Date	Document
2005-06-16	(57/747/CD)_IEC 60850-7-4 Amd.1 Ed.1.0

National Committee	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph Figure/ Table	Type of comment (General/ Technical/Editorial)	COMMENTS	Proposed change	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
DE-19	General		Technical	See above, how to handle arrays?	Add explanation how to deal with such arrays	Generic Part 7 Tissue 51? To be addressed in Part 7-2.
DE-20	General		Technical	See above, how to handle 2 dimensional arrays as in OpCnt[i,j]. It is not clear how such objects shall be modelled	Add explanation how to deal with such arrays	Generic Part 7 Tissue 51? To be addressed in Part 7-2.
PT-1			Technical	The definition of "surge" was included into clause 3.22 by mistake.		Accepted: Delete
DE-1	3.5.	Flagged data	Editoral	Use of word “parameters” may be not correct	use the term channel instead of parameter → … the measurements results of all other channels…	Parameter as defined in IEC 61000-4-30. Explanation to be added in the Semanitcs section.
DE-2	3.11.	hysteresis	Editorial	Use of word “parameter” may be not correct	use the term channel instead of parameter → ..the magnitude of channels	Parameter as defined in IEC 61000-4-30. Definition to be added in Secion 3.
DE-3	3.19.	overderivation	Editorial	Use of term “nominal value of a parameter” may be not correct	Use the term “declared supply value” instead	Parameter as defined in IEC 61000-4-30. Definition to be added in Secion 3.
DE-4	3.19.	dto	Editorial	Use of word “parameter” may be not correct	Use the term “channel” instead of parameter	Parameter as defined in IEC 61000-4-30. Definition to be added in Secion 3.
DE-5	3.22.	r.m.s. voltage refreshed each half – cycle	Editorial	Defintion of surge is doubled, see 3.27.	delete	Accepted: Delete
US-1	5		Editorial	Clause 5 of the proposed FDIS is also the proposed amendment to Part 5 of the original document	The proposed Clause 5 should state words to the effect that the following is the proposed amendment to Part 5 of the original document, then the actual amendment could be numbered as it would appear in the actual Part 5	To be resolved

National Committee	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph Figure/ Table	Type of comment (General/ Technical/Editorial)	COMMENTS	Proposed change	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
US-2	6		Editorial	Clause 6 of the proposed amendment refers to changes to Part 7 of the original document	Users could 'tear apart' the amendment and insert the pages into the Part 5 document and the Part 7 document.	
CAN-1-RH	6.3.2 and elsewhere		Technical	This document defines various types of power factor measurements, including averages of power factors, for example in Section 6.3.2 and elsewhere. Power Factor is defined simply as P/S, where S is apparent power, and makes no reference to the concept of leading and lagging power factors. In our experience, computer representation of power factors where distinction must be made between leading and lagging power factors is a problem. The most common solution is to represent lagging power factors as a positve number 0 < PF(lagging) < 1.0 and leading power factors as negative numbers -1 < PF(leading) < 0. However this solution makes it very awkward to define minimum and maximum power factor limits and also because of the severe +1/-1 discontinuity makes the concept of an "average" power factor invalid if PF may be leading and lagging during the averaging interval.	We don't have a perfect solution but one, which is rather non-conventional, is to represent leading power factors as a positive number greater than 1.0 - e.g. power factors of 0.98 lagging, 1.0, 0.98 leading, 0.95 leading would be represented by PF values of 0.98, 1.0, 1.02 and 1.05, respectively. The "beauty" of this solution is that it makes the PF function both monotonic everywhere and continuous around 1.0. However, defining a PF with a value greater than 1.0 is very non-conventional.	Rejected.
DE-6	6.3.2.	MADV		Names of data with lowercase letter From “nssN” to “nssS1uS1p”	All data object names shall begin with capital letters	Accepted
DE-7	6.3.2		Technical	EEHealth should be of type INS as all other EEHealth in 7-4 are.	Change Attr. Type to INS	Accepted
DE-10	6.3.3		Technical	Attr.-Type DELTA is not defined	There is no need to create a new CDC. CDC WYE can be used, because only one value is mandatory for WYE, so the value for neut can be left away	Accepted
DE-11	6.3.3		Technical	Attr.-Type FLKPROB is not defined. How shall the array of values be modelled?	Add definition to 7-3	

National Committee	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph Figure/ Table	Type of comment (General/ Technical/Editorial)	COMMENTS	Proposed change	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
DE-12	6.3.3		Technical	Attr.-Type FLKMOD is not defined. How shall the array of values be modelled?	Add definition to 7-3	
DE-13	6.3.3		Technical	Attr.-Type FLKSPEC is not defined. How shall the array of values be modelled?	Add definition to 7-3	
DE-8	6.3.3		Technical	EEHealth should be of type INS as all other EEHealth 7-4 are.	Change Attr. Type to INS	Accepted
DE-9	6.3.3.	MFLK		There is no explanation for the CDC DELTA, FLKPROB, PLKMOD, FLKSPEC	Include list of these CDC with all attributes	
DE-14	6.4.2.	QVVR	Editorial	“o” in column M/O missing	Add “o” for optional	Accepted
DE-15	6.4.2.	QVVR		There is no explanation for two-dimensional arrays, eg. for TmLvl[k].	We have to add such an explanation	
DE-16	6.4.2.	Figure 1,2, 3		These figures illustrate an issue and should be moved in the annex	Move in the annex	Move to Semantics
DE-17	6.4.2		Technical	Attr.-Type PQS is not needed. Can easily be modelled with an CDC INS and the allowed values of the enumeration can be given in the explanation of the DO	Change according to other enumerations in existing 7-4 to CDC INS	
DE-18	6.4.2		Technical	TmLvl[k], OpCnt[i], etc. How shall these “arrays” be modelled? Is it the intention to have multiple instances of this DO,e.g TmLvl01, TmLvl02, TmLvl03,…	Add explanation how to deal with such arrays	
DE-22	6.5	Table 3	Editorial	Semantic for TrnStrVal is missing	Add semantic	Accepted
DE-23	6.5.	Table 3	Editorial	For Area semantic is missing the reference for figure	Add reference instead of xxx	Accepted