

SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report				2. Award or Grant Number:	38-10-S18038
				4. EIN:	45-0309764
1. Recipient Name	State of North Dakota - Information Technology Department			6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	06/29/2021
3. Street Address	600 E. Boulevard Ave			7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021
5. City, State, Zip Code	Bismarck, North Dakota 58505-0100			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	41	Cumulative number of governance, subcommittee, or working group meetings related to the NPSBN held during the grant period	
2	Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences	No	0	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	Yes	1	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	0.75	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	No	0	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	No		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 - Our State Interoperability Executive Committee (SIEC) includes 22 members North Dakota 911 Association which include representation from the following agencies. We met 41 times during the grant period and was attended by FirstNet/ATT.

North Dakota Adjutant General
North Dakota Department of Emergency Services, State Radio Director's Office
North Dakota Department of Emergency Services, Division of Homeland Security
North Dakota Department of Transportation
North Dakota Emergency Management Association
North Dakota Emergency Medical Services Association
North Dakota Fire Chiefs Association (Current Vice Chair)
North Dakota Highway Patrol
North Dakota Chief Information Officer/Information Technology Department (Current Chair)
North Dakota Police Chiefs Association
North Dakota Peace Officers Association
North Dakota Sheriff's and Deputies Association
North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission
North Dakota Game and Fish
North Dakota Department of Health
North Dakota League of Cities
North Dakota Association of Counties
North Dakota Legislative Assembly, House of Representatives
North Dakota Legislative Assembly, Senate

11.3 - North Dakota convened one stakeholder event which was a webinar/presentation and was very well recieved by our stakeholders 124 which was hosted by FirstNet

11.4 - FTE staff were hired during the life of the grant which fulfilled the role:

a.Program

Manager: 0.50 FTE

b.Project Sponsor: 0.10 FTE

c.Project Management Specialist: 0.10 FTE

d.Accountant: 0.05 FTE of Financial manager

11.7 - Created data

sharing agreements with stateholders

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.

NO

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

Good program, achieved the goals set forth with what the SIEC intened. The only minus to the entire grant program is the extremely combersome reports that this grant required. This grant could have been much easier to manage if the reporting wasn't so problematic and combersome.

Total Funds Allocated to Contracts	\$299,670.00	\$0.00
---	---------------------	---------------

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	\$98,000.00	\$22,960.00	\$120,960.00	\$28,136.17	\$0.00	\$28,136.17
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$35,584.00	\$8,336.00	\$43,920.00	\$10,414.05	\$0.00	\$10,414.05
c. Travel	\$50,062.00	\$0.00	\$50,062.00	\$997.83	\$0.00	\$997.83
d. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	\$0.00	\$3,851.00	\$3,851.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
f. Contractual	\$286,412.00	\$102,120.00	\$388,532.00	\$299,670.00	\$0.00	\$299,670.00
g. Other	\$64,934.00	\$0.00	\$64,934.00	\$7,477.10	\$123,164.09	\$130,641.19
h. Indirect			\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
i. Total Costs	\$534,992.00	\$137,267.00	\$672,259.00	\$346,695.15	\$123,164.09	\$469,859.24
j. Proportionality Percent	80%	20%	100%	74%	26%	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.	4-Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	It assisted the state to better position ourselves.

<p>15b. I plan to continue any SLIGP 2.0 program activities beyond the SLIGP 2.0 period of performance.</p>	<p>2-Disagree</p>	<p>What do you plan to accomplish after the period of performance?</p>	<p>The state of North Dakota has accomplished what we set fourth to do.</p>
<p>15c. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing my stakeholders about FirstNet.</p>	<p>4-Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>The program opened avenues for studies and data collection. Only challenge is North Dakota is a large Verizon State, so stakeholders were slow to come to a ATT event</p>
<p>Statement</p>	<p>Agree/Disagree</p>	<p>Additional Questions</p>	<p>Response</p>

<p>15d. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in maintaining a governance structure for broadband in my state/territory.</p>	<p>4-Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>North Dakota has a very good governace structure</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>4-Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>Yes. The planning activities assisted the state with getting a better footprint of FirstNet towers in North Dakota. It also allowed staff a opportunity to work directly with FirstNet representatives.</p>

<p>15f. Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in preparing for FirstNet.</p>	<p>4-Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>Open avenues to work with stateholders on ATT/FirstNet</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>16a. Typed or printed name and title of Authorized Certifying Official:</p>	<p>16c. Telephone: 701.328.4360</p>
<p>Duane Schell CTO</p>	<p>16d. Email Address: dschell@nd.gov</p>
<p>16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:</p>	<p>16e. Date: 7/8/2021</p>
<p><i>Duane Schell</i></p>	

Public Burden Statement: According to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 25 hours per response. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Natalie Romanoff, Program Director, State and Local Implementation Grant Program, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW, Room 4078, Washington, DC 20230.