

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

Role	Comments?
Consultant	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the exact problem you are trying to solve? 2. If it ain't broke don't try to fix it.
Industry: Manufacturer	<p>AHJ's that don't have the experience to review and approve plans need to have a trusted SME they can use if needed. Bottom line is the AHJ is responsible for their jurisdiction and the safety of first responders comm systems. We do need better clearly defined requirements in the codes since there are still too many subjective interpretations. It is getting better though, and SBC is leading the way to help do that. Keep it up!</p>
Industry: Systems Integrator	<p>Although the intent is to provide legitimacy to the test results, and accountability to the installation companies; don't overlook requiring copies of FFC GROL and factory certified test technician certifications along with using approved calibrated testing equipment with written certificate of validation.</p>
Industry: Systems Integrator	<p>As a company that is approved tester and installations u believe you are opening can of worms by allowing this. We have to fix many installation by these folks.</p>
Govt: Code Official	<p>As a government official, I cannot recommend a vendor nor require a vendor for the testing or installation. I can, however, inform the building owner/general contractor of vendors that have worked within our jurisdiction previously. We recommend that the vendor that tests the building, not be the installing vendor but we cannot stop this practice. We do review the results from the test prior to determining if the ERCES system is required. Some of the information we have gathered from the owner/GC's that we have discussed this with indicated that they were offered a reduction in the testing price if they were required to have a system installed by the same vendor. I truly do believe that this can be a conflict of interest, however, it is completely impractical for our agency to hire and maintain someone that performs a determination test and a post-install acceptance test. We require upon inspection of this system that they power down the system and verify the results that were initially indicated. Then they are to power up and show the improvement at the numbers that were indicated on the post-install submittal.</p>

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>As a signal strength tester and system installer, we take a great deal of pride on conducting accurate and detailed reports to both determine the BDA system necessity and commissioning BDA systems.</p> <p>I do agree that there is a conflict of interest, but companies (like us) who take pride in their work and to build trust with all AHJs we work with, our first priority is to involve the AHJ as much as possible to verify signal strength reporting and BDA system documentation. Trusted installers should not be restricted from testing the signal and installing a complete BDA system. Because like AHJs face manpower issues on plan review and site visits, there is also not enough reliable system integrators to cover this much ground.</p> <p>We are certified PCTEL public safety testers and install the best UL2524 signal boosters on the market. I should not be forced to rely on someone else to test my system and also have to be subject to finding that third party, though it should always be an option for installers who lack that manpower.</p> <p>We have begun conducting signal tests for several other installers who do not have the time, and the process has worked out great for everyone involved, but this should be encouraged, not required.</p> <p>I also believe AHJs could adopt a quick process for testers to fill out a form and gain written approval to conduct the signal strength test. This form would verify all frequency requirements, and the testers credentials prior to conducting the test. This process would increase trust between the AHJs and the testers/installers, which would also weed out untrusted testers as well.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>As and SI focusing in building the last 7 years I never understood how I could test, recommend, design, install, and certify my own system. I always thought it should be another qualified tester. Some districts do a more involved acceptance test with the inspector post final report some just do a few can you hear me nows and let it ride. Unfortunately all municipalities have so few people who have any understanding of the code and requirements there is no one on their end to do the acceptance.</p>
<p>Govt: Code Official</p>	<p>As the AHJ I have had testers resubmit for not following the proper method of testing. Out of many tests and companies only one company seemed to be out to sell a system that was not needed. If need be the AHJ can request the initial test be redone with the AHJ present to witness the parameters of testing.</p>

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>Code covers the 3rd party requirement as does the FCC. In terms of only installing what's needed if it's needed.</p> <p>Many jurisdictions lack the knowledge to even approve/deny/question the systems.</p>
<p>Govt: Public Safety Radio System Administrator / Operator</p>	<p>Every vendor I've spoken to thus far says they can adequately test downlink, but have no ability to test uplink. Salt Lake City Fire performs exclusive testing.</p> <p>We're going to discuss this during an upcoming webinar, and would love to hear your expert opinion if you're willing to join us. Thank you.</p> <p>https://www.slc.gov/calendar/events/das/</p>
<p>Govt: Public Safety Radio System Administrator / Operator</p>	<p>For the first question, although I think vendors should be able to test and also bid, I don't think the AHJ should take their opinion as the one and only. For instance, if another vendor tests and finds conflicting results, it is the responsibility of the developer/owner to determine how to proceed.</p> <p>The property rep should be acting in consideration of needing to comply with the fire code at the conclusion of the project.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>Forcing an integrator that has qualified personnel certified on RF survey test equipment to pay for a third-party testing service is fundamentally wrong. It unnecessarily raises the cost to the integrator and the customer. If an integrator is qualified and accepted by the AHJ, the integrator should be trusted to perform proper pre- and post- install surveys. The post-install survey will confirm a functional ERCES - or it will identify shortcomings which can be addressed immediately. Requiring coordination between a third-party RF survey company and the integrator always leads to more costs and time delay.</p>

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>I can fully appreciate the concern that pretesting, installing, and acceptance testing for one vendor can be a concern. It seems that with this and almost anything else if someone chooses to be dishonest they will find a way around whatever is placed in front of them and be dishonest. It will eventually catch up with them but unfortunately casts a shadow on the rest. From my perspective, there are few, mostly urban dense areas with significant radio infrastructure and support personnel who are driving ordinances, procedures and new regulations based on their experiences. There is nothing wrong with that but my experience has revealed that even in large metropolitan areas the AHJ's have little understanding of ERCES and do not have the support personnel to assist them so the whole issue around just getting what is needed in place is far from organized which makes things very difficult for them, the integrator, and the venue owner. I believe emphasis should be on just getting everyone on board the train while it moves slowly but surely along.....rather than expect the few who drive the train rapidly along, keeping up to their pace and expecting others along the way to "jump aboard". I don't know many willing to jump aboard a fast moving train, do you? I have been trying to get others in my region on board and find that most AHJ's are reluctant to get involved because RF systems are not in their wheelhouse, and they do not have the support. Just this week I reached out to a large city in California to get their requirements (IFC 510.4.2.2) and was shocked to find out they have been working on putting something together for over 2 years since they have "seen this come up more and more". It's no different in my area. I regularly meet with AHJ's, General Contractors, Electrical Engineering groups, and Architectural firms to help educate them on what this is and what they need to do. I have worked with NICET to as a writer/reviewer for their Level II, III credentialing test and have been shocked to find out from others around the country how far along they are and how developed their regions are compared to what I have seen. Consider this, in 2004 the FCC began the 800MHz rebanding for Public Safety and calculated a budget and time frame to complete it. Well, we know it was insanely over budget and it just wrapped up not so long ago making it ~15 years in duration.....and they had a plan with industry experts helping every step. Well ERCES was introduced in 2009 and we are just getting noticed more now. Let's not get this train moving so fast no one dares jump aboard. I guess you can look at it like federal verses the states in government..... anytime you can leave it to the people to decide it is a better thing, if it is in the code, and the AHJ has the final say it is the same thing and is localized, or "in the hands of the people", the focus should be getting the local AHJ on board to begin with. If you have any questions about the "wild west" you can call me at 801-420-1455. Thanks for asking my opinion.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>I feel that 2 options in question 3 are reasonable. Yes test with the AHJ if the AHJ is qualified and capable. If the AHJ does not have the proper resources or training, a third party test should be performed to certify a system and it should be performed by an AHJ approved vendor from a list of at least 2 companies.</p>

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

<p>Govt: Public Safety Radio System Administrator / Operator</p>	<p>I have several trusted vendors that do the pre-testing, I provide a list as we cannot endorse any particular one. Many buildings pass without needing a system. For those that do need ERRCS, there is a more narrow list of vendors that, again, are trusted. Sometimes it is the same vendor and sometimes it is not. As an FCC licensed engineer and AHJ I review all plans and attend final testing as does our engineer from our regional cooperative system we operate on. A rebroadcast authorization is required with a final test on site to insure uplink levels are appropriate to our towers and we require Class A systems which also narrows the scope of vendors. However, there are many smaller municipalities even in our region that do not have any internal resources capable of managing these concerns or even have any technical knowledge at all. Even for my agency, I have to depend on vendors as I do not have staff to actually perform the testing. This is all a very good discussion to be having, thank you! Ron Parks - Chandler, Arizona Police Department. Phoenix Metropolitan Region, Regional Wireless Cooperative.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>I see that a big problem in the RF Coverage Assessments for inbuilding applications are being done incorrectly by some integrators. I have seen many reports where the integrator has failed a building even though the building passed the Downlink coverage test. In these cases the integrator fails the building for UP Link. This is due to some training that is being done where the integrator is simply subtracting -13 db from the measured DL signal level and since that level is lower than -95 dbm they fail the building. This is an incorrect way of looking at it, as they dont know, what receive antenna, Tower Top Amp or LNA is being used in the receive side of the base station.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>In cases where third-party testing is required, I've never seen the AHJ regulate pricing and they rarely cover the costs themselves. This makes each market vulnerable to predatory pricing hikes which can hurt business and development. The more of this process directly managed by the AHJ, the better.</p>
<p>Retired Fire Marshal / RF test consultant - Spectrum RF LLC</p>	<p>In my experience some of the most egregious failures of BDA installations have come from jurisdictions who allow one party to pretest, install and final test. Third party testing is the most practical solution to the twin problems of conflict of interest and limited knowledge by AHJ. If properly vetted, third party test vendors add very little to the cost of a building project...BDA installed or not.</p> <p>I extend services to oversee the installation of BDA products as well. Oversight is just another area sorely lacking in this industry. Very few AHJ have the staff or RF expertise to properly qualify, inspect and finalize these systems.</p>

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

<p>Govt: Public Safety Radio System Administrator / Operator</p>	<p>In my opinion the most significant conflict of interest is not the companies who "pre-test" and then may proceed to design solution. The most significant conflict of interest is after a solution is designed and installed by company "A" and then is company "A" is also the same one that performs the coverage testing inspection. This is "foxes running the hen-house" as they say, or at the very least would be considered "self-policing". In my opinion, a separate third-party should always be required to perform any "official" testing after the install. The issue here is that the conflict of interest leans heavily against more strict testing, and more towards "erring on the side of profit" and therefore against the best interests of safety. Pardon the long description here, but I think fine detail on this issue will add needed insight... Example: company A has completed an expensive design/install project for a new building. Whether there have been delays or not there is likely significant pressure to pass inspections in order to meet TCO deadlines. If there is some flaw in the design or the installation that requires adding additional service antennas to truly resolve it best, this will cause further delay. When the FCC licensee comes to perform their BDA RF tests (to protect Macro from interference) they may require the installer to reduce power or gain settings (we do this frequently in our jurisdiction). The FCC licensee inspection must be performed first (before coverage testing) because it could impact the coverage results. This can put the installer in a position where they are tempted to either: a) tweak the results of the coverage testing they perform to ensure there is no TCO delay, or b) after the Licensee inspection has reduced their gain/power settings, the installer goes behind them and modifies the gain/power settings in order to "pass" coverage. Then once the building has passed coverage, will they remember to reinstate the settings that the licensee imposed on them? If they do not, it could endanger the entire macro system outside the building. If they do go back to the licensee settings, then it is likely the building still has insufficient coverage. Either way is not an optimal situation. As a result, when we perform our licensee inspections, if we require any gain/power settings changes that could alter coverage results, we make sure to also test any weak areas known to the installer so that they still have confidence that their design/install will pass coverage. If they are just not able to make the system work with the modified settings, we do our best to urge to resolve the issue the right way (add more antennas, etc.), however, as long as they keep the settings we require and do not exceed the levels we define, they have "passed", and it is up to them whether or not they should proceed to the next step of performing a coverage test and an AHJ inspection (some level of poor coverage is acceptable, 95%, etc.). Unfortunately, this process adds time to our inspections and is not really our role to measure the performance of the system inside the building, as these enhancement systems are not required by FCC licensees, but rather they are a fire code requirement.</p> <p>All that being said, once the building has met all requirements and "passed" by a separate 3rd party "double-check", I do not see a conflict of interest if the original design/installation company also acquires a contract for annual maintenance and follow up testing on the building. From that</p>
<p>Govt: Code Official</p>	<p>In our jurisdiction we currently test our own buildings, which puts us at an advantage and eliminates the concerns we were having with companies being able to test and bid on the project. However, once the building requires a system, we require the company to perform their own test for design purposes and post-install records. We also perform a post-install to insure the noise floor is not affected and system is not leaking to the exterior. I feel that more specific standards on who can install and design systems is what would be most helpful.</p>

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

<p>Govt: Code Official</p>	<p>In our jurisdiction we would not even think of requiring the same third party restrictions on fire alarm systems, which I understand is simpler in testing as you see the results more readily as compared to RF testing. Also, some consideration must be made in that the annual test is sometimes done by a contractor other than the installing contractor. In truth, I don't want to be responsible for vetting a third party contractor that I don't know personally how they perform. I have already been party to a conversation where two contractors are bitter competitors, already suspect of each other's motives, and now one of the two gets to sign-off on the other's work.</p>
<p>Govt: Code Official</p>	<p>In regard to the last question, all jurisdictions have the ability to use third party technical experts as they choose. There is no reason to add such language to any NFPA standards. See IFC 104.7.2 (2018) and NFPA 1 section 1.15 (2018)</p>
<p>Govt: Public Safety Radio System Administrator / Operator</p>	<p>Inspections need to take place with the active involvement of both the AHJ and the FCC Licensee. Many Governmental entities are unable/unwilling to develop vendor lists as Management and/or the Legal Beagles do not believe they have the required qualifications to determine who those vendors should be. Their stated concern is that if a company was not on the recommended list, a law suit could/would be filed challenging the exclusion. I know of one jurisdiction that gives verbal recommendations, but will not provide names in a documented format. The bottom line is the FCC Licensee is the ONLY entity that can provide authorization for an ERCES to be turned on. Hopefully, that person is not the City or County Clerk, but someone with the RF technical expertise to make an informed decision.</p>
<p>Industry: Manufacturer</p>	<p>It is a conflict of interest for a company that bids and loses a job to be the inspection service determining compliance of a job installation by another vendor. A complete test along with documentation from the installation company should be sufficient. Should a vendor do substandard work or not follow local code the AHJ can not give a permit for installation. If a totally objective 3rd party inspector could be found they could verify the numbers and readings submitted by the installation company.</p>

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>It is the jurisdictions responsibility to provided oversight and fully vet the results. Permit fees alone for this type of work could easily be referenced as viable revenue stream to off-set training or additional headcount for municipal employees to become proficient at review test results. The integrator, a licensed electrical contracting professional, should be able to take the project from initial assessment to acceptance and approval by the AHJ. If a specific GC, REIT or building owner wants to implement as a best practice and mandate that there be some independence, avoid a conflict or interest in an effort to get a better performing solution that should be up to them as they are paying for it. There is already too much nepotism in small, solution orientated ecosystems it shouldn't become institutionalized by municipalities or similar oversight bodies that should be focused on transparency, performance and inclusivity of qualified solution providers. These approaches also are not taking into account the very likely scenarios where new or empty buildings will initially pass a inspection pre-occupancy and may not once it is filled and fully functional. These projects are going to be very dynamic and required a lot of coordination across AHJs, integrators, equipment providers, GCs, building owners, etc.. Trying to add additional layers of 'peer oversight' or 'independent verification' is adding complexity and expense to already very challenging project with no clear ROI. An integrator should be able to provide verifiable documentation that the system is working as designed and performs to the satisfaction of the local AHJ. It is unrealistic to think with the still evolving code, very small pool of qualified talent and the required investment in equipment and training that it would be commercially viable to try to implement many of the recommendations covered in this survey.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>Knee-jerk regulations needlessly creates complications to otherwise straightforward situations that can be solved with simple checks and balances that often result from the free market being allowed to use competition and creativity to solve problems. All that is needed for that to work are commonsense guard rails that are thought out with appropriate input from all participants.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>Most approved testing companies, already are an approved vendor that maintains or works with public safety radio systems in the state/region they are performing testing. Therefore they have security clearance and the staff and support to perform Uplink testing via accessing the Public Safety Radio System. This should be the requirement, being certified with the systems, FCC license and other criteria set by the Public Safety System Manager and sometimes the AHJ. As far as DAQ (can you hear me know) testing, there needs to be very stringent requirements and training because it is so subjective.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>Need to be very careful on restricting the work. Other Life Safety systems for example- they have NFPA forms to complete for installations. This allows the installer to "certify" the system. It's then up to the AHJ to do there part of the acceptance testing.</p> <p>I think the more important issue is the AHJ's - proper education- to say if a facility needs or doesn't need a system. The data doesn't lie.</p>

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>Overall the AHJ should put the same effort in to understanding and testing the systems as they do with outer systems. Train / Hire one inspector to focus on ERRCS.</p> <p>If pretested, installed and post tested by the same contractor, ultimately the contractor assumes liability for the performance of the system and any interference issues.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>Seeing how the testing needs to happen throughout the construction, the initial test (pre ground breaking) could be done by a non-bidding party to determine the base line but the during construction mid phase testing and final acceptance testing should be the installing contractor for they have to complete a full functional test to complete all paper work anyway. More cost on the customer if a third party is required.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>Setting requirements for accepted, calibrated equipment that is used for testing as well as some supervision by the AHJ, particularly on post-installation testing, may help to develop some consistency from vendor to vendor. I've seen vendors use a radio and converting the RSSI reading to dBm and using that as the pre and post installation testing results.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>Testing is an integral part of the initial design process. If tests were required to be reviewed and validated by a Registered Engineer in conjunction with the plans and design documents Some of the testing issues could be solved while allowing contractors to provide turnkey services. AHJ should be responsible for Code and Coverage Compliance not limiting Contractors Service offerings.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>Testing should only be acceptable from an organization that has certified equipment and certified technical staff using the equipment. The test results need to be based on criteria set by the local AHJ. The final approval/disapproval needs to be performed as a live DAQ test by a trained and certified AHJ, or an organization approved by the AHJ.</p> <p>The end result is that Public Safety personnel must have radio coverage within the structure.</p>
<p>Govt: Code Official</p>	<p>Thank-you for initiating this survey. Can you please make the survey results available? We are all struggling with this code requirement.</p>

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>The AHJ is often the entity that dictates ERCES system necessity. In addition, in almost all cases, the AHJ is engaged to provide their jurisdictions' requirements, code compliance, and DAQ testing upon completion. I see no conflict of interest, as the interactions with the AHJ protect against any lack of integrity. With municipal integrations, it is even more vetted by the (usual) requirement to garner 3 bids. I think it may be optional to utilize 3rd party acceptance testing, completely up to the AHJ/jurisdiction. In any case, the AHJ SHOULD be present for the testing, again to maintain and protect the integrity and reputation of all involved parties.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>The ERCES industry is already full of so many regulations the profitability of doing this work versus similar type jobs (cell boosters for example) make it difficult to justify pursuing the business. If anything, this market needs less regulation, not more.</p> <p>All of these rules place an undue burden on the fire department, the customer and the installer. If the FCC can allow integrators to install microwave communications without such strict regulation, the ERCES industry should take note.</p> <p>The assumption behind these regulations is that integrators are not honest enough to do the job correctly in the first place. This notion has been proven false in almost every other industry segment regarding communications products.</p> <p>If a company has to be "certified" to do the work or hold a specific license, that is one thing. All of the rules and regulations surrounding this market now is overreach and should not be allowed.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>The goal here should be to have a standard that allows AHJs to ensure buildings have the required coverage. Having a testing standard spelled out would ensure that testing guidelines were consistent. If a particular software or tool is required by the AHJ, it will also ensure a consistent test result. Separating out testing and installation should not be necessary. Even if a building is tested, that does not prevent the building owner from getting additional quotes. I think splitting them out and requiring an approved list as opposed to approved standards/ hardware and software would limit the ability of the AHJ to get the best level of service and could indeed create additional costs to the building owner.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>The issue I often see is unqualified integrators performing tests in a way that generates failures, therefore requiring a system to be installed where it is not needed. Often the AHJ lacks the expertise to understand what is happening, or the report never goes to the AHJ. Systems have been installed where they are not needed, and this is mostly attributed to integrators who do not even understand what they are doing. I have heard, first hand, integrators who have said, "We shouldn't be doing these because we have no idea what we are doing." This was after I went to their project and fixed their system...</p>

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

<p>Property Owner / End User</p>	<p>The last question also would create a possible “restraint of trade” issue.</p> <p>How is this any different than a company installing a code required fire alarm and the certifying the installation for acceptance and then annual testing and maintenance?</p> <p>Where’s the concern of third party oversight in this scenario?</p> <p>The same malfeasance can occur with and mandated life safety system because the complexity of the system prevents most owners from falling prey. It is up to the owner to manage their business and the jurisdiction to provide oversight that it meets code not regulate how to meet code.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>The list of qualified vendors in any given jurisdiction is a relatively short one and consists of competitors and/or subcontractors of the installing companies looking to award the contract for third-party final testing. The competitors have an interest in failing the system and the sub-contractors have an interest in collecting a check and being offered contracts on future work.</p>
<p>Industry: professional services/Consultant</p>	<p>The pertinent point is that the AHJ/Licensee needs to be involved in determining who is qualified to perform the work. This determination must be made by a qualified agent of the jurisdiction who has the knowledge to make such a decision.</p>

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

<p>Consultant- We do independent third party assessment testing but do not design/build</p>	<p>The system integrator who does the assessment testing does have a potential conflict of interest as well as potential liability. Consider the scenario where the envelope stage assessment testing indicates a system will not be needed. Not uncommon with wood frame structures. Sometime later, perhaps during an annual review, or during a first responder incident on premises, it is found that a system is needed. Who is responsible for correcting the coverage shortfall, and perhaps faces a claim if someone is injured? In our area it would be the building owner/developer who would then need to pursue the integrator/GC. As a result the integrator / testing entity has an incentive, to avoid liability, to say a system is needed when in fact one may not. The flip side is when an integrator does testing and falsely says that a system is needed in order to win the design build project and reap a financial reward. I believe the AHJ needs to have detailed assessment procedures and at least send an official to the site to do some uplink testing.</p> <p>At the same time, the developer/property owner and GC needs to be educated about their responsibility to insure radio coverage not only at occupancy, but years later. And, that their contractual agreements have language that clearly defines who is responsible for the consequences of any assessment shenanigans, design and system performance short falls. I believe that this type of education will help mitigate conflict of interest issues.</p> <p>Last year I was told on two occasions by a GC that they were told by an integrator that if one grid failed on a grid test that this meant a failed test and that the entire building would need a system. I have been also asked by a GC to fudge test results in order to get pass the assessment test and not hold up a certificate of occupancy. The vast majority of integrators and GC's are honest. Continuing education based around testing protocols/deliverables as well as the key items that should be addressed in construction agreements will help.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>There is just as much potential for conflict of interest by requiring 3rd party testing. If unscrupulous, they have an incentive to fail projects so as to charge for re-inspections. We have also seen 3rd parties change requirements between re-inspections so the re-inspection will fail, again. A 3rd party can also provide "optional" services to "ensure" the inspection passes. When this "fee" is paid, failing projects suddenly become passing. Honesty is required by all parties, and requiring 3rd party testing only leads to more costs to the building owner and just shifts the onus of honesty to a different party. The AHJ and radio shops should closely inspect all tests and documentation as part of the permit process (already charging high fees in many jurisdictions to cover this).</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>Third party testing is much preferred over third party test review</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>Third party verification works in DC.</p>

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

Govt: Code Official	This is a huge problem here in South Florida! Thank you for reaching out and assisting us in tackling this growing issue.
3rd party test service for ERRCS	This is an essential quality control function that should not be bypassed. Ask Boeing how self certification has helped their business. Ethics are necessary to ensure both the building owner and the AHJ interests are maintained. Expertise and knowledge is necessary to ensure "system" functionality meets spec. 3rd party testing also simplifies coordination and the number of people that access the radio network. 3rd party testing is as valuable to the building owner as to the AHJ. Contractors, system suppliers, integrators and maintenance suppliers are by definition not a 3rd party test service. The CA SMOG program designates "test only" stations to perform the test and submit documentation and "repair" stations to fix issues. This is a highly efficient and effective program with a proven track record of success. This approach minimizes government involvement, delays and cost and benefits the community on many levels.
Industry: Systems Integrator	this is so important to get this in place ASAP.
Industry: Systems Integrator	<p>Using a third party to test is reasonable but has downfalls.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lead time to test and provide reports. 2. Work flow issues. 3. Test equipment availability and specifications. 4. Qualifications and renewals. 5. Who pays for this testing? This could lead into conflict of interests as well. 6. Will there be a uniform standard for test results?
Govt: Public Safety Radio System Administrator / Operator	Usually third parties wind being just as crooked as the vendors.

THIRD PARTY TESTING SURVEY COMMENTS

June 2022

<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>Vendors who illegally falsify pre-test results so that they can win design build projects should have their business or contractors license is fined and or revoked. With DAQ and BER being the criteria for ERRCS coverage results any vendor performing pre-testing should be collaborating and consulting with the AHJ radio shop. That is going to give the AHJ more insight to the pre-tests being performed. My experience has seen having third-party involvement leads to less oversight and collaboration with the AHJs where the AHJ and entities of third parties acquiring abusive levels of power in the system.</p>
<p>Govt: Public Safety Radio System Administrator / Operator</p>	<p>We don't have a hard and fast rule about testers also being the installers. I would say that 90% of our pre and post testing is done by third parties and that works well, with most vendors being very supportive.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>We find that about 60 percent of the buildings we test pass without a system. The ones that do need a system rarely need it for the entire building. We push to pre wire a building then test once site is complete to only install what's needed. With the wires in place, if the RF changes or another building is built between ours and the tower, we can simply and cheaply add more coverage. This future proofs the building and protects the client.</p>
<p>Govt: Code Official</p>	<p>We have a population of >75,000 people and also a >30,000 student university in the city. The fire prevention consists of the fire marshal only, so there are many things that need to be prioritized or put under the purview of others. We currently have a third party do the majority of these (it is also the company that installed and maintains our public safety radio system), but we have allowed other third party companies do it. I'm not sure what is the best method, but with the workload of a fire prevention bureau that is majorly understaffed, any solution would be great.</p>
<p>Govt: Code Official</p>	<p>We have seen some conflicts in the process of testing and bidding. We are lucky enough to know our area and radio system capabilities well enough that when testing results look out of sorts for the area we flag them. We then work in conjunction with our radio division manager who reviews the results and may then send his own crew to the site to test. We have explored having one or two approved vendors in the area but this created conflict as well. Before we allow the testing we do our best to verify the company and have a rep on site to watch or witness the testing.</p>
<p>Industry: Systems Integrator</p>	<p>will be alot of hurdles. as we see already, RF companies sabotaging fire alarm companies. Fire companies hurting their business so they not happy with that.</p>