

Chair: Nenad Uzelac

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to order and introduction:

Called to order at 11:00 CDT

2. Roster Check:

Attendance included 16 RODE members and 1 guest. Have quorum.

3. Meeting Highlights:

- Purpose of the meeting: Clarify the PAR that is to be submitted.
 - o There have been a number of email comments that are mostly in sync but with different details.
 - o Overall question – should this be a **standard** or a **guide**?

- History:
 - o The previous PAR was rescinded because the subcommittee didn't provide enough definition/details. (Tim Royster)
 - o Nenad walked through a brief history from the initiation in Spring 2002.
 - In Spring 2006 – It was decided to create a guide.
 - A PAR was completed Spring 2007.
 - In the fall 2008 the PAR was finally approved and the working group was created.
 - In Fall 2011, the PAR was canceled due to lack of progress. But the users said we needed the document. So in Spring 2012, a task force was created to write a technical report.
 - In Spring 2016, the technical report was presented to RODE.
 - In Spring 2017, a PAR was presented which led to this meeting.
 - Antone added that this is a difficult document to create, as shown by the document history.

- Discussion on types of documents:
 - o 4 Types: Guide, Trial Standard, Full Standard, and Recommended Practices
 - o The current Task Force report includes many different options which would have to be simplified before it could be included in a user specification or industry standard.
 - Regarding a full standard:
 - Edgar – we need to define which of the items would be included in the standard as requirements.
 - Nenad – yes, Karla, Paul, and Nenad had met and reviewed the report for which items could be so defined. This was used in creation of the PAR.
 - It was noted that the PAR did not fully capture this concept.

- Regarding a guide:
 - Ian – Changing the report into a list of specific normative topics is going to be very difficult. The advantage to making this a guide allows us to take a first step to select key requirements and create specific normative for them. It could then be changed into a standard later.
 - Francois – Agrees with the idea to have a guide (with best practices). It would help to raise the particularity for requirements in our environment (distribution equipment up to 38kV). We do not have the experts to fully cover all of the normative requirements.
 - Paul – It can be difficult, as a user, to select items from a guide to include into a purchase specification. Manufacturers would not have clear direction from a guide in developing their tests
 - A guide vs and a recommended practice – would one be better than the other for the manufacturers to meet the intent?
- Nenad – There is currently a huge gap between current standards and what the report shows as needed. Is there a way to make a list of minimum requirements outside of a standard?
 - Tim R – if you make it a guide it leaves the door open for the user to specify the requirements. We may not have the expertise to write all of the test standards, but if some of those exist – we can reference existing tests within our document. Currently there is no one standard that defines the requirements and every manufacturer does it differently. This group should pick the main requirements and leave other considerations in an annex. He is now leaning away from a guide and towards a standard.
 - Bill – a standard is the way to go – it is simpler for the user. (Referenced IEEE-519 and said they use it as a standard.)
 - Antone? – How do we want the information to look once it gets out there? A standard has “shalls” and “should” with minimal description (it doesn’t teach principles.) The recommended practices and guidelines describe the how and why things are done.
 - Nenad – What would it look like if we narrowed it down to 8 tests and the rest is recommendations? 10 pages of requirements and 80 pages of recommendations? How would users and manufacturers use this?
 - Tim R – maybe we need both a standard and a guide? One for requirements and one for application considerations? (Similar to what is done in fuses. C37.48 – General Guide and C37.48.1 – Application guide)
 - Edgar – Familiar with the IEC version and it isn’t very specific/helpful. The group really has to decide what can be standardized and tested vs was is just consideration. The standard would include the essential things.
 - Tim R- one suggestion, have the standard and in the bibliography reference this technical report (it would need to be officially published.)
 - Antone and Nenad noted that a lot of work is needed to clean up and editorially correct the current report.
 - ? – we are assuming that we will be able to pare down the current report into a specific number of tests and requirements for a standard.

- Nenad – if we can't – how can a user pare it down from a guide or report?
- Paul – Would it be more manageable if we broke it into 2 PARs or 2 groups to work on standards vs considerations?
 - Nenad – I don't know that we need to define those categories now, but based on comments that were received we can clarify the scope. We could add that the standard will include informational annexes.
 - ? – The scope should be precise, but the application information can be included in the purpose section.
 - Francois – at one time we had C37.60 and C37.61 (guide). It has now been disposed and some information has been included into 37.60 because people understand reclosers. In regards to this document, we need more details on the required testing. If we do a guide now it can be step/ buffer towards the standard.
 - Nenad: A con to two documents is the work and personnel requirements to create 2 documents.
 - Francois, the guide is just the “annex” you are talking about. If we split the documents we can complete the standard much faster because we won't have to worry about creating the annexes.
 - Bill – Like the idea of going ahead with the standard and then seeing what is left that we may want to do something with.
 - Travis – Would really like a standard to come out of this work. There is a lot of variability in what manufacturers are currently doing as well as many best practices that can be captured. Separating the enclosures and security out will help with the amount of work needed for this document.
 - Anil – so what is the focus? There are already standards to cover the relays. What else would this add?
 - Nenad – the current standards focus on devices in the substations. We are looking at grounding and other factors that are impacted by the fact the control is not in the substation.
- Antone – The current report includes a combination of good design practices as well as good application practices. It has both USER and MANUFACTURER requirements. Most of our current standards are focused on manufacturers rather than user/ application.

4. Motion:

- Nenad - Based on this discussion, proposing that we create a PAR for a shorter standard with just mandatory testing. A separate PAR can then be created for either recommended practices or guide at a later time.
- User Feedback: Anil, in favor. Paul, in support. Tim R, in support. Bill, in favor. Francois, support. Travis, support.
- Other votes: Steve, support. Chris, support. Jeff G, support. Frank, abstain. Karla, support. Ian, abstain. Nenad, support. Bob, abstain.
 - Don Martin will go with the majority.

- Motion carries.

5. Next steps:

- PAR will need to be reworded. Next deadline for PAR submission is July 28th. We would need to electronically ballot.
 - o Volunteers to work on rewording of the PAR: Paul Found, Ian Rokser, Karla Trost, Travis Johnson. Tentatively Edgar Dullni. Paul or Karla to lead the effort.
- Task force shall send the PAR proposal to Francois and Nenad before end of June and then PAR will be distributed for electronic ballot to RODE members.

6. Meeting was adjourned at 12:20

Annex: RODE Member Attendance

Count	Role	First Name	Last Name	Company	Country	
1	Chair	Nenad	Uzelac	G&W Electric	USA	X
2	Vice-Chair	Francois	Soulard	Hydro-Quebec	Canada	X
3	Member	Chris	Ambrose	Federal Pacific	USA	X
4	Member	Robert	Behl	ABB	USA	X
5	Member	Antone	Bonner	Eaton	USA	X
6	Member	Frank	DeCesaro	Eaton's Cooper Power Systems	USA	X
7	Member	Edgar	Dullni	ABB	Germany	X
8	Member	Paul	Found	BC Hydro	Canada	X
9	Member	Harold	Hirz	Thomas and Betts	USA	
10	Member	Chris	Lettow	S&C Electric Company	USA	Excused
11	Member	Donald	Martin	G&W Electric Co.	USA	Excused
12	Member	Timothy	Royster	Dominion Virginia Power	USA	X
13	Member	David	Stone	DTS Technical Services	USA	Excused
14	Member	William	Walter	We-Energies	USA	X
15	Member	Jeffrey	Gieger	Thomas & Betts	USA	X
16	Member	Steven	Meiners	GE	USA	X
17	Member	Karla	Trost	G&W Electric	USA	X
18	Member	Ian	Rokser	Eaton's Cooper Power Systems	USA	X
19	Member	Travis	Johnson	Xcel	USA	X
20	Member	Anil	Dhawan	ComEd	USA	X
21	Guest	Tim	Myers	Eaton's Cooper Power Systems	USA	X
Members Attending		16				
Guests Attending		1				

Submitted by:
Nenad Uzelac
May 5, 2017