

The working group met on Monday, May 7, at 3:00PM. This is the second meeting of the working group.

Patents:

IEEE-SA rules on Patents were reviewed prior to further discussions. The introductory slide, and slides #1 through #5 of the IEEE-SA Patents Slide Set dated 1-May-2007 were shown. The WG attendees were advised:

- The IEEE's patent policy is consistent with the ANSI patent policy and is described in Clause 6 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws;
- Early identification of patent claims which may be essential for the use of standards under development is encouraged;
- There may be Essential Patent Claims of which the IEEE is not aware. Additionally, neither the IEEE, the WG, nor the WG chair can ensure the accuracy or completeness of any assurance or whether any such assurance is, in fact, of a Patent Claim that is essential for the use of the standard under development.

The participants were provided an opportunity to identify patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) and/or the holder of patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) that the participant believes may be essential for the use of the standard which will result from the activity of the WG.

No responses were received during the meeting regarding patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) and/or the holder of the patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) that were identified (if any) and by whom.

General:

The PAR for this project was approved by IEEE-SA in xx, xxxx.

Attendance included 17 WG (of 21) members and 24 guests. Attendance is as shown below:

Members	Members	Members	Guests	Guests
P. Barnhart (P)	R. Hartzel (P)	M Orosz (P)	H. Attia (P)	T. Meeks (P)
E. Byron (P)	T. Hood (A)	R. Puckett (P)	H. Bannick (P)	C. Morris (P)
V. Coletta (A)	F. Mayle (P)	C. Schneider (P)	T. Burse (P)	A. Patel (P)
R. Cabbage (A)	T. McNamara (P)	J. Smith (P)	L. Conner (P)	A. Peterson (P)
P. Dwyer (P)	D. Mazumdar (P)	A. Storms (P)	D. Edwards (P)	D. Pearson (P)
L. Farr (A)	A. Morgan (P)	C. Taylor (P)	H. Josten (P)	J. Profir (P)
D. Gohil (P)	T. Olsen (P)	M. Wactor (P)	C. Kennedy (P)	D. Sharma (P)
			K. Goldstein (P)	P. Sullivan (P)
			D. Lemmerman (P)	S. Toe (P)x
			A. Livshitz (P)x	N. Uzelac (P)
			N. McQuin (E)	D. Yek (P)
			J. Wiseman (P)	J. Zawadzki (P)

P = present, E = excused, A = absent

- The minutes of the previous working group meeting were approved as distributed.
- Continuation of discussions from the previous meeting:
 - Several sections discuss "no intentional openings" (e.g., 3.1.6.b, 7.7, and D.6). It is agreed is that this statement is not sufficiently descriptive and that modification of the language is needed. Mr. Mazumdar presented proposal for clause 7.7 for consideration. Further discussion required.

- WG members are requested to further consider current transformer requirements (5.7 and 8.7.1). It is possible that the transformer committee is working on new documents, including documents on electronic devices and resistive / capacitive dividers.
- On 7.2, modification of the words is needed to reflect objective requirements.
- Discussed use of ground studs, ground bails, or similar devices, in which the device may or may not be provided with an insulating cover of some sort. In most cases, such coverings would not pass the foil test specified in 6.2.1.3. It was decided that we will not deal with such arrangements, as these violate the basic concept of metal-clad switchgear.
- Discussed use of grounding switches, in which the terminal to be grounded is not insulated. It was decided that we will not deal with such arrangements, as these violate the basic concept of metal-clad switchgear.
- WG members are again requested to review the topic of partial discharge testing (6 and annex C) and limits.
- Metal thickness. Mr. Byron had raised the issue of conflicting metal thicknesses in the various C37.20.X documents. Mr. Olsen will forward a summary of relevant information to the chair
- 6.2.7.1 covers flame resistance tests. C37.55 provides guidance for substitution of materials, but allows different requirements for the substitute materials. C37.55 allows 94V0 flame resistance, quite different from the requirement in C37.20.2. We need to address proper requirements and both C37.20.2 and C37.55 should agree. If 94V0 is sufficient for substitution, why isn't it acceptable in the first instance? Is 94V0 sufficient? UL 94V0 is based loosely on ASTM 4804. This issue affects a wider group than just C37.20.2. It is requested that the Switchgear Assemblies subcommittee appoint a task force to study this issue.
- 8.1.4.6 covers seismic, and it appears obsolete. This is an issue that affects a wider audience, and it is requested that the Switchgear Assemblies subcommittee appoint a task force to study this issue.
- Common clauses – members are requested to assist in the review of the document versus the newly approved C37.100.1 common clauses device.
- 7.12 primary fuses and transformers – requested clarification of the first sentence.
- 5.7 covers current transformer accuracies – it was suggested that this should be eliminated and instead rely on C57.13. It may be helpful to solicit rationale for this material from certain of the “elder statesmen” involved in the earlier versions of C37.20.2.
- MOC switches. At least one user would like the standard to specify that MOC switches shall be operable only in the “connected” position as standard, and that they may be operated in the test position on request of the purchaser.

A request for interpretation was received. It was agreed that the existing C37.20.2 standard does not address the issue raised. The issue will be considered in the revision of C37.20.2 now in process.

All those who accepted assignments are requested to provide their input by July 31.

The meeting adjourned at 5:08PM.

Report submitted by: M. Wactor, WG Chair