

Clarification Request

References: “e.g” BTL Functionality Checklist

Date of BTL-WG Response: June 19, 2025

Background: “e.g” Footnotes for Data Link Layer – Secure Connect

	C ⁶	Supports B/SC over IPv4
	C ⁶	Supports B/SC over IPv6
	O ⁷	Supports configurable <u>Out Of Service</u> property
	C ^{7,8}	Supports hierarchical Network Port objects
	C ^{7,8}	Supports Non-hierarchical Network Port objects
	C ^{7,9}	Supports writable <u>Network Number</u> property
	O ⁷	Supports the <u>Routing Table</u> property
	O ⁷	Supports the Network Port Object Command property
	O ^{7,10}	Supports the DISCARD_CHANGES command
	O ^{7,10}	Supports the RESTART_PORT command
	O ^{7,10}	Supports the GENERATE_CSR_FILE command
	O ^{7,10}	Supports the VALIDATE_CHANGES command
¹ At least one of these options must be supported. ² At least one of these options must be supported if the device supports direct connections. ³ Required if the IUT claims Protocol_Revision 24 or higher. ⁴ Required if the IUT claims a Protocol_Revision greater than 16 and less than 24. ⁵ At least one of these options must be supported. ⁶ At least one of these options must be supported. ⁷ Protocol_Revision 24 or higher must be claimed. ⁸ At least one of these options must be supported. ⁹ Support for writable <u>Network Number</u> properties is required in routers and other IUTs that need to know the network number in order to operate. ¹⁰ At least one of these options is required if the Network Port object Command property is supported.		

Problem:

The footnotes provided in the ‘Data Link Layer – Secure Connect’ part of the Checklist seem to impose conflicting requirements. For a router claiming a PR greater than 16 and less than 24, it cannot claim support for a writable network number because it’s not PR24 or greater (per footnote 7) but must claim it because it’s a router (per footnote 9).

As a secondary point of confusion: it is unclear why a SC device, claiming a PR greater than 16 and less than 24 cannot claim functionality (highlighted in red) as these options were available in PR 17.

Questions:

1. Should a BACnet/SC device at Protocol_Revision greater than 16 and less than 24, that is also a router, claim 'Supports writable Network_Number property'?
2. Is footnote 7 correct in restricting the above checklist items to devices at Protocol_Revision 24 and higher?

Response:

1. Yes
2. No