



For IEC use only

SMB/2873A/RV

2004-09-21

INTERNATIONAL ELECTROTECHNICAL COMMISSION

STANDARDIZATION MANAGEMENT BOARD

SUBJECT

Report of voting on document SMB/2873/QP: Submission of one IEEE product under the IEC-IEEE Agreement for publication as a double logo IEC/IEEE standard.

BACKGROUND

1. The Standardization Management Board was invited to vote on document: SMB/2873/QP
2. END OF THE VOTING: 2004-09-17

RESULTS OF THE VOTING:

Note: Y=Yes; N=No; A=Abstention

AU	CN	DE	DK	ES	FR	GB	HU	IT	JP	KR	MX	NL	SE	US	Total
Y	Y	N	N	A	N	N	-	A	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	6=Y, 5=N 3=A

1 no reply

SMB members' comments: DE, DK, FR and GB. Comments were also received from SC 17D and SC 17C on the DE comment

CONCLUSION

Decisions of the Standardization Management Board taken by correspondence require a two-thirds majority of those voting, abstention is not considered as voting; clause 10.4, Rules of Procedure.

In this case, 6 members of the Standardization Management Board voted in favour, 5 voted against with 3 abstentions and 1 no reply.

The SMB has not approved the publication of *C37.24™: IEEE Guide for Evaluating the Effect of Solar Radiation on Outdoor Metal- Enclosed Switchgear* as a double logo IEC/IEEE standard.

ACTION

IEEE is informed of the IEC SMB decision. The comments received, together with the comments from the IEC TC concerned are attached to this document.

Submission of one IEEE product under the IEC-IEEE Agreement for publication as a double logo IEC/IEEE standard

The UK National Committee votes negative for the following reasons

This IEEE document makes some assumptions about metal enclosed switchgear which whilst true in the IEEE world is not so in the IEC world.

Example: "primary connections in metal enclosed switchgear are usually silver surfaced or equivalent and no trouble should be experienced with them if rated temperatures are exceeded under similar conditions"

It also fails to point out sufficiently that de-rating may not be necessary, if the unit in question did not reach its maximum figures during thermal test. In the examples, and so the readers assumption, above 25C, de-rating is necessary.

This is a US document for US weather and equipment style, it is useful as a basis for a wider document, but should not be adopted world wide without modification.

The IEEE document is very specific to the particular requirements and definitions of the North American market and the document is not general enough to cover the full scope required by IEC.

The inclusion of tables giving very specific temperature record data for the USA and conversion tables are not appropriate for a document carrying an IEC logo.

In many cases the main interest for users will be in gas insulated metal enclosed switchgear (GIS) and the IEEE document does also not reflect the current status of application in areas with high solar radiation e.g. Middle East.

German NC

The IEEE standard refers to enclosed switchgear and controlgear for outdoor installation independent of the voltage level. The introduction, the scope and the references refer to metal-enclosed low-voltage power circuit breaker switchgear, outdoor metal-clad switchgear, metal-enclosed bus and control switchboards and list the relevant IEEE standards. The technical content of the standard is also independent of the voltage. Limiting the scope to SC 17C or SC 17D is impossible since both committees are concerned.

The standard deals with a question that has not yet been dealt with in the relevant IEC standards. Nevertheless, the adoption of the present standard must be rejected, because

- a) it refers to other IEEE standards and is based on these (e. g. with respect to limiting temperatures), which are contradictory to the relevant IEC standards,
 - b) the major part of the present standard consists of passages exclusively dealing with and listing in tables the climatic conditions which only apply for the territory of the USA and Canada.
-

The Danish National Committee welcomes the initiative of bringing IEEE publications into the IEC community.

However the Danish NC does not feel that the current IEEE document C37.24 fulfills the criteria of an International Standard.

The content of the document is of an informative nature with a collection of data, which indeed is useful for the IEC community. On the other hand some terms in the document is not in line with terminology used in IEC.

A Technical Report is more descriptive than normative; this is an informative document of a different kind from normative documents (e.g. collection of data).

Bringing the document in line with ISO/IEC Directives Part 1 the Danish National Committee can only support the IEEE document submitted as a Technical Report with the correction of any terms and definitions according to the International Electrotechnical Vocabulary (IEV).

The French National Committee opposes the submission of IEEE C37.24 as a dual logo IEC/IEEE document*

as work has first to be done to have a document acceptable as an IEC Guide (references to IEC standards must be added to the existing IEEE references, more data are needed as all those given are from North America only). In addition it has to be checked if this document is in conflict with current work by SC 48D (see doc 48D/297/CDV).

* As it is an IEEE Guide and it can only be a Guide in IEC, not a standard.

The following comments have been received from the chairman of SC 17C and Secretary of SC 17D to the German comment circulated 2004-09-02:

Guido von Trentini
Secretary IEC SC 17D

SC 17D cannot support the acceptance of the IEEE Guide as is to become an IEC document. Prior to any decision for adoption, a thorough assessment of the content must be carried out by TC 17 and its subcommittees concerned. As a conclusion, the rejection of the IEEE initiative is recommended at this point in time.

Serge Théoleyre - Chairman of SC17C

The statement made by the German member of the SMB is correct, and it seems that some work on the document shall be done before being acceptable as an IEC guide (ref to IEC standards, enlarge data tables, cross checking with equipment not covered by SC 17C). Therefore the stage 3 (fast track procedure) does not seem appropriate at this stage and actually, rejection shall be considered.