

NASNA Annual Meeting Minutes
Tampa Convention Center
Tampa, Florida

Sunday, June 13, 2004

ATTENDANCE

Members:

Steve Marzolf, <i>President</i>	Virginia
Bob Oenning, <i>Vice President/Treasurer</i>	Washington
Paul Fahey, <i>Secretary</i>	Massachusetts
John Benson	Iowa
John Crabill	Maryland
Al Gervenack	Maine
Barbara Jaeger	Arizona
Paul Mallett	Texas
Jim Martin	Florida
Daphne Rhoe	California
Art Rios	New Mexico
Chris Ternet	Indiana

Guests:

Ken Lowden	Indiana
Carey Spence	Intrado
Bob Sherry	Intrado

Call to Order and Introductions :

President Steve Marzolf called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

Administrative Business:

Minutes

Paul Fahey presented the minutes from the March interim meeting; Barbara Jaeger made a motion, seconded by Art Rios, to approve the minutes from the March 14, 2004 meeting; it was passed unanimously.

Financial Report

Bob Oenning presented the financial report. The current balance is \$6,407.09, with \$300 in receipts and \$150 in expenses. Invoices are going out this week for FY 2005 dues. Updated E-mail addresses for NASNA members should be sent to Bob Oenning for the list server and Steve Marzolf for the website. Chris Ternet made a motion, seconded by Art Rios, to approve the financial report; it was passed unanimously.

Legal Counsel

Jim Hobson has a new legal agreement and a rate increase for NENA. In the past, NASNA has had a “not to exceed \$2000” policy with Jim. The only use of Jim’s time in the recent past was review of the NORAD agreement. Paul Fahey represents NASNA on the Legislative/Regulatory Committee: NASNA provides input through that committee, which requires no additional money from NASNA.

Barbara Jaeger made a motion, seconded by Art Rios, to : increase to 10 hours, \$3,200 total. Steve: we may need his services on our dime, not NENA. Motion by Barb, continue relationship not to exceed 10 hours @ \$3,200. Rios 2nd. President authorizes.

FCC/NRIC VII/Legislative Update

The current status of the pending federal legislation is that Senator Burns is awaiting consensus on the program authorization and where the federal E 9-1-1 coordination office would be placed in the bureaucracy. Jim Rion of South Carolina circulated a redraft that tried to merge existing language into a consensus document, while NENA has tried to create general consensus on points of agreement. Steve Marzolf feels that the House version is more likely to pass due to its narrowed scope and lower program authorization, even though the fund raising language is weaker than the Senate bill. Bob Oenning hopes the final bill will remove sunset provisions.

Steve Marzolf updated the meeting on NRIC VII. There are five subcommittees in place relative to E-911: short-term, long-term, outage reporting, PSAP-first responders, “E”. He encouraged NASNA members to be involved; the website is www.nric.org

Intrado’s Next Generation E-911 Project:

Carey Spence is Intrado’s new Director of State Govt Affairs, and she stated that NASNA is a target group for discussing this project. She noted that Non-Disclosure Agreements are needed for Intrado to have a detailed architecture discussion. She stated that Intrado has a different perspective and plays a unique role relative to E-911, and that 90% of all such calls hit Intrado’s infrastructure. She wants Intrado to partner with NASNA, not to sell to it, and that their proposal is evolutionary and hopefully an open standard. A white paper was submitted to ATIS thru ESIF relative to PSAP ALI Interface Issues and “Next Generation Need”. She feels that costs will shuffle, not reduce; and that there will need to be increased flexibility to subscribe or unsubscribe as the business model changes.

Bob Sherry gave the 5th Generation 9-1-1: Architecture Directions presentation.

By-Law Amendments

There was a discussion of expanding the NASNA membership definition to include the Governor's wireless E 9-1-1 designee or regional association representative in the absence of a state coordinator.

Paul Fahey wants NASNA to expand its membership, but should give the final decision to the NASNA Board. Barbara Jaeger feels that it is important to have the right people from each state. Daphne Rhoe asked if there have been inquiries from other states about membership; she feels that the decision of who should represent the state should be made by the state itself. (Steve Marzolf said that two states expressed an interest).

Paul Fahey suggested that there be a priority for state coordinators over governor's appointees in the event of a conflict. Paul Mallett favors increasing the NASNA membership. Art Rios stated that New Mexico is represented at the FCC by the state's homeland security agency. Al Gervenack said that he is Maine's coordinator and governor's designee. Chris Ternet agreed with Paul Fahey on making the NASNA membership rules more inclusive.

Bob Oenning made a motion, seconded by Art Rios, to change the by-laws to allow for governor's designees and regional associations to seek to represent their states at NASNA, subject to NASNA Board approval. After a review of the by-laws, Bob Oenning amended his motion, seconded by Art Rios, to state that members not in attendance at the meeting will be polled via E-mail by the end of June 2004. The amended motion was approved unanimously.

Lunch Break from 12:00 noon to 1:30 p.m.

Technology Updates/Discussions:

Steve Marzolf brought up the issue of accuracy testing. Carriers want to use an averaging method. Chris Ternet expressed concern about revenue loss to local PSAPs resulting from the wire-line migration to wireless. He noted that carriers vary widely relative to cost recovery for wireless, and that the Indiana legislation was based on FCC 94-102. John Crabill stated that there is no wireless cost recovery in Maryland.

Bob Oenning noted challenges in Washington and asked if costs can be driven down by using resources elsewhere? Chris Ternet wondered if state coordinators can impact the numbers of PSAPs in their states. Steve Marzolf said that Virginia is seeking to decrease tandems. Al Gervenack felt that PSAP consolidation would lead to some decreased carrier cost. The CPE is owned by the program; costs there would decrease but not much.

Paul Fahey and Chris Ternet questioned whether cost recovery requirements can be removed from state legislation based on the King County decision – this may allow states to reduce the wireless surcharges where cost recovery requirements are removed. Paul Mallett noted that Texas is collecting money for cost recovery and that carriers are

inconsistent in response, often with the determination that Phase II costs don't meet a "reasonable" standard; Verizon and Cingular are the only ones now asking for recovery.

The issue of VoIP relative to revenue loss is another issue. Should a surcharge be placed on the voice service provider or internet service provider? Should states receive money for cost recovery by VoIP carriers?

State Reports/Open Forum

Instead of the usual review of state activity, Paul Fahey asked each of the coordinators present to identify the three most important items of concern in their state:

Washington: (1) visibility; (2) state to state comparisons; (3) carrier consistency

Indiana: (1) cost recovery/self-recovery/chip set reimbursement; (2) PSAP efficiency/consolidation/reconfiguration; (3) VoIP

Maine: (1) PSAP consolidation; (2) future funding/other technologies; (3) VoIP as operational issue

New Mexico: (1) deployment of Phase I; (2) cost recovery; (3) PSAP consolidation (mandate, no criteria)

Texas: (1) political/funding issues; (2) future funding model; (3) VoIP

California: (1) political concerns: agency vs. PSAPs and agency vs. legislature (visibility); (2) PSAP consolidation "vanity PSAPs"; (3) VoIP/PSALI

Maryland: (1) VoIP; (2) PSALI

Arizona: (1) VoIP (technical/funding); (2) funding; (3) deal with 3rd parties as group

Massachusetts: (1) cost recovery; (2) PSAP consolidation (wireless); (3) VoIP funding

Virginia: (1) funding reform: repeal telecom taxes, new fund tied to sales tax->all devices; (2) accuracy testing; (3) legislative issues

Iowa: (1) Phase II implementation: funding, PSAPs, 3rd party user group; (2) "legal flotsam & jetsam": convert legislation into admin. process, re-educate PSAPs; (3) VoIP

The issues identified above fell into three broad areas: Policy (cost recovery/funding/political/legal issues; Operations: PSAPs consolidation/coordination; and Technical: 3rd party user issues/PSALI. It was agreed that these three groups of issues would be addressed on the July 29th quarterly conference call and that volunteers to work on each group would be solicited.

Steve Marzolf announced that the next NASNA meeting would be in Washington D.C. – a joint E 9-1-1 coordination summit with NGA in October. He stated that the Rural Cellular Association is interested in working with NASNA on accuracy testing issues relative to handset-based solutions. Barbara Jaeger suggested that NASNA strengthen its relationship with CTIA.

Adjournment

Barbara Jaeger made a motion, seconded by Art Rios, that the meeting be adjourned at 4:30 p.m.; the motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Fahey
Secretary