

## IEC 61850 User Feedback Task Force - Feature #5083

### Clarifications on the local/remote concept 3/8

09/20/2021 08:44 AM - Carlos Rodriguez del Castillo

<b>Status:</b>	Resolved	<b>Start date:</b>	09/20/2021
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	03/20/2022
<b>Assignee:</b>	Tom Berry	<b>% Done:</b>	0%
<b>Category:</b>	Standard clarification required	<b>Estimated time:</b>	0.00 hour
<b>Target version:</b>		<b>To discuss in WG10:</b>	No
<b>ID:</b>	7	<b>Short Proposal:</b>	Include a statement
<b>Source:</b>	MH	<b>Standard(s):</b>	IEC 61850-7-1 Ed2.1,7-5
<b>TF Unique ID:</b>	7 # MH	<b>Needs More Information:</b>	No
<b>WG10 Proposal:</b>		<b>Assigned TF:</b>	
<b>Estimated Completion:</b>			
<b>Discuss in Upcoming Meeting:</b>	No		
<b>Description</b>			
Add a statement about the use of XCBR.Loc (and similar LN classes). Assume XCBR.Loc="true". Will protection trips and switchgear controls by GAPC be rejected?			
<b>Proposal descriptions</b>			
Not affected by Loc DO: - Protection trips are not affected by Loc data object. - GAPC.Op (will go through) --> PTRC.Tr (to trip) --> XCBR  Otherwise, they are affected by Loc DO (control model) - GAPC SPC/DPC/APC controllable objects will be affected by Loc data object.  The proposal is to include a statement about this behaviour in 7-1. There is a section about local/remote in 7-1, maybe it is the good place for that.			
<b>Related issues:</b>			
Related to IEC 61850 User Feedback Task Force - Feature #5081: Clarifications...		<b>Resolved</b>	<b>09/20/2021</b>
Copied to 61850-7-5 and 61850-7-500 - IEC61850-7-5 #6389: Clarifications on t...		<b>In Progress</b>	<b>09/20/2021 03/20/2022</b>

### History

#### #1 - 10/05/2021 11:34 AM - Carlos Rodriguez del Castillo

- Due date set to 03/20/2022
- To discuss in WG10 changed from Yes to No

#### #2 - 01/18/2022 09:23 AM - Carlos Rodriguez del Castillo

- Discuss in Upcoming Meeting changed from No to Yes
- Proposal descriptions updated
- Short Proposal set to Include a statement

#### #3 - 01/18/2022 09:24 AM - Carlos Rodriguez del Castillo

- Status changed from New to In Progress

#### #4 - 02/01/2022 08:14 AM - Vladan Cvejic

- Related to Feature #5084: Clarifications on the local/remote concept 4/8 added

#### #5 - 02/01/2022 08:17 AM - Vladan Cvejic

- Related to deleted (Feature #5084: Clarifications on the local/remote concept 4/8)

**#6 - 02/01/2022 08:18 AM - Vladan Cvejic**

- Related to Feature #5081: Clarifications on the local/remote concept 1/8 added

**#7 - 02/09/2022 07:18 AM - Vladan Cvejic**

- Status changed from In Progress to Resolved

- Discuss in Upcoming Meeting changed from Yes to No

**#8 - 02/10/2022 06:21 AM - Tom Berry**

Proposed clarification

Trip signals e.g. communicated by GOOSE are not affected by Loc.  
This includes trip signals direct from protection logical nodes or PTRC.  
A GAPC.Op status routed as an input to PTRC will not be affected by Loc.

When GAPC or any other logical node uses control services to activate SPC/DPC/INC/ENC/APC controllable objects in a destination logical node, then these commands may be affected by the local/remote status of the destination logical node and containing logical device(s).

See Feature [#5082](#)

**#9 - 02/14/2022 02:50 AM - Carlos Rodriguez del Castillo**

- Assignee set to Tom Berry

**#10 - 02/14/2022 03:57 AM - Tom Berry**

- Standard(s) changed from IEC 61850-7-1 Ed2.1 to IEC 61850-7-1 Ed2.1,7-5

**#11 - 05/09/2023 09:32 AM - Carlos Rodriguez del Castillo**

- Needs More Information set to No

**#12 - 05/09/2023 09:33 AM - Carlos Rodriguez del Castillo**

- Discuss in Upcoming Meeting changed from No to Yes

**#13 - 06/05/2023 01:58 AM - Carlos Rodriguez del Castillo**

- Discuss in Upcoming Meeting changed from Yes to No

**#14 - 06/14/2023 08:21 AM - Vladan Cvejic**

- Copied to IEC61850-7-5 #6389: Clarifications on the local/remote concept 3/8 added