

Meeting Notes of WG-E3
October 21, 2010 – Conference Call

Chair: Don Delcourt
Secretary: Randy Clelland

1. Don Delcourt, the chairman of E3 Working Group, opened the conference call with introductions.

A total of 16 people participated, seven in Nashville and 10 others on the phone. Of the 16, there were 11 members and 5 guests and/or corresponding members. The working group has 12 members so a quorum existed. Attendance is documented in a separate document saved on the working group's web page under protected files.

NOTES:

- a. Although not all discussed at this point, the follow requested and were granted member status by the Chair. This status was recognized in the above totals and in the votes that occurred during the meeting.

- Ajay Garg
- Raj Ghai
- Tom Larose

Boris Shvartsberg ,who has been a corresponding member, also asked if participation via conference call would allow him to be a member.

- b. Patrick MacShane pointed out he is not listed on the roster.

Post Meeting Note: was due to an old email address in 123Signup which Patrick has been notified of.

2. **Obligatory Statement** - The latest revision of five-page long obligatory document from IEEE, regarding patents in standards and inappropriate topics for working group meetings was mentioned to the members. All were familiar with the requirements and accepted them.
3. The notes from the Montreal meeting were reviewed. No corrections were raised. The comment on the document's scope and purpose not matching the PAR was raised. Don reported that this was changed so the scope and purpose in the latest document matched the PAR. Information in the previous scope and purpose was merged into a new subclause, 1.3 General. Patrick McShane commented he liked how this was done.
4. **PAR Review** – Don discussed the current status. The PAR currently expires 2010 Dec 31. A one year extension (to 2011 Dec 31) has been requested (two weeks ago). This should allow for the expected two ballots. The original scope and purpose was retained in the PAR revision.

Gary Engmann provided some insight into how the ballot process works. When comments from the first ballot are received, a legitimate response by the working group is that “we don't agree with the comment”. Also, if there is a second ballot, balloters are only able to comment on the changes, not the entire document so new issues cannot be raised. Approval in two ballots is then a realistic expectation.

Meeting Notes of WG-E3
October 21, 2010 – Conference Call

5. Project Status and Next Steps:

- a. Changes between the most recent document, draft 7 (D7R3 October 2010), vs the previous document, draft 6 were discussed.
- Mandatory Editorial Coordination (MEC) completed by IEEE which includes editorial and legal reviews. Replies are posted on the web page under protected files.
 - Discussion on what to do next. The group was uncomfortable going ahead with the ballot without having seen the document. Gary described what the 998 working group did and it was agreed we would do the same. The proposal was that Working Group members would be asked to send an email vote by November 8, 2010 on if they approve the current document (D7R3) to go to ballot. The replies may be: **Yes** or **No** with a reason for the negative vote. 11/11 members present supported the proposal to proceed with the email vote.

Post Meeting Notes:

1) *The working group actually did this earlier in the year, but it was not compliant with the Substation Committee Policies and Procedures which requires a supermajority of 2/3rd of the members.*

2) *The following is a high level summary of the changes made between draft 6 and 7:*

- *Incorporated comments from IEEE editorial review*
- *Incorporated comments from IEEE legal review*
- *Incorporated selected comments from Patrick McShane*
- *Incorporated selected comments from Gary Engmann*
- *Revised Scope and Purpose to match PAR and created subclause 1.3 General to capture the content of the previous Scope and Purpose.*
- *Deleted Annex F in draft 6 because they created conflicts with other documents*
- *Added definitions for Switchyard and Control Building.*
- *General editorial changes by Randy and Don*

3) *The vote was passed by 14 of 14 of the working group's Members. The ballot group is now in the process of forming and will close on Dec 22.*

- b. Patrick discussed about Normative vs Informative references in the document. He felt it's valuable to highlight the difference for users since they must read the Normative ones but the Informative ones are optional. It was agreed to add this to the draft sent to ballot.
- c. To help see the changes made from draft 6, Randy will post all the comments received and a version of the latest draft with revision tracking.

Post Meeting Note: the revision history has been lost for the latest draft, but a previous version (D7R2) with most of the changes is available so it will be posted.

6. Ballot Response:

The following tentative schedule was discussed. If the dates needed to change after the meeting the original date discussed is shown in brackets.

Meeting Notes of WG-E3
October 21, 2010 – Conference Call

<i>Date Current (Original)</i>	<i>Step</i>
November 22 (November 1)	Start formation of ballot group
November 8	Deadline for <u>WGE3 Members</u> voting on if we should proceed to ballot with the current draft
December 23 (November 22)	Ballot group invitation closes.
January 2 (December 6)	Start of ballot on Draft 7
February 2 (January 14)	Ballot closes (allow 2 extra weeks for Christmas holiday)
March 15 (February 28)	Subgroups send recommendations on ballot comments to Randy
April 15 (April 4)	Web meeting/conference call to review comments which require group input. Tentative time: 1 PM EST, 10 AM PST
May 15-20	Chicago meeting, WG meets to finalize any other details

Clause Assignments – The following people will be involved in the review of comments for the specific clauses.

<i>Clause</i>	<i>Working Group person</i>
1	Ajay Garg Raj Ghai Don Delcourt
2	Ajay Garg Raj Ghai Don Delcourt
3	Don Delcourt
4	Joe Gravelle Brian Farmer
5	Steve Shelton Deb Logtin
6	Ajay Garg Raj Ghai Boris Shvartsberg
7	Ajay Garg Raj Ghai Boris Shvartsberg
8	Patrick McShane Tom Larose
9	Brian Farmer Joe Gravelle

Meeting Notes of WG-E3
October 21, 2010 – Conference Call

<i>Clause</i>	<i>Working Group person</i>
A	Subclauses will be reviewed by appropriate main clause reviewers.
B	Ajay Garg Raj Ghai Don Delcourt
C	Ajay Garg Raj Ghai Boris Shvartsberg
D	Randy Clelland Boris Shvartsberg Ajay Garg Raj Ghai,
E	Patrick McShane Don Delcourt
F	Randy Clelland

7. **Tutorial** – It was agreed that a tutorial was a good idea. This will be discussed in more depth at the Chicago meeting.
8. **Next Meetings**
 - 2011 April 4, 1 pm EST/10 am PST – Web meeting/conference call
 - 2011 May 15-20 – Substation Committee Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL
9. **Roundtable**
 - Brian Farmer asked why Annex F was removed from Draft 6. Don explained that the fire protection inspection, maintenance and testing section was deleted 2+ years ago. The rationale was that it covered an area that could be in conflict with the requirements of national, state, provincial and local codes. The requirements for fire protection inspection, testing and maintenance should therefore only be those required by the local authority.
 - Joe Gravelle asked if a benefit/cost example could be covered at the Chicago meeting when we do examples. Specifically he would like to know where to find the data to do the analysis. Don said that he has examples that could be used.

Meeting notes were recorded by Randy Clelland.