

Draft Minutes
OP/TF 4 Adoption of ISO 10110 as an American National Standard
(Held in conjunction with SPIE OptiFab)

May 8th, 2011, 13:30 – 17:00 EDT

Rochester Riverside Convention Center
123 East Main St. Rochester, NY 14604
Aqueduct Room (A/B)

1. Welcome and Introductions

D. Aikens opened the meeting at 13:35 EDT with introductions. Present were H. Johnson, A. Krisiloff, D. Howland, G. Boulton, R. Williamson and R. Youngworth. On the phone were T. Ward and S. Martinek. Of the 16 experts, 9 were present, for a voting quorum.

2. Adoption of Agenda

H. Johnson moved we adopt the agenda, and G. Boulton seconded the motion, which carried.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the August 2010 Meeting

H. Johnson moved that the draft minutes be approved; R. Youngworth seconded the motion, which carried.

4. Publication Status, ISO 10110-1

D. Aikens reviewed the development sequence of all standards, First is a PINS, then a BSR Form 8, then a BSR Form 9. Each step must be approved by letter ballot. The Date of the PINS must necessarily occur before the BSR Form 8, but there is no time limit on standards development.

There may be an issue with OP1.0110-1, because the numbering within the draft standard logged with a BSR-8 is incorrect. Dave needs to clean this up as well, and make sure the right version of the standard is published.

R. Youngworth asked if submitting a ballot showing he abstained was helping or not. Dave said that every collected vote helps

Note: after the meeting I checked the voting rules, and in fact a non-submittal is the same as an abstention, so all that really matters is the number of yes votes.

5. OP Ballot status, BSR/OEOSC 1.0110 -10, -12, and -9

D. Aikens reviewed the list of PINS on file with ANSI. Half of them are mysterious, and the standards are not actually being developed. In addition, many of the standards on our project plan have no PINS officially logged. D. Aikens needs to clean up the PINS for all the standards under development.

OP1.0110-10 is out for ballot, and -12 and -9 are coming next.

R. Youngworth explained that ISO was indeed revising -12, and wanted to allow explicit Forbes notations. Unfortunately in their implementation, they have gone for something a little too elegant, and it had some mistakes. As a standard, it needs to be crystal clear, but the elegance makes it too ambiguous. Specifically, they are quoting the recursion formula, which is fine, but there is a chance for error in the extraction of the correct formulas, and they've made some mistakes as a result. Peter Takacs has been helping to make sure the math is right. R. Youngworth and D. Aikens will work with Sven Kiontke, the head of the German delegation, at OptiFab to try and get the math correct.

Action: R. Youngworth to continue to work with Sven Kiontke to get the ISO version correct. We may want to use the ISO version for the ANS as well.

Once the OP1.0110 series PINS are fixed, we need to clean up the PINS for the ISO 9211 series.

Action: D. Aikens to clean up all PINS records
Action: D. Aikens to do editorial corrections to OP1.0110-1
Action: D. Aikens to file paperwork for -10 when ballot closes
Action: D. Aikens to generate draft versions of -9 and -12 and circulate for OP ballot

6. TF Ballot status, ISO 9211-1 through -3

Parts 1 and 2 require some minor changes. D. Aikens will implement these changes. Part 3 is ready to go, but it is better to hold it until the other two are ready as well, so we can do them as a group.

D. Aikens will circulate these for TF ballot as soon as the OP1.0110 standards are on track, and all the PINS are registered. There should be lots of comments during the TF balloting, since it helps with the drafting process. At the OP level, all comments, particularly serious comments, must be processed, documented, and often re-balloted.

7. Review ISO 10110-6

R. Williamson explained that there are some additions in the new drafts, and the changes are relevant. He also reported that R. Litschel told him that the German delegation is soon going to submit a draft to ISO. Key to the new draft is non-rotationally symmetric systems. We need to define axis and clocking directions for these, and the German delegation has agreed to add this.

D. Aikens offered that if the new ISO version does not suit us, we can offer our own domestic version.

8. Draft of OP1.0110-11

R. Youngworth reported that the standard is essentially ready to go. He will need a template or some draft document to be consistent with the new ISO format. The announcement letter contains relevant links to documents on their website.

Action: D. Aikens will get R. Youngworth a template to work from.

R. Youngworth also reported that ANSI has granted permission to reproduce the table in ISO 10110-11, because the presentation and paper will not be posted on the SPIE website.

9. Review OP1.0110-18

A. Krisiloff provided a brief tour of the current draft of ISO 10110-18. The scope of the standard was just finished components, and the new version is finished components and raw material. The definitions section has changes to stress birefringence, inclusions, inhomogeneity and striae. Bubbles definition is unchanged. New definitions added for birefringence, allowed bubbles, primary bubbles, controlled bubbles, and equivalent diameter. He has attempted to create a definition of inhomogeneity and striae which is continuous as well as quantified. This effort may not be successful.

Birefringence is specified in OPD in nm per cm as before. Bubbles and inclusions are also unchanged in terms of measurement and accumulation. Inhomogeneity had been defined as six classes of peak deviations. This draft proposes to change this to variation in index without grades. Striae had been max OPD over percent area, and becomes peak OPD.

It was suggested to change the name and scope of the standard to cover birefringence, including natural or desirable birefringence.

Concentration rules are just not right; should be written in terms of 20% of the allowed bubble area, not individual bubbles, in 5% test area.

There were long discussions over the proposed -18 language. While most people agreed that we should clean up some of the language, it is more important to fix what is broken in the standards, and combine them into a single document as

our first priority. The next priority would be to provide a notation that allows us to specify the raw materials properties of ISO 12123 on the drawing. This needn't be based on the same structure as ISO 10110, and could even go into the material block. The one case, though, where we can expect to inspect a finished part for a material property is the bubbles specification.

D. Aikens pointed out that ISO standard format rules will not allow major subdivision, each with its own definitions, notation, etc.

Action: A. Krisiloff to distribute current draft to TF4 members via direct email. He will send out a .doc rather than a .pdf, so people can edit it and send it back to him.

10. Laser damage

The committee briefly discussed part 17, the laser damage notation. S. Martinek pointed out that there was a difference between bulk laser damage and surface laser damage. Coatings are surfaces, and there has been a lot of work, but no one on the committee is a damage expert. D. Howland said that there was an expert at Northrop named Jon Erenberg, who may be interested in helping us with this section. They will contact him and see what he thinks.

11. Action Items

Action Items from this meeting

Action: R. Youngworth to continue to work with Sven Kiontke to get the ISO version correct. We may want to use the ISO version for the ANS as well.

Action: D. Aikens to clean up all PINS records

Action: D. Aikens to do editorial corrections to OP1.0110-1

Action: D. Aikens to file paperwork for -10 when ballot closes

Action: D. Aikens to generate draft versions of -9 and -12 and circulate for OP ballot

Action: D. Aikens to create committee drafts of ISO 9211-1 through -3 and circulate for TF ballot

Action: D. Aikens will get R. Youngworth a template to work from.

Action: A. Krisiloff to distribute current draft to TF4 members via direct email. He will send out a .doc rather than a .pdf, so people can edit it and send it back to him.

12. Time and Place of next TF 4 Meeting

H. Johnson moved that TF 4 meet by teleconference in the summer, followed by an informal review of action items at O&P. R. Youngworth seconded the motion, and it carried.

13. Adjourn

G. Boulbee moved to adjourn, seconded by A. Krisiloff, which carried. The meeting adjourned at 17:36 EDT..