Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Summary Test Report (STR) Template

Comments on STR Templates	Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program (CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Replies
Is the date in B5 of the General Info tab still necessary?	Yes, this date is necessary since it will be the only date. Please use the date the STR is submitted to P25 CAP as the document date.
Is the date in B5 to be updated when a model tab is added or removed?	The date is changed any time the STR is resubmitted to P25 CAP.
Models & Software tab, cells B18, B25, B32 and B39: for increased clarity, we recommend adding wording to these table titles to make clear these are the subscriber units tested with the base station being reported in this STR.	The Table Titles will be modified to add 'subscriber' and 'base station repeater' where appropriate.
"Model_Name" tab, cells C277-C280: Trunked Frequency Division Multiple Access (FDMA) interop 2.2.2. Group Voice Call appears to be missing a test case. We believe 2.2.2.4.4. Test Case 4 – Group Call Interrupt should be included in this test suite since it is valid for FDMA in Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA)-102.CABC-C and because the test case is included in the list of required Subscriber Unit Trunked FDMA tests in P25-CAB-CAI_TEST_REQ - July 2017, and thus is required to be run during an interoperability test anyway. Note that the same omission appears to exist in P25-CAB-CAI_TEST_REQ - July 2017 table 22.	The Group Call Interrupt test case for trunked FDMA and Time Division Multiple Access (TDMA) base station repeater testing will not be added to the base station repeater STR as this test case is not included in the 2017 Compliance Assessment Bulletin (CAB). The Group Call Interrupt test case for trunked FDMA and TDMA subscriber interoperability testing will be added to the subscriber STR as this test case is included in the 2017 CAB.
"Model_Name" tab, cells C344-C347: Trunked TDMA interop 2.2.2. Does not match the test case list in P25-CAB-CAI_TEST_REQ - July 2017 table 23. We believe the template is correct and the CAB is wrong.	The 2017 CAB needs to be updated. Some of the test cases in table 23 (TDMA) should be removed as they are tested during the FDMA testing, i.e., these test cases only involve the control channel. Only test cases that require the assignment of a voice channel are tested in table 23 (TDMA).
Where are product model classes to be handled in conjunction with the new SDOC and STR formats?	The first table on the 'Models & Software' tab has been modified to include the model Name, Equipment Type, Software Versions/Options, Frequency Bands/Hardware Options. This table can be repeated to show multiple model classes if needed.

Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Summary Test Report (STR) Template

Comments on STR Templates	Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program (CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Replies
We assume the Base Station Repeater representative unit(s) that were tested will be recorded on the "Model_Name" tab in the "PRODUCT UNDER TEST" fields, and that the software versions for Trunked and Conventional will be recorded in the fields at the top of the Models & Software tab. But where are we to record the versions covered by this representative testing? Is it OIC's intent that all of the versions in the model classes covered by the representative testing *also* be listed on the Models & Software tab in the upper-most box, somehow denoting which versions belong to which model class and which were the representative versions actually tested? Or does OIC have other mechanism for declaring model classes in mind?	OIC understands that certain equipment models will be used as 'representative samples.' The representative equipment tables on the 'Models & Software' tab will have additional columns for software versions and language to link the representative equipment to additional vendor equipment that can be found on that Vendor's STR. The model class table has been modified to allow the definition of multiple model classes if needed. The model class table shall include all the 'Model_Names' that are included in that Model class. OIC is asking that the model class be named in the title of the Model class table.
Review of these new templates caused us to discover a number of what we believe are needed corrections/revisions to P25-CAB-CAI_TEST_REQ - July 2017: Need to be revised to reflect that the additional performance testing at 700 MHz for Unwanted Emissions (Adjacent Channel Power Ratio) is no longer required to be done under the P25 CAP. In particular, footnote 5 needs to be changed to make the document consistent with the proposed new SDOC and STR templates.	Updates to the CAB will be made to remove the 700MHz Adjacent Channel Power Ratio performance test case result reporting.
a) Does CAP intend to publish SDOC/STR CABs as well as SDOC/STR templates?	Yes, a SDOC/STR Requirements CAB for the SDOC and STR templates will be available soon after the SDOC and STR templates are made available.
b) 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 to be 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.

Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Summary Test Report (STR) Template

Comments on STR Templates	Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program (CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Replies
In row 16, a date and a title of the CAB tested to is to be provided. We understand this to represent the version of a CAB that was tested to. CAB cover page date and CAB effective date do not always match. The CAB cover page title does not provide version control, but the CAB filename does. Do you want CAB cover date or CAB effective date and CAB cover title or CAB filename on the submitted documents? We suggest filename should be included.	In order to know which P25 CAP Test Requirements CAB was used for testing, the STR asks that the filename of the test requirements CAB used for testing be recorded in the General Info tab.
CAB reference and CAB test section information is provided in the "Model Name" tabs on a test section by test section basis and includes specific lists of tests associated with the referenced CAB. The "Model Name" CAB references and test lists allow a more complete understanding of which CAB (2016 vs. 2017) is used for each area of testing. Note that various tests may be performed by different labs, some of which may have 2016 or 2017 CAB recognition. Note also that some sections common between the 2016 and 2017 CAB 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.	P25 equipment will be submitted according to the 2016 CAB or according to the 2017 CAB. The STR template has been modified to support both 2016 and 2017 CAB.
We believe the CAB references and CAB test sections listed on the "General Info" tab is unnecessary and may be confusing when compared and when multiple CABs are referenced on the various "Model Name" tabs. We therefore suggest that the CAB and CAB section references be removed from the "General Info" tab.	This table will be removed.

Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Summary Test Report (STR) Template

Comments on STR Templates	Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program (CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Replies
The first table provides for a model name and 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 reflect all software versions to 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?	Updated tables on the 'Models & Software' tab of the STR template will have a 'Tested Software Version' column and a 'Software Version Update' column.

If new testing occurs with new software, that software version should be listed in the 'tested software version' column.

If updated software is released by a vendor and the vendors impacted by this update have determined the new software does not impact the previous test case results, i.e., no new testing required, the updated software version(s) will be listed in the 'Software Version Updates' column.

Modified STRs will need to be submitted to P25 CAP. |
| The templates provide separate tables to identify representative products used in interoperability testing. Presumably, in each area, this should list the equipment that the subject of the document was tested against, true? While this may seem intuitively obvious, it seems worth noting to ensure consistent reporting styles between manufacturers. Suggest that the table headers could be modified to reflect "subscriber manufacturer" or "base station manufacturer" table by table to clarify. | Table header will be modified to add 'subscriber' and 'base station repeater' where appropriate. |
| Note that the Conventional Interoperability tests are being revised in 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. | P25 CAP is tracking the changes discussed in TIA. The test cases that TIA is eliminating will be eliminated in the 2016 and 2017 CAB and in the STR template.

New Conventional Interoperability test cases may added in the future. |

Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Summary Test Report (STR) Template

Comments on STR Templates	Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program (CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Replies
From questions and answers during the webinars, CAP stated that every Model Name listed in the "Models and Software" Tab should have a corresponding "Model Name" test result page. Assuming this is the case, this should be stated. Note that there may be EXCEL limitations on tab naming.	This instruction will be added the SDOC/STR Requirements CAB document. An instructive note will also be added in the STR 'Model_Name' tab. EXCEL 2016 allows 31-characters in the 'Model_Name' tab label.
Rows 5 and 6 ask for Hardware and Software Options Tested. 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?	Please describe the options in plain language rather than the detailed ordering information for that option. Examples are provided in the STR template.
The report key lists several notations with notation definitions. While this is a logical set of notes, are manufacturers allowed to create their own specific notations/definitions when needed or are these the only ones allowed?	Manufacturers are allowed to create their own specific notations/definitions subject to review by OIC. OIC's goal is to have 'note commonality' across manufacturers.
Testing experience shows that some tests may be performed with acceptable procedure variations and/or the test result conclusion may require explanation. This will be noted in the DTRs. Do these types of things need to be noted in the Report key?	OIC reviews the documentation submitted. OIC assumes that the accredited labs are following their procedures using the skills they demonstrated to the accreditation body. If the test case passes in the view of the accredited test lab, then the test case is reported as passed. If the vendor wants to provide a notation describing an optional situation, the vendor may create a unique note. 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.

Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Summary Test Report (STR) Template

Comments on STR Templates	**Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program (CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Replies**
Subscriber template rows 10 and 24 and Base Station Repeater template rows 10 and 20 use the word "requirements." Only the performance tests list qualitative "requirements" that must be met in order to "pass." We suggest this be clarified somehow, i.e., "Test was passed and met stated requirements where listed."	The definition for the 'P' (Pass) notation will be changed to 'Test was passed and met stated requirements where listed.'
There is a column for "retest date" in the tables. It is not clear why a product would be retested or how and when this column is to be used. Please explain.	This test date column was removed and replaced by a STR Revision Table on the 'General Info' tab. Anytime the STR is revised and resubmitted, the vendor shall date and describe the reason for the STR update.
There is a column for listing "Test Cases." Neither the 2016 or the 2017 CAB number the tests listed in any section. In fact, the Performance tests in both CABs reference "measurement methods" and "performance recommendations" and the Interoperability tests in both CABs reference "normative tests." Since the tables list the names of each test, it's not clear why this "Test Cases" column is needed, but if it is retained, we suggest the references in the "Test Cases" column be clarified or explained to match what is in the CABs.	The following notes will be added to the STR template: For performance testing: The 'test case' number refers to the paragraph number for the test procedure found in the TIA-102.CAAA-E Digital C4FM/CQPSK Transceiver Measurement Methods for FDMA and in TIA-102.CCAA-B Two-Slot Time Division Multiple Access Transceiver Measurement Methods for TDMA. For conventional interoperability testing: The 'test case' number refers to the test suite paragraph number in TIA-102.CABA Interoperability Testing for Voice Operation in Conventional Systems. For trunking interoperability testing, the 'test case' number refers to the test suite paragraph number in TIA-102.CABC-C Interoperability Testing for Voice Operation in Trunked Systems.

Public Comment Feedback Matrix for Summary Test Report (STR) Template

Comments on STR Templates	Project 25 (P25) Compliance Assessment Program (CAP)/Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) Replies
Each area of testing (i.e., Conventional Performance, Trunking Performance, etc.) starts by identifying a CAB. The actual test result tables appear to have used the tests found in the 2017 CAB. We suggest a note to the reader that explains the test table headings used in the tables are expected to match the headings used in the referenced CAB and the tests listed in the tables are expected to match the tests listed in the referenced CAB. This comment applies to multiple test areas in both templates wherever a CAB reference is expected.	A multi-table border with a wider width will be added so that it is visually understandable which test case result tables are connected to which test section identification block. There is some variation in the test section titling and the table numbering between the 2016 CAB and the 2017 CAB. STR defines the requirements and test cases within a test section that apply to both the 2016 and 2017 CAB and those requirements and test cases that apply to only the 2017 CAB.
This comment is more relevant to the Base Station Repeater template, but in principle, also applies to the Subscriber template. In all interoperability test result tables in both templates, only 3 "product" columns are provided. In practice, customers are interested in all products tested and so, some manufacturers have listed more than 3 products. Please clarify that this will be allowed.	Manufacturers are allowed to add columns for as many products as they want. Three columns were shown to indicate the minimum. A note will be added to indicate that more product columns can be added.