

## Clarification Request

**References:** BTL Test Plan 12.0

**Date of BTL-WG Response:** August 1, 2013

**Background:**

### 7.3.2.21.3.6 Recipient\_List Property Supports Network Address Recipients

**Purpose:** To verify that the Recipient\_List property of the Notification Class object supports the address form of the Recipient component. The intent is to ensure that the IUT is able to send notifications to the specified recipient.

**Test Concept:** The tester shall select a single event-generating object E in the IUT that references Notification Class object N. The tester shall add an entry into the Recipient\_List of the associated Notification Class object that specifies a BACnetAddress A, where A is a unicast or is a local, remote, or global broadcast address.

**Test Steps:**

1. WRITE N.RecipientList = ( {all days, all times, A, any process ID, FALSE, all transitions} )
2. MAKE (the event generating object, E, transition)
3. BEFORE **Notification Fail Time**  
 RECEIVE  
     DESTINATION = A,  
     UnconfirmedEventNotification-Request,  
     'Process Identifier' = (the valid process ID from step 1),  
     'Initiating Device Identifier' = IUT,  
     'Event Object Identifier' = E,  
     'Time Stamp' = (the current local time),  
     'Notification Class' = (N's instance),  
     'Priority' = (any valid priority),  
     'Event Type' = (any valid event type),  
     'Notify Type' = ALARM | EVENT,  
     'AckRequired' = TRUE | FALSE,  
     'From State' = (any valid event state),  
     'To State' = (any valid event state),  
     'Event Values' = (values appropriate to the event type)

**From the vendor:** ... the “Network Number 0 and MAC address X” should only function on an IUT that does not function as a BACnet router. When multiple network ports are present the IUT may not be able to distinguish which port(s) was the desired the port.

**BTL Manager notes:** When applying test 135.1-2009g-7 - 7.3.2.21.3.X (which going forward, will be numbered as 135.1-2011 - 7.3.2.21.3.6) The concept I have of routers is that they have one Application entity, that homes on one network, and that it acts always in its NPDU packet emissions as though it is homed on one network. I do though, understand that the single-home vs multi-home debate is not an entirely settled matter throughout the BACnet community.

**Question:**

Should test 135.1-2009g-7 - 7.3.2.21.3.X (which going forward, will be numbered as 135.1-2011 - 7.3.2.21.3.6) in concept be relaxed to omit the “Network Number 0” behavior testing when the IUT functions as a BACnet router?

**Response:**

**Yes. We believe this is an SSPC-135 matter and needs to be decided before that committee. Until then, routers cannot be required to support the network number 0.**