

## Clarification Request

**References:** 135-2008 and 135-2004

### Background / Proposed Solution:

I looked at the five existing AWS/OWS BTL Listings. The Alerton, ALC, and Delta B-AWS, and the Siemens B-OWS all do support DS-WP-B. However, [http://www.bacnetinternational.net/btl/listings/reliable%20controls/BTL\\_Listing\\_L23674\\_Reliable\\_RCStudio20.pdf](http://www.bacnetinternational.net/btl/listings/reliable%20controls/BTL_Listing_L23674_Reliable_RCStudio20.pdf) does not, though that Reliable B-OWS is listed for support of DM-MTS-A

DS-WP-B is the ability to via BACnet write the Time\_Synchronization\_Recipients list in the OWS itself, I wonder if I'm applying the rules right.

```
>> 135-2004 section 12.11.30 has
>> If it is present, this property shall be writable. If the PICS
>> indicates that this device is a Time Master, then the
>> Time_Synchronization_Recipients property shall be present.
>>
>> Now-deprecated (because separate DM-MTS-A and DM-ATS-A replace it)
>> section K.5.13 in 135-2004 has:
>> Devices claiming conformance to DM-TS-A must support the
>> Time_Synchronization_Recipients property of the Device object.
>>
>> And later in BACnet history, in 135-2004d-5 f.
>>
>> A device that conforms to the BACnet protocol and contains an
>> application layer shall:
>> . . .
>> (f) execute the WriteProperty service if the device contains any
>> objects with properties that are required to be
>> writable.
```

I think we would require a Protocol\_Revision 4 B-OWS to execute the WriteProperty service

DM-ATS-A is more derivative of DM-TS-A than is DM-MTS-A. A plausible position could hold that DM-MTS-A does not require the presence of Time\_Synchronization\_Recipients at all, writable or otherwise. The DM-ATS-A BIBB I feel does require the presence of Time\_Synchronization\_Recipients, and UTC\_Time\_Synchronization\_Recipients and Time\_Synchronization\_Interval and Interval\_Offset, and Align\_Intervals, and all must be writable. In 135-2008, sections 12.11.31 and 12.11.4 both use the language: "If the list is of length zero, or the property is not present, the device is prohibited from automatically sending a TimeSynchronization / UTCTimeSynchronization request." and footnote 14 covers the latter three with "14 If either Time\_Synchronization\_Recipients or UTC\_Time\_Synchronization\_Recipients is present, then this property shall be present and writable."

A plausible position could hold that Protocol\_Revision 4 B-OWS are required to execute the WriteProperty service in order to get a BTL Listing, but later revisions are not. The language became less prescriptive in DM-MTS-A in 135-2008 than it was in DM-TS-A in 135-2004, and what 135-2004 section 12.11.30 says point-blank, 135-2008 section 12.11.31 does not say at all except that it does affirm: "If present, this property shall be writable." in the footnote 5.

Irrespective of the decisions above, the clarification separately needs to determine whether the presence of Time\_Synchronization\_Recipients and specified in the PICS/EPICS as writable, would require a Protocol\_Revision 4 B-OWS to execute the WriteProperty service in order to get a BTL Listing.

The clarification also needs to determine whether if present, that the Time\_Synchronization\_Recipients must be specified in the PICS/EPICS as writable, in order to get a BTL Listing (135-2004 section 12.11.30 says so, point-blank, see above).

**Response:**

Yes, If Time\_Synchronization\_Recipients is present then it must be Writable. The standard is explicit and has never wavered from this. And Yes, If Time\_Synchronization\_Recipients is present then the device must Execute WriteProperty, according to 135-2004d-5 bullet-point f in Protocol\_Revision 5.

135-2004b-6 added the four properties: UTC\_Time\_Synchronization\_Recipients, Time\_Synchronization\_Interval, Align\_Intervals, and Interval\_Offset, while DM-UTC-A existed prior to that in 135-2004. DM-UTC-A can be claimed, in Protocol\_Revision 4, without Time\_Synchronization\_Recipients being present.