

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

<b>In the Matter of</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems</b>	)	<b>CC Docket No. 94-102</b>
	)	
<b>E911 Requirements for IP-Enabled Service Providers</b>	)	<b>WC Docket No. 05-196</b>
	)	
<b>Wireless E911 Location Accuracy Requirements</b>	)	<b>PS Docket No. 07-114</b>
	)	
<b>Framework for Next Generation 911 Deployment</b>	)	<b>PS Docket No. 10-255</b>
	)	
<b>Facilitating the Deployment of Text-to-911 and Other Next Generation 911 Applications</b>	)	<b>PS Docket No. 11-153</b>

**INITIAL COMMENTS OF THE TEXAS 9-1-1 ALLIANCE, THE TEXAS  
COMMISSION ON STATE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS, AND THE  
MUNICIPAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION DISTRICTS ASSOCIATION  
TO THE PUBLIC NOTICE**

July 5, 2012

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

<b>In the Matter of</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems</b>	)	<b>CC Docket No. 94-102</b>
	)	
<b>E911 Requirements for IP-Enabled Service Providers</b>	)	<b>WC Docket No. 05-196</b>
	)	
<b>Wireless E911 Location Accuracy Requirements</b>	)	<b>PS Docket No. 07-114</b>
	)	
<b>Framework for Next Generation 911 Deployment</b>	)	<b>PS Docket No. 10-255</b>
	)	
<b>Facilitating the Deployment of Text-to-911 and Other Next Generation 911 Applications</b>	)	<b>PS Docket No. 11-153</b>

**Table of Contents**

I.	Executive Summary .....	3
II.	E9-1-1 MLTS solutions providing sufficiently precise location information are currently feasible .....	5
III.	Under present circumstances, the cost-benefit analysis clearly supports Commission action addressing E9-1-1 MLTS in rules or best practices .....	6
IV.	The Commission is the proper regulatory authority to fully address IP, Interconnected VoIP, and MLTS demarcation responsibilities and issues for E9-1-1 .....	8
V.	NENA Model Legislation: Whether in Part 68 or elsewhere, the ELIN, ERL, and other substantive parameters suggested by NENA are appropriate E9-1-1 MLTS requirements for Commission rules or best practices .....	12
VI.	Conclusion.....	14

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

<b>In the Matter of</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems</b>	)	<b>CC Docket No. 94-102</b>
	)	
<b>E911 Requirements for IP-Enabled Service Providers</b>	)	<b>WC Docket No. 05-196</b>
	)	
<b>Wireless E911 Location Accuracy Requirements</b>	)	<b>PS Docket No. 07-114</b>
	)	
<b>Framework for Next Generation 911 Deployment</b>	)	<b>PS Docket No. 10-255</b>
	)	
<b>Facilitating the Deployment of Text-to-911 and Other Next Generation 911 Applications</b>	)	<b>PS Docket No. 11-153</b>

**INITIAL COMMENTS OF THE TEXAS 9-1-1 ALLIANCE, THE TEXAS COMMISSION  
ON STATE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS, AND THE MUNICIPAL  
EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION DISTRICTS ASSOCIATION  
TO THE PUBLIC NOTICE**

The Texas 9-1-1 Alliance,<sup>1</sup> the Texas Commission on State Emergency Communications,<sup>2</sup> and the Municipal Emergency Communication Districts Association<sup>3</sup> respectfully submit the following comments to the Federal Communications Commission (the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Texas 9-1-1 Alliance is an interlocal cooperation entity composed of 24 Texas Emergency Communication Districts with E9-1-1 service and public safety responsibility for approximately 53% of the population of Texas. These emergency communication districts were created pursuant to Texas Health and Safety Code Chapter 772 and are defined under Texas Health and Safety Code § 771.001(3)(B).

<sup>2</sup> The Texas Commission on State Emergency Communications (“CSEC”) is a state agency created pursuant to Texas Health and Safety Code Chapter 771, and is the State of Texas' authority on emergency communications. CSEC administers the Texas state 9-1-1 program under which 9-1-1 service is provided through the state’s 24 regional planning commissions to approximately two-thirds of the geography and one-third of the population of Texas.

<sup>3</sup> The Municipal Emergency Communication Districts Association is an association of 26 municipal emergency communication districts, primarily in the Dallas-Fort Worth area, as defined under Texas Health and Safety Code § 771.001(3)(A).

“Commission”) Public Notice seeking comments on (1) the feasibility of Multi-Line Telephone Systems (“MLTS”) manufacturers including within all such systems after a certain date, as determined by the Commission, sufficiently precise caller location information; and (2) the National Emergency Number Association’s (“NENA”) Technical Requirement Document on Model Legislation E9-1-1 for Multi-Line Telephone Systems (“NENA Model Legislation”).<sup>4</sup>

## **I. Executive Summary**

E9-1-1 MLTS solutions are feasible. In the context of Internet Protocol (“IP”) MLTS particularly, the feasibility of MLTS manufacturers, operators, and managers having within all such systems after a certain date sufficiently precise E9-1-1 location requirements, including auto-location capability, for callers at either station level or within the NENA Emergency Location Identification Number (“ELIN”) and Emergency Response Location (“ERL”) parameters is well-documented by the public record.

E9-1-1 MLTS is relevant to a fully functioning modern communications network. The growth of IP MLTS and the growing popularity of session initiation protocol (“SIP”) trunk systems may further increase the ability of IP MLTS to displace more traditional Centrex and Private Branch Exchange (“PBX”) MLTS going forward. Distinctions, if any, between Interconnected VoIP business service and or cloud IP MLTS may become more blurry in the future. Under present circumstances, the cost-benefit analysis supports Commission action addressing E9-1-1 MLTS in rules or best practices.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau seeks comment on Multi-Line Telephone Systems pursuant to the Next Generation 911 Advancement Act of 2012 (“Public Notice”), DA 12-798, CC Docket No. 94-102; WC Docket No. 05-196; PS Docket Nos. 07-114 and 10-255 (rel. May 21, 2012).*

The Commission concluded in 2003 that states and local governments were in a better position to address E9-1-1 MLTS issues,<sup>5</sup> and the NENA Model Legislation followed with a suggested state-by-state approach.<sup>6</sup> However, as evidenced by incomplete efforts nationwide and the increasing number of states enacting VoIP and IP statutory restrictions, the Commission is now the proper regulatory authority to fully address E9-1-1 MLTS.

The Commission's purported IP and Interconnected VoIP E9-1-1 jurisdiction has altered the federal and state E9-1-1 regulatory framework landscape. E9-1-1 MLTS issues are inextricably intertwined with the Commission's Interconnected VoIP E9-1-1 requirements, and also with the demarcation of responsibilities between providers of Interconnected VoIP service and providers of MLTS to provide sufficiently precise callback number and location information currently and for Next Generation 9-1-1 ("NG9-1-1"). The Commission should determine what the Interconnected VoIP provider needs to send as location and callback number to satisfy the current Commission rule, and thereafter what, if anything, the business VoIP customer in either the IP Centrex or IP PBX MLTS situation is responsible for on the business customer's side of the demarcation to provide location and callback number.

Whether in Part 68 or elsewhere, the ELIN, ERL, and other substantive parameters suggested by NENA are appropriate E9-1-1 MLTS requirements for Commission rules or best practices. Accordingly, the Commission should promptly act on the E9-1-1 MLTS requirements consistent with the ELIN, ERL, and other substantive parameters for E9-1-1 MLTS suggested by NENA.

---

<sup>5</sup> Public Notice at p. 2. See also, *Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems*, CC Docket No. 94-102, Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 18 FCC Rcd 25340, 25361-62, ¶¶ 49-50 (2003) ("E911 Scope Report and Order").

<sup>6</sup> Public Notice at p. 3.

## **II. E9-1-1 MLTS solutions providing sufficiently precise location information are currently feasible.**

There is a wealth of information supporting that E9-1-1 MLTS solutions are feasible. As the staff of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (the “California PUC”) found in April 2010, “[b]ased on an Internet search of web sites and news reports, Staff has concluded that there is a healthy and competitive market as to the offering of commonly available and affordable E9-1-1 MLTS solutions at all price points for all sizes of LEC business customers.”<sup>7</sup> In October 2010, the California PUC staff appropriately summarized the current status as follows:

MLTS equipment manufacturer AVAYA and third party E9-1-1 solution providers identified several trends that have made solutions more feasible for the MLTS owner/operator:

- For the last ten years, major equipment manufacturers have built E9-1-1 capabilities into new models and PBX upgrades. It is very rare to find a PBX in use that cannot be programmed to deliver the caller ID needed to retrieve caller location information.
- Lower cost ISDN PRI circuits are now more common, and expensive mileage-based CAMA trunks are no longer required.
- Third party MLTS E9-1-1 solutions are going down in cost and are available for under \$5000. Small business solutions can be as low as \$1250 for a one-time implementation fee and \$65 to \$100 per month in recurring fees.
- The VoIP MLTS/PBX platform natively provides improved support for 9-1-1 for multilocation customers, and automated solutions can discover and update phone locations as they change which greatly reduces the administrative burden and cost to the business owner of tracking Moves/Adds/Changes (MAC) in a VoIP installation.
- SIP Trunking is more available from Internet Telephony Service Providers (ITSP) permitting the smallest enterprise VoIP PBX system to send caller ID with the 9-1-1 call.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> *Order Instituting Rulemaking to Improve Public Safety by Determining Methods for Implementing Enhanced 9-1-1 Services for Business Customers and for Multi-line Telephone System Users*, Rulemaking No. 10-0-011, California Public Utilities Commission (Apr. 8, 2010), Order Instituting Rulemaking at Appendix A at p. 15 (available at [http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/published/FINAL\\_DECISION/116400.htm](http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/published/FINAL_DECISION/116400.htm)).

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*, MLTS E9-1-1 Workshop Report (“California Report”) at p. 7 (Oct. 22, 2010).

Product offerings and information on E9-1-1 MLTS solutions, include, but are not limited to, solutions available from 911 Enable,<sup>9</sup> Redsky,<sup>10</sup> Cisco Emergency Responder,<sup>11</sup> Microsoft Lync (including Boeing case study),<sup>12</sup> and Amcom Software (including case study on the Mesquite Independent School District in Texas).<sup>13</sup> There can be no reasonable disagreement on the feasibility of E9-1-1 MLTS solutions.

**III. Under present circumstances, the cost-benefit analysis clearly supports Commission action addressing E9-1-1 MLTS in rules or best practices.**

On the issue of costs, the California PUC staff in April 2010 and October 2010, as noted above, concluded that costs have been coming down, and SIP trunking and IP is much more readily available. On the benefits side, the California PUC staff compellingly stated:

There is no excuse for continuing non-action when the case for improving public safety was so clearly presented by California's 9-1-1 and public safety subject matter experts. The goal is simply to improve the public's access to E9-1-1 where we work, shop, relax and vacation; where our kids go to school and college; where we receive government services and medical care; and where many of our disabled and elderly citizens live.<sup>14</sup>

Also on the benefits side, the 2008 NENA Technical Information Document ("NENA TID") appropriately noted:

Much public dialogue has taken place about locating individuals when they dial to signal that an emergency is in progress from cellular telephones or other mobile devices including Voice over the Internet Protocol (VoIP). Less discussed, yet as critically relevant is the large numbers of individuals who on a daily basis might

---

<sup>9</sup> [http://www.911enable.com/documents/pdf/emergency\\_gateway\\_datasheet.pdf](http://www.911enable.com/documents/pdf/emergency_gateway_datasheet.pdf).

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.redskye911.com/e911-solutions/enterprise>.

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.cisco.com/en/US/products/sw/voicesw/ps842/index.html>.

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.microsoft.com/casestudies/Microsoft-Lync-Server-2010/Boeing/Boeing-Promotes-Knowledge-Sharing-for-Global-Workforce-with-Communications-Solution/4000009654>.

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.amcomsoftware.com/resources/customer\\_case\\_studies/Mesquite\\_E911.aspx](http://www.amcomsoftware.com/resources/customer_case_studies/Mesquite_E911.aspx).

<sup>14</sup> California Report at p. 30.

use their office telephone or other device in an MLTS environment to dial for help.<sup>15</sup>

...

Recent headlines have demonstrated the significance of this problem. According to the Washington Post, “On April 19, 2006 Dr. Kaafee Billah experienced chest pains while in his office in the Medimmune biotech complex in Gaithersburg, Maryland. After telling the emergency responder that he was having chest pains, he was no longer able to speak. Emergency personnel raced to the building address that appeared on the screen at the Public Safety Answering Point Center. After combing the building and finding no one, they determined there was no emergency. Ten hours later, cleaning personnel found the body of Dr. Billah on the floor of his private office in a different building.”<sup>16</sup>

In Texas, the number of businesses providing residential phone service via a private telephone switch that utilizes traditional static Automatic Location Identification (“ALI”) solutions has been decreasing in recent years from pre-competition days. In contrast, MLTS customers are increasingly seeking to obtain more precise location information for E9-1-1 MLTS. One such example, as noted above, is the Amcom Software case study involving the Mesquite Independent School District in Texas. The traditional static ALI solution inherent in legacy Centrex and PBX equipment and service is giving way to MLTS solutions with greater features and functionality. These new MLTS solutions utilize more and more a dynamic NENA i2 solution perhaps with a VoIP class of service instead of a traditional static ALI solution. Accordingly, under present circumstances, the cost-benefit analysis clearly supports the Commission acting to address IP E9-1-1 MLTS in rules or best practices.

---

<sup>15</sup> NENA TID 06-502 at p. 6.

<sup>16</sup> NENA TID 06-502 at p. 18.

**IV. The Commission is the proper regulatory authority to fully address IP, Interconnected VoIP, and MLTS demarcation responsibilities and issues for E9-1-1.**

The Commission concluded in 2003 that states and local governments were in a better position to address E9-1-1 MLTS issues.<sup>17</sup> The NENA Model Legislation followed thereafter with a suggested state-by-state approach.<sup>18</sup> However, the Commission's purported IP and Interconnected VoIP E9-1-1 jurisdiction has sufficiently changed the federal and state E9-1-1 regulatory framework landscape for IP and VoIP matters. At least twenty state legislatures have enacted provisions attempting to follow the Commission's desired intent to have a comprehensive federal jurisdictional regulatory framework for IP and VoIP matters. As the Voice on the Net Coalition ("VON") stated in its April 23, 2012, testimony in Wyoming:

As of today, no state public utility commission regulates interconnected VoIP or any other IP-enabled service. In fact, more than 22 states have legislation in place recognizing there is no reason to burden IP enabled services with legacy telecommunications regulations, most recently joined by Mississippi and Utah. Similar legislation has also been introduced and is under consideration in California, Colorado, Connecticut, New Hampshire and New York.<sup>19</sup>

In addition, the ability of MLTS providers, particularly IP MLTS providers, to provide turn-key operations to customers across several states of the country perforces action by the Commission to avoid inconsistent actions, or inaction, by the states. The current record demonstrates that the Commission is now in a better position to act on MLTS regulations or best practices, including mandates that MLTS solutions collaborate deployments with state, regional, and local public safety entities as applicable (similar to wireless providers and Interconnected VoIP providers) in order to implement feasible E9-1-1 requirements for MLTS solutions.

---

<sup>17</sup> Public Notice at p. 2. See also, E911 Scope Report and Order.

<sup>18</sup> Public Notice at p. 3.

<sup>19</sup> <http://legisweb.state.wy.us/interimCommittee/2012/07MIN0423.pdf>;  
[http://www.von.org/filings/year/00\\_2012/2012\\_04\\_23\\_VON\\_Wyoming\\_Testimony.pdf](http://www.von.org/filings/year/00_2012/2012_04_23_VON_Wyoming_Testimony.pdf).

IP E9-1-1 MLTS issues are necessarily intertwined with the Commission's Interconnected VoIP E9-1-1 requirements. In the traditional non-IP telecommunications service situation between a local exchange company ("LEC") and business customer, there is a demarcation point defining where the responsibility for providing location and callback number ends on the LEC side and where it begins on the business customer side. This demarcation point may be different for Centrex and PBX MLTS, and may also be different for different types of IP Centrex or IP PBX MLTS solutions. In a non-IP Centrex situation where the LEC provides telephone service all the way to the station level and where the MLTS business customer does not move the stations, the LEC remains responsible for providing sufficiently precise appropriate E9-1-1 location and callback information. But where the MLTS business customer can move the stations, the information must be communicated to the LEC:

While Centrex is not a typical MLTS telephone system, from a 9-1-1 data perspective, Centrex presents similar issues and will be briefly addressed. Centrex is a service, that when available, is provided by the Local Telephone Service Provider. Centrex gives the appearance of a fully functional MLTS system. The Centrex customer purchases a block, or range, of telephone numbers from the Local Telephone Service Provider. Each telephone is connected directly to the Local Telephone Service Provider's Central Office switch instead of an on-site MLTS. Centrex service can include 3 or 4 digit station to station dialing, Voice Mail and other customized calling features. The Local Telephone Service Provider can generate and process the initial 9-1-1 ALI records.

**After the initial installation of Centrex telephone service, the telephone station can be moved to new locations within the Centrex customer's premises without the awareness or involvement of the Local Telephone Service Provider. Therefore, communicating these changes to the provider of the Centrex 9-1-1 ALI shall be the responsibility of the Centrex customer.<sup>20</sup>**

In the context of IP Centrex where the Interconnected VoIP provider has the responsibility to comply with the Commission E9-1-1 registered location requirement, the IP Centrex provider

---

<sup>20</sup> NENA 06-003, Private Switch (PS) E-9-1-1 Database Standard (August 2004) at p. 9.

provides service all the way to the station level and the business customer does not move the stations, the Interconnected VoIP provider should remain responsible for providing sufficiently precise appropriate E9-1-1 location and callback information in accordance with the Commission Interconnected VoIP rule. But where the IP Centrex customer can move the stations, the IP Centrex customers must be responsible for communicating this information to the Interconnected VoIP providers.

The demarcation for E9-1-1 MLTS responsibilities may be different and have some complexities depending on the demarcation point of the systems for purposes of location and callback number:

The LEC, CLEC or ISP is responsible for accurate location information up to the point of the demarcation. From the demarc, the responsibility for establishing and maintaining the MLTS with the required or desired level of location accuracy falls on the MLTS Operator/Manager.

Here is where the location challenge begins for the MLTS Operator/Manager. Today, the demarc can represent a single address such as an office building. The demarc may also be the beginning of a complex deployment of thousands of end-user communications devices. Even when the demarc identifies a single office building, there can be great complexity in identifying the location of a caller during an emergency such as when there are multiple walled offices or large numbers of distributed cubicles.

In the MLTS environment, the demarc signifies the beginning<sup>21</sup> of the responsibility for providing accurate location information about a caller.

It is an appropriate threshold matter for the Commission to determine where the Interconnected VoIP provider's E9-1-1 responsibilities end under the Commission's rule and where the responsibilities begin for the IP Centrex or IP PBX MLTS customer (e.g., what the Interconnected VoIP provider needs to send as location and callback number to satisfy the current Commission rule, and thereafter what, if anything, is the responsibility of the business

---

<sup>21</sup> NENA 06-502 at p. 12.

VoIP customer in either the IP Centrex or IP PBX situation on the business customer's side of the demarcation to provide location and callback number).

The importance of these E9-1-1 MLTS demarcations is not only important for current E9-1-1 MLTS purposes but it is also important in NG9-1-1 transitions:

MLTS customers may have to incorporate a new architecture (e.g. a LIS and other NG9-1-1 functions) and egress calls to an NG9-1-1 system. The i3 Legacy Network Gateway may have to incorporate a provisioning interface to emulate the current PS-ALI functionality.

...

Table 2 below includes 12 use cases where the MLTS system is a legacy system and 30 use cases where the MLTS is a VoIP system. For each use case, 1) consideration was given to the type of trunks the MLTS employs, 2) if there is a subscription to a PS-ALI service, 3) if the MLTS is deployed in single or multi sites, and 4) whether the MLTS deploys a single or multiple POPs.

...

Below is a summary of the transition impacts to each category of use cases.

A. The MLTS operator has subscribed to "POTS-like" service with the expectation their E9-1-1 SSP will both route 911 calls and maintain the ALI database included with the service offering. The transition of the Public Safety jurisdiction to NG9-1-1 will have impact on the SP, but not direct impact on the MLTS. It is assumed the SP will continue to offer the same service to the MLTS operator, route calls and deliver the ALI information to the PSAP.

B. The MLTS operator has subscribed to PS-ALI service and utilizes normal Class 5 trunks for 911 calls. The MLTS operator is responsible for maintenance of the ALI records via the E9-1-1 SSP's PS-ALI service. The transition of the Public Safety jurisdiction to NG9-1-1 will impact the E9-1-1 SSP, but not directly impact the MLTS operation. This assumes the E9-1-1 SSP will continue to offer the same PS-ALI service as pre-transition.

C. The MLTS operator has subscribed to PS-ALI service and utilizes dedicated trunks for 911 calls using the same E9-1-1 SSP. The MLTS operator is responsible for maintenance of the ALI records via the E9-1-1 SSP's PS-ALI service. The transition of the Public Safety jurisdiction to NG9-1-1 will impact the E9-1-1 SSP, but not directly impact the MLTS operation. This assumes the E9-1-1 SSP will continue to offer legacy trunk service (via a legacy network gateway, as an example) for 911 calls post transition.

D. The MLTS operator has subscribed to i2 type service. The MLTS utilizes dedicated VoIP trunks for 911 calls. The MLTS operator is responsible for maintenance of the ALI records via the i2 E9-1-1 SSP PS-ALI like service. The transition of the Public Safety jurisdiction to NG9-1-1 will impact the i2 SP, but not directly impact the MLTS operation. This assumes the i2 SP will continue to offer i2 type service for 9-1-1 calls post transition.

E. The MLTS operator has subscribed to PS-ALI service from SP "A". The MLTS utilizes dedicated trunks for 911 calls going to SSP "B"'s selective router. The MLTS operator is responsible for maintenance of the ALI records via the SP 'A' PS-ALI service. The transition of the Public Safety jurisdiction to NG9-1-1 will impact both SPs, but not directly impact the MLTS operation. This assumes the E9-1-1 SSP will continue to offer legacy trunk service, via a LNG, for 911 calls post transition. This also assumes the SP "A" and SSP "B" will coordinate between the ALI db and the LNG post transition.<sup>22</sup>

In sum, the Commission is the appropriate regulatory authority to fully address IP, Interconnected VoIP, and MLTS demarcation responsibilities and issues for E9-1-1, and in doing so the Commission should require that providers of MLTS solutions collaborate deployments with state, regional, and local public safety entities as applicable in order to implement feasible E9-1-1 requirements for MLTS.

**V. NENA Model Legislation: Whether in Part 68 or elsewhere, the ELIN, ERL, and other substantive parameters suggested by NENA are appropriate E9-1-1 MLTS requirements for Commission rules or best practices.**

Sections two, three, and seven of the NENA Model Legislation present appropriate substantive parameters and rationales for Commission rules or best practices on E9-1-1 MLTS solutions. These sections provide, in relevant part, as follows:

**Section 2. Shared Residential MLTS Service**

Operators of Shared Residential MLTS serving residential customers are required to assure that the telecommunications system is connected to the public switched network such that calls to 9-1-1 result in one distinctive Automatic Number Identification (ANI) and Automatic Location Identification (ALI) for each living unit.

**Section 3. Business MLTS**

For a MLTS serving business locations, the MLTS Operator shall deliver the 9-1-1 call with an Emergency Location Identification Number (ELIN) which will result in one of the following:

(a) an ERL which provides a minimum of the building and floor location of the caller, or (b) an ability to direct response through an alternative and adequate means of signaling by the establishment of a private answering point.

---

<sup>22</sup> NENA NG9-1-1 Transition Plan Considerations, NENA 77-501, v1 at pp. 52-53 (Feb. 24, 2011).

The MLTS Manager must make reasonable efforts to assure that 9-1-1 callers are aware of the proper procedures for calling for emergency assistance.

**Rationale:**

The minimum recommended number of ERLs was developed in the interest from being cost efficient and as not to place an undue financial burden on the MLTS Operator or MLTS Manager. Conversely, there is no reason that would preclude an MLTS Operator or MLTS Manager of assigning additional ERLs as deemed sufficient to adequately cover the workspace, regardless of square footage involved.

Examples of logical starting points for ERL boundaries could include fire alarm boundaries, smoke boundaries or sprinkler zones. The creation of ERL boundaries should not exceed fire alarm zones.

**Exceptions:**

(a) This limits the burden on small business most of which will be less than 7,000 sq. ft. In addition, emergency response teams can generally search areas less than 7,000 square feet quickly.

**Section 7. Industry Standards**

MLTS Operators shall be considered to be in compliance when the MLTS complies with E9-1-1 generally accepted industry standards as adopted by the Federal Government (specifically the Federal Communications Commission) or as adopted by the State (agency to be defined by each State) until such time as there is a nationwide standard. The telecommunication local exchange carriers and ISPs are responsible for providing interconnectivity through the use of generally accepted industry standards.

The NENA Model Legislation suggested that the Commission incorporate E9-1-1 MLTS requirements into its Part 68 rules.<sup>23</sup> But a January 2012 *ex parte* filing by the Administrative Council for Terminal Attachments (“ACTA”) in another Commission proceeding appears to indicate that there may be some open questions or differing views on the applicability of Part 68 to VoIP and IP: “Specifically, there is a question surrounding whether or not VoIP equipment that have jacks capable of being plugged into the PSTN need to register in the ACTA Database.”<sup>24</sup> However, whether in Part 68 or elsewhere, the ELIN, ERL, and other substantive

---

<sup>23</sup> Public Notice at p. 4.

<sup>24</sup> ACTA Ex Parte Presentation, CC Docket No. 99-216 (Jan. 30, 2012).

parameters suggested by NENA are appropriate E9-1-1 MLTS requirements for Commission rules or best practices.

## **VI. Conclusion**

E9-1-1 MLTS solutions are feasible. The Commission is now the proper regulatory authority to fully address IP, Interconnected VoIP, and MLTS demarcation responsibilities and issues for E9-1-1 and ENS, and in doing so the Commission should require that MLTS solutions collaborate deployments with state, regional, and local public safety entities as applicable in order to implement feasible E9-1-1 requirements for MLTS solutions. Consistent with the ELIN, ERL, and other substantive parameters for E9-1-1 MLTS suggested by NENA, the Commission should promptly address E9-1-1 MLTS in rules or best practices.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Tomsu  
Vinson & Elkins L.L.P.  
2801 Via Fortuna, Suite 100  
Austin, Texas 78746  
512-542-8527  
512-236-3211 (fax)  
[mtomsu@velaw.com](mailto:mtomsu@velaw.com)

On behalf of the Texas 9-1-1 Alliance



Patrick Tyler  
General Counsel  
333 Guadalupe Street, Suite 2-212  
Austin, Texas 78701-3942  
512-305-6915  
512-305-6937 (fax)  
[Patrick.tyler@csec.texas.gov](mailto:Patrick.tyler@csec.texas.gov)

On behalf of the Texas Commission on State Emergency Communications



Melissa Tutton  
President

On behalf of the Municipal Emergency Communication Districts Association

On the comments:  
Richard A. Muscat  
Bexar Metro 9-1-1 Network District

July 5, 2012