

Chair: Paul Found

Secretary: Karla Trost

Meeting Minutes

- 1. Call to Order** Paul
The meeting was called to order at 2:04PM CST.

- 2. Call for Patents/Copyrights** Paul
IEEE Patent and Copyright slides were shown. No issues were raised to the chair.

- 3. Introduction of Members and Guests**
Self-introductions with affiliations were made in the chat.

- 4. Attendance and Quorum Check** Karla
The Working Group has 19 members. Quorum requires 10.
12 members were present.

- 5. Approval of previous meeting minutes** Paul
 - April 12, 2022
 - May 11, 2022
 - May 17, 2022 pdf comment file
 - May 19, 2022 (Rev 1) with Comment Appendix
 - May 26, 2022 (Rev 1)
 - August 26, 2022
 - October 5, 2022

No comments were received by the deadline of November 7, 2022. Per the pre-meeting correspondence, minutes were approved by consensus.

- 6. Comment Resolution Continuation**
Re-circulation Ballot review of select items. (Pages 4 – 6 of attached pdf.)
Current state leaves 37 comments to review (9 are similar in nature).



PC37.68_Recirc1_co
mments_PF_WGrevic

- Comments related to the Scope/ PAR of the document. The scope is to mitigate harsh environments. The commenter states that some individual clauses exceed the scope of the PAR.
 - R1-56: Clause 6.2.1:
 - The intent of the working group was to document that the standard environments are harsh, but the commenter appears to have taken the harsh environment statement as the unique environment we are attempting to cover.
 - The WG agrees that this is part of the scope of the PAR that calls out “basic requirements for the design”. **The Chair will reach out to the commenter to discuss the working group’s intention.**
 - In addition, the WG agreed to remove the word “harsh” from the sentence. This could potentially “increase” the scope. One option would be to change “harsh” to “various”.
 - R1-62, R1-63, R1-64, R1-65, R1-66, R1-67, R1-68: See comment on R1-56. Same commenter/ concern.
 - R1-69: Clause 8 – **The Chair will reach out to the commenter to discuss their comment** as “testing” is clearly within the scope of the document.
 - R1-44: MBC definition: Editorial staff agreed with the WG proposal to make the definition shorter and make the remaining content into a Note.
 - R1-5: **Pending recommendation from P. Meyer**
 - R1-4: **Pending recommendation from P. Meyer**
 - R1-71: Clause 6 – proposal to add language that documentation includes reports of necessary verification tests.
 - The WG agreed in concept and decided to revise the statement as “The manufacturer shall **provide** document ~~confirmation~~, **including test reports**, that the control meets all design requirements in Clause 6.”
 - R1-57: 6.2.1 and connector keying:
 - One member described applications where keying is needed when there are not visibly similar connectors. The keying helps with the alignment.
 - The WG discussed whether the two sentences should be combined or if they are separate items.
 - The WG decided to reject the comment on the basis that the keying and labeling are not for the same purpose and that the intent of the comment is met in the document.
 - R1-59: Clause 6.2.3:
 - The existing language (unused openings (e.g. knockouts) was a change from Ballot 1 and should be kept.
 - The WG agreed to “revise” the subclause to read: “Unused openings in the enclosure (e.g. knockouts), if supplied, shall not compromise the ability of the enclosure to withstand required tests.”
 - R1-81: Clause 6.2.4:

- Discussion in the WG of when this would be applicable and ways to verbalize the concern. **K. Trost** will propose some language.
- R1-83: Clause 6.2.4:
 - WG feels that the Proposal “a” is already covered. And proposal “b” is the users’ responsibility.
 - In addition, the WG suggested we may no long need lines 502 and 503. To be discussed later.

7. Next steps/ meeting(s):

The next meeting will be virtual. A poll has been sent out to the members to select the date and time.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:31PM CST.

