

Draft Minutes v1
ASC OP/TF 2—Committee for Optics and Electro-Optical Instruments—
Appearance Imperfections Standard Meeting
Tuesday August 25, 2015
11:00-13:00 EDT

1. Welcome and Introductions

Gordon Boulton called the meeting to order at 11:09 EDT. In attendance as the meeting started were Allen Krisiloff, Ray Williamson, Walt Czajkowski, Frank Dombrowski, Bill Royall, Hal Johnson, Gordon Boulton, and Dave Aikens. It was determined that these eight attendees did not constitute a quorum (there are 19 members of TF 2, so a quorum, defined as >50%, is 10 members) and therefore this meeting continued as an informal discussion of comments received in the balloting. Trey Turner joined the meeting later, but his attendance did not trigger quorum (9/19 <50%).

2. Approval of the agenda

Bill Royall motioned to accept the agenda. The motion was seconded by Hal Johnson and the motion passed without objection.

3. Approval of the minutes of the February meeting

Frank Dombrowski asked for a clarification of the phrase “the current ISO version of the appearance standard and our version....” Dave Aikens replied that the version of the ANSI/OEOSC OP1.002 that we have been working on for five years that was reviewed at the February 2015 meeting was WDver05-06-003; the first version that incorporated the discussions from that meeting was WDver05-06-004; and the version that was circulated for TF balloting was WDver05-06-007.

Hal Johnson motioned to accept the minutes from the previous meeting. The motion was seconded by Walt Czajkowski and the motion passed without objection.

4. Status of ISO scratch-dig standards 10110-7 and 14997

Dave Aikens reported that he is compiling comments received on the DIS voting results for both 10110-7 and 14997 for discussion at Paris. He is hoping for approval to proceed with FDIS ballots during the Paris meeting.

5. TF votes and comments received on OP1.002 WDver5-06-007

Fourteen affirmative and no negative ballots were received allowing OP1.002 to proceed to an OP level ballot. Several of these included comments which were discussed during this teleconference.

Allen Krisiloff uploaded a summary of the general and technical comments to the OEOSC website for discussion. We agreed to leave the typos undiscussed.

Dave commented that the document is long. Suggestions included lessening the font size for headings; starting the text for subparagraphs that are not merely subheadings on the same line as the subheading; removal of excess white space; reducing or eliminating the computer-generated examples provided by Northrop in Annex B; deleting Annex B and making it a free pdf download from the OEOSC website; and

not starting a new page with each major heading. Allen will make his best editorial judgments. It was noted that some of the examples, e.g., B.13, are distorted but unless John Hamilton of Northrop has the original files and can get them fixed there is nothing we can do about it.

2.1.1.1.2 discussion of size <0.003 mm in definition of sleeks – this presumably calls for measurement of all sleeks using 100X magnification, which is not the intent. Dave suggests adding the word “typically”; Ray suggests separating phrases into two sentences to clarify that the size statement is an informative note and not part of the definition: “...angles. Sleeks are typically <0.003 mm in width.”

2.1.4.3 Accumulations and concentration: Dave Aikens pointed out that this seems to call for a case where only class C and B are subject to these special rules. Bill Royall pointed out that this comes from previous standards. But now with the addition of An class, we may want to extend the meaning of these rules. It was decided that one way to do this is to exchange the naming of minimum scratch and dig sizes with a phrase referring to the “considered” class, which is defined elsewhere.

2.4.2 Ray Williamson’s comment regarding the definition of roof surfaces: As defined here, a “roof” is formed by two adjacent perpendicular surfaces; and rules are given for evaluating the size and length of scratches and the aperture for digs as if the roof were a single surface. This may be the intent for surfaces used in internal reflection, but the definition also includes the entry and exit legs of a 90 degree bend prism which are optically equivalent to the entry and exit faces of a window. Ray’s suggestion was to define a roof surface in terms of its optical function in “mutual internal reflection.” The question arose whether this would require additional notes on the drawing, as technicians may not be privy to the final optical function. Attendees were invited to consider, and offer suggestions.

3.1.1 – 3.1.5, and 3.2, Figure 3, 3.3.1, and 3.3.5. Ray Williamson’s comments address longstanding inconsistencies in the definitions of “edge,” “edge surface,” “rim,” “rim edge,” “perimeter,” “surface,” “side,” etc. His suggestions are an attempt to provide consistency and clarity. He pointed out that he is not entirely happy with his choice of the word “boundary.” Attendees were invited to consider, and offer suggestions.

There was general agreement on including in 3.1.5 how the ANSI and ISO drawing standards define “bevel” and “chamfer.” Perhaps the phrase “protective chamfer” can be used.

Allen will confer with Ray and Frank off-line, and make appropriate edits.

Gordon Boulton had three technical comments. In 3.1.1 he stated that not all edge surfaces lie between clear apertures and recommended that phrase be deleted from the definition. His recommendation was accepted.

Gordon felt that the definition of 3.3.3 was still not clear; Dave Aikens concurred. The concept pertaining to the definition was raised by Dan Palmari at the February 2015 meeting. Gordon offered a rewording based on what he thought Dan was trying to describe. Allen Krisiloff was requested to continue his efforts to contact Dan and clarify the intent of the paragraph. Gordon said he would provide some sketches of possible examples to aid the discussion.

Gordon pointed out that spatter and pinholes are always evaluated as digs regardless of their degree of roundness, and recommended a change to the wording on 5.3, which was accepted: just drop the introductory phrase “long and round imperfections unique to coatings.”

Allen Krisiloff was requested to provide a complete list of all comments received, technical, general and editorial, and his response to those comments, as is done in ISO, and post those comments on the OEOSC website for all members to read.

6. Readiness and schedule for OP vote on OP1.002

The members present requested that Allen Krisiloff have a new draft of the standard available for review before a teleconference meeting to be scheduled for Tuesday November 10, 2015, 11:00 EST. The goal is to then distribute the draft for OP balloting by November 17, 2015.

7. Any new business/new action items.

There was no new business.

Members present at the meeting were urged to provide any inputs they had with respect to the meeting’s discussions to Allen Krisiloff and copy the others. Specifically:

- Allen Krisiloff will contact John Hamilton with respect to the pictures in Annex B: do they still exist and if so, can those that need fixing be fixed by John?
- Frank Dombrowski will provide a better version of Figure 3.
- Gordon Boulton will provide some sketches to aid in the discussion pertaining to 3.3.3.
- Allen Krisiloff will compile all comments received with the TF ballots and post them on the OEOSC website.

8. Time and place for next OP/TF 2 Meeting

Gordon Boulton directed that there will be a teleconference meeting on Tuesday November 10, 2015, 11:00 EST. He will send out an email announcement as soon as the draft meeting minutes are posted on the OEOSC website.

9. Adjourn

At 1:01 EDT Ray Williamson moved we adjourn. Bill Royall seconded and the motion carried.