

The WG meeting was attended by 32 members and 15 guests.

Sushil Shinde opened the meeting with a review of the MOM from Galveston, TX. MOM were accepted as presented.

No draft for the C37.06.1 tables are prepared.

The status of the working group has all of the working documents transferred for review. It is defined that the Task Force made up of a small group provide recommendations to the Working Group. PAR has been recommended to extend by 2 years. A discussion will occur with ADCOM in December for a final decision.

Change from 1-cos to a 2-parameter proposed. Also to change from 7% to 10% to be aligned with testing already required. Table 1, 2, and 3 are currently in the standard. New revisions are being proposed to have 6 Tables. Table changes were proposed and outlined to define requirements. Discussion was directed towards defining new requirements for the fault current requirement. A general acceptance was made to accept a change from 7% to 10%, this will be in alignment with the IEC requirement.. ~~This will be more in alignment with the C37.06 ratings.~~ A possibility of 'recommended practice' tables move into C37.06 and then move into C37.04. This will become a supplement to C37.04 at that time. It is not a concern for this WG. This is applicable for all circuit breakers above >1000v.

Bibliography can include further references for TRV. Add 04b and 09b for references.

Definitions nothing to be added.

The Table 1 TRV ratings were presented to show what was reflected from previous work in the WG. This shows the requirement for the KA. The values are given from the data and not from a calculation. This is from data collected from the WG to show how much fault current is actually seen. Today the 7% and 30% are required. A discussion was to determine if 30% shall be still required or if the fault current rating needs to change. It was determined to keep the 30% values.

Convert table to heading to rated TLF. Include a table for 10% and not just for 30%. Give details to show how the configuration is the worst case scenario.

The possibility of showing how the requirements are calculated in an annex was ruled out. A proposal was discussed with increasing the rating to 45% in place of the existing 30%.

Discussion points for creating / calculating the requirements in peak TRV levels were initiated without resolution. Mike Skidmore gave a presentation to show the reliability of TLF modelling considerations.

No motions were made.

Next step discussion was to come back with recommendations from the Working Group in the Spring meeting.

Respectfully Submitted

Jön Rogers, jon.rogers@ieee.org, September 16, 2013, San Antonio, TX