

SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report				2. Award or Grant Number:	25-10-S18025
				4. EIN:	04-6002284
1. Recipient Name	Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety and Security			6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	09/28/2020
3. Street Address	10 Park Plaza, Suite 3720			7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	06/30/2020
5. City, State, Zip Code	Boston, MA 02116			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)	06/30/2020		
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	7	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	0.70	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	4	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	Yes		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	Yes		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.**

Activities under the SLIGP2 grant focused on creating a statewide contract for selling Public Safety Grade Wireless Data Services to municipal, county, and state agencies and others, working with AT&T/FirstNet and the FirstNet Authority on how services would be made available in Massachusetts, and supporting the public safety agencies that purchase those services.

**11.1 Governance Meetings:** During the life of the SLIGP2 grant, governance, oversight, and daily grant responsibilities largely transitioned from the Public Safety Broadband Office and the Massachusetts FirstNet Advisory Board at the Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (EOPSS) to the Interoperable Communications Bureau at the Executive Office of Technology Services and Security (EOTSS). Governance oversight has been led by EOTSS Secretary Curtis Wood and Assistant Secretary Matthew Moran. With the award of AT&T FirstNet as a qualified vendor under the new statewide contract for Public Safety Grade Wireless Data Services, monthly management meetings have been set up with AT&T/FirstNet and the FirstNet Authority. Governance activities covered state obligations needed to support the use of FirstNet in the Commonwealth and to resolve any organizational and contractual problems for the adoption of FirstNet services and the meeting of obligations.

**11.2 Broadband Conferences:** The SLIGP2 grant helped fund the participation of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the 2018 International Wireless Communications Expo, and the 2018 and 2019 Public Safety Communications Research Annual Conference. Massachusetts attendees participated in a variety of FirstNet related sessions, including those covering Location-Based Services, Security, Resilient Systems, Analytics, Enhanced User Interfaces, Mission Critical Voice, and other related topics.

**11.4 Staff Hired (FTE):** Portions of staff services were compensated from this SLIGP2 grant by the EOPSS Office of Grants and Research to manage and oversee compliance for the SLIGP2 grant.

**11.5 Contracts Executed:** Four contracts were executed during the SLIGP2 grant to compensate in part the activities of the program's project director, communications subject matter expert, the ICB's governance and communications manager, and the grant and program's project manager. All contracts were executed using the statewide contract for staff augmentation.

**11.7 Data Sharing Policies/Agreements Developed:** Continued to work with AT&T/FirstNet to communicate security and access standards for connecting FirstNet users with criminal history data stores at the Department of Criminal Justice Information Services. This helped resolve a major obstacle with the use of FirstNet services by law enforcement within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

**11.8 Further Identification of Potential Public Safety Users** The ICB maintained and updated contact lists for communications distribution to public safety leaders throughout the Commonwealth. Determined the criteria for public safety user eligibility as part of statewide contract for Public Safety Grade Wireless Data Services. The ICB also tracked new requests for information about priority LTE services and distributed newsletters to our stakeholder community.

**11.9 Plans for Emergency Communications Technology Transitions** Meetings were conducted with AT&T and FirstNet to discuss several topics related to the rollout of the NPSBN in Massachusetts and the improvement of coverage. Members of the PSBO continued to participate in periodic and repeating stakeholder meetings to answer questions about FirstNet in Massachusetts.

**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 Governance Meetings: Two governance meetings were held this quarter. Governance meetings coincided with meetings with account meetings with AT&T/FirstNet and the FirstNet Authority in May and June. Topics covered included in building coverage planning, macro site build-outs, credentialing, and other topics.

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

- Coordinating with other states on best practices for rolling out LTE-based services.
- Providing executive level governance participation to see lasting change implemented.
- Focusing on areas of LTE need throughout the Commonwealth and working with Public Safety Grade Wireless Data Services vendors to address those needs.

**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
Undersecretary of EOPSS, SPOC	20%	SPOC; governance leadership; senior coordination with AT&T and FirstNet
Deputy Director, State 911	10%	Provide input and coordinate participation concerning 911, emergency response and data communications needs
Data Engineer, State Police	10%	Provide input and guidance concerning wireless data needs throughout the Commonwealth
CJIS Director	10%	Provide input and guidance concerning public safety applications and databases in MA
Special Projects Director	10%	Helps manage project logistics, including office space, team collaboration tools, and issue resolution
Grant Program Coordinator	5%	Grant management, program reporting, and program close out.
Budget Director	5%	Grant set-up, Accounting and Reconciliation, Fiscal Monitoring, Financial Reporting and Fiscal Close Out

**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
McInnis Consulting Services, Inc.	W-2 staff augmentation for project director	Contract	N	Y	03/01/2018	06/30/2020	\$158,100.00	\$0.00
McInnis Consulting Services, Inc.	Staff augmentation for subject matter expert	Contract	N	Y	03/01/2018	06/30/2020	\$130,000.00	\$35,000.00
McInnis Consulting Services, Inc.	Staff augmentation for project manager	Contract	N	Y	03/01/2018	06/30/2020	\$260,000.00	\$0.00
McInnis Consulting Services, Inc.	Staff augmentation for governance, communications	Contract	N	Y	03/01/2018	06/30/2020	\$37,500.00	\$0.00

**Total Funds Allocated to Contracts** **\$585,600.00** **\$35,000.00**

**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)
<b>a. Personnel Salaries</b>	\$14,800.00	\$140,000.00	<b>\$154,800.00</b>	\$10,070.70	\$113,196.18	<b>\$123,266.88</b>
<b>b. Personnel Fringe Benefits</b>	\$5,368.00	\$0.00	<b>\$5,368.00</b>	\$3,735.56	\$0.00	<b>\$3,735.56</b>
<b>c. Travel</b>	\$17,600.00	\$0.00	<b>\$17,600.00</b>	\$16,029.96	\$0.00	<b>\$16,029.96</b>
<b>d. Equipment</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>e. Materials/Supplies</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>f. Contractual</b>	\$585,600.00	\$35,000.00	<b>\$620,600.00</b>	\$386,547.93	\$28,125.00	<b>\$414,672.93</b>
<b>g. Other</b>	\$1,650.00	\$0.00	<b>\$1,650.00</b>	\$944.50	\$0.00	<b>\$944.50</b>
<b>h. Indirect</b>	\$74,982.00	\$0.00	<b>\$74,982.00</b>	\$38,836.14	\$0.00	<b>\$38,836.14</b>
<b>i. Total Costs</b>	<b>\$700,000.00</b>	<b>\$175,000.00</b>	<b>\$875,000.00</b>	<b>\$456,164.79</b>	<b>\$141,321.18</b>	<b>\$597,485.97</b>
<b>j. Proportionality Percent</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**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
-----------	----------------	----------------------	----------

<p>15a. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in planning for the integration with the NPSBN.</p>	<p>3-Neutral</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>Coordination with AT&amp;T/FirstNet was critical for addressing access issues to criminal justice information for FirstNet users.</p>
<p>15b. I plan to continue any SLIGP 2.0 program activities beyond the SLIGP 2.0 period of performance.</p>	<p>4-Agree</p>	<p>What do you plan to accomplish after the period of performance?</p>	<p>Massachusetts has established a statewide contract for Public Safety Grade Wireless Data Services. We will continue to manage this contract and our relationship with AT&amp;T/FirstNet. Monthly account meetings will continue with AT&amp;T/FirstNet and the FirstNet Authority.</p>
<p>15c. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing my stakeholders about FirstNet.</p>	<p>3-Neutral</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>Funding for Massachusetts participation in national conferences has allowed our key program office staff to track developments with FirstNet and LTE services. This has then been communicated back to our stakeholder community. Often times the materials provided at national conferences are too technical or otherwise difficult to easily share with local stakeholders and agency leaders.</p>
<p><b>Statement</b></p>	<p><b>Agree/Disagree</b></p>	<p><b>Additional Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></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>SLIGP 2.0 funds were used to pull together a strong program management office that helped guide our governance processes, stakeholder communications, and LTE usage planning.</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>Most staff most directly involved in the planning for and implementation of the NPSBN in Massachusetts are contracted employees, paid in part through the use of SLIGP 2.0 funds. Without the SLIGP 2.0 funding, the Commonwealth would have likely have had less of a focus on the national effort to implement public safety grade, priority LTE. We ran into organizational issues regarding fund transfers when resources were shifted from one secretariat to another.</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>The SLIGP and the SLIGP 2.0 grants were helpful in providing focus on the implementation of the National Public Safety Broadband Network nationally and in Massachusetts. Most issues identified during the process related to the relationship with the FirstNet Authority and expectations for the implementation of the NPSBN.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>			
<p>16a. Typed or printed name and title of Authorized Certifying Official:</p>		<p>16c. Telephone:</p>	<p>617-725-3334</p>
<p>Curtis Wood, Secretary of Technology Services and Security</p>		<p>16d. Email Address:</p>	<p><a href="mailto:curtis.wood@state.ma.us">curtis.wood@state.ma.us</a></p>
<p>16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:</p>		<p>16e. Date:</p>	<p>9/28/2020</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.