

Template for comments and project leader observations

Date:	Document:	Project:
-------	-----------	----------

Reviewer ¹	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Project leader observations
PM	Fwd			ed	The term “centring” is used instead of “centering”; is this spelling common to the ISO standards?	None	“centring” is the accepted terminology in ISO standards. No change.
PM	3		Notes 6-11	ed	Since Note 5 says that OP1.004:20XX is to be used in place of ISO 14999-4, shouldn't notes 6-11 really be on OP1.004 rather than here? It seems a little weird reading a pile of notes that tell you to replace something in a different document, after already stating that document is to be used.	None required, I just wonder whether Notes 6 -11 are redundant with what is in OP 1.004 If the committee deemed that these extra notes were need for clarity here I don't object to that.	The extra notes serve as clarification as the terminology in OP1.004 referred to in Notes 6-11 is different than the terminology in ISO 14999-4. These terms are called out directly in Section 3 Terms and definitions. No change.
PM	5.3		After “The quantity E”	te	For smaller evaluation apertures, (all phi) is appended, which is all well and good. But no guidance is given regarding how to indicate the sampling of these apertures. How many different evaluation zones must there be? (e.g. 5; one in the center and 4 off at each compass point some distance off axis)	Perhaps a note, or informative example in the appendix, giving some guidance oh how to specify the sampling for evaluation apertures that are smaller than the clear aperture.	Added the following statement to 5.3, “When the evaluation aperture is smaller than the clear aperture, one may use five evaluation zones, e.g., one in the center and four equidistant zones from the center point as a sampling guideline.”
PM	Annex A			ge	The equations do not display properly; probably some font conversion issue.	Fix the display – then double check the equation.	The equations display correctly in my version. I'll check with Dave.
	Annex A			ed	Given that 547 nm wavelength was largely replaced in the rest of the standard, shouldn't (usually 546.07) be replaced with 632.8?	Use 632.8 rather than 546.07 nm.	Changed wavelength to 632.8 nm.

¹ Enter the reviewer's initials

² **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial