

Draft Minutes
 Tuesday, May 15, 2007, 2:00 p.m. — 5:00 p.m.
 Rochester Riverside Convention Center
 Aqueduct B
 123 East Main Street, Rochester, NY 14604

Present	Participants (5/15 + 5 Alt.)	Representing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Voting OEOSC Members	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David Aikens	Past Chairperson (Zygo Corporation)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sidney Braginsky	Olympus America, Inc., Retired, Alternate
<input type="checkbox"/>	Charles Campbell	OLA (Consultant), Alternate
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Walter Czajkowski	APOMA (Edmund Optics)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marla Dowell (by phone)	Chairperson (IEEE/LEOS (NIST))
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lincoln Endelman	SPIE (Endelman Enterprises), Alternate
<input type="checkbox"/>	Thomas Germer	NIST
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hal Johnson	Director (Harold Johnson Optical Lab)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gene Kohlenberg	Secretary (OEOSC)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Allen Krisiloff	Chairperson-Elect (Triptar Lens Co. Inc.)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Albert C. Parr	NIST (Alternate)
<input type="checkbox"/>	James Peyton	International Imaging Industry Association
<input type="checkbox"/>	William Royall	Treasurer (Eastman Kodak Company)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ronald Scotti	SPIE
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lee Shuett	Director (Nikon Inc.)
<input type="checkbox"/>	George Steares	Olympus America Inc.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Rich Linke	IEEE-LEOS, Alternate
<input type="checkbox"/>	William Strackbein	OPIA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Daniel Torgersen	OLA (Walman Optical)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Alan Tourtlotte	OSA
Observers (4)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gordon Boulton	JDS Uniphase Corporation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Charles Gaugh	Davidson Optronics, Inc.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jonathan McGuire	Northrop Grumman Laser Systems, Alternate
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Judie Oberheuser	Guest
<input type="checkbox"/>	Steven VanKerkhove	Corning Tropel

Welcome and Introductions:

M. Dowell opened the meeting at 1:10 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda:

A. Krisiloff moved that the draft agenda be modified to include new business items: Paris ISO meeting, Sid Braginsky challenge to change the business plan. C. Gaugh seconded the motion, which carried.

Approval of January, 2007 OEOSC Board Meeting Minutes:

M. Dowell asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes. A. Krisiloff moved that the draft minutes be accepted. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion, which carried.

Reports

Financial Budget. W. Royall submitted an income and expense report for the first three months of 2007. Since he could not attend, G. Kohlenberg reviewed the report for Bill.

OEOSC	
Treasurer's Report for 2007 Through April 30	
Income	
2006 Fees	188.00
2007 Fees	22,264.00
Training	4,100.43
Savings Interest	191.31
Sale of Standards	122.50
Total	26,866.24
Expenses	
Administrative	10,116.11
Preparation of Standards	0
Training	64.63
Dues	19,180.00
	ANSI
Total	29,360.74
End of April, 2007:	
Checkbook balance	26,785.09
Savings balance	43,729.05
Total Cash	70,514.14
William E. Royall	
May 15, 2007	

A. Krisiloff asked if those who teach an OEOSC course are compensated for their expenses. The secretary said that there is provision for compensation. The training policy is available on the OEOSC web site under the 2007 January Board meeting documents. D. Aikens said that he was paid when he conducted a class at a company. G. Boulton said that he has not as yet charged for training.

D. Aikens noted that expenses were greater than income. He asked if there are any outstanding receipts. The secretary said that there were some outstanding dues, as usual. There would be future training receipts. D. Aikens asked if the Secretary predicted that OEOSC would have a positive cash flow in 2007. The Secretary replied that he did not expect to see continued corporate sponsorship by Olympus America. So there would be a drop of receipts by \$5,000. There could be a small deficit in 2007.

ANSI/OEOSC OP Meeting Reports.

Optical Imperfections Everyone at this Board meeting was at that meeting so we the activities were not reviewed. The minutes of the meeting are on the OEOSC web site for review.

Optical Wavefront Measurement D. Aikens reported for S. VanKerkhove. The wavefront project has been split into two standards, OP1.004 to be led by P. Takacs, and OP1.005 led by S. VanKerkhove. During the OP1.004 portion of the meeting, V. Yashchuk discussed issues in developing such a standard, and made a presentation on "Two dimensional power spectral density measurements of X-ray optics with the MicroMap interferometric microscope." D. Aikens said that the scope for this standard will be challenging, and progress will be slow. We should not expect a publishable version of OP1.004 until late 2009 or early 2010. The Task Force has made more progress on the deterministic standard OP1.005, but is still struggling with the terms and definitions phase. S. VanKerkhove accepted the task of writing an outline and a first cut of a notation section so that the group could then settle upon the set of definitions required. D. Aikens expects that this draft will be ready for publishing in 2009.

The next meeting will be held in San Diego, CA in August. J. Harvey asked to have the meeting during the week because he had a Sunday conflict. G. Boulton had no preference when the imperfection meeting is held. D. Aikens suggested that the Board meeting be held on Monday afternoon, the imperfections meeting on Sunday morning, OP business meeting on Sunday afternoon, and the wavefront meeting on Monday morning.

Other Business

Trip Support for ISO Meetings. M. Dowell noted that there is \$2,500 in the 2007 budget to provide assistance to those who need it to travel to ISO meetings. There are three requests for trip support:

- **ISO/TC 172/SC 3 November Meeting in Kyoto, Japan** – G. Boulton, who is chairing the SC 3 meeting, has requested \$1,200;
- **ISO/TC 172/SC 1 June Meeting in Paris, France** – A. Krisiloff has asked for \$1,000;
- **ISO/TC 172/SC 1 June Meeting in Paris, France** – R. Williamson (amount not known).

D. Aikens moved that OEOSC provide trip support for the three up to the limit of \$1,500. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. M. Dowell noted that in the worst case the budget would be exceeded by \$1,200. Although the budget may be exceeded for this item, other savings will probably keep the total budget in the black. The motion carried with one abstention by A. Krisiloff.

Business Model. D. Aikens stated that the business model, which originally was membership based, evolved about two years ago into a model where the loss from membership was offset by including a business plan for selling training. It has worked so far. The other business model centered on selling standards, but has never been viable. At earlier meetings the concept of selling standards was expanded, as a result of a suggestion by R. Parks, to include the adoption of ISO standards as national standards. This concept would increase the number of active standards in the OEOSC portfolio.

Adopting ISO 9211 as a test case. If adoption of this standard benefits the US optics industry, OEOSC should do it. Parts 1 and 2 are up for review at the Kyoto meeting, and 4 is up for final voting. D. Aikens moved that OP wait until the revisions are complete, A. Krisiloff seconded the motion. The motion carried.

IEEE/LEOS Funding. M. Dowell attended the CLEO IEEE/LEOS meeting the previous week. IEEE/LEOS has about \$250K for special projects. OEOSC could write a proposal for trip support for experts to attend ISO meetings, or to subsidize some of OEOSC educational development. IEEE/LEOS is now offering free tuition for students to attend short courses at IEEE meetings. She suggested that OEOSC could ask IEEE if they would be willing to provide tuition aid for students to attend OEOSC training courses. The other possibility is to ask IEEE to fund OEOSC instructors to teach the course at universities. There is a potential issue because IEEE/LEOS is an international society, so IEEE/LEOS support would be for anybody to attend an ISO meeting, not just US representatives. She asked if OEOSC is an international organization, which would have to manage any request. The Secretary replied that OEOSC is a US organization which manages the US TAG to the international organization. Only US experts participate on the TAG. ANSI requires OEOSC to accept international participation on ASC OP. M. Dowell suggested that OEOSC should concentrate on US educational initiatives.

M. Dowell said that IEEE/LEOS assumed that projects would be on the order of \$20K – \$50K range. She wanted to be sure that the Board favored pursuing this idea, before she called the IEEE/LEOS coordinator to determine if IEEE/LEOS would be interested in working with OEOSC.

D. Aikens asked if IEEE/LEOS was an OEOSC member. M. Dowell replied that it is and that she is the representative on the OEOSC Board. D. Aikens thought that the Board would need to look to M. Dowell for guidance concerning how to proceed. M. Dowell said that part of the project could be funds for instructors to travel to universities to teach the scratch and short courses. She asked if there are OEOSC experts who would be willing to travel to teach these short courses. This would mean more work for OEOSC's experts, but it would increase OEOSC's visibility.

D. Aikens asked what would interest IEEE/LEOS. M. Dowell thought that the educational project would attract their attention. IEEE/LEOS is pushing to develop short courses for students, and are always looking for ways to send lecturers to schools to talk with students. This presents an opportunity for experts from industry to work with students who will be seeking employment in industry rather than educational institutions. D. Aikens proposed that OEOSC give the short course at four universities (perhaps U of R, U of A, Davis, CREOL, UNC Charlotte) of IEEE/LEOS's choosing for \$4,000 each. He would be willing to give OEOSC the profit from this activity. D. Aikens said that he had a meeting with J. Bennett from the U of R to discuss presenting the class for free. In general, if the class is given without compensation, he is not motivated to pursue teaching it.

J. McGuire said that there were courses at Davis sponsored by SPIE and OSA that were well received. As he was leaving the school, IEEE was beginning to partner with the school, too. They had monthly or bi-monthly noontime presentations by industry. The school had to motivate the students by offering free pizza, but 20 – 40 students attended.

D. Aikens said that the course is four hours long, and would have to be edited to fit into a 1½ – 2 hour time span. He suggested that OEOSC offer D. Aikens as the instructor to give the four-hour class at several universities. M. Dowell said that she would contact IEEE/LEOS to see what they would think about the proposal.

M. Dowell asked if A. Krisiloff was developing one-hour short courses. D. Aikens answered that A. Krisiloff was looking at the Glass Standard, OP3.001, and G. Boulton was shortening the Scratch and Dig, OP1.002 class to get it closer to one hour. G. Boulton thought that he was supposed to be looking at standards from raw glass and coatings, e.t.c., which would be a broad overview. He said that he has not gotten too far along, and could change direction to shortening the scratch and dig class instead.

D. Aikens replied that he thought that G. Boulton was to develop a survey tutorial for Irvine College covering scratch and dig with some other material concerning coatings added.

A. Krisiloff thought that the one-hour class should be a reduced OP1.002, which would be more unique and

OEOSC Board Meeting, May 17, 2007, 2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., Continued

easier to sell to IEEE/LEOS than a general survey of standards. In the future nothing stops OEOSC from offering a survey class.

M. Dowell will talk to Alan Wilner at IEEE/LEOS before the next meeting. D. Aikens suggested that she sell IEEE/LEOS on the product OEOSC makes rather than a new course. If they want to pay \$10K for OEOSC to create a new course, that would be the alternative, but there should be no strings attached whereby IEEE/LEOS would want to dictate where and when OEOSC experts traveled. M. Dowell suggested that she could tell IEEE/LEOS where the class is being taught and they could fund seats at these existing classes for students. A. Krisiloff urged that that proposal be a part of the conversation.

D. Aikens suggested that M. Dowell be trained to teach the scratch and dig course so that she could handle the task at IEEE/LEOS conferences. She said that she is not opposed to doing that. CLEO is held in May, alternating between East and West coasts. Next spring CLEO will be in San Jose, CA. There is also an annual IEEE/LEOS meeting in the fall, usually the week before or after the annual OSA meeting.

D. Aikens asked the secretary to follow up on the offer to teach the course at OSA conferences.

One-Hour Briefing / Tutorial / Class. G. Boulton had previously set a goal of having a draft by the end of 2007, and thought he might have material ready to discuss by San Diego. The question is whether it is a shortened OP1.002 course or a survey. A. Krisiloff thought that a shortened OP1.002 course would be more easily accomplished. D. Aikens added that it will be challenging to get it down to an hour, but if it could be cut to 40 – 50 minutes, then something about the glass standard could be added, along with ISO 10110-7. It should be a surface defect discussion with some comments about other standards that OEOSC wants to sell. A survey course would be difficult to make interesting. G. Boulton agreed with that observation.

ANSI/OEOSC OP3.001, Optical Glass. A. Triptar had prepared a course outline that had been uploaded to the OEOSC web site under the Board section. He said that his first draft was a Power Point version, but he changed it to a text document for the Board discussion. He suggested that the class be two 1 hour and 20 minute sessions because that is the typical length of a college class. He thought that it is particularly important to determine for whom the course is intended, and the level of education presumed. A copy of the course notes would be given to the student in addition to a copy of the standard.

D. Aikens had a comment concerning the title –“A SHORT COURSE ON THE ANSI OP 3.001-2001”. He presumed that the target audience would be attendees of conference short courses. That audience wants to learn about specifying glass. So the title should be about the specification of bulk properties of glass, and the course should be placed in the context of international standards to attract a larger audience.. A. Krisiloff liked those ideas. C. Gaugh suggested that there could be a subtitle referencing OP3.001. D. Aikens said that if a reference to international standards could be worked into the title, so much the better. Many do not know about OP3.001, so there is no recognition on the part of the participant about that standard. C. Gaugh said that is why he was suggesting a subtitle, “A Short Course on Optical Glass Standards.” The student may assume that it covers ISO standards, and be introduced to OP3.001. D. Aikens added that the scope statement about the course could also amplify the subject matter.

C. Gaugh suggested that under Section V, A. Krisiloff could supply a background bibliography. A. Krisiloff replied that there is a bibliography of about a dozen documents in OP3.001, that he would refer to during the class. C. Gaugh countered that he likes to do some background reading before he takes a course, so a bibliography in the course description would be beneficial.

A. Krisiloff then discussed the outline of the course. D. Aikens said that the course should not be obsessive about OP3.001, even though that is what we want to sell. What is included in the course outline is applicable to both the US and ISO glass standards. D. Aikens added that there may be other glass standards as well, and a little research is required to determine what options are available for the engineer. A. Krisiloff said that he has heard a lot of interest in international standards from those he has contacted, so this approach is good. The class could contrast the various glass standards, which would provide material to easily fill a three-hour course. G. Boulton said that ISO/TC 172/SC 3 is considering a new draft of the international glass standard, and the new draft will be a subject for discussion at the upcoming Kyoto meeting.

D. Aikens recommended that A. Krisiloff compare OP3.001 with ISO and any others that may exist. G. Boulton said that he could give him info concerning updated ISO documents.

D. Aikens offered support by other US experts to help A. Krisiloff complete this project.

G. Boulton asked if there is a target date for giving the class for the first time. A. Krisiloff suggested that he create a serious draft one for consideration for the January OEOSC meeting. G. Boulton suggested that a separate session be scheduled for reviewing the draft.

G. Boulton suggested that if students were to read from a bibliography, then they may be disappointed in the material actually presented in the class.

W. Czajkowski reminded the group about presentations concerning bulk glass characteristics from Schott, Kathleen Richardson, APOMA, etc., that could be reviewed.

D. Aikens urged the Board to respect copyrights of manufacturers and other standards organizations concerning information shared during the course.

D. Aikens also pointed out that a discussion of the **Restriction of Hazardous Substances Directive (ROHAS)** would

OEOSC Board Meeting, May 17, 2007, 2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., Continued

attract many to the class.

D. Aikens said another opportunity for this course is to present a unified glass map including all of the manufacturers materials.

W. Czajkowski suggested that glass is actually a polycrystalline liquid rather than an “a frozen, amorphous, non-crystalline liquid”. A. Krisiloff said that this point was well taken, and that he needs to study the nature of glass.

C. Gaugh offered to act as a proofreader for the draft as it progresses.

D. Aikens suggested that OP should ask permission from the glass manufacturers to use their glass data in a unified glass map that would become an annex of OP3.001 C. Gaugh noted that most glass manufacturers have cross-reference tables for material from other manufacturers.

ISO 10110, Optical Drawings. D. Aikens distributed a paper copy of the course outline to those attending the meeting in person. A copy of the presentation will be uploaded to the Board section of the OPTSTD web site. D. Aikens read the course detail description for the benefit of those on the phone. He said that he could add material offering OP3.001 and OP1.002 as alternatives for ISO 10110 parts 2 – 4, and part 7. As OP develops more standards, they could be added as alternatives. He surmised that there is enough material for a full-day class.

C. Gaugh thought that the first part could stand on its own as an overview. D. Aikens agreed that if the introduction to ISO 10110 could be augmented with two-page summaries of each of the ISO 10110 sections, he could probably reduce the class to a half day. However, he plans to lay it out as a full-day class at first to see the magnitude of it. A. Krisiloff said that the class could be set up in two halves because some may only want the first part. There could be a separate charge for each half, with the advanced topics covered in the second class.

D. Aikens said that his family will be away in August and he will take vacation time to work on the draft.

D. Aikens asked that a review of the classes be added to the next Board meeting. M. Dowell suggested that only one be covered at the next meeting so that the subject could be covered in depth.

New Business

Paris meeting: D. Aikens asked for confirmation of whom will attend the ISO/TC 172/SC 1 meeting in Paris June 26 – 29,2007.

- D. Aikens, confirmed;
- W. Czajkowski, possibly; he has a draft of ISO 10110-6 due;
- G. Kohlenberg, confirmed;
- A. Krisiloff, confirmed;
- R. Williamson, confirmed;
- P. Takacs, not known; he has a draft of ISO 10110-9 due.

He asked that the four who were at the meeting stay afterward to discuss logistics of the Paris meetings.

Sid Braginsky challenge to change the business model. A. Krisiloff reviewed S. Braginsky's earlier comments about how large companies such as Kodak had formerly contributed significant funds toward the OEOSC annual budget; but with changing times such funding is no longer being offered. Since in the US there is no government support for standards development, OEOSC has difficulty assembling delegations of experts to travel to foreign meetings, and must seek other sources of funds. His proposed approach was to solicit personal donations for the American standards effort including international and domestic development. S. Braginsky asked for names of executives at companies of all sizes that he could personally visit.

In Rochester there are several optical companies. A. Krisiloff has contacted three of them. He told them that he was approaching with hat in hand about the need for money. He prepared a presentation because he knew that executives expect prepared material to review. The presentation contained pie charts of the OEOSC financial history because he could get that data off of the OEOSC web site. However, there needs to be two other parts for future presentations, if we are to take S. Braginsky's approach seriously:

- a product oriented description of what has OEOSC done in the past: what kind of training was done and with associated costs;
- a strategic view of the near future — a five-year plan.

He called Mike Mandina at Optimax, but got no return call. He approached JML because he had formerly worked there, and he knew Jim Sydor of Sydo Optics. J. Sydor said that he belonged to APOMA; perhaps APOMA could contribute toward OEOSC's expenses. He suggested that a financial report be given to APOMA. D. Aikens replied that APOMA has a budget comparable to OEOSC's, and is already contributing \$5,000 per year to support OEOSC.

A. Krisiloff said that J. Sydor told him that OEOSC has made technical presentations at APOMA meetings, and it should consider making a business case presentation at the upcoming January meeting.

D. Aikens said that in addition to the three points discussed above, OEOSC needs a pitch to say why it needs lots of money. A. Krisiloff said that would be part of the strategic, forward-looking plan. He suggested that one pitch might be that a company, such as JML, could be listed as a sponsor of training course. He described a range of support, from altruistic to what immediate return to company would result. D. Aikens said that first OEOSC needs to know what it would do if it got

OEOSC Board Meeting, May 17, 2007, 2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., Continued

increased financing. W. Czajkowski said that in-house training is important for companies so that their employees know how to interpret ISO standards on the shop floor. A. Krisiloff noted that it would not be advantageous to tell companies that OEOSC would use their contributions to train their competitors. W. Czajkowski countered that contributors could then be offered discounts for in-house training. Contributions would make it possible for OEOSC to hire an expert to present the in-house training.

D. Aikens said that OEOSC needs to make a definitive presentation that says OEOSC plans to raise \$N to hire X full-time persons to do Y. The optics industry will benefit by K.

J. Oberheuser said that OEOSC would need to have a range of “gifts” as thank yous for contributions from companies. For example, if a company contributes \$5,000, then OEOSC would give the company a 50% discount for training. If they give \$10,000 then OEOSC would train five employees without charge. OEOSC will need both a five-year and a ten-year plan for how the contributions will be used.

D. Aikens complimented A. Krisiloff for taking the initiative to have a fresh look at the funding problem.

J. McGuire said that OEOSC needs to plan what they could do with different levels of funding.

D. Aikens commented that OEOSC needs to develop an OEOSC vision so that it knows how to proceed. He suggested a phone conference brainstorming session. A. Krisiloff suggested that that conference call include the past, present and future Board Chairs, who would agree upon a set of talking points for the August Board meeting.

J. Oberheuser said that her daughter may be able to help with public relations.

Next Meeting

M. Dowell called for a Board meeting again on August 27, 2007. in San Diego, CA.. She would participate by phone.

Adjournment:

As there was no further business to come before the Board, A. Krisiloff moved that the meeting be adjourned. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.