

Task Force on IEEE 259
Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Virtual Meeting
Session 5
4:45 PM, October 19, 2020

Chair: David Stankes

Vice-Chair: Joseph Tedesco

This was the third meeting of the task force, and the first that was not an ad hoc meeting. The task force meeting was held in the WebEx Session 5 meeting space during the Virtual Meeting and was called to order at 3:51 PM.

There were 19 people present in the meeting. There were 5 members and 14 guests. 4 guests requested membership. The task force has 6 members; therefore, with 83%, a quorum was achieved, and business could be conducted.

There was unanimous approval of the agenda and the minutes from the Fall 2019 meeting. The patent and copyright policy were discussed and a request was made for essential patents, but no one had any.

Old Business:

- Dave Stankes provided an update on the status of the PAR. It had been reviewed and approved by Jim Graham, and was submitted to RevCom for review at the next meeting.
- Dave gave a brief overview of how IEEE 259 got to do this point: it was going to be withdrawn due to lack of use, but it was discovered that it was still referenced by IEEE C57.12.60, and the subcommittee then voted to form a task force to revise it.
 - At the first task force meeting, the membership discussed whether they wanted to “do the standard justice” and make a serious revision to bring IEEE 259 up-to-date, and the members agreed to do so.

New Business:

- Dave introduced Draft 1 to the task force.
 - He discussed how he and Joe Tedesco had worked on it, with the development being helped by initial feedback from a small team.
 - He discussed his plan to divide Draft 1 into sections and solicit volunteers to help with the different sections. Experts on electrical insulation systems and insulation system testing would be good, but anyone knowledgeable in transformer design and/or insulation materials would be welcome.
- Discussion began regarding the Draft and the plans for the standard.
 - Roger Wicks asked about the maximum voltage range. He suggested that it would be good to keep from conflicting with IEEE C57.12.60, which has 601 V as its minimum.

- Annirudha Narawane and Vijay Tendulkar mentioned that 660 V and 690 V are both common, and that IEC has a 1.1 kV class.
- Vijay proposed using 1.2 kV class instead of 600 V.
- Dave brought up how he wanted the experts to work on test procedures and aging temperatures.
 - He asked Roger to contribute his expertise from IEEE C57.12.60, and assist in addressing the discrepancies in thermal classes between IEEE 259 and IEEE C57.12.60.
 - He also was interested in adding the proof testing from IEEE C57.12.60.
- Dave discussed improving the section regarding interpretation of data.
- Dave also described one of the reasons that IEEE 259 was not used was because most such testing was performed pursuant to UL 1446.
 - He thought it might be possible to incorporate parts of UL 1446 into IEEE 259.
- Casey Ballard asked what was the plan?
 - Was the plan to cover all the sections in the meetings only?
 - Or was the plan to work in small task forces to work on the sections outside the meetings?
 - Dave planned to parse out the work to smaller task forces,
 - Casey agreed that this was a good plan.
 - Time will be working against the revision, so splitting up the work allows it to move forward more quickly, which is good.
 - Casey stated that it should be acceptable to also have the task force members report at the first working group meeting, which will presumably be in Spring 2021.
- Dave asked Casey about how to involve experts that had expressed an interest in participating but were either retired or not IEEE members.
 - Casey speculated that there might be ways to make that happen, and he would investigate them.

The date of the next meeting was not explicitly set, but it would most likely be part of the Spring 2021 meeting on April 26 or 27, 2021. That meeting will be in either Toronto, Canada or virtually.

The current meeting was adjourned at 4:46 PM.