

Clarification Request

References: 135.1-2013 - 9.23.1.12

Date of BTL-WG Response: January 7, 2015

☒ All actions necessitated have been completed

Background:

Test 9.23.1.12 is cited here specifically but this CR is intended to address a potential problem with many tests in both the BTL Specified Tests and 135.1. In short the problem is that there is not an explicit 'Wait UnconfirmedResponse Fail Time' step between steps 6 & 7. This is usually not a problem when the device responds within a reasonable time period where 'reasonable time period' is defined by the tester using common sense. The problem arises, however, when trying to use an automated tool to conduct the test. How long should the tool wait? 135.1 has defined two fail time values that seem appropriate when a response is expected from the IUT. Acknowledgement Fail Time for responses to confirmed requests and UnconfirmedResponse Fail Time for responses to unconfirmed requests but these fail times are not always used in test steps where they should be.

Unconfirmed Response Fail Time was invented at BTL-WG in 2010, and added into tests in sections 9.33.1, 9.33.2 and 13.5. All the tests written prior to that--such as the 9.32.1.12 and other tests of Who-Has execution in section 9.32, did not have WAIT statements added at that same time.

135.1-2013 - 9.23.1.12 Who-Has After Object_Name Changed

Dependencies: Who-Has Service Execution Tests, 9.32.1.2

BACnet Reference Clause: 16.9

Purpose: To verify that a device correctly responds to Who-Has service requests after the Object_Name property of an object in the device is changed.

Test Concept: The Object_Name property of the referenced object is read to determine its initial value. The Object_Name property is then changed to a different value, V2, which is not already used by an object in the IUT. The test then verifies correct responses to Who-Has requests that include an 'Object Name' parameter, using the values V1 and V2.

Configuration: An object, O1, exists within the IUT that has a modifiable Object_Name property and has the value V1. If IUT does not support objects with modifiable Object_Name properties, then this test shall be skipped.

Test Steps:

1. READ V1 = O1, Object_Name
2. IF (Object_Name is writable) THEN
 WRITE O1, Object_Name = V2
ELSE
 MAKE (O1, Object_Name = V2)
3. TRANSMIT
 DESTINATION = GLOBAL BROADCAST,
 Who-Has-Request,
 'Object Name' = V1
4. WAIT **Internal Processing Fail Time**
5. CHECK (Verify that the IUT does not respond with an I-Have request)

6. TRANSMIT
DESTINATION = GLOBAL BROADCAST,
Who-Has-Request,
'Object Name' = V2

7. Before UnconfirmedResponse Fail Time

78. RECEIVE
DESTINATION = LOCAL BROADCAST | GLOBAL BROADCAST,
I-Have-Request,
'Device Identifier' = (the IUT's Device object),
'Object Identifier' = O1,
'Object Name' = V2

Questions:

Should testers just ignore failures from automated tools that do not allow any response time for the IUT (is this a non-issue)?

Should an effort be made to add language in a general location such as 135.1 section 6.3.9 that allows the appropriate fail time to be implied even when not stated explicitly in the test steps?

Should an effort be made to correct other existing tests by adding the appropriate fail time?

Response:

- 1) Testers should manually verify the omitted RECEIVE if that is reported by an automated tool that implements no delay.**
- 2) No.**
- 3) Yes, wID0933 is created to change all tests where this applies.**