

Chair: Paul Found

Secretary: Karla Trost

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order

Paul

The meeting was called to order at 12:01PM CST.

2. Introduction of Members and Guests

Self-introductions with affiliations were made in the chat.

3. Attendance and Quorum Check

Karla

The Working Group has 19 members. Quorum requires 10. 8 members and 1 guest were present.

4. Comment Resolution Continuation

Re-circulation Ballot review of select items. (See attached pdf.)



PC37.68_Recirc1_comments_PF_WGreview

- The chair reviewed the remaining open comments. There were 5 that were more editorial. The chair and secretary reviewed proposed resolution and will send to the working group for review and approval.
- Previous Action Item: R1-5 & R1-4: Pending recommendation from P. Meyer (Commenter recommended change to the format of the tables to reduce the number of columns headings.)
 - P. Meyer agrees with the commenters proposal for “Integral” and “Not Integral”.
 - Discussion on if this will drive any changes to the text in the subclauses.
 - The revised tables will be sent out to the Working Group to review.
- R1-83: Clause 6.2.4 (Request to add additional labeling related to power sources)
 - The Working group believes that the labeling for manufacturer provided power sources are already covered.
 - Discussion on “areas where a customer could potentially land power sources for customer-added wiring”
 - If the manufacturer does not include the power source at time of shipment, it would seem to be the responsibility of the user.
 - One user was concerned that they want to ensure that “hidden” voltages be labeled which is already covered in the document.

- Working Group agreed to reject.
 - Discussion if lines 502/503 (> one source of voltage) is redundant to 497/ 498.
 - Discussion that 499-501 are applicable to lower voltages and mechanical stored energy sources.
 - Some members read 497/498 to call for “a” label, others read it to mean a label next to each part.
 - Proposal to have a small group propose language using ANSI Z535 as a guide. **P. Found and K. Trost**
- R1-60: (Clause 6.2.4) Lines 494/495 – Recommendation to change language to align with ANSI Z535.
 - In general, the working group agrees. P. Found and K. Trost to review with previous comment.
- R1-72 and R1-105 (Clause 6.2.7 and 6.2.8) – Question to the level of protection required for these two applications.
 - General agreement these should be IP X3.
 - Discussion on the structure that lines 536 and 537 should be inserted as a 6.2.8.X subclause and be specific to polemount.
- R1-108 (Clause 6.3.1.1) – Suggested language for lines 560/561 to improve clarity.
 - Working group agreed to use “Operational logic shall permit the **operator to cancel** a local operation during a running time delay.”
- R1-80 (Clause 6.3.2) – Suggested language to clarify when this requirement is applicable.
 - Working group agreed to use ““Where a front panel interface is provided, it ~~The control user interface~~ shall be located in the enclosure behind the closed door or access panel.”
- R1-110 (Clause 6.4.1) – Proposal to deleted Rows 616-617 due to potential redundancy with 507/509.
 - General agreement that we should combine the language.
 - Discussion on if this should be placed in the “protection” section or if it should be in the “cable design” section.
 - Discussion on if this language is a mandate (all controls as option); if it is only applicable to publicly accessible controls; and if it is user requested only.
 - Decision – this applies to publicly accessible control and we do not need language that says “if required by the user”. Place it in the “507” subclause.
 - **C. Hastreiter** to draft a proposal.
- R1-20 (Clause 6.5.3) – Commenter proposed to remove use of word “harvest”
 - Discussion on changing it to “derives”.
 - Discussion on simplifying the sentence by removing a portion. The current language was added after Draft 3.1 balloting comments.
 - Working group agreed to reject.
- R1-73 (Clause 6.5.4) – Commenter suggests removing the clause.
 - Working group is going to add a reference to “as defined in 7.4.2” to this clause.
- R1-21 (Clause 6.5.5) – Suggestion to replace “rated” with “duration”.

- Discussion by one member to keep “rating”.
- Discussion that a “rating” requires a design test. Previous revisions to the document moved the documentation testing in 6.5.5.2 from design tests to design requirement.
- Agreement to accept the commenter’s proposal.
- R1-112 (Clause 6.6) – Suggestion to change the requirement to be on the manufacturer.
 - Agreement to accept the commenter’s proposal.
- R1-77: (Clause 7.6) – Suggestion to change shall to should.
 - Working group decided to remove the word “optionally”.
- R1-70 (Clause 9) – Commenter suggests removing clause 9 or changing the scope
 - Comment that shipping and storage is part of the application.
 - This comment will be rejected.
- R1-101 (Clause 8.7) – Commenter suggested changes for clarity.
 - K. Trost proposed an alternative: “Monitoring inputs which utilize an analog signal shall be tested ~~Dielectric medium monitoring inputs that provide an analog input to the control shall be calibrated~~ using an appropriate simulated input (voltage, current, etc.), covering the measurement range of the control. Monitoring inputs that utilize ~~provide~~ a digital input shall be tested using the appropriate input condition corresponding to the pass/fail condition.”
 - Working group agreed to use the proposed alternative in the draft with the phrase “dielectric medium monitoring” added to the beginning.
- There are 4 comments that are currently noted by the Chair as “consider”. P. Found will follow up with the commenter and/or working group via email.

5. Next steps/ meeting(s):

The next meeting will be scheduled once the working group has reviewed the comment resolution file and redline markup.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:37PM CST.

