

AV Project Assurance Review

Executive technical-readiness output | Sample Project A

TECHNICAL-READINESS OPINION

PROCEED WITH CONDITIONS

The project appears generally viable within the reviewed boundary, provided the defined conditions are resolved before procurement release and acceptance criteria are incorporated into the project record.

REVIEW BOUNDARY

Gate: Design Development to Award / Procurement

Corpus: Owner requirements, AV drawing set, room schedule, equipment schedule, integrator proposal, SOW, network requirements, and draft acceptance plan.

Excluded: Field verification, construction conditions, programming review, penetration testing, and enterprise security assessment.

Executive residual-risk statement

The project record is directionally coherent, but three material interfaces remain incompletely controlled: responsibility for AV network readiness, lifecycle disposition of a proposed substitution, and acceptance criteria for divisible-room operation. These conditions should be resolved before procurement release.

Prioritized findings

ID	Priority	Finding	Why it matters	Project-gate action
PA-01	HIGH	AV network prerequisites are referenced but not assigned to a named owner or dated readiness gate.	Procurement and installation can proceed while VLAN, QoS, multicast, PoE, or enterprise-service dependencies remain unresolved.	Assign owner, required evidence, and readiness date before procurement release.
PA-02	HIGH	Proposed processor substitution is not reconciled across drawings, BOM, control narrative, and support lifecycle.	The substitution may alter I/O, control, support, and commissioning assumptions.	Issue one coordinated substitution record and update affected documents before award.
PA-03	MEDIUM	Divisible-room acceptance criteria do not define required combined/ separate states or failure recovery.	Functional completion may be disputed because the intended behavior is not testable from the current record.	Add state-based acceptance tests before contract issue.
PA-04	LOW	Room schedule and reflected ceiling plan use inconsistent microphone quantities in two rooms.	Creates avoidable pricing and coordination ambiguity.	Normalize quantities and reissue the room schedule.

Evidence confidence

STRONG

Owner requirements, AV drawings, and room schedule are present and revision identified.

PARTIAL

Network requirements and acceptance plan exist but do not fully assign owners or gates.

NOT REVIEWED

Field conditions, code compliance, enterprise security posture, and final programming.

Project-Gate Action Plan

Conditions required to support the readiness opinion

Gate actions

Gate	Required action	Owner	Completion evidence	Status at review
Before procurement release	Approve an AV network responsibility matrix with dates for prerequisite readiness.	Owner IT / Network	Approved matrix and readiness evidence list	Open
Before award	Reconcile the processor substitution across BOM, drawings, control narrative, support plan, and pricing.	Designer / Integrator	Coordinated substitution record	Open
Before contract issue	Add divisible-room combined/separate-state acceptance tests and recovery behavior.	Designer / Owner AV	Revised ATP / acceptance section	Open
Before final issue	Normalize microphone quantities between room schedule and drawing set.	Designer	Reissued coordinated documents	Open

Cross-document validation examples

Requirements vs. drawings

Room intent is generally represented, but one user workflow is described in the requirements and absent from the control narrative.

Drawings vs. BOM

Most device counts align. Two microphone quantities and one proposed substitution require reconciliation.

BOM vs. SOW

The equipment list includes monitoring capability, while the SOW does not assign configuration, alert ownership, or handoff.

Design intent vs. acceptance

Core conferencing functions are represented, but divisible-room states and failure recovery are not yet testable.

Residual risks accepted or carried forward

- Final field conditions remain subject to installation verification.
- Enterprise security approval remains with the customer’s authorized security function.
- Programming quality and DSP tuning are not concluded from the pre-award document review.
- Product availability and commercial lead time should be revalidated at release.

Zero findings can be success. Cognitive AV is not paid by the finding. If the project record is sound and no material unresolved risk is identified, a Proceed opinion is a successful engagement.

Clarification boundary

One bounded written clarification cycle is included to explain the issued findings and project-gate actions. Corrective design, production CAD, programming, project management, commissioning execution, or continuing assurance support are separate scopes if requested.