IEEE Power Engineering Society
Switchgear Committee
C37.20.7 Working Group Report
Oct. 1, 2001

The working group met on Oct. 1, 2001 to review revisions to address the comments received with recirculation ballots on D15. Attendance included 5 WG members and 17 guests. Excused absence was recorded for J. Smith. The IEEE-SA ballot was successful (affirmative) with 56 affirmative votes and 7 negative votes. On recirculation, a total of 64 affirmative votes were cast with 4 negative votes. One negative has been resolved (G. Sakats), but the remaining 3 negative votes are regarded as non-resolvable.

Mr. Swindler maintained his negative position. Specific items discussed:

- Mr. Swindler wishes to delay issuing C37.20.7 until such time as an application guide can be added. The WG had voted earlier (unanimously) to proceed with issuing C37.20.7, with the intent of developing an application guide later.
- Changes are requested to recognize that different sections of an assembly may have differing ratings, for arcing current level, and for arcing current duration. Lengthy discussion ensued, generally to the effect that the second paragraph of 5.2.5 already allows differing arcing current duration. It was agreed that differing current levels are not allowed. The following changes were agreed:
  - 5.2.5, remove “and this will be the rated duration of the tested equipment”.
  - 5.2.2, change “a reduced voltage may be used” to “a reduced voltage may be used, except if the arcing current duration is limited by a current limiting fuse in a separate compartment from the fault initiation location. In this case, the test shall be conducted at the rated maximum voltage of the assembly.”
- 4.3 should be modified to recognize that a shorter duration of time may be appropriate, depending on the type of protection and the system design. It was agreed that the second sentence indicates a “preferred” duration, which is inherently not a restrictive statement.
- 5.1.1.3.a allows mockups, but Mr. Swindler suggests that these may reduce the fault energy during the test. It was agreed that mockups which “have similar materials as the original items” will not have significant impact on the fault energy.
- 5.2.3, under “test value” at the top of page 7. Mr. Swindler suggests that the instant of closing during the actual test shall be the same as that used in the calibration test. Laboratory personnel present agreed that this could result in a significantly less severe test. This change is not accepted.
- Re: 5.3, third paragraph . Mr. Swindler requested that sealed insulation systems (sometimes referred to in prior meetings as “gas tight insulation systems”) not be perforated. Based on prior discussions with laboratory personnel, this change is not accepted.

Mr. Laubach maintained his negative position, which is non-resolvable. His original draft 14 comments were reviewed and the original WG response to these comments was reconfirmed.

Mr. Byron maintained his negative position, and has not responded to subsequent correspondence intended to resolve his negative. His original draft 14 comments were reviewed and the original WG response to these comments was reconfirmed. His negative is regarded as non-resolvable.

All changes are regarded as editorial and the document will be submitted to the Standards Board for final approval.

Report submitted by: M. Wactor
WG Chair