

Doc: ESMI-061-R1
Title: Clarifications/Notes Regarding NENA Operations Committee Comments
Date: Apr 15, 2005
Contact: Mike Fargano (ESIF TF34 Co-Chair)

For original NENA Operations Committee Comments (w/o Clarification): See ESMI-061

The right column in the table that follows are clarification notes that were taken by Mike Fargano during the April 12, 2005 TF34 Virtual Meeting; Nadine Abbott also contributed to some of the notes. The clarifications were provided primarily by Pete Eggimann as the spokesperson for the following NENA Operations Committee Delegation:

- Pete Eggimann (NENA Operations Co-Chair);
- Rick Jones (NENA Operations Co-Chair);
- Steve O'Connor (NENA SOP Committee Chair)

NENA Ops Committee Comments	Clarification/Notes
1. There was much concern that an interface unique to 911 was being proposed rather than using existing business or commercial off the shelf applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding stream are tight • Don't want unique protocols to 911 • PSAPs don't see single source network provider
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The type of data formats that PSAPs need to send and receive are not unusual and are routinely handled by readily available software 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Don't want a single vendor - Telecom tariff structure is burdensome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Significant development costs will be associated with the implementation of this standard 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A limited number of vendors may be willing to invest in the development process, reducing competition and increasing price 	
2. PSAPs would be required to update their equipment to operate in an IP environment to utilize this interface, yet this interface does not seem to be consistent with the NENA i3 work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Coordination needed across broader stakeholders
3. The proposed interface appears to conflict with the NENA IP PSAP Features and Functions Standard	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The NENA standard emphasizes the use of existing business or commercial applications whenever possible to reduce costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce costs

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The NENA standard requires that PSAPs be able to handle data either as a “push” or as a “pull” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - VoIP service providers are unregulated - Need common interface - Want a direct connection to internet and info service providers. - Location info with call
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The NENA standard requires that PSAPs be able to receive data from multiple sources in multiple formats 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed ESIF standard requires an “always on” constant connection between the PSAP and the ESNets – simultaneous support of multiple connections would appear to greatly increase network costs for the PSAP and add unnecessary complexity to CPE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could impact CPE - Could impact Call Taker. - CPE should make call takers life’s simple - Concerned about impacts on call-taker of having to support multiple types of sources. CPE needs to sort that out without forcing the call-taker to have to think about how to respond.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data creators should be able to maintain their own location database and “push” that information directly to the PSAP, significantly reducing the costs for both, as opposed to “pulling” data from a single, remotely maintained master database. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The NENA standard emphasizes the use of a shared IP infrastructure for all voice and data applications, not a separate, stand alone data interface 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need simple network architecture; not multiple networks
<p>4. The proposed interface does not appear to support ALI steering between multiple ESNets</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need to deal with calls from outside service area.
<p>5. There are several references in the proposed interface that refer to “authorized agencies” being able to send unsolicited messages to the PSAP – authorized by who? Is this feature optional for the PSAPs? Can PSAPs pick and choose between agencies when deciding to permit unsolicited messaging? Can PSAPs control the display of unsolicited</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who is authorizing what, for whom? ○ What is displayed? ○ How it is displayed?

messages or will they just appear on the call taker's screen, possibly interrupting an on-going emergency?	
6. The NCIC / NLETs criminal justice network already provides PSAPs with much of the proposed functionality in the ESIF interface. A PSAP with NCIC, a legacy 911 system, and an Internet connection would appear to have all of the functionality proposed in the ESIF standard.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Legacy systems + internet (plus info services) + multitask Call Taker/CPE would satisfy the need.
7. How much involvement was there in the development process of this standard from industry representatives from law enforcement, EMS, fire, FBI, homeland security, DOT, DOD? A unique 911 interface seems inconsistent with the "interoperable communications" mandates coming from the federal and state government. Whatever 911 uses needs to work seamlessly with a very broad cross section of other government programs and with the global telecommunications industry.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Coordination needed; including international.
8. How will PSAPs that conform with this proposed interface transfer calls and data with non-conforming PSAPs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interaction with multi-infrastructure communications is required.
9. A unique interface may complicate IP security issues for PSAPs that want to receive and send data through multiple sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Open source – desirable ○ If PSAPs have something unique, will they need to support two different security schemes.
10. The proposed interface would appear to require significant development to become integrated with PSAP CAD, RMS, AVL, mobile data, etc. driving up PSAP costs significantly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If unique interface – could have problems with integration. ○ True of I3 also.
11. The propose interface supports the ESNets ability to monitor and retrieve PSAP activity information. Network management seems to be an inadequate reason to support this. Why is this really necessary? This raises data practices issues. How will the information be used? Will the information be sold to vendors? Will the information be used for pricing? What controls do the PSAPs have?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who will have access to what info? ○ Info access controls are needed for various applications – e.g., Data Mining. ○ Policy issue – just because ESnet received the info – what can it do with it?
12. The interface appears to be designed to promote the use of large remote databases rather than support the use of multiple, self-maintained location data sources. This	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Push vs Pull. ○ Simplify ALI process

<p>increases costs for the data creators and for the data users by adding complexity to the process.</p>	
<p>13. The proposed interface appears to be a “solution in search of a problem” with significant costs associated for all involved.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Generally agree with and echo the NENA Technical Committee comment that project should not go forward. ○ Want open source ○ Don't want single source, unique solution.