

Minutes of the IEEE PSES TSTC teleconference held Wednesday, January 11, 2017 at 11:00 AM EST, for one hour.

## 1. Attendance/Introductions

Members present: Don Gies (Nokia Bell Labs), Philip Havens (Littelfuse), Al Martin (retired), , Paul Ng (GE Energy), Joe Randolph (Randolph Telecom), Dan Roman (Colgate-Palmolive), Jim Wiese (Adtran).

Members absent: Ernie Gallo (Ericsson – Telcordia), Peter Lim (Alpha Technology), Mick Maytum (MJMaytum), Gary Schrempp (Dell), Tom Smith (TJS Technical Services Inc), Svetlana Ulemek (Burndy), Anne Venetta-Richard (Nokia).

Interested parties (not present)

Tim Ardley (Adtran), Doug Parker (Adtran), Peter Tarver (Enphase Energy), Steve Zugay (Cree)

## 2. Meeting arrangements

Join me now in my Personal Room.

Join WebEx meeting

<https://nokiameetings.webex.com/join/don.gies>

Meeting number: 953 999 550

Join by phone

8200300 Internal

+14702263458 US Atlanta

Access code: 953 999 550

Global call-in numbers

Join by video conferencing system

\*953 999 550 Internal

@ 953 999 550@nokiameetings.webex.com External

## 3. Previous meeting minutes

The minutes of the December 7, 2016 meeting were reviewed and approved with a minor change.

## 4. New business

### a) *Changes to IEC62368*

Paul Ng: Showed his presentation. Essentially what IEC62368 wants to do is replace the 1.2/850 surge test with a dielectric withstand test. In IEC 60664 the dielectric withstand test is 4000 V. For the case of a 480 V delta input power supply, IEC62368 says to do the dielectric withstand test at 6000 V. The dielectric withstand test is hard to do at 6000 V due to corona discharge. My proposal is to use 6000 V surge test instead.

The new dielectric withstand test in IEC62368 is intended to simulate a 1.2/50 impulse test. But there is a big difference in doing a surge test and a dielectric withstand test. IEC62368 makes distinction between surface breakdown and insulation withstand. My argument is that if a test is copied from IEC60664, it shouldn't make the requirements tougher than they are in IEC60664. Apparently the logic for the IEC62368 requirement is that in the case of a distribution transformer fault it can take up to 5 seconds for the fault to clear. So this case looks like a long-term event which can be simulated by a dielectric withstand test. IEC62368 oversimplified things, which causes problems. The IEC62368 test is not realistic.

Don: If we have 480 V delta, Annex G puts you in a higher surge category. The issue is that the electric strength test is tied back to a surge voltage. There doesn't seem to be a clean way to connect IEC62368 to IEC60664.

Joe: What is problem?

Paul: The problem is that a new clause in IEC62368 is tougher than the corresponding one in IEC60664. What IEC62368 did was to make everything a dielectric test instead of a surge test. The rationale was that not everyone has a 6000 V surge generator.

Don: You have to meet the highest voltage in the three tables. For a 240 V input the worst case of the 3 tables was a bit higher than 60950-1. The issue is that 480V delta equipment gets thrown into higher test voltage.

Joe: So what the new standard does is impose a stricter requirement than the older one.

Paul: IEC62368 tried to take a more scientific test. Why do a hipot? Do it because a transient imposes high voltages. IEC62368 has 3 hipot tables one for transients, one for swells, and one for internally generated voltages. My problem is a specific case where a mains transient is simulated by 6000 V dielectric test – I want to go back to a surge test.

Phil: Can we just change the note that sends us to the 6000 V test?

Paul: It's not easy to change an international standard.

Don: Al do you know why the delta case is worse than a grounded Y?

Al: No. The logic for that is probably in the CDs for the standard.

Paul: There is a hipot test for clearances and a hipot test for insulation thickness.

Joe: Most common hipot equipment only goes to 5000 V.

Don: I recommend you get familiar with the new dielectric test requirement. What voltages are different from IEC60950?

*b) Posting of minutes to a website*

Don: We need a destination for posting minutes.

Dan: What destination do you want?

Don: Google drive would work.

Dan e-mail me the google address you want to use, and I'll set up an account.

*c) C Surface temperature requirements*

Jim: There is a conference call discussing the change in surface temperature measurements on February 25. Telcordia and ATIS use a baseline of 25 °C for normalizing temperature. The test procedure has been changed to normalize to the max operating temp of the equipment.

Don: People don't want to give up on normalizing temperatures, including service providers.

Jim: Service providers use the ATIS recommendations. The safety standard is OK – it normalizes the surface temperature to 25 °C.

Joe: An empty box would fail a test referenced to the environmental temperature.

Don: The new standard should only be concerned with the internal temperature rise, but it's hard to get people to accept this.

Jim: There are short-term and long-term limits. Most of equipment life is in an environment at about 28 °C, so it doesn't make sense to assume max operating temp.

Joe: As product designers, we want to regulate the temp rise. But a purist would say no, you need to look at the temperature where people could be burned. Rich Nute gave presentation on touch temperature. But it wasn't accepted for standards.

Don: We'll see if we can get a copy of Rich's presentation to circulate.

**5. IEC 62368 updates**

Don: Any updates?

Jim: Nothing yet.

Don: In my environment buried former telecom copper cables could be used for power.

**6. Changes to 2017 National Electrical Code Regarding powering over low-power interfaces**

Changes have been made to Articles 840, 725 and possible other areas regarding requirements and marking of Class 2 and Class 3 circuits intended to power devices. Common examples are power over Ethernet and USB.

**7. Additional agenda items**

None

**8. Old Business**

None

**Next meeting**

The proposal is to hold meetings on the second Wednesday of the month. So the next meeting will be Wednesday February 8, 2017.

Respectfully submitted  
Al Martin, Secretary