METRO REGION
800 MHz Trunked Regional Public Safety Radio System
Standards, Protocols, Procedures

Document Section:	**6—Financial Policies & Procedures**	Radio TOC Approval – Signature:
Sub-Section:	**METRO 6.5.0**	Date: 5/28/03
Procedure Title:	**Prioritizing Capital Spending**	
Date Established:	**4/9/03**	
Replaces Document Dated:		MESB Approval - Signature:
Date Revised:	**5/28/03**	6/6/03

1. Purpose or Objective

To establish a policy that will provide criteria and a process for determining how the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB) spends its capital funds for the metropolitan region portion of the ARMER system.

2. Technical Background:

▪ **Capabilities**

  Capabilities are based on the current state of the art.

▪ **Constraints**

  Subject to vendor availability of products and resources and the availability of capital funds.

3. Operational Context:

The MESB is empowered by statute to set its budget for capital improvements to the system. This standard provides a methodology for the Radio Technical Operations Committee (Radio TOC) to make recommendations to the MESB in determining priorities and timing for such expenditures.

4. Recommended Protocol/ Standard:

The proposal for determining capital spending is composed of three main evaluations and three check "valves." The first evaluation is a series of questions regarding the effect on the system. In this evaluation projects pass, fail or are given a deferred result. The second evaluation determines criticality and will put projects in one of four levels. The check valves determine whether funding is available, the vendor is able to accomplish the project, and if other prerequisites are met, such as dependencies, system upgrades and frequencies are available. The last evaluation determines the timing of the project and placing it on the timeline. It should be noted that the Radio TOC will recommend to the MESB the level of criticality and the timing of the projects.

5. Recommended Procedure:

Evaluation #1—Pass/Fail/Deferred

In the first evaluation, a project must receive a "yes" answer to one of the following questions. If no "yes" is received, the project fails and would need to go to the Radio TOC for further consideration. The exception to this is a deferred project. For example, it is likely that at some time in the future a county subsystem will move to join the system. It is fairly certain that once they submit a plan it will be accepted. At this point, without any specifics, the county's subsystem would fail. However the Radio TOC members know that this will need to be done, so they will give it a deferred rating. Deferred project skip evaluation #2 and go straight to the deferred section of the timeline. Once the project meets one of the below questions, it will then go through evaluation #2 and be repositioned on the timeline.

Questions:
- Does the project add needed capacity to the system?
- Does the project add needed coverage to the system?
- Is the project a required system change (as required by the Legislature or vendor)?
- Does the project improve an identified system degradation?
- Does the project provide improved system reliability?
- Is the project an approved subsystem plan?
- Does the project provide needed interoperability?
- Has the project been requested by the Radio TOC?

Evaluation #2—Criticality

At this stage, projects are placed by the Radio TOC into one of four criticality levels:

- **Critical**—addresses system limitations that have a direct and/or imminent impact on users' ability to effectively use the system.
- **Priority**—required by law or to maintain industry support *or* is needed to *maintain* system availability, reliability and performance.
- **Needed System Improvement**—*improves* system availability, reliability and performance.
- **System Enhancement**—provides desired feature sets *or* improves for operational efficiency or cost effectiveness.

Evaluation #3—Dependencies

These check valves are yes/no questions. They do not prevent a project from going onto the timeline (see Evaluation #4 for further explanation).

1: Is funding available?
2: Does the vendor have the capability to provide the product or meet deadline?
3: Are all prerequisites met (ex. are frequencies available, are software upgrades required, resources available, other standards and other dependencies)?
4: If applicable, does MnDOT approve of the impact on the backbone?

Evaluation #4—Timeline

The timeline spreadsheet will have four blocks where projects will be located. The blocks correspond to the four criticality levels. The timeline will include a fifth block for the deferred projects.

Depending upon the results from the check valves, the projects will be color-coded: if a project passes all three it will be green; if funding is not available for the project it will be blue; if the vendor cannot support it, it will be orange; and if all prerequisites are not met it will be red. All deferred projects will be black.

All projects that are not "green" will have footnotes attached to the project timeline spreadsheet identifying the dependencies and other pertinent information.

6. Management
The staff of the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board shall manage the administration of the plan. The Radio TOC will rank projects and instruct MESB staff to place projects on the timeline.

This policy shall be reviewed for possible revision or cancellation within two years of its adoption date.