

### Clarification Request

**Request from:** "Horst Hannappel" <Horst.Hannappel@mbs-software.de>

**References:** BTL Test Plan 9.0.final

**Stage:** ☒ Request, ☐ Listed, ☐ Analysis, ☐ Resolved

**Actions necessitated:** ☒ Checklist/Test Plan change, ☐ BTL Specified Tests change,  
☐ SSPC Interpretation required, ☐ Implementation Guidelines change,

**Date of BTL-WG Response:** \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ All actions necessitated have been completed

#### Background:

#### checklist and testplan for the BIBBs SCHED-R-I-B, SCHED-WS-B, SCHED-I-B

the BIBBs SCHED-R-I-B and SCHED-WS-B look like describing subsets of the functionality of SCHED-I-B.

For marketing reasons vendors like to check any possible BIBB when they actually support the functionality. Problem is, that a naive compare of different implementations might see a missing BIBB in a device as negative.

#### Questions:

Assume a device can be configured to contain different schedule objects each conforming to one of the above mentioned BIBBs.

1. is the device allowed or even required to claim all three BIBBs in EPICS, PICS and BTL checklist?
2. Is it sufficient to execute the testplan for SCHED-I-B if one of the other BIBBs is marked in the checklist as SCHED-I-B covers the functionality of the other BIBBs?
3. The testplan for SCHED-WS-B contains a VerifyChecklist entry to verify that no exception schedule property exists in the device. This will fail when the device actually also support SCHED-I-B. Should that VC be removed or changed?

#### Response:

SCHED-WS-I-B and SCHED-R-B were defined for weaker devices, so any device capable of SCHED-I-B shall not claim SCHED-R-B nor SCHED-WS-I-B. They are mutually exclusive.