# INTERPRETATION IC 135-2016-23 OF
# ANSI/ASHRAE STANDARD 135-2016 BACnet® -
# A Data Communication Protocol for Building
# Automation and Control Networks

Approval Date: February 1, 2020

**Request from:** Carl Neilson, BACnet International, 61 Seagirt Road, BC, V9Z 1A3.

**Reference:** This request for interpretation refers to the requirements presented in ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 135-2016, Clause 12.56 and Table 12.71, regarding the presence of optional properties.

**Background:** The standard provides conflicting direction on whether certain properties are allowed to be present, or not, in the Network Port object type.

In the clause 12.56 overview, the standard provides a blanket statement allowing properties to exist in the Network Port object even when they do not apply to the specific Network_Type:

> Aside from the properties so required, it is a local matter whether a Network Port object contains properties that do not apply to its Network_Type. For example, a Network Port object whose Network_Type is MSTP may include the IP_Subnet_Mask property, although the value of this property would not be used by the network.

In conflict with this statement are 3 footnotes on properties in Table 12-71 which restrict their presence in objects.

The properties and footnotes which are in conflict with the above statements are:

| Property | Footnote |
|---|---|
| Command | [2] Shall be present if, and only if, the object supports execution of any of the values of the Command property. If present, this property shall be writable. |
| IP_DHCP_Enable | [8] Shall be present if, and only if, Network_Type is IPV4 and the port can be configured by DHCP. |
| Event_Detection_Enable | [24] These properties shall be present only if the object supports intrinsic reporting. |
| Notification_Class | |
| Event_Enable | |
| Acked_Transitions | |
| Notify_Type | |
| Event_Time_Stamps | |
| Event_Message_Texts | |
| Event_Message_Texts_Config | |

**Interpretation:** Footnotes 2, 8, and 24 are overly restrictive. Any Network Port properties are allowed to be present in an instance of the Network Port object if the functionality related to the property is supported by any Network Port object in the device.

**Question:** Is this Interpretation correct?

**Answer:**  No.

**Comments:**  Footnotes 2 and 8 are overly restrictive.

Footnote 24 is not in conflict with the paragraph from 12.56 overview as the properties are related to all Network_Types and the requirements for presence or absence in the Network Port object type is the same as for all other object types.

In addition, the standard does not mandate that properties included in a Network Port object be actually supported by a Network Port object in the device. This is in recognition that different product models might use the same firmware but support different data links and thus properties in a Network Port might be present due to functionality found in related product models.