**Approved by OMB**

**3060-1122**

**Expires: March 31, 2021**

**Estimated time per response: 10-55 hours**

Annual Collection of Information

Related to the Collection and Use of 911 and E911 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions

Pursuant to OMB authorization 3060-1122, the FCC’s Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau seeks the following specific information in order to fulfill the Commission’s obligations under Section 6(f)(2) of the NET 911 Act:

1. **Filing Information**
2. **Name of State or Jurisdiction**

|  |
| --- |
| **State or Jurisdiction** |
| Alabama |

1. **Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| Adam Brown | Deputy Director | Alabama 9-1-1 Board |

1. **Overview of State or Jurisdiction 911 System**
2. **Please provide the total number of active Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in your state or jurisdiction that receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2017:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PSAP Type[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Total** |
| Primary | 117 |
| Secondary | 0 |
| **Total** | 117 |

1. **Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators[[2]](#footnote-2) in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2017:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Number of Active Telecommunicators** | **Total** |
| Full-Time | 856\* |
| Part-time | 117\* |

 \*These totals are based on self-reported data from PSAPs; only 60 of the 117 reported.

1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2017, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Amount****($)** | $114,430,061.00\* |

\*This figure is for total expenditures as provided by an independent auditors’ report for the fiscal period of October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017.

**3a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Please provide the total number of 911 calls your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Service** | **Total 911 Calls** |
| Wireline | \* |
| Wireless  | 2,534,374 |
| VoIP | \* |
| Other | \* |
| **Total** |  |

\*These statistics are maintained at the local emergency communications districts and are not readily available to the state office. Alabama completed their wireless aggregation project in December 2014, which allows for all wireless calls in the state to be routed through the Alabama Next Generation Emergency Network (ANGEN); therefore, we are only able to provide wireless statistics for our state. Progress is being made by our NG911 service provider to aggregate all wireline and VoIP traffic through ANGEN. Upon completion, the state office will have the ability to provide a comprehensive type of service total.

1. **Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanisms**
2. **Has your State, or any political subdivision, Indian tribe, village or regional corporation therein as defined by Section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act, established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation (please include a citation to the legal authority for such mechanism)?** *Check one.*
* Yes ………………….. [x]
* No ………………..….. [ ]

**1a. If YES, provide a citation to the legal authority for such a mechanism.**

|  |
| --- |
| Under § 11-98-5, Code of Alabama 1975, a single, monthly statewide 911 charge was imposed on each active voice communications service connection in Alabama that is technically capable of accessing a 911 system. |

**1b. If YES, during the annual period January 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017, did your state or jurisdiction amend, enlarge, or in any way alter the funding mechanism.**

|  |
| --- |
| No. |

1. **Which of the following best describes the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 911/E911 fees?** *Check one*.
* The State collects the fees ………………………………….. [x]
* A Local Authority collects the fees ……………………….. [ ]
* A hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies

 (*e.g.*, state and local authority) collect the fees …………….. [ ]

1. **Describe how the funds collected are made available to localities.**

|  |
| --- |
| Under § 11-98-5, Code of Alabama 1975, service providers remit the monthly statewide 9-1-1 charge collected from the service subscriber to the state board by the end of the calendar month following the month the provider received the charges from its subscribers. The state board then makes monthly distributions to the local districts based on a distribution formula outlined in § 11-98-5.2, Code of Alabama 1975, and population. |

1. **Description of State or Jurisdictional Authority That Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes.**
 |
| **Jurisdiction** | **Authority to Approve** **Expenditure of Funds*****(Check one)*** |
| **Yes** | **No** |
| State | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Local (*e.g.*, county, city, municipality) | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **1b. Please briefly describe any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction (*e.g.*, limited to fees collected by the entity, limited to wireline or wireless service, etc.)** |
| Under § 11-98-5.2, Code of Alabama 1975, a sum not to exceed one percent “from the total amount of the statewide 911 charges paid over to the 911 Board during such month…[can] be applied by the 911 Board exclusively for payment of administrative expenses theretofore incurred by it.” Limitations placed on local authorities are set forth by the disposition of funds in § 11-98-6, which is provided in the next item of this questionnaire. |

1. **Has your state established a funding mechanism that mandates *how* collected funds can be used? *Check one*.**
* Yes ………………….. [x]
* No ………………..….. **[ ]**

**2a.** **If you checked YES, provide a legal citation to the funding mechanism of any such criteria.**

|  |
| --- |
| Under § 11-98-6, Code of Alabama 1975, the deposition of funds sets forth that:(a) Funds received by a district pursuant to Section 11-98-5.2 shall be used to establish, operate, maintain, and replace an emergency communication system that, without limitation, may consist of the following:(1) Telephone communications equipment to be used in answering, transferring, and dispatching public emergency telephone calls originated by persons within the service area who dial 911.(2) Emergency radio communications equipment and facilities necessary to transmit and receive dispatch calls.(3) The engineering, installation, and recurring costs necessary to implement, operate, and maintain an emergency communication system.(4) Facilities to house E-911 operators and related services as defined in this chapter, with the approval of the creating authority, and for necessary emergency and uninterruptable power supplies for the systems.(5) Administrative and other costs related to subdivisions (1) to (4), inclusive.(b) A district or county or municipal governing body may receive federal, state, county, or municipal real or personal property and funds, as well as real or personal property and funds from private sources, and may expend the funds or use the property for the purposes of this chapter.(c) Subject to the remaining provisions of this chapter and the approval of the 911 Board and the creating authority, two or more districts, cities, or counties, or a city and a county in another district may agree to cooperate, to the extent practicable, to provide funding and service to their respective areas, and a single board of commissioners of not more than seven members may be appointed to conduct the affairs of the entities involved. In the event that two or more districts are consolidated for purposes of this chapter, the base distribution amount as defined in Section 11-98-5.2 (b)(3) shall include the combined base distribution amounts that would have been calculated for the individual districts.(d) Subject to rules that may be adopted by the 911 Board, a district may expend available funds to establish a common address and location identification program and to establish the emergency service number data base to facilitate efficient operation of the system. The governing body and the E-911 Board of each county or city affected shall be jointly responsible for purchasing and installing the necessary signs to properly identify all roads and streets in the district.(e) Beginning with fiscal year 2013, the Department of Examiners of Public Accounts shall audit each district on a biennial basis to ensure compliance with the requirements of this chapter regarding both revenues and expenditures. |

**2b.** **If you checked NO, describe how your state or jurisdiction decides how collected funds can be used.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees**
2. **Provide a statement identifying with specificity all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state, or political subdivision thereof, has obligated or expended funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes and how these activities, programs, and organizations support 911 and E911 services or enhancements of such services.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Funds collected for 911 or E911 have been received by the 87 Emergency Communications Districts (ECDs) in the State of Alabama and have been used to support the activities of those 911 districts by providing funding to maintain, and in some cases enhance, the 911 service provided to their populous. (*See table below for complete list.*)

|  |
| --- |
| List of ECDs |
| Adamsville (Municipality) | Elmore County | Marion County |
| Auburn (Municipality) | Enterprise (Municipality) | Marshall County |
| Autauga County | Escambia County | Midfield (Municipality) |
| Baldwin County | Etowah County | Mobile County |
| Barbour County | Fairfield (Municipality) | Monroe County |
| Bessemer (Municipality) | Fayette County | Montgomery City |
| Bibb County | Fort Payne (Municipality) | Montgomery County |
| Birmingham (Municipality) | Franklin County | Morgan County |
| Blount County | Gardendale (Municipality) | Mountain Brook |
| Bullock County | Geneva County | Perry County |
| Butler County | Greene County | Pickens County |
| Calhoun County | Hale County | Pike County |
| Chambers County | Henry County | Pleasant Grove (Municipality) |
| Cherokee County | Homewood (Municipality) | Randolph County |
| Chilton County | Hoover (Municipality) | Russell County |
| Choctaw County | Houston County | Shelby County |
| Clarke County | Hueytown (Municipality) | St Clair County |
| Clay County | Irondale City (Jefferson) | Sumter County |
| Cleburne County | Jackson County | Talladega County |
| Coffee County | Jefferson County | Tallapoosa County |
| Colbert County | Lamar County | Tarrant (Municipality) |
| Conecuh County | Lauderdale County | Tuscaloosa County |
| Coosa County | Lawrence County | Vestavia (Municipality) |
| Covington County | Lee County | Walker County |
| Crenshaw County | Leeds (Municipality) | Washington County |
| Cullman County | Limestone County | Wilcox County |
| Dale County | Lowndes County | Winston County |
| Daleville City | Macon County |  |
| Dallas County | Madison County |  |
| DeKalb County | Marengo County |  |

 |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Please identify the allowed uses of the collected funds. *Check all that apply*.**
 |
| **Type of Cost** | **Yes** | **No** |
| **Operating Costs** | Lease, purchase, maintenance of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software) | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software) | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Personnel Costs** | Telecommunicators’ Salaries | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Training of Telecommunicators | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Administrative Costs** | Program Administration | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Travel Expenses | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Dispatch Costs** | Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Grant Programs** |  | **[x]** **If YES, see 2a.** | **[ ]**  |
| **2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2017, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant.** |
| While grant programs are an allowable use for collected funds, there were no grants awarded for the reporting period. |

1. **Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Please describe the amount of the fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services. Please distinguish between state and local fees for each service type.**
 |
| **Service Type** | **Fee/Charge Imposed** | **Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance****(*e.g.*, state, county, local authority, or a combination)** |
| Wireline | $1.75 | State |
| Wireless | $1.75 | State |
| Prepaid Wireless | $1.75 | State |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | $1.75 | State |
| Other | $1.75 | State |

1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2017, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Service Type** | **Total Amount Collected ($)** |
| Wireline | $20,117,531.79 |
| Wireless | $73,379,363.14 |
| Prepaid Wireless | $20,774,469.07 |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) |  |
| Other |  |
| **Total** | $114,271,364.00 |

\*These figures are the total collections for the fiscal period of October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017.

**2a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Please identify any other sources of 911/E911 funding.**

|  |
| --- |
| None. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2017, were any 911/E911 fees that were collected by your state or jurisdiction combined with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services?** *Check one.*
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **4a.** **If YES, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.** |
| Some local emergency communications districts receive a variety of funding from county/municipal appropriations, federal/state grants, dispatch fees, various service contracts, and donations. The total amount of funding that was combined to 911/E911 fees was $14,341,105.66 for the fiscal period of October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017. This information is based on self-reported funding data provided by the local districts; only 76 of the 87 reported. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Please provide an estimate of the proportional contribution from each funding source towards the total cost to support 911 in your state or jurisdiction.**
 | **Percent** |
| State 911 Fees | 89.098% |
| Local 911 Fees | 0.000% |
| General Fund – State | 0.000% |
| General Fund – County | \*3.361% |
| Federal Grants | \*0.013% |
| State Grants | \*0.466% |

\*These three percentages are based on self-reported funding data by the local districts for the fiscal period of October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017; only 76 of the 87 reported.

1. **Description of Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Uses**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **In the annual period ending December 31, 2017, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction made available or used solely for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism?** *Check one*.
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **1a.** **If NO, please identify what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, including any funds transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state's general fund. Along with identifying the amount, please include a statement identifying the non-related purposes for which the collected 911 or E911 funds were made available or used.** |
| **Amount of Funds ($)** | **Identify the non-related purpose(s) for which the 911/E911 funds were used. (*Add lines as necessary*)** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1. **Oversight and Auditing of Collection and Use of 911/E911 Fees**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911?** *Check one.*
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **1a.** **If YES, provide a description of the mechanisms or procedures and any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2017.** *(Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)* |
| Under § 11-98-6 (e), Code of Alabama 1975, “beginning with fiscal year 2013, the Department of Examiners of Public Accounts shall audit each district on a biennial basis to ensure compliance with the requirements of this chapter regarding both revenues and expenditures.” |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider’s number of subscribers?** *Check one.*
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **2a. If YES, provide a description of any auditing or enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2017.** *(Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)* |
| Under § 11-98-13, Code of Alabama 1975, “on a biennial basis, if not more frequently, the 911 Board shall retain an independent, third-party auditor for the purposes of receiving, maintaining, and verifying the accuracy of any and all information, including all proprietary information, that is required to be collected, or that may have been submitted to the board by voice communication providers and districts, and the accuracy of the collection of the 911 services charge required to be collected.” |

1. **Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **Does your state or jurisdiction classify expenditures on Next Generation 911 as within the scope of permissible expenditures of funds for 911 or E911 purposes?** *Check one.*
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **1a. If YES, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority:** |
| Alabama Next Generation Emergency Network (ANGEN) costs are permissible expenditures of funds for 911 or E911 purposes by individual agreements between the board and each district. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **In the annual period ending December 31, 2017, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on Next Generation 911 programs?** *Check one.*
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **2a. If YES, in the space below, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended.** |
| **Amount****($)** | $1,732,375.00 |
| 1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2017, please describe the type and number of NG911 Emergency Service IP Network(s) (ESInets) that operated within your state.**
 |
| **Type of ESInet** | **Yes** | **No** | **If Yes, Enter Total PSAPs Operating on the ESInet** | **If Yes, does the type of ESInet interconnect with other state, regional or local ESInets?** |
| **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. A single, state-wide ESInet
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  | As of 2017, an ESInet was in place with 4 PSAPs connected. | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  |
| 1. Local (*e.g.*, county) ESInet
 | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  |  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| 1. Regional ESInets
 | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  | [If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, in the space below, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet] | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet: |  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet: |  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

1. **Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2017.**

|  |
| --- |
|  Alabama completed its wireless aggregation project in December 2014, which was as far as the first iteration of Alabama Next Generation Emergency Network (ANGEN) was able to accomplish with the vendor selected during the first phase of the project. All wireless calls in Alabama have been routed through this network for 3+ years.  In CY2016, Alabama completed our second RFP process for NG911 core services and transition/ incorporation of our existing network. After evaluating the proposals, the evaluation team made a recommendation to the full Board in July 2016 to enter contract negotiations with an intent to award, which the Board unanimously supported. We successfully negotiated a contract that was executed and then favorably reviewed by the Contract Review Permanent Legislative Oversight Committee in March 2017. Transition of the existing network began in 2017 and has continued into 2018. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Total PSAPs****Accepting Texts** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2017, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts?**
 | 21 |
| **Question** | **Estimated Number of PSAPs****that will Become Text Capable** |
| 1. **In the next annual period ending December 31, 2018, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable?**
 | 49\* |

\*No statewide deployment. The state office has conducted several online surveys sent to our 87 Emergency Communication Districts (ECDs), of which 69% of our ECDs participated in. The survey results showed that 17% are live with text-to-911, 56% anticipate becoming text capable, and 27% either did not participate or have no plans to request service. However, the current ANGEN project will contain its own TCC for a statewide deployment for text-to- as well as text-from-911 services.

1. **Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Check the appropriate box** | **If Yes,****Amount Expended ($)** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2017, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?**
 | Yes**[x]**  | No**[ ]**  | These expenses are part of our NG911 service provider’s project scope, but there is no way to itemize them. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Total PSAPs** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2017, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program?**
 | Not reported at state level |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** | **Unknown** |
| 1. **Does your state or jurisdiction adhere to the National Institute of Standards and Technology *Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity* (February 2014) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction?**
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

1. **Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees**
2. **Please provide an assessment of the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds, including any criteria your state or jurisdiction uses to measure the effectiveness of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges.**  **If your state conducts annual or other periodic assessments, please provide an electronic copy (*e.g.*, Word, PDF) of the latest such report upon submission of this questionnaire to the FCC or provide links to online versions of such reports in the space below.**

|  |
| --- |
| Data collection began in late 2013 on a biennial basis by a third-party agency, with the first round of complete data collection being completed in 2016. While this data has provided a starting point for analysis of the effective utilization of the 911/E911 funding collected at the state level, it has not delivered a comprehensive enough representation for the state office to complete a full assessment. Starting in 2016, the state-level 9-1-1 authority in Alabama has taken steps in making significant changes in organizational structure and approach to better measure the effectiveness of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges. As of 2017, multiple surveys have been conducted to collect further information. This effort has been voluntary on the part of the local districts and the response rate has been just over fifty percent. There have been administrative rules submitted during this reporting period that are pending the approval process. These rules will offer additional tools that can be used to assess the effectiveness of funding usage. Additionally, part of our NG911 project will provide enhanced data collection that will yield a detailed view into PSAP operational efficiency. |

1. A Primary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are routed directly from the 911 Control office. A secondary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP. *See* National Emergency Number Association, Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology (*Master Glossary*), Aug. 8, 2017, at 167, available at <https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards/NENA-ADM-000.21-2017_FINAL_2.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A telecommunicator, also known as a call taker or a dispatcher, is a person employed by a PSAP who is qualified to answer incoming emergency telephone calls and/or who provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP. *See* *Master Glossary* at 196. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)