

Clarification Request

References:

Date of BTL-WG Response: 08-October-2018

☒ All Actions Necessitated have been Completed

Background:

Addendum 135-2008q is approved January 24, 2009 for I-AM and that addendum somehow missed for “Who-Has and I-Have” services, which is corrected in addendum 135-2012ar. Please refer both rationales:

I AM: The BACnet standard currently requires that the I-Am message be broadcast in order to minimize multiple Who-Is broadcasts to locate a particular device. There are assumptions regarding time and bandwidth savings that may be true for wired media, but the costs of sending broadcasts on a high latency mesh network are considerably higher.

I Have: “Currently, I-Am requests can be sent as either broadcast or unicast, but I-Have requests are required to be broadcast. It is not clear why there is this difference between the two services, as there may be situations in which it is desirable to send I-Have as a unicast in order to minimize the use of broadcasts.”

Problem:

Addendum f to BTL Test Package 15.1 in section BTL-15.1f-4: Allow Unicast I-Have added testing of unicast_I-Have with PR_15 conditionality, in every relevant test, expressed as:

```

4. IF (Protocol_Revision is present and Protocol_Revision >= 15) THEN
  RECEIVE DA = LOCAL BROADCAST | GLOBAL BROADCAST | TD,
    I-Have-Request,
    'Device Identifier' = (the IUT's Device object),
    'Object Identifier' = Object1
    'Object Name' = V1
ELSE
  RECEIVE
    DA = LOCAL BROADCAST | GLOBAL BROADCAST,
    SA = IUT,
    I-Have-Request,
    ...

```

CR-requestor states:

For better interoperability and avoiding mesh network traffic, this should be acceptable since PR 8. For us, it is not possible to go for PR 15 and I-Have broadcast solution. Please let me know your view and suggestion on it.

Question:

Should the testing of unicast_I-Have with PR_15 conditionality in section BTL-15.1f-4 be replaced by a different expression, or no PR_15 conditionality, i.e.

RECEIVE DA = LOCAL BROADCAST | GLOBAL BROADCAST | TD,
I-Have-Request,
...

Response:

YES. The RBTO's should ignore the Protocol_Revision requirement.