

SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report				2. Award or Grant Number:	37-10-S18037
				4. EIN:	56-2032825
1. Recipient Name	North Carolina Department of Information Technology			6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	06/14/2021
3. Street Address	4101 Mail Service Center			7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021
5. City, State, Zip Code	Raleigh, NC 27699-4101			8. Final Report	
				Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				No	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Project/Grant Period				10. Reserved for Reviewer	
9a. Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/01/2018	9b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021		
11. Program Activities					
11a. Identify the activities you performed during SLIGP2.0 grant period of performance					
	Activity Type (Planning, Governance Meetings, etc.)	Was this Activity Performed during the grant period? (Yes/No)	Total Project Deliverable Quantity (Number)	Description of Activity Deliverable Quantity	
1	Governance Meetings	Yes	12	Cumulative number of governance, subcommittee, or working group meetings related to the NPSBN held during the grant period	
2	Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences	Yes	28	Cumulative number of individuals sent to national or regional third-party conferences with a focus or training track related to the NPSBN using SLIGP 2.0 grant funds during the grant period	
3	Convened Stakeholder Events	No	0	Cumulative number of events coordinated or held using SLIGP 2.0 grant funds during the grant period, as requested by FirstNet.	
4	Staff Hired (Full-Time Equivalent)(FTE)	Yes	1.63	Cumulative number of state/territory personnel FTEs who began supporting SLIGP 2.0 activities during the grant period (may be a decimal).	
5	Contracts Executed	Yes	2	Cumulative number of contracts executed during the grant period.	
6	Subrecipient Agreements Executed	No	0	Cumulative number of agreements executed during the grant period.	
7	Data Sharing Policies/Agreements Developed	Yes		Yes or No if data sharing policies and/or agreements were developed during the grant period.	
8	Further Identification of Potential Public Safety Users	Yes		Yes or No if further identification of potential public safety users occurred during the grant period.	
9	Plans for Emergency Communications Technology Transitions	No		Yes or No if plans for future emergency communications technology transitions occurred during the grant period.	
10	Identified and Planned to Transition PS Apps & Databases	No		Yes or No if public safety applications or databases within the State or territory were identified and transition plans were developed during the grant period	
11	Identify Ongoing Coverage Gaps	No		Yes or No if participated in identifying ongoing coverage gaps using SLIGP 2.0 funds during the grant period.	
12	Data Collection Activities	No		Yes or No if participated in data collection activities as requested by FirstNet	

11b. Please provide a description of each activity reported in response to Question 11; any challenges or obstacles encountered and mitigation strategies you employed; and any additional project milestones or information.

11.1 - The State Interoperability Executive Committee (SIEC) formed a Task Force to keep updated on the NPSBN and track progress in accordance with the State Plan. Some meetings of the Task Force occurred during the greater SIEC meetings, depending on agenda availability. The Task Force met quarterly for a total of 12 meetings over the course of the grant.

11.2 - North Carolina was able to offer a "Travel Scholarship" in accordance with grant guidelines and following State Travel Policies to allow first responders from NC agencies to attend Broadband Conferences that had a focus or track about FirstNet. This allowed for a total of 28 different trips for key decision-makers to learn more about FirstNet, especially for smaller agencies that did not have a travel budget. This offering was discontinued during the COVID-19 pandemic which restricted travel.

11.4 - The FTEs utilized for SLIGP 2.0 was difficult to categorize in a single number. This number represents the sum of the highest recorded FTE for each of the positions reported in response to 12a on the quarterly reports. All staff had other duties and dedicated some portion of their time to SLIGP allowable activities.

11.5 - NC DIT signed an MOU with North Carolina Emergency Management as we explored utilizing their personnel and resources to delivery the datasharing workshops, however we moved in a different direction due to availability. Federal Engineering was hired to deliver Data Sharing workshops focusing on gaps and opportunities to share information and data on the NPSBN. This contract delivered in-person workshops at several locations in North Carolina and was then expanded after the SLIGP no-cost extension was awarded to include virtual workshops delivered during the pandemic.

11.7 - Data sharing workshops engaged with public safety and developed a template for a data sharing agreement.

11.8 - Additional users were identified during workshop discussions and such users were invited to participate with public safety.

11c. Did you perform activities during the last quarter of the grant that haven't been reported previously (i.e., new programmatic activities, staffing changes)? If so, please describe.

11.1 - 1 SIEC Task Force meeting took place during the last quarter of the grant.

11.7 - The last Data Sharing Workshops were held during the last quarter of the grant.

11d. Please share any lessons learned or best practices that your organization implemented during your SLIGP 2.0 project.

North Carolina learned that there is a need for strategic thinking about first responder technologies. SLIGP 2.0 allowable activities gave North Carolina the opportunity to focus on the planning for FirstNet as a new technology program and it became evident that many agencies only have the capacity to focus on present and near-term issues. As the FirstNet Authority continues to be a champion and catalyst for advancing first responder technologies, North Carolina is looking to stay engaged and assist our agencies through the continuation of the DIT's FirstTech program.

FirstTech administered the SLIGP 2.0 grant funding by mainly focusing on 3 allowable activities - Travel Scholarship program, Data Sharing Workshops, and Coverage Gap Analysis. The Travel Scholarship program provided funds for responders to attend broadband conferences with a FirstNet track or focus which gave the responders opportunities to directly participate and receive information relevant to the planning for FirstNet usage. The Data Sharing Workshops allowed for responders to engage in conversations about gaps and barriers to sharing data while considering ways to overcome such challenges using the NPSBN. The Coverage Gap Analysis work that we performed did not mature into a field examination of such coverage gaps but involved research into that allowable activity by communicating with other states, exploring technologies to perform the function, discussing the activity with consulting firms that offered such a service, examining the State Plan coverage maps, and internal discussions about the value of this activity. Ultimately, North Carolina decided that moving forward with a field Coverage Gap Analysis would not be valuable for our responders since it was just a snapshot in time and AT&T was exceeding deployment targets in several areas already.

Throughout the activities conducted, we found that discussions about the NPSBN usually drilled down to the topic of the specific application(s) that is used and how the data or information could be shared from the application layer with other agencies that might be using a different application or even a different network.

12. Personnel		
12a. Staffing Table - Please include all staff that contributed time to the project with utilization. Please only include government staff employed by the state/territory NOT contractors.		
Job Title	FTE%	Project (s) Assigned
FirstNet SPOC	53%	Continue serving as the SPOC, Overall program management, coordination with fiscal, participate in FirstNet tracks at broadband conferences
Program Specialist	60%	Delivery of SLIGP allowable activities, oversight and management of contract personnel, participate in FirstNet tracks at broadband conference
Technical Specialist	50%	Technical knowledge for input to data sharing workshop, examination of State Plan coverage and coverage gap analysis, participate in FirstNet tracks at broadband conference

13. Contractual (Contract and/or Subrecipients)								
13a. Contractual Table – Include all contractors. The totals from this table should equal the “Contractual” in Question 14f.								
Name	Subcontract Purpose	Type (Contract/Subrec.)	RFP/RFQ Issued (Y/N)	Contract Executed (Y/N)	Start Date	End Date	Total Federal Funds Allocated	Total Matching Funds Allocated
Staff Support	Additional staff for support of allowable activities	Contract	No	No			\$140,000.00	\$0.00
Program Consultant	Consulting services for allowable activities	Contract	No	No			\$89,600.00	\$0.00
Delivery contractor	Delivery of allowable activities	Contract	No	Yes	5/15/19	3/31/21	\$719,993.00	\$20,007.00
GIS Support	GIS support for coverage analysis	Contract	No	No			\$60,900.00	\$0.00
<b>Total Funds Allocated to Contracts</b>							<b>\$1,010,493.00</b>	<b>\$20,007.00</b>

14. Budget Worksheet						
Columns 2, 3 and 4 must match your project budget for the entire award and your final SF 424A. Columns 5, 6, and 7 should list your final budget figures, cumulative through the last quarter						
Project Budget Element (1)	Federal Funds Awarded (2)	Approved Matching Funds (3)	Total Budget (4)	Final Federal Funds Expended (5)	Final Approved Matching Funds Expended (6)	Final Total Funds Expended (7)
a. Personnel Salaries	\$0.00	\$127,500.00	\$127,500.00	\$48,276.00	\$70,760.00	\$119,036.00
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$44,911.00	\$44,911.00	\$16,210.38	\$22,012.00	\$38,222.38
c. Travel	\$54,023.00	\$44,257.00	\$98,280.00	\$34,020.60	\$17,987.77	\$52,008.37
d. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	\$7,964.00	\$6,486.00	\$14,450.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
f. Contractual	\$1,010,493.00	\$20,007.00	\$1,030,500.00	\$553,424.00	\$26,591.00	\$580,015.00
g. Other	\$47,520.00	\$36,839.00	\$84,359.00	\$0.00	\$34,894.67	\$34,894.67
h. Indirect	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
i. Total Costs	\$1,120,000.00	\$280,000.00	\$1,400,000.00	\$651,930.98	\$172,245.44	\$824,176.42
j. Proportionality Percent	80%	20%	100%	79%	21%	100%

15. Additional Questions: Read each statement below. Rate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement and answer follow-up questions to provide additional information.			
Statement	Agree/Disagree	Additional Questions	Response
15a. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in planning for the integration with the NPSBN.	3-Neutral	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in conducting data-sharing workshops throughout our state. The Travel Scholarship allowed responders to attend broadband conferences and hear more about FirstNet as they looked to plan for usage and integration. The COVID-19 pandemic shifted the workshops to a virtual environment, which we found to increase the amount of responders registered but participation was more challenging than an in-person event. The pandemic also effectively ended our Travel Scholarship program as events were canceled and our agency banned such travel.
15b. I plan to continue any SLIGP 2.0 program activities beyond the SLIGP 2.0 period of performance.	5-Strongly Agree	What do you plan to accomplish after the period of performance?	The creation of the First Responder Emerging Technologies (FirstTech) program within NC DIT to manage the SLIGP funds also filled a gap for agencies in North Carolina that need support in strategic thinking for the FirstNet Network as well as other technology areas. FirstTech was fortunate to receive state appropriations for salaries at the beginning of the SLIGP 2.0 period of performance and will continue to work with our state and local response agencies as they look towards the future implementations of FirstNet and related technologies.
15c. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing my stakeholders about FirstNet.	5-Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	We found that the SLIGP 2.0 funds allowed responders to directly engage with various experts from around the country at broadband conferences as they sought more information about FirstNet. The datasharing workshops that we conducted in North Carolina provided good insights to the current gaps for data and information sharing among agencies and sparked some great conversation about ways to fill such gaps, including technologies that could be developed for the FirstNet Network. This would not have been possible without the NTIA SLIGP 2.0 grant. The pandemic created a number of different challenges. We also found that some public safety agencies were either confused or overwhelmed by the information they were receiving about FirstNet from various sources.

Statement	Agree/Disagree	Additional Questions	Response
<p>15d. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in maintaining a governance structure for broadband in my state/territory.</p>	<p>2-Disagree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>North Carolina formed a Task Force under the State Interoperability Executive Committee to address governance. This Task Force served as an input body for SLIGP 2.0 activities and was regularly updated on the status of the NPSBN deployment in NC. A challenge to this structure was the question of scope. Since the NPSBN is a federal project with a nationwide presence, there was not really anything to 'govern' at the State level and the Task Force had a conversation about the importance of nationwide governance. North Carolina's responders are often involved in emergencies outside of our state boundaries and we also receive assistance from neighboring states and jurisdictions so the Task Force did not want to develop policies or recommendations that would be specific to our state which could have unintended consequences or differ nationwide. One of the challenges has been the different expectations from the FirstNet Authority, NTIA, and the public safety community on the question of governance and confusion about the NPSBN versus other commercial offerings.</p>
<p>15e. SLIGP 2.0 funds provided resources that were helpful in preparing for FirstNet planning activities in my state/territory (e.g. staffing, attending broadband conferences, participating in training, procuring contract support etc.).</p>	<p>5-Strongly Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>The SLIGP 2.0 funds allowed state and local responders to learn more about FirstNet and participate in planning activities that would have otherwise not occurred. The travel that we scheduled to meet with FirstNet Authority staff at the boulder lab was really appreciated and led to a greater understanding of Priority and Preemption on FirstNet. The pandemic was a challenging obstacle that limited our activities in 2020.</p>
<p>15f. Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in preparing for FirstNet.</p>	<p>5-Strongly Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>Funds were instrumental in bringing knowledge and conversations about FirstNet to the first responder organizations in North Carolina. The datasharing workshops and travel scholarships programs delivered two allowable activities that served a broad audience and helped agencies think more critically about planning for FirstNet usage. North Carolina looked at conducting a coverage gap analysis and took lessons learned from other states. Ultimately we did not conduct a detailed coverage analysis as it would have just concentrating on areas where deployment would have taken place in accordance with the State Plan with a documented reason to evaluate such coverage. We felt that the effort to determine coverage under these parameters would not have been useful to the public safety community for a number of different reasons: it would have just been a snapshot in time, AT&amp;T was ahead in target coverage goals in several areas, we felt that the throughput metric used in the State Plan for coverage modeling was too low for practical usage, and the promise of High Power User Equipment on Band 14 would change such coverage gaps dramatically.</p>
<p>16. Certification: I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that this report is correct and complete for performance of activities for the purpose(s) set forth in the award documents.</p>			
<p>16a. Typed or printed name and title of Authorized Certifying Official:</p>		<p>16c. Telephone:</p>	<p>919.961.1131</p>
<p>Red Grasso, FirstNet SPOC and FirstTech Program Director</p>		<p>16d. Email Address:</p>	<p><a href="mailto:red.grasso@nc.gov">red.grasso@nc.gov</a></p>
<p>16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:</p>		<p>16e. Date:</p>	<p>14 Jun 2021</p>