

## Clarification Request

**Request from:** Frank Bitter (frank.bitter@wspcert.de)

**References:** ASHRAE 135-2010, ASHRAE 135.1-2009, BTL\_CRR\_0103.

**Stage:** ☒Request, ☐Listed, ☐Analysis, ☐Resolved

### Background:

I see that the BTL/BI has a different approach to solve problems – following informal rules. From the certification point of view it is essential to have official and public available documents which state the additional information and rules. Having a “indirect information” in the addendum referring to a lower protocol revision (as in your example) doesn’t serve as a rule.

From Thomas Kurowski I got the pan-Protocol Revision document (I’m not sure if it is the latest version). I have some concerns about the general requirement to meet the latest BIBB definition:

“\* to promote interoperability, devices claiming older protocol revisions are required to meet the latest BIBB definition. See section 1.2. BIBB Requirements in the BTL Test Plan.”

I would change the requirement to a recommendation for the following reasons:

1. From my point of view, it is necessary that the product meets at least the protocol revision it claims. If a BIBB changes in a future revision and is not compatible with the previous one we will get problems (of course changing BIBBs should be avoided in any case).
2. A manufacturer develops a product for a certain protocol revision and during the development period the protocol revision is increased with new defined BIBBs, which the manufacturer doesn’t know. So before the test he always has to check the latest standard revision.
3. There are also different requirements for the manufacturer for the same protocol revision if he sends in the product before or after a new standard release with a higher protocol revision.
4. BIBBs in higher revisions might require additional functionality which was not defined for the protocol revision the device claims.

In general, if it is defined in the test package/test plan 9.0 it would be ok. This would help for tests done according to the new test plan. I also suggest, to add an “addendum/errata” to the current test plan 5.0. Currently we have to deal with several products which have followed this unofficial “policy”. Without a statement for the test plan 5.0 we have problems in accepting the already performed tests, as the test explicitly refers to the test plan. I kindly ask you to bring this suggestion to also change the old test plan into the BTL-WG.

### Question:

Can BIBBS (especially the new BIBBs of addendum L) of a newer standard protocol revision be claim~~plement~~ed in products claiming an older standard protocol revision and can this be tested ?

If yes, will there be a policy document written and made publicly available?

As this policy was applied for BTL Listing already, I believe this policy also affects test plan 5.0 and has to be applied for tests done with TP 5.0. Is this correct?

We need to address policy usage toward older test packages — do policies go with the test package release or are they global to any test package? In particular how does this policy affect TP 5.0? I believe it applies here also since the policy was created in June 2009 when we accepted the new addenda. The TP 5.0 was published in June 2009.

**Response:**

Yes, the new BIBBs of addendum L can be claiming an in older protocol revision and this can be tested. Yes, there is a policy document under development and it will be written and made publicly available. And yes, this policy also affects Test Plan-5.0.final and applies to devices tested with Test Plan-5.0.final

The BIBBs and device profiles defined in the original BACnet standard were incomplete and resulted in interoperability problems between devices. The BIBB definitions and device profiles were updated in June 2009 with 135-2008/L, prior to the finalization of Test Plan 5.0.final. In order to promote interoperability between devices, it is the requirement of the BTL that all devices (of all Protocol Revisions) meet the requirements of the new BIBB and device profile definitions as defined in 135-2008/L.

A specific exception to this policy was noted by clarification request BTL\_CRR-0103\_DM-DOB-B\_ProtRev4.doc (dated May 20, 2010). Here is the response to that clarification request:

“While in general, changes to the device profiles are considered Protocol\_Revision independent, this specific change is not sufficiently important to do so. In particular, the DM-DDB-B amendment in the standard, to require it of all device profiles including B-SA and B-SS, applies to all devices no matter which Protocol\_Revision they claim. But DM-DOB-B will be required by the BTL Test Plan only for devices which claim Protocol\_Revision 5 or higher.”