

Clarification Request

References: 135-2016 / 135-2012a1

Date of BTL-WG Review: 15-Mar-2018, 06-Sep-2018

Background:

We will submit a BACnet router for BTL certification. We would like to use the B-RTR profile. This profile requires DS-WP-B. We do not support DS-WP-B because our settings are only writeable via our built-in webpage. Would this be acceptable or do we need to support DS-WP-B?

Problem:

Both B-RTR and B-BBMD and also the NM-BBMDC-B BIBB are added to the standard at Protocol_Revision 17, The B-BBMD Device Profile table shows that requires DS-WP-B as well as NM-BBMDC-B and the B-RTR Device Profile table shows that requires DS-WP-B as well as NM-RC-B. The already pre-existing NM-RC-B BIBB was extensively revised in the standard at Protocol_Revision 17.

NM-BBMDC-B was added to the standard at Protocol_Revision 17 and its service model is that it requires DS-WP-B so that BBMD_Broadcast_Distribution_Table property (and perhaps numerous other properties) in Network Port objects--a standard object which was also added to the standard and required in every device at Protocol_Revision 17, shall be manipulated through those writable properties.

NM-RC-B at Protocol_Revision 17 revision adopted a service model that it requires DS-WP-B so that numerous properties in Network Port objects shall be manipulated through those writable properties.

But while a router when its Network Port objects contain any writable properties, must claim DS-WP-B, prior Protocol_Revisions that implement a BDT and FDT manipulated by BVLC messages, have no compelling requirement to have any writeable properties at Application layer.

An implementation would be correct that claims Protocol_Revision 16 or lower, if either the WriteProperty bit is set in Protocol_Services_Supported and it always returns Error Class: PROPERTY Error Code: WRITE_ACCESS_DENIED to every BACnet write services request, or if it claims Protocol_Revision 16 or lower and the WriteProperty bit is clear in Protocol_Services_Supported, and it always returns BACnet-Reject-PDU with UNRECOGNIZED_SERVICE to every BACnet write services request.

Questions:

1. Is it inaccurate (or lacking the appropriate conditionality in the standard) that those Device Profiles require DS-WP-B?
2. Should we ask applicants requesting the B-RTR and/or B-BBMD Device Profiles, to claim DS-WP-B in Functionality checklist?

Response:

1. **Yes, it is inaccurate. Devices claiming PR_16 and before do not require DS-WP-B; devices claiming PR_17 and beyond do require DS-WP-B.**
2. **The checklist will be modified to make the above requirements clear.**