

Approved  
 Minutes of ASC OP Meeting  
 Sunday, January 21, 2007, 8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.  
 Fairmont Hotel, Cupertino Room  
 170 South Market Street, San Jose, CA 95113

<b>Present</b>	<b>Participants (12 of 19 + 2 alt.)</b>	<b>Representing</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Committee Members</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David Aikens	Zygo Corporation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sam Bailey (alternate)	Davidson Optronics, Inc.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gordon Boulton	JDS Uniphase Corporation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Andrei Brunfeld	Xyratex
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bryan Clark (alternate)	Xyratex
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Walter Czajkowski	APOMA (Edmund Optics)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Frank Dombrowski	Gage-Line Technology, Inc.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marla Dowell	IEE/LEOS (NIST)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lincoln Endelman	SPIE (Endelman Enterprises)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Charles Gaugh	Davidson Optronics, Inc.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Thomas Germer	NIST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	John Hamilton (by phone)	Northrop Grumman
<input type="checkbox"/>	Rudolf Hartmann	Retired
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hal Johnson	Harold Johnson Optical
<input type="checkbox"/>	John Knaur	Olympus America
<input type="checkbox"/>	Kathleen Richardson	School of Materials Science & Eng., Clemson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	William E. Royall (by Phone)	Eastman Kodak Company
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Peter Takacs	Brookhaven National Lab.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Trey Turner	Research Electro-Optics, Inc.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steven VanKerkhove	Corning Tropel
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ray Williamson	Ray Williamson Consulting
<b>Observers (2)</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gene Kohlenberg	OEOSC
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Allen Krisiloff	Triptar Lens Co., Inc.

**Welcome and Introductions**

S. VanKerkhove opened the meeting at 8:33 a.m. Since there were new participants, a round of introductions was completed.

**Adoption of Agenda**

D. Aikens moved that the draft agenda be adopted. W. Czajkowski seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**Approval of October 9, 2005 ASC OP Meeting Draft Minutes**

G. Boulton moved that the draft minutes be approved. H. Johnson seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

**Reports**

**Performance Based Optical Surface Imperfection Standard**

The Task Force began at clause 3.6.4, working on the concentration section of the standard. At the next meeting they will start at clause 3.7. F. Dombrowski and G. Boulton will propose a straw man for the measurement method.

**Wavefront Specification Project**

The Task Force met with the intention of completing a purpose statement before defining the scope. Two draft standards will be prepared. BSR/OEOSC OP1.004 will address surfaces and wavefronts in terms of statistical nomenclature; BSR/OEOSC OP1.005 is for description of surfaces and wavefronts with a deterministic method such as polynomial fitting. The purpose statements for both documents were approved by the Task Force. P. Takacs will prepare scope definition for OP1.004 and S. VanKerkhove will prepare the scope statement for OP1.005.

**ANSI/OP Approved Minutes continued, Sunday, January 21, 2007, 8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.  
Fairmont Hotel, Cupertino Room, 170 South Market Street, San Jose, CA 95113**

**ANSI Five-Year Audit of ASC OP**

G. Kohlenberg reported that this is the second five-year audit that OP has undergone. He said that he filled out an ANSI questionnaire in the spring, and in July he had a conference call with two ANSI persons to go over the contents of the questionnaire. He then had to collect OP policies and information of all activities of the committee for the previous five years and make it available to the ANSI auditor. A second phone conference was held in October to go over the auditor's findings. Then G. Kohlenberg had to submit a letter to ANSI outlining what he would do to satisfy the findings of the auditor. The auditor criticized the method of managing the documents: an outline of the documents by subject that were listed on a web page with appropriate hyper links. The auditor didn't want to review the documents on line, so he downloaded each one and saved it on his hard drive. The file names were not duplicates of the listing on the web page, so he renamed each file to match the hyper link. The ANSI representative called to discuss the secretary's response letter, and asked about how he had collected the documents. When the ANSI representative understood what the secretary had done, he removed the auditor's criticism and apologized for the negative comments.

Originally OP used the Model Procedures offered by ANSI. ANSI withdrew those Model Procedures and asked each ASC to prepare its own. G. Kohlenberg had gone through the ANSI document and removed references to ANSI. Each year ANSI asks for changes to the procedures, so he modified the OP Procedures accordingly. During the audit, suggestions for improving the OP Procedures were discussed. Those changes have been made and OP must approve them, and then the Board must endorse them at the upcoming meeting.

The auditor repeated his concern about the balance of interest of those participating on OP. OP has more Producers than Users and General Interest categories. G. Kohlenberg's response to the auditor was that the corresponding ISO committee is similarly unbalanced. The auditor's other concern was the low number of participants. G. Kohlenberg pointed out that the ISO committee has about the same number of participants representing the entire world. He told the auditor that OP would review the interest designation for each participant to see if there should be changes. They responded that if OP is still out of balance that the committee ask some participants to become observers to reduce the number of Producers.

Another area of auditor concern had been that the Secretariat had rejected a person from Pakistan who had asked to join OP. G. Kohlenberg had redirected him to the Pakistani ISO member organization. The auditor said that OP must accept participants from anywhere in the world as long as OP maintains balance. The ANSI/OEOSC TAG is limited to US experts since each country can have its own TAG.

**Periodic Review of ANSI/OEOSC OP3.001-2001**

G. Kohlenberg said that he got few ballots returned with respect to the reaffirmation of the glass standard OP3.001-2001. OP procedures permit the secretariat to ask the OP Leader for an extension, which was granted. The balloting period extended until January. The number of ballots returned just met the majority criterion. The ballot was successful because the secretary had changed the OP procedures to say that only a majority of participants must approve the ballot rather than a two-thirds majority as ANSI had originally recommended. The secretary said that it was frustrating to have minimal response considering all of the work that went into the draft five years ago. He wondered if perhaps the lack of response indicates that OP is not considered to be important. Perhaps the committee should be disbanded.

G. Boulton observed that if the ANSI recommendation were adopted, whereby some participants are asked to become observers, then it may become easier to get a majority.

L. Endelman suggested that the secretary discuss the requirement that ballots be faxed or mailed. G. Kohlenberg said that following the previous audit OP was required to collect ballots that had written signatures on them because H. Pollicove had accepted some e-mail ballots that couldn't be tracked.

D. Aikens looked back at previous discussions concerning the glass standard. He noted that Schott and Hoya participated in the approval of it, but neither has adopted it in their catalogs. Since the glass standard isn't reflected in the glass catalogs, no one is using the standard. G. Kohlenberg pointed out that the military has approved it, however. W. Czajkowski said that the glass manufacturers may not have begun using the standard because some of the nomenclature was changed from the original military document. D. Aikens agreed that the Task Force had made changes that the user community wanted rather than what the glass manufacturers were doing.

D. Aikens suggested that he and G. Boulton should include reference to the glass standard in the scratch and dig course, and perhaps give the optical glass standard to students during scratch and dig class. If persons put OP3.001 on their drawings, then the glass companies may start using it.

G. Boulton said the ISO document does not have a code such as H1, H2 and H3 as OP3.001 does. Schott is chairing the ISO glass draft standard. G. Boulton has agreed to participate at least to correct the English. He said that ISO draft is now considering input from OP3001.

D. Aikens suggested that the US should participate on the ISO drafting committee to make the international standard more like OP3.001 or MIL-G-174, and replace OP3.001 when the ISO standard becomes available.

**ANSI/OP Approved Minutes continued, Sunday, January 21, 2007, 8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.  
Fairmont Hotel, Cupertino Room, 170 South Market Street, San Jose, CA 95113**

S. VanKerkhove said that OP should keep track of OP3.001 usage. P. Takacs suggested that there are opportunities at SPIE trade presentations to make a standards presentation. G. Boultee says that he only sees MIL-G-174 referenced in drawings. J. Hamilton said that engineers on new programs clone the notes from old programs. Perhaps OP should go to companies such as Northrop Grumman and educate them. Let them know that they cannot just reference a standard; they must state what portion of standard is being used. D. Aikens said that there is an opportunity for another class covering optical glass similar to the scratch and dig class to educate industry about the proper use of glass standards MIL-G-174, OP3.001 and the ISO standard. The challenge is that someone would have to commit the time to write the course.

A. Krisiloff was concerned that after all the work to develop the glass standard it was difficult to get votes to reaffirm it. There must have been a break down in the process. If the suppliers, who have a lot of influence in using the standard, were not heard during the deliberations, or if they had a change of mind late in the deliberations, then there may have been a break down in communication during some critical points in the process. D. Aikens said that change in codes was voted in over the objections of the glass companies. The standard is not being adopted because of the changes in code. It does not serve the user community enough to get them to use it, and therefore, there is no reason for the glass manufacturers to put it in their catalogs.

S. VanKerkhove said that the glass standard was a mistake and we should learn from this when preparing future standards. D. Aikens said that the standards committee felt that the modifications were justifiable; it was being improved with respect to the old military specification. He said that the prime contractors (the Lockheeds, the Grumman, the Raytheon) should never put MIL-G-174 on their drawings. They should write ANSI/OEOSC OP3.001.

J. Hamilton offered another idea. The IHS web site (a company that offers a comprehensive collection of Historical Mil Specs currently available featuring historical documents designed to assist engineers, maintenance and logistics personnel with the support of these aging systems. ) says that MIL-G-174 is obsolete for new programs, but does not say what it should be replaced with. There is nothing in the user community that says to use the new glass standard. The military doesn't say that OP3.001 is replacement of MIL-G-174 on the military web site.

**NOTICE OF  
VALIDATION**

**INCH-POUND**

**MIL-G-174B  
NOTICE 2  
28 July 2004**

**DETAIL SPECIFICATION  
GLASS, OPTICAL**

MIL-G-174B remains inactive for new design,  
however, the document is valid for use.

**OEOSC-OP3.001**

**ADOPTION NOTICE**

OEOSC-OP3.001, Optical Glass, was adopted on 19 March 2004 for use by the Department of Defense, (DoD). Proposed changes by DoD activities must be submitted to the DoD Adopting Activity: Commander, U.S. Army RDECOM-ARDEC, ATTN: AMSTA-AAR-AIC-S, Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000. Hard copies of this document may be purchased from the Optics and Electro-Optics Standards Council (OEOSC), P.O. Box 25705, Rochester, NY 14625-0705, or on line from the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), <http://www.ansi.org/>.

The committee asked the secretary to e-mail D. Aikens, J. Hamilton and Merrill to ask when they could support a meeting with J. Salerno at the Picatinny Arsenal, with a copy of the e-mail to the committee. J. Hamilton said that OP3.001 does not show up on the IHS web site. It was suggested that this topic be added to OEOSC Board agenda.

**ISO Standards that are candidates for adoptions as US standards**

D. Aikens said that of all of the ISO standards, ISO 10110-1 is probably best candidate for the US to adopt as a national standard. In order to do that OP would need to edit it to remove references to other ISO documents.

The other document is ISO 10110-6 – wedge and tilt specification. W. Czajkowski had been working on that standard.

G. Kohlenberg reminded the committee that the original reason for considering national adoption of ISO standards was to generate some revenue.

### **Future of ASME Y14.18 Optical Drawing Standard**

W. Royall had done nothing on this since the last meeting. At his new company he is experiencing a new set of customers. There is a new tabular format somewhat similar to ISO 10110 and ASME Y14.18; the format is consistent among the companies, but none of their engineers know where the format comes from. So there is a basis for updating Y14.18 and there is a need for a standard that is different from ISDO 10110. He is still willing to be the lead on this.

S. VanKerkhove asked if W. Royall was proposing that the revision be done by ASC OP. W. Royall replied that he would like for OEOSC to take ownership of the standard. and issue it as an OP document.

### **Approval of Revised ASC OP Operating Procedures**

D. Aikens moved that the revised procedures be adopted; W. Czajkowski second the motion. The changes include a notice that there is a participation fee, and the definitions of interest categories. D. Aikens said that the problem with the proposed definitions is that all companies fit all three categories. G. Kohlenberg replied that the ANSI auditor countered that supposition by saying that a company would primarily be one type for a particular standard. They might be a different type for another standard. In order to avoid the imbalance problem for each Task Force, the procedures now call for the entire committee to vote on the adoption of a draft as a national standard. Approval of a draft standard was changed to require a simple majority rather than a  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority. Changes to the scope and votes for member dismissal still require  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority. W. Royall asked what the credentials for e-mail communication meant. G. Kohlenberg said that the document must show the name of the author, the date and time of the transmission.

The revised procedures were to be submitted to ANSI within two weeks after this meeting per the audit agreement.

W. Royall asked why the procedures were not changed to say that the draft is accepted if there is a  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority of those who respond with ballots. S. VanKerkhove said that he would have to think about that proposal because the point is to get more participation. D. Aikens replied that there are quite a few experts who are willing to pay a fee but are not actively attending meetings or returning ballots. G. Kohlenberg's comment was that ANSI's position is that OP should ask those who are not active to become Observers so that the number of participants will result in a smaller majority.

D. Aikens said that it is a waste of the secretary's time to have to chase participants to get them to return ballots. If they do not respond, then they should not bloat the majority number. A. Krisiloff asked if there are any ANSI regulations that would prevent the adoption of this new idea. G. Kohlenberg said that ANSI will review the modified document and accept it or reject it. L. Endelman asked if the document was ANSI wording. G. Kohlenberg said that the original was by ANSI, but each ASC now must maintain its own procedures. S. VanKerkhove asked if it were possible to create a non-voting class of membership. The secretary replied that that is an Observer. A participant is a Member or an Observer.

A. Krisiloff said that he had some experience writing by-laws, which are similar to these procedures. OP should not vote on this issue at the present time, because it is an action that goes to the heart of the legal structure. These procedures should be approved so that they can be submitted to ANSI within the time requirement, and the committee should then study W. Royall's proposal with the intent to once again revise the procedures to reflect that suggestion.

G. Kohlenberg said that when he submits a standard to ANSI for approval, ANSI wants to know how many voted for approval, how many abstained, and how many did not vote. Observers are not counted.

The motion carried unanimously.

### **Maintaining Membership List**

The secretary put up a list of the 2006 membership including each participant's interest group. He then asked the committee to review each to see if the proper interest group was assigned. The revised listing is up on the OEOSC web site.

### **Other Business**

There was no other business.

### **Time and Place for Next OP Meeting**

G. Boulton moved that the OP meetings be held in San Jose, CA during Photonics West annually. H. Johnson seconded the motion, which carried. It was suggested that the Board be shifted to the afternoon and extend the OP meeting by one half hour.

### **Adjourn**

Since there was no further business to come before the committee, D. Aikens moved that the meeting be adjourned. M. Dowell seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 10:04 a.m.