

Hello all,

I just wanted to remind you that the latest draft of OP1.002, which says **WD Version 05-03-011** in its footer, has been uploaded to the OEOSC meeting documents location.

Allen has done a lot of work since the February 2013 meeting, implementing in the latest draft the decisions we made at the February meeting. With some exceptions, I think the draft up to Section 9 Glossary is in pretty good shape. I also think the Annexes are in pretty good shape. I think the definitions in Section 9 need a lot more discussion. For example, are there too many of them, are some of them too complicated, do some of them require further wordsmithing and/or correcting?

Other "significant" issues on which we need to reach consensus:

- Should we make the drawing Dave developed based on the Army's drawing an OEOSC drawing and make it a normative reference?
- Allen is still trying to come to grips with the fact that in the Visibility System the dig artifacts have a dimensional aspect to them and digs are evaluated against the dig artifact based on their "apparent size." There is both a dimensional and brightness aspect to this. Allen is searching for the right words. See Footnotes 2 and 8 in the latest draft standard.
- At what size does a short scratch become a dig?
- Allen has some questions in Footnotes 4 and 5 that he will explain.
- A reasonable allowance for area imperfections, section 3.3.
- Brightness contours in determining length using digital cameras. See 9.1.3, Footnote 13 and Annex D. Trey, please weigh in!!!

I have attached my own comments to v05-03-011. Many of my comments are just minor fixes of typos and so forth that have already been addressed in the Word version of the draft. In these cases I added the word "Fixed" so you will know. If you have comments of your own you can

email them to the other participants or put them in the "phorum" at [www.triptar.com/phorum-5.2.18](http://www.triptar.com/phorum-5.2.18).

Regards,

Gordon  
TF2 Leader