

Clarification Request

References: BTL Specified Tests-18.1_final.pdf

Date of BTL-WG Response: 2022-01-13

Overview:

Whenever a subscription is made with any process identifier V1 and again subscribing to the same object with different process identifier V2, then IUT should transmit COVNotification to the latest subscription only with process identifier V2.

We have one device in lab after subscribing to it with process identifier V1 and again subscribing to the same object with different process identifier V2 IUT initiates COVNotification to both the subscriptions with process identifier V1 and V2 as well.

Hence, when Subscription is transmitted with process identifier V5, IUT initiates total 5 COVNotifications with process identifier from V1 to V5.

9.10.1.X1 Ensuring 5 Concurrent COV Subscribers

Reason For Change: No test exists for this functionality. This test is not in any SSPC proposal.

Purpose: This test case verifies that the IUT can support 5 concurrent subscriptions.

Test Concept: Have the TD subscribe with 5 different process identifiers, V1 through V5, and then check to ensure that 5 notifications are sent when the monitored object changes.

Test Steps:

```

1. REPEAT (X=V1 to V5) DO {
  TRANSMIT SubscribeCOV-Request,
    'Subscriber Process Identifier' = X,
    'Monitored Object Identifier' = (any object supporting COV notifications),
    'Issue Confirmed Notifications' = TRUE | FALSE,
    'Lifetime' = (any valid value that will allow the subscription to outlast the test)
  RECEIVE BACnet-SimpleACK-PDU
  IF (if confirmed notifications were requested) THEN
    BEFORE Notification Fail Time
    RECEIVE ConfirmedCOVNotification-Request,
      'Subscriber Process Identifier' = X,
      'Initiating Device Identifier' = IUT,
      'Monitored Object Identifier' = (the same object used in the subscription),
      'Time Remaining' = (any valid value),
      'List of Values' = (the initial Present_Value and initial Status_Flags)
    TRANSMIT BACnet-SimpleACK-PDU
  ELSE
    BEFORE Notification Fail Time
    RECEIVE UnconfirmedCOVNotification-Request,
      'Subscriber Process Identifier' = X,
      'Initiating Device Identifier' = IUT,
      'Monitored Object Identifier' = (the same object used in the subscription),
      'Time Remaining' = (any valid value),
      'List of Values' = (the initial Present_Value and initial Status_Flags)
  }
2. MAKE (Present_Value = any value that differs from "initial Present_Value" such that a COV notification
would be generated)

```

```
3. REPEAT (X=V1 to V5) DO {
  IF (if confirmed notifications were requested) THEN
    RECEIVE ConfirmedCOVNotification-Request,
      'Subscriber Process Identifier' = X,
      'Initiating Device Identifier' = IUT,
      'Monitored Object Identifier' = (the same object used in the subscription),
      'Time Remaining' = (any valid value),
      'List of Values' = (the new Present_Value and Status_Flags)
    TRANSMIT BACnet-SimpleACK-PDU
  ELSE
    RECEIVE UnconfirmedCOVNotification-Request,
      'Subscriber Process Identifier' = X,
      'Initiating Device Identifier' = IUT,
      'Monitored Object Identifier' = (the same object used in the subscription),
      'Time Remaining' = (any valid value),
      'List of Values' = (the new Present_Value and Status_Flags)
  }
}
Passing Result: The notification in step 3 can be received in any order by the TD.
```

Question:

1. Is this implementation acceptable, of sending multiple COVNotification even if subscription is sent with new Process Identifier for same Object instance?
2. Or it is required for IUT to initiate only single COVNotification for that current process identifier.

Response:

1. **No. Only the new COV subscription context or COV re-subscription context should be sent a COV notification.**
2. **Yes.**