

C37.74 Working Group Meeting Minutes

March 28th 2024 - Virtual



Chair: Kennedy Darko

Minutes taken by Karla Trost

Secretary: Travis Johnson

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:34 AM CDT.

2. Call for Patents and Copyrights.

- i. [Patent Slides](#)
- ii. [Copyright Slides](#)

There were no patent or copyright issues brought to the attention of the chair.

3. Introduction of Members and Guests

Attendees used the chat feature for self-introductions.

4. Attendance and quorum check

16 of 21 members were present. Quorum was met.

5. Approval of agenda

Motion by J. Stemmerich and second by P. Found to approve the agenda.

6. Chair's remarks

Reminder that many hands make light(er) work – please help us with addressing the comments.

7. Resolution of comments

- I-575 (6.14) – The commenter suggested different language to document if this is the phase to ground vs visible break withstand voltage.
 - CRG felt that Table 8 was clear in regard to application.
- I-646 (6.14) – The commenter asked if the power frequency withstand rating is the type test or route test voltage.
 - 5.6 calls out the requirements for the power-frequency withstand voltage as Column 5 of Table 1 which is different than the production value in Column 6.
- I-65 (7.1.1) The commenter is questioning the definition of “DSG shall be new and in good condition”
 - The WG members feel that language is sufficiently clear and as it is used in multiple standards, additional clarification is not needed.

- I-395 (7.1.4) The commenter documented that there is potentially a conflict on tolerances for frequencies during testing. The CRG would like to have a volunteer(s) to review the document and propose a solution.
 - **(C. Riley)** agreed to do this review after Ft. Lauderdale.
- I-478 (7.4.1) The commenter is requesting clarifying language regarding the rating of the switch.
 - The WG felt that the current language is clear in that it implies that both units would have the same ratings.
- I-556 (7.4.3) – The commenter feels that the table data is in conflict with the subclauses.
 - 7.7.10.2 calls out 2 variations, one with 50 additional operations and one with 200 additional operations.
 - Discussion in the group suggests that 50 operations should be sufficient. It was agreed to change the Switched Way and Fused-switch way to 50 operations.
 - If we decrease the switched way to 50, what do we do with the grounding switch (currently at 100) and fused loadbreak and visible break (currently at 10)?
 - 7.10 Note 2 calls out the grounding switch testing as only that listed in Table 7, therefore, leave the grounding at 100 in Table 7. (Pending the comment received about subclauses for grounding switches.)
 - Given line 1681 and Note 1, the fused loadbreak and visible break will be left at 10.
- I-524 (7.4.3) The commenter feels Table 7, Test #6, footnote (b) is not clear what should be tested on the non-grounding switches (only open, other positions?).
 - The CRG suggested either to remove footnote (b) or to add verbiage to the other categories documenting which tests are required.
 - It was shared that the intention is to test all of the ‘switches’ as open gap although ground switches cannot be tested phase-to-phase as one side is tied together.
 - If the note is removed, is there language missing in 7.7.2.4 about testing phase-to-phase? **V. Savulyak** will submit a comment for the WG to review.
 - The decision was made to remove footnote (b).
- I-479 (7.5.2) The commenter questions the differences in the test sequences (7.4.2 and 7.5.2) and requests that they be combined or aligned. The CRG requests an ad hoc review/propose. **K. Bush** agreed to do this review.
- I-482 (7.5.2) The commenter is questioning if lines 835 / 836 are pertinent for all designs and if so, language is needed to address that.
 - Could a statement be added after 720/721 that would be applicable to all types?
 - The statement on 834 refers to design modifications of a fused-loadbreak way. There are aspects to fused based designs which makes it particularly relevant, but it could/would still apply to other design types.
 - Proposal to add the following after line 721 (Clause 7.1)
 - and remove the language from 7.5.2.
 - The complete sequence of design tests need not be performed on each design modification of a previously certified design. The DSG manufacturer shall certify that all requirements are met based on test history of similar units and conformance.
- I-483 (7.6.2) The commenter feels there is a gap between 7.6.2 and Table 7.
 - This will be held for the Spring in-person meeting.
- I-95 (Line 906) The commenter questioned the labeling of Figures 3a-3d vs the Visible Break position column.
 - It was noted that footnote c was added to that column originally for the reason noted by the commenter, but more clarity is needed.

- *I. Rokser agreed to review and provide a proposal.*
- *I-104 (6.7) The commenter recommends the addition of a maximum force with a suggestion of 50 lbs.*
 - *Comment that the 50 lbs does not take account into the length of the leverage.*
 - *It was noted the commenter requested a maximum force but suggested a single number.*
 - *It will be difficult to require a specific amount as the location of the force application as well as where the person is standing have an impact. H. Bannink said IEC 62271-200 has a requirement in Newtons. He will look this up and provide it next week for further discussion.*

8. Any other business – *None noted*

9. Next meeting

*In-person meeting planned for Spring '24 Switchgear Committee Mtg. (April 2 & 3, 2024)
Westin Hotel Ft. Lauderdale, FL*

10. Adjournment at 10:59 CDT.

Name (Printed)	Employer	Mar 28, 2024	
Caryn Riley (Voting-Member)	Georgia Tech/NEETRAC	X	
Francois Soulard (Voting-Member)	Hydro-Quebec		
Frank DeCesaro (Voting-Member)	DeCesaro Consulting Services, LLC	X	
Harold Hirz (Voting-Member)	Vesco		
Ian Rokser (Voting-Member)	Eaton	X	
John Kapitula (Voting-Member)	ABB	X	
Karla Trost (Voting-Member)	G&W Electric	X	
Kennedy Darko (Chair)	G&W Electric	X	
Travis Johnson (Secretary)	Xcel Energy		
Harm Bannink (Voting-Member)	G&W Electric	X	
Jeffrey Gieger (Voting-Member)	ABB/Elastimold	X	
Victor Savulyak (Voting-Member)	Kema Labs	X	
Edwin Almeida (Voting-Member)	Southern California Edison	X	
David Beseda (Voting-Member)	S&C Electric Co		
Rahul Jain (Voting-Member)	S&C Electric Co	X	
Kelsey Bush (Voting-Member)	ABB/Elastimold	X	
Joseph Stemmerich (Voting-Member)	Trayer Engineering Corporation	X	
Paul Found (Voting-Member)	BC Hydro	X	
Mohit Chhabra (Voting-Member)	S&C Electric	X	
Eric (Qian) Li (Voting-Member)	Powertech Labs	X	
Jonathan Neujahr (Voting-Member)	Eaton		

Key: X – present
E – excused