

## Clarification Request

**References:** BTL testplan 5.0 final, tests 9.10.1.1 and 9.10.1.2

**Date of BTL-WG Response:** \_\_24-May-2011\_\_

### Background / Proposed Solution:

Problem #1: The test specifications are broken, the tests require support for either confirmed or unconfirmed COV (or both, at least one of the two options is required if the IUT supports COV). Teststep 2 requires a simple ack in all cases regardless which of the two options is supported. The tests will only pass, if the IUT supports both options.

The structure of the tests need to be re-worked (including the IF/ELSE statement).

Problem #2: Typo in 9.10.1.2 must read: unconfirmed instead of confirmed in step 3.

### 9.10.1.1 Confirmed COV Notifications

Reason For Change: This test incorrectly used a WAIT instead of the BEFORE structure when defining the delay before the notification may be sent. This test is not in any SSPC proposal.

Purpose: To verify that the IUT correctly responds to a SubscribeCOV request to establish a subscription for confirmed COV notifications. An implementation that supports COV reporting cannot respond with an error for both this test and the test in 9.10.1.2.

Test Steps:

1. TRANSMIT SubscribeCOV-Request,
  - 'Subscriber Process Identifier' = (any valid process identifier),
  - 'Monitored Object Identifier' = (any object supporting COV notifications),
  - 'Issue Confirmed Notifications' = TRUE,
  - 'Lifetime' = (any value > 0 if automatic cancellation is supported, otherwise 0)

#### 2. RECEIVE BACnet-SimpleACK-PDU

3. IF (the IUT supports confirmed notifications) THEN
  - BEFORE Notification Fail Time**
  - RECEIVE ConfirmedCOVNotification-Request,
    - 'Subscriber Process Identifier' = (the same identifier used in the subscription),
    - 'Initiating Device Identifier' = IUT,
    - 'Monitored Object Identifier' = (the same object used in the subscription),

'Time Remaining' = (any value > 0 if automatic cancellation is supported, otherwise 0),  
 'List of Values' = (values appropriate to the object type of the monitored object)

**ELSE**

**BEFORE Notification Fail Time**

RECEIVE BACnet-Error PDU,

Error Class = SERVICES,

Error Code = SERVICE\_REQUEST\_DENIED | OTHER

### 9.10.1.2 Unconfirmed COV Notifications

Reason For Change: This test incorrectly used a WAIT instead of the BEFORE structure when defining the delay before the notification may be sent. This test is not in any SSPC proposal.

Purpose: To verify that the IUT correctly responds to a SubscribeCOV request to establish a subscription for unconfirmed COV notifications. An implementation that supports COV reporting cannot respond with an error for both this test and the test in 9.10.1.1.

Test Steps:

1. TRANSMIT SubscribeCOV-Request,

'Subscriber Process Identifier' = (any valid process identifier),

'Monitored Object Identifier' = (any object supporting COV notifications),

'Issue Confirmed Notifications' = FALSE,

'Lifetime' = (any value > 0 if automatic cancellation is supported, otherwise 0)

2. RECEIVE BACnet-SimpleACK-PDU

3. IF (the IUT supports confirmed notifications) THEN

**BEFORE Notification Fail Time**

RECEIVE UnconfirmedCOVNotification-Request,

'Subscriber Process Identifier' = (the same identifier used in the subscription),

'Initiating Device Identifier' = IUT,

'Monitored Object Identifier' = (the same object used in the subscription),

'Time Remaining' = (any value > 0 if automatic cancellation is supported, otherwise 0),

'List of Values' = (values appropriate to the object type of the monitored object)

**ELSE**

**BEFORE Notification Fail Time**

RECEIVE BACnet-Error PDU,

Error Class = SERVICES,

Error Code = SERVICE\_REQUEST\_DENIED | OTHER

**Proposal:**

The structure of this test needs to be re-worked sending a transmit, checking if the device supports either confirmed (9.10.1.1) or unconfirmed (9.10.1.2) COV, if this is TRUE wait for simple ack plus the notification (conf/unconf). If this is not TRUE, wait for the error PDU. If this structure looks good, I volunteer to re-write the spec and propose it to BTL-WG.

**Question:**

Is the proposed structure OK?

**Response:**

These issues have been dealt with in CRR-0182 and CRR-0194.