Hiroaki Ikeda <ikeda@HIKE.TE.CHIBA-U.AC.JP>
2000-07-03 10:10

To: VT60617@IEC.iec.ch
cc: (bcc: Per-Ake Svensson/SEBUS/ABB)
Subject: Re: A Question and Confirmation to Change Request C00036

Dear Mr. Svensson, and the members of VT60617,

I would like to change a JP vote to YES on S00067 in C00036 because of the following reason.

The original NO vote, with the comment of a question mark, has been based on our understanding of the aim of VT60617. VT60617 is validating 60617 of the database version against the established International Standards IEC 60617 Ed.2 in multiple parts. JP found discrepancy between the two, which resulted the NO vote.

We believe that the graphical symbol for direct current in IEC 60617 Ed.1 is the correct one, which means the graphical symbol in the database is correct, however, it is different from the currently available International Standard.

JP is changing its position because we sincerely wish that the erroneous graphical symbol printed and distributed world-wide, and in some countries being translated into local versions, will be corrected as early as possible based on an official corrigendum.

Expressing your hard work in this field,

With kind regards,

Hiroaki Ikeda
JP member of VT60617

per-ake.svensson@se.abb.com wrote:
>
> Dear Prof. Ikeda,
>
> I have got a question about symbol S00067 from Mr Araki and the voting on
> CR00036.
>
> I have tried to give an explanation of the actual situation, see below, and
> in the light of this, I kindly ask you to reconsider your NO vote on
> Symbol S00067. Since only two validation team have actually voted the
> situation is unclear, and the change of vote by you should solve the
> immediate problem.
>
> Another obvious problem coming up here is if we need some kind of minimum
> number of validation members voting, or we can say that this is no problem:
> it can be as few members as 1 (maybe even 0?), because the decisions taken
> are anyway reported to TC3. But that is something that need to be
> discussed in TC3.
>
> With best regards,

> Per-Åke Svensson
>
> ---------- Forwarded by Per-Ake Svensson/SEBUS/ABB on 2000-07-03
> 08:42 ----------
>
> To: Sumio Araki <saraki@ma.neweb.ne.jp> @ SE_INTERNET
> cc:
> Subject: Re: A Question and Confirmation to Change Request C00036
> (Document link: Per-Åke Svensson)
>
> Dear Mr Araki,
>
> The symbol of IEC 60617 Ed.1 with three dashed lines, now appearing as
> symbol S00067 is the correct one, and the one with 2 i wrong. There was, to
> my knowledge, no decision taken in the former SC3A nor in TC3 to change
> that symbol. You could also compare to the same symbol appearing in IEC
> 60417 which has also three dashed lines.
>
> This matter was actually brought to the attention of the group working with
> the Task II and there was an request shortly after the publication of Ed. 2
> that obvious errors in the printed Ed. 2 should be immediately corrected
> (with a so called Erratum sheet or Corrigendum) , but no action was taken
> by the former SC3A for unknown reasons.
>
> Unfortunately I have not had the time to treat the change requests as
> quickly as I would have liked, but I hope that I will be able to handle the
> actual one, CR00036, during the coming week and include an appropriate
> explanation. We have said that the database version of IEC60617 should be
> equivalent to Ed. 2, but at the same time it does not make any sense to
> forward obvious errors that we know of.
>
> Unfortuneately, once more, this is not the only not corrected error in
> Ed.2, compared to Ed. 1. Symbol S00076 for example should also have three
> dashed lines.
>
> Another example I found while treating CR00035 and looking at the comment
> from Prof. Ikeda on symbol S00673, I discovered that symbols S00673,
> ..674, ..676, ..677 and ..678, had all been drawn in Ed. 2 in a way that
> more or less makes it impossible to see the difference between these
> symbols (without connection to the "middle gate") and the corresponding
> symbols with connection to the gate (A connection line is "2M". In Ed.1 a
> not connectied line was "M", but it had been drawn "1,5M" in Ed.2".) These
> lines have now been slightly shortened to emphasize the difference. But
> this is a minor correction, and not as visible as the one with the symbol
> for direct current, so I thought that there is no real need to document
> also the Ed.2 variant with an erratum in the database as has been done in
> that case (S001347.)
>
> Still questionable on CR00035 is symbol S00679. The one still shown in the
> database differ considerably from the one shown in Ed. 1. I have asked Mr
> Fornalski if there is any documentation available that justify these
> differences or if this another drawing error that has passed the final
> check (and actually, I have my doubts that even the symbol in Ed.1 is
> entirely correct: the primary insulated gate should probably be longer.)
>
> Back to your question about CR00036, if the no-vote by Prof. Ikeda means
> that the change back to the Ed.1 version of the symbol for direct current
> is rejected.

> Well, one no vote does not automatically cause these consequences, but this
> case is complicated by the fact that only two members of the validation
> team has actually voted, with one of them voting no, and the time for
> voting has expired. To apply the normal voing rules under these
> circumstances makes little sense. Therefore, I will send this message also
> to Prof. Ikeda with a request to reconsider his vote in the light of the
> explanation given above.
>
> Also, I find it appropriate to report about the corrections made in the
> databasde to the plenary meeting of TC3 in Stockholm and try to get its
> approval.
>
> With best regards,
> Per-Åke Svensson
>
>
> (Embedded Sumio Araki <saraki@ma.neweb.ne.jp>
> image moved 2000-07-01 07:18
> to file:
> pic18874.pcx)
>
>
>
> To: Per-Ake Svensson/SEBUS/ABB@ABB_SE01
> cc: Sumio Araki <araki@air.linkclub.or.jp>
> Subject: A Question and Confirmation to Change Request C00036
>

>
> Dear Mr. Svensson
>
> Other than my trouble, I would like to confirm to Change Request C00036 as
> follows.
>
> Professor Ikeda submitted a following comment:
>
> Request ID : C00036
> JP(HIKE): Symbol S00067, the graphical symbol is different from the paper
> version of IEC 60617 Ed.2, whereas it is the same as the paper version of
> IEC 617 Ed.1. Is current electronic version correct?
>
> The answer is simply like this:
>
> JP(HIKE): Symbol S00067, NO
>
> >From this answer, I am considering the paper version of "02-02-03" with two
> dashed lines below the straight line is correct.
>
> Meanwhile, there is a following remark on S01347 which has two dashed lines
> below the straight line:
>
> S01347
> .
> Status: Withdrawn
> Remark(s): Corrigendum
>
> This symbol, published in IEC 60617-2 Ed. 2, was for reasons of
> incapability of the used drawing system published with two dashed lines

> below the straight line instead of three.
> It is replaced by symbol S00067.
>
> Depending on the answer to C00036, is this remark rejected automatically?
> If we have to follow the remark on S01347, the influence is so much. In my
> opinion, the symbol should use S01347.
>
> If there is needed an official "Change Request", I discuss within Japanese
> National Committee.
>
> Best regards,
> ----------
> Sumio Araki
>

Hiroaki S. IKEDA, Lab. of Multimedia Systems,
Division of Information Network Systems,
Chiba University.
1-33, Yayoi, Inage, Chiba 263-8522 JAPAN
http://w3.hike.te.chiba-u.ac.jp/IEC/100/TA2
ikeda@hike.te.chiba-u.ac.jp