



**Department of
Homeland Security**

Office of Emergency Communications

**STATEWIDE COMMUNICATION
INTEROPERABILITY PLAN (SCIP) WEIGHTED
EVALUATION CRITERIA**

September 2007

I. BACKGROUND

The Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) Grant Program and the Fiscal Year 2007 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) have required States and Territories to develop and adopt a Statewide Communication Interoperability Plan (SCIP). In accordance with the PSIC Grant Program, States and Territories must submit final SCIPs and Investment Justifications (IJs) by December 3, 2007.

The Office of Emergency Communications (OEC) within the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is responsible for reviewing all SCIPs. The following document is intended to provide States and Territories with further clarification on how SCIPs will be evaluated, highlighting the SCIP Weighted Evaluation Criteria.

II. REVIEW PROCESS

SCIPs and IJs will be evaluated by peer review groups, DHS program staff, and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). SCIPs must address the PSIC requirements identified in the *PSIC Program Guidance and Application Kit* and the Statewide Plan Criteria outlined and explained in the *Statewide Interoperability Planning Guidebook*—specifically “Section 5: Explanation of Statewide Criteria.”

The Statewide Plan Criteria is made up of eleven (11) categories (ex. “1: Background and Preliminary Steps) and forty-nine (49) sub-elements (ex. “4.1: Identify the executive or legislative authority for the governing body of the interoperability effort”). The PSIC requirements add the eleventh (11th) criteria with four (4) additional sub-elements.

OEC, with practitioner input, established the SCIP Weighted Evaluation Criteria for the review process. Percentage weights have been assigned to all criteria and criteria sub-elements, excluding the PSIC requirements. Based on these criteria, the review process will determine whether the SCIP receives a “pass” or “needs additional information.” SCIPs must receive an 80% score in order to pass. In addition, “critical sub-elements” have been identified. Critical sub-elements are items that are deemed absolutely essential for a SCIP to pass. Critical sub-elements have been identified in “III. SCIP Weighted Evaluation Criteria.”

OEC will hold ultimate approval authority over SCIPs. In addition, NTIA will review each SCIP to ensure that States and Territories address the four (4) PSIC requirements set forth in the PSIC Program Guidance and Application Kit.

Definitions for “Pass”/“Need Additional Information”

For the purposes of this evaluation, the definitions of “pass” and “needs additional information” are as follows:

- *Pass*—the SCIP sufficiently addresses and includes the information required by the particular criterion. If the SCIP does not provide the required information, a “pass” may be given provided that the SCIP either identifies a plan for obtaining

- and including such information or offers compelling reasons for why the information has not been provided.
- *Needs Additional Information*—the SCIP does not sufficiently address or include the information required by the particular criterion. Where required information is omitted, the SCIP does not identify a plan for obtaining and including such information or provide compelling reasons for why the information has not been provided.

Additionally, for the purposes of the evaluation:

- *Sufficient* is defined as providing adequate information that demonstrates an understanding of and the necessary information to satisfy the criteria.

Thresholds for Determining a “Pass”/ “Needs Additional Information” Rating

Each sub-element of the criteria has a weighted score attached to it. No partial percentage credit will be given to any sub-element. If the plan provides sufficient information on a sub-element, then it will receive the full percentage associated with that sub-element. If the plan does not sufficiently address the sub-element, then it receives no credit for that sub-element.

In order for a SCIP to receive a “pass,” the following conditions must be met:

- The SCIP sufficiently addresses all critical sub-elements, including all of the sub-elements of “11. PSIC Criteria” and
- The SCIP receives a total score of 80%.

If the SCIP receives a “needs additional information” rating, it will be sent back to the State or Territory for revision and resubmission.

III. SCIP WEIGHTED EVALUATION CRITERIA

100%

		Pass	Needs Additional Information	Critical Sub-element
10%	1. Background and Preliminary Steps			
1%	1.1 Provide an overview and background information on the state and its regions. Include geographic and demographic information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
2%	1.2 List all agencies and organizations that participated in developing the plan. (List them according to the categories recommended for a communications interoperability committee in the All-Inclusive Approach section above.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
2%	1.3 Identify the point of contact. DHS expects that each state will have a full time interoperability coordinator. The coordinator should not represent or be affiliated with any one particular discipline and should not have to balance the coordinator duties with other responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
1%	1.4. Describe the communications and interoperability environment of the current emergency response effort.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
2%	1.5. Include a problem definition and possible solutions that addresses the challenges identified in achieving interoperability within the SAFECOM Interoperability Continuum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1%	1.6 Identify any Tactical Interoperability Communications Plans in the state.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1%	1.7 Set the scope and timeframe of the plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
15%	2. Strategy			
5%	2.1 Describe the strategic vision, goals, and objectives for improving emergency response interagency wireless communications statewide, including how they connect with existing plans within the state.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
2%	2.2. Provide a strategic plan for coordination with neighboring states. If applicable, include a plan for coordination with neighboring countries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2%	2.3 Provide a strategic plan for addressing data interoperability in addition to voice interoperability.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
2%	2.4 Describe a strategy for addressing catastrophic loss of communication assets by developing redundancies in the communications interoperability plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1%	2.5. Describe how the plan is, or will become, compliant with the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and the National Response Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2%	2.6. Describe a strategy for addressing communications interoperability with the safety and security elements of the major transit systems, intercity bus service providers, ports, and passenger rail operations within the state.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1%	2.7 Describe the process for periodic review and revision of the state plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5%	3. Methodology			
2%	3.1. Describe the method by which multi-jurisdictional, multi-disciplinary input was provided from all regions of the state. For an example of a methodology that ensures input from all regions, see the Statewide Communication Interoperability Plan, or SCIP, methodology developed by SAFECOM.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
1%	3.2 Define the process for continuing to have local input and for building local support of the plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
1%	3.3 Define how the TICPs were incorporated into the statewide plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1%	3.4. Describe the strategy for implementing all components of the statewide plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
20%	4. Governance			
3%	4.1 Identify the executive or legislative authority for the governing body of the interoperability effort.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5%	4.2 Provide an overview of the governance structure that will oversee development and implementation of the plan. Illustrate how it is representative of all of the relevant emergency response disciplines and regions in the state.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
4%	4.3 Provide the charter for the governing body, and use the charter to state the principles, roles, responsibilities, and processes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4%	4.4 Identify the members of the governing body and any of its committees. (List them according to the categories recommended for a communications interoperability committee in the All-Inclusive Approach section above.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
1%	4.5 Provide a meeting schedule for the governing body.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3%	4.6. Describe multi-jurisdictional, multi-disciplinary agreements needed for decision-making and for sharing resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**DHS Office of Emergency Communications
 SCIP Weighted Evaluation Criteria**

10%	5. Technology			
3%	5.1 Include a statewide capabilities assessment (or a plan for one) which includes, critical communications equipment and related interoperability issues. At a minimum this should include types of radio systems, data and incident management systems, the manufacturer, and frequency assignments for each major emergency responder organization within the state. Ultimately more detailed information will be required to complete the documentation of a migration strategy. States may use the Communications Asset Survey and Mapping (CASM) tool to conduct this assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
3%	5.2 Describe plans for continuing support of legacy systems, and developing interfaces among disparate systems, while migrating to newer technologies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2%	5.2.1 Describe the migration plan for moving from existing technologies to newly procured technologies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2%	5.2.2 Describe the process that will be used to ensure that new purchases comply with the statewide plan, while generally allowing existing equipment to serve out its useful life.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
15%	6. Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)			
5%	6.1 Include an assessment of current local, regional, and state operating procedures which support interoperability.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5%	6.2. Define the process by which the state, regions, and localities will develop, manage, maintain, upgrade, and communicate standard operating procedures (SOPs), as appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
2%	6.3. Identify the agencies included in the development of the SOPs, and the agencies expected to comply with the SOPs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3%	6.4. Demonstrate how the SOPs are NIMS-compliant in terms of the Incident Command System (ICS) and preparedness.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5%	7. Training and Exercises			
3%	7.1. Define the process by which the state will develop, manage, maintain and upgrade, or coordinate as appropriate, a statewide training and exercises program.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1%	7.2. Describe the process for offering and requiring training and exercises, as well as any certification that will be needed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1%	7.3. Explain how the process ensures that training is cross-disciplinary.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5%	8. Usage			
5%	8.1. Describe the plan for ensuring regular usage of the relevant equipment and the SOPs needed to improve interoperability.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5%	9. Funding			
3%	9.1. Identify committed sources of funding, or the process for identifying and securing short- and long-term funding.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2%	9.2. Include a plan for the development of a comprehensive funding strategy. The plan should include a process for identifying ongoing funding sources, anticipated costs, and resources needed for project management and leveraging active projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
10%	10. Implementation			
2%	10.1 Describe the prioritized action plan with short- and long-term goals for achieving the objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
1%	10.2. Describe the performance measures that will allow policy makers to track the progress and success of initiatives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
1%	10.3. Describe the plan for educating policy makers and practitioners on interoperability goals and initiatives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2%	10.4. Describe the roles and opportunities for involvement of all local, state, and tribal agencies in the implementation of the statewide plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
1%	10.5. Establish a plan for identifying, developing, and overseeing operational requirements, SOPs, training, technical solutions, and short- and long-term funding sources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1%	10.6. Identify a POC responsible for implementing the plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
2%	10.7. Describe critical success factors for implementation of the plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓

**DHS Office of Emergency Communications
 SCIP Weighted Evaluation Criteria**

11. PSIC Requirements*				
N/A*	11.1 Describe how public safety agencies will plan and coordinate, acquire, deploy and train on interoperable communications equipment, software and systems that: 1) utilize reallocated public safety - the public safety spectrum in the 700 MHz frequency band; 2) enable interoperability with communication systems that can utilize reallocated public safety spectrum for radio communications; or 3) otherwise improve or advance the interoperability of public safety communications system that utilize other public safety spectrum bands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
N/A*	11.2 Describe how a strategic technology reserve (STR) will be established and implemented to pre-position or secure interoperable communications in advance for immediate deployment in an emergency or major disaster.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
N/A*	11.3 Describe how local and tribal government entities' interoperable communications needs have been included in the planning process and how their needs are being addressed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
N/A*	11.4. Describe how authorized non-governmental organizations' interoperable communications needs have been included in the planning process and how their needs are being addressed (if applicable).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The weighted scale is not applicable for "11. PSIC Requirements" Each sub-element in "11. PSIC Requirements" must be addressed sufficiently in order for States and Territories to receive total funding allocations from the PSIC Grant Program.

III. FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQs) AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

OEC has developed FAQs to address the many questions that have arisen about how and to what level of detail SCIPs should address the Statewide Plan Criteria. Additional information to assist States and Territories in the development of SCIPs, including the *Statewide Interoperability Planning Guidebook*, can be found at:

<http://www.safecomprogram.gov/SAFE/COM/statewideplanning/>.