

Draft Minutes v2

ASC OP/TF 2 – Committee for Optics and Electro-Optical Instruments – Appearance Imperfections Standard Meeting

Tuesday, October 28, 2014

11:00 - 13:00 EDT

(08:00 - 10:00 PDT)

Teleconference Call

(866) 576-7975, participation code 305866

1. Welcome and Introductions

Gordon Boulton called the meeting to order at 11:03 EDT. In attendance were Dave Aikens, Marla Dowell, Bill Royall, Frank Dombrowski, Patrick Augino, Donna Howland, Allen Krisiloff, Doug Wilgis, Trey Turner, Charles Gaugh, and Ray Williamson. Quorum was established. Chris Svec joined at 11:33 EDT. Donna Howland and Marla Dowell left the meeting at 11:55. Marla Dowell re-joined the meeting at 12:30 EDT.

2. Approval of the agenda

Bill Royall motioned to accept the agenda. The motion was seconded by Donna Howland and the motion passed.

3. Approval of the minutes for the August meeting

Donna Howland moved that we accept the corrected version (v2) of the minutes. Charles Gaugh seconded, and the motion carried.

4. Status of ISO scratch-dig standards (10110-7 and 14997)

Dave Aikens reported that the project to add the ANSI scratch and dig standard has been approved by ISO TC172 SC1 WG1/2 joint committee. The current version adds the appearance notation and inspection methods to the existing ISO notation, and is currently at the CD level. The difference between the ISO version of the appearance standard and our version is that the ISO version will require the user to identify the comparison standard to be used on the drawing using a note. It will also define the brightness of the illumination conditions for inspection in lux rather than call out wattage, and to remove all mention of the SavvyInspectorTM or the Army.

5. Ballot to reaffirm, revise, or withdraw existing standard

Since it has been five years since we approved the 2009 edition, we will need to vote, before the end of the year, to reaffirm, revise, or withdraw the 2009 edition. Since we want to continue with the revision of the document based on our current working draft, we should advise the OP committee to vote to revise, rather than reaffirm, the standard.

Dave Aikens to draft a ballot for OP, and send it to Gordon Boulton for his “TF leader comments and suggestions”.

6. Project leader’s status report on revising OP1.002 draft version 05.04.005

Allen Krisiloff announced that he had finished the new revision of the OP1.002 draft based on our August meeting and discussions with individual members. The new draft, labeled 05.04.005, was posted to the website yesterday for review.

Ray Williamson reminded the committee that he sent out detailed thoughts on how to revise the section for the dig notation in August.

Gordon Boulton questioned the change to Table 1, which is no longer a subjective description of the scratch visibility but instead references the artifact number. Dave Aikens commented that this was not the plan as of the end of the last meeting, but Allen explained that John Hamilton had objected to the subjective descriptions in Tables 1 and 2. Doug Wilgis suggested that we be clear about the artifact which is the reference artifact for the scratches in Table 1. This began a long discussion regarding issues associated with how we want to define these scratches. In the end, the committee decided to leave Table 1 as is for now, and will review comments received at the ballot.

We then turned our attention to the digs, by reviewing Ray Williamson’s comments. Of issue was whether we wanted to retain the construct that the visibility notation for digs was independent of the dimensions of the dig, or if we wanted to return to the language of the MIL standard or the 2009 edition of OP1.002. Allen Krisiloff explained that his intent is to differentiate the Visibility specification from the Dimensional specification. Bill Royall explained that, in his experience, the assessment on digs was always based on appearance or visibility, and deciding whether a given dig was more or less visible than the specified comparison standard. Microscope measurements would only be invoked in worst-case scenarios to resolve conflicts. This interpretation is based on a careful reading of the standard, which describes digs by size, and the inspection method, which is visual. Since the Army provides dig comparison standards, the intent seems that the imperfections are based on visibility or appearance, and not measurements.

In the end, we concluded that we want to remove the paragraph after the table 2, and key off of the fact that the visibility of digs is based on a visual assessment of the size, but to refrain from detaching the dig grades completely from the dimensional specifications given in the MIL standard. Allen will review the standard, make changes as needed to move away from visibility and move toward appearance or apparent size.

We then briefly described the default requirements for the scratch and dig specifications outside the clear aperture. Dave Aikens suggested we look at the wording for defaults from the 2009 edition, section 3.4.1.3.

Dave Aikens also said he reviewed the document completely, and carefully compared our current draft to both MIL-PRF-13830B and OP1.002, and found some other discrepancies that we should probably address. Since we didn't have time to review it here as we were out of time, he will send them directly to the chairman and project leader.

Allen Krisiloff committed to getting Dave Aikens a new draft by November 7th, who will post them on the website. We will then get our comments to Allen by the 21st. Allen will have a new draft January 16th, 2015.

7. Any other new business and action items

There were no new items.

8. Time and place for next meeting

Charles Gaugh moved that we next meet at Photonics West on February 8th, 2015 at 11:00 PST. Frank Dombrowski seconded, and the motion carried.

9. Adjourn

At 13:21 Allen Krisiloff moved we adjourn. Ray Williamson seconded, and the motion carried.