

Group	Year	BallotNumber	Company	Last First	Primary	Vote	Comments
OP	2010	5	4D Technology	Marti Stephen	Primary	Yes	
OP	2010	5	APOMA	Czaj Walter	Primary	Yes	
OP	2010	5	Davidson Optronics,	Gau Charles	Primary	Yes	
OP	2010	5	Harold Johnson	John Hal	Primary	Yes	
OP	2010	5	IEEE Photonics	Dow Marla	Primary	Yes	
OP	2010	5	Individual	Roya William	Primary	Yes	
OP	2010	5	JDSU	Boult Gordon bee	Primary	Yes, with Comments	Comments accompanying ballot for Gordon Boulton on OEOSC/OP/TF 4, Ballot 2010-1, pertaining to ISO 10110-10 MOD. July 17, 2010 Foreword 1) line 1 delete comma after "texture." Line 2 add comma after "required." In line 1 in the paragraph above the table, "for which" is repeated twice. In the list of Organizations Represented the "cross" symbol before Brookhaven National Lab is in a smaller font size and is above the line compared to the others. Title: as part of the MOD, may we change the title from "Optics and Electro-Optical Instruments..." to "Optics and Photonics..."? Normative references and Bibliography: we need to do a check of which parts of ISO 10110 have had title changes to "Optics and photonics..." 3.3 I don't believe "subdivided" is hyphenated. Table 1: 5/: there are extra spaces after "ISO 10110-7" and after "or."
OP	2010	5	Light Capture, Inc.	Youn Rich	Primary	Yes	
OP	2010	5	NIST	Dow Marla	Primary	Yes	
OP	2010	5	Northrop Grumman Aerospace Systems	Howl Donna and	Alternate	Yes	
OP	2010	5	Northrop Grumman Laser Systems	Snyd Keith er	Primary	Yes	
OP	2010	5	Optimax Systems, Inc.	DeGr Jessica	Primary	Yes	
OP	2010	5	R.A.Smythe, LLC	Smyt Robert	Primary	Yes	
OP	2010	5	Savvy Optics Corp.	Aike David	Primary	Yes	
OP	2010	5	Triptar Lens Co., Inc.	Krisil Allen	Primary	Yes	
OP	2010	5	Zygo Corporation	Evan Chris s	Primary	Yes, with Comments	The spirit of this standard is fine, but the examples are inadequate. Specifically, there are not examples that really demonstrate all of the "ANS Note" additions in the Table Field. On first pass this just looks like ISO 10110 examples — people will look at this with so few examples and decide to keep doing what they are doing. What about a drawing with as PSD spec? A slope spec? What about aspheres? If aspheres are to be dealt with in a separate document (likely a smart thing) then this standard should state that it is explicitly for spheres. What about wedge specified in the "Field of the drawing (F.O.D.)," rather than by "4". In this manner centration may be specified as a run--out tolerance (as it is measured) with clear indications to datums on the lens. Perhaps most concerning to me is the specifications on glass properties and surface imperfections...ANS Note 7 and ANS Note 8. It states the option to use ANSI/OEOSC 0P3.001 and ANSI/OEOSC OP1.002 symbols and notations with a note clarifying which glass standard is in effect — yet there is not an example of how this could/should be done on a drawing.

Count - Vote	
Vote	Total
Yes	14
Yes, with Comments	2
Grand Total	16