		SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closed	out Report			2. Award or Grant Number:	72-10-\$18072
						4. EIN:	66-0679060
Recipient Name	PUERTO RICO OFFICE FOR PUBLIC SAFETY A	ND SECURITY				6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	06/29/2021
. Street Address	P.O. BOX 194140					7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021
. City, State, Zip Code	SAN JUAN, PR 00919-4140				-	8. Final Report Yes 🗸 No	
. Project/Grant Period				10. Reserved for			
a. Start Date: MM/DD/YYYY)	03/01/2018 9b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021		Reviewer			
1. Program Activities				20 Deside Sections			Paul Charles and
La. Identify the activities	you performed during SLIGP2.0 grant period						
	Activity Type (Planning, Governance Meetings, etc.)	Was this Activity Performed during the grant period? (Yes/No)	Total Project Deliverable Quantity (Number)		Description of Activity De	liverable Quantity	
1	Governance Meetings	No		Cumulative number og grant period	f governance, subcommittee, or working g	roup meetings related to the l	NPSBN held during the
2	Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences	Yes	12		f individuals sent to national or regional th using SLIGP 2.0 grant funds during the gra		ocus or training track
3	Convened Stakeholder Events	No	0	Cumulative number oj FirstNet.	f events coordinated or held using SLIGP 2	0 grant funds during the gran	t period, as requested t
4	Staff Hired (Full-Time Equivalent)(FTE)	No		Cumulative number of period (may be a decident	f state/territory personnel FTEs who begai mai).	n supporting SLIGP 2.0 activitie	es during the grant
5	Contracts Executed	Yes	1	Cumulative number oj	f contracts executed during the grant period	od.	
6	Subrecipient Agreements Executed	No		Cumulative number oj	f agreements executed during the grant po	eriod.	
7	Data Sharing Policies/Agreements Developed	No	ويولقه	Yes or No if data shar	ing policies and/or agreements were deve	loped during the grant period.	
8	Further Identification of Potential Public Safety Users	Yes		Yes or No if further ide	entification of potential public safety users	s occurred during the grant per	riod.
9	Plans for Emergency Communications Technology Transitions	Yes		Yes or No if plans for j	uture emergency communications techno	logy transitions occurred durin	g the grant period.
10	Identified and Planned to Transition PS Apps & Databases	Yes		Yes or No if public safe were developed during	ety applications or databases within the S g the grant period	tate or territory were identifie	d and transition plans
11	Identify Ongoing Coverage Gaps	Yes		Yes or No if participat	ed in identifying ongoing coverage gaps u	sing SLIGP 2.0 funds during the	e grant period.
12	Data Collection Activities	No		Yes or No if participat	ed in data collection activities as requeste	d 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 Throughout the term of the SLIGP 2.0 period of performance, our work team provides valuable information about FirstNet to the 78 municipalities of Puerto Rico. Municipal Emergency Management personnel, search and rescue teams, radio operators and emergency managers, participated in meetings and presentations on the capabilities of the Nationwide Public Safety Broadband Network and how it benefits them to be part of said network. In addition to the emergency managers, municipal and state police personnel and firefighters received one-on-one meetings, where potential users were identified, many of whom went on to subscribe to FirstNet.

11.2 Over 250 meetings were held between our office work team, Federal agencies, State agencies, local agencies, and the private sector, like the Department of Correction, Puerto Rico Police Bureau, Puerto Rico Emergency Management Bureau, Department of Transportation and Public Works, University of Puerto Rico, AT&T, USGS, San Lucas hospital (Ponce), every emergency management state zones, and every municipality across the island of Puerto Rico.

A.) Some of the topics of the meetings were:

- Wat is firstnet?
- The purpose of FirstNet.
- The 9/11 communications challenges.
- Who qualifies?
- Push to talk services.
- The priority in the network.
- The quality of services.
- Band 14 and coverage in urban and rural areas.
- Technology transition between Radiofrequency and LTE.

11.3 Among the achievements, the state Emergency Management Bureau in all its zones Directors and Search and Rescue Teams obtained FirstNet ready Sonim telephones with PTT with FirstNet LTE. Also, Puerto Rico EMS, Puerto Rico Firefighters Corps Bureau, and 9-1-1 have FirstNet contracts with AT&T.

11.4 The broadband conferences allowed us to learn about the technological advances and updates that FirstNet has had. In them, we learned about banda14 technology for the first time, as well as we could see the firstnet ready equipment that served as a reference to take into consideration, including the Sonim XP8 telephones acquired by the Emergency Management Bureau.

11.5 The contract for Project Management and Data Collection allowed us to approach each municipality on the island, carrying a direct message to the first respondent, the mayors, heads of operations and the field. The 78 municipalities received attention to their needs, concerns and we channeled the matters that required the assistance of AT&T FirstNet.

11.6 Our contractor identify and participate in the process of transitioning radio frequency flood sensors to LTE FirstNet and participated in various meetings of the municipalities so that FirstNet could become an alternate or primary system that allows managing the data of these sensors for the benefit of the first responders and the communities that are in flood zones.

11.7 During the visits to each municipality on the island, data was taken from places with poor coverage and the information was channeled to AT&T. One of the places that were identified was the capital of Puerto Rico itself, San Juan, in the area near the Secretary of State, where the signal was weak. Likewise, a poor signal was reported to AT&T at the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) in the Emergency Management Bureau. At that time, AT&T deployed equipment to reinforce EOC operations.

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 programmatic activity was carried out beyond the closing and no change of staff was reported.

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

Small meetings and presentations are most effective in terms of giving first responders a better understanding of what FirstNet is and its scope. In addition, this method allows to create an environment of trust focused on solving particular situations of the first responders, and also helps to identify potential subscribers.

2. Personnel		e man se la se la V	CONTRACTOR STATE	THE REAL PROPERTY.	A CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER	Assessment and contraction			THE REAL PROPERTY OF
2a. Staffing Table - Please	include all staff that	at contributed time to the	project with utilization. Plea	ise only include govern			NOT contractors.		
Job Title	FTE%				Project (s)) Assigned			
echnology Officer	40%	Provide technology supp	ort and prepared the PPR.						
Grant Administrator	30%	Provide grant manageme	ent support, managing the pro	pject's budget, and ens	uring that the grant act	ivities are completed of	n time.		
inancial Coordinator	25%		ments, oversight transaction a		t system.				
WIC	50%		vide vision for interoperability						
Program Manager	100%		outreach and educations plan		Safety community and	completing progress r	eports.		
Administrative Assistant	20%	Provide grant administra	tive and coordination suppor	t					
								· · · · · ·	
- 1	+	1						<u></u>	
					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
64 ·									
									1 M M
									di
-									
								· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		1			19. m.				
			- the data of	·					
(*******************************		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
13. Contractual (Contract an	d/or Subrecipients	5)					The second second	STATISTICS STATISTICS	510 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
13a. Contractual Table – Inc	lude all contractor	s. The totals from this ta	ble should equal the "Contrac	ctual" in Question 14f.					
Name	Subco	ntract Purpose	Type (Contract/Subrec.)	RFP/RFQ Issued	Contract Executed	Start Date	End Date	Total Federal Funds	Total Matching Funds
Name			Type (contract/ Subrec.)	(Y/N)	(Y/N)			Allocated	Allocated
Lex R. Santos Rivera	Project Managem	nent and Data Collection	Contract	Y	Y	11/14/2018	3/3/2021	\$128,236.25	
								· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
				<u> </u>					
					<u> </u>				+
				1					
			······································	<u>+</u>					
Total Funds Allocated to Co								\$128,236.25	\$0.00

Columns 2, 3 and 4 must match your project bu	dget for the entire award	d and your final SF 424A. Colu	mns 5, 6, and 7 should	list your final budget	figures, cumulative th	rough the last quarter	
Project Budget Element (1)		Approved Matching Funds (3)		ıdget (4)	Final Federal Funds Expended (5)	Final Approved Matching Funds Expended (6)	Final Total Funds Expended (7)
a. Personnel Salaries	\$292,500.00	\$0.00	\$292,	500.00	\$180,628.33	\$0.00	\$180,628.33
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$38,058.75	\$0.00	\$38,0	58.75	\$22,269.29	\$0.00	\$22,269.29
c. Travel	\$19,360.00	\$0.00	\$19,3	60.00	\$30,939.70	\$0.00	\$30,939.70
d. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	\$2,881.25	\$0.00	\$2,8	81.25	\$2,461.63	\$0.00	\$2,461.63
f. Contractual	\$271,040.00	\$0.00	\$271,	040.00	\$128,236.25	\$0.00	\$128,236.25
g. Other	\$76,160.00	\$0.00	\$76,1	60.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
h. Indirect	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
i. Total Costs	\$700,000.00	\$0.00	\$700,	00.00	\$364,535.20	\$0.00	\$364,535.20
j. Proportionality Percent	100%	0%	10	0%	100%	0%	100%
15. Additional Questions: Read each statement	t below. Rate your level o	f agreement or disagreement	with each statement	and answer follow-up	questions to provide a	dditional information	
Statement	Agree/Disagree	Additional Qu		and the state of the		Response	A SAME STATE TO A SAME AND A SAME AND A SAME AND
15a. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in planning for the integration with the NPSBN.	S-Strongly Agree	What was most helpful? Wh encounter?		municipal level. For the integration Indeed, Puerto Ric southern area, sin impacts the first ro damage. So far, A including undergro	n activities the bigg to is still recovering ce the first respond esponders, but criti F&T has told us that bund systems as pa	est challenge was t from Hurricane M lers were found at cal telecommunica t they have made r rt of their efforts t	st responders at the state level, and at the the natural hazards that impact the island. aría, and the earthquake events in the tending emergencies. All of this not only ations infrastructure had also suffered numerous improvements to the network o protect against atmospheric events.
15b. I plan to continue any SLIGP 2.0 program activities beyond the SLIGP 2.0 period of performance.	3-Neutral	What do you plan to accomp of performance?		activities. Howeve	r, we are in the bes	t position to help i	mown, the funds detail the set of permitted municipalities obtain FirstNet ready nder our Department of Homeland Security

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?	SLIGP 2.0 funds helped to hold meetings and presentations, impacting all the municipalities of Puerto Rico and the main first responders agencies by providing knowledge to first responders about what are the benefits they have under the FirstNet network. The biggest challenge we had was with the emergency managers, as they originally had difficulty in being classified as first responders when they requested the service in AT&T stores, but the situation was resolved, thanks to the conversations between our office and the main consultant of FirstNet in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who was of great help throughout the orientation and education process to the first responders.
Statement	Agree/Disagree	Additional Questions	Response
15d. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in maintaining a governance structure for broadband in my state/territory.	4-Agree		Of approximately 250 meetings, multiple of them had state and municipal representation, and made up the structure that defined our decision-making in favor of first responders. From technological transitions, use of PTT, as well as the benefits of FirstNet as an alternative network to traditional means of communication.

 15e. SLIGP 2.0 funds provided resources that were helpful in preparing for FirstNet planning, attivities in my state/territory (e.g. staffing, attending broadband conferences, participating in training, procuring contract S-Strongly Agree What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?
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 What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? What was most helpful? What challenges did you
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 Vhat was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter? Vhat was most helpful? What challenges did you
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
were helpful in preparing for FirstNet planning activities in my state/territory (e.g. staffing, attending broadband conferences, participating in training, procuring contract
were helpful in preparing for FirstNet planning activities in my state/territory (e.g. staffing, attending broadband conferences, participating in training, procuring contract
were helpful in preparing for FirstNet planning activities in my state/territory (e.g. staffing, attending broadband conferences, participating in training, procuring contract
were helpful in preparing for FirstNet planning activities in my state/territory (e.g. staffing, attending broadband conferences, participating in training, procuring contract
were helpful in preparing for FirstNet planning activities in my state/territory (e.g. staffing, attending broadband conferences, participating in training, procuring contract
activities in my state/territory (e.g. staffing, attending broadband conferences, participating in training, procuring contract
attending broadband conferences, participating in training, procuring contract
participating in training, procuring contract
support etc.).
In general terms, everything that our office achieved was thanks to the funds obtained from SLIGP
2.0. Without them, activities related to education on FirstNet could not be carried out as our office
operates 100% with Federal funds from SHSP, EMPG among others from DSH.
15f. Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in What was most helpful? What challenges did you
preparing for FirstNet. 5-Strongly Agree
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.
16a. Typed or printed name and title of Authorized Certifying Official: / 16c. Telephone: (787) 763-3424
Joel J. García Rodríguez, Technology Officer, SLIGP 2.0 AOR 16d. Email Address: igarcia@oasp.pr.gov
16e. Date: 6/29/2021

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 Natalle 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.