

Project 25 Compliance Assessment Program Governing Board Conference Call Meeting Minutes

June 25, 2008

Purpose:

Governing Board (GB) review and approval of proposed Compliance Assessment Bulletins (CABs)

Agenda:

1. Welcome
2. Approval of Final Laboratory Application Process CAB
3. Approval of Final Baseline Testing Requirements CAB
4. Discussion of Draft Supplier's Declaration of Compliance (SDoC) CAB
5. Public Comments on Project 25 Compliance Assessment Program (P25 CAP)
6. Adjournment

Invitees (√ indicates attendance)

- √ Rick Adams, GB Member
- √ Luke Klein-Berndt, GB Chair
- James Downes, GB Member
- √ Kurt Fischer, GB Member, Laboratory Program Manager (LPM)
- √ Patrick Kenealy, GB Member
- √ Martin McCoy, GB Member
- Dereck Orr, GB Ex-Officio Member
- Tom Sorley, GB Vice Chair
- David Steingraber, GB Member
- √ Rob Zanger, GB Member
- √ Members of the Public

Action Items:

Action	Owner	Due Date
Receive public comments on the SDoC CAB.	Public	6/27/2008
Detail the process by which P25 CAP will receive public comments on CABs and the method by which they will be disseminated to the GB.	Andrew Thiessen	7/15/2008
Analyze and send additional public	Andrew Thiessen &	7/15/2008

comments received on the SDoC CAB to GB.	David Keller	
Work on the Summary Test Report CAB.	National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)/Andrew Thiessen	TBD
Detail, if applicable, how ISSI may support testing.	NIST/Kurt Fischer	TBD

Discussion Notes:

1. Welcome
 - Luke Klein-Berndt called the meeting to order and established quorum.
 - Six of nine GB members participated on the call.
2. Approval of Final Laboratory Application Process CAB (see the SAFECOM Web site for CAB)
 - Luke Klein-Berndt moved to approve the Laboratory Application Process CAB.
 - Patrick Kenealy seconded the motion.
 - The motion passed unanimously.
3. Approval of Final Baseline Testing Requirements CAB (see the SAFECOM Web site for CAB)
 - Andrew Thiessen discussed a proposed change to the CAB based on a public comment made at the May 21, 2008, GB Open Session.
 - i. When emergency response agencies, the P25 CAP GB, and industry leaders refer to a test in the CAB it needs to be extremely simple; it should be consistent so that everyone knows what a set of tests actually mean.
 - ii. The previous version of the CAB did not explicitly call out what P25 standards a particular section was testing.
 - iii. The proposed change adds a third section (Reference of Baseline Compliance Assessment Tests) to the Baseline Requirements CAB that provides an exact reference that allows both industry members and emergency response officials to refer to a section.
 1. This change gives section number and specifies what the actual reference is.
 - iv. SDoCs, Summary Test reports, and other documents that reference tests in this CAB will be drafted in the same manner.
 - Luke Klein-Berndt moved to approve the Final Baseline Testing Requirements CAB with the proposed change.
 - Rick Adams seconded the motion.
 - The motion passed unanimously.
4. Discussion of Draft SDoC CAB (see the SAFECOM Web site for CAB)
 - Luke Klein-Berndt indicated the GB will take public comments on this CAB until close of business on Friday, June 27, 2008.
 - Andrew Thiessen provided an overview of the SDoC CAB.

- i. The Compliance Assessment Processes and Procedures Task Group produces a Telecommunications Services Bulletin which defines what an SDoC actually looks like. While the Bulletin provides a template for manufacturers to produce SDoCs, it does not do the following:
 - 1. State that manufacturers had to complete it
 - 2. Indicate what information has to be put in
 - 3. Indicate how to refer to a test
 - ii. This SDoC CAB details how industry members may complete an SDoC so that emergency response agencies can easily compare one manufacturer's product with another manufacturer's similar product. These guidelines ensure that the look of all SDoCs remains consistent.
 - 1. The CAB includes information on the right logos and names and specifies how industry should refer to their own corporation.
 - 2. Section 2.5 of this CAB will change to be consistent with the updated Final Baseline Testing Requirements CAB; the change concerns how a specific section is called out.
- Andrew Thiessen discussed public comments received to-date and indicated that additional public comments will be sent to the GB prior to the next GB session.
 - Andrew Thiessen indicated the P25 CAP will develop a process by which future CABs will be reviewed and approved by the GB, including the receipt and dissemination of public comments.
- 5. Public Comments on the P25 CAP
 - Samantha Hood from Motorola provided the following comments:
 - i. Two high-level concerns related to SDoC CAB and Baseline Requirements CAB
 - 1. Mandatory standard option and required standard option in the SDoC CAB
 - a. These options cause confusion and do not call out specific tests.
 - b. Removal of these options is recommended.
 - 2. Baseline Testing Requirements CAB's "rule of three" where infrastructure manufacturers have to test against at least three subscriber manufacturers (and vice versa)
 - a. Infrastructure manufacturers don't have the ability to force a subscriber manufacturer to test on their system.
 - i. The best approach is to make an open invitation.
 - b. With the first batch of recognized labs there may not be three infrastructure manufacturers that have recognized labs.
 - c. The "rule of three" is band specific – if one of the infrastructure manufacturers does not have infrastructure in a particular band, then one could claim that interoperability was not possible for their product.
 - d. From a subscriber manufacturer's perspective, there is a limited opportunity to test equipment.
 - i. For example, Motorola is only planning to open its lab during two scheduled events.

- e. Suggest replacement of the “rule of three” by items that are actionable by manufacturers to prevent the issues above
 - i. Require P25 infrastructure manufacturers that have recognized labs to invite all P25-licensed subscriber manufacturers to their interoperability events.
 - ii. From a grant funding eligibility perspective, require P25 subscribers to attend 100 percent of P25 infrastructure interoperability events when there are two or less certified labs or attend 50 percent of these events when there are more than two certified labs.
 - 1. Although the percentage is tied to grant funding, even if a manufacturer only tested against one infrastructure or subscriber manufacturer, the P25 CAP may still want to issue an SDoC.
- The GB provided the following comments on Motorola’s comments:
 - i. Luke Klein-Berndt indicated the P25 CAP will need to look at how to handle the start of the program.
 - 1. There may need to be a lot of special exceptions instituted.
 - a. A lot of these changes will depend on how many infrastructure manufacturer labs are certified in a timely manner during the P25 CAP kickoff.
- Roy McClellan of EADS provided the following comment:
 - i. Where does an infrastructure manufacturer like EADS go if they have infrastructure to test but don’t have a recognized lab?
 - 1. It is easy to move handsets back and forth but more difficult moving a rack of equipment.
- The GB provided the following comments on EADS’s comment:
 - i. The concept of the lab is more focused on personnel and the process.
 - 1. For example, if a subscriber has a recognized lab, they may go to the infrastructure manufacturer’s facility and perform the tests.
 - 2. The concept of a lab is not a fixed spot – manufacturers can travel to a particular infrastructure manufacturer to test their equipment.
- Roy McClellan of EADS provided the following response to the GB’s comments:
 - i. Does the notion of labs that are not recognized based on their physical location open the door to testing remotely using the ISSI via the web?
- The GB provided the following response to EADS’s follow-up comment:
 - i. No ISSI tests exist in the baseline testing requirements so the issue has not been examined deeply.
 - ii. Assessors are looking to see if manufacturers can run the tests.
 - 1. This can be completed assuming that tests are not performance-bound and that the Internet adds to the test.
- Randy Robinson of Tyco Electronics provided the following comment:
 - i. Can labs now apply to be recognized?

- The GB provided the following comment on Tyco Electronics' comment:
 - i. No – P25 CAP still needs PRA approval on the laboratory application form from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
 - ii. As soon as confirmation from the OMB Paperwork Reduction Act is received, applications can be received and an assessment of labs begun.

6. Adjournment