

Policy Subcommittee Meeting

November 19, 2014

Camp Murray, WA

0930 – 1200

Attendance:

Constituency	Primary		Alternate	
Chair	Richard Kirton	X		
King County	Marlys Davis	X	Deb Flewelling	X
Large Counties East	Lorlee Mizell	X	Amy McCormick	
Med Counties East	Brad Coughenour	R	Jackie Jones	X
Rural Counties East 1	Mike Worden (VC)	X	Angie Fode	X
Rural Counties East 2	Kathleen Slaybaugh	X	Ray Maycumber	
Large Counties West	Jim Quackenbush	X	Laura Caster	X
Med Counties West	Craig Larsen	X	Tom Shaughnessy	X
Rural Counties West 1	Stephanie Fritts	X	Joannie Bjorge	R
Rural Counties West 2	Steve Romberg		Karl Hatton	X
Advisory Committee	Rose Parr	X		
State Office	Andy Leneweaver	X	Teresa Lewis	X
	Kim Mask	X		

KEY: X=In Person R= By Conference Bridge

Guests:

Donna Barnes, WSP	Keith Flewelling, Thurston County	Jim Fosse, Douglas County
Hillman S. Mitchell, MK Hamilton & Assoc.	Corey Sulenes, MK Hamilton & Assoc.	Peggy Fouts, Grays Harbor (R)

Richard Kirton opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and addressed housekeeping issues and roll call of attendees both in person and on the phone.

Richard also thanked Jackie Jones for completing the October meeting minutes. The minutes were approved as written.

Richard noted there was an addition to the agenda (5e) after it was posted to OneDrive.

Open Issues:

ESINET SECURITY (A)

Everyone read the CPD and Operations policies to include deliverables. Need to ensure every PSAP connecting to the ESInet is following security policy once Ziggy signs it.

The Policy Subcommittee is not waiting for Ziggy to sign the standards to continue work.

****Brainstorming Ideas****

Priority 1: Should have little to no cost involved in order to implement.

Every county should be required to follow standard. There should be some considerations made to those who do not in the way of reduced funding or ineligible for contracts. Suggest focusing on the positive implications rather than the negative.

May need to have the same discussions to set as a statewide service.

Comment [WC1]: security standard.

Priority 2: Any county who wants to access to this, must comply with P1 level.

The state office is reluctant to have the document discussed and released in a public meeting due to the sensitive nature of it and the vulnerabilities it mentions. Further discussions were that personnel on the PSAP floor and call takers are trusted agents of the center.

Comment [WC2]: security document

What would be the remedies if a PSAP doesn't meeting the requirements or refuses to comply?

The suggestion would be that they would pass their functions over to another PSAP that does meet the requirements.

Comment [WC3]: security requirements

Would funding be available if a PSAP is moving forward with modernization? Yes.

Most P1 and P2 would be policy issues. There would be little hardware and software requirements, with the exception of updating antivirus software on a daily basis.

Comment [WC4]: funding for what? Is this still part of the security discussion?

Phone systems would be protected by antivirus software.

The RFP has a request for gateway design to public internet. The Policy subcommittee will refer the recommended standards back to the NG911 subcommittee.

At what point does the state's responsibility end and local responsibility begin? Border Control Function; Back-to-Back function...Everything would be fine and allows this to go through. This will be moving a lot of security into the network. It would be a 2-prong approach. Virtual network security and physical security, both would need to be met.

Firewalls are essential at PSAP level. **Is the State planning to add firewalls at the PSAPs?** The state office could not answer due to not knowing what the budget will be.

Only issue for counties that have already gone i3 needing help determining cost – approximate is unknown due to the assessment not yet completed.

The CPE and public internet are vulnerabilities. There is an agreement document between CenturyLink and Intrado that states that an IP direct connect to the ESInet is not a threat when using Viper equipment to receive text. Due to the assessment not being complete and King County having Viper equipment, this is considered not a threat at this time unless the assessment discovers differently which the state office will address at that time. Per Andy and the State Office, there is no evidence to support what is written as incorrect.

Systems other than Vipers (supported) would be recommended to have firewalls installed.

The MK Hamilton contract performance period ends June 30, 2015. The report due date has yet to be determined.

Currently the state does not internet connections as a statewide service so this cannot be disallowed. If counties want to move forward, they will need to fund on their own at this time.

Marlys: Asking if it would be recommendable to wait for the official word from the security vendor before purchasing anything?

MK Hamilton/State Office: Yes, it would be wise.

Kenn Moisey: Current contract with CenturyLink ensures that a secure network is being provided at this time.

Viper equipment uses a non-standard approach to deliver text messages.

Discussion:

Suggestion – All counties will meet P1 standards in order to get funding, according to the Statewide Services Policy. P2/P3 standards will be met by a self-certification or a triggering event. For Operations Counties, need to include funding amount in order to get completed. CPD Counties will have the ability to request funds if needed. King County shared a circulated email warning all about a server that was recently hacked and brought attention that they are out there trying to get at systems.

Action: Add Security as an agenda item for December 8th meeting.

INTERIM TEXT-TO-911 (B)

There is minimal cost to implement. The cost is approximately \$93-\$100 per position per month for 1-4 positions in reoccurring charges.

JQ: Implementation costs should be a part modernization costs as well reoccurring costs should be a part of statewide services. The number of licensed positions could be capped.

Action: Richard will bring this recommendation forward to Ziggy.

A request made to add to policy.

Correction: Last time expanded definitions to include NG911 may be interim solution not integrated solution.

The WAC definition was changed to state that NG9-1-1 is designed to provide access to emergency services from all sources, and to provide multimedia data capabilities for PSAPs and other emergency service organizations.

This would include text.

Richard will approach the state office that the understanding is the same that no state money would be used for text to 9-1-1 until there is an i3 solution. Once it is available, may need to be added under the same funding mechanism as what trunks and database charges are (as Statewide Services).

The state office is trying to get this as “embedded” services. Andy sees this as the same as phone calls. This is no difference. The state will need to work on negotiating the cost of this service.

Snohomish County is in the process of negotiating a contract for testing purposes of texting and does not want to create issues for the state position when they start to negotiate costs. Laura is looking for guidance from this group on how to move forward with creating a conflict for the state.

Guidance offered: Stick with the browser application would be in the best interest of the county in case the state adds services under the new RFP. This way the state office and Snohomish County would not be held under separate contracts at separate or possibly higher rates.

Action: Richard requests that JQ, Lorlee, Marlys, Andy, and Kenn meet to discuss issues with Intrado and report back at December 8th meeting.

FY2015 POLICIES – “CAPS” (C)

Draft policies need to be ready prior to January meeting.

Not all language is as clean as it needs to be. Example is 2. a. ii. of the FY2015 County Operations Contract Policy.

There is conflicting language in in 3.1.e. also.

Under the Reimbursement Schedule, there is some language that needs to be cleared up to make this less confusing about equipment purchases.

Basic Services Category – If Maintenance is not spent in this category, it can be moved up into Basic Services.

Action: Richard and Mike will have meet with Bill to see if the understanding of the Policy Subcommittee is reflecting what the actual policy is saying. If this is not the understanding of the state office of what the Policy

Subcommittee and the State Office, that needs to be clarified so everyone has a clear understanding of what the intent was so Teresa can reimburse counties according to policy and the counties are clear what the policy and purpose is stating.

Richard will ask Ziggy to send a letter describing what is happening this year.

Action: Mike and Craig will review the FY2015 policies and develop draft language.

Application Training – Will add this (Block Grant) to the training now that the counties have had a year of experience working with it.

FUNDING SPLIT

Teresa presented spreadsheets of breakouts with different scenarios of splits in revenues (70/30 and 80/20).

Action: Teresa will add the 60/40 split to the spreadsheet. She explained each column of the spreadsheet. These will be sent out electronically.

It was asked if there was a possibility of eliminating the split and how this would be done.

Could this be transitional or all at once?

Richard will present this at tomorrow's Advisory Committee meeting.

PENDING ITEMS

Priorities from October Minutes:

Action: Invite Regionalized Counties to March meeting to discuss what is /isn't working with the contracts and policies.

Action: Bill will provide a presentation on FY2016 contracts for December meeting.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

December Meeting

Monday, December 8, 2014

01000 – 1700

Camp Murray

January Meeting

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

0930 – 1200

Camp Murray