

DIGB 5

Encryption Sub-Committee

Meeting Notes
(August 30th, 2018, 10:00)
Bannock County Sheriff's Office, Training Room

Committee Members:

- Dan Argyle
- Loren Nielson
- Bill Guiberson
- Eric Hobson
- Robert Hugi
- Mark deJong
- David Gates
- Aaron Clark
- Scott Wright
- Kendal Anderson
- Pat Teton

New Business:

1. **Chair Appointment – *Chief Gates***
2. **Need for encryption – Discussion**
 - a. *Dan Argyle, some encryption is necessary citing security concerns as the primary driver, individuals are listening. Several instances were related where the bad guys knew what was going on.*
 - b. *David Gates, Fire is not concerned with encrypting but also want to be able to communicate with law partners when necessary.*
3. **Current interoperability plan – Review and Discussion**
 - a. State wide interoperability and communication.
 - i. *A review of the current Statewide Interoperability Plan was reviewed*
 1. *XX-REG – Hailing and Short-Term interoperability*
 2. *XX-OPS 1-16 – County Wide interoperability*
 3. *XX-REG 1-16 – Region Wide Interoperability*
 4. *EVENT 1-16 – State Wide Interoperability*
 5. *Currently no encryption channels/talkgroups identified*
 - ii. *Presently, local and state personnel are exchanging radios during incidents.*
4. **Encryption impact on Interoperability – Review and Discussion**
 - a. Agency Primary and Agency dedicated Talkgroups/channels
 - i. *Should Primary calling channels be encrypted?*
 1. *Scott Wright brought up a concern that primary talk groups should not be encrypted, the need for similar agencies to know what each other are doing.*
 2. *Sherriff Nelson pointed out that for interoperability, no main calling group should be encrypted.*
 3. *Kendal Anderson - addressed the need for state resources to be able to communicate with Local resources on both encrypted and clear talk groups.*
 - ii. *Power County Law is reported to have already encrypted its primary talkgroup – This is already impacting interoperability.*
 - b. Interoperable Talkgroups/channels –
 - i. *Sherriff Nelson pointed out that for interoperability, no main calling group should be encrypted, that for tactical communications, tactical talkgroups should be utilized and maybe encrypted.*
5. **Dedicated encrypted interoperability channels/talk – Review and Discussion**

DIGB 5

Encryption Sub-Committee

Meeting Notes
(August 30th, 2018, 10:00)

Bannock County Sheriff's Office, Training Room

- a. *Gates, questions, given the limited slot space is there a need for a dedicated set of encrypted interoperability channels/Talkgroups that follow the similar interoperability scheme of the statewide interoperability plan?*
- b. *Sherriff Nelson pointed out that for tactical communications, tactical talkgroups should be utilized and maybe encrypted. Groups such as the Narc's, Detectives and SWAT.*
- c. *Gates, Questioned if these was ever a time went multiple agencies would need to talk together on encrypted channels/talkgroups. Joint SWAT, Detective, Narc or others?*
- d. *No real recommendation was concluded. This needs to be future discussion.*
- e.

6. Communications Standards – Review and Discussion.

- a. Slotting assignments –
 - i. *Kendal Anderson and others related the reality that if there is slot assignment conflict, two separate encryption keys located on the same slot assignment with in two radio's these radios would not be able to communicate on the encrypted channel/talkgroup. This requires that a statewide system of slot assignments must be developed and adheard to in order to maintain interoperability on encrypted channels/talkgroups.*
 - ii. *It is the subcommittee's recommendation that the IPSCC and all DIGBs work together to develop and adhere to a state-wide encryption slot assignment scheme.*
 - iii. *Future Question is how many are needed in each region?*
- b. P-25 Compatibility –
 - i. *There was discussion on AES and ADP Encryption. AES is the recognized P-25 Compliant encryption standard. AES is the more expensive encryption.*
 - ii. *ADP is a Motorola encryption; it was once proprietary but it is believed to have been open sourced. This raises the question, is ADP now considered P-25 compliant? ADP is generally less expensive then AES, which is why many agencies are utilizing it.*

7. What options can we recommend and implement now – Action Item

- a. Concerns were voiced about the cost of encryption. Many agencies including Chubbuck has just reprogramed radios with encryption.
 - i. Having a state-wide plan could/would require Chubbuck to rekey their radios.
 - ii. The cost of encrypting would be high – every radio would need to be re-keyed.
- b. The committee came to the following recommendation:
 - i. Agency Primary - At present Agency Primary channel/talkgroups should not be encrypted in order to maximize agency interoperability and coordination on a daily basis.
 - ii. Slot Assignment Plan - A State wide slot assignment needs to be developed and distributed to all agencies to minimize collocating encrypted talkgroups.
 - iii. Agency Specific Talkgroups - Agencies are free to utilize agency specific trunked and tactical encrypted channel/talkgroups, these are talkgroups that no other agency would have. As these channels have no bearing on interoperability the type of encryption used is not important.

8. What is the ideal future - Review and Discussion?

- a. The ideal future was a slow migration to the state wide slot assignment scheme by all agencies utilizing encryption.
- b. Talkgroups designated as “interoperability Encryptions Talkgroups would meet P-25 compliance standards.

9. How do we realize the ideal future – Action Item.

- a. The Sub-committee believe the next step was to answer sever questions and meet with DIGB 6s Sub-committee in order to gain consensus and understanding. The outstanding questions are:

DIGB 5

Encryption Sub-Committee

Meeting Notes

(August 30th, 2018, 10:00)

Bannock County Sheriff's Office, Training Room

- i. How many Slots would be required in a state wide scheme
 - ii. Is ADP Encryption P-25 compliant?
 - iii. Are there instances that one can imagine needing dedicated interoperability encryption talkgroups: large events such as public unrest, Mass Casualties and other such disasters?
- b. It was further hoped that this would happen prior to the IPSCC meeting scheduled for October 1st, 2018 in order to at least start the conversation state wide.

Old Business:

1. None

2. None

Open Discussion:

1. Item 1 -None

2. Item 2 - None

Adjourn – Action Item