

NWX-DOC-NTIA-FIRSTNET

Moderator: Ruben Vasquez
March 16, 2016

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by. Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Sue Swenson: Thank you very much. Welcome everybody. Either good morning or good afternoon or good evening depending on where you are calling in from.

I would like to thank each of you for joining today's joint meeting of the board and committee meeting which is the first time that we have had a virtual board meeting. That I think in light of the topics on the agenda we thought it was the most efficient and cost effective way to conduct the meeting.

And just to give everyone a lay of the land today we are having a single meeting that combines all of the committees and the board into one session.

We will call the roll for the board and accept the minutes from the December meeting and then we will do the same for each committee.

Following that we will receive reports according to our agenda from the FirstNet management team. We will have one resolution today to vote on a very minor administrative change in the bylaws and there will be no closed sessions today.

So I just wanted to kind of lay that out a little bit. And before proceeding with the actual board meeting I just thought it would be helpful to just make a few comments.

Obviously a lot has happened since our mid-December board meeting where the board unanimously approved the release of the FirstNet RFP. Quite a milestone in my view and I think many others.

As you all know I think the RFP was released on January 13th and the FirstNet team and the board has been very busy since that time focusing on our key initiatives that will move us closer to the realization of the Nationwide Public Safety Broadband Network.

You will hear today comments about roadmap. As I think you all know there was a preproposal conference last week. The FirstNet team has been very busy answering questions that are coming in on the RFP. And we continue to make progress organizationally in FirstNet.

(Michael) closed the meeting today on some comments on sector relocation and other things. But obviously lots of activity.

All very encouraging and I think you will find today's session I think quite informative to bring everybody up to speed on what is happening in the world of FirstNet and the Nationwide Public Safety Broadband Network.

So to kick off today's meetings and committees and board meetings I would like to ask Eli, our board secretary to read our conflicts, our standard conflicts notification. So Eli if you would be so kind to go through that process I would appreciate it.

Eli Veenendaal: Thank you madam chair. In advance of FirstNet's March 2016 committee and board meeting 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 today's meeting.

The members were also provided with a conflicts of interest assessment which was produced jointly by the Department of Commerce General Counsel and FirstNet's Office of Chief Counsel.

Providing these documents in advance of the board members allows them to identify potential conflicts and to recuse themselves from participation, if required.

We will, prior to this committee combine committee and 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 combined meeting today each member should consider his or her obligations with respect to the appropriate board role and committee role and for some of you that might be more than one.

Just to be clear we are only doing one conflicts notification for this joint meeting. With that said if any board members believe they must now recuse themselves please state so for the record.

Hearing none we are ready to proceed madam chair.

Sue Swenson: Great thank you Eli. Now if you would please call the roll for the board so we can accept the minutes and then each committee will convene and accept their

minutes. But if you could call the roll for the board meeting that would be great.

Eli Veenendaal: Sure. Sue Swenson?

Sue Swenson: Here.

Eli Veenendaal: Jeff Johnson?

Jeff Johnson: Here.

Eli Veenendaal: Barry Boniface?

Barry Boniface: Here.

Eli Veenendaal: Ed Horowitz?

Edward Horowitz: Here.

Eli Veenendaal: Chris Burbank?

Chris Burbank: Here.

Eli Veenendaal: Jim Douglas?

Governor James Douglas: Here.

Eli Veenendaal: Kevin McGinnis?

Kevin McGinnis: Here.

Eli Veenendaal: (Annise Parker)?

(Annise Parker): Here.

Eli Veenendaal: Neil Cox?

Neil Cox: Here.

Eli Veenendaal: Ed Reynolds? Richard Stanek? (Teri Takai)?

(Teri Takai): Here.

Eli Veenendaal: Dave Mader? Suzanne Spaulding? Ron Davis?

Ron Davis: Here.

Eli Veenendaal: Madam Chair we have a quorum for the board meeting and based on the attendees we also have a quorum for all of the committee meetings, all the committees.

Sue Swenson: Great I appreciate that Eli. We are going to take care now the minutes for the board and all of the committees. So if we could start with the board. I think each member of the board has before him or her the minutes of our last meeting in December.

And I would like to take this opportunity to ask if there are any additions or corrections to the minutes at this time? And if not, I would like to have a motion to accept.

(Teri Takai): So moved. This is (Teri).

Sue Swenson: Thank you and any further discussion? All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

Woman: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Sue Swenson: Opposed, nay or any abstentions or objections? I think the minutes are approved there so let's now move to the committees. Let's start with the governance and personnel committee.

Again I believe the governance and personnel committee has the minutes before them from the last meeting. And would see if there are any corrections or additions. And if not, if somebody would make a motion to approve.

Barry Boniface: So moved.

Sue Swenson: Thank you Barry.

(Teri Takai): Second.

Sue Swenson: Thank you (Teri). And any discussion? Okay all those in favor please signify by saying aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Sue Swenson: Opposed or abstentions? Minutes are approved Eli if you could put those in the record and I know you will make those available on our site post the meeting today.

Eli Veenendaal: I will.

Sue Swenson: Thank you. Barry I think you are up for technology.

Barry Boniface: Terrific well we will go through the same motions as Sue did on the governance committee with respect to technology. I guess I do have one suggested change before we go out for further changes.

And that is Eli in the sentence after we lay out the annual performance review achievements for 2015 it says, the committee chair conclude by saying it was a busy and productive year for the finance committee and ask other members for comment.

I am sure that I wanted to commend Jim Douglas on the achievements and productivity of his committee. I think that should read the technology committee. So if you would make that change I would appreciate that.

Does anyone else on the technology committee have any other changes or suggestions to the minutes?

Governor James Douglas: We tried to slip that compliment in actually.

Sue Swenson: Jim wrote the minutes.

Barry Boniface: Hearing no changes I would like to entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

Man: So moved.

Man: Second.

Barry Boniface: All in favor state so by saying aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Barry Boniface: Any opposed? The motion passes. With that Madam Chair I guess we turn it over to Jeff Johnson at the consultation committee.

Sue Swenson: That is correct.

Jeff Johnson: Thank you Barry and thank you Madam Chair. So of the other two committees have gone before us I think we will basically repeat that action. The committee has before them the minutes from the prior meeting. Do we have any corrections or additions to the minutes before us?

Hearing none, the chair entertains a motion to approve or amend the motion?
Or the minutes rather.

Woman: So moved.

Man: Second.

Jeff Johnson: We have a motion on the second. Is there discussion on the motion? Hearing none all those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Jeff Johnson: Opposed same sign? Any abstentions? Okay motion passes. Governor given the time and attention being brought to our nation's elected official. It seems only appropriate I turn the meeting over to you.

Governor James Douglas: I am not sure how to take that.

Sue Swenson: Yes go ahead.

Suzanne Spaulding: I just wanted to let you know that I am on now and did vote in that last vote. So for the purpose of the minutes.

Sue Swenson: Great Madam Secretary. Thank you for letting us know I appreciate it Suzanne.

Governor James Douglas: All I can think of in response to the Vice Chairman's comment is, "Beware the ides of March." Anyway I think the members of the finance committee know the drill by now. You have got the minutes. Any comments, additions, corrections?

If not, is there a motion to approve them?

Woman: So moved

Man: Sorry.

Governor James Douglas: Seconded?

Man: I will second.

Governor James Douglas: All in favor of approving the minutes say aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Governor James Douglas: Opposed no? Abstentions? Minutes of the finance committee are accepted and I know Eli you will make those available right after our meeting to anyone who wants to see them.

Eli Veenendaal: I will.

Sue Swenson: Madam Chair.

Sue Swenson: Great thank you Governor. I appreciate it. Well we are now to the meat of the meeting and first up we are going to have President TJ Kennedy bring us up to date on the strategic roadmap.

And I think all of you remember that I think it was – I remember vividly March of 2014 we were in New York City and we unveiled the first strategic roadmap which I think served us quite well both internally and externally on what to expect in – provided a roadmap for us to demonstrate our ability to achieve what we commit.

So TJ I think you have an update for the board and for the listening and attending audience? So the floor is yours.

TJ Kennedy: Thank you Madam Chair. As you mentioned about two years ago this week we brought forward the strategic roadmap. And one of the things that I think we really focused on was doing what we said what we were going to do.

And on this particular slide that is up now you can see over the past two years we have accomplished a lot. There have been many things we set out to do from the very beginning in this strategic roadmap.

With the public notices and comments, with the initial state consultations, really working to have that outreach to all public safety stakeholders across the country.

And our key stakeholders within states within the tribal community and making sure that we were being, you know, very responsive in preparing for our acquisition and the RFP.

We have taken that input that we received we put it into draft RFP documents. Received a lot of feedback from that. And worked all the way to the release of the RFP that occurred in January.

Very much following the roadmap that was set forth and making sure that we received a lot of input and had a lot of two way feedback. We are lucky enough here today to be sitting here with Chief Harlin McEwen who is just across the table from me.

Chief McEwen as you know has really done a terrific job of leading the Public Safety Advisory Committee and their 42 members to provide a lot of input into the RFP itself.

And key elements that they are working on today related to identity, credentialing and access management. The great work that has been done on the use cases that became a foundation of the RFP itself.

And key efforts with the early builders as well as our trouble working group and now they are actually working on a federal working group. So all these key elements have been part and parcel of the work we have done in both consultation and in creating the RFP.

And what I would like to do now, if there are no questions on the past, I will step into where we are going forward. Which is one of the key things we wanted to talk about today.

Sue Swenson: Good so just take a pause there. Any questions from the board on anything that has occurred on the history here?

Okay TJ why don't you take a look forward then?

TJ Kennedy: Sounds good. So looking forward we find ourselves here in March of 2016 and there is a lot on the roadmap going forward. We will continue to work

with our partners in the FCC and in NTIA. And we will work with them to make sure we are working through the review notices that they have.

And we are going to do that while we are continuing to work on our focus consultation. And as we do that it is really critical and important for us to have that interaction with the states and to have the four major components that are going to be part of our 2016 consultation.

And I am going to just talk through those kind of one at a time. The first off is the consultation cash teams. The consultation team has worked very closely with a single point of contacts to set up a number of meetings and key deep dive sessions that can happen with the consultation task teams.

We plan to work with them on governance meetings within their state and make sure that FirstNet is supporting those. And we are going to work very closely on setting up executive consultations with key decision makers in the state and make sure that key public safety and state and local decision makers all have an ability to ask questions of the FirstNet team.

We will be supporting their in-person SPOC meetings and we have our next nationwide SPOC meeting actually occurring here in April. And we currently have 48 of the 56 state territories that have already committed to attend.

And really looking forward to that session where we can have the states talk to each other as well as to FirstNet and make sure that we are answering their key questions.

We will also be bringing forward the Public Safety Advisory Committee feedback with the single points of contacts and vice versa. The Public Safety

Advisory Committee executive committee will be a part of that key spot meeting day.

I am going to pause there for a moment just to see if there are any questions.

Sue Swenson: No questions but I think on the Web cast we are still on Phases 1 and 2. So could somebody – there we go okay.

TJ Kennedy: So it appears on the Web cast that there is one slide that has popped out. So I am going to talk through the Phase 3 and then Phase 4 is what is up on the Web cast right now. I am not sure there is a slide issue but I will continue to walk through Phase 3 and then we will guide into Phase 4.

Sue Swenson: Okay.

TJ Kennedy: Also on Phase 3 we are going to work obviously a huge portion of this year to evaluate proposals. We know that proposals will be coming in at this point in May. And we look very forward to having the team focus on those proposals and the evaluation that needs to occur.

We want to make sure that just like we did our preproposal conference that we have answered questions that come out of that. We held a preproposal conference just last week.

We took probably 45 minutes to an hour worth of questions and answers at the end of that. And the team has worked diligently to respond to 400+ questions that were asked by potential proposers on the RFP itself.

This process is asking for capability statements that will come later on this month. And then driving towards that RFP proposal submission.

We will be working with a source selection advisory committee and really working this year on getting to that award later on this year and that is a huge part of what the team is working on.

In consultation with the RFP responses that we get the state plans team will work closely to make sure that they are working to prepare for state plans. Once we have an award in place their state plans can then be completed into a draft format and those draft state plans can be taken forward.

So the real focus for 2016 and the early part of 2017 is getting ourselves through an award and getting to draft state plans. Any questions there?

Sue Swenson: TJ I just have a question. You know on this roadmap, you know, the initial roadmap we did a lot of the work was really dependent on us. And it seems to me that now we are really dependent upon some other folks to complete work to make sure we can make forward progress. Could you just comment on that?

TJ Kennedy: Yes I can. And so there – our two main partners that we are going to be working very closely with over the next year, the FCC specifically on the orders and the role that they play for FirstNet in relation to opt out.

They have also been supporting our efforts on the Spectrum clearing. Both of those efforts are absolutely critical. Our Spectrum clearing funding order will be coming out today and that will be guiding us to be able to clear that Spectrum by mid of 2017.

And also on the NTIA side they play an important role when it comes to the opt out process as well as the grant guidance process that they would have for

FirstNet opt out plans. And those are very important pieces that we need to going forward.

Both of those agencies have federal registered notice and other key things that are on our strategic roadmap. And we are going to count on them to help us meet these important deadlines as we go forward.

Sue Swenson: Yes I am particularly concerned. I don't know if the rest of the board is. But I am particularly concerned about making sure that the states have clarity on the opt out process with the FCC is critical in.

And I remember from the hearing that you attended recently, the house hearing that there was quite a bit of discussion about that. So I don't know how the FCC is thinking about that but in responses at the hearing I remember them saying we will get it done before the governors have to make a decision.

I am hoping that it can be done well before that because I think it is important for the governors and their staffs to understand that prior to getting it right at the point of having to make a decision.

TJ Kennedy: No that is very important and two things on that. One we do believe the FCC is working very hard to get out the opt out notice and they have a very specific process that they will use for input over the next year.

And they have committed to getting those final opt out orders complete before we get to draft state plans being delivered to the states. And everything we have had in discussions both in the hearing and in other discussions has been very much in line with that.

Also at the upcoming SPOC meeting we are having I know the consultation team is very committed to talking through everything that we know now related to opt out.

And really work with the SPOC to make sure that this discussion is an ongoing discussion and they have the information that they will need coming forward and understand the timing and the roles of FirstNet, the FCC and NTIA.

Sue Swenson: Great. Any other questions or comments from the board on Phase 3? Okay why don't you take us to Phase 4?

TJ Kennedy: So on Phase 4 this is really important as we move forward. There are a lot of steps that will get us through to actually getting to a network deployment. And we are going to kind of walk through each of those at a high level and I will pause for some questions that come up.

Our current plan is post award and post the initial state plan interaction and discussions between the FirstNet board and what we are going to do is we want to be able to get that draft state plan in the hands of the state and the key public safety stakeholders to be able to discuss that.

And then finalize that state plan so that we can deliver 56 state plans to the 56 state and territorial governors and the mayor of the District of Columbia. And make sure that they have the information that they need to make that decision.

We know it is critical to have the discussions and input of the state and we want to make sure that it is critical that we are providing them the data they need to make good decisions.

Our current plan would be to deliver these plans electronically when it comes to the final state plan and have the ability for them to be delivered on the same day with follow up meetings occurring with the FirstNet team that as quickly as possible across the country.

There will be a lot of key folks travelling and sitting down and discussing the details of this with each and every state as they move forward. But very critical that we get these out and we give the same timeframe for folks to be able to weigh in.

FirstNet and its partner will then have to certainly discuss the details that are in the state plan both during the draft and the final state plan process.

So this is a lot of work that occurs post award. It is compressed due to the need to obviously move with urgency towards deploying a network. But at the same point a very important part of the process.

And so I want to pause there for any questions.

Sue Swenson: Any questions or comments from the board on what TJ just went over in terms of the timing and the – you know I guess my reaction is the magnitude of the work is a little overwhelming to me.

You know when I think about developing all this obviously whoever the winning bidder is obviously is going to play a big part in this. But it seems to me we are going to have all hands on deck to get this work done in the timeframe that you have laid out.

TJ Kennedy: Yes you are absolutely right. I mean everyone in the FirstNet organization leveraging the board, leveraging our partners and then working very closely

with the states. The states are going to have to really organize their key resources to also be at the table.

As you know, over the past year or so we went out and met with 55 states and territories and it is a huge logistical set of discussions that requires a lot of cooperation on both sides to get the right people in the right places. And make sure they have folks that can really weigh in and give good input. It is a lot of moving parts and it is very hard to do as you mentioned.

You know Governor Douglas maybe you can comment on this. I think you have actually attended some of the recent meetings where we have been talking I think more specifically to the governors and their staffs.

I believe you were recently at NGA. And I am just wondering if there is anything coming up substantively out of those discussions that causes us to rethink what we are doing or do you think we are on the right path?

I just would love your perspective or anybody else. Neil I can't remember if you have gone to any of those and Ed? So any board members who have experienced this I think it would be great to hear your comments about those interactions.

Governor James Douglas: This is Jim. I don't think anything came up at those meetings that leads me to think we are not on the right course. As I have suggested to the board a number of times with all due respect, FirstNet isn't the foremost thing on the minds of many governors when dealing with fiscal crises and natural disasters and things like that.

So although the latter should be of interest. So I think it is important to reinforce our message as we are doing periodically and the chiefs of staff with

whom you and I met Sue a year ago. With whom Jeff and I met this year are important key personnel with whom to keep in touch with.

And meetings with individual governors I thought the ones I attended were quite positive. They had some questions about what they had heard. What they thought about FirstNet. I think we laid a lot of their concerns. Answered a lot of their questions.

So I think it is just a matter of maximizing those opportunities which as we have said is a challenge. That does lead me to one question. Where on this roadmap will the summer NGA meetings fall? Will the governors like to have their draft plans at that point or not?

TJ Kennedy: No this upcoming summer meeting they will not. That won't occur until post award. But ironically, you know, next year post award the winter meeting will have the initial discussions that are starting to happen.

But the actual final plan would be close to the summer meeting in '17. So you would see that happening around July of 2017 timeframe.

Governor James Douglas: Right okay.

TJ Kennedy: One of the key things though and you mentioned this Governor today is these meetings are ongoing. We have been meeting with governors as they have either identified that they are ready to have a discussion or have some key questions.

And we have made ourselves available. We have reached out to all the SPOCs across the country and we have asked that – and told them that are available to have these discussions.

And looking at it now that this is an initial discussion so that they know what is happening over the next 18 months and understand the key importance of us getting through the award of the contract as well as through the draft state plan process and then into a final state plan.

And so this really requires, you know, an ongoing set of communications and based upon which governors will be in place next year.

You know it has really been a key focus to make sure that we are reaching out to all those that are ready and Governor Douglas and other board members have been very much supporting the management team on these discussions and we look forward to continuing that.

Jeff Johnson: Sue this is Jeff. I would echo what TJ and the Governor said. I had one realization while we are there. It has occurred to me at some level before but it became really salient in our meetings with the governors.

The single point of contact is very important to us and to the state. But that is not synonymous with single point of communication. And we are now entering a phase where I think we have to create parallel communication channels to the chiefs of staff in addition to the SPOC and to the governors.

And that was our primary mode or primary purpose for participating at NGA. Is it creates another pathway. And if we do those properly it will just reinforce and support and help the SPOCs do their job and create direct access for the chiefs of staff and the governors in terms of, you know, any questions they may have.

So it just became really clear to me that we have hit a place in our inbound freeway here of information where we have to start adding lanes to our freeway of communication and not just stick with where we are at.

So time to broaden out where we are talking and adjust our strategy accordingly.

Sue Swenson: That makes a lot of sense Chief. You know I think, you know, it is part of the evolution and I think you know obviously as you indicated the SPOCs are so critically important that the audience now has become broader.

I would also say that I think the audience differs by state. When we were speaking Governor Douglas with you early in the process I mean you – I think we assumed and you confirmed it that every state has kind of a different set of influencers. So I think you know having an understanding of who the audience is in every state is an important aspect as well. I think.

Governor James Douglas: Correct.

Sue Swenson: So I think that is important.

Governor James Douglas: I would agree 100% with that. The SPOC is the person that has to be very much educated on what the process is. But he or she may not be the decision maker. They may report to somebody else who will take it to the governor.

So we really have to know each individual state and who is really going to be the person that presents the plan to the governor.

Sue Swenson: Right. Hey TJ and maybe this is a question for you and (Mike). You know back to my comment about the enormity of the task. I think one of the roles of a board is to make sure an organization has the adequate and appropriate resources to do the work. And I guess the question to the management team is do we have that?

Mike Poth: Sue this is (Mike). Certainly at this point in time we feel very comfortable that our current staffing and our projections over the next three or four months will put us in a very good position for that.

Obviously one of the key factors and we have looked to our offers is what they submit to us in the bids and the completeness or wellness of these state plans.

Obviously those with more robust approaches and buy the 56 state territories makes the mutual work of us and our partner that much less.

If we find across the board that the framework for each of the states is not as robust as we need to be able to submit to the governors then the level of effort obviously could drive, you know, outside the resource boundaries that we have. But we do have contingencies in place for surge staffing and those types of things.

Sue Swenson: Okay and then one last question. Whenever I see something that involves a system and I am looking at the third little green bubble, little bubble head on here that says, synchronous delivery of 56 state plans. I am presuming that is a system and I sure hope that we have planning in our schedule to test the system before we try to use it.

Because experience in the last two weeks with systems that I have been asked to engage with have not worked very well. So I just I am sorry I had to ask the question.

TJ Kennnedey: It is a very fair question and I am looking right at Rich Reed here and he is nodding his head in the correct direction that there will be robust testing. And this actually leads to key point of the proposal today.

In our proposal or RFP we have asked for the proposers to really go and leverage the reading room. And to (Mike)'s comments, you know, we have put that data collection that we have received from the states into the reading room and we expect them to draft those state plans with as much information as they can to meet those needs and to be as robust in their hard work to do that.

Also they have been asked to propose, you know, the electronic format for delivering that and to be a part of those proposals. So we are really looking to very robust offers that include that.

Sue Swenson: And could you do me a favor? Could you make sure that we test that not just internally but with the end users. So I am sure there are some states and SPOCs who would be willing to – I mean obviously you are not going to have the actual content. But I am sure there are some SPOCs out there who would be willing to actually test the process in the system.

TJ Kennedy: Yes we will and also we plan to use a similar mechanism for the draft state plan. So we will be doing it before the draft, then the draft, then the final.

Sue Swenson: Okay good. Sorry I have to ask that but I have some horrible experiences in the last two weeks. Not with you guys. I won't even mention who I have had

the experience with. But it just caused me to be concerned and we can't afford to have that not work as you know okay.

TJ Kennedy: Understood.

Sue Swenson: Okay. So any other – did you want to add some more? Did you want to leave more room for questions for the board?

TJ Kennedy: I am going to add a little more to the second half of this slide and then we will open up again for questions.

Sue Swenson: Okay go ahead.

TJ Kennedy: So the governor's decision is the next piece of this. And what we want to do after the governor's decision is we want to make sure that we are publishing the updated network policies.

One of the things the team is doing right now with our technical team is preparing the early network policies. We will be working with our partner to make sure that the network policies also are being included in their key offerings as we go forward.

And then working with the states to consult on these network policies over the next year. And this is going to be a critical part of what we do going into the final state plans and the network deployment.

We don't believe that network policies are static. We do believe that there are some key foundational issues that will go into network policies but also that they will continue to be updated as we move forward.

You know this network is going to be around for a long time and it is going to continue to progress. So these network policies will have to be developed.

But I can tell you that Jeff Bratcher and his team have been working very closely with the user advocacy team to make sure that they are starting on key elements of the network policies and how important this will be to the network itself.

Sue Swenson: Okay TJ before you go on. What is an example of a network policy? I mean that sounds like a very broad topic? I don't know if Jeff can comment but what is an example?

Jeff Johnson: Well I mean there are a bunch of them but generally they are going to boil down to things like who uses the network in an area? When do you change priorities on the network? How is that accomplished? Et cetera, et cetera.

It seems like most, you know, if where we have been spending our time is on the design and the engineering of a network that would accommodate a lot of flexibility in the network.

Now we have to basically do network policies to describe how we are going to use such a powerful tool. That is how I would describe it. TJ I will defer to you.

TJ Kennedy: I think you did a good job. I also have Jeff Bratcher sitting right next to me. So Jeff do you want to...

Jeff Bratcher: Yes great job Jeff Johnson as well highlighting some of the things we are already working on as well as others that – as we have more discussion and

internal debate what is the goal and scope of some of these policies that we need to make sure are in place?

And also have those (strawmans) ready so once we do have an award of the RFP we are able to quickly populate the network policies because some of them will be dependent on who the partner is for the Nationwide Public Safety Broadband Network.

So we are doing all that legwork up front so that we are not scrambling after award to get all of that in place and ready to go and feed into the state plans and everything else where that will be needed.

Sue Swenson: Okay thank you. Go ahead TJ.

TJ Kennedy: So obviously post the governor decision and going through the network policies we will be moving into the initial deployments. It will be key that the opt in, opt out decisions occur in the timely manner as it has been laid out in the act.

We know that the opt out procedures which we have been talking about with states and we are starting to talk about with governors and key staff as they have come forward to talk through that.

You know there are key steps for the FCC and NTIA. We do know that these will take some time. So some of the initial deployments are likely to start with the opt in deployment and then we will move into the opt out deployments once they are through that process.

So, you know, we are going to move very quickly and with as much urgency as our winning partner can do to make sure that we get the work deployed as

fast as possible. Knowing that different parts of the country and key regional deployments and being able to deploy in multiple locations at one time is going to be expected.

We don't see this as a serial deployment. We see this as going to those states that have opted in and going to the opt out states as soon as that process is complete to make sure that we are deploying very quickly.

Sue Swenson: And TJ the one big caveat that is not here is this assumes that all goes really smoothly and we don't have people who are unhappy with the outcome. And so I think it is important to highlight the fact that, you know, there may be parts of this process that get halted by things beyond our control. Would that be fair to say?

TJ Kennedy: It is very fair to say and we know that there are a number of things that could be outside our control. The most likely kind of challenges that could come forward could be from a protest or something like that that would occur as part of the RPF process.

And you know those are things that we have certainly worked hard to try to mitigate but there are always options and opportunities for those things to occur.

Sue Swenson: Right. I just want to, you know, put that caveat in there because obviously we are at a point where, you know, some of things – and I know we are doing everything possible to mitigate that. But you know I just want to make sure whoever is looking at this doesn't say, well gosh you didn't meet your commitment.

I mean there are some things that we will try to manage as best we can but there will be things that might happen, you know, beyond what shows on this roadmap.

TJ Kennedy: Agreed. And we will continue to evaluate as we progress through this and anything that does arise we will immediately be discussing with you and others to make sure that we do the best we can to stay on track and stay on time and do what we say we are going to do.

Sue Swenson: Great I appreciate it. Let me just pause here. FirstNet board any other comments, observations, or questions for TJ or the rest of the management team on what has been laid out here on the roadmap?

Governor James Douglas: Just one thought. This is Jim. I know we talked earlier about an asynchronous delivery schedule. But I think this is certainly the right way to go. For one thing, the governors talk to each other and we don't want someone wondering why he or she didn't get it and someone else did. And perhaps more importantly there are a lot of situations where there is a lot of population on state lines where governors want to talk to their neighbors to make sure there is some consistency in the plan. So I think this is a good approach.

Sue Swenson: Thank you Governor.

So TJ does that wrap that up? Because if so we will move onto our CFO update or...

TJ Kennedy: It does wrap it up. We will go ahead and switch over to (Kim) who is right next to me here.

Sue Swenson: Great so (Kim) I think you are going to give us financial update at least in terms of the most recent information we have to share publicly.

Kim Farrington: Yes.

Sue Swenson: So the floor is yours.

Kim Farrington: That is correct. Good morning, afternoon and/or evening everyone. We are going to start today's financial update with a review of the first quarter for 2016 obligation and expense budgets.

Then I am going to focus on the annual financial statement audit as well as the internal control programs and conclude with an update on our strategic planning process.

So to begin focusing on the budget. For the first quarter we have just focusing on obligations right now. We are about a third under obligated in Quarter 1 compared to where we had anticipated being after Quarter 1.

And that was mainly due to a delay in the award of contracts. These are contracts that we had planned to award in October, November, December but not all of them, about a third were delayed and are awarded either in the second quarter or further on beyond Q1. So, basically total wide overall the work stream we have obligated 24.3 million of our obligations and that compared to our obligation budget for all work streams of 38.8 million. Any questions on the obligations budget? Okay.

Moving onto the next slide. We're focusing now on the expense budget for quarter 1 of FY16. The actual expenses are only 9% off our actual budget. This is actually great news and the difference is recognized by the green in the

grass is what our budgeted expenses were and the blue and red represent the expense actuals and the forecast. With 91% of our expense forecast utilized, this actually puts us in a very good place, especially compared to last fiscal year.

We have across all work streams expense 16.3 million of the anticipated 17.9 million so far this fiscal year as of December 31, 2016, and the thing to note about the 9% of variance that we have here is this is natural. Because we delayed some of our contracts obligating our contracts at the beginning of the fiscal year, it's only natural that we won't have expenses that are hitting in Q1 for those contracts that were not yet obligated. So this is again just a natural progression of our budget lifecycle.

Sue Swenson: The thing that - I'm sure you know I was going to ask this question but it's curious to me how the forecast can be so close to the actual, and I think there's probably a good reason for it but normally you have actuals that look different from a forecast and look different from budget and I was just curious how you could make your forecast be precisely what actuals are.

Kin Farrington: I would like to say that.

((Crosstalk))

Kim Farrington: That will be changed and you'll see a difference come the future quarters in FY16. Basically that is due to the development of the FY16 budget prior to the permanent staff coming onboard in the senior level. So what we did was revisited the FY16 budget right after the fiscal year began and we now have a better forecast of where we expect our expense and obligations to occur the rest of fiscal year. So, yes, this is an anomaly just because of the transition across the fiscal year for the same time.

Mike Poth: So what we did, Sue was also re-baselined - did a bottoms up view of the entire budget for FY16 and the timing of such was that by the time we completed that re-baseline, there was only about two more weeks left in the quarter so we knew exactly where we were going to land so the coincidental forecast was dead on to the actual because we only had about the visibility of two more weeks, but this brings up an important point that I want to make sure the board and I believe the finance committee is sensitized to is that we've instilled a lot of financial rigor into the organization so you will expect going forward, although we'll have variances, hopefully they will be minimal so that there is a high level of predictability because obviously one of the key components going forward for us, both operationally and for the growth of the network is that we're doing everything we can to be good stewards of the taxpayer's dollars and keep our operating costs at the barebones minimum to be a cost-effective organization, with any excess funds obviously coming in from the partner to maximize the reinvestment back into the network. It starts with our obligations and our expenses and our ability to forecast year to year.

Sue Swenson: Right. Right. No, I appreciate that. I just - like I said, when I saw this material in advance to the meeting I went, wow, I'm going to have to talk to you guys because frankly the forecasting that happens in my business is not this accurate. I might have to figure out what you guys are doing, but I guess when you look back, it's easy to forecast actuals.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Poth: ...with only two weeks left in a quarter you can usually get dead on.

Barry Boniface: Hey, (Kim), it's Barry. Can you (unintelligible) I probably should have asked this on the last leg. Can you give us a sense of some of these contract delays

and you know why they're delayed and will we see these get sort of caught back up in the second or third quarter?

Kim Farrington: Yes. We anticipate that we will have the catch-up in the second and third quarter. The reason predominantly for the delay is because twofold - 1. the urgency of all the contracts being initiated at the beginning of the year we fell into that overwhelming top of the spectrum - pun intended - when all of these contracts were being awarded so there was some delay just because of the bottlenecks. But at the same time, we first then actually recognized that we could identify and did identify an efficiency that we could utilize for our contracts and so we decided to switch over transition to that more efficient and effective process which caused a small delay in awarding of those contracts.

Sue Swenson: So what's the cycle time for a contract these days? I mean it sounds like we got to get started like six to nine months before we actually want to start something. Is that an appropriate way to think about it?

Kim Farrington: That is a reasonable timeline. Yes.

Mike Poth: But we have been taking measures to stress test the system and push it along through the various acquisition and procurement arms both within the first net and within some of our sister agencies that assist us on some of these, but some of the bigger contracts do get visited and revisited due to the complexity and we have multiple handshakes along the way that we're trying to shorten down with the advent of with (David Basher) coming onboard in our chief procurement office within the four walls of FirstNet we're expecting that some of those delays that were outside the control of FirstNet are going to be quickly eliminated since I can just walk across the hall and find my chief procurement officer but some of the delays on some of the larger efforts did

cause this. To Barry's other questions, because of the delay and we are now an award we won't necessarily be in a catch-up mode relative to expenses for those since we did have the delay so the benefit of those savings will have to be rolled over into FY17.

Barry Boniface: And (Mike) it looks like (Mike) and (Kim) it looks based on the prior chart that a lot of these are just consulting related contracts, some corporate services but mostly consulting related stuff. Is that right?

Kim Farrington: Mostly consulting related items as well as travel. We reduced our travel budget.

TJ Kennedy: The biggest one in there Barry was on consultation and there was a significant contract that instead of being awarded at the beginning of Q1 was awarded at the very end of Q1 is now in place and that is definitely supporting the consultation and outreach team.

Barry Boniface: Got it. Okay, thanks.

Kim Farrington: Actually, to go back to the last slide, in the consultation work stream you'll see we're only 23% of our obligations budget so that will validate what TJ's mentioning.

Sue Swenson: Okay.

Kim Farrington: Okay, any other questions on the budget? Okay, I'll move onto the update on the annual financial statement audit. This audit was for fiscal year 2015 and the great news is FirstNet received an unmodified or clean audit opinion on this FY15 financial statement audit. There are three types of audit opinions that can be given and we received the cleanest, the best one. What does this

mean? This really means that the auditors determine in their opinion that our financial statements and accompanying notes are presented fairly in all material respects to the financial position of FirstNet and that our financial statements are free from material misstatements. So that is good news like for FirstNet. Another highlight is that we did not receive any material weaknesses. And a material weakness is not a good thing. That's basically a reportable condition that results in more than a remote likelihood that a material misstatement could occur if one was detected it could impact the financial statements. So we have no issue with any material weaknesses.

At the same time we did receive a repeat significant deficiency on our financial statement audit. This was the same one from last fiscal year and this relates to our shared service providers IT and access controls. This is actually a derivative deficiency. It was noted on the Department of Commerce's financial statements through their audits and it just trickles down to FirstNet because we are utilizing the Department of Commerce's financial management system. This deficiency basically means that there was an internal control that is less severe than a material weakness or a truly significant deficiency, so this is a trickle-down event here. But it is important enough to merit attention by management and as you can see, we are already taking steps to mitigate this significant deficiency for FirstNet.

Sue Swenson: Hey, Kim, on that issue, I know we were part of the exit interview, the finance committee was. The way we're mitigating that is are we getting off of the shared system?

Kim Farrington: We are currently developing an analysis of alternative to consider our different options for transitioning from that system that we are currently using to another system. So, yes, that is our short-term corrective action that is already underway.

Sue Swenson: That's right. I forgot the analysis that you were doing and when do you think that analysis will be complete?

Kim Farrington: We are anticipating that analysis to be completed in mid to late April.

Sue Swenson: Okay. Great. We don't want to go through another year.

Ed Horowitz: No, I was just going to support - what I think you're about to say is I think that Kim has recognized the issue and is undertaking to see what the mitigation possibilities are including an independent system if the system on which we were hosted is not being corrected.

((Crosstalk))

Ed Horowitz: I feel will know more in April when she's done and then I assume when we get together next time she'll have a recommendation.

Kim Farrington: That is correct.

Sue Swenson: Great.

Kim Farrington: Okay. any other questions on the financial statement audit? Okay.

Sue Swenson: No.

Kim Farrington: Okay, moving onto the internal control program. As you know, at the last board meeting I actually presented to you that we were in the process of developing our internal control implementation plan. Well, since the last board meeting, we did complete that plan and we're now adopting it, and the

importance of this plan is to make sure or to instill good internal controls across the entire FirstNet organization to reduce the risk of asset loss and to help ensure that all of the information that we provide to our stakeholders is complete, accurate, and reliable, and compliant with all laws and regulations.

So, now that we have adopted this internal control implementation plan, all staff are involved in our internal control program. We've already completed our first business process risk assessment and the great new story about this is that our risk assessment is being recognized independently from other bureaus within the Department of Commerce and it is being recognized as an entity within Commerce so, making great headway on that. And the other good thing is our risk assessments are reflecting good internal control so we feel very good about our internal control program as we're adopting the plan.

As we complete our risk assessments though we are taking our analysis and we are enhancing our FirstNet financial management regulation creating new policies that might be needed and also revisiting our policies that are currently in existence to make sure that they reflect the strongest internal control for us. The other thing we've started doing was, as you know we've got the senior assessment team established but we're also involving the remainder of the FirstNet organization through a core assessment team and basically we're taking the internal control program down to the working level of FirstNet to make sure that our controls are being considered and enhanced at all levels of the organization and these are just a few of the steps that we have taken over the last quarter to make sure that we are closer to ensuring that our internal controls are as effective as they can be.

Sue Swenson: Hey, Kim? Who oversees this outside of FirstNet? Does somebody audit this? I mean you present obviously something in paper to somebody but does

somebody actually come and test this like internal audit from another group from Commerce or GAO?

Kim Farrington: Actually have the Office of the Inspector General that comes in and tests our controls and audits us. We also have our auditor that did the financial statement audit that also tests our internal controls and feels that through our audit that our internal controls are sound.

Sue Swenson: And do we have a report back from the IG that this is compliant and also from our auditors or is this something that we've just given them and we will hear back?

Kim Farrington: Our auditors have given us the okay that our internal controls are sound.

Sue Swenson: Okay.

Kim Farrington: They did provide management two recommendations for minor internal control improvement that we have already developed corrective action plans for and are enacting those corrective actions but those are at such a minor level they did not raise to the level of being identified and explained in the audit report. So we do get good reviews from our auditors. Now the Inspector General's Office, they actually come in and audit certain aspects of our programmatic and financial controls and those reports we get after they complete their testing of each of those specific items.

Jason Karp: Yes, and on that note, the IG will come in and they will test certain items that they determine kind of in their discretion they want to test. We wouldn't proactively provide them necessarily the results of our own internal assessment unless that was germane to their review, and that's per the (GAO) right, so we, as you recall they did an audit of our internal controls and that

will be ongoing but that's more you know based on what they determine they want to audit versus the auditors where you know we - they do a full kind of top to bottom review of our internal control process.

Sue Swenson: So based on that, based on the IG and the (GAO) process, when would we expect to hear something regarding these (Adhawk) reviews? Do we have an estimate on when we might hear back from them?

Kin Farrington: It really depends on the scope of the item that they're auditing. They are pretty reasonable in providing us their reports after they complete all of their testing but it's really dependent on their initial testing, the findings from those initial tests that they run, whether or not they need additional testing. If there's less additional testing needed, we receive the report sooner rather than later.

Sue Swenson: Let me be more clear. Are they currently testing and do you have an estimated time when you might hear something?

Jason Karp: As of right now through the only audit going on by the IG is an ongoing audit regarding our (IAAs) interagency agreement process so that's...

((Crosstalk))

Jason Karp: ...decided to look at. They initiated that I'd say a couple of months ago I think. They're generally a three to four month process followed by anywhere from probably six thereafter to issue their draft report findings and you know for us to respond. So it's generally about a six month process for each audit and they plan about two a year.

Sue Swenson: Okay.

Jason Karp: So I would expect we will see something in terms of these results in the mid summer - or early in the summer, June-July timeframe.

Sue Swenson: Great. Thanks. That's what I was looking for, just kind of when to expect that. I remember them doing this before but I couldn't remember in my mind when we'd see that so that's helpful. Thanks.

Kim Farrington: Okay. Any other questions? All right. I'll move onto the update on the five-year strategic plan. As you may remember during the last board meeting we actually presented the five-year strategic goals and objectives. Those strategic goals focused on partnerships, stakeholder engagements, innovation, and lastly people and organizations. Since that last board meeting we have taken steps to further enhance our five-year strategic plan. We developed a our goals which are basically the strategic goals and objectives for this current fiscal year and we're now focusing on developing performance metrics or key performance indicators for each of the strategic goals and objectives, and not only create those key performance indicators but also create measures so we can actually measure success against our mission - our goals and objectives. We do anticipate completing the five-year plan in June 2016 so hopefully I'll have it in place next board meeting but this will really help us identify and create that vision for establishing the values and the approach for the next five years in accomplishing the FirstNet mission, and also with those key performance indicators and metrics, we will be able to share with your our results and that I think will reflect the accountability that we have made achieving our mission of FirstNet, which, of course, ultimately enhances the success across the whole organization and with our partner.

Sue Swenson: Maybe a question for (Mike) on this but it seems to me that obviously if you were just working by yourself with an organization versus having a partner, it

seems to me that whoever is your partner will greatly influence your five-year strategic plan. Is that the appropriate way to think about it (Mike)?

Mike Poth: Oh, absolutely, but you know we didn't want to wait for the partner to be identified but we'll be adjusting every step of the way, even after the partner's identified. As you know, every five-year plan gets revisited every year and we make updates and adjustments based on the internal and external realities that the organization is dealing with.

Sue Swenson: Okay, thank you. Any questions from the board on the five-year plan.

Governor Jim Douglas: So I just wanted to thank Kim for her leadership of the CFO office. She's brought some real energy and discipline to these processes and has positioned us quite well I think as we get into the next phase of our program.

Sue Swenson: I agree. I agree, Governor. Ed, I think you were trying to make a comment.

Ed Horowitz: Yes. I just think it's really good to see how this is evolving from the original stated objectives to really a plan which will become actionable and really is kind of a standard against which we can kind of make course corrections or add new initiatives.

Sue Swenson: Yes. No, I agree. If you don't have a plan, you'll end up in Abilene, right?

Sue Swenson: No offense...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Johnson: Not that there's anything wrong with Abilene.

Sue Swenson: No, I was going to make that comment. There's nothing wrong with Abilene but if that wasn't your destination you don't want to end up in Abilene. So you know with whole story around that. If you don't have a roadmap you end up in a place you don't want to end up. So, that's the point. That's great. So does that conclude your presentations, Kim?

(Kim): Yes. Yes it does.

Sue Swenson: Great. Well I appreciate it and thank you for all your hard work and that of your team. You know there's a lot that goes on obviously beyond you so we would express our appreciation to the hardworking accounting and finance team to make all this happen. It looks really nice and pretty on the page but I know there's a lot of hard work behind that. So please be sure to send our appreciation to them.

Kim Farrington: Thank you, Sue. Will do.

Sue Swenson: Okay, great. So next up we have a guest, Mr. Harlin McEwen, and not much of a guest really. He's been part of this team for a long time and, Chief before I get started I just wanted to congratulate you on your unanimous reappointment to the (PSAC) chair position and thank you and the entire (PSAC) for the work that you're doing. I think you know having attended the webinar yesterday, you know the work that you're doing on (ICAM) and local control and the devices you know all such important work for us and I think it's, as you know, been very instrumental to the (RFP) and it's going to be very instrumental to the operational success of FirstNet so thanks to you and your team and I think you're going to give us a quick update on the (PSAC) so the floor is yours.

Harlin McEwen: Thank you. Well, in keeping with your wishes, when you first became the board here, (PSAC) has become very engaged as you just described and I reported to the board in the December meeting that we were creating two new task teams, one on identity credential and access management better known as (ICAM) and the other one on local control. We started those meetings by phone early in February. They culminated in a face-to-face meeting of each of the task teams and the early builder working group last week in Boulder.

We were all in Boulder for the week and so I'll give you an update on those discussions. First of all, on the identity credential and access management, you can see who the members of the team are on the slide. So we've got a number of key (PSAC) members who have volunteered to participate in this discussion and I must say that we found that the face-to-face meetings in Boulder really were important because it's much easier when you have people sitting around the table and you can see the expressions on their face and whether they agree or disagree and you know get them to weigh in. So we had a very spirited discussion.

It went really well and we established some really good foundational documents. Jeff Bratcher spent most of the time with us as did Rich Reed. We appreciated their participation along with many of the technical staff and I just feel really good about the outcome of that meeting and the fact that we made great progress. So, that was the first task team. The second task team was local control. Again, very critical to the success of this FirstNet network and again I want to just kind of explain some of the issues that we're talking about.

So first of all, it says on the slide that you know we are tasked with further defining and refining the operational guidance of the local control application that FirstNet will provide. In short, that means some kind of a manual control that could theoretically have some effect on the network. So I want to talk

about that for just a minute because our discussions last week I think are critical to the success of the network.

First of all, we preliminarily we had strong agreement after a lot of discussion by the task team that (unintelligible) all local control of the network should rarely, if ever, be necessary, and that's a very important statement that I just made because a lot of people don't - we didn't understand until after we had robust discussions with Jeff and his team exactly what the capabilities were of the network and so on, and then that leads to further discussions on the governance of who will have eventually some capability to manually change the network or local control of the network. The discussion really evolved around the fact that almost everything will be automated and dynamic.

The network, if properly developed, should basically manage most of that automatically and dynamically and we are now beginning our discussions about developing some method of inputting change of status or users to affect the automated process. In other words, during an event certain people will be more important for that during that event than others and if the network is in a task in a stressed condition inputting those users names and so on so that they can be automatically prioritized with whatever priority that they need to be so I hope that makes sense to the board.

I mean I think this is a very critical you know agreement by the tasking. We haven't completed our recommendations yet but this is foundational, I believe. So that's the second one. The third is the early builder working group and as you know we have five early builders. This past year Todd Early and Darryl Ackley reversed their role. Darryl is this year serving as the president of (Nasio) and it necessitated his stepping back a little bit. Todd agreed to step up as the chair and Darryl stepping down to vice chair, at least for the time being, to be able to keep us moving forward.

The five early builders were all represented in a day-long meeting in Boulder last week and again the value of their being together and discussing what I would call early successes and lessons learned so that we are not duplicating you know mistakes. We're learning and all of that information, of course, is filtering between them but also to Jeff and his staff so that you know there are some lessons learned for the full network benefit. So I'm pretty - again very enthused about the way that all occurred and pleased that it moved as it did.

On the Tribal Working Group, yesterday Sue you, of course, were on the (PSAC) webinar call and yesterday we received notification from the National Congress of American Indians that they have nominated a new representative to the (PSAC) and that person will be - you will have to eventually appoint that person and (Richard Bronsho) will be stepping down so it is assumed that things go well, that person will become the chair of the Tribal Working Group, and during the last part of last year, because we needed additional leadership I appointed Randell Harris as the vice chair and he is from the State of Washington and the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians.

So I think we've now got - we will have very shortly a very strong leadership team. They will all be meeting with Outreach and Consultation Group in April in McClain, Virginia. They'll have their own one-day meeting and they'll be - I think (Amanda) will be reporting further on some of that information. One more thing, we held a meeting this morning. I'm here at the FirstNet offices in Reston and we held a meeting this morning to further discuss a recommendation that will eventually go to you, Sue, for the (PSAC) to be authorized to create a (PSAC) federal working group. I've been advocating that for a long time and we're trying to work out the details now and we're getting closer.

So you should expect to hear something eventually on my recommendation to do that. We think it's important to integrate the work of the State and local agencies, the Tribal Working Group, and the federal people now into a common discussion about the you know the outcome of this network and how it will affect the users at all levels of government.

Sue Swenson: No, I think that's very important for lots of reasons, particularly with distribution of the federal agencies and you know, as you know we've had some challenges in terms of effective outreach there so I think that makes a lot of sense. Do you want to open it up for questions from the board, Harlin?

Harlin McEwen: I do but I kind of want to first thank everybody, in particular the staff, (Mike, TJ, Rich Reed, (Amanda), Jeff Bratcher, and David Buchanan for their continuing efforts to work with us. It's been a - they're all wonderful people. I think you have to know that the relationship is excellent and I just want to thank them in front of the board. So, yes, I'm open to any questions.

Sue Swenson: Great. Any comments or questions for Harlin on any of these updates? Because if not, I do have a question. You know, (ICAM) I did share in the webinar yesterday. For those of you who don't recall, when we were in Salt Lake City with Chris for the board meeting - I can't remember what month it was in, but Harlin drug us to a very early meeting in the morning to talk about (ICAM) and several of us attended that meeting and obviously having the focus on that now is very important, Harlin but you know it just seems to me that it's a topic beyond us and so, could you just comment on you know who we're going to need to interact with because it seems to me to be you know a very complex topic that is not just resident within our four walls.

Harlin McEwen: So, this started - I started by being a cosponsor of a meeting in October 2014 with a whole lot of federal agencies that are involved in (ICAM). There are

many different federal agencies that are developing (ICAM) approaches and many from the State and local community, and it was clear that in the big area, like you said, (ICAM) is a bigger issue than FirstNet. Out of that has come a working group that includes the FCC, DHS, OIC, OEC, and NTIA (Paul) and his information sharing environment and many others and they're dealing with those larger issues beyond FirstNet, which have been you know difficult to conquer by the State, local, and federal community for a long time.

So, we have - Jeff Bratcher has staff assigned to that and I'm involved with those discussions so they're going on. Our focus at FirstNet is really basically how we're going to identify, register, and manage users of the network. So that's basically where we're focused and that's a fairly narrow focus. It's not solving the big problems. I mean we think that the exchange of information and the way it goes now, particularly in the law enforcement community works pretty well and FirstNet probably doesn't need to get involved in that intricacy just basically how we're going to manage the users on the network.

Sue Swenson: Okay. Any comments, Jeff Bratcher to that because I know you're really involved in it.

Jeff Bratcher: Hi, Sue. I've got a few slides in my deck that I'll go over some details on that.

Sue Swenson: Okay, great. All right, thanks. Any other questions, and like you, Harlin, I want to thank not only the staff at FirstNet but all the members of the (PSAC) on these working committees. I- you know a tremendous amount of effort and work and perspective is provided by the people who are taking this on, not only the members of the team but the people who are leading it like Todd and Darryl and Barry and you know just all the people who are involved in it so I just want to express my appreciation on behalf of the board for all that work. It's invaluable. Priceless, as MasterCard says. So we really appreciate it.

Harlin McEwen: Yes, we appreciate that. I would be very tardy or negligent if I didn't mention the wonderful work that Jeff Johnson does with the (PSAC). The board and he has just been wonderful to work with. I want to make sure that Jeff knows we appreciate that.

Jeff Johnson: Thank you, Harlin. I appreciate you guys. To see you hit it on the nose. There's a bunch of all very capable people with tremendous operational insight and the taskings have been well prepared and thoughtful. The work has been really detailed. It's amazing any of these folks are able to hold down a full-time job as much time as they give us, but they really do. They give and it's excellent perspective and, you know what, they're not bashful at all and they want to make sure we get this right for public safety and we will, in part - in a large part because of the work they're doing, and frankly Harlin's leadership, so I thank you guys.

Sue Swenson: Yes. Thank you, Chief. So Harlin, we're going to move on if you're ready. But I don't want to cut you off, so are we ready to move on to your friends, (Amanda), (Dave), and Rich to talk about user advocacy?

Harlin McEwen: Absolutely. I'm ready for them to go.

Sue Swenson: Okay, great. Well thanks for being there and thanks for everything you do. (Amanda), (Dave), and Rich, I think you're going to update us on outreach state consultation and state plans. And so (Amanda), are you going to go first?

(Amanda Hilliard): I am. Yes, thank you.

Sue Swenson: Okay, go ahead.

Amanda Hilliard: All right, so thank you for the opportunity to continue to brief the Board on our activities. I'm going to kick it off and then turn it over to (Dave) who will cover our state and federal consultation update. And then Rich Reed will wrap it up with our state plans update.

So my outreach update is going to focus on four quick points. First I'm going to do a quick snapshot of events from the past quarter. Second I'm going to highlight the work that our senior public safety advisors have been doing on behalf of FirstNet.

Third I want to talk just briefly about our tribal strategy and some of our recent engagements with the tribal community. And then lastly I want to take just a couple of minutes to preview our upcoming SPOC meeting.

So starting with our events, the User Advocacy and Government Affairs Team along with Jeff Bratcher's team, senior management, and of course many of the Board members, have been very busy continuing to engage with our stakeholders. By the end of this quarter or the end of this month we expect to have well over a hundred events that we've participated in.

And if you look at the little chart there to the right, you know with about half of those engagements occurring at the state and local level, a quarter of them with the national associations and then the other quarter between our federal and tribal stakeholders.

I wanted to note that these, you know, hundred plus events are in addition to, you know, a hundred or more appointments and meetings that we're also tracking that have been done over the last couple of months.

And when I say appointments or meetings I'm talking about the SPOC engagement meetings that (Dave) is going to touch on. All our PSAC, you know, working group task team executive committee conference calls.

So there's just a ton of work by the team. We're having conversations every day with Public Safety and key stakeholders.

And I just wanted to note, our CRM tool that we launched late last quarter has been instrumental in helping is to track all of this and kind of keep track of who we're talking to and where everybody is going.

TJ Kennedy: One quick question - this is TJ. I just wanted to ask (Amanda), Rich, and (Dave) to just kind of comment on the kinds of things that are the most common key questions and issues that come up in these engagements.

We know there's a great cross section across the country of folks that you're interacting with as you just discussed. But can you just highlight a couple of the key things in case the Board wants that feedback, and make sure that they're up to speed on the kinds of issues that are being raised?

Amanda Hilliard: Sure. So I'll start it off and then I'll turn it over to (Dave). So I think in terms of the Public Safety senior advisors who have been going out, you know, engaging at the national level, but also per some of the comments Chief Johnson made the last meeting, now starting to get down to some of the state and local conferences as well.

You know we're still surprised that we're still finding folks, in particular you know, users kind of boots on the ground folks, that still haven't heard about FirstNet or don't know much about what we are.

So I think we're still, you know, very much continuing to just do that ground level, you know, education awareness of what FirstNet is. You know, that we're talking about commercial broadband, wireless systems not land-mobile radio. So you know that's one point I would add.

I know (Dave) has a lot from the SPOC kickoff calls that they have been doing over the last couple of months. So, I'll let him reflect on that.

Dave Buchannan: Yes, so a couple of issues that come up almost in every state, you know from the SPOC and the SPOC community, there's a lot of interest in what the process is going to be over the next 12 months.

What's the process for evaluating and reviewing and understanding the state plan process? The opting out - the opt-out process as you asked about earlier. And just general questions about how we're going to continue to work with the states and the SPOCs as we go through this process.

And a big part of what you're going to hear me describe later is how we're going to use this year's consultation to address that issue very specifically.

You know and as (Amanda) mentioned, with future customers, as we've expanded our outreach and education, we continue to get questions from those public safety users about coverage and their interest in where FirstNet is going to be for them.

And there's an interest in the user population, whether they're going to get to be a user or not. And so we continue to use these consultation activities to educate and inform and have dialogue with those - with the states and the stakeholders about those specific issues.

Rich Reed: Yes, and this is Rich Reed. I agree with everything that has been said up to this point. It's a reoccurring theme. Cost, coverage, process, what goes into a state plan; when do we get to see it; all those topics are very much a reoccurring question - not a question, a dialogue that we have with stakeholders.

Sue Swenson: Great question TJ?

Amanda Hilliard: All right, so moving on, the next area I wanted to talk about was the work of our Public Safety senior advisors. So again, just a reminder there, we brought on three additional staff late last year. Bill Hinkle, to work with the 9-1-1 community; Brent Williams with the EMS community, and (Mike Rowe) with the Fire community.

I also wanted to take a minute just to note that Josh Ederheimer has gone back to the Department of Justice where he had been on detail here to FirstNet. So I wanted to take just a minute to publicly thank Josh, if he's listening, to the great work that he has done with our Law Enforcement Board members in establishing the strategy and really implementing it over the last year, working with the Law Enforcement community. Really setting an excellent example for this senior advisor role as we move forward.

And I have advertised for a Law Enforcement Senior Advisor. We saw a lot of interest in that position. I'm just going through all the candidates right now and we'll start the interview process shortly. And doing that in coordination with Sheriff Stanek and Chief Burbank. So, looking forward to bringing on some additional staff there.

Jeff Johnson: (Amanda), Jeff Johnson. I just want to thank Josh. He was spectacular in his role. A credit to FirstNet and he really did a great job plugging into the Law Enforcement community.

And as you said, he built a lot of the baseline strategies and plans that we pushed across some of the other outreach verticals. So wish Josh the best, but that was a blow for us so, thank you Josh.

Sue Swenson: Well and let me just add one thing. Welcome back any time Josh, when you're done with whatever you're doing at the DOJ, you know, right.

Amanda Hilliard: Right. And it's good to see he is nodding his head as well.

Sue Swenson: Okay.

Amanda Hilliard: So with the senior advisors, of course their main role is really focusing with the National Association leaders and events and helping our Board members with that.

We've had great coordination with our Public Safety Advisory Committee members as well on that front.

And then as I also mentioned, another element of the role is really getting down, you know, participating state events. I would highlight in particular, you know Bill has been very active attending many of the state NINA and APCO Chapter meetings.

And Brent, some of the statewide EMS meetings as well as (Mike). So that has gone well. And we've been coordinating all those with the SPOC Community.

Last, I wanted to note, they will also be playing a role in our metropolitan strategy which (Dave) will probably cover briefly, in particular on the Fire and Law Enforcement side there.

And then of course they have served as really good internal resources to our CTO Team as well as our full UA Team.

So moving on, I just wanted to talk for a few minutes about our tribal engagement strategy. Again here, if you'll recall, we had two new members join the team in late 2015 - (Adam Eisler) and Margaret Muhr. Again, both enrolled tribal members.

So that has really helped to kind of refocus and redouble our efforts, both at the state and national levels with the tribal community.

So in terms of our state level engagements, what we're really doing here is working on relationship building and information sharing between tribal leaders, the SPOCs, as well as our FirstNet staff.

And the goal here is really to help ensure that the Public Safety considerations from the tribes are reflected in our plans going forward.

So the approach here is really working to establish trust, foster dialogue, correct misinformation, and reassure elected tribal leaders of our commitment to include tribes in our planning and deployment.

But also to make sure that those tribal leaders understand that we need their participation and their feedback in this process.

And I wanted to just quickly highlight as an example that Margaret from our team, with David Cook, our Region 2 Lead, they took, together with the nod of the New York SPOC, they visited a number of Indian reservations across New York State. You know, really meeting with a couple of different tribes, helping to build this relationship; educate them on FirstNet and start to get their feedback.

So that was just a good example of the great collaboration that's been going on between the Tribal team, our Regional team with the SPOC team.

In terms of the national level, I think Harlin hit on it a little bit with the work we're doing with the Tribal working group. All of those associations that are represented on the Committee or on the working group are great partners with us. And we're working to attend and participate in many of their events to expand our outreach and education.

We are also working with federal agencies that have a tribal trust responsibility such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs for Law Enforcement and the Indian Health Service for EMS.

And then lastly I just wanted to note, we are you know, looking at potentially hosting a National Tribal Broadband Summit later on in the year potentially, in collaboration with The President's Broadband Opportunity Council.

Again as just another opportunity, given the vast amount. We have 567 tribes to again try to provide another opportunity to bring tribal leaders and our SPOCs together. So, more to come on that as our plans come together.

So the last element I wanted to focus on in my update is just to give you a quick update on where we are with the SPOC meeting. As TJ mentioned that

will be April 12 and 13 in McLean, Virginia. We've got 48 states and territories registered and are working with the remaining eight states in hopes that we'll get most if not all of them to participate.

We've got almost 100 - 200 folks registered for the meeting. We have the TSAC Executive Committee coming, as well as many of the tribal working group members. I know there will be at least one representative from Canada Public Safety and then some of our federal partners.

And the goal of this meeting will continue to be, you know, to engage on many of the required state consultation topics and really just foster a lot of dialogue.

I think TJ mentioned earlier in his update, the state plan process and you know, ensuring that everybody has a good understanding of all the work that we have ahead, will be a key topic of discussion.

So my last slide here just shows you some of the key topics that we're planning on covering during the full two-day meeting. We'll do the roadmap update that TJ shared with you earlier today, with the community.

Again, we're going to spend a significant amount of time in smaller groups to talk about the state plan development and delivery process and continue to answer questions there.

(Dave) will touch on this a little bit more, but we're going to look to officially launch our first Consultation Task Team regarding quality of service, priority, and preemption.

And then we're also looking forward to having Dereck Orr's team participate. And we're going to have a CSCR session focused on mission critical voice, local based services, and local control.

So this is just a couple of topics I wanted to highlight. I think it will be another great two days. And appreciate the full team here at FirstNet and some of our partners in pulling this meeting together.

I also wanted to note, I'm looking forward to Board member participation in the meeting. We've got Chief Johnson, Governor Douglas, Chief McGinnis, and Neil Cox registered so far to participate.

So if any other Board members are interested in coming to the event, please let me know in the next couple of days and I'll work with you to get the arrangements there. And of course we'll work you into the agenda. I know that the community always enjoys hearing from the Board members.

So unless - are there any questions before I transition it over to (Dave)?

Sue Swenson: Sounds like we're ready for a transition.

Amanda Hilliard: All right, thank you.

Sue Swenson: Thanks (Amanda). (Dave), tell us what's happening in Consultation.

Dave Buchannon: Sure will Sue. Thank you very much and good afternoon. I'm going to do three things today. One is to update the Board on the progress we've made with Consultation at the state level.

I'm going to update you on what we've done with staffing this year. And finally update you on our approach for 2016 Federal Consultation.

You see on Slide 27 here, the slide we discussed at the December Board meeting. And you might remember from that dialogue, we talked about our - really our evolved approach for 2016, really focusing on two main approaches.

One is a targeted consultation targeting the specific groups and individuals and organizations we think are important to reach through Consultation this year, as well as an expanded outreach to ensure that we're reaching the additional stakeholders we know are going to be critical to the FirstNet decision in 2016.

In the targeted Consultation you can see here we've got an approach to reach the SPOC and the SPOC teams. We have an approach to reach the governance bodies; the bodies that support the SPOC in the state. We have an approach to connect with the subject matter experts and experts from states who have keen interest in our network operation management topics.

And we have an element here to reach those executives and key influencers in the state who are going to be critically important to understanding and making the FirstNet decision.

And again, in addition to that targeted outreach - or targeted Consultation expanded outreach to reach those future customers, key influencers, metro leaders, Chief Johnson to your comment earlier about having a parallel communications path, I really believe we've put together an approach here that targets that very specific dialogue and give and take on Consultation to those who are involved in the FirstNet decision.

While at the same time, going beyond those state decision makers to make sure we're hitting the key influencers, key metro leaders, and others who we also know are important to the future of FirstNet.

I want to give you just a quick update on the progress we've made in those four Consultation tracks. Starting from the left, our SPOC engagement kickoff meetings. We've completed 47 of these meetings to date. We started these on January 25. And in the 50 days since that have completed 47 of them. Seven more are scheduled for later this month and two more to be scheduled by the end of April.

So, great progress in getting those meetings kicked off. And they've really been very productive engagements to begin the discussion in 2016 and reconnect with the SPOC and the SPOC teams on the important topics that are critical to the state this year. To continue to coordinate and collaborate with the states on our education and outreach campaign that we'll be doing with them.

And really plan for the additional Consultation in 2016 and make sure we're completely aligned with the state in terms of how we're going to go about achieving those Consultation milestones and how we're going to work together.

I had the opportunity two weeks ago to travel to Minnesota for their engagement meeting with Jackie Mynes and her team. Again, very productive discussion, aligning our approaches on education outreach, building our Consultation program so it's really customized to fit Minnesota's needs.

And identifying additional leaders in the state that we want to work together on to continue our education.

Before I move on with the rest of the slide, I want to see if there are any questions on what we've done so far to date. And then I'll go ahead and talk about where we're headed next.

Sue Swenson: Hey (Dave), just we've done a real I think shift, in Consultation. So as I look at the chart where you show all those four buckets of SPOC engagement governance body meetings; this new acronym called TTT which I had to go back and see what that was; the executive consultation meeting - how would you characterize really, the difference this year versus last year? Just from a big picture perspective.

Dave Buchannan: So, big picture I would say Sue, would be last really, it was really about starting the process. Introducing FirstNet to the state teams. Introducing the FirstNet issue to the states and the stakeholders. Introducing FirstNet to the critical issues that are in the states. And laying the groundwork for the work we're doing now.

This year the shift has been to then, based on the inputs we received and the information and intelligence we gathered from those 55 meetings we completed last year, then to really target then the additional Consultation to reach these critical network operation and management topics which we'll cover through the Consultation Task Teams.

To reach the people who are important to the governor's decision through both the governance body and executive Consultation.

And to maintain and grow and expand the relationship we have with the SPOC and the SPOC Team and the other stakeholders in the states.

So it really - it's taking it to, not just another level, but multiple other levels in terms of the breadth and depth of consultation outreach that we want to do with those states.

Sue Swenson: Okay great. Thank you that helps.

Dave Buchanan: Consultation Task Team, I'll talk about that.

Sue Swenson: I know. Okay.

Dave Buchanan: So moving right along -- back to the previous slide please -- on the governance body meetings, these meetings that we will be really targeting this spring to launch these meetings. We'll be using these meetings to connect and engage with the governance bodies who are there to support the SPOC and support the governor and their work on Public Safety broadband; Public Safety communications, and FirstNet issues.

We're going to use this meeting - again April, May, June, July and August, to bring two important things to the states. One is this -- and Rich is going to talk more about it in a second -- but this conversation around state planning and state plans; opt-in and opt-out is one of the biggest topics that comes in from the states.

So we're going to use these meetings to have consultative dialogue with the teams in the states. Make sure we understand their needs and they understand what our approach is.

And second is to use these meetings to continue our consultation on critical consultation topics that are outlined in the act and we know that are important to adoption of the network, focused around training and other topics.

We've completed four of these to date. We've got 14 more scheduled. And we're going to schedule the rest of these again, after the SPOC meeting once we've brought about new information about these topics for the states.

The Consultation Task Team's third pillar started with a Webinar on February 26 where we kicked off the dialogue with the states about quality of service, prioritization of preemption.

We're going to use demand dimension, the SPOC meeting on April 12 and 13 to have additional dialogue and bring them content around the - around that topic so that they can then bring their teams together.

We'll then work in the states and in the regions to support their effort to convene in each state Consultation Task Team around this specific topic. Collect their inputs; their feedback and produce a report that they can use and we can use at the end of this that shows the results of their dialogue around this topic.

Also we'll have additional Consultation Task Teams planned for later in the year. And we're going to work with the SPOC community to get a good understanding of which topics they'd like us to bring to them so we can have a good approach with them on that.

And finally - final pillar, Executive Consultation. Again this is focused really towards the end of the year when we really are trying to do two things. One is the Executive Consultation Meeting with the key influencers and key

decision-makers in the state who are important to influencing the governor and the governor's decision.

And the second piece which we're doing right and we'll continue to do through Ed Parkinson's team is the individual meetings with individual governors.

You see here we've been able to hold ten of those meetings already and are going to continue to schedule those throughout the year.

The second thing I wanted to do today is give you a quick update on our staffing. A year ago at the March 2015 Board meeting we had zero regional staff and zero area leads.

I'm happy to say that today we have almost every region outfitted, but for Region 4. And offers have gone out for those regions. So we'll have ten regional leads in the regions. We have two area leads supporting those regional leads.

And really they've been - they're the main reason why we've been effective in re-doubling our Consultation efforts this year. Not reflected on this page are additional federal staff who are outfitted in the regions, as well as our contract staff which bring us subject matter experts, Consultation support and program support, all to help us execute against our mission and execute against our strategic plan that we've outlined before.

To the resource question earlier, this is the place where we're using a bulk of the contract in order to outfit our regionals teams with Consultation and subject matter professionals to help us achieve those goals.

Final update, and I'll stop for questions. Around Federal consultation, not unlike state Consultation, we've evolved our approach this year to really expand the way that we're consulting with federal agencies.

Last year we had a linear process, again focused, not unlike state consultation, focused on introducing FirstNet to the agencies. Understanding agency's needs, bringing about a dialogue to build a relationship, and beginning the conversation about federal agency's needs and issues and continuing that consultation with them.

This year we're focused on reaching additional agencies and additional bureaus within the agencies to expand the federal entities we're having consultation with.

We're going to target that consultation around different segments. Obviously there's the different interests from the practitioner level than there is from the acquisition and budget level. And we're going to bring consultation to those different groups.

And we also know that there's going to be a different interest in consultation on FirstNet based on regional and operational sector areas. The federal issues are different in the City of New York than they are at the Southwest border. And we're going to bring a Consultation Program to those areas.

Final slide, just to take a slightly deeper dive on federal for this year, we have federal task teams proposed that we're going to work with the federal agencies to bring about this specific dialogue around acquisition; around encryption, around assets.

You heard Chief McEwen mention earlier, our approach that we want to endeavor with the PSAC to bring about a federal working group which we think will complement our overall Consultation Program this year.

In the second column, our Regional Engagement Forums we're going to hold this year, again to bring about specific consultation - targeted consultation. Places like the Southwest border, metro areas, rural areas, and Northern border consultation.

And finally, continue to expand and grow the individual agency Consultation, both at the executive level and the agency POC level so we can continue to grow the relationships and expand the number of individuals and agencies and bureaus in these departments with the relationships they have with FirstNet.

So I gave you again, a high level sketch on where we're going with Consultation this year; our staffing plans and federal Consultation. Happy to answer any questions you might have.

Teri Takai: Sue this...

Sue Swenson: Go ahead Teri. Go ahead.

Teri Takai: Yes, I just wanted to make a couple of comments because you know TJ and the team and I have talked a little bit about this.

I just would like to emphasize a couple of things. I mean one is to extend the comments that Jeff Johnson made about the need to really expand the touchpoints if you will, on a federal consultation to be much broader.

I think the working groups worked really well on, you know, specific issues and sort of letting point people be aware. But I'm not so sure that those point folks necessarily have the, if you will, clout to really move the big federal agencies forward.

The second point that I think I again would emphasize is the importance from a budgeting perspective. Because again, you know to some extent, the federal participation is as dependent on the funding mechanisms, you know, as the state. And the funding mechanisms, they're far more complex.

So thinking through how the federal consultation needs to work with, you know, as part of the team around the committees that effectively fund Public Safety or fund communications for these agencies, I think is another area that we need to think through. Particularly if we're looking for this funding to be available in the 2018 budget.

Sue Swenson: Yes Teri, I was actually going to raise a similar and related topic. And I've actually spoken to Dave Mader about this and commended to his reading, the IG Report. Because IG Report references the fact that the federal agencies - I mean I was a little surprised by this, that they felt like they were not adequately funded to provide the resources to participate with FirstNet. So, is that what you're referencing?

Teri Takai: Well I'm referencing to some extent Sue. It's not just the question of the resources to be participating, but I think that's symptomatic of the agencies not really putting this at a high enough priority. And the huge bureaucracy that they have to go through to get it to be a priority.

Sometimes it's helpful to have their budget mechanism, which is effectively through Congress, remind them and point out to them the importance of FirstNet and the importance of allocating funds.

So it's not only from a resource perspective, but it's also thinking forward into 2018 in terms of whether we have specific agencies that we might want to do pilots with or we might want to make sure that there's money in their budgets to be able to participate. Not only from the standpoint of representatives, but from the standpoint of actually being early adopters or you know, whatever other mechanism we want to have them really participate.

Sue Swenson: Yes. I'm really out of my element here and I'm going to look to you, Undersecretary Spaulding, Ron Davis; Dave Mader. I have no idea how to do what you just said.

TJ Kennedy: So Teri, you know this is one of the key insights that you shared with the team. And the team is following up with the agencies right now on really working with their budgeting contract folks to make sure they have the contracting vehicles that will allow this to occur. And that their budget folks are aware of the future planning and timelines of FirstNet.

Also we've worked with folks - and I know Undersecretary Spaulding is on the call. You know we work with her for instance to make sure that we get leadership discussions with all the key leaders the Department of Homeland Security. As an example, this meeting that's coming up in a couple of weeks, so that they have top down support for the key needs of getting on the FirstNet Network in the future. And that all the key directors for instance, in the Department of Homeland Security are keenly aware of how important this is.

Teri Takai: Right, thanks TJ. And I think the other point that I'll make on this one, and I think, you know, Suzanne Spaulding is very well aware of this. Although DHS isn't the only agency, but it's really - I know you've done an inventory of the types of federal grants that are available to support public safety and public safety communication.

But again, you know, a look at those to see whether any of those might be useful, again in helping the agencies to carve the money out to make sure that they're participating in FirstNet, I think would be a good thing.

It's not going to be all money, but it's indicative and gets them going and gets them pointed in the right direction so that they see the importance of allocating their limited budget dollars so that a part of that is going to FirstNet.

Sue Swenson: So maybe Suzanne or Ron can comment, because they're like in, you know, the federal agencies. Now like I said, I'm completely out of my element here, so I need to look to you guys for advice and counsel.

Suzanne Spaulding: Yes, this is Suzanne. Teri is right. And I know that TJ and his team have met with and worked with the EC PC - Emergency Communications and Preparedness Communication Center, our federal body that's made up of representatives from the various federal departments and agencies. That was initially a federal consultation touchpoint for FirstNet.

They had a working group that did consolidate, looked across all the departments and agencies at grant funding for, you know, emergency preparedness communications and had a lot of very useful information along those lines. And TJ I know you guys plugged into that and have been looking at that.

I will say, you know, Teri is right about, you know, trying to find mechanisms to allow federal departments and agencies to really focus on this. Not unlike what I'm sure - what I know you're encountering in the state with our state and local folks. The feds also are really consumed by finding ways to address the immediate, near-term communication challenges that they face.

And it's always a bit of a challenge to get focus and attention on the things that you have to do now to prepare for things that will come on line several years from now.

But as TJ said, we are working and have scheduled a meeting with our leadership here in the Department, across the Department of all of the operational entities to try to make sure that they at least have this on their radar screen.

TJ Kennedy: Thank you Suzanne.

Ron Davis: And this is Ron. And I was going to add to it, and TJ I don't think we've done this yet, but I would definitely be willing to do the same to connect with the Deputy Attorney General who has oversight of all the Federal Law Enforcement components, to make sure you have access to the DAG and to the AG. The same thing; priority.

I would say sooner rather. I think we're still - I think we're in a process of our '17 right now, to really take a look at what you're talking about.

The grant part, I think for us, I'm going to be a little bit limited because for I would say, most of the Justice Department grants it can't go to federal agencies. It goes to state and local. But I think we can discuss further.

Sue Swenson: Maybe Dave could help, Ron.

TJ Kennedy: So Ron, thank you. As you know, we've asked for those meetings. We definitely want to make those happen so I will follow-up with you to make sure that those occur. I think that's critical.

Ron Davis: You know I think there was a coordinator. But I'll tell you what, I'll follow up personally with you and we'll make that happen for sure.

Sue Swenson: Thank you Ron, I appreciate it. Because we're going to - Suzanne and Ron and you know Dave - I've already talked to Dave. We're going to need you guys to help on the other side. Because you know like I said, you guys have insight into things that we don't have visibility to. So we're going to need you to - you know, we're going to have to push on both sides and meet at the middle somehow, to make this work.

((Crosstalk))

Teri Takai: And I know you recognize the - you know the challenge that's there from the standpoint that while we talk about this being a national Public Safety Broadband Network, and the federal departments and agencies certainly look at their communications challenges from a national perspective, at the end of the day it's really a state-by-state. And that complicates the planning and analysis for the federal folks.

Sue Swenson: Right, right. Okay, great. Good discussion. Thank you. (Dave), does that wrap it up for you?

(Dave Buchannan): Thank you Sue.

Sue Swenson: Great. So I think we're on to Mr. Rich Reed and State Plans. Rich, the floor is yours.

Rich Reed: Good afternoon everyone. Thank you Sue. I'll be very, very brief. I got the high sign that I need to move through quickly. And I'll let everyone know that I only have one slide, so this will be very quick.

We continue to refine what we believe will go into the state plan. We've got some simple goals. We want to make sure that the governor has the information they need to make a sound decision. That's goal number one.

And then we want to make sure that our federal partners have what they need to do their statutory obligations under the act. We want to make sure that they can do the appropriate level of review for opt-out space.

We recognize that the conversation that we're going to have with the partner post-award is going to have to be time limited. It's going to have to be quick. We want to make sure that the conversation we have post-award with the partner in developing that state plan is as streamlined as possible.

So we're coming up with a process of developing an internal plan development guide that will allow us to not only document internal FirstNet opinion, but the information, you know, derived through consultation and data collection.

And have every division really document their opinions so that the appropriate level of information gets applied to that state plan with the idea of the more information we can document, as we're going through this process, we'll

speed up the state plan development process post-award. So again, time is of the essence and we recognize that.

We continue to support the data analysis portion of our data collection. We still support the RFP Team as they ask us to mine the data and graphically represent the information that the states provided us through that data collection. And we're supporting the RFP Team in the Q&A response process. So our team is actively engaged in the RFP process and supporting them.

We're still supporting Consultation. As (Dave) mentioned, you know there's a lot of energy around state plan development, both process and content. Our team is engaged with helping him develop the FY '16 Consultation process, as well as supporting the SPOC meeting.

We're going to have a significant amount of time on the agenda during the upcoming SPOC meeting where we're going to provide the next level of fidelity in terms of state plan process, as well as setting the expectations for the type of content, you know, states can expect to see in that draft plan when we release it.

Chief Harlin McEwen mentioned participation in the SPOC meetings, both local control task teams, ICANN, as well as the Early Builder working group, participating in those.

We like supporting that dialogue. I think it helps ground not only the conversation, the PSAC meeting but as well as the information being provided by this CTO Team.

In addition to that we learn a lot. It helps us ground our perspective as we go out and consult with states. And we can take the information and the themes

that we learn from that interaction and weave that into our consultation and our briefings.

And then lastly, I want to speak to product management. We recognize the need to develop a more structured approach to product management. TJ and Mike asked Jeff Bratcher and myself to develop a strategy around how FirstNet would look at product management, both pre and post-award.

We spent some time, both of our teams together, developing that concept operation and that strategy and documenting it, as well as building a draft product management plan that we're going to continue to refine over time.

Ultimately, those responsibilities will fall to a Chief Customer Officer that's yet to be hired. But we're in the recruiting process for now.

My team continues to be lean. As you can see, we're - on the right-hand side of the slide we're still very lean. But we do engage with a lot of the other divisions and have good support from our vendor community through the IAA.

So that's all I really have. I just wanted to give you a quick update. And I'm open for questions.

Sue Swenson: So just a comment on product management Rich. You know this is kind of the new territory for our organization; probably many. And I notice here it says, management plan with the CTO.

Just my vantage point, because I've spent a lot of time on product management and product marketing, you know, PML Offices and things like

that. There really has to be clear accountability in the PML Office. And no offense Jeff Bratcher, but you're an input to it. You're not a driver to it.

So I just want to be very clear about my expectations around Product Management. Otherwise it will be - it will not be effective.

TJ Kennedy: Thank you Sue. I see Jeff Bratcher nodding his head. We are in alignment, very much in the draft stages and it will continue to be refined over time so, appreciate the input. Thank you very much.

Sue Swenson: Yes, okay. I don't know how the rest of the Board members feel, but you know, obviously the technical team is really important. But there's got to be a real market perspective; a customer perspective that drives the development of the solution.

And obviously there's a lot of input beyond the CTO that we have to create a product management organization that drives that along with whoever our partner is. But that's one person's view from having the scars on her back to prove it.

Mike Poth: So and that's why it's embedded in the Chief Customer Officer Group. It won't be, as you said, the CTO Team and all the other teams are data points into that organization.

Sue Swenson: Right.

Jeff Bratcher: Sue this is Jeff. I've had that experience in the private sector. I totally understand what you're getting at, so we're taking that approach.

Sue Swenson: Okay, and the technology led, and I know to be partially successful, not because you didn't try, it's just the perspective. So I just, you know, I'll personally be very involved in, you know, providing some oversight to that, and I welcome any of the other board members who have experience in this as well, because it's very important to our success. So thanks Rich, appreciate it.

Rich Reed: Thank you everyone.

Barry Boniface: Sue, it's Barry and I agree.

Sue Swenson: Okay, okay great. Okay, so speaking of CTO, I think Jeff you're up next to give us an update.

Jeff Bratcher: Sure thing. Greetings everyone, I'm actually in the room here with (Preston) and (Reston). I've got a presentation tomorrow I'm giving at one of the Aegis Institute seminars that they're hosting, glad to be speaking with you today. I've got a few things I want to cover while we're all here together. I've got to, I'm going to give an update on standards, some of the early builders, the PSAC task teams, cyber security and our Band 14 market research.

Before we jump into the standards development we've got some pretty good, pretty big announcements I want to share on that front. We have added four additional hires to the team. Jennifer Harder has joined our team, and has been a great resource already. For those that don't know her, she's a former dispatcher out of Colorado in the early 2000s. And more recently has been supporting public safety across the country in various shapes and fashions, and she was involved last week with the on-site meetings that we had and I think Harlin would agree brought a great perspective.

We're actually leveraging Jennifer in both my team and on the user advocacy team for the consultations going forward. Also added Steven Yuen to our team, he's our senior core engineer that's been with us for a while as a contractor, he's now joined us officially. (Mustafa Rashidi) is a networks operations analyst, and he's plugged in on our networks ops team, and doing some analysis on the early builder projects.

Finally, last but not least, (Sean Shahidi), he's an application developer that's now part of the team and is supporting the various efforts in those, with (Mark Golishef).

So moving into the standards development, the first slide's just a recap of our strategy and what we're doing in the formal standards bodies. Specifically the third generation partnership project or 3GPP, and how we've partnered with some of our federal partners as well, the foreign governments that are looking to deploy public safety LTE in their respective countries.

We've garnered a great deal of support across those communities, and again we're trying to piggyback on that commercial feature development whenever possible so that we create the largest available worldwide market for public safety LTE.

Some of our key successes have been getting public safety declared some top priorities for 3GPP in their Release 12 and 13 development. Release 12 was frozen as I reported last March, a year ago, and that included some direct mode and group communications functionality that we needed.

We also helped create a new system architecture group, SA6, that's focused on these mission-critical application architectures for the standards within 3GPP.

Going to the next slide, we'll talk about Release 13. So for those that have been following the news, there was an article posted last night in a blog I believe on our website. The first bullet said we were expected to complete this, these slides were completed prior to last week's meetings in Sweden, that was the plenary meeting, the system architecture where it was finalized, push to talk feature and capability has been put in the frozen release state for Release 13.

So what that means is that now vendors can start leveraging those commercial standards to develop their products or upgrade existing products to meet the mission-critical push to talk standards that are in there now. Along those lines, two weeks ago, the next public safety communications research program also hosted their mission-critical voice roundtable. And that brought together partners across different federal agencies, public safety practitioners, some state and local representatives to discuss mission-critical voice and its capabilities.

For a reminder for the board there is \$300 million that has been set aside for the NIST program to accelerate some of the key functions needed for a public safety nationwide broadband network, mission-critical voice being one of those key functions.

So this initial roundtable was to help set that standard. So, I was involved as well as several of my technical staff, Chief McEwen from the PSAC was involved as well, and they will be hosting a summit later this year on that research and development activity and the funding that they look to use out of that \$300 million to help the industry drive these solutions and bring them to market faster. I'll pause for any questions there.

Sue Swenson: The standards work is quite challenging, and you have to have the patience of a saint.

Jeff Bratcher: Absolutely. And I was looking back and we actually started the efforts back in 2012, as you may recall Sue, when you know, you needed to get in there and get the ship turning now to help us. So that, those are paying off now and the fruits of those are paying off.

Sue Swenson: Yeah, appreciate the work on this because I've been involved in standards work, I'm sure none of the other board members, that's a long process and you have to stay with it, so you know, it's really critically important.

Jeff Bratcher: I would add it takes a special individual that wants to do so.

Jeff Johnson: I would add that it's not just technical standards, having worked on a number of fire code changes, I can tell you that is one parallel that exists across the entire universe is standards change.

Jeff Bratcher: So, and then with Release 14, it's actually kicked off as well, and there are now developing, if we move to the next slide, they're not just focused on the voice aspect, now 3GPP with the pressure from the other networks worldwide, they're now tackling some video and data aspects for the mission critical functions that will be riding on 3 GPP networks. So that will be kicking off and again within Release 14 that's what's starting now.

The next slide, just to give a recap of what was going on with 5G, we hear a lot about fifth generation, what's going to happen, it's already starting, there's a lot of marketing obviously going on right now, the standards aren't actually anywhere near being done, the radio access network and the service and system aspects are right now being focused and developed within the official

standards bodies. So that is also going on in parallel and I'll be providing updates as that progresses over the next several years.

I'd like to move to our early builder projects updates. And again, Harlin mentioned we had a face-to-face last meeting with the early builder working group that taught early chairs, there's great dialogue across the projects. I think it was one of the first times we'd had a big face to face of all the respective projects so they can learn from each other what are some of the successes, and honestly what are some of the challenges that they're all having.

Some of the highlights, you know, LA (Ricks) have done some live demonstration with the Rose Parade, Harris County with the Houston Rodeo is still going on now. New Jersey, and I've got a few more in some of the efforts they've done here in the deck, in a few slides. Adams County with their continued Denver airport expansion and working to enable some of the enhanced core capabilities they need. And then New Mexico's focusing on some of the international border testing efforts and some of the lessons learned on that.

So this just gives a highlight of some of our lessons learned over the last quarter. You'll notice the dropoff for that quarter, the third quarter of '15. That was really when the early builders were transitioning their focus to some of our key lessons learned as laid out in the spectrum management lease agreement. So these were the informal that we'd been documenting up to that phase, now we're really focused on some of the key, the formal, key learning conditions as outlined in the Spectrum management lease agreement.

Highlights again of some of the informal ones, and this is out of the discussion last week and I wanted to share some of this discussion with the board. Use of

federal locations for some of the sites may be problematic. Side access rules don't always allow 24/7 and it's a very rigorous time window for when we can access sites.

Multiple sources of transport, so using different back hall arrangements, having strong service-level agreements for that integration. Turnover within the actual agencies and who has been, you know, operating the system up to this point, leaves for different position, where's the gap in transferring that to someone that can run it after that.

Uplink, downlink video capabilities, that's what a lot of the early builders are hearing from their users, and we all know the challenges with video, especially if you're putting static video cameras, that's really not a great use for a wireless mobile network. Some of the RF interference monitoring down on the border and also for other operations that show up in your areas and you're not sure what's going on, and monitoring those network performance stats.

Transitioning from deployment to an operational network, some of the management structures that are needed for that and for some of the projects they're actually looking to build through these services, how do they set those systems up. And then disparate rules for some of their pricing agreements on smartphones across the different agencies. So it was a great discussion, I thought the attendees got quite a bit out of that discussion and we were happy to host them in Boulder.

Some of the real-time uses of these early builders, I wanted to highlight for the board and what's been happening over the last several months. The team worked very closely with the city of Philadelphia for the papal visit, so you see the picture there with the pope and his use of the network.

The newer police departments use the network in the early builder project to apprehend the subject, coordinating officer locations situational awareness, Texas and Harris County are using it for the Houston Rodeo, as I mentioned before. Some of my staff are down there, that's not them on the bull but they're down there today, how it's being used and what they're doing.

A key lesson that Todd shared with us last week, there's over, I think he said, 30 children a day go missing at that rodeo, so trying to locate children and where they're at is an interesting aspect we hadn't thought about. So getting pictures out of those kids, out of the kids to the responders is critical. State of New Mexico used it for the recent balloon festival and also same type event for children at the balloon festival, sharing those photos and reuniting the kids with their families.

And then the Rose Bowl parade in Los Angeles, LA (Ricks) used that, they have high-speed throughput and used it for some different applications and video on that effort.

So Harlin mentioned earlier transitioning into the PSAC task team's work, and I started to create a new acronym Sue, but I thought it might confuse everyone with TPP and CTT, so ...

Sue Swenson: Yeah, please. No more.

Jeff Bratcher: PSAC task teams that, my technical staff are really focused on our, their local control and ICAM that we talked about earlier. And I want to, you know, thank the volunteers from the PSAC for attending and supporting these projects. The technical team gets so much out of that education and experience from the PSAC volunteers, I can't even quantify that. Every one of

them came up to me after the two days of meetings and said it was fantastic to understand the operational aspects the public safety community deals with.

Honestly, they've been focused in the wireless, predominantly wireless technology realm, and hadn't focused on public safety-specific operations. And that was really my goal for having this active engagement with the PSAC task team so that the technical staff learned from the operational volunteers that we have supporting this.

So the first one as Harlin mentioned was the local control aspects, and it's being led by (Barry Frazier), and we have dedicated technical staff on my team as well. And this really bears out of the work that was done last year with the task team that was focused on quality of service, priority and pre-emption. And some of those states that they developed, static, dynamic and controlled. And I'm going to pause there for any questions before I go into some of the key outcomes with this task team.

Sue Swenson: Jeff, just not about this, on the task team but back on the early builders, you know, since I have a real affinity for that, having been involved in it from day one. I think one of the things, you know, it's great to understand the use cases in terms of how it's being used, but I think one of the key things is, in those particular instances where the regular wireless network because of the demand, let's say the papal visit, you know, and the number of users on the network, the primary benefit is just access to the network, and then the applications on top of that.

I think Fred Scalera and his team in New Jersey have really experienced that. Maybe some of these other events are not as heavily attended, but I think that was one of the key benefits of having that network up and running during those events. Is that, did I capture that right?

Jeff Bratcher: You captured it perfectly, that's accurate. Yeah, when you have the Band 14 superhighway as I've, you know Jeff Johnson and I have been working on the terms of what we want to call that. When you have that available for the public safety traffic, that makes a huge difference, especially in some of the big events that aren't pre-planned, you know, where you can bring extra capacity and it's set up but those unplanned events where incidents occur and you need access, that's the goal and what we'll have for our network.

Sue Swenson: Right, thanks. Anything else from anybody?

Barry Boniface: Yeah, hey Jeff, it's Barry. And I guess in these use cases that you've outlined here, right now it's largely just the, largely the public service safety groups that are using the network, we're not really, we haven't really tested priority and pre-emption, these types of scenarios. Is that right?

Jeff Bratcher: Yeah, that's a fair statement Barry, and several of the projects are looking to do some pilots of some of the early technology that their respective vendors have to support that. But again, there's not a, it's a dedicated public safety network at this point, there's not a lot of, there's no actually commercial use of that band going on.

Barry Boniface: Yeah, yeah, I get it. We're testing that in the lab obviously but we haven't done it in one of these live environments yet.

Jeff Bratcher: Absolutely.

Barry Boniface: Yeah, thanks.

Jeff Bratcher: So again, focusing on the local control task team and what we're working there, I think Harlin said it earlier, you know, rarely if ever should a manual use of the local control be needed if we're focused on some of the governance issues nationwide, local agency and how we can support that from the technical side as well as understanding operational limitations of that with our task team.

The second issue of credentialing and access management group, the ICAM, and working on how we get the right individual access to the right resource at the right time for the right reason. I attended the summit that Harlin talked about in October of 2014, so we've been involved with that bigger effort.

I think Harlin can correct me if I'm wrong, the initial thinking going into that summit is FirstNet will solve this for everyone. And I think we've successfully brought them to the realization we need to solve it for the nationwide public safety broadband network and we want to leverage all the best practices in use today, but that's a big load to try and solve that for all the other aspects that aren't really wireless network or broadband network related. So, yes sir.

Harlin McEwen: So I got thinking after you asked the question earlier, so I think in some respects, although I said there is this bigger discussion, I will say that FirstNet and our activities have prompted them to get more involved in trying to solve the bigger problem, so I think that is good, actually.

Sue Swenson: Okay, that's good to know, thanks Harlin.

Jeff Bratcher: And again, the focus of the group, it's being led by Chris Lombard out of Seattle, you know, establishing this framework for onboarding agencies and some of the federal identity aspects. It's really key to the framework, you

know, access to the network, identity, your identity being recognized by the network, you get certain attributes based on your role within the use of the network, and then access to your services that you need to do your job, and then how you share that data and application sharing. So we've got a...

Sue Swenson: Say Jeff, no, I was just going to say sorry to interrupt, but I just think it's all of those things, but it's also the ease of use, because you know, one of the things that you know security can make it really, really hard, but I think as we think about the people who are, you know, on the street and in the field and, you know, I think that's an attribute that has to always be considered is yeah, we've got to have security but you have to be easy for the end user to use it.

Jeff Bratcher: Absolutely agree, and we had that was a very dynamic discussion with the group last week. I think one of the participants even said their police just want four, you know, a four-digit password, all ones, and that's it. So there's some definite, unique aspects to this to move forward.

Jeff Johnson: You expect me to leave that alone?

Jeff Bratcher: All right, next slide please. So again, some of the different components that are associated with ICAM and what we're working on within the task team. And then the governance of that, the identity management, the credential management, and the access management to that data, which really is the key for them to do their jobs.

Wrapping up a couple of slides here, so our cyber security outreach and efforts. So we've been working across DHS, the Idaho National Labs who's supporting us, reviewing our RFP and the J-10, which is our cyber security framework and objectives in the RFP, leveraging our partners in this and

PSCR with some of the ICAN analysis in concert with these task teams, they're participating actively as well.

Some of the device and application security challenges that we have. Cross walking some of the 3GPP and other security framework standards, and then one here that you see, the ShmooCon presentation, I don't know who all's familiar with that, that is an actual hacker type conference, and they are, you know, looking at LTE vulnerabilities, so the community is out there and looking at different aspects of wireless networks and what can be done, and we're tracking those with our partners in NIST for that.

And this recently stood up a national cyber security center of excellence, based in Gaithersburg, and there's a dedicated entity for a lot of these aspects that are going on in the commercial marketplace, and that we know for certain we will need to build in up front on the national public safety broadband network.

And then finally I'd like to wrap with we are continuing even though we have the RFP out on the street with some of the device-focused market research, how we will drive Band 14 into the devices. You can't leverage the network unless you have the capability within our devices, and meeting with vendors that are currently thinking about or going to be developing Band 14 devices for this community.

Meeting with some of the core device, the chip suppliers, end-vehicle routers, ruggedized smartphone suppliers, you know, they all say the same thing, which I think I've been sharing for the last several years. Everyone's kind of waiting to see what happens with the award. And we fully understand that, we want to keep the engagement, though, with those device manufacturers and

child sub-providers that it's coming, it'll be here soon, and we hope you have Band 14 ready to plug right in.

The picture you see there is an actual shot from the consumer electronics show, you know you have drone providers now selling to police departments and wanting to put in wireless broadband capabilities. So there's a lot of different areas within the device ecosystem and also the Internet of things and other devices that are being looked at now.

So with that, I think I caught us back up on time, I'll open for any questions and pause there.

Sue Swenson: Thanks, Jeff any questions from the board or comments? Lot going on in the technical area and those of you who are involved in the technical area you know it's moving faster than ever, so it's pretty hard to keep up with everything, right Jeff?

Jeff Bratcher: Absolutely, and I didn't even mention the network policies development and our development of answers for the questions, but I think James coming up will give us an update on that.

Sue Swenson: All right, so if there's no questions or comments from the board, James I think you're going to bring us up to date on the RFPs. The floor is yours.

James Mitchell: Great, thank you Sue and thank you everyone. Good afternoon, we're fresh on the heels of our pre-proposal conference from last week. I'm going to talk a little bit about that today. I'm also going to go through some of the Q and A outcomes on the RFP, and talk about what that means moving forward with our timeline to proposals.

So if we can go to the first slide. So some of this is slideware from last week and I'm bringing it up again because it's important to provide context. We like to show this just because it shows the evolution of FirstNet's engagement, not only with industry but also with public safety, our stakeholders at the state and local level. It really shows a growing organization, with that growing organization you have a maturation of our engagement processes and methodology.

I want to focus on the industry engagement, because it's pretty fresh in our minds. We've done a lot of outreach with industry, whether that's through RFIs, through the draft RFP, special notices, I would even refer to the public notices as part of this as well because of the work that's gone into that and how that's influenced the RFP. But also through consultation and that sort of vehicle.

We've had vendor meetings, we've done one-on-ones from large and small vendors, we've done a lot of work, and this last pre-proposal conference really points to that. I've got some numbers to give you in a second but if you look at this slide, really the escalation of engagement up to the RFP release, and by the way our continued engagement post-RFP release, it's really requiring us to be you know, as mature as we can in that engagement.

You know, I've talked to (Dave Dasher), our chief procurement officer about this, that you know we sort of lose the ball when we stop listening. And it's really important to keep listening to what industry has to say to us, which is why we've gone through this Q and A process and why we've done these vendor engagements as well. Next slide, please.

So let's talk about Q and A first before I move into the overall pre-proposal conference, because really when I spoke last week I talked about these topics

and I talked about the volume of questions that we received. You can see here we received 402 questions from 26 total submitters from around our stakeholder community, and that includes industry, states, locals, public safety as well. So we had a pretty good representation.

This is less, this number is obviously smaller than the over 650 questions we received from a draft RFP and the special notice from last year. And we think that's because of our engagement, we think it's because we've been very transparent in our process and we've released an RFP that shows the impact of that engagement. Our second industry day I said that when industry and public safety saw the RFP, they would see fingerprints on those documents, and I believe that's true. I believe we've seen the impact of that moving forward, and it's really quite gratifying.

So I made sure at the pre-proposal conference to once again thank industry for their input and thank public safety for their input in getting us the RFP that we believe public safety needs to deliver that network.

So when you look at the questions that we received, it's obviously a smaller number, but the focus areas, the topics that we've looked at, or that we received, we're fairly, almost 100 of them were administrative. And when I say administrative I mean requests for extensions, questions on paper size, questions on delivery of the actual proposal, on capability statements, things that kept Terrie Callahan, our contracting officer, fairly busy.

Close second there is obviously the technical questions, which Jeff just alluded to. Your team was fairly busy Jeff, I know, and I want to thank you for your help there, that was incredibly important getting these questions out the door. And we're well on our way. If we can go to the next slide.

So this slide shows the questions by topic area that I've just referenced, but also the blue means that we've completed all of our questions. And I want to pause here for a second, we missed our deadline. Last week we had hoped to get all these questions answered by the pre-proposal conference but we really killed ourselves trying to make sure that the answers we put out were the best possible, that they were accurate and that all amendments were made to the RFP real time, so that offers, potential offers would have the ability to flex on their proposal development.

And that's really important to us, you know, we say what we're going to do, and we do what we're going to say, and in this instance we missed a deadline, but by the end of today we'll have the remainder of those answers out, as well as the 22 additional questions we received in the room after the submission date, so really proud of that, I think that you're going to see industry react positively and also indicated at the pre-proposal conference and it states in the RFP that questions may be submitted by potential offerers up until award, and I've worked with our CO, I've worked with the RFP team to make sure that we're ready to flex to industry's request for clarification on the RFP, because we know that they're investing in this process. This is not a cheap process, moving forward a proposal of this magnitude, and we're very aware of that.

So we expect more questions to come in, and we'd like to review those as they come in and make a determination as to their impact and importance and then release answers as is reasonable. I'm going to pause here for a moment on what we're seeing through the Q and A process.

Sue Swenson: James, on the interaction, could you clarify what interaction is now committed between FirstNet and the vendor community, I'm just trying to get clear on that.

James Mitchell: Absolutely. So I'd like to start with the practical reality of engaging industry. I mean, most of us here actually have some experience, having coming from industry, we work with industry in our day to day on other contract actions and other areas. The RFP being the size that it is, it's hard to avoid that topic. But there are specific avenues that industry knows they must take to talk to us about the MPSBN and the RFP. They're listed in Section L of the RFP, it's absolutely critical that questions are submitted through that process, it's an e-mail address, it's fairly simple. We get those questions and we'll answer them.

In terms of our regular day to day lives, I think you and I talked about this Sue last year at the PSCR. We don't want folks just running away from industry when they say hello to you.

Sue Swenson: Right.

James Mitchell: Be a decent human being, say hello, there's plenty to talk about other than the NPSBN. But again, we like to have that listening mode and we're, you know, we're hearing, the news, looking at Twitter, seeing what industry is doing and it's good to observe, because there is a business intelligence aspect to this process. But to the extent that we can protect the integrity of the procurement by not engaging directly with industry, that's incredibly important, it's important to point them to the RFP, point them to Section L and say "The instructions to submit your questions are located there."

Sue Swenson: Great, thank you. I just wanted to clarify that, and we'll, that process will be open until the RFP responses are in, correct?

James Mitchell: Actually, the Q and A process goes throughout the entire proposal process, so up until award, we will receive questions for clarification, yeah.

Sue Swenson: Okay, thank you.

James Mitchell: It's important, we need to continue to clarify that, because like I said at the pre-proposal conference our last question we received was 12:58 Eastern time on the due date listed in the RFP, and that's great that everyone kept to that deadline. Last time on the RFP, we had quite a few stragglers throughout the weekend. It means they were listening and they paid attention, but I clarified that, because it's important they understand that this is a, you know, potentially a two-way street moving up to award.

Sue Swenson: Right.

James Mitchell: Thank you. All right, so at the pre-proposal conference, I opened it up with a program overview and some of the discussions that I'm going to get into today. Our CAO talked about the FirstNet value proposition, and then we had Terrie Callahan come up and give some logistical discussions around the RFP, some key dates, and she provided some closing remarks before we moved to the panel, where it was TJ Kennedy, myself, Jason Karp and Terrie Callahan answering questions from the audience real time, both on the webinar, on the phone, and then in the room.

And we had 22 questions total that we've documented from the transcript that we received from our contract staff that were monitoring this, and we provided those answers and those will be out in the process today.

Can you go to the next question, (Lawrence)? Next slide. All right, so the actual attendees, and this is actually breaking news, just got these numbers in because we actually had 178 attendees in the room, fairly packed auditorium here at the USGS building, and FirstNet headquarters.

On the webcast we had about 260, 259 total, so our total of 437. And if I'm looking at trends across our industry days as well as this pre-proposal conference, the number has stayed intact, it hasn't really grown or shrunk to any alarming degree. It stayed pretty steady, and you know we had some new companies showing up, some new folks, new stakeholders, and that tells me that we're either still teaming out in the field or people are just picking it up in their Google or Twitter news feed that there's this massive RFP out there, and that's natural.

We see familiar faces and we see a lot of familiar organization names in the register, and that's comforting, that means folks are still with us and they're still watching us with interest. And to that point, we take that opportunity when we have these events to talk about our teaming list.

We currently have 640 companies that have signed up on our teaming list, and that's pretty huge. We've been very clear with industry both large and small that this is an important tool for you to use if you want to, it doesn't bar you from participating if you aren't on it, but it certainly will help the community at large, because if you look at our RFP and what we asked for, it's quite a bit.

Those 16 objectives are loaded. This is not a small effort and we expect teams to show up and really maximize the community that we've established around FirstNet to either public safety states and locals or members of industry as well and associations. We like to point to that frequently.

That teaming list will close soon, actually, but it will still be available for potential offers to peruse. But the fact is, we're moving into a phase of this acquisition, and I'll talk about it on the last slide here, but we're moving into a phase that has us reviewing capability statements, we should be seeing some of the ink dry on the proposals that are being developed, teams should be

probably well within their red teaming, their pink teaming for their proposals at this point, sort of getting everything together before they make that deadline, and I'll talk about some of the deadlines toward the end of this presentation as well.

But we have to close that list off, we will keep it out on SBO with all of our other documents and that's an important tool for industry moving forward. Next slide.

All right, so I want to go over some major topics in the actual RFP Q and A, and we're just going to cycle through here, but I want to pause for just a second, because as I went through this, I wanted to point to the fact that the RFP really isn't hard-wired for anyone. Something we saw in the actual Q and A process where again, folks sort of searching for that line of requirements or this is clearly for a segment of industry. It's not, it simply isn't. I mean, if you look at our objectives, if you look at our evaluation factors and their focus, this is an RFP built for those that can innovate around a solution for public safety, maximizing the assets that FirstNet brings to the table.

And if I can stretch that theme as long as I can, I'm going to. And I think we all need to when we go out and talk about this, because we want to make sure we maximize competition but that we also get to a solution, the best solution for public safety at the end of the day. That's why we adopted the best value approach, that's why we adopted objectives instead of requirements.

I told the folks in the pre-proposal room and on the call that if you're looking at your government capture managers and you're looking at your think teams, go with your big thinkers, go with your creative folks, don't expect requirements to come out of this, there aren't any hidden requirements. We ask for a lot in the objectives but we are not specific, because far be it from us

to hem creative engineers and creative program managers from a solution that, you know, frankly we haven't thought of. That's why we're asking for this to happen.

So always an important message here, in our tailoring of answers we've tried to stretch that as well, so every opportunity we get we like to talk about that. So I'm going to go through some of the topics, sorry.

Man: Just any other questions.

James Mitchell: Oh, I'm sorry. Do you have any questions on the phone? Okay.

Sue Swenson: Looking good.

Man: Thank you.

James Mitchell: So on the Q and A, we saw some particular topics that caught our eye right out the gate, capability statements was something that we found, industry we thought was, I think, confusing and we needed to clarify immediately. So we responded to the requests on capability statements.

One, capability statements are not a requirement, they're an opportunity for potential offerers to position themselves strategically to let FirstNet know what their capabilities are at a high level, which will drive our written response back to those potential offers on the capability statement and, oh by the way, we will offer a meeting with that potential offerer to talk about their capability statements, identify the virtues, strengths and weaknesses of those capability statements and frankly, that should be something that's useful as you develop your proposals and we continue to hammer on this because we think it's important.

That deadline is approaching, it's March 31. In fact we provided an extension request of two weeks on the capability statement because of that lack of clarification, we know that was conservative but we think it's also important given our mission to give an extension on the proposal due date. So no longer is it the end of April, it's now May 13. Also, that's due to the fact that we want folks to understand that if you're going to go back and do your capability statement, here's an additional two week buffer that we could absorb moving into the summer for evaluations.

So we did get an extension request for longer, we had one for eight months, we were not prepared to allow for eight months of an extension, sorry about that, but two weeks seemed to be the right approach there.

On rural considerations, we saw this in the Q and A, we've seen it in our vendor engagement, we've seen it as recently as the pre-proposal conference, where you know, rural telecommunications providers and rural associations are asking us questions on how to assist them in their teaming efforts moving forward with potential primes.

And part of that is actually defining rural telecommunications provider, that's now been updated in the RFP, so it should give a clear indication to the potential offerers who they need to go seek out when they try to meet the metrics that we've established in Section L and Section M regarding rural considerations. We've pointed to those in several instances throughout the Q and A, some good clarification there.

On the covered leasing agreements, this is not your typical contract, we have said that since day one, it's a very unique RFP, the CLA being one of the more unique aspects of our acquisition, of our ask, but it was important for us

to once again emphasize that the CLA is the mechanism by which the partner will have access to the spectrum capacity. And it was important to clarify that at every step. I brought that up in the room in the pre-proposal conference so folks knew where to go on that response and sort of ironing out some of those issues and I think we really nailed it there.

We also see these requirements versus objectives issue continue to pop. Folks are looking for those requirements. I alluded to it earlier in the call today and again in the pre-proposal conference last week that you're not going to find requirements in our documents outside of those thresholds that we provide as well as in the FCC tab report, this is a fundamental piece of our acquisition, we have had the statement of objectives out there for the better part of a year and a half, almost two years now, since September of 2014, and not much has changed on those objectives.

And that's important because if you've been following us over those three timelines I showed earlier on the deck, you know those objectives and we like to continue to bring this up because it's a fundamental part of our acquisition.

Finally the timing of payments to FirstNet. There were some questions on the payment structure but nothing that really alarmed us, but we did realize we needed to clarify when exactly those payments would happen. I like to always hope and enclose my presentations with a timeline, and I think it's always important to put timelines out there when we can and the timing of payments is no exception. We have now in the RFP a table that shows that timeline based off of our anticipated let of past orders on a state by state level.

I'm going to close on a timeline. We have our key dates listed here moving forward for the summer. Obviously, the RFP was released on January 13, the questions that we have in hand were due on February 12, those can continue

to be received by FirstNet, we've obviously answered all of those questions that we received before the deadline. We reserve the right to answer any questions we see necessary moving forward.

We're obviously on our way to capability statements, which is phase one of our evaluation process. Those are due on March 31, with proposals being due on May 13, when we start our phase two for, phase two being the solicitations conformance check, which is basically the contracting officer making sure that everything is included in the package we've asked for.

We have a pass/fail phase on phase three, which is dealing with the payment thresholds that we talk about in the RFP as well as rural partnerships. And then finally on Phase IV, our competitor range to termination which is really where the rubber hits the road and that's that best value discussion.

Finally, we're looking at an Award and Contract in place. Per the RFP we actually it listed as early November, November 1st, is the anticipated award Date. And I had mentioned the Pre-Proposal Conference that can move left or right, depending on the complexity, and number of Proposals that we receive. And we like to keep that basically up in view of all times. We know that this is the next deadline, right? Not a day went by before December 31st of 2015 that I didn't hear that date or see that date in my queue. This is the new date. So now we're all very aware of it. Very excited about it.

So with that, I'm going to open it again for question on anything I talked about today.

Sue Swenson: Any questions from the Board? Go ahead.

Kevin McGinnis: Yes, this is Kevin. In the review of Capabilities statements, that's obviously a really compressed timeframe. What can you tell us about the process that's going to be involved in there and the people that are going to be involved in doing that?

James Mitchell: Well...

Kevin McGinnis: And I might, too, just for everybody's, you know, piece of information. This is one very unusual additional piece that FirstNet has built in. It's not a great opportunity for, you know, potential bidders to test out their approach. And you don't see that in the Federal realm very often, if at ever, do you?

James Mitchell: You do, but that you see it with a little bit more, I'll say, it it's more weaponized, if you will. Typically, you'll see an Agency down select on a Capability Statement. And tell folks that we're actually, we're using this as an opportunity to, sort of, it's a soft approach to industry. So to that end, yes, it is aggressive and we're aware of it.

I have a small team ready to review and start scheduling meetings as necessary when we receive those Capability Statements. To the process and the members of that team, I can't really get into that because it's determined sensitive. But it is something that we've got scheduled down to the minute and were ready to absorb that work moving forward into Proposals.

Kevin McGinnis: Thank you.

James Mitchell: Thank you.

Sue Swenson: Hey James, two questions.

James Mitchell: Sure.

Sue Swenson: Did you mention? Do we have all the questions answered? Or do we still have some outstanding?

James Douglas: We have all of them answered, and they will be out the door today.

Sue Swenson: Okay. Okay. Because I was thinking there was one little batch left that you had to do. So that's helpful.

And then the same question I asked some of your colleagues before. You know, obviously taking all this work in, processing it as non-trivial. How we are doing on resources? And I know it's procurement sensitive, and you don't want to give too many details. But are we clear now on the structure for evaluation of the RFP, and advice, and all that sort of thing? So whatever you can comment is appropriate.

James Douglas: Yes, we are very clear. I think we poured some cement on that over the past three months. You know, working with the team here, the Management Team, as well as the RFP folks. Particularly, Terrie Callahan's been very helpful in giving us, sort of, the rules of the road and helping us build that structure. I'm very confident that we have the right folks in the room to execute this.

I would, would I like to clone a couple of us? Sure. Frankly, I would love to. But, you know, we have what we have and we're going, we're definitely going to make it work.

Sue Swenson: All right. Other questions on this? Obviously we're entering a very important period here to get to the finish line. I just want make sure you all have opportunity to ask James questions.

Teri Takai: Sure. This is Terrie. On the Advisory Consult, I think, the SHAC, did I get that right? Have you made the decision on who's going to participate? And, you know, you sent us out a Proposed Schedule which was hugely helpful. But I was just wondering if we were going to hear back from you so that we could lock those dates in on our calendar? Or, what was the next steps on that?

James Mitchell: So Terrie, we'll have to take that conversation off line. I'm sorry, some of that is considered a procurement sensitive area.

Teri Takai: That's great. Thank you.

James Mitchell: Thank you.

Sue Swenson: Others? So thanks to James, you, and the team because I know it takes an army of people to get us to this point. And we are just entering another phase of the exercise here. And but we're excited that we're moving forward. And thanks for meeting, not meeting a date. I think you're the only person in the organization that hasn't met a date. Just kidding.

James Mitchell: Let's just see if I can. I would like to thank the Board last December, when we met and we worked through this, and got to that crucial vote. That is a meeting that I will not forget. I appreciate it and appreciate everyone's input. Thank you.

Sue Swenson: Yes, it was momentous, for sure. Thank you, James, I appreciate it. I think we're ready to move on to Jason. And Jason is going to take us through the Legal and Compliance Update. I hope it's not too late in the meeting. And you know, Jason, we probably should've put you first so people, you know, as you know this is pretty exciting stuff.

Jason Karp: I was just going to say, Sue. I mean, you know, it's good to have the warm up act with James, and TJ, TJ's Road Map. But now that we've got through the boring stuff, we can get to the meat of the meeting.

Sue Swenson: And then we're going to a Resolution on the Bylaws. So I just told you your two items. Okay go ahead.

Jason Karp: That's right. So we'll run through this pretty quickly. And of course, we're, you know, any questions you all have we're available now or at any time.

But, you know, basically we've got a pretty robust Compliance Program here at FirstNet as part of the Finance Committee Charter and the Compliance Committee Charter that we have in place. We give a Periodic Update to the Board and to the Finance Committee, in particular, on the status of our Compliance Program. So it's really what we're doing today. Just an update and a status for folks.

And I know it's not the most exciting topic, but the reality is, it's crucially, crucially important. I know you all appreciate that. And all of the fine work and information received earlier today from folks. You know, that all gets put at risk if we don't have a strong foundation of compliance in place to ensure that we're doing what we need to do to meet our obligations.

So just working through on Slide, we can go to the next Slide. So on this Slide, this is really just, kind of, reiterating and reminding everyone of the key principles that backed up our Compliance Program. I remember it's almost two years ago when we started putting these together and in place. And it's really about, you know, forging something very similar to what you see in the

corporate world, right? And first, it's unique. And some of you have heard this before, we have some newer Board Members.

But, you know, we're an independent authority. You know, we sit inside an Executive Agency. We have a Board made up of both Government and Private individuals. We have to be self-sustaining. We have to partner with industry. You know, show me somewhere else in the Government where this is happening? And, you know, I'll gladly duplicate what they're doing. So you know this is really unique and it creates a lot of unique risks for the organization.

So we've developed a Program that is very much like a Corporate Compliance Program with Ethical Standards, Principles, that I'll take you through very quickly. But really, it's about, you know, presenting the highest ethical standards and we will feel that. It's a tone from the top and it trickles its way down to all staff. We want to make sure that our Program is ethical, meets the highest standards. I want to make sure it's effective. And ultimately, that everything that we do is in compliance with the law and regulations. And those are really the three fundamental principles that we live by.

Next Slide? Just to give you an idea of a Governance and how we're governed. And this has changed over the last year or so since we've given this update. As I noted, ultimately the Finance Committee has the ultimate responsibility that is delegated by the full Board of oversight, for first, it's compliance. Beneath that we have internally our Compliance Committee, which is made up of all the Senior Leaders within the organization. And that Committee is responsible for overseeing and reviewing all compliance items, policies, training, risk assessments. Really all elements of risk roll up to the Compliance Committee.

And then you'll see we've got a number of Sub Committees in areas, that we've developed over the course of the year, dealing with different aspects of compliance and risk. Starting, you know, over kind at the right, the Legal Compliance. That's the one that we stopped about a year ago. And really, my organization is also working with all the other Senior Leaders to ensure that we're meeting all of our legal requirements.

One of the newer organizations that we put in place. While we've always addressed this on an ongoing basis, we're now getting some real organizational structure around it, is the Business Enterprise Risk Process and Enterprise Risk Management Program. For those in the private sector, this should be very, very familiar to you. And even in the Government, you know, sector they have ERM processes that are similar in purpose. And I want to thank James and the PMO Team for bringing us some dedicated resources with Miriam Montgomery and (Joseph Miles). Who are now running that Program for us -- and are adding a lot of project management rigor to the overall business and enterprise risk process -- which is really going to be great going forward.

In addition to that, you heard earlier (Kim) talking about the Internal Controls Program, so we won't spend a lot of time on that. But we've got the Senior Assessment Team. She also mentioned under that, the Core Assessment Team, which brings in the staff level into this process. And I don't think she got into, in a lot of detail, but we literally have individuals designated within each organization throughout, for each person responsible for compliance and internal controls. And those folks are all rolling up through the CAT and ultimately, throughout the Senior Assessment Team. And so that's a great program run by (Kim Farrington) and (John Wobbleton) in the Finance organization.

And then, I've carved out here, kind of, separately although it's part of the rest is DOI, right? Because we've got the big acquisition. We've just heard about this. In fact, you know, kudos to James who, you know, was an issue we couldn't talk about because it was procurement sensitive. That's a matter of compliance, right? Ensuring we don't put anything at risk. And we rely on DOI to help us guide us specifically, you know, through a lot of those challenges on the procurement side as well as CLD at the Department of Commerce. So that's our Governance structure. And it's constantly, kind of, growing and changing. And, you know, next year, they'll probably be more nuances to it as well.

So just moving on real quickly to, kind of, a couple of key accomplishments or so or change and statuses of where we are. So policies and procedures. One of the big areas of compliance. In the last year, we've implemented, I think 30 or so, policies within FirstNet in these given areas. These are in addition to the, kind of, the generic policies that we follow, either Government wide or that exist within the Department of Commerce. Some of these are brand new in terms that they're FirstNet-specific, like our Administrative Expense Policy, our Vendors Coms Policy. Which, you know, folks had asked about earlier today in terms of vendor integration, rules of conduct

Other things are, you know, Department of Commerce Policies themselves. They're IT Rules of Behavior that we've adopted. Document Retention Policies, these kinds of things. The Department puts these out. We follow them. If we feel we need to modify them, then we will. And then we've got some Policies that the Department has, but we've duplicated and modified, you know, to fit FirstNet-specific circumstances. So things that to where our Policies are slightly different to really manage the disperse workforce that we've got. Professional credentials and some of the other Policies that we've put in place. So we've got different categories. We've done a lot of work here.

And this is going to continue. I would not be supposed if this doubles when I give you the update next year, or sooner.

Moving on to communications and training. You know, a lot going on here. And I'm going to anticipate some questions or issues, you know, at the get go. One of our big focuses has been, and will continue to be, training. What I mean by focus, there's a lot of training out there. The Department has required training that we all have to take. Things like EEO, HR-related training. And most of you have just gone through the IT Security training. And I know that we've had some challenges there.

We have, FirstNet, has layered on top of that certain specific training that it required. And we've made a lot of strides here. As you can see on this Slide, we've done a lot in terms of training, in the first two bullets. A lot more to do here. I mean what we recognize is the training can be, it can take up a lot of person hours. It can hurt productivity. But at the same time, the materials are really important.

And so our team is working with the CAO organization which has a responsibility within FirstNet for overseeing our training program. To really look to ways we can streamline that training going forward. Identify the real critical items. You know, where we take a topic that was it is being trained by the Department -- and feel that we need it to be tailored or we can do it more efficiently -- and we're able to do that. We want to put together a program where at, you know, at day one, the beginning of the fiscal year, we have a mapping out of all the training that folks need to take. And they'll be able to plan ahead of time.

So, you know, these are part of the growing pains of a new organization. Part of the growing, or the pains of a large government organization, that, you

know, where we sit within it. So we're navigating those two things. But it is high on our priority list when it comes to compliance. And we understand the challenges.

The other big things that we've done on this, is a tracking and communications. You know, very positive. What we have done in training is we've developed our own FirstNet Web site. So when you do go to training, it's now a FirstNet-dedicated Web site. And we're looking at continuing to improve that.

And we've created a Communications Plan that I think is really important. I mean, it's just because it's good business practice. But in response to a lot of the interactions we've had with the IG and GAO. And to make sure that all this good information that we're putting out -- and all the great steps people are taking -- people need to know about and they need to be able to follow it.

So I think you all received the Compliance Connect Newsletter that we put together, which is a monthly snapshot of new Policies and Programs and Key Issues. We've got a new Onboarding Process for employees who get the Key Policies. They get trained. We have a segment in our Orientation where we train folks in person when they join FirstNet on our Compliance Program. And of course all of this is accessible in a shared drive on a hard drive for everyone. So a lot were doing there to make sure folks are aware.

You know, other things that, you know, we focus on that are really critical has been reporting, right? So if there is a problem, we need to make sure folks have the avenues to report it. And know that they're going to be able to do it without any retaliatory behaviors. And with impunity, that's critical. And so we've done a lot there in communicating, reporting channels directly to the Department of Commerce and the IGs Office. Folks can always do that. They

have reporting channels within FirstNet to the Supervisory Chain into the Compliance Committee.

We publish Leaflets annually, not bi-annuals, different information about any whistle blower protections. So that, you know, if folks do have to report an issue, they know that they are free and protected from any, kind of, retaliatory conduct and behavior. So that's really important. We focus on that a lot.

And, you know, finally, of course we're continuing to look at risk areas for us. And risk assessments are ongoing. So that's why it, kind of, says implemented and ongoing. We're constantly looking at what our risks are? Where the holes are? Where do we need to fill those gaps? And that really feeds and drives a lot of our Compliance program. And (Kim) mentioned earlier, the Internal Controls Risk Assessment that she and (Herb)'s team did. And we've coordinated with them on that and others that we're doing. We're doing a similar thing in ERM. Really critical part of the process to identify and proactively identify where we have risks.

And then, of course, finally we continue to work with the IG and GAO. We mentioned that earlier in the Call. They are, you know, engaged in ongoing routine audits and that will continue on different topics. So it's really a full-time job for some of our staff to just work with the IGs office and GAO periodically to respond to their inquiries. We do a lot of interviews. We provide a lot of documentation on a regular basis. And of course you've all the publically available reports on FirstNet. And I'm very proud to say, that I think especially in the last year, they have been extremely favorable.

So, you know, that's the Compliance Program in 30 seconds or less. You know, what I want to do is just open it up obviously for any questions or comments from anyone on the Board, and certainly now, or at any time.

Sue Swenson: So, Governor Douglas, did you want to go first on the training?

Governor James Douglas: No, I'll yield to the Chair.

Sue Swenson: Well Jason, you know, it's just, I think it goes to my earlier comment about people need to test things. And I know that some of things are not in your control, because it came from higher in the hierarchy of the Federal Government.

But, you know, it's frustrating for me as a Board Member to be a sent an email from somebody to say, "Take this training." And you try to log on and it doesn't work. And it is because people didn't think through who we are and who they're sending it to. And so we do spend a lot of extra time, as I did on Sunday, going to the 24-hour Chat Line to find out what the official browser is for, you know, for the Commerce Learning Center.

So I just, you know, it's not as you meet with our colleagues. If you could ask them to be a little more thoughtful of testing something. I would be happy to test something before they ship it out like that. Because it does, you know, the Board Members just don't have a lot of extra time. So I just wanted to make a public statement of that.

On a positive note, I want, you know, your interface with I think with DOC on the OIG, GAO, with the new person who's been there for a year, which I think, came from (Noah), I think is really, really good. (Ben Freidman), I believe, is his name. I just want to call him out because I think he's made a big, big difference on how things are working there.

So I did want to acknowledge I think that's working well. And it just shows that people can make a difference when they, you know, when they think about their customers. So just to comment on that. Just frustrating.

Jason Karp: No, that's great, Sue. I appreciate it. And I agree on (Ben) and his team, and we work very closely with them, and have appreciated their support.

And on your other point. You know, I'll step back a little bit. I know you said it's not our problem, but we do view it as our problem. And it's a problem we're going to try to solve going forward in working with the Department and others, so that, you know, they really do understand.

You know, we're a little bit different than some of the others. And we need to approach things in a way that makes sense for everyone within the Department. So that's definitely on my radar. And I know it's on (Frank)'s radar. And we're going to continue to pursue that to make things easier.

Sue Swenson: I appreciate it. Anybody have questions or comments about compliance?

Okay, you want to move on to the Bylaws update. And I think everyone received update yesterday from Eli. So that's the one we're actually talking about.

Jason Karp: Yes. And this is, you know, we finally go to the real work of the Board today, which is the only decision of the day, is discussing the Bylaws. Just a little background. I don't think the Model has been updated. Maybe once since they originally put out, you know, very early on, but it's been quite some time. And they're really just out of date. I mean, I would say 98% of the updates that you all received were about bringing them current, to current our form, current

maturity level. You know, knowing what we know now, and how we operate. We make sure that our documents are and our Governance is consistent.

So that's really, for the most part, that's really what we're addressing here. But certainly, you know Sue, I'll turn it over you. And if there is other questions before we move forward with a vote, certainly we're available to address those.

Sue Swenson: Sure. I know that there's been a quite a bit of interaction the last couple of days. I believe that the requests that were made have been adopted. But let me ask the Board Members who had concerns and that these have been addressed to their satisfaction.

Governor James Douglas: Yes.

Sue Swenson: Okay.

Jason Karp: Like I say, I'm going to give a shout out to the Governor, who read then, talked about them, and gave very detailed comments. And I'm highly appreciative that he spent the time to read the fascinating documents that we sent over. It's very much appreciated.

Sue Swenson: Right. I just want to make sure. I just to make sure because I haven't spoken to the Board members that did have issues? And I just want to make sure that, in fact, has been addressed. I'm going to assume if there are no comments, that they've addressed. That people don't want to particularly comment.

Suzanne Spaulding: Sue, this is Suzanne. I do want to be make clear we did have some comments. And the staff was great and accommodated, you know, worked this out with us. And so, we're comfortable with this.

Sue Swenson: Okay. Any other Board Members want to comment on anything that was of concern?

Okay. So I think we're ready to consider a vote to adopt. So I'm, could I have a Motion to approve the Bylaws, as represented in the most recent email dated March 15th at 2:55 pm Pacific?

So moved.

Richard Stanek: Seconded by Stanek.

Sue Swenson: Thank you, Rich. And any further discussion on the matter? All those in favor, please signify by saying, "Aye."

(Group): Aye.

Sue Swenson: Any oppositions or abstentions? So I think we have adopted the Bylaws. And, you know, and I mean just, you know, it's an interesting set of Bylaws. I mean, coming from the private sector, I just have to say they're they've got some unique, they're calling them unique characteristics, that are not really representative of current organization and more in the private sector. But I know I live in a different world, so they are what they are.

Jason Karp: Sue, just one last item there. You know, we've Eli standing by, and just so they're red into the record. I'd like you, just to read the Operative Provisions, the Resolutions?

Sue Swenson: Thank you. Yes. Yes, go ahead, Steve. Sorry abbot that.

Eli Veenendaal: So the Operative Provision that was voted on would have been, "Now for there be it be resolved that the FirstNet Board hereby adopts the Revised and Amended Bylaws for the First Responder Network Authority, as presented by Management, a copy which is attached to the Final Resolution."

Sue Swenson: Great. Thank you. I apologize for skipping over that. Sorry, now I have that formally in the record. Thank you very much.

(Mike), I think you're up to give us to, to bring us the tail of the meeting here with a quick update from you.

Mike Poth: Great. I don't know what's worse. Following the legal, or being last.

Sue Swenson: Or you're both.

Jason Karp: Go with both.

Mike Poth: Exactly. So we'll go to the next Slide. I just spend a couple of minutes to, you know, level set and remind the Board as you all are aware.

You know, FirstNet and our responsibilities aren't just with the RFP. There's a lot of other activities and programs in order to make this successful. So I do want to just talk a little about them. But all of them, all the work that we do, truly is precursor to the public, private partnership that have embodied up to the point. So a lot of the work that has been occurring in the past, and will occur in the future, is under that spirit.

You've heard, if we go to the next Slide, from James today on the RFP Release and some of the highlights. So I won't spend any more time on that. You know, one of the key dates, obviously, next near term date that discussed

on the Road Map is March 31st. But we also have a lot of work and efforts going on with our Program. So I wanted to just give the Board a brief update relative to that.

And then two in particular. First is the NEPA, which is a National Environmental Policy Act requirements under. And are requirements to do Program Environmental Impact Statements. Now that's, while it's a long word, the work is even 12 billion times more than that.

The team of five have been working tirelessly nights and weekends to get the first of the five Program Environmental Impact Statements out. And they were able to accomplish that on March 4th. It's literally about a 2,000 page document. Multiple, multiple volumes. It is a requirement. It came out of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1970, as my team reminders. President Nixon was actually an Environmental President and it got enacted. So they have the responsibility of build out of the National Public Safety Broadband Network to sweep all 56 States and Territories for their Environmental Impacts. And they have completed 1/5 of the work.

If we go on to the next Slide, you can see that the next plan is to cover the East Region, which are 14 States from Virginia to Maine. And then they'll continue with the series of Releases of these documents and the analysis over the next year. The outreach and the requirements, both under the Act and what's being prudent as FirstNet, is that there are opportunities for public comment, 60 days' comments, and Public Meetings in each of these States and Territories. They're have been Hearings on other concerns relative to the build of the National Network.

If you can imagine, we have the opportunity, with an offer, that says, "They already have Tower A, and they're going to put one more device onto Tower

A, that needs to be examined to make sure there isn't any additional environmental impact." So it's not a trivial exercise. And this reaches out to the also the Federally Recognized Tribes, the Alaskan Native Corporations. I will point out that the Turtle is not a deployable device, but it is actually a turtle. And so those of the things that we're trying to focus on. But as with that spirit that the NEPA Team continues.

And if you go the next Slide, here is the Regions. So each of these areas have to be analyzed, and then Environment Impact Statements done, and then revisited with our partner. But, you know, under the opus of that partnership, you know, our network partner must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act. But our FirstNet NEPA Team is standing, ready to assist the partners and their Environmental Staff. And they are subcontractors immediately upon contract award to make them successful. To make sure that they build, the roll outs, and the implementation is successful in timely manner.

So are there any questions relative to the NEPA? It's something that they toil away in the back rooms. But it is a critically, critically important effort for the successful build-out.

Any questions?

Sue Swenson: So (Mike), do you feel that it's on schedule to make the needs of the RFP and the responses and deployment?

Mike Poth: Yes.

Sue Swenson: Okay.

Mike Poth: So the team is completely staffed up and they have the line of sight to get the all the work done and with the Hearings. And then when the partners come in with their plans and implementations, they'll, the onus is on the partner to provide that analysis. But we will help them be successful as quickly as possible also.

Sue Swenson: Okay.

Mike Poth: The next area that's equally has focus -- and we've talked about countless times the value prop of a cleared spectrum -- is our Band 14 Spectrum Relocation. So we wanted to just provide a quick update in the way ahead.

You know, that's once again, it's a great partnership that we have reached out to all the 56 States and Territories to try to identify all known agencies that are currently operating under this Band 14. And have conducted follow-up calls and meetings with all the incumbents to help ensure that they are clear on FirstNet's requirements and what we can do to assist them. Spending a lot of time. You know, thanks to the Board's foresight and, you know, approval with a funding to clear the incumbents, we actually completed the necessary work today. And the Federal funding opportunity, the Grant, is actually posted today on Grants.com to assist with these agencies to get some funding.

If you go to the next slide? This, kind of, gives you a heads up view of where the Spectrum relocations areas are, the scopes. Obviously, with the States of Virginia, Illinois, and Arkansas. And then the other agencies that we've identified. And our Teams are actively working with them. Sometimes, we need to make sure that they have the information. And they are working efficiently and effectively to move their existing equipment and devices onto another Band.

If you look at the Timeline, we've set, we believe this is a realistic, yet aggressive Timeline. So with March 2016, we literally today, the FirstNet Funded Grant Program, is out and available for the agencies to apply to assist in their relocation. Once again, it's posted out on Grants.gov. And our Spectrum Relocations Team is standing by in that partnership to assist the agencies to successfully complete the Grant Applications. They will be administered by FirstNet, along with assistance of the Grant office from MIS, to make sure that we are successful.

We have set Timelines for the Review Process and then the relocation windows with the target of August 2017. All those agencies are, have moved successfully, without service interruption over to other Spectrums. So that the Band 14 Spectrum, as we have told industry and is critical to the FirstNet Value Prop, is free and clear.

So while we all focus rightfully so a lot of the mechanics of the RFP and the acquisition, I think this is a critical component. And we do still have we believe we have the staffing in the line of sight to make this successful for all of the 15 Agencies. Are there any particular questions on that? And we'll provide periodic updates to the Board during the Quarterly Board Meetings on the progress that, those projects.

Sue Swenson: And (Mike), just to be clear? I mean, I know we've talked about this before. I mean Spectrum relocation is not a new process and is pretty standard. I mean, I don't think you anticipate any issues with this, do you? As long as the funding is there and people have enough time to do it?

Mike Poth: Correct. Correct. I mean, they've already, all the 15 Agencies already have their plans in how they're going to pull it off. Now the critical component is the funding to be able to secure that.

I mean some of the agencies or, you know, have literally two or three devices. You know it may \$700 of cost and they may decide not to, for example, even apply for the Grant. Just move the two or three devices themselves because it's more cost effective than coming through for a Grant process.

Sue Swenson: Right. Right. Like I said...

Mike Poth: So they're all not huge giant initiatives and the team has worked with all of them and is very comfortable and confident that those individual agencies, and their project teams, have the methodology to be successful over the next year.

Sue Swenson: Okay. Thank you. Other questions from the Board on this or comments?

Mike Poth: All right. Last thing before we close, I first want to thank the Board for their time. Hopefully, you know, this Conference Call was effective. And we look forward to seeing everyone in Chicago in June for our next scheduled Board Meeting.

You know, as we saw during the Road Map presentation, there's a lot of big decisions coming up pretty soon. Not just for FirstNet, but for every State and Territory, and the potential offers, and all our partners. You know, we're continuing to do everything that we can think of for public safety, PSACs, due diligence, to get the best possible solutions. You know, with our vendor outreach, the market research, all the consultation that's been done working with our fellow agencies, with the FCC, the NTIA, Public Safety, the Department of Interior, assisting us with this effort. You know lots of moving parts.

Now you've heard a lot from the outreach team relative to the next focus and that is a key critical component. And is actually our largest cost driver this year, is that consultation and outreach to prepare the States for the State Plans. And we understand the States now, with the, you know, the eminent warding of a Contract coming up, that they are also beginning their due diligence and planning, so that they can brief their Governors on what's the best approach. And we certainly understand that. And that's only a logical course of action for them.

You know, the Governors and the States need to be prepared and informed and educated with their State plans, so when the Governor gets the Plan and the clock starts ticking, they are in a position to have already explored and researched as much as possible. That's why we have set up a process with consultation with the SPACs, the executive consultation, asking, you know, meetings with the executives and key stakeholders in the State so they do make an informed decision.

Because as the Board knows, you know, the Law lays out the process, consultation, RFP, and State plans. And, kind of, building on the College Basketball March Madness theme, the shot clock is pretty short. It's only 90 days once the final Plans are delivered to the Governors. So it is appropriate for the States to be considering and weighing, you know, what the best course of action is. And we are committed to over communicate everything that we possibly can, so that they can make those things.

You know, this is as we've talked about, a very complex deal. And I mentioned last week during the Pre-Proposal Conference, lots of moving parts. And it's easy to, kind of, wrapped around the art of the deal, and the teaming and relationships, and all the complexities. But I think it's important, and we remind ourselves constantly, at FirstNet. You know, the focus for the

truly National Sustainable Inoperative Network, is for public safety. And that, you know, it's their network and we're just the stewards.

And as I remind ourselves, and as we close today's meeting, I really want to thank the Board for their ongoing leadership and support. And I know that each of you, even with your different backgrounds an expertise, are looking through it with that filter and that lens. So we are really appreciative of that.

So with that, Madam Chair, I don't have anything else. But I'll open it for any questions that the Board may have on any topics.

Sue Swenson: Right. I think that's great, (Mike). Thanks for the update on that.

And as (Mike) said, any topics that have covered or things not covered. Anything else on your mind that you want to ask (Mike), or the rest of the Management Team about, while we have them?

Guess you did a good job today, folks? And or else you absolutely put stuff...

Mike Poth: We wore you down. That's it.

Sue Swenson: Yes. No, I appreciate us having the Teleconference. Just because, particularly for those of us who don't live in the D.C. vicinity. it becomes a three-day event. And so it's pretty challenging from a travel perspective. And since we didn't have any large votes, and need for closed session and face to face interaction, we thought we might as well as use the technology of the appropriate century. And use this technology to have this meeting. Because we want to be as frugal and cost efficient a possible when necessary. So if we don't need to meet face to face, no reason to incur all that cost.

But, hopefully we found the updates useful. If you have feedback for (Mike), or myself, in terms of the Board Agenda? Or, ways or like to handle some for these topics, we're open to that discussion as you know.

So with that, unless, I'm going once, going twice?

Governor James Douglas: Once.

Sue Swenson: Okay. Okay, I think the bell's going to ring. So I think we need to have a motion to adjourn. Can I have a motion?

Governor James Douglas: So moved.

Suzanne: So moved.

Sue Swenson: Thank you. Is there a second?

(Group): Second.

Sue Swenson: Thank you so much. And I presume there is no further discussion. If in favor, please indicate by saying, "Aye."

(Group): Aye.

Sue Swenson: And any abstentions or objections?

I want to thank everybody whose attending, either in Reston, or on the Webcast for joining us today. And look forward to seeing everybody in. Actually I think we'll everybody at the PSCR in June?

Jeff Johnson: Right.

Sue Swenson: Will probably be the first place. Right, Jeff?

Jeff Johnson: I think that's right. In summit IWCE.

Sue Swenson: Right. The summit IWCE and then Board Meeting in June. So have a good couple months. This meeting's adjourned.

END