SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report							2. Award or Grant Number:	10-10-\$18010
							4. EIN:	51-6000279
1. Recipient Name	ISTATE OF DELAWARE					6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	06/24/2021	
3. Street Address	3050 Upper King Rd							03/31/2021
5. City, State, Zip Code	Dover, Delaware 19904				8. Final Report Yes No			
9. Project/Grant Perio	d					The street of	1.10	
9a. Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/01/2018 9b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021		10. Reserved for Reviewer				
11. Program Activities								
11a. Identify the activ	ities you performed during SLIGP2.0 grant peri	od 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	32	Cumulative number of governance, subcommittee, or working group meetings related to the NPSBN held during a grant period				NPSBN held during the
2	Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences	Yes		Cumulative number of individuals sent to national or regional third-party conferences with a focus or training trac related to the NPSBN using SLIGP 2.0 grant funds during the grant period			ocus or training track	
3	Convened Stakeholder Events Yes 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	0.31	Cumulative number of state/territory personnel FTEs who began supporting SLIGP 2.0 activities during the grant (may be a decimal).				es during the grant period
5	Contracts Executed	Yes	2	Cumulative number of contracts executed during the grant period.				
6	Subrecipient Agreements Executed	No		Cumulative number of agreements executed during the grant perio		riod.		
7	Data Sharing Policies/Agreements Developed	No		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.				riod.
9	Plans for Emergency Communications Technology Transitions	No		Yes or No if plans for future emergency communications technology transitions occurred during the grant period.			g the grant period.	
10	Identified and Planned to Transition PS Apps & Databases	No	Reserve	Yes or No if public safety applications or databases within the State or territory were identified and transiti were developed during the grant period			d and transition plans	
11	Identify Ongoing Coverage Gaps	ntify 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 participat	ed in data collection activiti	ies 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. Delaware's State Interoperability Executive Committee (SIEC) is comprised of members from the Department of Safety and Homeland Security, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Health and Social Services, the Department of Corrections, the Adjutant General of the Delaware National Guard, representatives from each of the three county Governments, the City of Wilmington, the Delaware Volunteer Firefighters Association (DVFA), the Delaware Police Chief's Council and the Governor's Office. Additionally, there is an SIEC Sub-Committee formed that is comprised of personnel from the Division of Communications, Department of Transportation, DVFA, Department of Corrections, Delaware National Guard, Delaware Police Chief's Council and several other agencies. During the grant period, these two committees met a total of 32 times with the purpose of focusing on, and dealing with, issues and improvements needed within the state. Representation at these meetings always included at least one member from FirstNet/AT&T, as well as someone from the First Responder Network Authority. Meeting topics always included updates pertaining to the various improvements and buildouts of AT&T's infrastructure, as well as outreach being scheduled and conducted throughout the state. Delaware sent three (3) representatives to conferences during the grant period; two (2) going to an APCO conference and one (1) attending an AGA conference. Our personnel attended presentations regarding FirstNet and NPSBN related sessions, as well as the support of them. During SLIGP 2.0 grant, Delaware participated in hosting three (3) stakeholder events with First Responder Network Authority. In total, 129 registrants from multiple first responder disciplines were in attendance. At each of these events, FirstNet / AT&T was invited and played a part along with our FirstNet partner. The first event was a presentation made to the Delaware Police Chief's Council, wherein an overview of FirstNet was supplied in order to show the benefits to the law enforcement community. The next two presentations, as a direct result of restrictions due to COVID-19 guidelines, were webinars. These webinars targeted, not only full time first responders, but also those entities that serve in support functions as needed. These included, but were not limited to, those such as EMS, DOJ, and the like. A section of the webinar included guest speakers who informed of their success using FirstNet during the Biden election process in Delaware, as well as the ability to successfully transmit data via drone to command vehicles and others. As it pertains to future potential public safety users, Delaware has continued to reach out to the public safety community by all means possible. This involved multiple phone calls that were followed up by in-person visits when possible or emails. As a result of this continuing process, and in cooperation with both FirstNet and AT&T/FirstNet personnel, the word has spread with positive results. A representative(s) of the Division of Communications will continue to assist in disseminating information regarding FirstNet going forward.

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.

The first quarter of 2021, that being the last quarter of this grant, continued to be very productive. During this quarter, one virtual (1) SIEC meeting was held by Cabinet Secretary McQueen on February 11th that was attended by 46 persons representing various entities within our area. During this virtual meeting, we supplied an update to everyone regarding the progress within the State as it pertains to NPSBN. An update was also supplied reference FirstNet's physical buildout, as well as outreach that had been accomplished with positive results. There were also three (3) SIEC Sub-committee conference calls held during the quarter, those being on January 28th, February 25th and March 25th. The number of attendees for these calls were 22, 11 and 19. During both the SIEC and SIEC Sub-committee meetings, these updates were supplied jointly by Rob Walls (AT&T/FirstNet) and myself. Outreach communication continued with the numerous agencies within the State that provided more detailed information on how FirstNet continues to be adopted by agencies statewide. As a result of these cofforts, and in conjunction will Rob Walls (AT&T/FirstNet), we were able to port over multiple individuals from various agencies during the quarter. In addition to these subscriber paid accounts, Wilmington Fire Department obtained service after determining that the carrier being used previously during the Biden election process at the Wilmington Riverfront was impacted and data was not accessible. In addition, again on the subscriber side, members of Wilmington PD's FSU (Forensic Science Unit) which includes the drone program, ported over their entire staff of 13 officers to FirstNet. As a direct result of what had transpired within the City of Wilmington, several talks and meetings have occured with COW's upper management in the furtherance of bringing FirstNet to other departments within the city. Meetings and calls between First Responder Network Authority, AT&T FirstNet Rob Walls, Delaware's Division of Communications and myself were h

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

Communication is paramount as it pertains to any effort in keeping everyone informed of improvements or issues that may impact them. This held true during our SLIGP 2.0 project. Shortly after my starting with the program in April 2019, I was affored a State email address. Once I transistioned over to using this email instead of the Gmail account I had started using for outreach, the communication with all the agencies increased dramatically. Feedback that I received supported the idea that many of the agencies to whom I sent emails were either not receiving them due to their being placed into their spam folder or they would simply delete the email assuming that I was involved with sales. With the State email address showing my name, this opened the door to those in the first responder family that I was previously familiar or, simply being from a state email, the recipient would open the email to see what was included. This opened the door to many of the subsequent meetings and calls that we were then able to setup for both the First Responder Network Authority and AT&T / FirstNet's principal contact person. As it involves best practices, especially taking into consideration how COVID-19 impacted everything and everyone, utilizing both phone and email for contact proved to be very beneficial. While in person presentations and webinars are beneficial and great, the actual one on one interactions proved to be the best way to solicit input from everyone. To that end, our successes continued to increase even through the pandemic.

S										
12a. Staffing Table - P	lease include all staff	that contributed time to	the project with utilization. P	lease only include gov			ory NOT contractors.			
Job Title	FTE%	Project (s) Assigned								
Director (SWIC)	7%	Assist SPOC with SLIGP 2.0 activities								
Deputy Dir. (SPOC)	20%	Provide oversight of all S	LIGP 2.0 activities							
Contract Specialist	2%	Assist the SPOC with inte	ernal contract / procurement p	nrocesses						
Legal Counsel	2%	Assist the SPOC with legal and contractural processes								
		L								
13. Contractual (Contr	act and/or Subrecipie	ents)			0					
13a. Contractual Table	– Include all contract	tors. The totals from this	table should equal the "Cont	ractual" in Question 1	41.					
Name	Subcont	ract Purpose	Type (Contract/Subrec.)	RFP/RFQ Issued	Contract Executed	Start Date	End Date	Total Federal Funds	Total Matching Funds	
			707800	(Y/N)	(Y/N)		752 500 -0.000	Allocated	Allocated	
Micro-Tech	Program / Project Su	pport	Contract	N	Υ	3/1/2018	3/31/2021	\$319,205.00	\$0.00	
Rybinski Consulting	Subject matter exper	t / Outreach	Contract	N	Y	3/1/2018	2/29/2020	\$144,000.00	\$0.00	
Rybinski Consulting	Pre-award Support		Contract	N	Υ	3/1/2018	2/29/2020	\$4,500.00	\$0.00	
	171									

Total Funds Allocated to Contracts							\$467,705.00	\$0.00
4. Budget Worksheet								
Columns 2, 3 and 4 must match your pro-	oject budget for the entire aw	ard and your final SF 424A. Col	lumns 5, 6, and 7 sh	ould list your final b	oudget figures, cumulative	through the last quarte	r	
Project Budget Element (1)	Federal Funds Awarded (2)	Approved Matching Funds (3)	Total Bo	idget (4)	Final Federal Funds Expended (5)	Final Approved Matching Funds Expanded (6)	Final Total Funds Expended (7)	
. Personnel Salaries		\$47,160.00	\$47,160.00			\$27,109.67	\$27,109.67	
. Personnel Fringe Benefits		\$13,205.00	\$13,2	05.00		\$13,312.00	\$13,312.	00
. Travel	\$50,136.00		\$50,1	36.00			\$0.00	
. Equipment			\$0	.00			\$0.00	
. Materials/Supplies	\$1,334.00	\$887.00	\$2,2	21.00		\$887.00	\$887.0	0
. Contractual	\$467,705.00		\$467,	705.00	\$243,923.85	\$61,573.57	\$305,497	.42
g. Other	\$15,825.00	\$72,498.00	16-71-6	23.00			\$0.00	
n. Indirect			\$0	.00			\$0.00	
. Total Costs	\$535,000.00	\$133,750.00	\$668,750.00		\$243,923.85	\$102,882.24	\$346,806.09	
Proportionality Percent	80%	20%	100%		70%	30%	100%	
15. Additional Questions: Read each sta	tement below. Rate your leve	el of agreement or disagreemen	nt with each statem	ent and answer fol	low-up questions to provi	de additional informatio	n.	
Statement	Agree/Disagree	Additional Ques	stions			Response		
15a. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in planning for the integration with the NPSBN.	4-Agree	What was most helpful? What encounter?	t challenges did you	The grant afforded Delaware the opportunity to enlist a designated person to conduct outreach to the first responding to this was accomplished by phone calls and emails that were then followed up with scheduled in permeetings. These were in addition to the monthly meetings and conference calls during which NPSBN and First particular were discussed. By doing this, Delaware was able to increase awareness regarding FirstNet and assist personnel via outreach to further the implementation thereof.				

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?	Delaware will continue to assist in spreading the word at both the bi-monthly SIEC (Statewide Interoperability Executive Council) meetings, as well as the monthly sub-committee meetings that are held to support the broadband initiative. A designated person will be tasked to spend part of the time doing this in order to support the efforts that were started during the SUGP 2.0 program. This person will work hand in hand with First Responder Network Authority personnel, as well as the AT&T / FirstNet principal in accomplishing this.
15c. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing my stakeholders about FirstNet.	4-Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	As previously touched on, the SLIGP 2.0 Grant was helpful with the ability to hire staff to conduct outreach while overseeing the funding allocated. While some funding was utilized for a few conferences to be attended and hosted, we feel that it would have also been beneficial if some funding had been available for devices. In this regard, if we had been able to either rent or purchase the various devices (phones, interoper kit, cradlepoints and the like, we would have had them at our disposal during our "one on one" meetings with the various agencies. While we did have AT&T's principal contact Rob Walls with us most of the time, there were other meetings wherein he was either not available or persons arrived at the office where we would have been able to display the equipment firsthand. Delaware partnered with First Responder Network Authority on a few occasions in developing presentations that were done in person and later via Webex during the pandemic.
Statement	Agree/Disagree	Additional Questions	Response

15d. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in maintaining a governance structure for broadband in my state/territory.	3-Neutral		The SLIGP 2.0 grant funding did assist with personnel being available to attend all meetings held wherein NPSBN and FirstNet were discussed. In furtherance of this, a network of all parties involved was developed wherein additional and future correspondence was facilitated. The only challenges that were encountered evolved around the schedules of attendees not being able to attend meetings due to other issues with their respective organizations wherein they had to prioritize which meeting to attend and where to go.
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.).	4-Agree	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	The grant funds received assisted Delaware in preparing and presenting a couple of events for the various stakeholder organizations. In addition, it affored us the opportunity to send personnel to two broadband related conferences where the training received helped the organization on their return. As for a challenge, again resources that could have been purchased or leased with SLIGP 2.0 funding were not available for this. In the future, possibly funding could be permitted to assist in this type of activity which would directly impact, in a positive way, successful outreach presentations.

15f. Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in preparing for FirstNet.	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?		and others in the support function. Additionally, having us in spreading the broadband initiative. As for with SLIGP 2.0 funding did not fall within the scope ped. While funding was obtained from Delaware for it so much easier and petter to bring the many agencies
16. Certification: I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief th		ice of activities for the purpose(s) set forth in the award docume	nts.
16a. Typed or printed name and title of Authorized Certifying Official Wagner / Dispeter	ii:	16c. Telephone:	302-698-8220
Eric Wagner / Director 16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:	. 1	16d. Email Address:	eric.wagner@delaware.gov
(-1)//	La- DIRECTOI		6/24/2021

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 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.