

Clarification Request

Request from: [Horst Hannappel Horst.Hannappel@mbs-software.de]

References: ["BTL Specified Tests-9.0.11"]

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 / Proposed Solution:

A number of tests for logging objects follow the following design pattern:

Test Concept: The log object is configured to acquire data by whatever means. ...

Test Steps:

```
...
#. WHILE(some condition on total-record-count) DO { }
...
```

The idea seems to be that the device is configured to show some constant flow of events that will gradually fill the buffer until the condition is met.

Depending on the device it may be cumbersome to configure such a constant flow of events. Especially for Event-Log that means a steady flow of alarms. These might also generate noise in other tests if they can not be easily started and stopped at will.

Other tests already show an other approach:
 If you look at test 7.3.2.24.3 you see it has

15. MAKE (IUT collect another record)

Therefore I propose that the necessary events may alternatively be generated by the tester after a MAKE statement. So the Step might read like:

```
#. IF (ManualEventGenerationSelected) THEN
    MAKE (generate the required number of events)
ELSE
    WHILE(some condition on total-record-count) DO { }
```

Tests that show this pattern:

7.3.2.24.6.1
 7.3.2.24.6.2
 7.3.2.24.7

7.3.2.24.8

7.3.2.24.9

Question:

Should the tests instead use the form of test 7.3.2.24.3 in all those other cases?

Response:

The BTL-WG agrees that these tests can be improved, and will propose changes in a revision of the tests at a future date.