

Draft
OEOSC Board Meeting

January 22, 2006 10:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Fairmont Hotel, Cupertino Room
170 South Market Street, San Jose, CA 95113

Present	Participants (10/15)	Representing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Voting OEOSC Members	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David Aikens	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	IEEE/LEOS (NIST)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lincoln Endelman	SPIE (Endelman Enterprises), Alternate
<input type="checkbox"/>	Thomas Germer	NIST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hal Johnson	Past Chairperson, Director (Harold Johnson Optical Lab)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gene Kohlenberg	Secretary (OEOSC)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Albert C. Parr	NIST (Alternate)
<input type="checkbox"/>	James Peyton	International Imaging Industry Association
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	William Royall (by phone)	Treasurer (Eastman Kodak Company)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ronald Scotti	SPIE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lee Shuett	Director (Nikon Inc.)
<input type="checkbox"/>	George Steares	Olympus America Inc.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Paul Shumate	IEEE-Leos
<input type="checkbox"/>	William Strackbein	OPIA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Daniel Torgersen	OLA (Walman Optical)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Alan Tourtlotte (by phone)	OSA
	Observers (6)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gordon Boulton	JDS Uniphase Corporation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Allen Krisiloff	Triptar Lens Co. Inc.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Charles Gaugh	Davidson Optronics, Inc.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	John Hamilton	Northrop Grumman
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steven VanKerkhove	Corning Tropel
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Trey Turner	Research Electro-Optics, Inc.

Welcome and Introductions:

D. Aikens opened the meeting at 10:25 a.m.

Approval of the Agenda:

M. Dowell moved that the draft agenda stored on the OEOSC website be approved. L. Shuett seconded the motion. The secretary noted that an item about the Nominating Committee be added. D. Aikens asked that the adoption of ISO standards also be included. which carried. He also wanted to discuss international standards training. The amended agenda motion carried.

Approval of August 1, 2005 OEOSC Board Meeting Minutes:

D. Aikens asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes. Al Tourtlotte moved that the draft minutes be accepted. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion, which carried. Page 2 above scratches. Change 2006- 2007 to 2007 – 2008.

Reports

Financial Budget. W. Royall good year in terms of expenses.

OEOSC Board Meeting, January 22, 2006 10:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., Fairmont Hotel, Cupertino Room, 170 South Market Street, San Jose, CA 95113, Continued

EXPENSES		BUDGET MONTH						
Account	Expenses ACCT #	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	
Exec. Director	101	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	
Admin. Asst.	102	\$412.50	\$650.00	\$475.00	\$237.50	\$187.50	\$450.00	
Admin. Exp.	200	\$8.37	\$3.41	\$20.62	\$1.20	\$45.10	\$12.00	
Travel	300	\$1,307.01				\$1,590.25		
ISO Trip Support	301							
ANSI/TAG Dues	400	\$17,750.00						
Board Expenses	500	\$60.00		\$195.00			\$48.00	
Refresh/Room Charges	501	\$293.90			\$127.66			
Credit Card Fees	502	\$29.03	\$23.98					
Grand Total		\$21,260.81	\$2,077.39	\$2,090.62	\$1,766.36	\$3,222.85	\$1,910.00	

EXPENSES									Grand Total	Budget
Account	Expenses ACCT #	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC			
Exec. Director	101	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$16,800.00	\$16,800.00	
Admin. Asst.	102	\$262.50	\$437.50	\$225.00	\$187.50	\$300.00	\$359.13	\$4,184.13	\$4,900.00	
Admin. Exp.	200	\$24.40	\$24.05		\$18.39	\$4.61		\$162.15	\$100.00	
Travel	300		\$1,183.97					\$4,081.23	\$5,900.00	
ISO Trip Support	301								\$2,500.00	
ANSI/TAG Dues	400							\$17,750.00	\$17,750.00	
Board Expenses	500		\$1,000.00					\$1,303.00	\$450.00	
Refresh/Room Charges	501							\$421.56	\$50.00	
Credit Card Fees	502						\$1.00	\$54.01	\$300.00	
Grand Total		\$1,686.90	\$4,045.52	\$1,625.00	\$1,605.89	\$1,704.61	\$1,760.13	\$44,756.08	\$48,750.00	

Beginning Savings Bal	\$32,721.54
Beginning Check Bal	\$11,533.47
2004 checks cleared in 2005	\$1,750.00
2005 fees received in 2004	\$1,575.00
1/1/2005 RESIDUAL	\$40,930.01
2004 Fees Received in 2005	\$0.00
2005 Fees Received in 2004	\$1,575.00
2005 Fees Received in 2005	\$41,789.00
Other Receipts	\$19,465.28
Savings Interest	\$606.27
EXPENSES	\$44,756.08
12/30/2005 RESIDUAL	\$59,609.48
Checks and fees not cleared by 12/30/05	\$1,759.13
Deposits not recorded by 12/30/05	
2006 Fees Collected in 2005	\$0.00
Transfers from/to Savings	(\$14,522.80)
Savings Interest	\$606.27
Beginning Savings Bal	\$32,721.54
CHECKBOOK BAL	\$13,518.00
SAVINGS ACCOUNT BAL	\$47,850.61
MONTHLY CASH ON HAND	\$61,368.61

OEO SC Board Meeting, January 22, 2006 10:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., Fairmont Hotel, Cupertino Room, 170 South Market Street, San Jose, CA 95113, Continued

D. Aikens asked what the \$1,000 Board expense covered. The secretary said that was the gift in memory of Harvey Pollicove. D. Aikens then asked if the room charge account should have a larger budget. The secretary replied that the charge in January was for the rental of a speaker phone to call D. Aikens, who was stranded because of a winter storm. The call was to plan how J. Hamilton and W. Royall could teach the scratch and dig training class in place of D. Aikens. The May charge was for components for the speaker phone connection to G. Kohlenberg's cell phone, which in the future would be used to avoid excessive hotel conference phone charges.

D. Aikens commented that a year or two ago the Board embarked upon a campaign to financially save this organization by changing our business model. He was glad to see that this change is working.

BSR/OEO SC OP1.002 Status

This is the scratch and dig standard. The secretary said that he had to resubmit the document for ANSI national review. The review period ended January 18, 2006. There were no comments so he is now completing the paper work for final submission for ANSI approval of the standard. D. Aikens asked the secretary when he expected that the standard could be released. The secretary said that he would probably be able to get the paper work submitted within a week, and he would expect that the ANSI board would approve it within six weeks.

Policy on Training Reimbursement. The reason this subject came up is because OEO SC was asked to provide the course at a company site. G. Boulton wrote a procedure which was placed on the OEO SC web site. When OEO SC is completely responsible for the course, OEO SC charges the company \$5,000 and OEO SC pays the expenses of the presenter. There is a second path when a company goes to SPIE and asks that the course presented at SPIE conferences be repeated in house. SPIE then pays OEO SC \$2,500 and also pay the expenses of the instructor. There was no negative response to the e-mail ballot for the adoption of the policy, so this document is now our policy. D. Aikens said that there are two other paths: when an OEO SC member company self-teaches the course, then that company pays OEO SC \$920. For example, G. Boulton provided training within JDSU. D. Aikens has done it and J. Hamilton plans to teach it at Northrop Grumman. OEO SC handout at in-house courses. The original arrangement was to teach the course at SPIE conferences. D. Aikens noted that he had asked that the honorarium given to the instructor by SPIE could be donated to OEO SC if the instructor could not accept it. The secretary added that the company who provided the instructor would receive a member fee credit in the amount of the honorarium.

The secretary was asked to update the policy to reflect the additions.

Other Business

Audit of OEO SC 2004 Finances. L. Shuett said that he is changing assistants and would have the audit within 30 days.

Memorial for Joe Oberheuser. G. Kohlenberg reported the death of J. Oberheuser who was from ITT and was originally the chair of the OSA standards committee. He was influential in the organization of OEO SC, and he wrote the by-laws. His wife has established a memorial in his honor at the University of Rochester. The Board needs to decide if they want to make a contribution in his honor. There was a question if there is a precedent for such a contribution. The secretary replied that a memorial was given for Harvey Pollicove in the amount of \$1,000.

M. Dowell moved that \$1000 be contributed to Joe Oberheuser memorial. H. Johnson seconded. The motion carried.

Video Projector. L. Shuett moved that OEO SC purchase a video projector so that the meeting material can be viewed for discussion. J. Hamilton seconded the motion. W. Royall asked if there are restrictions to using a personal projector at a meeting because the conference venue wants to offer such services for a fee. D. Aikens replied that many heads in the room were shaking their heads to indicate it would be no problem. The SPIE representative shrugged, however. The motion carried unanimously.

2007 -2008 Proposed OEO SC Budget. W. Royall presented the proposed budget and compared it to previous years.

EXPENSES		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007 Draft	2008 Draft
Account	ACCT #	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	Budget	Amount	Budget	Budget	Budget
Exec. Director	101	\$16,800.00	\$16,800	\$16,800	\$16,800	\$16,800	\$16,800	\$16,800	\$16,800	\$16,800	\$16,800
Admin. Asst.	102	\$7,925.00	\$4,388	\$5,700	\$4,575	\$3,800	\$3,400	\$4,184	\$4,900	\$4,900	\$4,900
COM Labor Expenses	103				\$0	\$0	\$7,000	\$0	\$0		
Admin. Exp.	200	\$1,933.99	\$1,158	\$1,375	\$1,182	\$99	\$100	\$162	\$100	\$150	\$150
COM Material Expenses	201				\$0	\$0	\$800	\$0	\$0		
Travel	300	\$1,983.33	\$2,855	\$4,970	\$2,955	\$4,725	\$5,300	\$4,081	\$2,500	\$5,900	\$5,900
ISO Trip Support	301				\$1,162	\$0	\$5,000	\$0	\$1,000	\$2,500	\$2,500
ANSI/TAG Dues	400	\$30,150.00	\$15,750	\$19,000	\$18,870	\$16,250	\$16,250	\$17,750	\$18,790	\$19,920	\$21,100
Board Expenses	500	\$1,279.10	\$1,330	\$2,427	\$464	\$311	\$500	\$1,303	\$3,900	\$450	\$450
Refresh/Room Charges	501				\$766	\$0	\$250	\$422	\$50	\$50	\$50
Credit Card Fees	502				\$635	\$648	\$700	\$54	\$300	\$50	\$50
Printing Cost	503									\$500	\$500
Total		\$60,071	\$42,280	\$50,272	\$47,409	\$42,632	\$56,100	\$44,756	\$48,340	\$51,220	\$52,400

OEO SC Board Meeting, January 22, 2006 10:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., Fairmont Hotel, Cupertino Room, 170 South Market Street, San Jose, CA 95113, Continued

The printing cost is for the new scratch and dig standard, which includes quite a bit of color.

W. Czajkowski asked if there would be significant costs for the upcoming ISO meetings in Boulder, CO. W. Royall replied that we do not know the magnitude of the meeting costs., but has estimated \$3,900 under Board Expenses. M. Dowell thought it may be around \$1,800 because OEO SC and LEOMA will be sharing the costs. NIST will be providing room arrangements and bus transportation, but can't fund the social event. The secretary reported that M. Dowell and he were going to look at the components of the cost for the ISO meetings following the Board meeting.

D. Aikens asked if we knew where the ISO meetings would be held in 2007 an 2008. The secretary replied that the 2007 location would be chosen at the end of the 2006 meeting, and the 2008 location would be chosen at the end of the 2007 meeting. London should be the next meeting site, since the last one was in 1998; however, the British delegation is also having funding problems, and does not know how to fund the meetings. The meetings have been held in Japan twice since the London meeting. Other meetings have been in St. Gallen, Switzerland; Paris, France; St. Petersburg, Russian Federation; and Weimar, Germany. D. Aikens asked if the \$2,500 ISO travel assistance budget is sufficient. G. Kohlenberg replied that none of his trips including France, Russia and Japan exceeded \$2,500; however, in Japan Harvey Pollicove subsidized several of the meals. M. Dowell said that her trip to London in the previous year was \$3,500. D. Aikens concluded that the \$2,500 budget was a good ball park figure, that perhaps is on the low side. W. Royall noted that the ISO meetings may not occur in both upcoming years. G. Kohlenberg replied that for the past several years the meeting cycle was about 12 months.

D. Aikens asked if expenses, such as for the video projector could be charged to room charges rather than Board expense. He also asked if the ISO meeting expenses could be segregated. The secretary said that he could create a new expense item.

RECEIPTS	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
OLA Membership	\$14,144	\$11,900	\$15,400	\$15,400	\$14,500	\$12,700	\$11,000	\$10,900	\$10,900
Company Individual	\$9,400	\$12,875	\$7,726	\$7,125	\$7,875	\$7,875	\$7,875	\$7,975	\$7,975
Self Employed/Academic	\$700	\$600	\$500	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$600	\$600
Trade Organization	\$9,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Corporate	\$25,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$5,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Professional	\$3,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Sale of Standards		\$4,639.00	\$350	\$140	\$168	\$182	\$350	\$2,500	\$2,500
Interest					\$85	\$606	\$500	\$500	\$600
Training						\$19,283	\$5,920	\$5,920	\$5,920
	\$61,244	\$58,014	\$51,976	\$51,365	\$41,328	\$62,347	\$47,345	\$49,395	\$49,495

D. Aikens asked if the number of corporate members would be stable. The secretary replied that the three are Olympus America, NIST, and APOMA. He is not aware of any changes. D. Aikens suggested that the training receipts be increased by \$2,500 for 2006 – 2008 because the release of the new standard will probably increase training interest. The secretary pointed out that there are only two SPIE classes scheduled for 2006, one at Photonics West and one at Photonics East.

D. Aikens suggested that there should be a built in cost of living increase based on a cost of living index for the Executive Director starting in 2007. M. Dowell said it could be pegged to the consumer price index. L. Shuett asked the significance of the note concerning SC 7:

SC 7 documents were 46% of total number of documents processed 1/04 -12/05.

OLA membership includes 46% of Admin. Asst., Admin. Expenses, COM Labor and Mtls.; 20% of Exec., Travel, Board Exp.; and all of SC 7's portion of ANSI dues.

In 2006 the OLA membership includes 46% of the ANSI 5-year audit of the TAG along with a \$2,500 increase in training receipts.

The secretary replied that in the US the SC 7 activity is handled by ANSI Z80. So the Optical Laboratories Association pays OEO SC a flat annual fee rather than having each SC 7 member pay an individual fee. The fee is calculated according to the description in the note (above).

L. Shuett moved that the Executive Directors fee be raised annually by a cost of living index beginning in 2007, and that the training receipt estimate be raised by \$2,500 for 2007 – 2008. W. Czajkowski seconded. the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

Passing of James G. Baker and Idea for Honorary . D. Aikens asked A. Tourtlotte to present this item. James Baker was an internationally known optical expert who died in 2005. There was a long obituary outlining his accomplishments in OSA's monthly magazine **OPN**. A discussion followed concerning honoring Dr. Baker with an optical unit of measure. No one knew how to start the process for accomplishing the naming of a unit. G. Kohlenberg suggested that it be added to the agenda of the OEO SC Board for discussion. G. Kohlenberg said that since he also did not have experience with this process, he contacted Karlhanns Gindele, the administrator of ISO/TC 172. Karlhanns replied as follows:

OEOSC Board Meeting, January 22, 2006 10:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., Fairmont Hotel, Cupertino Room, 170 South Market Street, San Jose, CA 95113, Continued

Dear Gene:

I also have no experience with creating new honorary units. Thinking about the proposal, I would like to have considered the following:

1) As Michael Jones already mentioned in his mail, the "Baker" would be an honorary unit rather than a true physical measure. This honorary "unit", I think, should be more a characteristic quantity (f.e. similar to the "Strehl" mentioned in Annex C of ISO 10110-5) than a unit.

2) But, first of all there should be a proposal for such a characteristic quantity, which shall have a close relationship to the work of Dr. Baker. This might be a quantity describing some important characteristic of a camera, component or device or a mathematical/physical equation or a specific design linked with aerial reconnaissance, instant photography or astronomy.

3) I think the following procedure for establishment might be appropriate: The proposal should come from some organisation or should be established or proposed at a conference related to the working field of Dr. Baker. I think this is at this stage rather a motion, movement or "flow" than a vote (it must be a bottom-up approach). The vote is done later by the scientists and experts involved in the field: If the "Baker" is accepted and used in papers, scientific literature and lab conversation, the vote is positive. This procedure can strongly be supported by introducing the "unit" in appropriate International Standards (international consensus and more binding), f.e. developed by ISO/TC 172/SC 6 "Surveying instruments" (I copy this mail to the chairman and secretary of SC 6 for information) or ISO/TC 42 "Photography".

Good luck with your OEOSC annual meeting on Sunday.
Kind regards,
Karlhanns

Dr. Karlhanns Gindele
DIN Deutsches Institut für Normung e.V.
Aussenstelle Pforzheim
Alexander-Wellendorff-Str. 2
75172 Pforzheim
Germany

Tel: +49 7231 / 91 88 22
Fax: +49 7231 / 91 88 33
e-mail: karlhanns.gindele@din.de

Internet: www.nafuo.din.de

>>> Gene Kohlenberg <gene.kohlenberg@toast.net> 13.01.06 16:34:16 >>>

Karlhanns:

I received a message from Alan Tourtlotte of OSA concerning an honorary unit named for the late James G. Baker. I have added the subject to the OEOSC agenda for the annual meeting on Sunday, January 22, 2006. Do you know if there is an established procedure for choosing names for optical units?

Regard,

OEO SC Board Meeting, January 22, 2006 10:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., Fairmont Hotel, Cupertino Room, 170 South Market Street, San Jose, CA 95113, Continued

Gene Kohlenberg
OEO SC

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Passing of James G. Baker and idea for honorary unit
Date: Tue, 26 Jul 2005 11:26:41 -0400
From: Tourtlotte, Alan <atourt@osa.org>
To: Gene Kohlenberg <gene.kohlenberg@toast.net>

Hi Gene.,

Would you have any thoughts on this? Please read the string of messages below. Is this something OEO SC might get involved in?

Thanks,

Alan
OSA

-----Original Message-----

From: Jones, Michael I [<mailto:michael.i.jones@lmco.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2005 2:15 PM
To: Rogan, Liz; Office of the Exec. Director; Keane, Tony; Awards; New Idea
Cc: ken@zemax.com; APOCASMAK@aol.com; Fisher, Robert; enqr@opticalres.com; Fantone, Stephen
Subject: RE: Passing of James G. Baker and idea for honorary unit

Hi Liz,

I just got off the phone with Dr. Albert Parr, Chief of Optical Technology at NIST. His counsel was that since the "Baker" would be an honorary unit rather than a true unit of physical measure, it could be directly adopted by optical community consensus and would not need ASTM or ISO standards approval and adoption. So, this may just be as simple as introducing it for vote at an appropriate upcoming optical design convention, or even on the OSA website.

Thanks!
Mike

```
+-----+
| Mike I. Jones |
| Technical Fellow |
| Optical/Directed Energy/Signature Technologies |
| Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company |
| P.O. Box 748 MZ 9384 |
| Fort Worth, TX 76101 |
| Phone: (817) 935-1770 |
| Fax: (817) 935-1571 |
| email: michael.i.jones@lmco.com |
+-----+
```

-----Original Message-----

From: Rogan, Liz [<mailto:eroqan@osa.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2005 12:41 PM
To: Jones, Michael I; Office of the Exec. Director; Keane, Tony; Awards; New Idea
Cc: ken@zemax.com; APOCASMAK@aol.com; Fisher, Robert; enqr@opticalres.com; Fantone, Stephen

OEO SC Board Meeting, January 22, 2006 10:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., Fairmont Hotel, Cupertino Room, 170 South Market Street, San Jose, CA 95113, Continued

Subject: RE: Passing of James G. Baker and idea for honorary unit

Hi Mike - thanks for the obituary on James Baker. Stephen Fantone, OSA's Treasurer and OSA staff wrote the attached obituary a few weeks ago which is on the OSA website.

<http://www.osa.org/news/release/07.2005/obit.asp>

As for the request to championing a name change to Baker, we don't have any experience doing this. Please let me know if you have any experience with this and what the path would be to achieve your goal.

Thanks, Liz
Elizabeth A. Rogan
Executive Director
Optical Society of America
2010 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-416-1484
Fax: 202-416-6130
E-mail: erogan@osa.org
<http://www.osa.org>

L. Endelman said that for those who are not familiar with Dr. Baker, he was one of the designers of the Baker camera which was used during the geophysical year in 1950s. His work was well recognized in the astronomical community. D. Aikens asked what action was coming before the Board. The secretary said that OEO SC needs to decide if it has a position concerning the establishment of a unit in honor of Dr. Baker, does it want to take responsibility for moving this idea forward, or is there another organization that OEO SC would recommend for spearheading the project. He thought that someone on the SPIE astronomical committee would be very familiar with Dr. Baker's work.

R. Scotti asked if it is something that would be of interest in the SPIE community. L. Endelman replied that it would be. The Baker camera is only one of a series of astronomical telescopes that he built. R. Scotti said that he was not aware of any experience in SPIE of establishment of astronomical units in the past, but he could explore how SPIE could be involved. D. Aikens suggested that the corresponding persons in OSA should also look at the issue. He felt that the OEO SC Board could not act on the topic unless there were a more concrete proposal before it. A. Tourtlotte asked if a specific proposal were presented to the OEO SC Board, would it endorse it. D. Aikens said that OEO SC would be happy to take a position for a specific proposal. He did not think that OEO SC would be making its own proposal but would endorse one presented to it. A. Krisiloff thought that the professional community needs to spearhead this and that OEO SC would be in the position to use the unit in a standard after it was established. D. Aikens said that another group is similarly wanting to honor Gary Sumergrind (sp). L. Shuett suggested that a reconnaissance arena would be a better venue.

Plan for ISO/TC 172/SC 1, 9 meetings in the US in 2006. This was already discussed under the budget item. W. Royall noted that many activities will occur during the week. He asked if a schedule could be placed on the web site. G. Kohlenberg said that ISO would be publishing the agenda, and OP meetings would then be scheduled.

TAG Leadership. D. Aikens put this item on the agenda to get this Board to think about leadership of the Tag and ASC OP. D. Aikens is leading ASC OP until a new person is identified, and W. Czajkowski has been TAG Leader for quite some time. L. Shuett, the Chairperson of the Nominating Committee said that they had asked Sidney Braginsky, who recently retired from Olympus USA, to accept the nomination for TAG Leader. Sid had been the ISO/TC 172 international leader for several years.

The TAG/SC 1 leader needs to be addressed. As the secretariat for the TAG, G. Kohlenberg can appoint the SC 1 leader, but he needs willing candidates. We need to determine how we are going to maintain active participation.. G. Boultee said that D. Aikens is doing a fine job as TAG/SC 1 Leader in spite of his self deprecation. For continuity M. Dowell recommended that D. Aikens fill both roles. D. Aikens responded that his role in this organization has become too large. It will be easy to break the back of the camel. He is active on many of the work groups, and it is improper for him to be in the position of leadership for both committees. J. Hamilton asked how quickly this needs to be resolved. D. Aikens said that it is not urgent, but that we need to be moving toward other leadership.

M. Dowell asked about the history of the leadership positions. D. Aikens said that Harvey Pollicove had been OP leader and also the TAG/SC 1 leader.

A. Krisiloff said that he is interested in becoming involved in standards activities, but this is his first attendance at an OEO SC meeting.

S. VanKerkhove said that he has agreed to work on an OP task force, and would consider agreeing to assume the ASC OP job rather than the OEO SC Chairperson Elect position, that was formerly held by R. Nasca.

M. Dowell said that she is active in ISO/TC 172/SC 9, and felt that others would be more qualified to lead the

OEO SC Board Meeting, January 22, 2006 10:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., Fairmont Hotel, Cupertino Room, 170 South Market Street, San Jose, CA 95113, Continued

TAG/SC 1. However, she said that she is interested in becoming more active in OEO SC. G. Kohlenberg said that she could become Chairperson Elect. S. VanKerkhove said that he liked that proposal. She could act as Chairperson because she is representing IEEE/LEOS, not NIST.

D. Aikens asked G. Boulton to consider taking leadership of the scratch and dig task force. G. Boulton said that he would be willing to consider that.

G. Kohlenberg said that if S. VanKerkhove were to assume the ASC OP leadership, then D. Aikens could be the TAG/SC 1 Leader in addition to completing his last year as OEO SC Chairperson.

D. Aikens said that in future years, A. Krisiloff could consider taking the TAG/SC 1 Leader role. That would free D. Aikens to take on other tasks.

Irvine Valley College, Irvine, CA Request for a Scratch and Dig Talk at the college. G. Kohlenberg said that the Board needs to decide if we will present an hour talk about optical standards for representatives of companies who send employees for optics classes. The intent is to inform managers about the importance of scratch and dig standards for their companies. The request was for the fall of 2005, but the Board asked if the decision could be delayed until this meeting. The talk would be a shortened version of the training class aimed at urging these company managers that the scratch and dig standard is important for their commerce. G. Boulton asked if it would be appropriate to ask the Irvine representative to cull the slides to help shorten the presentation. G. Boulton said that he would be willing to make the presentation if he had help in selecting what aspects of scratch and dig should be included.

W. Czajkowski said that the Board has to be careful about setting the precedent of making such a presentation. Other colleges may then ask for the same presentation. The Board needs to consider how closely it wants to guard the course content. D. Aikens thought that the Board would not get enough benefit from this presentation to make the effort worthwhile. It would dilute OEO SC's effort to present the full course.

J. Hamilton asked if the student population was known. G. Kohlenberg said that there are a series of companies in his area who send students for optics training. G. Boulton said that he understood that the overview for management was to encourage them to send students to the full four-hour class.

G. Kohlenberg said that in the previous minutes the companies listed were Raytheon, Newport, Northrop Grumman.

L. Shuett moved that OEO SC respectfully declines the request to provide a one hour talk about scratch and dig standards for Irvine Valley College. M. Dowell seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Business Models. D. Aikens noted that this was a hot topic two years ago, and the Board has made some progress. After establishing a training campaign the Board has developed a source of revenue that, combined with our participation fees, will help sustain OEO SC. However, there were two proposals that still need to be evaluated.

Scratch and dig calculator. D. Aikens asked if everyone had been able to spend a little time with it after downloading it from the OEO SC website. D. Aikens would like to see the spreadsheet put up on the website. It is a handy tool to work out the math to determine acceptance or rejection of an optic. D. Aikens questioned whether it had commercial value. J. Hamilton said that Northrop Grumman offered this tool as something that may draw users to OEO SC. J. Hamilton said that he would approach Northrop Grumman to see if he can make it available on the OEO SC web site.

Adoption of ISO Standards as US Standards. This topic was discussed at the OP business meeting. OP decided that there were a couple of standards worth releasing under the ANSI flag, such as the coating standards. The secretary was asked to compare the old PH3 standards with the ISO equivalents including the MTF standards that were originally developed in the US. The documents to be considered are restricted to SC 1 and SC 3. D. Aikens asked if there were SC 5 or SC 9 documents that could also be considered. The secretary stated that in the past SC 9 was not interested in participating in OP because they felt that all of their activity was in the international arena. L. Shuett wondered what the advantages and disadvantages, costs, etc. were for considering SC 5 standards. There are no US microscopy standards. D. Aikens noted that OEO SC would derive revenue from the sale of US adopted ISO standards. More importantly by endorsing some standards, we would have the opportunity to not endorse standards that were unfavorable to the US industry. The secretary reported that recently he received an inquiry from passed from ISO through ANSI asking why Z80 was not adopting SC 7 standards as national standards. Charles Campbell explained why they had chosen not to adopt those standards. D. Aikens asked the secretary to make that information available to the Board. He also asked L. Shuett to explore the possibility with SC 5. L. Shuett asked if there would be overhead if the standards were adopted. D. Aikens said that he didn't see any unless the US group decided to modify the document for US sales. Then he would need a committee to handle the modifications.

J. Hamilton asked if there were ANSI charges associated with releasing these US documents. The secretary said that formerly ANSI charged a fee in the year after a standard was released, but that seems to have been rolled into the new continuing fee that is charged for audits. For the record, D. Aikens didn't think that this portion of the business model will generate large revenue, but it may be a service that we would like to provide.

Election of Officers:

- A. Tourtlotte presented the list of candidates for the 2006 election.
- Chairperson-Elect - Steven VanKerkhove, Corning Tropel
 - Secretary - Gene Kohlenberg, OEOSC
 - Director - Walt Czajkowski, APOMA/Edmund Optics

S. VanKerkhove nominated M. Dowell to be Chairperson Elect. M. Dowell accepted the nomination. He withdrew his name from consideration as Chairperson Elect.

There then was a discussion about voting rights on the Board. D. Aikens was concerned because at times there is not a quorum at meetings, so no votes can be taken. With teleconferencing now available, all voting members should be able to participate. He thought that the way the Board is formed should be reviewed to eliminate the problem of not meeting a quorum. The secretary replied that the problem of attendance should be addressed, rather than changing the structure of the Board. A. Tourtlotte agreed with that assessment.

D. Aikens asked for a vote for the slate. The slate was elected unanimously.

Nominating Committee:

The secretary stated that the Chairperson of the Nominating Committee has to be either a Director, or a representative of a Professional Society or Trade Organization. D. Aikens appointed W. Czajkowski to be Chairperson, with H. Johnson, and L. Shuett makeup the rest of the committee.

Biophotonic Workshop: M. Dowell made a brief presentation concerning the workshop that was being held during Photonics West. She invited meeting participants to get More information concerning the US Measurement System at <http://www.USMS.nist.gov>.

Next Meeting:

D. Aikens asked if the Board wanted to hold only one meeting a year. A. Tourtlotte proposed that the Board hold the Annual Meeting in person and then hold an additional meeting by phone. D. Aikens asked the Secretary to arrange a phone meeting in June or July. M. Dowell moved that the Board hold a phone conference in July and that the Annual Meeting be held in San Jose, CA at 10:15 a.m. on January 22, 2007. H. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Adjournment:

As there was no further business to come before the Board, A. Tourtlotte moved that the meeting be adjourned. W. Royall seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m.