

Draft Minutes v2

ASC OP/TF 4 –Committee for Optics and Electro-Optical Instruments – Adoption of ISO 10110 as an American National Standard

Wednesday, October 29th, 2014 11:00-12:00 EDT
Teleconference

1. Welcome and Introductions

Dave Aikens called the meeting to order at 11:02 EDT. In attendance were Donna Howland, Gordon Boulton, Bill Royall, Brian Stamper, Rich Youngworth and Ray Williamson. Everyone knew each other, so no introductions were required. Quorum was established.

2. Approval of the agenda

Gordon Boulton moved to accept the agenda, the motion was seconded by Donna Howland and the motion passed.

3. Approval of the minutes for the prior meeting

Gordon Boulton observed that the spelling of Arial font was incorrect in the minutes to the prior meeting. Donna Howland moved to accept the minutes with the spelling error corrected, Bill Royall seconded and the motion carried.

4. Status of other standards

Dave Aikens announced that the publication of all the approved parts of ISO 10110 is imminent, since we now have approved versions of parts 1, 5, 8, 10, 11 and 12. He has already submitted the BSR-9 for parts 1, 10, and 12, and will do the others in the coming weeks. Part 9, meanwhile, has just gotten enough votes to approve, and will follow shortly. The publication of the other approved standards, ISO 9211-1 to -4, is waiting on a final, printable version of part 4, which is expected in November. If all the BSR-9's go as planned without any issues at ANSI, we should have versions ready for sale by the beginning of next year, and have all the standards issued in 2015. If we can quickly follow with completion of parts 6 and 14, then we will truly be done, and can start looking at outreach and announcements and the like, as well as revisions.

Rich Youngworth pointed out that we have an opportunity to publicize the standard at the APOMA meeting in Tucson. Ray Williamson said that he was planning to go, and could present something if we can get it on the agenda. Dave Aikens and Donna

Howland committed to work with Ray to try and get a presentation together for next week.

Action Dave: BSR-9 for all remaining standards

Action Dave: Contact Jim Sydor at APOMA to see if they can make room for a presentation by OEOSC

Action Donna: Get presentation overview slides to Ray

Action Ray: If all goes well, present at APOMA

1. Status of OP1.0110 -14

Marla Dowell wasn't on the call, but Dave Aikens said that we are working towards a draft, but don't have an editable version of the standard yet.

Action Dave: Get Marla a version of ISO 10110-14 that she can edit

2. Status of OP1.0110-9

Dave Aikens announced that we now have the required number of ballots in for Part 9, and he will close the ballot on 10-31 and proceed with publication.

6. Status of OP1.0110-6

Manfred told Ray Williamson over the summer that the new draft was being held in editing and was not available yet. When it did become available, only a few weeks before our meeting in Berlin, Ray Williamson read through it and discovered a number of unexpected problems.

1. The datum, datum feature, and datum system definitions had been changed without explanation prior to the previous meeting, and nobody had noticed, apparently because we did not expect them and were directing our attention solely toward the sections to be addressed in the formal comments from the various delegations.
2. The meaning of "rotationally invariant", which was discussed in St. Gallen, was apparently misconstrued by the editor and its sense reversed with "non-symmetrical" in a global replace.
3. Figure 2, also discussed at length in St. Gallen, was missing from Ray Williamson's copy of the new draft. Manfred Thomae had supplied to Ray a copy of what he had submitted to Ms. Trunk, which still needed some changes to bring it into full consistency with the text, and we had discussed these changes. Only a few weeks before the meeting Ray was able to see a copy of the draft which included the Figure, without those changes.

Dave Aikens was able to negotiate with Akira-san and Manfred a strategy of extended discussion at Berlin in which we resolved all issues, and a “no” vote to move this to FDIS-2.

The discussion was a delight – truly collaborative, cooperative, and productive.

Assuming that all changes are in fact made correctly, we should be able to vote Yes on the FDIS-2 when it is available. Figure 2, however, is as yet unchanged because Manfred is not in control of the drawing – it is done at a drafting office and they use .tif format. The version I sent to Manfred and Ms. Trunk is an edited version of Manfred’s, in .xls format. Ms. Trunk has suggested that if Ray could submit a copy of the desired change before the ballot, it may be accommodated; otherwise it could be placed in the ballot comments as an editorial suggestion.

The changes remaining on Figure 2 are in part for readability and in part to bring it into consistency with the text defining the Non-circular cylindrical datum system. The remaining actual discrepancies are, in Ray’s opinion, not a show-stopper: The proposed text is clear and unambiguous, and it should be clear to any metrologist that in practice the text makes more sense, and the differences would, in the worst case, make for negligible difference in actual measurement. Nevertheless it’s worth an effort to fix.

Ray Williamson is in communication with Ms. Trunk and Manfred Thomae regarding how and where to submit an acceptable figure before ballot.

7. Status of OP1.0110-17

Dave Aikens reported on the status of the revisions to ISO 10110-17 and the discussions in Berlin. It appears that we will not be able to change the description of the CW damage threshold to W/cm^2 , but might be able to at least decouple the units from the requirement, so users could do so if they wanted to.

Donna Howland reported that, at the Boulder damage conference, there was no discussion regarding the units of damage threshold for CW lasers. But in NO technical presentations was the damage threshold described in Wcm^{-1} , as required by the ISO standard. Nevertheless, there was quite a bit of interest from both US companies and abroad to improve the way we develop the number for the damage threshold, even if we do nothing to the notation.

Ray Williamson offered that Thor Labs actually quotes damage thresholds for CW laser optics in Wcm^{-1} . (A quick check after the meeting showed that Edmund Optics and Newport Corporation, the other big suppliers of laser optics, both specify CW laser damage thresholds in W/cm^2).

We concluded that, even if we leave the notation in part 17 alone, we will want to wait until the new version comes out, probably in 2016. That gives us time for TF7 to form

up and decide the best strategy for testing as well as specification of damage thresholds.

8. Other action items review

There were no other action items to review.

9. Time and place for next meeting

Donna Howland suggested we have a short, perhaps 1 hour or less meeting at Photonics West, just to help raise awareness. Gordon Boulton pointed out that we will still have the ASC OP general meeting, where each TF will give a status report, and that will probably be exactly what Dave Aikens said at the beginning of the meeting.

After some discussion, we concluded that a quick meeting won't hurt, and may help, followed by another telecom in March or April, depending on how the ANSI review and publication efforts go.

Donna Howland moved that we meet briefly at Photonics West some time on Sunday, February 8th. Gordon Boulton seconded, and the motion carried.

10. Adjourn

At 11:37, Donna Howland moved we adjourn. Gordon Boulton seconded, and the motion carried.