Draft
Minutes
ASC OP/TF 2, Performance Based Optical Imperfections Task Force Draft Standard Meeting
January 25, 2009
Fairmont Hotel, California Room
170 South Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

☒**Committee Members (16 of 20 w/2 alt.)**	Representing
☒David Aikens	Savvy Optics Corporation
☒Gordon Boultbee	JDSU Corporation
☐Andrei Brunfeld	Xyrtex
☒Benjamin Catching (Alternate)	JDSU Corporation
☒David Corridon	Individual
☒Walter Czajkowski	APOMA (Edmund Optics)
☐Jesica DeGroote Nelson	Optimax Systems, Inc.
☒Frank Dombrowski (by phone)	Gage-Line Technology, Inc.
☒Marla Dowell	IEEE/LEOS (NIST)
☒Marla Dowell	NIST
☒Lincoln Endelman	SPIE, (Endelman Enterprises)
☒Charles Gaugh	Davidson Optronics, Inc.
☒Ulf Griesmann	OSA (NIST)
☐Krishna Gupta	Zygo Corporation
☒Hal Johnson	Harold Johnson Optical Lab
☐Rudolf Hartman	Retired
☒Alan Krisiloff	Triptar Lens Co., Inc.
☒Jonathan McGuire (by phone)	Northrop Grumman Laser Systems
☒Rick Plympton (Alternate)	Optimax Systems, Inc.
☐Sam Richman (Alternate)	Research Electro-Optics, Inc.
☒William Royall (by phone)	Eastman Kodak Company, Retired
☒Trey Turner	Research Electro-Optics, Inc.
☒Ray Williamson	Ray Williamson Consulting
Observers (4)	
☒Gene Kohlenberg	OEOSC
☐John Hamilton	Northrop Grumman Defensive Systems
☒Donna Howland	Northrop Grumman Aerospace Systems
☐Ashish Mistry	FLIR Precision Optics
☒Bruce Netherton	Lockheed Martin Coherent Technologies
☒Ari Siletz	CCDMETRIX

Auditor's Summary of Meeting

The Task Force reviewed a concept for updating ANSI/OEOSC OP1.002-2009. Changes to several tables and equations were presented. The Task Force asked the author to collect suggestions from the other members and prepare a new working draft for the members to review 30 days before the next meeting.

1. Welcome and Introductions

G. Boultbee opened the meeting at 8:32 a.m. He named each person in the room and on the phone.

2. Adoption of Agenda

G. Boultbee asked for a motion to approve the revised draft agenda. D. Aikens made the motion and A. Krisiloff seconded it. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of the Monday, August 11, 2008 ASC OP/SC 1, BSR/OEOSC-OP1.002, Optics and Electro-Optical Instruments – Optical Elements and Assemblies — Appearance Imperfections Draft Review Minutes

G. Boultbee asked J. McGuire if he had been able to determine the origin of the image anomalies behind some of the lens-imperfection illustrations that appear in Annex A of ANSI/OEOSC OP1.002. John said that he had to contact the person who generated the images, and would report what he found. G. Boultbee then called for a motion to approve the minutes from the San Diego meeting. A. Krisiloff moved that the draft minutes be approved as presented; R. Williamson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

4. Status of Release of OP1.002

G. Kohlenberg reported that the ANSI public review of ANSI/OEOSC OP1.002 will end on January 26, 2009. Assuming that no comments are received by then, the draft will then be submitted to ANSI for final approval. There is no way to predict how quickly ANSI will grant the approval. G. Boultbee asked if the publication should be delayed until the status of the Annex A illustrations could be determined. J. McGuire replied that he could have an answer about the illustrations within two weeks.

5. Concept for New Work Item for Rev 3 of OP1.002

G. Boultbee introduced the subject by saying that additional ideas that could be included in this standard would be prepared for the next revision. A. Krisiloff agreed to document proposed additions for the update. His modified OP1.002 accompanies these minutes.

Suggested changes are to clause 3.5.3, Table 1 Scratch Designation, Table 2 Dig Designation, clause 3.5.5 with subclauses, clause 3.6 with subclauses up through 3.6.2.

F. Dombrowski found different result for 3.5.5.1 and 3.5.5.2. He interpreted 3.5.5.1 as E-D, and 3.5.5.2 as C-C. A. Krisiloff agreed with F. Dombrowski's interpretation for 3.5.5.1. However, 3.5.5.2 is B-B because there is no 15 µ scratch classification; therefore, the smaller classification of B would be used. Likewise, there is no 130 µ classification, and B would be used.

D. Aikens said that this condition should be explicitly stated in the specification, not the example. A. Krisiloff made a note of this discussion so that he could examine it further.

D. Aikens said that 3.5.3 refers to the scratch width as the widest portion of the scratch. How is that width going to be determined?

D. Aikens suggested that in Table 1 accumulation class A2 and A should be A2.5 and A. A. Krisiloff replied that the table has a typographical error, and A2.5 is correct.

G. Boultbee said that an optician on the floor would look at the third column in the tables and ask what he can ignore. and then continue using the current method.

D. Aikens said that the revised equations using $\sum_{i=max}^{min}$ ... are ambiguous. Change them to $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$ ... and make n the number of scratches to be considered for accumulation.

T. Turner added that S_{max} needs to be defined.

A. Krisiloff wondered if there would be confusion on the shop floor if the equations were reorganized as he proposes.

D. Aikens suggested that the Task Force consider whether sleeks should be considered as scratches. His experience is that 50% of those he has poled in his classes do consider sleeks to be scratches. The standard should reflect current practice. So ASC OP should determine what the current practice is.

D. Aikens moved that the Task Force ask A. Krisiloff to prepare a committee draft that includes the scope of the revision . B. Netherton seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

G. Boultbee then asked that the members of the Task Force submit ideas to be included in this draft to A. Krisiloff 45 days before the next meeting so that he can prepare an update for the Task Force 30 days before the next meeting.

The Task Force recessed at 10:00 a.m. and reconvened at 10:11 a.m.

6. Review Draft of One-Hour Short Course

G. Boultbee reviewed the history of the project. A. Krisiloff then went through the presentation slide by slide. A copy of the presentation accompanies these minutes.

M. Dowell suggested that the illustrations on slide 8 should be labeled.

R. Williamson noted that the word "crack" was used on slide 9. He said that is dangerously close to "crack edges." D. Aikens suggested that the definition in OP1.002 be used.

G. Boultbee asked if ISO 14997:2003 should be listed on slide 18. A. Krisiloff replied that it should probably be ISO 10110. C. Gaugh noted that the old MIL-O-13830 still appears on many documents.

M. Dowell suggested an OEOSC introduction is needed at the beginning to help motivate the reason for the presentation.

T. Turner suggested that there needs to be an explanation as to why there are three different methodologies.

D. Aikens said that this presentation does not mention the OEOSC course on the subject. It also can give the listener a false sense that he or she can now obtain the standards and begin using them without difficulty.

C. Gaugh thought that in this survey presentation there is no need to talk about process development. M. Dowell countered that a manager listening to this presentation needs to understand that there are many problems facing a person who is attempting to characterize scratches and digs.

B. Netherton said that scratch and dig evaluation is the biggest cost of production.

G. Boultbee asked D. Aikens if he was suggesting a modification of this presentation, or a separate presentation. D. Aikens was not certain.

7. Report on status of scratch inspection vision system being developed by Ari Siletz and evaluated by JDSU

At the request of the Task Force Leader, A. Krisiloff moved that this topic be moved ahead of the discussion of the Picatinny Arsenal visit. C. Gaugh seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

D. Aikens discussed the inspection system that A. Siletz and he developed. A copy of the presentation accompanies these minutes.

G. Boultbee suggested that this technique could become example two in the ISO scratch and dig standard.

8. Visit by OEOSC representatives to Picatinny Arsenal in NJ

The purpose of this visit is to bring representatives of Picatinny up to date on revisions of OP1.002. Perhaps D. Aikens could describe the Savvy instrument.

C. Gaugh said that John Salerno retired 2½ years ago. His replacement is not that familiar with the reference standard and has no love for the current reference standard. The military would accept a new system that is shown to be superior. The Military will not give up its reference standard until NIST assumes responsibility.

G. Boultbee asked who would agree to attend a Picatinny meeting. D. Aikens could go if the fact that he has a potential product in this arena is not a conflict of interest.

W. Royall would be interested in attending the meeting, as are J. McGuire, C. Gaugh, and B. Netherton.

G. Boultbee asked D. Aikens to lead the delegation.

L. Endelman suggested that OEOSC set up a dinner meeting with an advance agenda so that Picatinny may have more persons participate. He said that he found that Picatinny will be reluctant to any changes in their procedures.

B. Netherton talked to J. McGuire about how they could show a cost savings by implementing a new scratch and dig evaluation system.

G. Boultbee asked that this visit be accomplished before the next meeting.

9. Time and Place of next TF 2 Meeting

J. McGuire said that OEOSC has not had a presence in the Florida conference in several years. There is a wide spectrum of companies interested in scratch and dig. G. Boultbee asked for a show of hands for having the next meeting in Orlando in April or Rochester in May. Three were in favor of Orlando, and nine were in favor of Rochester.

The Orlando show is for the military prime contractors. A. Krisiloff said that it is not necessary to have a Task Force meeting in Florida, but OEOSC should have some presence. J. McGuire agreed. D. Aikens suggested a panel discussion in Florida in 2010 where scratch and dig or standards in general could be the subject. D. Aikens suggested that a group be formed to develop a strategy for increasing OEOSC presence at the April SPIE conference in Florida.

A. Krisiloff asked J. McGuire to set himself a reminder to weekly ping D. Aikens and A. Krisiloff about a strategy for future Orlando participation.

W. Czajkowski moved to meet in Rochester, NY. B. Netherton seconded the motion, which carried with 15 for and 2 against. The motion carried.

10. Adjourn

A. Krisiloff moved that the meeting be adjourned; R. Williamson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:56 a.m.