



**Testimony of
Lisa McCabe
CTIA
In Opposition to Maryland Senate Bill 466
February 14, 2017**

Before the Maryland Senate Finance Committee

Chairman Middleton, Vice-Chair Astle, and members of the committee, on behalf of CTIA®, the trade association for the wireless communications industry, I write to express our concerns regarding SB 466, which revises Maryland's Public Safety and other statutes regarding 911 Emergency Telephone Systems. As discussed below, certain of the proposed changes in the bill create inconsistencies and confusion regarding their applicability to wireless providers and are unworkable.

Senate Bill 466 would blur the distinction between 911 service providers and originating service providers. State and local governments contract directly with wireline and IP-based 911 system vendors for 911 and NG911 facilities dedicated to handling 911 calls. In contrast, wireless and VoIP service providers are originating service providers, not 911 system vendors.

The current law defines "9-1-1 service carrier" for purposes of identifying service providers who act as collection agents for the 9-1-1 Trust Fund with respect to the 9-1-1 fees. The term "9-1-1 service carrier" was not intended to refer to 911 system vendors that directly serve PSAPs.

Yet, in proposed Section 1-315, P.01 quality service reporting is extended to all "9-1-1 service carriers," which would appear to include wireless and VoIP originating service providers. Due to the nature of how wireless and VOIP networks operate, P.01 reporting is unworkable. P.01 reporting should not apply to originating service providers as most originating service provider facilities are not dedicated to 911. 911 calls are just a small fraction of the traffic they handle, and the capacity of their networks is designed around many factors, not just 911 call demand. Moreover, even their facilities that are dedicated to 911 support calls and data for multiple PSAPs.



Additionally, even if such studies were possible at some level, the bill is unclear as to which originating service provider facilities would apply to the study. It is unclear whether reporting would apply to cell sites, backhaul transport from the sites, gateway facilities at the network core or an interconnected VoIP provider's server. In the wireless and VOIP environment, all these facilities are mixed-use facilities, serving non-911 and 911 calls. Furthermore, over-the-top VoIP service providers and resellers with no transport facilities of their own would have no way of complying with the proposed reporting requirement.

Because wireless and VOIP providers are not system vendors for 911, we respectfully submit that all references to "9-1-1 service carrier" in Section 1-315, regarding P.01 studies be deleted. This would align Maryland with other states, which apply service quality regulation such as this to 911 system vendors, not to originating service providers.

Finally, it is important to note that wireless and VoIP providers' 911 and E911 call origination capabilities are already extensively regulated by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The FCC has established compliance and outage reporting requirements for wireless carriers. Wireless and VoIP service providers are subject to extensive 911 call delivery and E911 data delivery and performance requirements.¹ Specifically, wireless service providers are required to file outage reports with the FCC when 911- and E911-specific facilities are out.² Moreover, wireless providers are required to notify affected PSAPs when those outages occur.³ Thus, having additional Maryland-specific regulation is unnecessary. Deviating from the national framework will cause needless complexity and burden for providers without providing any concomitant benefit for Maryland PSAPs and consumers.

¹ See 47 C.F.R. §§ 9.5, 20.18.

² See 47 C.F.R. §§ 4.9 (e), 4.5 (e).

³ See 47 C.F.R. § 4.9 (e).