

Subject: RE: ASC OP 2010: 1 - Vote by Correspondence

From: "Dave Aikens" <daikens@savvyoptics.com>

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 2010 15:41:40 -0500

To: "Gene Kohlenberg" <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>, "Steve Martinek" <Steve.Martinek@4DTechnology.com>, "Walt Czajkowski" <wczajkowski@edmundoptics.com>, "Peter Takacs" <takacs@bnl.gov>, "Charles Gaugh" <sales@davidsonoptronics.com>, "Mistry, Ashish" <ashish.mistry@flir.com>, "Frank Dombrowski" <fad@gage-line.com>, "Hal Johnson" <hj@hjol.com>, "William E. Royall" <wroyall@rochester.rr.com>, "Gordon Boulton" <gordon.boulton@JDSU.com>, "Donna Howland" <donna.howland@ngc.com>, "Ulf Griesmann" <ulf.griesmann@nist.gov>, "Jeffrey Guttman" <jguttman@photon-inc.com>, "Ray Williamson" <rwilli60@tampabay.rr.com>, <trety@reoinc.com>, "Lincoln Endelman" <ansostan@att.net>, "Allen Krisiloff" <allen@triptar.com>, "Chris Evans" <cevans@zygo.com>

yes with comment.

my preference would be to add a leading zero to the document number if possible. Thus the standard would be OP1.0110. If this is not possible, so be it.

Dave

[Savvy Optics](#)

www.savvyoptics.com

860-878-0722

=====

The information contained in this message may be confidential and legally protected under applicable law. The message is intended solely for the addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, forwarding, dissemination, or reproduction of this message is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by return e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Gene Kohlenberg [mailto:gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org]

Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 3:23 PM

To: Steve Martinek; Walt Czajkowski; Peter Takacs; Charles Gaugh; Mistry, Ashish; Frank Dombrowski; Hal Johnson; William E. Royall; Gordon Boulton; Donna Howland; Ulf Griesmann; Jeffrey Guttman; Ray Williamson; trety@reoinc.com; Dave Aikens; Lincoln Endelman; Allen Krisiloff; Chris Evans

Subject: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence

At the previous OP meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no binding votes could be taken.

Numbering System for ASC OP Standards

This subject was raised because of the need to add US adopted ISO standards to the stable of OP standards. The first one to be considered is ISO 10110. D. Aikens had suggested to make the US number similar to the ISO number, so it could be should be labeled 10.110. However, this does not fit into the current numbering philosophy. Since the standard would fall under fundamental standards, in the OP system the document would be numbered OP1.110. W. Royall said that he would want to see the US version appear in a computer search along with the ISO version. He would be searching for 10110. The Secretary said that since the US version of the ISO standard has some differences, the standard cannot be labeled ANSI/ISO 10110. It has to have a unique OP number followed by the ISO number. Therefore the US version of ISO 10110-1 would have to be labeled, "ANSI/OEOSC OP1.110-1:20XX (ISO 10110-1:2004 MOD)." The "MOD" term is applied to confirm that the

document has been modified for the US version. The Secretary continued that when one searches for 10110-1, the US version should also appear, since 10110-1 is part of its total designation. No version of the OP number, whether it started with "1." or "10." would, by itself, cause the US version to appear in a search for 10110. M. Dowell moved that OP resolve to keep the current OP numbering system so that OP1.110 would be adopted. A. Krisiloff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, M. Dowell moved that there be a vote by correspondence to confirm this decision. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Please reply to this e-mail by Friday, January 15, 2010 to indicate your vote concerning this topic. Do you agree that OP should continue using its current numbering system for optical standards?

1. Yes,
2. Yes, with comments,
3. No, with comments.

If no reply is received from you, then I will assume that you are voting in favor of the motion, and will record your vote accordingly.

Regards,
Gene Kohlenberg
OEOSC

Subject: RE: ASC OP 2010: 1 - Vote by Correspondence
From: Gordon Boulton <Gordon.Boulton@jdsu.com>
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 2010 12:37:13 -0800
To: Gene Kohlenberg <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>

I vote YES.

Regards,

Gordon

From: Gene Kohlenberg [mailto:gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 12:23 PM
To: Steve Martinek; Walt Czajkowski; Peter Takacs; Charles Gaugh; Mistry, Ashish; Frank Dombrowski; Hal Johnson; William E. Royall; Gordon Boulton; Donna Howland; Ulf Griesmann; Jeffrey Guttman; Ray Williamson; treyt@reoinc.com; Dave Aikens; Lincoln Endelman; Allen Krisiloff; Chris Evans
Subject: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence

At the previous OP meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no binding votes could be taken.

Numbering System for ASC OP Standards

This subject was raised because of the need to add US adopted ISO standards to the stable of OP standards. The first one to be considered is ISO 10110. D. Aikens had suggested to make the US number similar to the ISO number, so it could be should be labeled 10.110. However, this does not fit into the current numbering philosophy. Since the standard would fall under fundamental standards, in the OP system the document would be numbered OP1.110. W. Royall said that he would want to see the US version appear in a computer search along with the ISO version. He would be searching for 10110. The Secretary said that since the US version of the ISO standard has some differences, the standard cannot be labeled ANSI/ISO 10110. It has to have a unique OP number followed by the ISO number. Therefore the US version of ISO 10110-1 would have to be labeled, "ANSI/OEOSC OP1.110-1:20XX (ISO 10110-1:2004 MOD)." The "MOD" term is applied to confirm that the document has been modified for the US version. The Secretary continued that when one searches for 10110-1, the US version should also appear, since 10110-1 is part of its total designation. No version of the OP number, whether it started with "1." or "10." would, by itself, cause the US version to appear in a search for 10110. M. Dowell moved that OP resolve to keep the current OP numbering system so that OP1.110 would be adopted. A. Krisiloff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, M. Dowell moved that there be a vote by correspondence to confirm this decision. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Please reply to this e-mail by Friday, January 15, 2010 to indicate your vote concerning this topic. Do you agree that OP should continue using its current numbering system for optical standards?

1. Yes,
2. Yes, with comments,
3. No, with comments.

If no reply is received from you, then I will assume that you are voting in favor of the motion, and will record your vote accordingly.

Regards,
Gene Kohlenberg

OEOSC

Subject: RE: ASC OP 2010: 1 - Vote by Correspondence
From: Walt Czajkowski <WCzajkowski@edmundoptics.com>
Date: Wed, 6 Jan 2010 07:10:26 -0500
To: Gene Kohlenberg <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>

Gene

I would like to vote **YES**

From: Gene Kohlenberg [mailto:gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 3:23 PM
To: Steve Martinek; Walt Czajkowski; Peter Takacs; Charles Gaugh; Mistry, Ashish; Frank Dombrowski; Hal Johnson; William E. Royall; Gordon Boulton; Donna Howland; Ulf Griesmann; Jeffrey Guttman; Ray Williamson; treyt@reoinc.com; Dave Aikens; Lincoln Endelman; Allen Krisiloff; Chris Evans
Subject: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence

At the previous OP meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no binding votes could be taken.

Numbering System for ASC OP Standards

This subject was raised because of the need to add US adopted ISO standards to the stable of OP standards. The first one to be considered is ISO 10110. D. Aikens had suggested to make the US number similar to the ISO number, so it could be should be labeled 10.110. However, this does not fit into the current numbering philosophy. Since the standard would fall under fundamental standards, in the OP system the document would be numbered OP1.110. W. Royall said that he would want to see the US version appear in a computer search along with the ISO version. He would be searching for 10110. The Secretary said that since the US version of the ISO standard has some differences, the standard cannot be labeled ANSI/ISO 10110. It has to have a unique OP number followed by the ISO number. Therefore the US version of ISO 10110-1 would have to be labeled, "ANSI/OEOSC OP1.110-1:20XX (ISO 10110-1:2004 MOD)." The "MOD" term is applied to confirm that the document has been modified for the US version. The Secretary continued that when one searches for 10110-1, the US version should also appear, since 10110-1 is part of its total designation. No version of the OP number, whether it started with "1." or "10." would, by itself, cause the US version to appear in a search for 10110. M. Dowell moved that OP resolve to keep the current OP numbering system so that OP1.110 would be adopted. A. Krisiloff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, M. Dowell moved that there be a vote by correspondence to confirm this decision. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Please reply to this e-mail by Friday, January 15, 2010 to indicate your vote concerning this topic. Do you agree that OP should continue using its current numbering system for optical standards?

1. Yes,
2. Yes, with comments,
3. No, with comments.

If no reply is received from you, then I will assume that you are voting in favor of the motion, and will record your vote accordingly.

Regards,
Gene Kohlenberg
OEOSC

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the addressee. This e-mail may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. Any review, transmission, disclosure, copying, or any action taken or not taken, by other than the intended recipient, in reliance on the information, is prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, notify the sender and delete this e-mail from your computer and network. In addition, please be advised that Edmund Optics reserves the right to monitor, access and review all messages, data and images transmitted through our e-mail system. By using our e-mail system, you consent to this monitoring.

Subject: RE: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence
From: frank a dombrowski <fad@gage-line.com>
Date: Wed, 06 Jan 2010 15:15:00 -0500
To: 'Gene Kohlenberg' <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>

Yes, I agree.

Frank Dombrowski
Gage-Line Technology, Inc.
121 LaGrange Ave.
Rochester, NY 14613-1577
Phone: 585-458-2000
Fax: 585-458-0524
E-mail: fad@gage-line.com
Web: www.gage-line.com

From: Gene Kohlenberg [mailto:gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 3:23 PM
To: Steve Martinek; Walt Czajkowski; Peter Takacs; Charles Gaugh; Mistry, Ashish; Frank Dombrowski; Hal Johnson; William E. Royall; Gordon Boulton; Donna Howland; Ulf Griesmann; Jeffrey Guttman; Ray Williamson; treyt@reoinc.com; Dave Aikens; Lincoln Endelman; Allen Krisiloff; Chris Evans
Subject: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence

At the previous OP meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no binding votes could be taken.

Numbering System for ASC OP Standards

This subject was raised because of the need to add US adopted ISO standards to the stable of OP standards. The first one to be considered is ISO 10110. D. Aikens had suggested to make the US number similar to the ISO number, so it could be should be labeled 10.110. However, this does not fit into the current numbering philosophy. Since the standard would fall under fundamental standards, in the OP system the document would be numbered OP1.110. W. Royall said that he would want to see the US version appear in a computer search along with the ISO version. He would be searching for 10110. The Secretary said that since the US version of the ISO standard has some differences, the standard cannot be labeled ANSI/ISO 10110. It has to have a unique OP number followed by the ISO number. Therefore the US version of ISO 10110-1 would have to be labeled, "ANSI/OEOSC OP1.110-1:20XX (ISO 10110-1:2004 MOD)." The "MOD" term is applied to confirm that the document has been modified for the US version. The Secretary continued that when one searches for 10110-1, the US version should also appear, since 10110-1 is part of its total designation. No version of the OP number, whether it started with "1." or "10." would, by itself, cause the US version to appear in a search for 10110. M. Dowell moved that OP resolve to keep the current OP numbering system so that OP1.110 would be adopted. A. Krisiloff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, M. Dowell moved that there be a vote by correspondence to confirm this decision. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Please reply to this e-mail by Friday, January 15, 2010 to indicate your vote concerning this topic. Do you agree that OP should continue using its current numbering system for optical standards?

1. Yes,
2. Yes, with comments,
3. No, with comments.

If no reply is received from you, then I will assume that you are voting in favor of the motion, and will record

your vote accordingly.

Regards,
Gene Kohlenberg
OEOSC

--

This message has been scanned for viruses and dangerous content by [MailScanner](#), and is believed to be clean.

Subject: RE: ASC OP 2010: 1 - Vote by Correspondence
From: "Evans, Chris" <cevens@zygo.com>
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 2010 15:27:15 -0500
To: "Gene Kohlenberg" <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>

Yes

From: Gene Kohlenberg [mailto:gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 3:23 PM
To: Steve Martinek; Walt Czajkowski; Peter Takacs; Charles Gaugh; Mistry, Ashish; Frank Dombrowski; Hal Johnson; William E. Royall; Gordon Boulton; Donna Howland; Ulf Griesmann; Jeffrey Guttman; Ray Williamson; treyt@reoinc.com; Dave Aikens; Lincoln Endelman; Allen Krisiloff; Evans, Chris
Subject: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence

At the previous OP meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no binding votes could be taken.

Numbering System for ASC OP Standards

This subject was raised because of the need to add US adopted ISO standards to the stable of OP standards. The first one to be considered is ISO 10110. D. Aikens had suggested to make the US number similar to the ISO number, so it could be should be labeled 10.110. However, this does not fit into the current numbering philosophy. Since the standard would fall under fundamental standards, in the OP system the document would be numbered OP1.110. W. Royall said that he would want to see the US version appear in a computer search along with the ISO version. He would be searching for 10110. The Secretary said that since the US version of the ISO standard has some differences, the standard cannot be labeled ANSI/ISO 10110. It has to have a unique OP number followed by the ISO number. Therefore the US version of ISO 10110-1 would have to be labeled, "ANSI/OEOSC OP1.110-1:20XX (ISO 10110-1:2004 MOD)." The "MOD" term is applied to confirm that the document has been modified for the US version. The Secretary continued that when one searches for 10110-1, the US version should also appear, since 10110-1 is part of its total designation. No version of the OP number, whether it started with "1." or "10." would, by itself, cause the US version to appear in a search for 10110. M. Dowell moved that OP resolve to keep the current OP numbering system so that OP1.110 would be adopted. A. Krisiloff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, M. Dowell moved that there be a vote by correspondence to confirm this decision. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Please reply to this e-mail by Friday, January 15, 2010 to indicate your vote concerning this topic. Do you agree that OP should continue using its current numbering system for optical standards?

1. Yes,
2. Yes, with comments,
3. No, with comments.

If no reply is received from you, then I will assume that you are voting in favor of the motion, and will record your vote accordingly.

Regards,
Gene Kohlenberg
OEOSC

The information transmitted in this message is intended only for the individual or entity to which it is

addressed and may contain material that is confidential, privileged or controlled by export regulations. If you are not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete the material.

Subject: Re: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence
From: Charles Gaugh <sales@davidsonoptronics.com>
Date: Thu, 07 Jan 2010 10:53:23 -0800
To: Gene Kohlenberg <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>

Dear Gene -

On behalf of **Davidson Optronics**, I vote yes on the motion.

--

See **DAVIDSON OPTRONICS** Products in Booth 2427 at **SPIE PHOTONICS WEST 2010** in San Francisco January 26 - 28!

With Best Regards,

- Charles Gaugh, Technical Director
Davidson Optronics, Inc.
2223 West San Bernardino Road
West Covina, California 91790
e-mail: sales@davidsonoptronics.com
Phone: 626/962-5181
Fax: 626/962-5188
URL: www.davidsonoptronics.com

=====

PRIVACY NOTICE

The information contained in this transmission is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. This information is intended solely for use by the individual or entity named as the recipient hereof. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that reading, disclosure copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this transmission is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please return it immediately to its sender at the above address and destroy it.

Tuesday, you wrote:

At the previous OP meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no binding votes could be taken.

Numbering System for ASC OP Standards

This subject was raised because of the need to add US adopted ISO standards to the stable of OP standards. The first one to be considered is ISO 10110. D. Aikens had suggested to make the US number similar to the ISO number, so it could be should be labeled 10.110. However, this does not fit into the current numbering philosophy. Since the standard would fall under fundamental standards, in the OP system the document would be numbered OP1.110. W. Royall said that he would want to see the US version appear in a computer search along with the ISO version. He would be searching for 10110. The Secretary said that since the US version of the ISO standard has some differences, the standard cannot be labeled ANSI/ISO 10110. It has to have a unique OP number followed by the ISO number. Therefore the US version of ISO 10110-1 would have to be labeled, "ANSI/OEOSC OP1.110-1:20XX (ISO 10110-1:2004 MOD)." The "MOD" term is applied to confirm that the document has been modified for the US version. The Secretary continued that when one searches for 10110-1, the US version should also appear, since 10110-1 is part of its total designation. No version of the OP number, whether it started with "1." or "10." would, by itself, cause the US version to appear in a search for 10110.

M. Dowell moved that OP resolve to keep the current OP numbering system so that OP1.110 would be adopted. A. Krisiloff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, M. Dowell moved that there be a vote by correspondence to confirm this decision. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Please reply to this e-mail by Friday, January 15, 2010 to indicate your vote concerning this topic. Do you agree that OP should continue using its current numbering system for optical standards?

1. Yes,
2. Yes, with comments,
3. No, with comments.

If no reply is received from you, then I will assume that you are voting in favor of the motion, and will record your vote accordingly.

Regards,
Gene Kohlenberg
OEOSC

No virus found in this outgoing message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 9.0.725 / Virus Database: 270.14.129/2605 - Release Date: 01/06/10 23:35:00

Subject: RE: ASC OP 2010: 1 - Vote by Correspondence

From: "Jeff Guttman" <jguttman@photon-inc.com>

Date: Wed, 6 Jan 2010 09:53:05 -0800

To: "Gene Kohlenberg" <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>, "Steve Martinek" <Steve.Martinek@4DTechnology.com>, "Walt Czajkowski" <wczajkowski@edmundoptics.com>, "Peter Takacs" <takacs@bnl.gov>, "Charles Gaugh" <sales@davidsonoptronics.com>, "Mistry, Ashish" <ashish.mistry@flir.com>, "Frank Dombrowski" <fad@gage-line.com>, "Hal Johnson" <hj@hjol.com>, "William E. Royall" <wroyall@rochester.rr.com>, "Gordon Boulton" <gordon.boulton@JDSU.com>, "Donna Howland" <donna.howland@ngc.com>, "Ulf Griesmann" <ulf.griesmann@nist.gov>, "Ray Williamson" <rwilli60@tampabay.rr.com>, <treyt@reoinc.com>, "Dave Aikens" <daikens@savvyoptics.com>, "Lincoln Endelman" <ansostan@att.net>, "Allen Krisiloff" <allen@triptar.com>, "Chris Evans" <cevans@zygo.com>

Gene,

I vote YES.

Regarrds,

Jeff Guttman

From: Gene Kohlenberg [mailto:gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org]

Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 12:23 PM

To: Steve Martinek; Walt Czajkowski; Peter Takacs; Charles Gaugh; Mistry, Ashish; Frank Dombrowski; Hal Johnson; William E. Royall; Gordon Boulton; Donna Howland; Ulf Griesmann; Jeff Guttman; Ray Williamson; treyt@reoinc.com; Dave Aikens; Lincoln Endelman; Allen Krisiloff; Chris Evans

Subject: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence

At the previous OP meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no binding votes could be taken.

Numbering System for ASC OP Standards

This subject was raised because of the need to add US adopted ISO standards to the stable of OP standards. The first one to be considered is ISO 10110. D. Aikens had suggested to make the US number similar to the ISO number, so it could be should be labeled 10.110. However, this does not fit into the current numbering philosophy. Since the standard would fall under fundamental standards, in the OP system the document would be numbered OP1.110. W. Royall said that he would want to see the US version appear in a computer search along with the ISO version. He would be searching for 10110. The Secretary said that since the US version of the ISO standard has some differences, the standard cannot be labeled ANSI/ISO 10110. It has to have a unique OP number followed by the ISO number. Therefore the US version of ISO 10110-1 would have to be labeled, "ANSI/OEOSC OP1.110-1:20XX (ISO 10110-1:2004 MOD)." The "MOD" term is applied to confirm that the document has been modified for the US version. The Secretary continued that when one searches for 10110-1, the US version should also appear, since 10110-1 is part of its total designation. No version of the OP number, whether it started with "1." or "10." would, by itself, cause the US version to appear in a search for 10110. M. Dowell moved that OP resolve to keep the current OP numbering system so that OP1.110 would be adopted. A. Krisiloff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, M. Dowell moved that there be a vote by correspondence to confirm this decision. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Please reply to this e-mail by Friday, January 15, 2010 to indicate your vote concerning this topic. Do you

agree that OP should continue using its current numbering system for optical standards?

1. Yes,
2. Yes, with comments,
3. No, with comments.

If no reply is received from you, then I will assume that you are voting in favor of the motion, and will record your vote accordingly.

Regards,
Gene Kohlenberg
OEOSC

Subject: RE: ASC OP 2010: 1 - Vote by Correspondence
From: "Howland, Donna J (AS)" <donna.howland@ngc.com>
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 2010 14:46:14 -0600
To: "Gene Kohlenberg" <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>

Yes.

Donna J Howland
Photonics Commodity Engineering Lead
Northrop Grumman Aerospace Systems
One Hornet Way M/S K08A60/D8
El Segundo, CA 90245
(310) 813-5420

From: Gene Kohlenberg [mailto:gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 12:23 PM
To: Steve Martinek; Walt Czajkowski; Peter Takacs; Charles Gaugh; Mistry, Ashish; Frank Dombrowski; Hal Johnson; William E. Royall; Gordon Boulton; Howland, Donna J (AS); Ulf Griesmann; Jeffrey Guttman; Ray Williamson; treyt@reoinc.com; Dave Aikens; Lincoln Endelman; Allen Krisiloff; Chris Evans
Subject: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence

At the previous OP meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no binding votes could be taken.

Numbering System for ASC OP Standards

This subject was raised because of the need to add US adopted ISO standards to the stable of OP standards. The first one to be considered is ISO 10110. D. Aikens had suggested to make the US number similar to the ISO number, so it could be should be labeled 10.110. However, this does not fit into the current numbering philosophy. Since the standard would fall under fundamental standards, in the OP system the document would be numbered OP1.110. W. Royall said that he would want to see the US version appear in a computer search along with the ISO version. He would be searching for 10110. The Secretary said that since the US version of the ISO standard has some differences, the standard cannot be labeled ANSI/ISO 10110. It has to have a unique OP number followed by the ISO number. Therefore the US version of ISO 10110-1 would have to be labeled, "ANSI/OEOSC OP1.110-1:20XX (ISO 10110-1:2004 MOD)." The "MOD" term is applied to confirm that the document has been modified for the US version. The Secretary continued that when one searches for 10110-1, the US version should also appear, since 10110-1 is part of its total designation. No version of the OP number, whether it started with "1." or "10." would, by itself, cause the US version to appear in a search for 10110. M. Dowell moved that OP resolve to keep the current OP numbering system so that OP1.110 would be adopted. A. Krisiloff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, M. Dowell moved that there be a vote by correspondence to confirm this decision. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Please reply to this e-mail by Friday, January 15, 2010 to indicate your vote concerning this topic. Do you agree that OP should continue using its current numbering system for optical standards?

1. Yes,
2. Yes, with comments,

3. No, with comments.

If no reply is received from you, then I will assume that you are voting in favor of the motion, and will record your vote accordingly.

Regards,
Gene Kohlenberg
OEOSC

Subject: RE: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence
From: "Hal Johnson" <hal_f_johnson@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 2010 14:31:46 -0800
To: "Gene Kohlenberg" <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>

Hi Gene,
I vote yes.
Hal

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

From: Gene Kohlenberg [mailto:gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 12:23 PM
To: Steve Martinek; Walt Czajkowski; Peter Takacs; Charles Gaugh; Mistry, Ashish; Frank Dombrowski; Hal Johnson; William E. Royall; Gordon Boulton; Donna Howland; Ulf Griesmann; Jeffrey Guttman; Ray Williamson; treyt@reoinc.com; Dave Aikens; Lincoln Endelman; Allen Krisiloff; Chris Evans
Subject: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence

At the previous OP meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no binding votes could be taken.

Numbering System for ASC OP Standards

This subject was raised because of the need to add US adopted ISO standards to the stable of OP standards. The first one to be considered is ISO 10110. D. Aikens had suggested to make the US number similar to the ISO number, so it could be should be labeled 10.110. However, this does not fit into the current numbering philosophy. Since the standard would fall under fundamental standards, in the OP system the document would be numbered OP1.110. W. Royall said that he would want to see the US version appear in a computer search along with the ISO version. He would be searching for 10110. The Secretary said that since the US version of the ISO standard has some differences, the standard cannot be labeled ANSI/ISO 10110. It has to have a unique OP number followed by the ISO number. Therefore the US version of ISO 10110-1 would have to be labeled, "ANSI/OEOSC OP1.110-1:20XX (ISO 10110-1:2004 MOD)." The "MOD" term is applied to confirm that the document has been modified for the US version. The Secretary continued that when one searches for 10110-1, the US version should also appear, since 10110-1 is part of its total designation. No version of the OP number, whether it started with "1." or "10." would, by itself, cause the US version to appear in a search for 10110. M. Dowell moved that OP resolve to keep the current OP numbering system so that OP1.110 would be adopted. A. Krisiloff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, M. Dowell moved that there be a vote by correspondence to confirm this decision. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Please reply to this e-mail by Friday, January 15, 2010 to indicate your vote concerning this topic. Do you agree that OP should continue using its current numbering system for optical standards?

1. Yes,
2. Yes, with comments,
3. No, with comments.

If no reply is received from you, then I will assume that you are voting in favor of the motion, and will record your vote accordingly.

Regards,

Gene Kohlenberg
OEOSC

Subject: RE: ASC OP 2010: 1 - Vote by Correspondence
From: "Allen Krisiloff" <allen@triptar.com>
Date: Thu, 7 Jan 2010 15:06:25 -0500
To: "Gene Kohlenberg" <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>

YES

Allen Krisiloff

From: Gene Kohlenberg [mailto:gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 3:23 PM
To: Steve Martinek; Walt Czajkowski; Peter Takacs; Charles Gaugh; Mistry, Ashish; Frank Dombrowski; Hal Johnson; William E. Royall; Gordon Boulton; Donna Howland; Ulf Griesmann; Jeffrey Guttman; Ray Williamson; treyt@reoinc.com; Dave Aikens; Lincoln Endelman; Allen Krisiloff; Chris Evans
Subject: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence

At the previous OP meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no binding votes could be taken.

Numbering System for ASC OP Standards

This subject was raised because of the need to add US adopted ISO standards to the stable of OP standards. The first one to be considered is ISO 10110. D. Aikens had suggested to make the US number similar to the ISO number, so it could be should be labeled 10.110. However, this does not fit into the current numbering philosophy. Since the standard would fall under fundamental standards, in the OP system the document would be numbered OP1.110. W. Royall said that he would want to see the US version appear in a computer search along with the ISO version. He would be searching for 10110. The Secretary said that since the US version of the ISO standard has some differences, the standard cannot be labeled ANSI/ISO 10110. It has to have a unique OP number followed by the ISO number. Therefore the US version of ISO 10110-1 would have to be labeled, "ANSI/OEOSC OP1.110-1:20XX (ISO 10110-1:2004 MOD)." The "MOD" term is applied to confirm that the document has been modified for the US version. The Secretary continued that when one searches for 10110-1, the US version should also appear, since 10110-1 is part of its total designation. No version of the OP number, whether it started with "1." or "10." would, by itself, cause the US version to appear in a search for 10110. M. Dowell moved that OP resolve to keep the current OP numbering system so that OP1.110 would be adopted. A. Krisiloff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, M. Dowell moved that there be a vote by correspondence to confirm this decision. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Please reply to this e-mail by Friday, January 15, 2010 to indicate your vote concerning this topic. Do you agree that OP should continue using its current numbering system for optical standards?

1. Yes,
2. Yes, with comments,
3. No, with comments.

If no reply is received from you, then I will assume that you are voting in favor of the motion, and will record your vote accordingly.

Regards,
Gene Kohlenberg
OEOSC

Subject: Re: ASC OP 2010: 1 - Vote by Correspondence
From: Steve Martinek <steve.martinek@4dtechnology.com>
Date: Wed, 6 Jan 2010 12:03:25 -0700
To: Gene Kohlenberg <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>
CC: Dave Aikens <daikens@savvyoptics.com>

Yes, with a comment.

I think Dave's suggestion is a good one in that it preserves the "ten-one-ten" manner of verbal description, hopefully without any additional confusion. The official title is a bit cumbersome and I would expect in conversation most people would find "OP ten-one-ten" an efficient and specific reference.

If this is not possible, you can count my response as a simple yes.

See you later this month.

S

On Tue, Jan 5, 2010 at 1:41 PM, Dave Aikens <daikens@savvyoptics.com> wrote:

[yes with comment.](#)

[my preference would be to add a leading zero to the document number if possible. Thus the standard would be OP1.0110. If this is not possible, so be it.](#)

Dave

[Savvy Optics](#)

www.savvyoptics.com

860-878-0722

The information contained in this message may be confidential and legally protected under applicable law. The message is intended solely for the addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, forwarding, dissemination, or reproduction of this message is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by return e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Gene Kohlenberg [mailto:gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org]

Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 3:23 PM

To: Steve Martinek; Walt Czajkowski; Peter Takacs; Charles Gaugh; Mistry, Ashish; Frank Dombrowski; Hal Johnson; William E. Royall; Gordon Boulton; Donna Howland; Ulf Griesmann; Jeffrey Guttman; Ray Williamson; treyt@reoinc.com; Dave Aikens; Lincoln Endelman; Allen Krisiloff; Chris Evans

Subject: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence

At the previous OP meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no binding votes could be taken.

Numbering System for ASC OP Standards

This subject was raised because of the need to add US adopted ISO standards to the stable of OP standards. The first one to be considered is ISO 10110. D. Aikens had suggested to make the US number similar to the ISO number, so it could be should be

labeled 10.110. However, this does not fit into the current numbering philosophy. Since the standard would fall under fundamental standards, in the OP system the document would be numbered OP1.110. W. Royall said that he would want to see the US version appear in a computer search along with the ISO version. He would be searching for 10110. The Secretary said that since the US version of the ISO standard has some differences, the standard cannot be labeled ANSI/ISO 10110. It has to have a unique OP number followed by the ISO number. Therefore the US version of ISO 10110-1 would have to be labeled, "ANSI/OEOSC OP1.110-1:20XX (ISO 10110-1:2004 MOD)." The "MOD" term is applied to confirm that the document has been modified for the US version. The Secretary continued that when one searches for 10110-1, the US version should also appear, since 10110-1 is part of its total designation. No version of the OP number, whether it started with "1." or "10." would, by itself, cause the US version to appear in a search for 10110. M. Dowell moved that OP resolve to keep the current OP numbering system so that OP1.110 would be adopted. A. Krisloff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, M. Dowell moved that there be a vote by correspondence to confirm this decision. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Please reply to this e-mail by Friday, January 15, 2010 to indicate your vote concerning this topic. Do you agree that OP should continue using its current numbering system for optical standards?

1. Yes,
2. Yes, with comments,
3. No, with comments.

If no reply is received from you, then I will assume that you are voting in favor of the motion, and will record your vote accordingly.

Regards,
Gene Kohlenberg
OEOSC

Subject: RE: ASC OP 2010: 1 - Vote by Correspondence
From: Trey Turner <TreyT@reoinc.com>
Date: Wed, 6 Jan 2010 10:54:30 -0700
To: Gene Kohlenberg <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>

Gene,

I vote YES.

Trey Turner

From: Gene Kohlenberg [mailto:gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 1:23 PM
To: Steve Martinek; Walt Czajkowski; Peter Takacs; Charles Gaugh; Mistry, Ashish; Frank Dombrowski; Hal Johnson; William E. Royall; Gordon Boulton; Donna Howland; Ulf Griesmann; Jeffrey Guttman; Ray Williamson; Trey Turner; Dave Aikens; Lincoln Endelman; Allen Krisiloff; Chris Evans
Subject: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence

At the previous OP meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no binding votes could be taken.

Numbering System for ASC OP Standards

This subject was raised because of the need to add US adopted ISO standards to the stable of OP standards. The first one to be considered is ISO 10110. D. Aikens had suggested to make the US number similar to the ISO number, so it could be should be labeled 10.110. However, this does not fit into the current numbering philosophy. Since the standard would fall under fundamental standards, in the OP system the document would be numbered OP1.110. W. Royall said that he would want to see the US version appear in a computer search along with the ISO version. He would be searching for 10110. The Secretary said that since the US version of the ISO standard has some differences, the standard cannot be labeled ANSI/ISO 10110. It has to have a unique OP number followed by the ISO number. Therefore the US version of ISO 10110-1 would have to be labeled, "ANSI/OEOSC OP1.110-1:20XX (ISO 10110-1:2004 MOD)." The "MOD" term is applied to confirm that the document has been modified for the US version. The Secretary continued that when one searches for 10110-1, the US version should also appear, since 10110-1 is part of its total designation. No version of the OP number, whether it started with "1." or "10." would, by itself, cause the US version to appear in a search for 10110. M. Dowell moved that OP resolve to keep the current OP numbering system so that OP1.110 would be adopted. A. Krisiloff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, M. Dowell moved that there be a vote by correspondence to confirm this decision. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Please reply to this e-mail by Friday, January 15, 2010 to indicate your vote concerning this topic. Do you agree that OP should continue using its current numbering system for optical standards?

1. Yes,
2. Yes, with comments,
3. No, with comments.

If no reply is received from you, then I will assume that you are voting in favor of the motion, and will record your vote accordingly.

Regards,
Gene Kohlenberg

OEOSC

Subject: Re: Fwd: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence
From: Ray Williamson <raywilliamson@verizon.net>
Date: Wed, 06 Jan 2010 17:27:08 -0500
To: Gene Kohlenberg <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>

I vote yes.

Kind regards,
Ray Williamson
Ray Williamson Consulting
(727) 372-0346 office, fax
(727) 534-7964 cell
raywilliamson@verizon.net
www.ray-optics.com

The information contained in this message may be confidential and legally protected under applicable law. The message is intended solely for the addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you hereby notified that any use, forwarding, dissemination, or reproduction of this message is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by return e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

Gene Kohlenberg wrote:

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

Subject: ASC OP 2010: 1 — Vote by Correspondence
Date: Tue, 05 Jan 2010 15:23:05 -0500

From: Gene Kohlenberg <gene.kohlenberg@optstd.org>

To: Steve Martinek <Steve.Martinek@4DTechnology.com>, Walt Czajkowski <wczajkowski@edmundoptics.com>, Peter Takacs <takacs@bnl.gov>, Charles Gaugh <sales@davidsonoptronics.com>, "Mistry, Ashish" <ashish.mistry@flir.com>, Frank Dombrowski <fad@gage-line.com>, Hal Johnson <hj@hjol.com>, "William E. Royall" <wroyall@rochester.rr.com>, Gordon Boulton <gordon.boulton@JDSU.com>, Donna Howland <donna.howland@ngc.com>, Ulf Griesmann <ulf.griesmann@nist.gov>, Jeffrey Guttman <jguttman@photon-inc.com>, Ray Williamson <rwilli60@tampabay.rr.com>, treyt@reoinc.com, Dave Aikens <daikens@savvyoptics.com>, Lincoln Endelman <ansostan@att.net>, Allen Krisiloff <allen@triptar.com>, Chris Evans <cevans@zygo.com>

At the previous OP meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no binding votes could be taken.

Numbering System for ASC OP Standards

This subject was raised because of the need to add US adopted ISO standards to the stable of OP standards. The first one to be considered is ISO 10110. D. Aikens had suggested to make the US number similar to the ISO number, so it could be should be labeled 10.110. However, this does not fit into the current numbering philosophy. Since the standard would fall under fundamental standards, in the OP system the document would be numbered OP1.110. W. Royall said that he would want to see the US version appear in a computer search along with the ISO version. He would be searching for 10110. The Secretary said that since the US version of the ISO standard has some differences, the standard cannot be labeled ANSI/ISO 10110. It has to have a unique OP number followed by the ISO number. Therefore the US version of ISO 10110-1 would have to be labeled, "ANSI/OEOSC OP1.110-1:20XX (ISO 10110-1:2004 MOD)." The "MOD" term is applied to confirm that the document has been modified for the US version. The Secretary continued that when one searches for 10110-1, the US version should also appear, since 10110-1 is part of its total designation. No version of the OP number, whether it started with "1." or "10." would, by itself, cause the US version to appear in a search for 10110. M. Dowell moved that OP resolve to keep the current OP numbering system so that OP1.110 would be adopted. A. Krisiloff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, M. Dowell moved that there be a vote by correspondence to confirm this decision. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Please reply to this e-mail by Friday, January 15, 2010 to indicate your vote concerning this topic. Do you agree that OP should continue using its current numbering system for optical standards?

1. Yes,
2. Yes, with comments,
3. No, with comments.

If no reply is received from you, then I will assume that you are voting in favor of the motion, and will record your vote accordingly.

Regards,
Gene Kohlenberg
OEOSC