

## Clarification Request

**References:** 135.1-2009 – Test 9.1.2.1, modified by Notes to Tester in BTL Specified Tests, and 135-2004c-11

*Italics/strikethrough* represent changes from **135.1 - 2009 - 9.1.2.3 to BTL - 9.1.2.3. Yellow highlighting** represents Proposed Solution.

### Background / Proposed Solution:

#### 9.1.2.3 Unsuccessful Alarm Acknowledgment of Confirmed Event Notifications Because the 'Event Object Identifier' is Invalid

#### Derived from 135.1 - 2009 - 9.1.2.3 Unsuccessful Alarm Acknowledgment of Confirmed Event Notifications Because the Referenced Object Does Not Exist

*Reason for Change: This test was updated to account for revision 5 specifications. There is no new SSPC proposal.*

**Purpose:** To verify that an alarm remains unacknowledged if the 'Event Object Identifier' represents an object that does not exist *or is not consistent with the other parameters that define the alarm being acknowledged.*

**Test Concept:** An alarm is triggered that causes the IUT to notify the TD and at least one other device. The TD acknowledges the alarm using an improper 'Event Object Identifier' and verifies that the acknowledgment is not accepted by the IUT and that the IUT does not notify other devices that the alarm was acknowledged. The TD then acknowledges the alarm using the proper 'Event Object Identifier' and verifies that the acknowledgment is properly noted by the IUT. The IUT notifies all other recipients that the alarm was acknowledged.

**Configuration Requirements:** The IUT shall be configured with at least one object that can detect alarm conditions and send confirmed notifications. The Acked\_Transitions property shall have the value B'111' indicating that all transitions have been acknowledged. The TD and at least one other BACnet device shall be recipients of the alarm notification.

**Test Steps:** The test steps defined in 9.1.2.1 shall be followed except that in the first AcknowledgeAlarm request the 'Time Stamp' shall have the same value as the 'Time Stamp' from the event notification and the 'Event Object Identifier' shall ~~have a value which is different from the 'Event Object Identifier' in the event notification and for~~ *specify an object that does not support or is not configured for alarming or, which does no object exists in the IUT..*

**Notes to Tester:** A passing result is the same message sequence described in 9.1.2.1 except that the Error Class ~~shall be OBJECT~~ and Error Code in step 7 *shall be OBJECT and UNKNOWN\_OBJECT if the object referenced by 'Event Object Identifier' does not exist or OBJECT and NO\_ALARM\_CONFIGURED if the object exists but does not support or is not configured for alarming.* For devices ~~that claiming a Protocol Revision less than of 5 or prior,~~ an Error Class of ~~SERVICES with an~~ and Error Code of ~~SERVICES and INCONSISTENT\_PARAMETERS~~ **or Error Class of OBJECT and Error Code of OTHER** shall also be ~~accepted~~ allowed.

### Question:

Should the tests 9.1.2.3 and 9.1.2.6 add the above-indicated yellow highlight alternative Error Class/Code to the acceptance criterion?

**Response:**

Yes.