

### Clarification Request

**References:** BTL Test Plan 5.0, 135.1 -2007 test 9.32.1.11 et al.

**Date of BTL-WG Response:** \_\_01-Sep-2011\_\_

#### 9.32.1.11 Object Name Version, Directed to a Specific MAC Address

Purpose: To verify that the IUT responds with a broadcast I-Have service request even if the Who-Has service requests was not transmitted with a broadcast address.

Test Steps:

1. TRANSMIT Who-Has-Request,  
    'Object Name' = (any object name specified in the EPICS),
2. WAIT **Internal Processing Fail Time**
3. RECEIVE  
    DA = LOCAL BROADCAST | GLOBAL BROADCAST,  
    SA = IUT,  
    I-Have-Request,  
    'Device Identifier' = (the IUT's Device object),  
    'Object Identifier' = (the object identifier specified in the EPICS for this object),  
    'Object Name' = (the object name specified in step 1)

#### Question:

In the Dynamic Object Binding test 9.32.1.11 should a unicast directed to the original SNET and SADR from which the Who-Has arrived also be accepted? A relaxation in the standard in this regard for I-Am was adopted in Addendum 135-2008q-1, and implementations proactively reducing their utilization of broadcast in BACnet are in line with the spirit of Addendum 135-2008q-1.

This relaxation would similarly affect test 9.32.2.2 and also the Dynamic Device Binding test 9.33.2.2

#### Response:

The BTL agrees that a unicast I-Have would not negatively affect interoperability. As such, it agrees that in step 3, a unicast I-Have directed to the original SNET and SADR from which the Who-Has arrived, shall also be accepted.

A proposal to modify 135.1-2009 tests 9.32.1.11, 9.32.2.2, and 9.33.2.2 shall be sent to TI-WG, and proposal JB-034-1\_Unicast\_I-Have.doc to modify the language of the standard in this regard is already on the OS-WG docket since 25-Jun-2011.