

3.0 Administrative Subcommittee – Jin Sim

Chairman Jin Sim covered the key points of the Administrative Subcommittee Meeting held on March 16, 2003. Full details of the Minutes of the Administrative Subcommittee Meeting Minutes follow.

3.1 Introduction of members and guests

Chairman Sim called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m., Sunday, March 16, 2003, in the Hannover III Meeting Room of the Sheraton Capital Center Hotel in Raleigh, North Carolina, USA. The meeting started with introductions of members and guests.

The following members of the Subcommittee were present:

G. Anderson	R. F. Dudley
D.J.Fallon	R.S.Girgis
E. G. Hager, Jr.	C.W. Johnson, Jr.
T. Lundquist	C. G. Niemann
B. K. Patel	D. W. Platts
T. A. Prevost	J. Puri
H. J. Sim	J. E. (Jim) Smith
R. J. Stahara (for J. E. (Ed) Smith)	L. B. Wagenaar

The following guests were present:

Naeem Ahmad (part time)	Peter Balma
Stephen Shull	

3.2 Approval of the Oklahoma City AdCom meeting minutes

The minutes of the previous Administrative Subcommittee meeting in Oklahoma City were approved as written. Greg Anderson provided comment on changes needed in Oklahoma City attendance figures as part of the Main Committee Meeting Minutes, and appropriate updates will be made.

3.3 Additions to and/or approval of the agenda

Peter Balma forwarded a request to the Chair to address the Administrative Subcommittee on the subject of recognition and awards. His discussion was added to the New Business section of the Agenda. With this addition, the previously communicated Agenda was generally followed.

3.4 Meeting arrangements, host reports, and committee finances – G.W. Anderson

The Meetings Planning SC report is included in the Committee meeting minutes. Items discussed during the Admin. SC Meeting include:

- Financial – Committee budget, prior to the Raleigh Meeting, was approximately \$13,787, essentially the same as at the start of the previous meeting in Oklahoma City, where it was \$13,940. The budget is at a reasonable level to provide for appropriate financing of meeting preparations.

- Raleigh Registration status – Ray Nicholas of ABB Electric provided an update on the status of meeting plans and registration totals. At the start of the Meeting, there were 308 registered attendees and 40 registered companions. Full attendance details are included in the Meetings Planning SC Minutes. Raleigh will be one of the highest attended meetings to date.
- Meeting planning modifications include:
 - moving the Newcomers Orientation to a 7:00a.m. timeslot Monday morning. Tables will be set up so attendees can bring their continental breakfast.
 - Moving the Standards Development Process informational meeting to a Monday luncheon session, with a box lunch at cost for those registered for this session.
- Future Meetings (full details in the Meetings Planning SC Minutes):
 - October 5-9, 2003 – Pittsburgh, PA; hosted by Dennis Blake for Pennsylvania Transformer Technologies, to be held at the Sheraton Station Square Hotel.
 - March 7-11, 2004 – San Diego, CA; hosted by Ron Kirker for San Diego Gas & Electric, to be held at the Catamaran Resort Hotel on Mission Bay in San Diego.
 - Fall'04 – Edinburgh, Scotland; tentative dates October 17-21, 2004; hosted by Jim Fyvie for VATECH Peebles Transformers. Hotel arrangements have not been made yet.
- Break Sponsorship – Greg Anderson outlined the status of the program for break sponsorships at this meeting. The program is intended to help contain costs for attendees. Present schedule includes 13 breaks, and even with limited refreshments budget for these breaks is almost \$12,000. Dry-Keep, Siemens, and SMIT are participating by each sponsoring a break during this meeting. Sponsorship costs run roughly \$750 for a beverage/snack break. The Committee recognizes and appreciates the support provided by these sponsors. If you wish to investigate future sponsorship opportunities, please contact Joe Watson (joe_watson@fpl.com). Joe is coordinating this activity.

3.5 ASC C57 ISSUES – H. J. Sim

Chairman Sim was pleased to report that the IEEE NEMA MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) issue has finally been resolved. NEMA has provided an appropriately signed letter transferring to IEEE the sponsorship of certain documents that had been sponsored by NEMA under the MOU. In our case, this includes all C57 transformer documents that had been under the sponsorship of NEMA. These documents, mainly related to distribution transformers, now fall under complete sponsorship of IEEE. The Transformers Committee will continue to have the responsibility for maintenance of these documents, with full indemnification provided by IEEE. A copy of the NEMA letter is included with the Chairs Report as part of the Main Committee Minutes.

The ASC C57 balloting process has ended. During the ASC C57 Committee meeting scheduled for Thursday this topic will be reviewed further, and a discussion on need for future ASC C57 meetings is expected.

3.6 IEEE delegation report ANSI C57 Committee – B. K. Patel

Due to the termination of the ASC C57 balloting process, there was no report from the IEEE delegation.

3.7 Committee Service Awards – B. K. Patel

Bipin Patel presented his report, which is included in the Committee meeting minutes. Note was made in particular of a new award has been added for the committee, for “Long-standing and Notable Contributions to the Transformers Committee”. This award is to recognize our retiring members after their years of active participation and contributions. The award, in the form of a plaque, has been presented on a selected basis in the recent past and now it is intended to become a regular practice of recognizing our worthy members.

3.8 Chair’s report – H. J. Sim

Jin presented his report, which is included in the Committee meeting minutes. Particular note was made of the new PES publication “Power and Energy” magazine, and of the resolution of the IEEE/NEMA MOU issue with the transfer of sponsorship of selected C57 documents from NEMA to IEEE.

3.9 Vice Chair’s report – K. S. Hanus

Ken was unable to attend this meeting. His report was submitted prior to the meeting, and is included in the Committee meeting minutes. Note was made of the schedule for the next PES General Meetings: July 13-18, 2003 in Toronto; and June 6-12, 2004 in Denver.

3.10 Secretary’s report – D. J. Fallon

The Secretary’s Report was submitted prior to the meeting, and is included here. The Addendum (Clause 3.10.5) reviews action taken at this meeting.

3.10.1 Membership Review

Voting Members – Six new members were added at the last meeting in Oklahoma City:

- James M. Gardner, Delaware Electric
- George E. Henry III, Central Moloney, Inc.
- Paul E. Millward, Instrument Transformer Equipment Corp.
- Robert Thompson, Duke Energy – Energy Delivery Services
- Ron Daubert, Finley Engineering
- Paul Orehek, Richards Manufacturing (renewing former membership)

Welcoming letters have not yet been sent to these, and other recent new members. The Secretary will address this shortly. Action was also taken at Oklahoma City to update Bill Kennedy’s membership status to Emeritus. A notification letter will be sent to Bill from the Committee expressing appreciation for his contributions.

A request has also been received from Linden Pierce asking consideration for Emeritus membership status. Linden intends to continue to participate in balloting and corresponding with the Committee, but he does not anticipate attendance at future meetings. Per the O&P Manual: “The Emeritus Member classification is intended to apply to individuals who have made longstanding and notable contributions to the Committee, but because of a change of personal situations are unable to participate as Voting Members.” We will review this request at the meeting, with the expectation that Linden’s participation, leadership, and dedication to the Committee over many years will be considered.

Review of the membership is continuing with contacts to members who have not been in attendance at any of the four most recent meetings. A letter has been received from Emeritus Member John Easley of GE resigning from the Committee; his name will be removed from the membership roster and a letter of appreciation will be forwarded. Several additional members who have not attended recently have communicated their desire to maintain membership. The status of those who have responded will be reviewed at the Administrative SC Meeting. Phone/mail contact will be attempted with those non-attending members who have not been accessible by e-mail, and membership status recommendations will subsequently be made to the Chair.

Following changes made, but prior to any actions to be reviewed in Raleigh, membership stands at:

Voting Members -	189
Classifications:	
Producers -	94
Users -	52
General -	43
Life Members	1
Corresponding Members -	1
Emeritus Members -	18

The invitation list has 551 names on it at this time. Several Guests who are no longer attending have been removed, and that review continues also.

3.10.2 New Member Applications

Applications for Committee Membership have been submitted for:

- Tommy P. Cooper, Public Works Commission, Fayetteville
- George J. Reitter, Delta Star, Inc.
- Waldemar Ziomek, Pauwels Canada, Inc.

These applications will be reviewed at the Administrative Subcommittee meeting. An application has also been forwarded by another applicant, but at the moment that application is incomplete and may be deferred for later action. An application is also expected prior to the Raleigh Meeting for Alan Darwin, Alstom T&D Transformers. The Committee welcomes and encourages active participants to become Voting Members of the Committee. Requirements and application forms can be found in the Organization and Procedures (O&P) Manual, accessible on the Committee website. Subcommittee Chairs are encouraged to recommend new members, and to communicate to applicants awareness that Membership is a privilege gained through active

participation in Committee work at the WG and SC level. WG and SC Chairs are reminded also that signing an application sponsoring a new member signifies their understanding that the applicant has met the requirement of active participation for at least one year. New member applications can be forwarded to the Secretary's attention at any time for review at the next AdsubCom meeting.

3.10.3 PES Directory Rosters

Subcommittee Chairs are requested to keep the rosters updated as they change constantly. Thanks to all SC Chairs for providing current roster information last November. That information was compiled and submitted to PES for inclusion in the 2003 PES Directory. Discussions will continue on movement towards eventual use of a single database of Committee roster information, so that when a member or guest registers, any corrections to contact information can be used to automatically update Subcommittee and Working Group rosters.

3.10.4 Meeting Minutes

The Minutes of the Oklahoma City Fall '02 meeting were reproduced at a cost of \$1,930.98 for 405 copies and postage costs were \$1,868.45 for 389 mailings (317 within the US and another 72 worldwide), which averages \$9.77 per mailing. While the net cost of Minutes printing and mailing varies for each meeting, the \$10 portion of the registration fee remains a valid nominal fee. Oklahoma City Minutes were mailed on February 26, with expected delivery to domestic US destinations by March 3, and to international destinations by March 7.

In a member vote at the Oklahoma City Meeting the consensus among Members was to move towards electronic posting, rather than printing and mailing, as the primary means of communication of Committee Meeting Minutes in the future, while also maintaining the capability to provide printed Minutes upon request and at a price based on printing and mailing costs. Implementation plans are not complete. One possible option will be to start with the Fall '03 Meeting in Pittsburgh, with request for printed Minutes included as a choice (with cost) at registration. Cost may exceed \$10 as the consensus vote indicates expectation of a smaller printing total. This issue will be discussed further at the Administrative SC Meeting.

We will strive for completion of the Raleigh Meeting Minutes at least 6-8 weeks prior to the next Meeting in Pittsburgh PA. Subcommittee Chairs are requested to submit their SC Minutes by May 9, 2003 for this Meeting. The submittal should be an electronic file via e-mail, formatted in Word 2000 (or earlier versions) and it would be appreciated if the minutes were put in the format as shown in the present assembled Minutes, with numbering as indicated in the Main Committee Meeting (3/20/03) Agenda. Please indicate total attendance count for each Subcommittee, Working Group, and Task Force meeting in your minutes. Please do not send a copy of the attendance listing for this attendance count. If a SC Secretary, or another SC member is preparing the SC Minutes, please let them know these details about submitting the minutes for publication. Individual SC Minutes will be posted on the Committee website as soon as they are available.

3.10.5 Addendum to Secretary's Report – Action Taken During Admin. SC Meeting

The Committee notes with sincere regret the passing of recently approved member George Henry, of Central Moloney, shortly before the Raleigh Meeting. With thanks to Greg

Anderson's effort, Condolences have been sent from the Committee to George's family, together with a note of appreciation for his long years of service to the industry and the Committee, and for the friendship so many of us shared with George.

Linden Pierce's status was changed to Emeritus membership, with the unanimous approval of the Administrative SC members present. A notification letter will be forwarded to Linden, expressing the Committee's appreciation for his outstanding service.

Member Chuck Murray also recently forwarded a letter of resignation from the Committee, and expressed his appreciation to all he had worked with for their professionalism and friendship over the years. A letter of recognition and thanks will be forwarded to Chuck for his years of contribution to the Committee.

Bipin Patel raised a question on the terminology "voting member" as used in the Committee O&P Manual. The terminology was more valid in the past when only members could participate in the balloting process. With the present open ballot process the terminology is no longer valid. The consensus of the group was that the terminology should be changed to simply indicate "member" and that appropriate modifications should be made in the next revision of the O&P Manual, scheduled to take place later this year.

Discussion continued on the need to reduce the membership list by removing non-participating and non-attending members. Contact with several members who had not attended recently but maintained interest in continuing participation led to review of the corresponding category of membership. Corresponding membership was suggested by the Secretary in these contacts as a means to maintain participation. Moving non-attending members to this category would also address the problems recently encountered in achieving quorum when votes are taken at Committee meetings, as corresponding members would not be included in the quorum count. There is no mention of requirements for corresponding membership in the O&P Manual, despite the fact that we presently have one corresponding member. The Secretary suggested that requirements for corresponding membership be defined in general as including all regular membership requirements, with the exception of attendance at meetings. It would be incumbent on corresponding members to maintain contact and participation with WG's and/or SC's in their areas of interest in order to maintain their membership. The proposed changes will be made in the next revision of the O&P Manual, for review and approval of the Administrative SC.

Tom Prevost reported that he learned at the IEEE Standards Board of Governors (BOG) meeting that different Technical Committees define their automatic ballot pools differently. All are subject to the open ballot process, but some limit the size of the automatic ballot pool to those WG members actively working on a particular project. Smaller ballot pools of interested and involved parties can make the process, including addressing negative ballots, more manageable. Anyone else can still become a member of the ballot group, but to do so they must apply through the IEEE SA website either for inclusion in a specific ballot, or inclusion in groups of ballots by subject matter. At present the Transformers Committee ballot pool consists roughly of our entire invitation list, roughly 500 members, although the Secretary has not regularly communicated updates on this list to our Standards Coordinator (Tom). Tom suggested that we may wish to

limit future ballot pools to WG members involved in a specific project, and members of the Committee. This could make the automatic ballot pool more appropriate and also be an incentive to membership. The Chair asked Tom to proceed to investigate this option (the automatic ballot pool consisting of main Committee membership) further. Each specific ballot pool will be supplemented by adding the WG members for that project. Our Standards Coordinator will have the responsibility to keep this automatic pool up to date, and to coordinate with IEEE SA to assure that those who do not participate in any ballots are removed from the pool at an appropriate time.

With future plans for electronic media as the primary means of communication for Committee business, Greg Anderson questioned whether the Invitation list should be maintained into the future. He suggested in future it might be appropriate to only keep track of active Main Committee, WG, and SC members. Programs are under review to modernize the membership database, including varying levels of security access to allow individual members to maintain accuracy of their contact information, and to allow WG and SC Chairs to control their membership lists.

Previously submitted membership applications were reviewed and approved for the new member applicants identified in Section 3.10.2 (Tommy Cooper, George Reitter, and Waldemar Ziomek). Alan Darwin had also submitted a completed application prior to the meeting, and this application was approved also.

The additional application mentioned above remained incomplete at the time of the meeting. Sponsoring signatures had been included, but notation by those signers of participation in those groups for a duration of at least one full year was not yet available. Communication with several members indicated the applicant's active participation, leading to the conclusion that it was appropriate to consider him for membership, but in the absence of three signatures attesting to the minimum one year's apprenticeship by each sponsoring group, the application was deferred for future action. The Secretary pointed out a discrepancy in the O&P Manual, with participation in WG's/SC's indicated on the reverse of the application form, and participation and membership listed in the body of text. The inconsistency will be addressed in the upcoming revision, with intent to more clearly indicate both active participation and membership in the respective WG's and SC's as a pre-requisite for Committee membership. Contact will be made with the applicant, thanking him for his participation, and encouraging continuing participation as part of the process of attaining membership. Our aim is to encourage active participation in the work of the Committee, and encourage all participants to become members of the Committee. The real work of the Committee takes place at the WG and SC level. The membership process is outlined in the O&P Manual. Membership in a WG or SC in many cases is simply a matter of requesting membership, and that membership carries with it the responsibility of participating in the work of the WG or SC. Some of our WG or SC Chairs require participation before granting membership, and it is within their authority to do so. The primary requirement for Main Committee membership is a year's apprenticeship as an active participant and member of several Working Groups and Subcommittee(s). With that apprenticeship, an applicant completes the application form, found in the O&P Manual, and has it endorsed by three WG or SC Chairs - at least one must be a SC Chair, with that SC sponsoring

the applicant. The three signatures attest to the membership and active participation in the respective WG or SC activities for at least that one year's time.

During discussion, one suggestion was made that applicants be required to list projects they had contributed to during their apprenticeship. Alternatively, wording can be added to the application form indicating that sponsoring signatures attest to knowledge of active participation. The wording would serve as a reminder to both applicants and sponsors of their responsibilities in the membership process. As discussion continued, the Secretary advised this alternate approach would be included in the upcoming revision of the O&P Manual for review by the Administrative SC.

The Secretary noted a request made by one of the Tutorial presenters at the Raleigh meeting, asking that consideration be given to either some form of stipend, or perhaps waiving meeting registration fees as a form of recognition of the additional effort involved in preparation and presentation of tutorial material. The request was first submitted to the Meetings Planning SC Chair, and after due consideration was denied on the grounds of difficulty in administering equitably and fairly. The presenter then appealed that request to the Committee officers through telephone calls and in writing. The Committee officers had discussed the possibility of funding members facing budget difficulties in the past, and had decided that the Committee could not in general agree to establish a policy to do so. The Chair prepared a written response, noting the volunteer nature of all Committee work, the budget difficulties that many members must live with, offering encouragement for continuing participation, but regretfully denying the request. The applicant again requested further discussion within our group, indicating that he felt this form of recognition should be considered for future presenters, either at the Administrative SC level or at the Main Committee. A good amount of discussion ensued, reviewing the above points and also noting:

- the increased educational value the tutorial sessions add to our meetings,
- the appropriateness of some form of recognition for tutorial presenters,
- the significant volunteer efforts of many of our participants in working on Committee business and projects, sometimes involving even greater effort than I tutorial preparation,
- the benefits in peer recognition and possibilities of additional business interaction provided by tutorial presentations

At the conclusion of discussion, the consensus of the Administrative SC was in support of the Chair's response, and there was agreement not to set up a policy for monetary recognition of the voluntary efforts of our participants, including tutorial presenters. At the same time, the Awards SC Chair was requested to consider other appropriate means to recognize the valued contributions of those involved in tutorial presentations.

The Committee's plan is that Raleigh will be the last meeting for which printed Minutes will be distributed to all Meeting attendees, and to all Members. Primary communication will be electronically, through the Committee website. Printed copies of Minutes can be made available upon request, and there will be a charge for printing and mailing. Our intent will be to have a checkbox on the registration form for Pittsburgh for a registrant to indicate if they wish printed Minutes to be sent to them. The Secretary plans to communicate this information via the reflector e-mail service, and to send a letter to all Members, as previously printed Minutes had been forwarded to them even if they did not attend the Meeting. The Committee will be advised

if there are any changes to this planned implementation of primary electronic communication of Minutes.

3.11 Standards Subcommittee - T. A. Prevost

3.11.1 Standards and coordination activities

Tom Prevost reviewed his report, which is included in the Committee meeting minutes. In addition, items of note during this section of the meeting include:

- NesCom (New Standards Committee) is taking an even harder look at requests for project extensions. Project Authorization Requests (PAR's) have a normal life of four years. A two year extension is readily granted if requested, and one additional extension may be granted, but only upon presentation of compelling reason. Beyond that, virtually no additional extensions will be granted. Review should perhaps be made for projects lasting 7 years or more, with re-grouping under a new PAR with new leadership as one possible solution. The following PAR's are expected to be subject to administrative withdrawal at the next Standards Board Meeting:
 - C57.13 (Standard Requirements for Instrument Transformers) PAR - The project has been ongoing for nearly 8 years, and no further extensions will be granted. Reaffirmation should be considered by years end.
 - PC57.113 (Recommended Practice for Partial Discharge Measurement in Liquid-Filled Transformers and Shunt Reactors) PAR will be withdrawn also. In the case of this document, reaffirmation was chosen rather than revision, and the reaffirmation has been successfully completed.
 - PC62.91 (Standard Requirements, Terminology, and Test Procedures for Neutral Grounding Devices) has been taken over by the Transformers Committee. PAR for PC62.91 will be withdrawn, and this revision work will be taken up under a new PAR for project PC57.32.
- A Corrigenda was prepared, balloted, and approved for the C57.91 Loading Guide to correct some specific errors in the document, but disapproved a reaffirmation of the base document because of the approval of the Corrigenda. Either the base document will have to be revised to include the Corrigenda corrections (opening it to general revision in other areas also), or the base document and Corrigenda will have to be subjected to reaffirmation together.
- SC and WG Chairs are advised to pay particular attention to the listing of PAR's (Project Approval Requests) that are nearing expiration, and to take appropriate action to either complete or request extensions, if necessary, through the on-line process available through IEEE. Note PC 57.12.01, PC57.130, PC57.140, and PC57.141 will expire at the end of 2003.
- Note also from the Report over 15 standards documents due for five year review by the end of 2003. Appropriate action is required for these documents. If revision is in process, extension of PAR should be requested if revision ballot would not be complete by years end. Otherwise work should promptly begin on reaffirmation in order to avoid administrative withdrawal.

3.11.2 Documents submitted to the Standards Board

See the status reports in Attachments 1 and 2 at the end of the assembled Committee Minutes.

3.12 Round-Table: Subcommittee Activities - Subcommittee Chairs

3.12.1 Audible Sound and Vibration - Jeewan Puri

Jeewan commented that definition of the role of “Corresponding” member, and encouraging participation through correspondence, may help to alleviate some of the difficulties all SC’s experience with getting sufficient participation at meetings to keep work moving forward.

3.12.2 Bushings - F. E. Elliott

There was no representative of the Bushing SC present, and subsequently no report.

3.12.3 Dielectric Tests - L. B. Wagenaar

Loren reported that in the continuing effort to provide sufficient depth of leadership in WG’s three WG’s within the Dielectric Test SC now have secretaries.

3.12.4 Distribution Transformers – Ron Stahara, for Ed Smith

Ron noted the contributions George Henry had made, and forwarded the appreciation of George’s family, and of George’s associates at Central Moloney, for the condolences sent by the Committee.

Ron also reported that the recirculation ballot on C57.12.34 closed on March 9. With a 90% ballot return and 79% affirmative votes, the ballot may technically be successful, even with 16 negative ballots. The negative ballots deal with metrification concerns, and as a result there is uncertainty on how to proceed. The Chair requested that this discussion be included during review of metrification issues later in the meeting.

3.12.5 Dry-Type Transformers – Chuck Johnson

The Chair noted that Wes Patterson had regretfully forwarded his resignation as Chair of the Dry-Type SC, due to increasing difficulty in including these responsibilities within the framework of his present workscope. The Chair expressed the thanks of the Committee for Wes’ contributions, and appointed Chuck Johnson as the new SC Chair.

Chuck had no items to report to the Administrative SC.

3.12.6 HVDC Converter Transformers & Smoothing Reactors - Richard Dudley

Richard reported that the standards under this S.C. are part of an evolving technology area. Current efforts are focused on possible future additions/revisions to IEEE C57.129 and IEEE 1277. Work areas include:

- Drafting of an Annex on transformers used in voltage source converter based HVDC schemes.
- Drafting of an Annex on overloading of converter transformers; emphasis on test issues.
- Measurement of losses of converter transformers.
- Feedback from HVDC projects and use of standards; converter transformers and smoothing reactors.

Richard provided a warning to all SC Chairs, based on the serious problems in reaffirmation of C57.21 due to errors introduced in the balloted document through character recognition during scanning by IEEE. Document sponsors are urged to check the documents carefully. IEEE has indicated they will provide additional editorial overview. We have also changed the process to have a Draft forwarded back to the WG Chair, or other appropriate person guiding the reaffirmations, after any scanning – for final review prior to balloting. These changes should go a long way towards addressing these problems, but we should remain vigilant. Questions were also asked on whether IEEE is using appropriately sophisticated programs to avoid such problems in future.

Richard also expressed significant concern with a seemingly growing problem, when conducting Committee business via e-mail, with individuals who simply do not respond. Even recognizing how busy most of us are, and how much e-mail we receive, he urges that we all be mindful of our responsibility to respond to Committee issues and correspondence. If work or personal schedules preclude thorough response, at least a note back that the correspondence has been received, and that the work should proceed without that individual's response, is in order. The problem is magnified when negative balloters do not respond to subsequent correspondence. The group concurred, and the Chair will plan to make an announcement in the Main Meeting appealing for all participants in our work to be mindful of these professional responsibilities.

3.12.7 Instrument Transformers - J. E. Smith

Jim reported that he had received a request for Standards interpretation, and asked how to proceed. The Chair advised that the interpretation response should be prepared within the SC, and then submitted to the Administrative SC for review and approval. Once approved, the interpretation response can be forwarded back to IEEE for ultimate reply to the requester.

3.12.8 Insulating Fluids – F. J. Gryszkiewicz

SC representation arrived in Raleigh subsequent to the Administrative SC Meeting, and there was therefore no report at the meeting.

3.12.9 Insulation Life – D. W. Platts

No items to report to the Administrative SC.

3.12.10 Performance Characteristics – R. S. Girgis

Ramsis noted that several preliminary conference calls had been held and that planning was proceeding for the expanded tutorial session on core excitation to be held at the Pittsburgh Meeting, with participation by both manufacturers and utilities.

3.12.11 Power Transformers - E.G. Hager

No items to report to the Administrative SC.

3.12.12 Underground Transformers and Network Protectors – C. Niemann

Carl noted that the metrification issue was on the agenda for discussion later in the meeting. He reiterated the importance of resolution of this issue in a manner recognizing the safety concerns of a large number of users of the product standards, and expressed dismay that he had not yet seen a response from IEEE SA or the BOG related to the Committee's concerns. The Chair indicated there would be further discussion of this issue later in the meeting.

3.12.13 Meetings & Planning - Greg Anderson

As indicated, Greg's report is included in the Committee meeting minutes. No other items to report to the Administrative SC.

3.13 IEEE Standards Activities – Naeem Ahmad

Naeem arrived towards the end of the meeting, and reported on the following items:

- Ongoing review of the metrification policy
- Electronic balloting, and IEEE's work on a new more user friendly process to be in place sometime in 2004
- Interactive, or Smart, Standards Development – IEEE is looking for interested WG's to be involved in development of this new process for standards development.

3.14 Old Business

3.14.1 Metrification Policy

Tom Prevost and Steve Shull provided an update on status of the ballot on C57.12.34, as a test case for Committee safety concerns with IEEE strict metrification policy. The original ballot, without any non-metric units, resulted in an approximate 35% negative ballot response. Steve then attempted, through normative annexes and footnotes within the document, to address the

negative ballots within a framework hoped to be acceptable to IEEE. This recirculation was technically successful, with 79% affirmative ballots. It is not normal, however, for the Committee to forward a document for approval with 21% negative ballots. In addition, the Metric Standards Coordinating Committee (SCC14) did not approve of the compromise document as written, as they judge it does not meet the present metrification policy.

Tom also reported that Judy Gorman, Managing Director of IEEE SA, had discussed this subject at a recent BOG Meeting. There is at least some understanding that the metrification issue is significant, and that there were concerns not only from PES, but from the Industrial Applications areas as well. There seems also to be recognition that the user community concerns must be addressed.

We have attempted to compromise, within the framework provided by IEEE. The result is a document that many users feel to be cumbersome and unworkable due to unwieldy inclusion of dual measurements, and which SCC14 does not approve. The ballot is technically successful, but there is concern within the WG and Committee for submitting a document with so many negatives to RevCom. The next step will be to bring this issue before the Standards Board in June to express our concerns and make our case for a specific exception to the metrification policy, for use of dual dimensions for this document. We are hopeful that this specific exception will be approved, and that it can subsequently be used as a precedent for documents with similar concerns

The Chair advises that we should proceed at this point in time as if IEEE SA will approve our request for use of dual dimensioning within the document body, and any documents presently being worked on where the same concerns are present the dual dimensioning should be used.

There were no other items of old business.

3.15 New Business

3.15.1 Thursday Morning Main Meeting Format, Function, and Value

As this subject was brought up at the previous meeting, the Chair had asked Administrative SC members to provide specific recommendations on improvement of the Thursday meeting structure and content – to be forwarded for review at this Meeting. Unfortunately there was very little input provided prior to this meeting. Discussion continued.

Some changes were suggested for the Main Meeting in Raleigh, moving some administrative areas after the technical SC reports, but it was recognized that there still was significant room for improvement to make the Thursday meeting provide significant value to attendees and their sponsoring organizations. Each agenda item in the Main Meeting should be reviewed from the perspective of the value it brings to the meeting, and whether there are ways to improve its value. The overall. The Chair commented to all Administrative SC members that it is understandably easier to recognize deficiencies in a process, and reminded all again that what is really needed is the more difficult task to provide specific constructive suggestions for improving the format and content of the Main Meeting. Input from all members and guests is encouraged, and should be

forwarded to either the Chair, the Secretary, or the Meetings Planning SC Chair, prior to the Pittsburgh Meeting.

3.15.2 Subcommittee Leadership – Co-Chair or Vice-Chair

Recently support for SC Chairs had been designated through appointment of Co-Chairs for several SC's. The question was raised as to whether this terminology created some confusion as to whether either or both Co-Chairs were required to address SC issues. Greg Anderson pointed out that the terminology Co-Chair implies shared responsibility, and Vice-Chair more clearly implies a redundancy of leadership, with the Vice-Chair taking full responsibility for SC issues when the Chair was not present or available, and providing a support role when the Chair is present. The Secretary pointed out that the O&P Manual uses the terminology Vice-Chair, rather than Co-Chair. With some further discussion, the decision was made, by vote of Administrative SC members, to use the terminology Vice-Chair, as used in the O&P Manual. The responsibility will be one of providing redundancy of leadership, rather than shared leadership. All SC Chairs are urged to consider designating a SC Vice-Chair and a Secretary

3.15.3 Recognition of Members with Significant Contributions

Award Chair Patel asked for some additional discussion on awards for members who contribute significantly to the work of the Committee. While it is appropriate to provide encouragement and recognition to those participating, concern was expressed that an overabundance of plaques or certificates might lessen the significance of such recognition. The Chair asked for discussion on whether the Administrative SC should provide some guidelines to the Awards Chair for recognition, or require the Awards Chair to provide that guidance. One particular area in question relates to tutorial presenters. The Secretary suggested that tutorial presenters might receive a letter of recognition from one of the Committee officers. Absent specific further recommendations during the meeting, this one item will be considered, the Awards Chair will continue with primary responsibility for recommendations of awards, and Administrative SC members are encouraged to give further thought on enhancing recognition for participants. Any recommendations should be provided to Bipin for review.

As noted, Peter Balma had requested the opportunity to address the Administrative SC on this the topic of recognition and awards also. Peter made a presentation several meetings back on the direction the Committee was going, with suggestions on how to enhance the Committee's capability to meet its goals and objectives of enhancing membership, increasing participation, improving value, and providing recognition. He noted that the Committee had made meaningful progress in several areas, and wished to visit again the area of recognition. Recognition is a complicated issue in management of personnel back where each of us works, and it is a complicated issue in encouraging and motivating our volunteer workforce in the Committee to achieve all we can. Different people are motivated by different forms of recognition, and we should be continually on alert for various methods, both large and small, to provide that motivation. Peter provided specific ideas that might be considered, including some form of recognition for:

- New member recognition award – for relatively new members with significant contribution, to encourage more participants to apply for membership

- Technical contribution – for participants providing very meaningful research or presentation that provides guidance and direction for the work of a particular WG.
- SC Chair's award – at the discretion of the SCV Chair, to recognize significant contribution to the work of the SC
- WG of the Year award – perhaps to recognize our WG nominee for the IEEE award, or other significant WG, even if they do not receive the IEEE award
- Tutorial recognition – a certificate to bring back home to show their management that they are participating actively and that their contribution is recognized as being of value
- SC or WG Secretary award – in recognition of the effort necessary when a secretary fulfills their responsibility well.
- Chair's Award – for the Committee Chair to recognize an individual for significant contribution during the course of the Chair's tenure as a Committee officer
- Transformer Committee Achievement award – again, at the discretion of the Chair, when an individual's contributions over several years warrant specific recognition.

The Chair thanked Peter for these suggestions, and asked all to provide additional thoughts on recognition. Awards Chair Patel will review all suggestions as he plans for future recognition, and will seek the comments of the Administrative SC as he proposes additional specific awards.

There were no other items of New Business for the Administrative SC.

3.16 Adjournment

Chairman Sim adjourned the meeting at 5:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
D. J. Fallon, Secretary