: Yes, please.

SUE SWENSON: I do just have a couple of questions. You would be disappointed, I'm sure, if I didn't, Rich.

RICH REED: Yes, ma'am.

SUE SWENSON: So, we didn't talk much about federal outreach. And this is something I think you guys have put a lot of effort and energy into. And something that people felt we needed to improve. So just provide a quick recap on federal outreach, and then I have a couple more follow on comments.

RICH REED: Sure. Sue, we have three dedicated staff doing federal outreach. And I just pulled the numbers, actually, at a previous meeting. We've engaged somewhere in the neighborhood of 1,200 state and local entities in a formal sort of engagement strategy. We're almost at 550 federal engagements. So even though we purposely started much, much after we did in terms of consultation with state and locals, the federal folks have really done a great job engaging federal agencies.

Keep in mind that federal agencies don't have grant dollars. They're not getting a plan specifically. They're wrapped up in the state plan. So the engagement is different, and the sort of level of effort we're receiving is different because they're very much taking a wait-and-see aspect. They want to see the service, they want to see the devices, and then make a purchasing decision.

SUE SWENSON: Great on that. And I appreciate all the work that we're doing on outreach to the people who need to be informed to make a decision and the potential recipients of this. And I guess this is a question for the Board, and we don't have to answer it specifically, but I think it's time that we take our story to more mainstream media. It's still surprising to me the number of people out there who don't understand, you know, it's one thing to talk about FirstNet inside to people who actually will use the service, but I don't think the general public understands the gap that's out there today that this will close.

So I don't know what discussions you've had internally about that, but I think it's time to take it to mainstream media.

RICH REED: I can tell you that our Comms Team is outstanding, and they're engaged on a daily basis, if not hourly basis, with all the trade magazines. And we're getting mainstream media inquiries at this point, obviously with the current status of the acquisition it's a little difficult to talk beyond what's publicly available. But we're very, very close to having that more mainstream dialogue.

SUE SWENSON: And then the last thing, and you know I'll just encourage this a bit, and that is having actual end-to-end process flow work to ensure the customer experience is good. It's one thing to sit around and do a table exercise, but I think actually going through the process, you'd be surprised at what you discover. I mean, in the current role that I'm currently playing outside of FirstNet, we've been doing some of that, and it's made a huge difference in the quality of that first experience. So, you know, to the degree that it hasn't been done, actually taking it through the systems, making sure that things go from end to end, is really important.

And lastly I just want to take the opportunity, Vice Chair Johnson, before we move on to Finance, is to thank Undersecretary Spaulding for her service on the FirstNet Board. We've worked together for how many years now, Suzanne?

SUZANNE SPAULDING: I was trying to think about that. I think it's five.

SUE SWENSON: Five years now, or something like that. And Suzanne and I have had lots of not only conversations at the Board, but offline, and I just appreciate your support and contributions and representing Department of Homeland Security. Your personal commitment has been very much appreciated. So I just wanted to – I know you won't be able to be with us tomorrow, so I wanted to acknowledge your participation today.

SUZANNE SPAULDING: Well, that's very kind of you, Madam Chairman, and I will be calling in tomorrow, and so I will probably, you know, repeat some of this. But I do intend to state very clearly what an honor it has been to be a member of this Board as the Secretary of Homeland Security's designee, and to work with such an outstanding and committed group of folks. And those of us who are in federal service, you know, made a commitment to public service for our careers, but all of you who serve on this Board have made that same commitment to public service. And it's incredibly commendable and honorable that you have made the decision to give your time and your efforts for such an incredibly important mission. And the talent, creativity, and expertise around this table, the Board members and the outstanding staff that

has come together here, it's really been wonderful to watch. And your leadership has made a huge difference in the progress this group has made. So thank you very much. It's been great.

MIKE POTH: Could – I have just one question for Rich that he could briefly answer.

RICH REED: And you couldn't just ask that at the office probably.

MIKE POTH: No, I think it's important for the Board to also get an appreciation. So at the SPOCFest, also, NTIA was a big supporter because although we talk about the opt-in and the obvious benefits of that, there is that possibility and NTIA has been a big advocate for FirstNet, so Rich, if you could just briefly touch on that, because they are an integral part, especially with the possibility of some additional grant funding, but also if a state does think about opting out. One of the interesting things on the portal, which is kind of overwhelming when you see it in a graphical display, is the area. So, for example, as Suzanne pointed out, around cyber, we have been very vocal that we are going to be unrelenting and unforgiving in our approach and examination of cyber for states as they consider alternative courses. That is one area. And they'll be able to dive deeply into that portal and see what the gold standard will be that they are going to have to match for further consideration. But, Rich, if you could just – a couple of moments on how NTIA is relating into the SPOCFest and what they've been doing to support us.

RICH REED: Sure, Mike, thanks. And I appreciate you bringing it up. I left that out, and I should have mentioned it. Marsha and her team actually participated in SPOCFest, and they did a really nice job, not only announcing the idea of (inaudible) 2.0, which is a follow-on potential grant program for opt-in states so they can continue to execute the much-needed work at the state level. But they sat down at the tables and answered questions from stakeholders as well. And some of those questions, and some of that dialogue is very, very difficult.

Brian's team, the Legal team, and myself, we're engaged on weekly conversations with NTIA. It's a very strong partnership in terms of NTIA wanting to make sure they understand what we value, what we're going to put in the State Plan. The information that they need to look at specifically in terms of the opt-out process. We couldn't have a stronger relationship and a better dialogue in terms of making sure that everyone appreciates the nuances and the specificity of what's necessary to integrate an opt-out state into the broadband network.

Did I answer your question, Mike?

MIKE POTH: Yes.

RICH REED: Quickly?

SUE SWENSON: Quickly.

MIKE POTH: And you guys are ready?

RICH REED: We are ready.

MIKE POTH: All right.

RICH REED: We are ready to receive.

JEFF JOHNSON: Very good. Any more questions or comments from the Board or staff?

Governor Douglas, it's all yours.

GOVERNOR DOUGLAS: Well, thank you, Chief Johnson. Let me first just add my compliments to Rich and his crew. It was great to attend SPOCFest. I think the format change was timely, appropriate, and

very welcomed. It gave a lot of chance for interaction, as you indicated, for all the attendees. And no one should have left with an unanswered question because you afforded ample opportunity for one-on-one conversation, so that was a great couple of days.

I'll convene the Finance Committee, and unlike the other slacker committees, we actually have two – two action items today. The first is the minutes of our meeting on August 26, and the Board may recall that it was a combined Finance Committee and Board meeting where we acted on the budget and another Resolution that I'll talk about in just a moment. But if the Committee members have had a chance to review those minutes, I'd welcome a motion to approve them.

MIKE POTH: I'll move to approve.

SUE SWENSON: I'll second.

GOVERNOR DOUGLAS: Any further discussion? If not, all in favor of approving the minutes say aye.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

GOVERNOR DOUGLAS: Opposed no. The ayes have it. We have approved our minutes.

Second item relates to the resolution that we adopted at that Finance Committee and board meeting to alter and enhance the delegation of authority to our CEO and his designees with respect to financial decisions. FirstNet obviously has evolved in the last few years. It's a lot more sophisticated now with our Chief Financial Office and our Management Team. And so we adopted a resolution at that August meeting to delegate to the CEO the authority to make, reasonable, appropriate, and consistent with the budget, decisions on obligations and expenditures, and specifically to make any decision up to $10 million, after which it would be reviewed by the Finance Committee and, if appropriate, then brought to the Board's attention. If it's over $25 million, it will come to the Board for your consideration and approval.

There are a couple of other circumstances under which it would come to the board. First is any commitment that exceeds five years, and any real estate lease would come to the Board. We approved, as you know, the Boulder lab lease which is under $10 million, but we feel it's appropriate that that kind of commitment come to the Board for approval, that would still be there.

The reason I'm bringing it up today is that we adopted the resolution, but we now need to amend our Committee Charter to be consistent with the resolution that we approved in August. There's language red lined and blue lined in the documents that have been provided to the members of the committee, and I believe the Board, because we'll have to take it up tomorrow as a full Board. This is, as I indicated, consistent with the Resolution we adopted. So I would welcome a motion or further discussion.

KAREN MILLER-KUWANA: And, Governor Douglas, if I can just read the operable language, it's one sentence, but –

GOVERNOR DOUGLAS: Okay.

KAREN MILLER-KUWANA: We are, as Governor Douglas said, there's a Resolution 17 to amend the Finance Charter. So now therefore be it resolved that the Finance Committee approve and recommend that the board adopt the revised and amended FirstNet Finance Committee Charter as presented to the Board by the Finance Committee, a copy of which will be attached here too as Exhibit A.

GOVERNOR DOUGLAS: Okay. This is just the Committee action, though, today.

KAREN MILLER-KUWANA: Yes, so simply the Committee needs to vote, so if I could have a motion from the Committee.

GOVERNOR DOUGLAS: Team?

SUE SWENSON: I move.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEKAER: Second.

GOVERNOR DOUGLAS: Further discussion? All in favor say aye.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

GOVERNOR DOUGLAS: Opposed, no. The ayes have it and we have adopted the resolution that amends our Charter and makes it consistent with the other resolution that we adopted in August. Thank you.

Just a brief update on what the Finances Committee has been up to over the last year, although we've just addressed some of it. We, along with the other committees, made some other charter amendments earlier in the fiscal year just to bring our document in conformity with the new reality of our structure as an organization and to make it consistent with the charters of the other committees as well.

We spent some time during the last year, as our Bylaws require, reviewing the draft RFP and working with our Management Team to see that it was released on a timely basis and in a way that was consistent with the principles that we discussed as a Board.

We reviewed the lease that I referred to already in Boulder and recommended its approval to the Board.

We had several briefings and ultimately a meeting to recommend the budget for the new year. An $85 million dollar operating budget for FirstNet, and of course the $6-1/2 billion that will be available for the award. I'm sensitive to how someone might look at the progress of our budgets over time and see this huge spike for fiscal 2017, but obviously this is the year of our substantial award, so that's why it's greater.

In fact, our operating budget has declined, so we're being as fiscally prudent as we can be.

I think those are the highlights. I've been delighted to have the chance to work with Kim, our CFO. She has enhanced the Team in her office. She's been working with our friends at the Department of Commerce to make some of our procedures more expeditious. There's a curious process called apportionment of funds that even a long-time government guy at the state level has never heard of, but she's made that work a lot more smoothly than perhaps had been the case in the past. So, Kim, I want to thank you for the great work you've been doing, and I'll turn it over to you to give some more highlights of your work.

KIM FARINGTON: Thank you, Chairman Douglas.

Good morning, everyone. I want to not only thank you for your support, but I really appreciate everything you do to make everything happen for us. And some of those things that have happened for us that may not be of notice to you that are happening behind the scenes, I just wanted to point out a few. And these are really, really important to FirstNet and us gaining our financial independence.

First and foremost, we received a clean or unmodified audit opinion for Fiscal Year 15. We also are talking about streamlining efforts, and as Mike has brought up in the past, being able to pivot as we move forward. We actually have transitioned our Accounts Payable function to FirstNet. And this is important because this means that we have the policies and procedures in place to do our own Accounts Payable internally, which really reduces the bureaucracy that's typical in control of procedures but really has streamlined the process and has made the Accounts Payable function as streamlined, and effective, and efficient as possible. So huge step towards, again, our financial independence.

We also have been performing financial modeling throughout the year. And we've also worked on creating a formal Investment Review Board framework, and we will share that with you at a future date, but just wanted to point out that that's something very important to FirstNet that we accomplished this fiscal year.

On the Policy and Internal Controls side, we actually have established the first ever FirstNet Financial Management Regulation. And this is important because this sets the policies for all financial transactions that will occur within FirstNet. So we have policies in place.

We've also completed our internal control evaluation. And what's important about this is that we were able to actually certify for the first year ever that we actually have a Letter of Assurance on the effectiveness of our financial controls, our compliance, and our reporting. So this is documented that we have controls in place.

Lastly, we are also operationalizing, or have operationalized, our enterprise-wide managerial cost accounting environment. We've been very anxious to get this going, and it is operational and we are moving out.

From the budget perspective, let's talk numbers. If I can get this to work.

As you can see on this slide, we actually have numbers for you related to Fiscal Year 2016 in review. And you can see our cumulative approach by month throughout last fiscal year. Our total obligations budget was $126 million. Of that we spent or obligated $104 million. And this provides us with an 82% utilization rate.

On the expense side, we actually had an expense budget of around $92 million. We utilized $71 million of that expense budget, which actually calculates to about 77% utilization.

Now you may ask why the deltas. Well, we actually have, I think, good news stories for those deltas. With regard to the obligations variance, we actually were able to not utilize those obligations in plan for good reasons. And I want to give kudos to Pete Tomzak (sp) and Warren Suthard (sp) and the Grants Team because 33% of that – or I'm sorry, 60% of that variance is due to the grants, and that's because Pete and Team, Warren, actually worked those estimates that we originally received for the grants obligations, questioned them, and was actually able to bring those numbers down by 33% compared to what we originally estimated.

The other part of that delta is due to contracts that we did not let in FY16 Fourth Quarter. And we consciously did that because, again, going back to that pivoting aspect, or guiding principle, we actually found that when it was time to let those contracts, our scope had changed. So rather than award contracts with the not-precise scope, we are pivoting, adjusting those scopes on those contracts, and we'll be awarding those later in Fiscal Year 17.

With regard to the expenses, we actually have the $20 million delta for expenses. And those are predominantly due to those contracts that we did not award that we were expecting expenses to hit in Fourth Quarter. And also the grants did not expense as originally planned in the Fourth Quarter of FY16, and that's a natural approach to grants. So we will expect to see expenses hitting more come January timeframe on the grants. But the good news is the period of performance remains the same for those grants and the expensing of those grants.

The other good news story is that, of course, as we mentioned last fiscal year, those expenses that did not hit in FY16 will carry over to FY17 and future years.

So my next slide was just an overview of the Finance Committee Resolution, but Governor Douglas did –

JAMES DOUGLAS: Disappeared on you.

KIM FARINGTON: a fabulous job of taking care of that, so, yes. If there are no questions, I will turn it over to James Mitchell.

JAMES DOUGLAS: Well, let me ask if there are any questions of Kim before we move on. Jeff?

JEFF JOHNSON: I've got a question. Kim, how are we doing on our administrative cap that's statutorily provided?

KIM FARINGTON: We are actually doing wonderful. We're staying under that cap. Even though we're about – more than half way through the life of that cap, we're still around 40% usage. So doing very well.

JEFF JOHNSON: So the trend line is positive, and as long as we're planning to trend off, right, we're going to be fine?

KIM FARINGTON: Yes.

JEFF JOHNSON: Thank you.

SUE SWENSON: Inaudible.

JAMES DOUGLAS: Go ahead.

SUE SWENSON: First of all, Kim, nice work in terms of, I think, just, again, operationalizing and creating the capability, the independence, to do all this work ourselves. I mean, you've done a tremendous job of getting all those elements in place. I particularly like the investment portfolio because, obviously, that's a part of moving into an operational mode and the resources that we'll have in making the right investments, so I think that's really important.

I would also like to mention the – I would call it the frugality of how the organization has operated. This is a principle that we adopted early on. You know, it wasn't, gosh, we have all this money, you know, let's just go crazy. We've been very disciplined, and I would just have to say I think the Finance Team and the rest of the organization has suffered all of the questions from the Finance Committee going back to Governor Douglas's predecessor, Mr. Bryan, and myself, and we ask a lot of questions. But I think it just creates the right kind of philosophy, the right kind of culture that we want to create because whoever we partner with is going to have that same kind of expectation. So I think the organization is really ready to operate in a, you know, kind of a real-world environment.

And the last comment I'll make is a couple of years ago I met with Secretary Pritzger, and it was about the strategic roadmap that we put together a couple of years ago. And during the meeting she said well what you do you think we're going to have to spend to get to an award. And fortunately, I don't know why I did it, but the night before I happened to be reviewing the financials, and, I don't know, it just stuck in my head, took a couple of minutes, and I put a number out there that I was pretty confident in. And I'm happy to say that we're actually coming in under that number. So I just want to thank the team for your discipline around this because I think it's something that's important for, you know, I think that it's just part of the culture we've created. So I want to thank all the people who have been part of FirstNet since the inception, and Mike for your continued diligence around this, and Ken, your work on this because I think it just puts us in a perfect place for execution. So thanks from me in particular.

KIM FARINGTON: Thank you.

JAMES DOUGLAS: Well put. Suzanne?

SUZANNE SPAULDING: I want to add my congratulations and thanks for all that you and your team have accomplished. It may seem very basic to folks who – on the outside – to have those internal controls in place to get that clean audit, etc., but those are really significant accomplishments that are not mirrored

across the Board, across the federal government by any means, and so I'm very impressed and I think it's really terrific.

And I hear you with regard to the good news or silver lining behind the delta in the projected obligations and expenses and actuals. But that is another, I think, indication of a maturing organization is when you close that delta, is when you are able to really be able to plan in advance and anticipate so that your expenditures and obligations come in more or less closer to where what you predicted.

And is that something that you anticipate? Do you agree that that's a goal that FirstNet should be striving for?

KIM FARINGTON: Yes, I completely agree with you. In fact, my personal target when we stabilize would be definitely be within two to five percent of our actual budget. I think this year is an anomaly. I expect next year will also be anomaly, just because as we're pivoting there are so many things we don't know, and we don't know what we don't know yet. So it will come in time, but I think the decisions that we're making, with regard to the contracts, for example, and the estimates. So many things we don't know but we're making good conscious decisions, should we invest and spend money on those items or should we consciously hold off and adjust accordingly.

The effectiveness, I think, of the contracts we're going to award in the future will really gear us more towards where we are headed versus where we thought we were headed a year ago.

Thank you for your points.

JAMES DOUGLAS: Mike.

MIKE POTH; Yeah. One of the big things that actually happens that we can guarantee you we are going to close the gap is that just about six weeks ago the – David Dasher and his team received the Warren Authority for FirstNet to do our own contracts. Because what has been in the past practice, and I've been beating up all the leaders, is when, say, Jeff Bratcher needed a contract, he would have to carve his money off, and it would be sent to another agency to do the procurement. Well, what would show up on our books is the appropriation would hit, and then sometimes a six, nine-month lag before expenses. Now that the procurement ability is completely contained within FirstNet, that gap in the forecast should narrow. So the appropriation and contract award and expenses starting to hit should be – will be – significantly tighter.

So that's kind of the last mile of what we needed to do to be able to successfully work and administer the big contract. Because all the other contracts that we have to procure on a year-to-year basis to be able to provide the support. So we're expecting a significant result.

Last year, as Kim mentioned, due to the great work with the Relo Team on the network, or on the spectrum relo, there was cost savings that got realized that ultimately get rolled back into the budget.

And right now, two months into the year, although it's early, two-and-a-half, Kim doesn't ever like me to say definitive numbers unless they're audited and all that, but we're about $2 million under burn right now, so we're still trending very positively.

KIM FARINGTON: One other thing just to note with regard to the contracts that we were awarding through our shared service provider, we are actually going to be saving, or not having to pay, five percent of all contracts that are awarded by them, so that's another good news story as to why we anticipate saving more money than we had anticipated originally.

JAMES DOUGLAS: We are an independent authority, and it's great to be enjoying more independence. So congratulations on that.

ED HOROWITZ ???(1:29:00): Actually, Jim, that was an interesting comment you made because what I think it all goes to show, and really underscores in combination with the procurement process, the establishment of the Technical Team and its operations, the Financial Team, the Outreach Team, that the organization really is in a mode to be a self-sustaining public-private partnership with whomever is selected, whenever that sorts itself out. And that the community who we are responsible to serve will know that we have our act together, right. And so it's very comforting, actually, Kim.

And also I'd like to add my complement on the comment-free audit for 15, and I know that's going to happen for 16.

KIM FARINGTON: Thank you.

ED HOROWITZ???1:29:30 And thank you for all your leadership.

KIM FARINGTON: Thank you. I appreciate it.

SUE SWENSON: Jim, just one comment. You know, we have been talking about costs and budget, and we're going to be moving in to a world where we're going to have customers, and we're going to have recurring revenue, and so we'll actually have a real P&L instead of just a cost budget. So, you know, that really changes the mindset around the profitability of how you actually deliver a service. So I think, you know, I think we're in a good place to actually move to the next phase of, really, as you said, running like a, you know, like a real business. So I'm really pleased about where we are. But we're moving to a P&L, Jim.

JAMES MITCHELL: That's great. We are maturing, as several of you have said, as an organization, and I think we see that with the professionalism of our Management Team. I neglected to mention one other provision in the Resolution we adopted in August was to give Mike or his designee authority to transfer among budget items up to ten percent of the total operating budget as the need arises.

So more flexibility, more like, as you say, a – yeah, right. I think we're on the right track.

Any other questions for Kim on her report?

Well, thanks so much, Kim, and we'll hear from you again tomorrow.

Madam Chairman.

SUE SWENSON: I think I'm going to turn it over to you, Mike, to introduce the next topic. This is a new area, and I think we have done quite a bit of work, so

MIKE POTH: Great. So if everyone recalls, at the last Board meeting, I announced that Steve Fletcher had taken over the Network Program Office, and that has several components, not just the big contract, but also NIPA, spectrum relocation. Steve will be our point person and will work with our federal partners, the FCC and NTIA as needed.

But today we wanted to also introduce, and it's just great luck and coincidence on our part, because part of the thing that we have done as we've changed the organization to operational readiness is we've started scanning our current staff and terrain. So most of you have known James Mitchell for the last 25 years as the guy that has been working on this RFP. Well that work is now coming to a close, and we've started to make decisions, TJ, and Steve and I, as to who is going to be that point person that can start now herding the cats on the actual program. And so James is taking off his Evaluation and Proposal hat when it's the appropriate time, but he also will be working with Steve to lead the efforts. And we wanted to just spend a couple minutes today and have James kind of walk you through some of the operational components that are already in place, ready for the contract signing. And then TJ tomorrow will talk to the full Board about the whole organization and how that all relates to our operational readiness.

But James?

JAMES MITCHELL: All right. Thanks, Mike. And thank you everybody for having me today. Usually it's in a closed room with food and water, maybe, but yeah, it's nice to be out in the open to talk about where we are today on the NPO.

I'm going to spend some time today talking about our high-level mission. Really what I want to focus on is the operational processes we have in place today. Really it's been an interesting year from the RFP release through evaluation to really standing up the NPO, sort of trying to predict things down the line as they happen.

And it really starts with building out from a mission. And our mission really is going to enable this organization and our partner to deliver the network that public safety deserves. It's a follow-on from the natural flow from consultation to the RFP to having our subject matter experts in the room evaluating proposals and then going to an eventual award. Really operationalizing this contract is where everybody is right now. That's sort of mentally where we are.

You know, Sue, you mentioned enough planning to choke a horse. I've got a stable back at FirstNet. So we're all very ready, and we're very excited about it.

As I said, it sort of started, the NPO, in earnest started when the RFP was released, and when we went through the evaluation process. And the model of that sort of – I'll use the word "agile" from a colloquial place, but really flexing to the day-to-day demands of our internal needs, from CCO and CTO, then user advocacy, and we were also the PMO at one point, but now, as we sort of mature into this NPO, really carrying that relationship forward. And it's not just hinged on personalities. We've created a concert of operations across the three organizations where we've envisioned task teams based off the task order structure in the RFP that will see owners of issues. You know, I think there are a couple throats to choke in FirstNet, but when it comes to the NPO, really it's going to be making sure that those task orders are delivered on time and not just to put the screws to the partner. We need to make sure that we're doing the job as well and necessary that we're never slowing the partner down. That we're always moving as fast or faster than the speed of business to ensure that the delivery is successful.

So really in the spirit of partnership that's what we're trying to do, both internally and eventually externally with our partner.

I've got a high level view of what the organization sort of looks like right now, but if you want to boil it down, it's two houses. There's a Program Business Management side, which is your more typical PMO functions, program support, so all your schedule and risk is going to be housed there, the monitoring aspect of it.

And there's an execution side to the house, which is really when we go to award, you know, day zero, day one, we are sprinting towards the next phase, which we all know is the State Plan delivery. It's going to be a huge effort, and we're here to support CCO. And you'll see that pendulum shift where those task orders are being let, who has the ball that week, day, minute. We're ready to sort of flex to that.

What I do want to focus on is that when we've gone to hire folks out of the PMO into the NPO, and we did a lot of hiring this summer to sort of stand up a lean, quick responsive organization with domain knowledge, not just in telecom, but also public safety, emergency management. And then obviously we need to be able to administer the acquisition itself. So we got program folks from both the private sector and government that come in and sort of monitor essentially quality assurance, deliverable management, making sure that everything is sort of data driven and it's not just, you know, putting your finger in the wind and seeing which way it's going. You are making quantitative and qualitative decisions based off the comprehensive operating picture in front of you.

And so I think we've got a really strong team right now. We're adding a couple folks on the Execution side, obviously as we ramp up into 17. But really the reason we can be so lean is because we can go to Jeff and Rich's teams and the staff really do have a very good working relationship where they know who to go to when they need a response or they need to move on to the next thing. Network Policies is a great example of where everybody was sort of in, sort of all hands-on deck, making sure that's happening. And you see a lot of that sort of getting stood up, moving forward.

TJ will point to the fact that we are already doing work as the NPO and we have been. We've had a couple of announcements, but I think that the big first thing out the gate was the RFP and the evaluation. That's when sort of the light bulb went on and said it's not going to just be a PMO, it's going to have to be, you know, these three offices coming together to manage this thing. And so I used the RFP as the starting point because it is the big success of January for us, or this year, in January, for us. And then following on with the actual evaluation.

But other things ancillary to evaluation were happening. We were supporting the planning processes for the CFO to establish a performance measurement process, not just for the partner or whoever we're contracting with. It's for us, too. So that program health check on the organization, make sure that we're doing what we said we were going to do. This is part of our culture, right, so we've got those processes put in place.

We're also working on the transition to a post-award operationalization of FirstNet, and really it's sort of making sure we don't have any false starts. We're just ready to go when it actually happens. And I think, frankly, that we're there, and now we're just sort of – we're running use cases and we're trying to figure out sort of exercise some of the issues that still exist that we haven't been able to have those conversations yet with a partner. And that's really what we're looking forward to- working those issues out in the room.

And then finally we have this Spectrum Relocation Grant Program which Kim alluded to earlier that we've actually saved some money on this. I'm going to give a little bit of a deeper talk on that when we close here today, but we are on target, on schedule, and it's moving along well.

I'll pause for any questions so far.

SUE SWENSON: So this is, I mean, a new structure for the organization. What do you think is going to be the biggest challenge with the NPO and execution? Because, I mean, we are moving into a whole new different phase.

JAMES MITCHELL: Right. And so I'm glad Dave Dasher is sitting next to me because I think the biggest challenge is going to be culturally communicating to folks who may have traditionally been involved in government acquisition, to let them know that we're not just going to put the screws to a contractor. And we're not to issue cure notices. And we're not going to, you know, we're going to be smart about it. We're going to be mature in our approaches, but we're really trying to flip the model of how acquisition can work in this case. And I think it can work better for us the more streamlined we are, the more appreciative we are of the other side of the table, which is why we've gone to great lengths to bring people in from the private sector and from public safety who understand not just the line item in the contract, but the full picture. Right?

The challenge is really going to be making sure that people understand that relationship, that the partnership is a partnership. And the contract exists, yes, as a tool, yes, as a plan. But that's it. Everything else is going to be taking those conversations in the hall that we are definitely going to have with the partner, and formalizing, informalizing, whatever we want to do, and build sort of the bones around that.

SUE SWENSON: Yeah, it seems to me that one of the things that will help is – and I think one of the things that has been helpful to us, I mean Suzanne's comment is, you know, people still continue to say 'Why are you involved in something like this?' I mean this is crazy that you would spend your time doing

this. And I think it's because it's the mission. And I think that will help when you come to a roadblock. It's like- let's remember who we're serving. And it's not about us.

JAMES MITCHELL: Right.

SUE SWENSON: It's not about the contract or anything like that. Let's do what's right here so that we can do what people have been waiting for for over 15 years. And I think that will probably be something that will help us unblock, you know, when we run into issues. Because we will.

JAMES MITCHELL: Right. That's right. And maintaining that sense of urgency – and it's not false, right? And keeping it real for everybody so they see the impact of their work. And we're very close to seeing that impact. And I think that's really kind of the tease for my team is that we're just almost there and we're ready to go. But we're definitely looking forward to that. And keeping that culture moving is going to be incredibly important.

TJ KENNEDY: Two points just to add on to that. I mean one of the things that I think you're hearing in James's voice, and I see it every day with the team, with the NPO, with CTO, with CCO, is they're the horses that are kicking to get out of the stable. And because they are operational and they are ready to make this happen. And that's a great thing.

And I think what's important is they're doing it with our core values in mind, and they're doing it with public safety at every element of that. And what you just mentioned, and what James said at the beginning, he used the word "enablement." And that word "enablement" cannot be understated. You know, it's not about enforcement for enforcement's sake. It's about enabling public safety to get the network that they need, and doing all the things that is going to make that successful. And that comes from a sense of mission, and it comes from having the right technical personnel, the right telecom personnel, the right public safety personnel, all working in a very lean fashion. There's no extra people sitting around. It's about making sure that they're ready to go make that happen.

And communication is very open. Our default is very open internally. Our default is open externally. And that information is being shared so people can work quickly. And I think that's really important.

JEFFREY JOHNSON: Two thoughts, Madam Chair. First, I want everyone to know the Comms Team has not approved any of the kicking horses, choking horses, comment. None of that has been vetted through our unit.

SUE SWENSON; You know we're just being spontaneous.

JEFFREY JOHNSON: I think also – my congratulations. I mean, I guess I can relate to this, I'm sure Kevin can. There is – if you spend your career in Fire and EMS, you spend a lot of time preparing for when the bell rings and the door rolls up. And some people may see that as down time I think. The insight there is that the amount of work that goes into getting ready for and being able to pull that cord and execute with your partner, it's not to be underestimated. It's culture building, which will perpetuate long beyond any of us as individuals. It's relationship building, which will last longer than any of us as individuals. And it's really critical work to start this relationship off right. My hat's off to you. I think you guys have really done an awesome job, and I look forward to watching the door roll up.

JAMES MITCHELL: Thank you.

So actually, I want to talk about that door rolling up because we've got a slice of our schedule here today. You know, if you've been around FirstNet long enough, there's always a timeline. In my presentation, there's going to be a timeline in Rich's presentation. There's always a timeline. What we've done here is we've boiled down, or at least tried to boil down, the first 100 days to a very high level of what we can expect in a partnership post-award. And everything is based off of what we've said we would expect in the RFP.

And so for consistency's sake, post-award, that's the big thing you get out of the way. You don't rest on your laurels. The first thing you're going to do is a kickoff meeting to talk about the deluge of things that are going to happen now, right? Post-award is going to be, you know, we envision a one to two-week kickoff I think because of the magnitude of this work and because of what's expected moving forward with the partner from a national perspective.

State Plans being the first major issue we're going to have to deal with and everything that flows into that. And if you've seen the State Plan template, if you've noticed on the wire diagram that Brian showed earlier, these are things that are just going to make their way into a conversation. They're going to be formalized, documented, and we're going to make sure that we all agree, contract aside, that this is how we're going to move forward. And I think that's probably the most exciting thing. And we talk about what we don't know, and I think – I think we actually do know more than we let on. We know quite a bit, and in our offices we like to talk about the things we know about and then plan for those things. And then if the unknown happens, flex to it and work for it. But always be prepared in that first 100 days.

In between each of these deliverables, I don't want anyone to get any wrong idea here, it's not just a paper report being delivered, right? There is work that is happening, and to use the word "enabling" again, we're going to put people together. We're going to put experts from our side with experts on their side. Those relationships haven't been realized yet because of the acquisition process, but we know folks exist out there that want to talk to us about the things we're working right now. And it's going to get to these deliverables.

It's going to be one of those weird situations where yes, there are things being delivered to FirstNet. But every step of the way we will be working with the partner to ensure the deliverable is what we would expect it to be, and that it can tell us what we need it to tell us.

I don't want useless reports. I don't want just a monthly status report that says 'Hey, everything's great.' That's not what we're looking for. We're 24/7 comprehensive input from the partner on what's happening when, and how can we, CTO, CCO, and NPO, work together to either solve the issue or anticipate the next one. And I think the first 100 days is going to be all about that.

SUE SWENSON: So, James, on the 100 days, I mean this is done independent of the partner. This is our view of the first 100 days.

JAMES MITCHELL: Yes.

SUE SWENSON: Obviously the first thing is going to be, 'This is what we see. What do you see?' And there would likely, I would think, be modifications to this based on their input.

JAMES MITCHELL: Absolutely.

SUE SWENSON: I would think.

JAMES MITCHELL: You want to see 100 turn into 50 maybe, right?

SUE SWENSON: Yeah, that's what I was hoping. I was hoping you were going to say that. Okay.

JAMES MITCHELL: Yeah, absolutely.

TJ KENNEDY: And to that point I think one of the things is depending upon when the partner is chosen, who that happens to be, and their ability to speed the deployment and to be prepared to deliver things quicker is certainly going to be anticipated. And that's part of that initial kickoff and consensus building that happens between any good teams in a partnership. And so we would expect that that would happen very quickly and that we would be able to make adjustments. What we want to make sure is that there is no secret for what has to be ready to be done in a very short period of time.

And even with this initial draft you can see it's an aggressive schedule, and we hope it gets even more aggressive.

JASON KARP: And I just want to add one thing. You know, we talk a lot about the partnership, and I think it's really important, you know, that we emphasize, you know, that this is different from I think a traditional acquisition in a lot of ways. But at the same token, at the end of the day, in all of this, there will be a contract in place. And there are going to be responsibilities on both sides, and enforcement, and the need to ensure that both sides are living up to their commitments and responsibilities. But it's also going to be done in a way that's going to be collaborative, and there are going to be, you know, things that are going to have to be written together throughout the process, and other things that are going to be very clear and enforceable. And as long as there is that clarity of communication, as we all know, and we can optimize efficiencies from the two parties, you know, I think that's going to be critical.

But it is important to remember, you know, we are entering into an arrangement where both sides are going to be committed and moving forward. And of course you've just got to leave it to the lawyer to go back to the rules, right? So.

SUE SWENSON: We would have been so disappointed had you not made a comment about that.

JAMES MITCHELL: Thanks, Jason. So I want to talk a little bit – I'm sorry.

KEVIN MCGINNIS: This is probably just a minor aside, but it showed up on your slide, and it's something that I've noticed of late, and that is as we talk about who's involved in the process, you talked about public safety, public safety, public safety. That's what we're all about. Telecommunications obviously because that's also what we're all about. But I've noticed of late a tacking on of emergency management. Not a problem in and of itself. Emergency management has a role in limited applications. And it's going to be involved in FirstNet somehow.

But we have a history in public safety where when we went from the civil defense mushroom cloud mentality of that kind of stuff to emergency management, emergency management did a funny thing where it evolved, and I think Harlin would agree with me on this, and others who observed this. We went through a period where emergency management decided that it was going to be the manager of public safety, day in and day out. And it's not. It's involved in helping us organize ourselves for a very small percentage of happenings.

And so I just want to make sure that, you know, it should be there, it should be in our consideration, but we just need to be careful that it doesn't become the major thing.

JAMES MITCHELL: No, thank you, Kevin. I meant it in the most literal sense possible, but I've got focus myself, even working in emergency management previously, so we throw the words around, so I understand your meaning and I take that to heart and I appreciate it.

So if I can talk a little bit about how we're going to go about the process of – sorry, I can't – there we go – actually acceptance of these deliverables, which may seem pretty vanilla, and it's going to get even more boring on the next slide so I don't want to disappoint anybody here. But what I want to do is use this as an example of an artifact of the relationship between CCO, CTO, and NPO. We know something has to happen post-partnership, but we like to put these things on paper to ensure that it happens and that the formal structure is there to enable the informal relationships that are going to happen around it.

If you can imagine FirstNet trying to take on the amount of information that we've asked for, it's a fire hose, and it's going to be rapid, and we've asked for a lot. I think someone compared it to just receiving a ton of boxes that aren't labeled, full of information that you've just got to go figure out – find out what it is, what's the story that's being told here. And the process is going to help us manage the intake.

But the people are going to be required to have that awareness and that understanding of the kind of information they're looking at. And at every turn on this chart, those folks are inserted so that we do know what we're getting, and we know how to toss to it, and we know how to measure it, and it's not just, you know, some folks get worried about receiving too much information and it becomes a little cloudy as to what the outcomes are, but we've built a series of processes to get the right people on from, you know, from the very nuanced stuff that's going to come through from Jeff's team, from the technical side, to the more politically-charged stuff that we might see coming to CCO, all the way down to my boring program management requirements.

So there's sort of an intersect and a nexus there that we need to consider, and that's really what this process is going to be about, is getting to that point and then driving the outcomes.

And then on the next page we actually have our QASP process, which is – it's your favorite acronym, Sue. I know every time we bring it up. We have to use this term QASP, but it's Quality Assurance, right? And what it stands for is Quality Assurance Surveillance Program. People hear QASP, and they think it's a report. And there may be a series of reports all the way down to some very basic stuff, depending on the size and complexity of the contract.

We're talking about an actual program where we will stand up our ability to say this is happening how we expected it to happen. We are pleased with the performance from our side and from the partner's side. And then the events where quality assurance becomes an issue, we have a remedy for it that goes to the spirit of the partnership, not the, you know, abrasive sort of all right, I'm stepping on someone's throat because they didn't deliver something on time. This is a two-way street, right?

SUE SWENSON: So give me a use case for this. I'm just trying to understand in the real world.

JAMES MITCHELL: Sure.

SUE SWENSON: I mean, it all sounds great, but give me a use case.

JAMES MITCHELL: So I think, you know, from the CTO perspective, you can look at something like readiness, right, or for availability, these are things that are going to be – yeah, these are things that we're going to be monitoring pretty closely. And these are things that the contract signs the partner up to. But, you know, I say two-way street because in any case, if we become a hindrance to our partner's ability to meet the level of quality that we've asked for, then shame on us, right? Because we've got significant skin in the game here. And so this process is to ensure that, you know, from both sides, that perspective is maintained.

SUE SWENSON: So who is the oversight on this? Obviously if you're NPO, and the partner is here, I mean is it another group, then, that does that from an independent perspective?

JAMES MITCHELL: Quality assurance is managed throughout the entire organization.

SUE SWENSON: Okay.

JAMES MITCHELL: But the task teams are going to be driven to ensure that the deliverables that they are responsible for, the issues that they own, meet the quality assurance standards set forth in the RFP and the contract.

SUE SWENSON: Okay.

JAMES MITCHELL: And they are doing that with the partner. We're not doing this in a vacuum where we pop up 30 days at the end of the month and say, 'Oh, you didn't do x, y and z?' This is real time. This is full access to the data on the partner's side and on our side to ensure that we have that readiness and awareness.

MICHAEL POTH: Some of the work product that we'll get out of that I think will be key for the Board as we do quarterly reviews. I mean this will generate the stoplight charts on the implementation and roll out. And if they're ahead of schedule or behind, and then what's the – you know, if they're behind schedule, what's the miracle to catch them up? Those types of things that you're used to seeing in the private sector. This is going to collect, you know, you think about 56 states and territories and all the moving parts, this will be kind of that roll up to give us, you know, a view at the management level, and then certainly at the Board level, of, you know, kind of the health check as the thing keeps progressing down to the weeds, but it can also be dialed up and rolled up.

It's just- we like fancy names.

JAMES MITCHELL: I'd love to rename it. I really would. But this is one of those things.

SUE SWENSON: Just one thing. I'm really glad to hear that you're documenting this because I think we experienced a sort of growing pain when there were ten of you, and then there were 50 of you, and then there were, you know, and you didn't have this kind of documentation in place. And clearly there will be some evolution and some bringing on of new people. So having this documented, I think, is really important so that people who are coming into the organization, onboarding, you know, can actually look at something and go, 'This is the way it's supposed to happen.'

JAMES MITCHELL: Right.

SUE SWENSON: So I really appreciate the fact that you're doing this in a disciplined way.

JAMES MITCHELL: Thank you. And it's not limited to these two things. Again, we're trying to put as much down as possible so that we're not spending the time putting the wheels on the truck, right, post-award, because I think we've all sort of been there. And I don't want to do that again, though we're ready to do it if we have to. Right.

I'm going to depart the standard NPO fare and move to the Spectrum Relocation update real quick if that's okay. If there are any other questions on NPO, generally speaking, I can take those now.

JAMES MITCHELL: On NPO… We inherited a grant program from our Chief Counsel's office. But just high level, we are saving money. We have saved money. We are on schedule, and we are well on our way to ensuring that incumbency isn't an issue post-award, which is really what this is about, right?

And we've co-located the Spectrum Relo program into the NPO because that's where RAN deployment is really going to be housed and where it's going to manifest with the Task Team so we can manage those issues internally without having to go across and really – we have a direct line to the grantees is what I'm saying, which is going to be really important. Pete Tomzak and Lauren Sout both now work in the NPO with expanded roles as well so that folks are sort of, you know… It's the Swiss Army knife model that we like to apply to folks in FirstNet that you've got to come prepared to handle anything. But you do have a day job, so.

I'm happy to take any questions on this, but I think that it's been a less than turbulent, actually, and pretty straightforward, streamlined process.

TJ Kennedy: One question. It looks like, based upon the chart, and I think it's important for everybody listening as well, that we should be on track for a partner having clear and available Spectrum across the country, across the 20 megahertz of spectrum, for FirstNet to make sure that they can move out very quickly?

JAMES MITCHELL: That's correct.

SUE SWENSON: You know, that's excellent because remember we started taking a look at this in the early, early days, and I think that early work has really paid off. So we appreciate the work of everybody making sure this happens because this is really key to the partner.

JAMES MITCHELL: Yes. It's – from the nascent days, I remember the first briefing on this, it was like, 'Ooh, how is this going to happen?' And it did. And you got two guys who really know grants and really moved this thing forward, and they did it. And I've worked grants as well, and it's surprising to see something happen so quickly. It's nice when a plan comes together, right, as they say.

Okay, that's all for the NPO, if there are any other questions?

SUE SWENSON: Any other comments or – yes, go ahead Harlin.

HARLIN MCEWEN: I just want to make a comment about what James just talked about with the Spectrum Relocation. Because as many of you know, the FCC juggled the spectrum in 2007, which created this problem. Which is something we liked, but – so I just want to say how happy I am because I've been engaged in trying to get that done, and I think FirstNet should be commended for finally finishing this job. So thank you.

JAMES MITCHELL: Thanks.

SUE SWENSON: Any other comments from Board members or management? I think we're at the bewitching hour, Mr. Poth, so if there's no other business before the Committees today, I look for a motion to adjourn.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So moved.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER #2: Second.

SUE SWENSON: Thank you. All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

SUE SWENSON: Those opposed. Meeting is adjourned. And just a point of comment for the Board members. We're going to take a 15 minute break, and then we're going into the Redwood Room, which is just across the hall for the closed session. And for those who are dialing in as Board members, your separate dial-in number is in your email. Obviously we can't announce it to those people on the call. And if you have any difficulty for any Board members calling in, please contact Karen and she will be happy to provide that to you.

But thanks for your participation today. This is another kind of exciting time for us. I mean, I just want to comment I really appreciate where we are operationally, and that we're ready for the next phase. So kudos to the entire team and all those people who are back home in Boulder and D.C. and wherever they are around the U.S. to get us to this point. I feel really good about where we are, so thank you.

Thanks, everybody.