



P25 EXECUTIVE SUMMIT

Working Together for Future Success

May 16 & 17, 2018 • Portland, Oregon

Sponsored by the P25 Steering Committee and
the DHS Office of Emergency Communications



P25 Executive Summit Executive Summary

May 16 – 17, 2018

Portland, Oregon

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Homeland Security Office of Emergency Communications (OEC) and the Project 25 (P25) Steering Committee sponsored a **P25 Executive Summit** in Portland, Oregon, May 16 and 17, 2018. Leaders from P25 public safety user agencies at all levels of government and the P25 vendor community were invited to address P25 Land Mobile Radio (LMR) user concerns. Topics included P25 LMR interoperability successes and challenges and opportunities to collaborate to ensure the future sustainment of critical LMR capabilities.

This two day event included an opportunity for the user community to share concerns and lessons learned, and identify topics on specific agenda items to discuss with manufacturers as the Summit progressed. On the second day, both users and vendors met to address key P25 issues and concerns from both the user and manufacturer perspectives and develop collaborative approaches to effectively address the improving and sustaining LMR capabilities.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The primary goals and objectives of the Summit were to provide participants with a better understanding of how the P25 user community and the vendor community can develop an enhanced dialog outside of marketing pressures to resolve the challenges that face public safety, specifically to:

- Address how disparate systems and manufacturers' interpretations of the standards can negatively impact interoperability
- Develop a process that will lead to an environment where all P25 compliant equipment, regardless of make or model, are interoperable upon delivery
- Articulate the importance of interoperability and critical activities to improve user-to-user communications and user-to-vendor interactions
- Obtain commitments from participants to support identified actions

SUMMIT OVERVIEW

The Summit was organized in a way that encouraged dialog regarding the current P25 Standards, implementation differences, and how to potentially resolve challenges to ensure the future effectiveness of the standard in a collaborative and cooperative manner. OEC support staff facilitated the meeting.

Day One – User Only Session

The session on day one allowed the P25 user community to openly discuss challenges that impact interoperability, as well as perceived misunderstandings among both the users and manufacturers. Participants addressed a number of topics and provided some examples of challenges in the following areas:

- Encryption, the challenges of key management, and how implementation decisions of vendors affect encrypted interoperability
- Inter-RF Subsystem Interface (ISSI)/Console Subsystem Interface (CSSI) and how to effectively address cross-vendor implementation challenges
- Optional P25 Standards and how implementation decisions affect interoperability
- Implementation of non-standard features
- Interpretation decisions on published standards by disparate manufacturers
- User and Manufacturer training and information sharing

The discussions of day one helped identify and address topics to introduce during day two of the Summit.

Day Two – Joint Session

The session on day two began with outlining goals and objectives, a welcoming address from George Crouch, State of South Carolina and P25 Steering Committee Vice-Chair, and opening remarks from each Summit participant, which included 35 representatives from federal, state, and local public safety agencies and user organizations and 15 executives and subject matter experts from the P25 manufacturing community. The participating organizations list is included in Appendix A.

Before the start of the Summit, participants were asked to review several topics posted around the meeting facility and identify which of those topics they felt was most critical to discuss in more detail. These topics, included the areas identified during the day one user session.

Throughout the day, the group discussed the impacts those topic areas had on interoperability and how to effectively address the challenges that come with those complex issues. The Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA) TR-8 Standards Committee, the APCO Project 25 Interface Committee (APIC), and the P25 Steering Committee are collaboratively working to address many of these issues, however, all potential approaches in the standards can have adverse effects in the user community.

KEY RESULTS

Manufacturers expressed a need to have a prioritized list of features and requirements from the user community to help them identify which investments are most important for manufacturers to address, and in what order. This would include standards development, clarification/modification of existing standards, and development of new features. Participants started brainstorming a list of features to include on the larger prioritized list for development or clarification.

Participants also discussed the need for increased education on the P25 standards. Summit participants discussed the amount of information users need to digest when trying to review the full suite of P25 standards, which total 85 individual documents with more than 2,500 pages. Participants agreed that developing a “P25 Guide” that explains what requirements and features are in the standards and what processes should be followed would be beneficial to the user community.

The group further agreed on three products and actions to address the discussed interoperability challenges. These primary actions include:

- A P25 Guide that educates stakeholders regarding the capabilities/limitations of P25
- Documentation of interoperability/interworking challenges within the P25 standards as they pertain to multiple implementation practices employed by different manufacturers
- Development of a prioritized list of requirements that address new standards, modification or clarification of existing standards to resolve interoperability challenges among P25 systems

Appendix A – Participating Organizations

| Organization |
|--|
| APCO International |
| BK Technologies |
| Catalyst Communications Technologies |
| City & County of Denver, Colorado |
| Connecticut Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection |
| Department of the Interior/Bureau of Land Management |
| DHS/FEMA |
| DHS/OEC |
| DHS S&T OIC |
| Etherstack Inc. |
| Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) |
| Grundy County, Illinois 911 |
| Harris Corporation |
| ICOM America |
| Illinois Emergency Management Agency |
| InterTalk Critical Information Systems |
| JVCKenwood Corporation |
| JVCKenwood - EFJohnson |
| JVCKenwood USA |
| JVCKenwood – Zetron, Inc. |
| Miami-Dade County, Florida |
| Michigan’s Public Safety Communications System |
| Missouri Department of Public Safety |
| Motorola Solutions, Inc. |
| NCSWIC Executive Committee |
| New York MTA Police Department |
| New York State Police |
| Oregon Department of Transportation |
| P25 CAP Advisory Panel (AP) |
| P25 Steering Committee |
| SAFECOM Executive Committee |
| State of Colorado / PSCN |
| State of Iowa |
| State of Michigan |
| State of Minnesota |
| Story County, Iowa Sheriff’s Office |
| Texas Department of Public Safety |
| U.S. Coast Guard |
| U.S. Department of Justice |
| USDA Forest Service |
| Washington State Patrol |