

Clarification Request

References: “e.g” [Specified Tests 14.0.Final or 135.1-2013 Test-Number](#)

Date of BTL-WG Response: June 25, 2026

Background: “e.g” Renewal regulation

Problem:

A manufacturer has applied for an extension for a Rev. 14 device that was tested in accordance with TP 16.2 at the time.

When comparing checklists 16.1.2 and 26.1 in the device object, the manufacturer is now faced with the following question:

That checklist 26.1 requires a configurable device name, whereas this was not the case in checklist 16.1 or protocol revision 14.

Comment 1

The requirement that a Device's Object_Name be configurable was added in Addendum [135-2012bg](#), Clause 12.1.1.4.

12.1.1.4 Device Name

The Object_Name property of the Device object (the Device Name) shall be an internetwork-wide unique character string. Because of this requirement, every BACnet device shall provide a means of altering the Device Name to assure uniqueness. The altered Device Name shall be persistent across power failure and restart of the device.

This change took effect in Protocol_Revision 18.

Comment 2

Rationale

The preamble to Clause 12 is the only location where many key concepts of the BACnet object model are defined, but it has no subclause structuring to reference, so important information is easily missed. These changes have no substantive impact and are entirely editorial in nature.

Question:

Can the manufacturer still obtain its renewal certificate even if it does not support a configurable name in the device object?

Does the function need to be modified in order to obtain the certificate?

Response:

No, the manufacturer cannot renew their BTL certificate without a configurable name in the device object. Even before Protocol_Revision 18, a product is required to have a configurable Object_Name and object instance in its Device object.

Yes, the function needs to be modified in order to renew their BTL certificate.