RWF Task Group on Pumps

Teleconference Meeting Summary DRAFT

December 12, 2022

Participating members:

Grundfos	Madison, Benjamin
IAPMO	Choe, Sung
Pentair Water Group/Wellmate	Gregory, Kenneth
FilterBalls, Inc.	Morris, Kirk
NSF International	Schaefer, Kevin

Participating observers:

Hayward Pool Products, Inc.	Parcell, Jason
Hayward Pool Products, Inc.	Trull, Jon
NSF International	Snider, Jason

Discussion

B. Madison welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. J. Snider took roll and read the anti-trust statement. Five of the 7 voting members were present (71%) which did represent a quorum.

The first topic the group discussed was RWF-2022-10 Pump performance testing. B. Madison walked the group through the proposed changes, which looked to revise pump testing to help accommodate testing for pumps that are non-dedicated pool use. K. Schaefer agreed with the concept, and suggested a definition for BEP be included in the language, adding that a thorough review of the methodology in Annex N-3 may be necessary as well. K. Schaefer also noted that including the rpm of the pump or speed corrections may be worth considering as well. B. Madison agreed, citing the Department of Energy's speed correction for efficiency regulation. J. Trull suggested either definition for dedicated and non-dedicated pumps be added to the language, or the group consider making the proposed language an optional test. K. Schaefer added that language should be added to the literature requirements to specify the operating range the testing was performed at. S. Choe suggested that language be added to the beginning of the section to make it clear that there are two testing methods. The group discussed a potential loophole because there were no requirements for the where test points are on the curve, or how close the points are to each other. B. Madison suggested removing language establishing the range of POR from 70 – 120% for pumps that did not have an identified POR.

The group moved on to discuss RWF-2022-11 Pump Hydrostatic Temperature. B. Madison explained that the paper was submitted to add flexibility to the temperature requirements for hydrostatic testing. He noted that the test was short in duration, and it could be difficult to adjust the temperature of the amount of water necessary for testing. K. Schaefer noted that pumps made of plastics may be more likely to be affected by temperature changes. He added that the assumption of the standard is that the higher temperature is a worst-case scenario. The group spent some time discussing allowing a larger range for swimming pool only pumps (65 to 107 °F). S. Choe noted that if a pump is tested at the hot tub / spa temperature, it qualifies for swimming pool use as well. J. Trull suggested that the manufacturer determine the temperature the test is conducted at. K. Schaefer added that a rationale statement would help explain the change and allay concerns that the test was becoming more conservative.

Action items

B. Madison & K. Schaefer to revise language regarding pump performance testing.
J. Snider to straw ballot pump performance testing language (50i199r1) with the Task Group.
B. Madison to craft rationale statement for pump hydrostatic temperature.
J. Snider to straw ballot pump hydrostatic temperature language (50i200r1) with the Task Group.
Next meeting: March 16, 2023