Grant Process Revision – Version 2.0.4

1. ECN and the SECB Grants Workgroup collaborates with each ECB/ESB region to identify grant funding needs and priorities.

   1.a. Regions develop independent regional strategic plans that parallel the State and Federal strategic plans while encompassing their specific needs.

   1.b. State secures funding that coincides with the strategic plans.

   1.c. Using the process outlined in SECB Standard 6.5.0 (FIN-1), the SECB Finance Committee engages other SECB Committees to approve, reject or request additional information for each proposed project. Review Hierarchy by SECB Committees, using the process outlined in SECB Standard 6.5.0 (FIN -1), the appropriate SECB Committee presents its findings and recommendations to the SECB.

   1.d Identify Funding Strategy.

   Strategic Plans
   Short term
   Long term

2. ECN opens the grant application period and sets up meeting with the Grants Workgroup to review.

   2.a   ECN releases to the regions, their grant applications sent to Federal and State agencies on specific requested funding.

   2.b. ECN provides the Grants Workgroup the grant summary standards and specific requirements of regions to apply in a timely manner.
        i. Date Parameters of grant
        ii. Matching requirements
        iii. Allowable expenditures
        iv. Unallowable expenditures
        v. Due dates for applications
        vi. Unique Reporting Requirements including any needed forms.

   2.c.   The Grants workgroup will review and receive clarification on any questions that arise.

3. ECB/ESB regions submit grant applications to ECN for initial review.

   3.a Regions submit grant applications to ECN via email for review. ECN will compile for grants workgroup while reviewing applications for the required information outlined in the grant summary.

3.b If ECN finds applications lacking in such requirements, applications are returned for updates, if time permits.

3.c. The ECN will provide a copy of each application along with a summary listing of applications to the grants workgroup and all will review all grant applications to discuss each region's needs and allow them to explain how they relate to the State and Regional strategic plans.

3.d The grants workgroup will determine if something does not meet the criteria of needs determined in the strategic plans. (the ECN office will have already determined if something in the application does not meet the grant requirement standards.)

4. The Grants workgroup AND the ECN present the application projects to the SECB Finance Committee for approval and presents to SECB committees.

5. The SECB approves, rejects, or requests additional information for each proposed project.

6. Once the project/applications are approved by SECB, ECN assists the ECB/ESB with submitting the required documentation to process the grant application in E-grants.

Allied Radio Matrix for Emergency Response
Standards, Protocols, Procedures

Document Section 6	**Financial Policies and Procedures**	**Status:** Complete
SECB Standard Number	**FIN-1**	
Legacy Standard Number	**6.5.0**	
Standard Title	**Prioritizing Capital and Other Spending**	
Date Established	**05/28/2003**	**SECB Approval**: 01/04/2018
Replaces Document Dated	**07/10/2008**	
Date Revised/Reviewed	**12/20/2017**	

1. Purpose or Objective

The purpose of this standard is to establish a policy that will provide criteria and a process for determining how the Statewide Emergency Communications Board (SECB) allocates its funds and certain grants for interoperable communications. This standard will also detail how the Grants Work Group operates underneath the guidance of the SECB.

2. Technical Background

▪ **Capabilities**

Capabilities are based on the current version of interoperable systems that are being purchased through state funds and grant programs. These include but are not limited to ARMER, Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1), IPAWS and the National Public Safety Broadband Network (NPSBN) managed by FirstNet.

▪ **Constraints**

Subject to the availability of funds, vendor products and services.

3. Operational Context

The SECB is empowered by statute to set its budget for capital improvements to the various strategic statewide interoperable systems for the public safety community.. Acting as the State Interoperability Executive Committee (SIEC), (MSA 403.36, subd. 1g), the SECB also makes recommendations on the allocation and use of various grant funds. This standard provides a methodology for the SECB Finance Committee along with the other Committees under the SECB, to make recommendations to the SECB in determining priorities and timing for such expenditures. The Grants Work Group works in conjunction with the SECB and Finance Committee to choose which projects to approve and make other grant related decisions. The Grants Work Group is represented by all regions in the State of Minnesota.

4. Recommended Protocol and Standard

The proposal for determining spending is comprised of three main evaluations. The first evaluation, "Project Scope," is a series of questions regarding the effect on the overall system. In this step, a proposed project will receive a pass, fail, or deferred result. The second evaluation determines a priority consistent with the adopted Investment Hierarchy of the Grants Work Group and gives proposed projects a priority rating. The third evaluation is the feasibility of the project to meet funding timelines and vendor capabilities.

All funding requests, whether from SECB allocated funds, grants, or other sources of funding the SECB has been asked to provide recommendations for shall be reviewed by the proper committee working underneath the SECB. The Committee Chairs shall determine the order of review. The committees will complete evaluations 1-3 on all projects.

The last committee to review the funding proposals and the other committee recommendations shall be charged with reporting the item to the SECB. Disagreements between the committees will be discussed by the committee Chairs and, if necessary, brought back through the process until a final consensus can be reached. If no consensus can be reached, the matter will be referred to the SECB for a final determination on the allocation of funds.

It should be understood that this procedure is a guide for allocating funding that is made available to the SECB for distribution to various units of government or eligible entities. Recommendations will be made with the emphasis that the funds made available to the SECB for allocation are dispersed in a manner that ensures the best possible use of funds to promote strategic interoperable communication initiatives intended to promote the improvement of public safety in the State of Minnesota.

5. Recommended Procedure

Evaluation #1 - Project Scope

In this first evaluation, a proposed project must receive a yes answer to at least one of the following questions. If no "yes" is received, the project will still be forwarded to the proper committee and listed as "Deferred". This committee may consider the project if it is anticipated that the project will receive at least one yes answer within the time constraints of the available funding or provide a reason to the Finance Committee as to why they think a project should have received a "yes" response.

Questions:

- Does the project support the current SECB strategic initiatives?
- Does the project add needed capacity to the ARMER system?
- Does the project add needed coverage to the ARMER system?
- Is the project a required system change (as required by the legislature or a vendor)?
- Does the project improve identified system degradation?
- Does the project provide improved system reliability?
- Does the project have an approved 9-1-1 or ARMER plan?
- Is the project an approved sub-system plan?
- Does the project provide needed interoperability?
- Has the project received a committee request?
- Does the project meet the funding criteria for the source of funds?

Evaluation #2 – Investment Hierarchy

For those instances in which the legislature has directed funding for a specific purpose, has imposed explicit restrictions, or the Commissioners of the Department of Public Safety (DPS) or Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) have direct spending authority, this Hierarchy will not apply. It is given that all investment decisions must be consistent with legislative direction.

In those cases where the SECB has explicit decision-making authority or broad discretion in establishing spending priorities, this Hierarchy should be used to provide direction and aid in decision making.

The Investment Hierarchy will change each grant period to better fit with the needs of the regional entities requesting the funds. It has been agreed upon by the Grants Work Group working underneath the SECB that training and exercises shall remain a high priority in order to strengthen knowledge and competence across all regions within the State of Minnesota.

Evaluation #3 – Feasibility

In this evaluation, a project must demonstrate that it can be accomplished within any time constraints imposed by either the funding source or the availability of technology. A project must receive a yes to all of the questions below:

- Is SECB funding available?
- Is the local funding available to support any grant match requirements?
- Does the vendor have the capability to provide the product or meet the deadline?
- Does the project fall within one of the SECB strategic initiatives?
- Are all prerequisites met? (i.e., software upgrades required, resources available, other standards or dependencies?)

6. Management

The Chair of the SECB shall manage the administration of this standard. In the case of projects selected for grant resources, the Grants Work Group will be tasked with making those decisions.

This policy shall be reviewed for possible revision or cancellation as required.