Comment i-104 (145.2.8.5, *P* 158, *L* 10)

The use of Ipeak-2P_unb can be simplified if we adopt the following principles:

a) The system unbalance for Pclass_PD and Ppeak_PD is almost the same (simulated differences around 0.2%)

b) If Ipeak is met, then I peak-2P_unb is intrinsically met and no need to measure it for compliance.

Mathematical Analysis:

$$I_{Con-2P\_unb} = 0.5 \times I_{Con} \times (1 + P2Punb) = 0.5 \times \frac{P_{Class}}{Vpse} \times (1 + P2Punb)$$

$$I_{Peak-2P\_unb} = 0.5 \times I_{Peak} \times (1 + K_{Ipeak}\_\max) = 0.5 \times \frac{1.05 \times P_{Class}}{Vpse} \times (1 + K_{Ipeak}\_\max)$$

If $P2Punb = K_{Ipeak}\_\max$ then $\dfrac{I_{Peak-2P\_unb\_\max}}{I_{Con-2P\_unb}} = 1.05$ ➔ Ipeak-2P_unb is limited as Icon-2P-unb does.

Proposed Remedy:

Editor to add the following text to page 158 after line 12:

"PDs shall not exceed pair-to-pair unbalance ratio of Equation (145-XYZ) for power levels from PClass_PD to at least Ppeak_PD. PDs that meet this requirement, intrinsically meet the limits of Ipeak-2P_unb_max."

P2PRunb=(2xIcon-2P_unb - Icon)/Icon   (145-XYZ)

where
      Icon   is defined by Equation 145-9.
      Icon-2P_unb   is specified in Table 145-16.

End of Baseline