

To: Gene Kohlenberg, Gordon Boulton
From: Dave Aikens, Savvy Optics Corp
Regarding: Strategy for proposing changes to MIL-PRF-13830B

In April, a delegation attended a Scratch and Dig summit meeting hosted by the Army at Picatinny Arsenal. My notes from that meeting have been distributed separately. As a result of our visit, we have been solicited for input to the next revision of MIL-PRF-13830B. This memo documents my proposed strategy for proposing changes to MIL-PRF-13830B. I am hoping that OEOSC can use this proposal to establish consensus on a single strategy for future interaction with the Army.

Our goal is to clarify the confusion related to MIL-PRF-13830B and its implementation as a national standard in the American optics industry. Any of the following achievements, in order of preference, will greatly improve this situation, with varying levels of success.

- 1) Adoption of OP1.002:2009, and the withdrawal of MIL-PRF-13830BA for new procurements.
- 2) Adoption of OP1.002:2009, and acknowledgement of our interpretation of the scratch and dig specifications, even if MIL-PRF-13830B cannot be withdrawn.
- 3) An overhaul of MIL-PRF-13830B to bring it into line with OP1.002:2009, consistent with the use of both standards in parallel.
- 4) Clear guidance from the Army that scratch and dig is a visual appearance specification unrelated to scratch width, consistent with the use of OP1.002:2009 for commercial procurements.

In deciding which of these objectives to pursue, we must recognize our limitations in both access to force the issue as well as to accomplish long and convoluted tasks as a committee. Central to our strategy is to maintain engagement with the Army on surface imperfections, and to achieve our changes in a timely manner. It is my assessment, and that of others in the delegation, that a push to withdraw MIL-PRF-13830B and adoption of OP1.002:2009 (Goal 1) will be met with strong resistance, and be counter-productive. Similarly, the number of "line and page" changes required to bring MIL-PRF-13830B into true alignment with OP1.002:2009 will require extensive work on our part and will likely seem presumptuous to the Army. At the same time, there was general recognition by the Army that OP1.002:2009 was superior in some ways, especially if it has the support of the optics industry, and simply asking for a clarifying memo seems to be letting this opportunity go without enough benefit.

I believe the best balance between the amount of work required and the probability of success, is therefore to work toward both the adoption of OP1.002:2009 for surface imperfections (goal 2), with a minimum of line and page changes in our recommendation. My vision is to propose a single change to MIL-PRF-13830B replacing sections 3.5 (surface quality) and 4.2.2 (verification) with a wholesale application of OP1.002. At the same time we can push for a new forward to MIL-PRF-13830B establishing that the scratch and dig specification is a visual appearance specification (goal 4), which will assure us of at least some improvement over the current situation for surface imperfections.