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Introduction

This introduction is not part of IEEE Std C57.104-2008, IEEE Guide for the Interpretation of Gases Generated in Oil-Immersed Transformers.

IEEE Std C57.104-1991 was officially withdrawn by IEEE based on recommendation by the Transformers Committee of the IEEE Power & Energy Society at the end of 2005. The intent of this document has been focused on making minor changes to address some of the most pressing issues (such as correcting typos, factual errors, and the values listed in Table 1 of the 1991 version of the guide), and to publish this guide for use by the industry.

Upon publication of this document, the working group plans to immediately begin the process of further revision to the guide to reflect additional advances in current knowledge and trends, and to incorporate relevant material presented during a previous unsuccessful attempt to revise the guide.

Notice to users

Laws and regulations

Users of these documents should consult all applicable laws and regulations. Compliance with the provisions of this standard does not imply compliance to any applicable regulatory requirements. Implementers of the standard are responsible for observing or referring to the applicable regulatory requirements. IEEE does not, by the publication of its standards, intend to urge action that is not in compliance with applicable laws, and these documents may not be construed as doing so.

Copyrights

This document is copyrighted by the IEEE. It is made available for a wide variety of both public and private uses. These include both use, by reference, in laws and regulations, and use in private self-regulation, standardization, and the promotion of engineering practices and methods. By making this document available for use and adoption by public authorities and private users, the IEEE does not waive any rights in copyright to this document.

Updating of IEEE documents

Users of IEEE standards should be aware that these documents may be superseded at any time by the issuance of new editions or may be amended from time to time through the issuance of amendments, corrigenda, or errata. An official IEEE document at any point in time consists of the current edition of the document together with any amendments, corrigenda, or errata then in effect. In order to determine whether a given document is the current edition and whether it has been amended through the issuance of amendments, corrigenda, or errata, visit the IEEE Standards Association Web site at http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/standards.jsp, or contact the IEEE at the address listed previously.

For more information about the IEEE Standards Association or the IEEE standards development process, visit the IEEE-SA Web site at http://standards.ieee.org.
Errata

Errata, if any, for this and all other standards can be accessed at the following URL: http://standards.ieee.org/reading/ieee/updates/errata/index.html. Users are encouraged to check this URL for errata periodically.

Interpretations

Current interpretations can be accessed at the following URL: http://standards.ieee.org/reading/ieee/interp/index.html.

Patents

Attention is called to the possibility that implementation of this guide may require use of subject matter covered by patent rights. By publication of this guide, no position is taken with respect to the existence or validity of any patent rights in connection therewith. The IEEE is not responsible for identifying Essential Patent Claims for which a license may be required, for conducting inquiries into the legal validity or scope of Patents Claims or determining whether any licensing terms or conditions provided in connection with submission of a Letter of Assurance, if any, or in any licensing agreements are reasonable or non-discriminatory. Users of this guide are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, is entirely their own responsibility. Further information may be obtained from the IEEE Standards Association.
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IMPORTANT NOTICE: This standard is not intended to assure safety, security, health, or environmental protection in all circumstances. Implementers of the standard are responsible for determining appropriate safety, security, environmental, and health practices or regulatory requirements.

This IEEE document is made available for use subject to important notices and legal disclaimers. These notices and disclaimers appear in all publications containing this document and may be found under the heading “Important Notice” or “Important Notices and Disclaimers Concerning IEEE Documents.” They can also be obtained on request from IEEE or viewed at http://standards.ieee.org/IPR/disclaimers.html.

1. Overview

The detection of certain gases generated in an oil-filled transformer in service is frequently the first available indication of a malfunction that may eventually lead to failure if not corrected. Arcing, partial discharge, low-energy sparking, severe overloading, pump motor failure, and overheating in the insulation system are some of the possible mechanisms. These conditions occurring singly, or as several simultaneous events, can result in decomposition of the insulating materials and the formation of various combustible and noncombustible gases. Normal operation will also result in the formation of some gases. In fact, it is possible for some transformers to operate throughout their useful life with substantial quantities of combustible gases present. Operating a transformer with large quantities of combustible gas present is not a normal occurrence but it does happen, usually after some degree of investigation and an evaluation of the possible risk.

In a transformer, generated gases can be found dissolved in the insulating oil, in the gas blanket above the oil, or in gas collecting devices. The detection of an abnormal condition requires an evaluation of the amount of generated gas present and the continuing rate of generation. Some indication of the source of the gases and the kind of insulation involved may be gained by determining the composition of the generated gases.

1.1 Scope

This guide applies to mineral-oil-immersed transformers and addresses:

a) The theory of combustible gas generation in a transformer
b) The interpretation of gas analysis
c) Suggested operating procedures
d) Various diagnostic techniques, such as key gases, Dornenberg ratios, and Rogers ratios

e) Instruments for detecting and determining the amount of combustible gases present

f) A bibliography of related literature

1.2 Limitations

Many techniques for the detection and the measurement of gases have been established. However, it must be recognized that analysis of these gases and interpretation of their significance is, at this time, not a science but an art subject to variability. Their presence and quantity are dependent on equipment variables such as type, location, and temperature of the fault; solubility and degree of saturation of various gases in oil; the type of oil preservation system; the type and rate of oil circulation; the kinds of material in contact with the fault; and finally, variables associated with the sampling and measuring procedures themselves. Because of the variability of acceptable gas limits and the significance of various gases and generation rates, a consensus is difficult to obtain. The principal obstacle in the development of fault interpretation as an exact science is the lack of positive correlation of the fault-identifying gases with faults found in actual transformers.

The result of various ASTM testing round-robin indicates that the analytical procedures for gas analysis are difficult, have poor precision, and can be wildly inaccurate, especially between laboratories. A replicate analysis confirming a diagnosis should be made before taking any major action.

This guide is intended to provide guidance on specific methods and procedures that may assist the transformer operator in deciding on the status and continued operation of a transformer that exhibits combustible gas formation. However, operators must be cautioned that, although the physical reasons for gas formation have a firm technical basis, interpretation of that data in terms of the specific cause or causes is not an exact science, but it is the result of empirical evidence from which rules for interpretation have been derived. Hence, exact causes or conditions within transformers may not be inferred from the various procedures. The continued application of the rules and limits in this guide, accompanied by actual confirmation of the causes of gas formation, will result in continued refinement and improvement in the correlation of the rules and limits for interpretation.

Individual experience with this guide will assist the operators in determining the best procedure, or combination of procedures, for each specific case. Some of the factors involved in the decision of the operator are: the type of oil preservation system, the type and frequency of the sampling program, and the analytical facilities available. However, whether used separately or as complements to one another, the procedures disclosed in this guide all provide the operator with useful information concerning the serviceability of the equipment.

2. Normative references

The following referenced documents are indispensable for the application of this document (i.e., they must be understood and used, so each referenced document is cited in text and its relationship to this document is explained). For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendments or corrigenda) applies.

ASTM D 923, Standard Practices for Sampling Electrical Insulating Liquids.¹


¹ ASTM publications are available from the American Society for Testing and Materials, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, USA (http://www.astm.org/).
3. Definitions, acronyms, and abbreviations

For the purposes of this guide, the following terms and definitions apply. The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms should be referenced for terms not defined in this clause.

3.1 Definitions

3.1 key gases: Gases generated in oil-filled transformers that can be used for qualitative determination of fault types, based on which gases are typical or predominant at various temperatures.

3.2 partial discharge: An electric discharge that only partially bridges the insulation between conductors, and that may or may not occur adjacent to a conductor.

3.2 Acronyms and abbreviations

TCG total combustible gas
TDCG total dissolved combustible gas

4. General theory

The two principal causes of gas formation within an operating transformer are thermal and electrical disturbances. Conductor losses due to loading produce gases from thermal decomposition of the associated oil and solid insulation. Gases are also produced from the decomposition of oil and insulation exposed to arc temperatures. Generally, where decomposition gases are formed principally by ionic bombardment, there is little or no heat associated with low-energy discharges and partial discharge.

4.1 Cellulosic decomposition

The thermal decomposition of oil-impregnated cellulose insulation produces carbon oxides (CO, CO₂) and some hydrogen or methane (H₂, CH₄) due to the oil (CO₂ is not a combustible gas). The rate at which they are produced depends exponentially on the temperature and directly on the volume of material at that temperature. Because of the volume effect, a large, heated volume of insulation at moderate temperature will produce the same quantity of gas as a smaller volume at a higher temperature.

4.2 Oil decomposition

Mineral transformer oils are mixtures of many different hydrocarbon molecules, and the decomposition processes for these hydrocarbons in thermal or electrical faults are complex. The fundamental steps are the breaking of carbon–hydrogen and carbon–carbon bonds. Active hydrogen atoms and hydrocarbon fragments are formed. These free radicals can combine with each other to form gases, molecular hydrogen, methane, ethane, etc., or they can recombine to form new, condensable molecules. Further decomposition and rearrangement processes lead to the formation of products such as ethylene and acetylene and, in the extreme, to modestly hydrogenated carbon in particulate form.
These processes are dependent on the presence of individual hydrocarbons, on the distribution of energy and temperature in the neighborhood of the fault, and on the time during which the oil is thermally or electrically stressed. These reactions occur stoichiometrically; therefore, the specific degradations of the transformer oil hydrocarbon ensembles and the fault conditions cannot be predicted reliably from chemical kinetic considerations. An alternative approach is to assume that all hydrocarbons in the oil are decomposed into the same products and that each product is in equilibrium with all the others. Thermodynamic models permit calculation of the partial pressure of each gaseous product as a function of temperature, using known equilibrium constants for the relevant decomposition reactions. An example of the results of this approach is shown in Figure 1 due to Halstead. The quantity of hydrogen formed is relatively high and insensitive to temperature; formation of acetylene becomes appreciable only at temperatures nearing 1000 °C.

![Figure 1 — Halstead's thermal equilibrium partial pressures as a function of temperature](image)

Formation of methane, ethane, and ethylene each also have unique dependences on temperature in the model. The thermodynamic approach has limits; it must assume an idealized but nonexistent isothermal equilibrium in the region of a fault, and there is no provision for dealing with multiple faults in a transformer. However, the concentrations of the individual gases actually found in a transformer can be used directly or in ratios to estimate the thermal history of the oil in the transformer from a model and to adduce any past or potential faults on the unit. As the simplest example: the presence of acetylene suggests a high-temperature fault, perhaps an arc, has occurred in the oil in a transformer; the presence of methane suggests that—if a fault has occurred—it is a lower energy electrical or thermal fault. Much work has been done to correlate predictions from thermodynamic models with actual behavior of transformers.

### 4.3 Application to equipment

All transformers generate gases to some extent at normal operating temperatures. But occasionally a gas-generating abnormality does occur within an operating transformer such as a local or general overheating,
dielectric problems, or a combination of these. In electrical equipment, these abnormalities are called “faults.” Thermal, partial discharge, and arcing faults are described in 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3. Internal faults in oil produce the gaseous byproducts hydrogen (H₂), methane (CH₄), acetylene (C₂H₂), ethylene (C₂H₄), and ethane (C₂H₆). When cellulose is involved, the faults produce methane (CH₄), hydrogen (H₂), carbon monoxide (CO), and carbon dioxide (CO₂). Each of these types of faults produces certain gases that are generally combustible. The total of all combustible gases may indicate the existence of any one, or a combination, of thermal, electrical, or partial discharge faults. Certain combinations of each of the separate gases determined by chromatography are unique for different fault temperatures. Also, the ratios of certain key gases have been found to suggest fault types. Interpretation by the individual gases can become difficult when there is more than one fault, or when one type of fault progresses to another type, such as an electrical problem developing from a thermal one.

Attempts to assign greater significance to gas than justified by the natural variability of the generating and measuring events themselves can lead to gross errors in interpretation. However, in spite of this, these gas-generating mechanisms are the only existing basis for the analytical rules and procedures developed in this guide. In fact, it is known that some transformers continue to operate for many years in spite of above-average rates of gas generation.

4.4 Establishing baseline data

Establishing a reference point for gas concentration in new or repaired transformers and following this with a routine monitoring program is a key element in the application of this guide. Monitoring the health (serviceability) of a transformer must be done on a routine basis and can start anytime—it is not just for new units.

Generally, daily or weekly sampling is recommended after startup, followed by monthly or longer intervals. Routine sampling intervals may vary depending on application and individual system requirements. For example, some utilities sample generator step-up (GSU) transformers four to six times a year, units rated over 138 kV are sampled twice a year, and some 765 kV units are sampled monthly.

4.5 Recognition of a gassing problem—Establishing operating priorities

Much information has been acquired on diagnosing incipient fault conditions in transformer systems. This information is of a general nature but is often applied to very specific problems or situations. One consistent finding with all schemes for interpreting gas analysis is that the more information available concerning the history of the transformer and test data, the greater the probability for a correct diagnosis of the health of the unit.

A number of simple schemes employing principal gases or programs using ratios of key gases have been employed for providing a tentative diagnosis when previous information is unavailable or indicated no fault condition existed. Principal gas or ratio methods require detectable or minimum levels of gases to be present or norms to be exceeded, before they can provide a useful diagnosis.

5. Interpretation of gas analysis

5.1 Thermal faults

Referring to Figure 1, the decomposition of mineral oil from 150 °C to 500 °C produces relatively large quantities of the low molecular weight gases, such as hydrogen (H₂) and methane (CH₄), and trace quantities of the higher molecular weight gases ethylene (C₂H₄) and ethane (C₂H₆). As the fault temperature in mineral oil increases to modest temperatures, the hydrogen concentration exceeds that of methane, but now the temperatures are accompanied by significant quantities of higher molecular weight gases—first
ethane, and then ethylene. At the upper end of the thermal fault range, increasing quantities of hydrogen and ethylene and traces of acetylene (C₂H₂) may be produced. In contrast with the thermal decomposition of oil, the thermal decomposition of cellulose and other solid insulation produces carbon monoxide (CO), carbon dioxide (CO₂), and water vapor at temperatures much lower than that for decomposition of oil and at rates exponentially proportional to the temperature. Because the paper begins to degrade at lower temperatures than the oil, its gaseous byproducts are found at normal operating temperatures in the transformer. A GSU transformer, for example, that operates at or near nameplate rating will normally generate several hundred microliters/liter (ppm) of CO and several thousand microliters/liter (ppm) of CO₂ without excessive hot spots.

The ratio of CO₂/CO is sometimes used as an indicator of the thermal decomposition of cellulose. This ratio is normally more than seven. For the CO₂/CO ratio, the respective values of CO₂ and CO should exceed 5000 μL/L (ppm) and 500 μL/L (ppm) in order to improve the certainty factor, i.e., ratios are sensitive to minimum values. As the magnitude of CO increases, the ratio of CO₂/CO decreases. This may indicate an abnormality that is degrading cellulosic insulation.

5.2 Electrical faults—Low intensity discharges

Referring to Figure 1, low-intensity discharges such as partial discharges and very low level intermittent arcing produce mainly hydrogen, with decreasing quantities of methane and trace quantities of acetylene. As the intensity of the discharge increases, the acetylene and ethylene concentrations rise significantly.

5.3 Electrical faults—High intensity arcing

Referring to Figure 1, as the intensity of the electrical discharge reaches arcing or continuing discharge proportions that produce temperatures from 700 °C to 1800 °C, the quantity of acetylene becomes pronounced.

6. Suggested operating procedures utilizing the detection and analysis of combustible gases

6.1 General

From an operational point of view, it is important to establish the following priorities:

a) Detection. Detect the generation of any gases that exceed “normal” quantities and utilize appropriate guidelines so the possible abnormality may be recognized at the earliest possible time in order to minimize damage or avoid a failure.

b) Evaluation. Evaluate the impact of an abnormality on the serviceability of the transformer, using a set of guidelines or recommendations.

c) Action. Take the recommended action, beginning with increased surveillance and confirming or supplementary analysis and leading to either a determination of load sensitivity, reducing the load on the transformer, or actually removing the unit from service.

The success of fault gas analysis necessitates the earliest possible detection of gases using the following methods:

- Direct measurement of the amount of combustible gas in the gas space or relay [total combustible gas (TCG)—see 7.2.1 and 7.2.2].
— Direct measurement of the amount of combustible gas dissolved in the oil (gas-in-oil monitors—see 7.2.3).
— Chromatographic separation and analysis for the individual components in a gas mixture extracted from a sample of the transformer oil or a sample of the transformer gas space (see Clause 9).

An operating procedure utilizing the gas data from the previously mentioned sources is to be developed immediately following the initial detection of combustible gases. Figure 2 is a flow chart that traces the suggested process from the initial detection of combustible gas to the final assessment of the status of the transformer.

---

**EXAMPLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservator</th>
<th>Gas Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Step 1**
- Gas detected in oil
- Gas detected in gas space

**Step 2**
- Data (μL/L): H₂ = 270
- CH₄ = 190, CO = 280
- C₂H₂ = 5, C₂H₄ = 17
- C₂H₆ = 4
- Total gas = 1.5%

**Step 3**
- Table 1 indicates Condition 2
- Proceed to Step 4

**Step 4**
- Resample (see 6.2) indicates a rate of 20 μL/L/day and 0.025%/day and increasing
- Resample (see 6.2) indicates a rate of 0.025%/day and increasing

**Step 5**
- Table 3 indicates Condition 2, Interval C, and Procedure 3. Advise manufacturer; extreme caution; plan outage; resample per interval; analyze gas space and dissolved gas components (see NOTE 1)

**Step 6**
- 6.6 Key gas: H₂, CH₄ – Electrical-corona
- 6.7.1 Doernenburg (see NOTE 1) fault type: Possible arcing
- 6.7.2 Rogers fault type: Case 2 Possible arcing

NOTE—Assume equal dissolved components in both examples.²

---

² Notes in text, tables, and figures of a standard are given for information only and do not contain requirements needed to implement this standard.

---

*Figure 2—Operating procedure flow chart*
6.2 Determining combustible gas generating rates

A given gas volume and distribution may be generated over a long time period by a relatively insignificant fault or in a very short time period by a more severe fault. Hence, one measurement does not indicate the rate of generation and may indicate very little about the severity of the fault. Once a suspicious gas presence is detected, it is important to be certain whether the fault that generated the gas is active.

An evolution rate greater than 2.8 L (0.1 ft³) of combustible gas per day may indicate the unit has an active internal fault. To calculate the rate of evolution, take the sum of the concentrations [in μL/L (ppm)] of all the combustible gases (everything but CO₂, O₂, and N₂) in the first and second samples and use Equation (1) as follows:

\[
R = \frac{(S_T - S_0) \times V \times 10^{-6}}{T}
\]

where

- \(R\) is the rate (liters/day)
- \(S_0\) is the first sample (microliters/liter)
- \(S_T\) is the second sample (microliters/liter)
- \(V\) is the tank oil volume (liters)
- \(T\) is the time (days)

Limits for average gas generation rates are given for gas space analysis (TCG) in 6.5.1 and for total dissolved gas analysis (TDCG) in 6.5.2.

6.3 Determining the gas space and dissolved gas-in-oil equivalents

Gas space and oil equivalents are used to compare the results of analysis of the gas space (TCG) with results from analysis of the gases dissolved in the oil (TDCG). Comparisons of gas ratios obtained from the gas space can then be compared to similar ratios of gases extracted from the oil. It should be noted that the calculated equivalent values of TCG_e and experimentally measured values of TCG probably do not show close agreement, since the equation for obtaining the equivalents assumes the existence of equilibrium between the gas blanket and the oil. This condition may not exist, particularly in the case of an actively progressing fault. However, the equation is valuable for the determination of a limiting value for the expected TCG concentration in the gas blanket. The dissolved gas equivalent of TCG_e is obtained using Equation (2).

\[
TCG_e = \sum_{i} \left[ \frac{F_i}{B_i} \right] \times 100
\]

where

- \(TCG_e\) is an estimate of the percent of combustible gas in the gas space
- \(C\) is the combustible gas
- \(G\) is each gas dissolved in oil (combustible and noncombustible)
- \(F_i\) is the concentration expressed in μL/L (ppm) of combustible gas, \(g\), dissolved in oil
- \(B_i\) is the Ostwald solubility coefficient of combustible gas, \(g\)
- \(F_g\) is the concentration of a particular gas dissolved in oil
$B_g$ is the Ostwald solubility coefficient of particular gas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>Ostwald coefficient $(B)$ (25 °C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_2$</td>
<td>0.0429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_2$</td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$CO_2$</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_2$</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_4$</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_2$</td>
<td>0.0745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$CO$</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_6$</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$CH_4$</td>
<td>0.337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE—Ostwald coefficients are for an oil with a density of 0.880 at STP.

a Combustibles.

### 6.4 Monitoring insulation deterioration using dissolved gas volume

One acceptable method for monitoring the deterioration of transformer insulating material involves calculating the total volume of gas evolved. The total volume of evolved gas is an indicator of the magnitude of incipient faults.

Succeeding samples indicate changes with time as the fault(s) develops. Trends are readily apparent when gas volume is plotted versus time. To determine the volume, in gallons, of fault gas dissolved in insulating oil, use Equation (3).

\[
TDCG_V = \frac{FG(V)}{1000000}
\]

where

- $FG$ is the sum of $H_2$, $CH_4$, $C_2H_6$, $C_2H_4$, $C_2H_2$, and CO [microliters/liter (ppm)]
- $V$ is the volume of oil in transformer [liters (gallons)]
- $TDCG_V$ is the total dissolved combustible gas volume [liters (gallons)]

This straightforward method is useful for completely oil-filled (conservator-type) transformers with conditions that produce small quantities of fault gas. These conditions warrant continued monitoring but have not yet developed a distinct character according to the other methods of fault determination described in this guide. This fault-gas volume method continues to be useful as fault conditions enlarge, with the added advantage that it permits continuous monitoring of insulation deterioration in spite of any oil handling activity that includes degassification.

### 6.5 Evaluation of transformer condition using individual and TDCG concentrations

It can be difficult to determine whether a transformer is behaving normally if it has no previous dissolved gas history. Also, considerable differences of opinion exist for what is considered a “normal transformer” with acceptable concentrations of gases.

A four-level criterion has been developed to classify risks to transformers, when there is no previous dissolved gas history, for continued operation at various combustible gas levels. The criterion uses both concentrations for separate gases and the total concentration of all combustible gases. See Table 1.

- **Condition 1**: $TDCG$ below this level indicates the transformer is operating satisfactorily (see Figure 2). Any individual combustible gas exceeding specified levels should prompt additional investigation (see 6.6 and 6.7).
— **Condition 2**: TDCG within this range indicates greater than normal combustible gas level. Any individual combustible gas exceeding specified levels should prompt additional investigation. Proceed per Figure 2, Step 3. Action should be taken to establish a trend (Figure 2, Step 4). Fault(s) may be present. Proceed to 6.5.1 or 6.5.2.

— **Condition 3**: TDCG within this range indicates a high level of decomposition. Any individual combustible gas exceeding specified levels should prompt additional investigation. Proceed per Figure 2, Step 3. Immediate action should be taken to establish a trend (Figure 2, Step 4). Fault(s) are probably present. Proceed to 6.5.1 or 6.5.2.

— **Condition 4**: TDCG exceeding this value indicates excessive decomposition. Continued operation could result in failure of the transformer. Proceed immediately and with caution per Figure 2, Step 3, and 6.5.1 or 6.5.2.

### Table 1—Dissolved gas concentrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Dissolved key gas concentration limits [μL/L (ppm)]&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hydrogen (H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 2</td>
<td>101–700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 3</td>
<td>701–1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 4</td>
<td>&gt;1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE 1**—Table 1 assumes that no previous tests on the transformer for dissolved gas analysis have been made or that no recent history exists. If a previous analysis exists, it should be reviewed to determine if the situation is stable or unstable. Refer to 6.5.2 for appropriate action(s) to be taken.

**NOTE 2**—An ASTM round-robin indicated variability in gas analysis between labs. This should be considered when having gas analysis made by different labs.

The numbers shown in Table 1 are in parts of gas per million parts of oil [μL/L (ppm)] volumetrically and are based on a large power transformer with several thousand gallons of oil. With a smaller oil volume, the same volume of gas will give a higher gas concentration. Small distribution transformers and voltage regulators may contain combustible gases because of the operation of internal expulsion fuses or load break switches. The status codes in Table 1 are also not applicable to other apparatus in which load break switches operate under oil.

**b** The TDCG value does not include CO<sub>2</sub>, which is not a combustible gas.

Table 1 lists the dissolved gas concentrations for the individual gases and TDCG for Condition 1 through Condition 4. This table is used to make the original assessment of a gassing condition on a new or recently repaired transformer or is used if there are no previous tests on the transformer for dissolved gases or if there is no recent history. Users of this guide are advised that the dissolved gas concentrations contained in Table 1 are consensus values based on the experiences of many companies. The transformer operator may decide to use different dissolved gas concentrations for the individual gases (particularly acetylene) and TDCG based on engineering judgment and experience with other similar transformers.

The condition for a particular transformer is determined by finding the highest level for individual gases or the TDCG in Table 1. For example, if a sample contained the following gas concentrations (in microliters/liter (ppm), vol/vol):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>CH&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>C&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>C&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;H&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>C&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;H&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>TDCG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>1,034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gases that fall into the highest condition are H<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub>, C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub>, and TDCG. Therefore, this data would indicate that the transformer would be classified as Condition 2. This example can also be used to show two other factors that should be considered when using this table, i.e., the age of the transformer and the type of incipient condition.
New transformers (one year or less) usually contain levels of gases that would fall well below Condition 1 and do not contain detectable levels of acetylene. Therefore, the degree of concern in the example would be much higher for a 1-month-old transformer than a 20-year-old transformer.

Another consideration is that acetylene may be generated from three different incipient fault conditions, i.e., high-temperature overheating of oil, partial discharge (low-energy discharge), or arcing. In the case of overheating, acetylene will represent a small proportion of the hydrocarbon gases. In the case of partial discharge, very high concentrations of hydrogen will be generated relative to acetylene, and this would generally be a cause for concern even though the TDCG is not abnormally high. The most severe condition is arcing. When high-energy arcing occurs, hydrogen and acetylene are generally of the same magnitude, as are the hydrocarbon gases. When an active arcing condition is found, immediate attention is required.

6.5.1 Determining the transformer condition and operating procedure utilizing TCG in the gas space

When sudden increases in the combustible gas concentrations or generating rates in the gas space of successfully operating transformers occur and an internal fault is suspected, use the procedure recommended in Figure 2.

Table 2 indicates the recommended initial sampling intervals and operating procedures for various levels of TCG (in percent).

Once the source of gassing is determined by analysis, inspection, consultation, or combinations thereof and the risk has been assessed, then engineering judgment should be applied to determine the final sampling interval and operating procedure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCG levels (%)</th>
<th>TCG rate (%/day)</th>
<th>Sampling intervals and operating procedures for gas generation rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sampling interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 4</td>
<td>≥5</td>
<td>&gt;0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 3</td>
<td>≥2 to &lt;5</td>
<td>&gt;0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 2</td>
<td>≥0.5 to &lt;2</td>
<td>&gt;0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 1</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&gt;0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: A transformer has a TCG level of 0.4% and is generating gas at a constant rate of 0.035% TCG per day. Table 2 indicates Condition 1. It should be sampled monthly, and the operator should exercise caution, analyze for individual gases, and determine load dependence.
6.5.2 Determining the operating procedure and sampling interval from the TDCG levels and generating rates in the oil

When sudden increases in the dissolved gas content of the oil in successfully operating transformers occur and an internal fault is suspected, the procedures recommended in Figure 2 should be used. Table 3 indicates the recommended initial sampling intervals and operating procedures for various levels of TDCG [in microliters/liter (ppm)]. An increasing gas generation rate indicates a problem of increasing severity; therefore, a shorter sampling interval is recommended.

Once the source of gassing is determined, by analysis, inspection, consultation, or combinations thereof, and the risk has been assessed, then engineering judgment should be applied to determine the final sampling interval and operating procedure.

Table 3—Actions based on TDCG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDCG levels (μL/L)</th>
<th>TDCG rate (μL/L/day)</th>
<th>Sampling intervals and operating procedures for gas generation rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>Daily&lt;br&gt;Consider removal from service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>Daily&lt;br&gt;Advise manufacturer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Weekly&lt;br&gt;Exercise extreme caution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 4</td>
<td>&gt;4630</td>
<td>Consider removal from service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1921 to 4630</td>
<td>Weekly&lt;br&gt;Exercise extreme caution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>721 to 1920</td>
<td>Monthly&lt;br&gt;Exercise caution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 3</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>Weekly&lt;br&gt;Exercise caution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>Weekly&lt;br&gt;Analyze for individual gases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Monthly&lt;br&gt;Determine load dependence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 2</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>Monthly&lt;br&gt;Exercise caution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>Monthly&lt;br&gt;Analyze for individual gases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Quarterly&lt;br&gt;Determine load dependence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 1</td>
<td>≤720</td>
<td>Monthly&lt;br&gt;Continue normal operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>Monthly&lt;br&gt;Continue normal operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>Quarterly&lt;br&gt;Continue normal operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Annual&lt;br&gt;Continue normal operation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: If a transformer has a TDCG level of 1300 μL/L (ppm) and generates gas at a constant rate below 10 μL/L (ppm) per day, it should be sampled quarterly, and the operator should exercise caution, analyze for individual gases, and determine load dependence. If the rate increases to 30 μL/L (ppm) per day, the operator should now sample monthly.

6.6 Evaluation of possible fault type by the key gas method

The preceding discussion of the dependence on temperature of the types of oil and cellulose decomposition gases (see 4.1 and 4.2) provides the basis for the qualitative determination of fault types from the gases that are typical, or predominant, at various temperatures. These significant gases and proportions are called “key gases.” Figure 3 indicates these “key gases” and relative proportions for the four general fault types.
1. Thermal – Oil: Decomposition products include ethylene and methane, together with smaller quantities of hydrogen and ethane. Traces of acetylene may be formed if the fault is severe or involves electrical contacts.

Principal Gas – Ethylene

2. Thermal – Cellulose: Large quantities of carbon dioxide and carbon monoxide are evolved from overheated cellulose. Hydrocarbon gases, such as methane and ethylene, will be formed if the fault involves an oil-impregnated structure.

Principal Gas – Carbon Monoxide

3. Electrical – Partial discharge: Low-energy electrical discharges produce hydrogen and methane, with small quantities of ethane and ethylene. Comparable amounts of carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide may result from discharges in cellulose.

Principal Gas – Hydrogen

4. Electrical – Arcing: Large amounts of hydrogen and acetylene are produced, with minor quantities of methane and ethylene. Carbon dioxide and carbon monoxide may also be formed if the fault involves cellulose. Oil may be carbonized.

Principal Gas – Acetylene

**Figure 3—Key gases evaluation**
6.7 Evaluation of possible fault type by analysis of the separate combustible gases generated

The use of gas ratios to indicate a single possible fault type is an empirical process based upon the experience of each individual investigator in correlating the gas analyses of many units with the fault type subsequently assigned as the cause for disturbance or failure when the unit was examined. This process was attributed to Doernenburg and subsequently confirmed by Rogers on European systems, from which the bulk of the diagnostic correlation is obtained. U.S. investigators have applied the European rules to units on U.S. systems with varying degrees of success; however, a U.S. database of comparable size to the European reports does not exist.

The diagnostic theories based upon the thermal degradation principles described in 4.1 and 4.2 employ an array of ratios of certain key combustible gases as the fault type indicators. These five ratios are:

- Ratio 1 (R1) = CH₄/H₂
- Ratio 2 (R2) = C₂H₂/C₂H₄
- Ratio 3 (R3) = C₂H₂/CH₄
- Ratio 4 (R4) = C₂H₆/C₂H₂
- Ratio 5 (R5) = C₂H₄/C₂H₆

The first ratio method (Doernenburg; see 6.7.1) utilizes Ratios 1, 2, 3, and 4. This procedure requires significant levels of the gases to be present in order for the diagnosis to be valid.

The second method (Rogers; see 6.7.2) utilizes Ratios 1, 2, and 5. The Rogers method does not depend on specific gas concentrations to exist in the transformer for the diagnosis to be valid. However, it suggests that the method be used only when the normal limits of the individual gases have been exceeded.

6.7.1 Evaluation of possible fault type by the Doernenburg ratio method

The Doernenburg method suggests the existence of three general fault types as discussed in Clause 4 and Clause 5. The method utilizes gas concentrations from which Ratios 1, 2, 3, and 4 are calculated. The step-by-step procedure (flow chart) is shown in Figure 4.

The values for these gases are first compared to special concentrations—L1 in Table 4 (see Steps 2, 3, and 4 in Figure 4)—to ascertain whether there really is a problem with the unit and then whether there is sufficient generation of each gas for the ratio analysis to be applicable. Then the ratios in the order Ratio 1, Ratio 2, Ratio 3, and Ratio 4 are compared to limiting values, providing a suggested fault diagnosis as given in Table 5. Table 5 gives the limiting values for ratios of gases dissolved in the oil and gases obtained from the transformer gas space or gas relay.

The flow chart in Figure 4 illustrates the step-by-step application of the Doernenburg ratio method for gases extracted from the transformer oil only. Exactly the same procedure is followed for gases obtained from the gas space or gas relays, except the limiting values for the ratios will be those appropriate for gas space (see Table 5).

Descriptions of the steps indicated in Figure 4 are as follows:

**Step 1** Gas concentrations are obtained by extracting the gases and separating them by chromatograph (see Clause 9).

**Step 2** If at least one of the gas concentrations [in microliters/liter (ppm)] for H₂, CH₄, C₂H₂, and C₂H₄ exceeds twice the values for limit L₁ (see Table 4) and one of the other two gases exceeds the values for limit L₁, the unit is considered faulty; proceed to Step 3 to determine validity of the ratio procedure.
Step 3  Determining validity of ratio procedure: If at least one of the gases in each ratio R1, R2, R3, or R4 exceeds limit \( L_1 \), the ratio procedure is valid; otherwise, the ratios are not significant, and the unit should be resampled and investigated by alternate procedures.

Step 4  Assuming that the ratio analysis is valid, each successive ratio is compared to the values obtained from Table 5 in the order R1, R2, R3, and R4.

Step 5  If all succeeding ratios for a specific fault type fall within the values given in Table 5, the suggested diagnosis is valid.

Figure 4 —Doernenburg ratio method flow chart

Table 4 —Limit concentrations of dissolved gas\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key gas</th>
<th>Concentrations ( L_1 ) [( \mu \text{L/L (ppm)} ) ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen (H(_2))</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methane (CH(_4))</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetylene (C(_2)H(_2))</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylene (C(_2)H(_4))</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethane (C(_2)H(_6))</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) These values differ from Doernenburg’s values and coincide with Condition 1 of Table 1.
Table 5—Ratios for key gases—Doernenburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested fault diagnosis</th>
<th>Ratio 1 (R1) C₄H₄/H₂</th>
<th>Ratio 2 (R2) C₂H₂/C₂H₄</th>
<th>Ratio 3 (R3) C₂H₂/CH₄</th>
<th>Ratio 4 (R4) C₂H₆/C₂H₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>Gas space</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>Gas space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Thermal decomposition</td>
<td>&gt;1.0</td>
<td>&gt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.75</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Partial discharge</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>&lt;0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(low-intensity PD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Arcing (high-intensity PD)</td>
<td>&gt;0.1 to &lt;1.0</td>
<td>&gt;0.01 to &lt;0.1</td>
<td>&gt;0.75</td>
<td>&gt;1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.7.2 Evaluation of possible fault type by the Rogers ratio method

The Rogers ratio method follows the same general procedure as the Doernenburg method, except only three ratios (R1, R2, and R5) are used. This method, shown in the step-by-step flow chart (see Figure 5), is also based on the thermal degradation principles described in 4.1 and 4.2. The validity of this method is based on correlation of the results of a much larger number of failure investigations with the gas analysis for each case. But, as with the Doernenburg method, the Rogers ratios can give ratios that do not fit into the diagnostic codes; therefore, other analytical methods given in 6.5 and 6.6 should be considered, as well as other options outlined in Figure 2.

Table 6 gives the values for the three key gas ratios corresponding to suggested diagnoses (cases). These ratios, according to Rogers, are applicable to both gases taken from the gas space (or relay) and gases extracted from the oil. The fault types (cases) given in Table 6 have been chosen by combining some cases from the number of fault types originally suggested by Rogers.

Table 6—Rogers ratios for key gases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>R2 C₂H₂/C₂H₄</th>
<th>R1 C₄H₄/H₂</th>
<th>R5 C₂H₂/C₂H₆</th>
<th>Suggested fault diagnosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&gt;0.1 to &lt;1.0</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
<td>Unit normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
<td>Low-energy density arcing—PD⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1 to 3.0</td>
<td>0.1 to 1.0</td>
<td>&gt;3.0</td>
<td>Arcing—High-energy discharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&gt;0.1 to &lt;1.0</td>
<td>1.0 to 3.0</td>
<td>Low temperature thermal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&gt;1.0</td>
<td>1.0 to 3.0</td>
<td>Thermal &lt;700 °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&gt;1.0</td>
<td>&gt;3.0</td>
<td>Thermal &gt;700 °C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵ There will be a tendency for the ratios R2 and R5 to increase to a ratio above 3 as the discharge develops in intensity.

Figure 5 is a flow chart describing the step-by-step application of the Rogers ratio method.
7. Instruments for detecting and determining the amount of combustible gases present

7.1 Portable instruments

Many of the gases generated by a possible malfunction in an oil-filled transformer are combustible. The on-site detection and estimation of combustible gases in the transformer in the field using a portable combustible gas meter can be the first and the easiest indication of a possible malfunction, and it may form the basis for further testing or an operating decision.

When a more accurate determination of the total amount of combustible gases or a quantitative determination of the individual components is desired, a laboratory analytical method using a gas chromatograph or mass spectrometer may be used.

**WARNING**

Gases generated in transformers can be explosive. Strict precautions must be observed when sampling the gases from the transformer.
7.2 Fixed instruments

The reliability of transformers can be improved by either monitoring the gas space or the gases dissolved in the oil using self-contained, fixed-mounted instruments. These continuous monitoring instruments indicate the presence of a certain gas or the total combustible gases as well as sound an alarm when the combustible gases exceed a predetermined level. Optional recorders can also be used to provide a daily record of the combustible gases present.

If the amount of the individual gas components is desired, a laboratory analytical method using a gas chromatograph or mass spectrometer should be used.

There are three somewhat related methods of monitoring the gases, as described in 7.2.1, 7.2.2, and 7.2.3.

7.2.1 Method 1

The first type of gas monitor continually compares the thermal conductivity of the transformer gas with that of pure nitrogen and is suitable for any transformer of the closed type with a gas space above the transformer oil.

It is calibrated with hydrogen, although the proportions of the combustibles are not obtained from the measurements.

The transformer gas is continually circulated through one section of a Wheatstone bridge and returned to the transformer. The other section of the bridge contains pure nitrogen and is balanced against the transformer gas.

When combustible gases are produced in the transformer, they mix with the transformer gas and increase the thermal conductivity of the transformer gas. The increase in the thermal conductivity of the transformer gas unbalances the Wheatstone bridge, and the unbalance is proportional to the total of the combustible gases as indicated on a meter.

7.2.2 Method 2

The second type of gas monitor continuously samples the transformer gas at fixed intervals and burns any combustible gases present to provide a measure of the total of the combustible gases. This type of monitor is used only on transformers with a positive pressure of nitrogen over the oil.

At a fixed interval (usually 24 h), a sample of the transformer gas is pumped from the unit, mixed with air, and passed over a platinum heating sensor of a Wheatstone bridge. Any combustible gas in the sample is burned. This raises the temperature of the sensor and unbalances the bridge, which was balanced against a second platinum sensor in air. The degree of unbalance is proportional to the amount of TCG present in the transformer gas as indicated on a meter.

7.2.3 Method 3

The third type of gas monitor continuously measures the amount of hydrogen and other combustible gases dissolved in the transformer oil.

Hydrogen and the other combustible gases of unknown proportions diffusing through a permeable membrane will be oxidized on a platinum gas-permeable electrode; oxygen from the ambient air will be electrochemically reduced on a second electrode. The ionic contact between the two electrodes is provided by a gelled high-concentration sulfuric acid electrolyte. The electric signal generated by this fuel cell is directly proportional to the TCG concentration and is sent to a conditioning electric circuit. The resulting output signal is temperature-compensated.
A relay is operated in conjunction with the percent gas meter so that when the combustible gases exceed a preset value, the relay sounds an alarm.

At the time of installation and each year thereafter, the equipment should be inspected to be sure the monitor is operating properly. The operator should follow the instruction guide of the manufacturer.

8. Procedures for obtaining samples of gas and oil from the transformer for laboratory analysis

8.1 Gas samples for laboratory analysis

All samples of gas from the gas blanket above the oil should be taken in accordance with ASTM D 3305.

8.2 Gas dissolved in oil

All samples of oil from electrical apparatus being taken for the purpose of dissolved gas-in-oil analysis should be taken in accordance with ASTM D 923.

Under certain conditions, stratification of dissolved gases in the oil may occur, and complete mixing could require many hours. In these cases, where possible, oil samples should be obtained from more than one location on the transformer.

9. Laboratory methods for analyzing the gas blanket and the gases extracted from the oil

9.1 General

Comparative tests on essentially identical samples of oil (for instance, from the same transformer) by various laboratories have indicated a lack of precision, with the measured concentration of certain key gases reported to differ by a factor of 3 or more. The principal reason appears to be lack of uniformity in the degree, i.e., the efficiency of gas extraction. For exact and generally applicable threshold or limit values of concentrations or evolution rates of key gases, it is necessary to obtain uniform and high (for instance, 97%) efficiencies of extraction for individual characteristic gases.

9.2 Determination of total dissolved gas

Determination of total dissolved gas should be made in accordance with ASTM D 2945.

9.3 Determination of individual dissolved gases

Determination of the individual dissolved gases should be made in accordance with ASTM D 3612.

9.4 Determination of individual gases present in the gas blanket

Analysis of the individual gases present in the gas blanket above the oil may be made by using ASTM D 3612, beginning at Section 10 of that standard. Sections 13.1 and 13.2 of ASTM D 3612 are not applicable in this case.

Information on references can be found in Clause 2.
Annex A
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