

Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Suppliers Declaration of Compliance (SDOC) Template

Comments on the SDOC Templates	Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program(CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Reply
Does CAP intend to publish SDOC/STR CABs, as well as SDOC/STR templates?	Yes, a SDOC/STR Requirements Compliance Assessment Bulletin (CAB) for the SDOC and STR templates will be available soon after the SDOC and STR templates are made available.
Assuming CAP will publish SDOC/STR templates, will those published templates serve as examples for the manufacturer to follow when creating their own documents for CAP submission or will those published templates be “forms” and the manufacturer fills in the required information?	The published templates are considered forms with the flexibility to accommodate the equipment performance variations found in P25 equipment.
Please note that some areas of the draft templates may require more text than the draft template allows for.	The areas that require a textual response can be made as large as needed. These SDOC responses will be subject to 508 review.
The heading (appears on every page) identifies the 2017 CAB using information from the cover page of the published version of the CAB. When referencing CABs, to ensure all manufacturers and all readers are using the same version, can we include a CAP filename?	In order to capture P25 CAP Test Requirements CAB revisions, the SDOC template will be modified so that the file name of the P25 CAP Test Requirements CAB version used for testing is recorded in the SDOC.

Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Suppliers Declaration of Compliance (SDOC) Template

Comments on the SDOC Templates	Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program(CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Reply
<p>The heading includes identification of a CAB. CABs used for actual testing are referenced in each testing subsection of this document and a given radio may be interoperability tested with some labs having only 2016 CAB recognition, and so may reference different CABs in different interoperability test sections. We suggest removing the CAB reference from the heading.</p>	<p>The SDOC template will be modified to allow the SDOC to be submitted according to either the 2016 CAB or the 2017 CAB.</p> <p>When submitting SDOC/STRs against the 2017 CAB, test case results from 2010 CAB or 2016 CAB can be used when the test case is the same as in the 2017 CAB. List the Detailed Test Report (DTR) identifier for the previous testing and the DTR identifier for any new testing.</p> <p>When submitting SDOC/STRs against the 2016 CAB, test case results from the 2010 CAB can be used when the test case is the same as in the 2016 CAB. List the DTR identifier for the previous testing and the DTR identifier for any new testing.</p>
<p>The STR covers multiple model names. In CAP webinars, it was stated that the expectation is that each model name included in an STR will have a corresponding SDOC. If this is true, this should be stated.</p>	<p>An instructive note will also be added in the STR 'Model_Name' tab.</p>
<p>The heading includes a date. Please clarify if this is to be the date the report was submitted.</p>	<p>The date on the SDOC header is the SDOC submittal date to P25 CAP.</p>

Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Suppliers Declaration of Compliance (SDOC) Template

Comments on the SDOC Templates	Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program(CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Reply
<p>The Product Information table includes a Tested Software Version. It is common practice for product software versions to change on a regular, sometimes frequent basis and our experience shows that customers want these documents to be updated as software revisions occur and to reflect all software versions for which the test results apply. In practice, a DTR will identify the software version actually tested, but new software versions are introduced without modifying the portion of the software that is related to the test results. In these cases, manufacturers have been creating a “Statement of Commonality” that represents an engineering analysis documenting the software revision will not impact the test results. This internal evidence allows the new software version to be added to the CAP documentation without re-testing. How will the new template accommodate adding software revisions for which the test results are valid but no actual test was performed?</p>	<p>The SDOC will include ‘tested software versions.’ A new tested software version would be added when new testing changed the previously submitted test case results.</p> <p>If updated software is released by the vendor and the vendors impacted by this update have determined the new software does not impact the previously submitted test case results, the SDOC vendor will email P25 CAP including the updated software version and stating that the updated software version does not impact the previously submitted test case results.</p> <p>To eliminate SDOC document updates for equipment software updates without new testing, OIC will take the following action: On the P25 CAP publication page for the impacted equipment, OIC will add an informational note that defines the current software version for the impacted equipment.</p> <p>In order to track software version history, the vendor is requested to submit an updated STR when software is updated, maintaining the software version history.</p>
<p>The Product Information table asks for Tested Hardware and Software Options. Please clarify the information you want so that it may be reported in a consistent manner across manufacturers. For instance, if my infrastructure has an option for conventional vs. trunking or my radio has an option for display, do you want this described or do you want an option number/name or do you want an option number/name with a description?</p>	<p>Please describe the option in plain language rather than the detailed ordering information for that option. Examples are provided in the templates.</p>
<p>A STR reference is to be provided. How is an STR uniquely identified?</p>	<p>The STR will be uniquely identified by “STR - Vendor_Name - Subscriber” or “STR - Vendor_Name - Base Station Repeater.”</p> <p>The Model Class table in the STR has been modified to allow for the definition of multiple model classes. There will only need to be one STR for subscriber units and one STR for base station repeaters per manufacturer.</p>

Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Suppliers Declaration of Compliance (SDOC) Template

Comments on the SDOC Templates	Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program(CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Reply
<p>This comment applies to the Subscriber Template only.</p> <p>The text in the Encryption Statement option boxes is confusing and seems to be attempting to make multiple points. The text above the table says: “shall be available with one of the following options,” but both rows in the table state requirements rather than options. Also, both statements seem to express multiple requirements. Hardware and software options are already described, but if you want to clearly identify whether the model complies with the Encryption Requirements CAB listed under Policy documents on the CAB website, we suggest that the options listed be clarified. We believe the descriptions below cover the options in the Encryption Requirements CAB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This model may be obtained with AES 256 Encryption Algorithm and encryption test results reflect AES 256 Encryption Algorithm testing. - This model may be purchased without any Encryption Algorithm and encryption. - A manufacturer may check either or both. 	<p>OIC will change this section to:</p> <p>“This product complies with the P25 CAP Encryption Requirements CAB (P25-CAB-ENC_REQ). The checked box indicates how the product was tested.”</p> <p>The suggested rewording of the statements within the table does not capture the P25 CAP requirement that equipment is <u>tested</u> when equipped with the AES-256 algorithm as the minimum or baseline encryption algorithm; or is tested without any encryption algorithm because the equipment is not available with AES-256. P25 CAP wants to know how the equipment was tested.</p> <p>If equipment is not available with AES-256 encryption, all test cases for encryption would be reported as ‘unsupported’.</p>

Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Suppliers Declaration of Compliance (SDOC) Template

Comments on the SDOC Templates	Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program(CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Reply
<p>The document is organized into subsections for a particular type of testing. Each subsection includes reference to a CAB and an abbreviated list of tests associated with that CAB. Note that various tests may be performed by different labs, some of which may have 2016 or 2017 CAB recognition. Note also that some CAB sections are common between the 2016 and 2017 CAB, but have different lists of tests. This may result in some test results of a single model tracing to either the 2016 or the 2017 CAB. We believe this document can and should allow 2016 CAB references and/or 2017 CAB references. This will necessitate instructions for the manufacturer to identify specific CAB and CAB tests in each of the subsections when creating the SDOC for submission.</p>	<p>The SDOC/STR templates are being modified to support either the 2016 CAB or the 2017 CAB.</p> <p>Most test sections apply to both CABs. The test sections, and in some cases test cases, are called out if they only apply to the 2017 CAB.</p> <p>The reason for this is that OIC wants a single document on the website—so that users get used to a single version and not be confused with multiple versions.</p> <p>When submitting SDOC/STRs against the 2017 CAB, test case results from 2010 CAB or 2016 CAB can be used when the 2017 CAB test case is the same. List the DTR identifier for the previous testing and the DTR identifier for any new testing.</p> <p>When submitting SDOC/STRs against the 2016 CAB, test case results from the 2010 CAB can be used when the 2016 CAB test case is the same. List the DTR identifier for the previous testing and the DTR identifier for any new testing.</p>
<p>Using the Conventional Performance section as an example, it is not clear what qualifies as an “excepted test case.” It is not clear which test in the STR the example is referring to, but all performance tests in the STR have a requirement that is either met or not met (pass or fail). We do not understand how an “exception” may be reported in the SDOC, but not covered in the STR. We suggest that “excepted test case” be clarified and consistently reported in either both SDOC and STR or neither the SDOC or STR.</p>	<p>Exceptions will be detailed in the STR. Exception references will be removed from the SDOC.</p> <p>Exceptions come up when there are issues with the TIA test case procedures or TIA test case performance guidelines, or when the referenced TIA specification is tied to a FCC regulation that allows an exception.</p>

Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Suppliers Declaration of Compliance (SDOC) Template

Comments on the SDOC Templates	Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program(CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Reply
<p>Note that the Conventional Interoperability tests are being revised in Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA) and the earliest possible publication of the revised document is June 2018. The revised document will likely still include pass criteria for certain optional aspects of several services. We expect that a CAB revision may follow the test document revision, but given the CAP test reporting deadlines, CAP Conventional Interoperability testing is likely to use the current published version of the CAB which references the current published version of the Conventional Interoperability Tests.</p>	<p>P25 CAP is tracking the changes discussed in TIA. The test cases that TIA is eliminating will also be eliminated in the 2016 and 2017 CABs and STR template.</p> <p>New Conventional Interoperability test cases may be added in the future.</p>
<p>As noted, the published version of the Conventional Interoperability tests includes pass criteria for certain optional aspects of several services. This point is made in every Interoperability testing subsection. Support of these optional aspects is likely to vary between manufacturers. It is not clear why the STR for interoperability tests will not report on the optional aspects, but the SDOC is expected to report Pass/Unsupported/Fail of optional aspects of the services being tested. It is also not clear how the SDOC (which represents interoperability testing with at least 3 manufacturers) can effectively describe which optional aspects are supported between which manufacturers.</p>	<p>The optional aspects requested in the SDOC refer to ‘optional product capabilities’ needed to pass test cases such as display and full keypad.</p> <p>If a vendor/P25 Test Lab utilizes TIA-102 defined ‘optional pass criteria’ to pass a test case, the product would pass. There would be no need to add notes in the SDOC nor the STR.</p> <p>If the equipment vendor desires, a note about optional pass criteria and how the optional pass criteria may impact interoperability can be added.</p> <p>If a vendor or P25 test Lab believes a published TIA Standard test procedure for interoperability will allow equipment to pass a particular TIA-102 test case yet might be viewed as non-interoperable by users, the vendor or P25 test Lab is requested to inform P25 CAP OIC as soon as possible.</p>

Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Suppliers Declaration of Compliance (SDOC) Template

Comments on the SDOC Templates	Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program(CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Reply
<p>All interoperability tests are expected to be performed with at least three manufacturers. The tests that pass or fail or are unsupported will vary depending on the combination of manufacturers involved in the interoperability test. Please clarify how the SDOC is intended to report the failed or unsupported interoperability tests by manufacturer combination.</p>	<p>P25 CAP is aware that not all P25 equipment combinations will pass all the same interoperability test cases. An SDOC states that the equipment model noted in the SDOC header was subjected to testing defined by the Test Requirement CAB. SDOCs do not document the individual combinational performance of the equipment that was tested with the equipment model named in the SDOC title. That information will be available in the STR.</p> <p>If the SDOC equipment model is not capable of passing a test case with any of the representative equipment involved in a rule-of-three interoperability test case, the SDOC would note that the feature/functionality, that was to be verified by that test case, is ‘unsupported’ or ‘failed’ depending on the situation.</p> <p>If the SDOC equipment model is capable of passing a particular test case with representative equipment from one vendor involved with the rule of three interoperability testing, the vendor shall indicate a Pass test case result with a note stating, ‘Interoperability verified with only one representative subscriber unit (or base station repeater depending on the equipment tested).’</p> <p>If the SDOC equipment model is capable of passing a particular test case with representative equipment from two vendors involved with the rule of three interoperability testing, the vendor shall indicate a Pass test case result with a note stating, ‘Interoperability verified with only two representative subscriber units (or base station repeaters depending on the equipment tested).’</p> <p>The SDOC for the representative equipment that was present at the interoperability test and did not support the test case would note that the feature/functionality, that was to be verified by that test case, is ‘unsupported’ or ‘failed’ in its SDOC.</p>