



STATE NAME

Statewide Communication Interoperability Plan (SCIP) Implementation Report

MONTH YEAR



Homeland
Security

Table of Contents

<i>SCIP Implementation Report Overview</i>	1
<i>Part 1. SCIP Implementation Update</i>	1
State Overview	1
Vision and Mission	1
Governance	1
Standard Operating Procedures	1
Technology	1
Training and Exercises	1
Usage	1
<i>National Emergency Communications Plan Goals</i>	1
Part 2 - County Communications Interoperability Capabilities Assessment Grid	1
<i>Part 3. NECP Goal 2 Methodology</i>	1

Paperwork Reduction Act: The public reporting burden to complete this information collection is estimated at 6 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and the completing and reviewing the collected information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number and expiration date. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to DHS/NPPD/CS&C/OEC Adrienne Werner, 2020-343-1613 ATTN: PRA [1670-0017].

SCIP Implementation Report Overview

The Statewide Communication Interoperability Plan (SCIP) Implementation Report provides an annual update on your State's progress in achieving the initiatives and strategic vision identified in the SCIP. Further, this information will provide OEC with a clearer understanding of your State's capabilities, needs, and strategic direction for achieving interoperability statewide.

- **Part 1, "SCIP Implementation Update"** of the report is to be completed by the Statewide Interoperability Coordinator (SWIC) or Statewide Communication Interoperability Plan (SCIP) Point of Contact (POC). As required by Congress, States provide updates and changes to the status of their Statewide Interoperable Communications Plans in this section. Each State created a SCIP in 2007 and all have been regularly updated. The template sections match those required in the original SCIP, and extensive instructions were provided to the States to understand the requirements of these sections and assist in the development of their SCIPs. The initiatives within each report include milestones identified in the NECP which will be standardized, as well as State-specific efforts.
- **Part 2, "County/County-Equivalent Interoperability Communications Assessment,"** is to be completed by the designated county or county-equivalent and submitted to the SWIC or SCIP POC. Goal 2 of the NECP states that by the end of 2011, 75 percent of non-UASI (Urban Areas Security Initiative) jurisdictions are able to demonstrate response-level emergency communications within one hour for routine events involving multiple jurisdictions and agencies. This section of template will provide OEC with broader capability data across the lanes of the Interoperability Continuum which are key indicators of consistent success in response-level communications.
- **Part 3, "NECP Goal 2 Methodology,"** is to be completed by the SWIC or SCIP POC. This portion of the SCIP Implementation Report will help the State prepare for the assessment of NECP Goal 2 in 2011. In 2011, capability data (identical to the questions asked of UASIs in the 2010 report) and response-level performance data will be collected at the county/county-equivalent level to meet the NECP Goal 2 mandate of assessing response-level communications in "non-UASI" jurisdictions. Through this section of the template, OEC is asking for each State's methodology, which must address key issues such as: ensuring that all counties will be assessed; ensuring adequate local input; and ensuring completion by the September 30, 2011 deadline. OEC will validate the proposed approaches before States begin the data collection process in FY 2011.

Part 1. SCIP Implementation Update

The following sections ask that States provide an update on the implementation of their SCIP. States will first provide an overview of their current interoperability environment (“State Overview”) and then identify their vision and mission statements (“Vision and Mission”). The remaining sections in Part I ask that States consider their progress along the five lanes of the SAFECOM Interoperability Continuum (Governance, Standard Operating Procedures [SOPs], Technology, Training and Exercises, and Usage).

For each lane of the Continuum, States are asked to provide a brief narrative explaining their efforts related to the identified lane. For each lane of the Continuum, States are also asked to address initiatives identified in the National Emergency Communications Plan (NECP) as well as any additional initiatives identified within their State. NECP-related initiatives appear pre-populated in the “NECP Initiatives” section of each table below. Additional initiatives identified by States can be addressed in the “Additional State Initiatives” section of each table below. States are not limited to the number of fields provided in the template and should add additional rows as needed to accurately address all applicable initiatives. When completing these tables, the following information must be provided for each initiative:

- **Gap:** Identify the gap that this initiative will address.
- **Owner:** Identify the State owner of this specific initiative.
- **Milestone:** List the date that this initiative was or is scheduled to be completed.
- **Status:** Identify whether this initiative is complete, in progress, or not started.

The following is an example of how the charts in Part 1 should be completed:

Initiative (Name / Purpose)	Gap (Brief Description)	Owner (Agency, Department, and/or POC)	Milestone Date (Month/Year)	Status (Complete, In Progress, Not Started)
NECP Initiatives				
Establish a full-time statewide interoperability coordinator or equivalent position.	No full time SWIC in place	Governor	2/2009	Complete

Part 1 is to be completed by the SWIC or SCIP POC.

State Overview

Overview of the State and its interoperability challenges:

Insert Brief Narrative

Vision and Mission

Overview of the interoperable communications vision and mission of the State:

The State SCIP has a timeframe of **XX years (Month 20XX – Month 20XX)**.

Vision: Insert Vision Statement

Mission: Insert Mission Statement

Governance

Overview of the governance structure, practitioner-driven approaches, and funding:

Insert Brief Narrative

Governance Initiatives

The following table should outline the strategic governance initiatives, gaps, owners, and milestone dates [State] outlined in its SCIP to improve interoperable communications.

Initiative (Name / Purpose)	Gap (Brief Description)	Owner (Agency, Department, and/or POC)	Milestone Date (Month/Year)	Status (Complete, In Progress, Not Started)
NECP Initiatives				
<i>Establish a full-time statewide interoperability coordinator or equivalent position.</i>				
<i>Incorporate the recommended membership into the Statewide Interoperability Governing Body (SIGB)¹.</i>				
<i>Establish the SIGB via legislation or executive order.</i>				
Additional State Initiatives				

Standard Operating Procedures

Overview of the shared interoperable communications-focused SOPs

Insert Brief Narrative

SOP Initiatives

The following table should outline the SOP strategic initiatives, gaps, owners, and milestone dates [State] outlined in its SCIP to improve interoperable communications.

Initiative (Name / Purpose)	Gap (Brief Description)	Owner (Agency, Department, and/or POC)	Milestone Date (Month/Year)	Status (Complete, In Progress, Not Started)
NECP Initiatives				
<i>Tactical planning among Federal, State, local, and tribal governments occurs at</i>				

¹ SIGBs should include representatives from the Governor’s office, State and local elected officials, State and local emergency medical services, State and local health officials, State and local fire response services, State and local law enforcement, State and local emergency management, State and local homeland security offices, tribal governments, State and local transportation agencies, military organizations, Federal agencies that need to be interoperable with State and local emergency responders, Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) regions, critical infrastructure, non-government organizations, response and recovery organizations, and regional planning committee chairpersons. This guidance is included in the Statewide Interoperability Planning Guidebook: <http://www.safecomprogram.gov/NR/rdonlyres/18F02413-CC4D-41B2-9097-F5FF04E080C7/0/StatewidePlanningGuidebookFINAL.pdf>.

Initiative (Name / Purpose)	Gap (Brief Description)	Owner (Agency, Department, and/or POC)	Milestone Date (Month/Year)	Status (Complete, In Progress, Not Started)
<i>the regional interstate level.</i>				
<i>All Federal, State, local and tribal emergency response providers within UASI jurisdictions implement the Communications and Information Management section of the National Incident Management System (NIMS).</i>				
<i>Incorporate the use of existing nationwide interoperability channels into SOPs.</i>				
<i>Update SCIP to reflect plans to eliminate coded substitutions throughout the Incident Command System (ICS).</i>				
<i>Define alternate/backup capabilities in emergency communications plans.</i>				
Additional State Initiatives				

Technology

Overview of the technology approaches, current capabilities, and planned systems:

Insert Brief Narrative

Major Systems

The following tables should list the major systems in [State] and include those used for solely interoperable communications, large regional systems specifically designed to provide interoperability solutions, and large wireless data networks.

Shared Statewide System² (Name)	Description (Type, frequency, P25 compliance, etc.)	Status (Existing, planned, etc.)

² Shared statewide radio systems are typically designed to consolidate the communications of multiple State agencies onto a single system, thereby providing strong interoperability. Many States also make these systems available to Federal, local, and tribal agencies on a voluntary basis. In this case, local governments either chose to use the shared statewide radio system as their primary system, or they decided to interface their system to the shared statewide radio system creating a system of systems.

State Systems (Name)	Description (Type, frequency, P25 compliance, etc.)	Status (Existing, planned, etc.)

Regional Systems (Name)	Description (Type, frequency, P25 compliance, etc.)	Status (Existing, planned, etc.)

Technology Initiatives

The following table should outline the technology strategic initiatives, gaps, owners, and milestone dates [State] outlined in its SCIP to improve interoperable communications.

Initiative (Name / Purpose)	Gap (Brief Description)	Owner (Agency, Department, and/or POC)	Milestone Date (Month/Year)	Status (Complete, In Progress, Not Started)
NECP Initiatives				
<i>Program nationwide interoperability channels into all existing emergency responder radios.</i>				
Additional State Initiatives				

Training and Exercises

Overview of the diversity, frequency, and inter-agency coordination of training and exercises:

Insert Brief Narrative

Training and Exercises Initiatives

The following table should outline the training and exercises strategic initiatives, gaps, owners, and milestone dates [State] outlined in its SCIP to improve interoperable communications.

Initiative (Name / Purpose)	Gap (Brief Description)	Owner (Agency, Department, and/or POC)	Milestone Date (Month/Year)	Status (Complete, In Progress, Not Started)
NECP Initiatives				
<i>Incorporate the use of existing nationwide interoperability channels into training and exercises.</i>				
<i>Complete disaster communications training and exercises.</i>				
Additional State Initiatives				

Usage

Overview of the testing of equipment and promotion of interoperability solutions:

Insert Brief Narrative

Usage Initiatives

The following table should outline the usage strategic initiatives, gaps, owners, and milestone dates [State] outlined in its SCIP to improve interoperable communications.

Initiative (Name / Purpose)	Gap (Brief Description)	Owner (Agency, Department, and/or POC)	Milestone Date (Month/Year)	Status (Complete, In Progress, Not Started)

National Emergency Communications Plan Goals

The National Emergency Communications Plan (NECP) established a national vision for the future state of emergency communications. The desired future state is that emergency responders can communicate as needed, on demand, and as authorized at all levels of government across all disciplines. To measure progress towards this vision, three strategic goals were established:

Goal 1—By 2010, 90 percent of all high-risk urban areas designated with the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI)³ are able to demonstrate response-level emergency communications⁴ within one hour for routine events involving multiple jurisdictions and agencies.

Goal 2—By 2011, 75 percent of non-UASI jurisdictions are able to demonstrate response-level emergency communications within one hour for routine events involving multiple jurisdictions and agencies.

Goal 3—By 2013, 75 percent of all jurisdictions are able to demonstrate response level emergency communications within three hours, in the event of a significant incident as outlines in national planning scenarios.

As part of the Goal 1 implementation process, OEC required UASIs to demonstrate response-level emergency communications during a planned event. Additionally, as part of the State's SCIP Implementation Report update in 2010, OEC is requiring information on UASIs' current capabilities. The capability questions are presented in Part II. UASIs must complete and submit responses on the capability questions to the SWIC or SCIP POC. The data generated from these questions will assist OEC in its analysis of Goal 1 performance and in identifying national trends in urban area communications. Similarly, to prepare for Goal 2 implementation in 2011, States are being asked to develop a methodology for collecting capability and performance data Statewide (please see Part III).

³ As identified in FY08 Homeland Security Grant Program

⁴ Response-level emergency communication refers to the capacity of individuals with primary operational leadership responsibility to manage resources and make timely decisions during an incident involving multiple agencies, without technical or procedural communications impediments.

Part 2 - County Communications Interoperability Capabilities Assessment Grid

The “Capabilities Assessment Grid” is to be completed by the designated county or county-equivalent and submitted to the SWIC or SCIP POC.

For each lane of the Interoperability Continuum (Governance, Standard Operating Procedures [SOPs], Technology, Training and Exercises, and Usage), please select the one row that best describes the assessed area by checking the appropriate box. While multiple descriptions may apply, counties should identify the one row that most closely describes their highest level of capability achieved. The below capabilities assessment grid is to be completed by each county within the State.

Lane	Question	Answer	
		Count y 1	Count y 2
Question 1: (Governance)	County decision-making groups are informal, and do not yet have a strategic plan in place to guide collective communications interoperability goals and funding.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Some <i>formal</i> agreements exist and <i>informal</i> agreements are in practice among members of a county decision making group; strategic and budget planning processes are beginning to be put in place.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Formal agreements outline the roles and responsibilities of a county decision making group, which has an agreed upon strategic plan that addresses sustainable funding for collective, regional interoperable communications needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	County-wide decision making bodies proactively look to expand membership to ensure representation from broad public support disciplines and other levels of government, while updating their agreements and strategic plan on a regular basis.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Question 2: (SOPs)	County-wide interoperable communications SOPs are not developed or have not been formalized and disseminated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Some interoperable communications SOPs exist within the county and steps have been taken to institute these interoperability procedures among some agencies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Interoperable communications SOPs are formalized and in use by all agencies within the county. Despite minor issues, SOPs are successfully used during responses and/or exercise(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Lane	Question	Answer	
		Count y 1	Count y 2
	Interoperable communications SOPs within the county are formalized and regularly reviewed. Additionally, National Incident Management System (NIMS) procedures are well established among all agencies and disciplines. All needed procedures are effectively utilized during responses and/or exercise(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Questions 3: (Technology)	Interoperability within the county is primarily achieved through the use of gateways (mobile/fixed gateway, console patch) or use of a radio cache.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Interoperability within the county is primarily achieved through the use of shared channels or talkgroups.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Interoperability within the county is primarily achieved through the use of a proprietary shared system.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Interoperability within the county is primarily achieved through the use of a standards-based shared system (e.g., Project 25).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Questions 4: (Technology)	What frequency band(s) do public safety agencies within the county currently utilize? (e.g., VHF-Low Band, VHF-High Band, UHF 450-470, UHF "T-Band" 470-512, UHF 700, UHF 800, UHF 700/800)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Question 5: (Training & Exercise)	County-wide public safety agencies participate in communications interoperability workshops, but no formal training or exercises are focused on emergency communications.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Some public safety agencies within the county hold communications interoperability training on equipment and conduct exercises, although not on a regular cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Public safety agencies within the county participate in equipment and SOP training for communications interoperability and hold exercises on a regular schedule.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	County-wide public safety agencies regularly conduct training and exercises with a communications interoperability curriculum addressing equipment and SOPs that is modified as needed to address the changing operational environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Questions 6: (Usage)	First responders in the county seldom use interoperability solutions unless advanced planning is possible (e.g., special event).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	First responders in the county use interoperability solutions regularly for emergency events, and in a limited fashion for day-to-day communications.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	First responders in the county use interoperability solutions regularly and easily for all day-to-day, task force, and mutual aid events.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Lane	Question	Answer	
		Count y 1	Count y 2
	Regular use of interoperability solutions for all day-to-day and out-of-the-ordinary events in the county on demand, in real time, when needed, as authorized.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Questions 7: (Usage)	What percentage of the time do you use the following communications technologies during emergency responses?		
	Cell Service	__%	__%
	Sat phone	__%	__%
	Mobile Data Commercial Networks*	__%	__%
	Private Networks	__%	__%

*Commercial Networks that operate at or above 128K; also includes use of broadband devices such as smart phones, mobile e-mail devices, or wireless air cards.

Part 3. NECP Goal 2 Methodology

The below methodology for Goal 2 is to be completed by the SWIC or SCIP POC.

Goal 2 Methodology

In the section below, describe the methodology that you will use in 2011 for demonstrating and reporting Goal 2 of the NECP for all county or county equivalents in your State. Methodologies should address the following:

- *The incorporation of all counties or county equivalents*
- *Proposed approach to collect capability data (including from individual UASI counties)*
- *Proposed approach to collect performance data (including from individual UASI counties)⁵*
- *County-level input prior to submission of Goal 2 data to OEC*
- *Completion of data collection by September 30, 2011*

Insert Brief Narrative

⁵ Counties with significant participation in NECP Goal 1 demonstrations can use the results for their Goal 2 performance data
