

Procedural comments

1. Not enough time provided for the ballot/ballot timing.

At the Louisville meeting in Fall 2017 it was agreed that a ballot of the working group would be conducted by November 17th. The hope was to receive comments for discussion at our Spring 2018 meeting in Pittsburgh. When this timing slipped, and the draft for ballot was only available just prior to the working group meeting, the chair decided to delay the ballot until after the working group meeting rather than have an open ballot during the meeting. The timing allowed (15 days) was extended by delaying the circulation by 10 days after the working group meeting due to concerns about this timing, as well as to finish some editorial revisions (updating bibliography, etc.). From experience, whether you give 2 months or 15 days, the work of review of documents usually happens in the last week before the deadline.

2. Items included/excluded from the draft inconsistent with the working group minutes.

The draft is consistent with what had been discussed in prior meetings. For example, from Louisville minutes:

Marion Jaroszewski made the motion to make a straw ballot within the WG starting by November 17 using the current document with the changes discussed today. David Sundin second it and the group approved unanimously. The significant changes discussed included combining Clause 4 and 7, incorporating a generic loading guide method using the aging example from IEEE C57.100 and incorporating the loading guide from IEEE 1276-1997 (aramid in mineral oil) and an updated version of the loading guide on natural esters into an informative annex linked to this method described in the main body of the document. Additionally, some of the information in the Annex on materials in the Annex will be condensed as no work has been done on this section.

This is exactly what was done, with the exception of the loading guide section. An additional clarification has been added to the end of Annex A because of these concerns which notes how the first step of determining a loading guide equation is derived based on a completed aging experiment which follows the requirements of IEEE Std C57.100. This addresses the generic loading guide approach described in the minutes.

In addition, information (such as the new Annex A) was discussed in the working group and provided to the working group (and guests who attended the meeting) in an email sent prior to the working group meeting. A detailed presentation on the addition was made during the working group meeting.

Additional input related to these procedural comments.

There are a series of honestly very abusive comments that have no place in IEEE. For someone to impugn that DuPont has commercial reasons for what has been done with these documents is very insulting. In fact, we always try to be as non-commercial as possible in standards. One example of this was the removal of all references to our "aramid" materials other than in the materials table to the Annexes, where such specific references belong. These still belong, as they related to one of two aging

examples the group agreed should be in the document as part of the new Annex B. “High temperature material” was used wherever possible, as this is what is appropriate in such a document.

I personally have been subjected to repeated attacks first as chairman of IEEE C57.100 and later as the chairman of IEEE 1276, and have respectfully addressed comments when made. Changes referred to within IEEE C57.100 were made to update a document which had not had significant revision since 1986, except for the addition of a quality control sealed tube test in the 1999 version. The revisions for the 2011 version were done with the consensus of the working group. The revised procedure for testing, was the result of a ballot resolution group which included the hand selected person from the company fielding this complaint. The revised document was then approved in the recirculation of the IEEE ballot.

The example given related to the working group meetings and having the chairs limit their discussion was presented on Monday, the day prior to our working group meeting in Pittsburgh. Unfortunately, the agenda for our meeting was already set, and guidance was understood, but not able to be accomplished, especially in the absence of my secretary. Additionally, I am not sure how to answer questions from the audience without staying at the podium. The comments related to Sasha are false. Here are the notes from the working group minutes related to this:

Q: Sasha Levin - where is distribution transformer information

A: Roger Wicks – recognizes that it doesn’t cover everything but will take suggestions during ballot. Would like additional input to add to document, which would be great if it included drawings like we have for the power options.

Sasha has provided this input during his ballot, and it will be incorporated into draft 2.2 as was agreed to in the meeting.

It seems that the commercial interests of some of the working group members were exhibited with their ballots. One balloter went to the extent of sending his comments to other balloters to try and influence their ballot, and in fact a few ballots “echoed” his comments. This is against the intent of individual balloting within IEEE.

Finally, there is content within this draft document that I do not agree, but it has been included because this is the expressed will of the working group. This is what we are supposed to do – gain consensus within the group. During working group meetings over the last three years, we solicited volunteers to finish the work of the working group, but ultimately in absence of content in some sections, a document had to be completed for ballot. This is what has been done, in a way that attempted to meeting the working group direction as well as possible.