

Clarification Request

Reference: "ASHRAE 135-2004"

Background:

Section 9.7 of 135.1-2003 revolves around the Get-Enrollment-Summary Request. However, I cannot find anywhere in 135-2004, the BTL-Specified test, or clarification request were it is defined when an Event-Enrollment object becomes "event-generating" and should be included in the results of a Get-Enrollment-Summary Request.

Question:

Should an Event-Enrollment object be included in the response simply because it exists? If not, under what circumstances should the Event-Enrollment object be included in the response to a Get-Enrollment-Summary request? How is BTL testing this with respect to Event-Enrollment objects?

Our interpretation is that the EE object should only be included in the response if the referenced property is valid (i.e. configured) AND at least one of the event-enable flags is true? Is this the correct interpretation?

A secondary question, would be what should happen if the EE is misconfigured? For example, set-up the EE object for change-of-bit-string but have the referenced-property set to an Analog-Input's Present-Value.

Response:

The BTL-WG believes the standard is not clear on this matter. The BTL-WG is moving forward to get clarification on this. Until such time as the clarification is available, the BTL will accept product that responds in either interpretation. In other words, the BTL will accept that the enrollment summary does not contain an event-initiating object if and only if ALL of the event-enable flags are FALSE. All other cases of event-initiating objects, must be present in the enrollment summary list.

In the case where product contains an EventEnrollment object that is not configured and cannot be deleted it is a local matter whether they are included in the EnrollmentSummary response.

Finally, the BTL does not test products that are considered 'misconfigured'. We assume that the product and its objects are configured correctly prior to running our tests.