

Draft Minutes
ASC OP/TF 2 Surface Imperfections
Sunday January 29, 11:00-12:30 PST
F2F Sutter Rm, 5th FL
Intercontinental Hotel, San Francisco, CA

or via Zoom:

<https://www.zoomgov.com/j/1600910899>

Meeting ID: 160 091 0899

Passcode: 829796

1. Introductions and assign note taker
Meeting started at 11 AM PST
Introductions were made with 8 attendees in person and 5 online
Adam Phenis was appointed note taker
2. Adoption of the Draft Agenda
Agenda was adopted as-is
Motion: Adam Phenis
Second: Patrick Augino
No opposed or abstentions
3. Approval of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting
Minutes from previous meeting were reviewed and approved
Motion: Patrick Augino
Second: Eric Herman
No opposed or abstentions
4. Discussion of potential revision of OP1.002
 - Edited version was displayed
 - Motivation behind revision is that the area imperfection specification was removed in the 2017 version. Upon getting into the details of the revision, language was cleaned up and a couple of corrections/clarifications/notes were added.
 - Eric Herman has comments to go through and notes were directly made in the document displayed
 - Discussion about clear aperture vs effective aperture vs equivalent aperture
 - It was noted that there is ambiguity in ISO about these
 - Clarification was made to say that Sleeks are included in the dimensional system but not in the visibility system unless specifically called out on the drawing.
 - Note for 9211-1, add definition for sleeks
 - Brian Monacelli will also send Dave Aikens specific feedback on wording to help with clarifications and areas where wording is confusing
 - 2.1.1.5.4 – Add clarification about “not visible” not actually being visible based on the specific lighting
 - Discussion about combining tables 1 and 2 and discussion when negligible
 - 2.1.3.4.1 delete “is” after “smaller
 - 2.1.4.2.2 – How are long scratches accounted for? In ISO, have L, how is that accounted for here? Can add note that says “In ISO system, long scratches are specified using the L

notation and short scratches are used as ...” Basically, add note that this is where you find the notation. See note in edited document that says “long scratches dimensional vs DIN”

- 2.1.5.2.2 – Equivalent used. Discussion about how this equation is defined
- Define system for CA and then what “equivalent” is
- 2.1.5.2.1 – Missing “)” at end
- 2.1.5.3 – What about smaller than 6.35 mm? Add “or smaller” at end
- 2.1.5.5.1 – add note to clarify that for parts less than 20 mm, accumulation rule applies
 - Dig concentration does not apply for parts ≤ 20 mm
- 2.3 – Add haze, grey and discoloration to agree with 9211-1
- 3.1.3 – add “typically cylindrical” and other common terms as to be provided by Brian Monacelli. These may go into the definition section as opposed to 3.1.3
- 3.1.5 - Note that “bevel” is the part of the leg where as a chamfer is the face width
- 5.3.3 – In 9211 don’t actually say to evaluate – delete last sentence
- 7.5.1 – Unit check. For example, have watts in lowercase.
 - Add note to show where illuminances come from.
 - What about modern illumination sources? Add note
- In beginning, maybe add note about the rational of using a visibility approach vs a measured approach. Maybe in 2.1.1
- Dave Aikens to make a new draft and circulate to committee to review for comment by middle of March. Motion by Donna Howland, Second by Eric Herman, no opposed, no abstentions

5. Additional items not on the agenda

Discussion about update in the world of surface imperfections and other standards.

- For US
 - Op1.002 for surface imperfections are being worked on as well as a US laser damage inspection standard.
 - In process of adopting ISO 10110 in the US
- For international standards. At international level:
 - New revision of 10110-11 with some changes
 - 10110-6 (centering) being revised primarily to correct description of datums
 - 10110-5 and 14999-4 for surface form specification and measurement
 - 9211-1 to -3 are in revision
 - Adding some standards for environmental standards to move closer to MIL
 - 10110-7 recently voted to revise and then put on hold due to not enough people available

6. Action items review

7. Next meeting: Suggestions

- a. Teleconference (Zoom) – May 10 at 4 PM Eastern to review comments received from circulation
- b. Optifab 2023 – with ballot circulated in July or August. Pat Augino to work with SPIE on date for room
- c. ~~Photonics West 2024?~~

8. Adjourn

Motion by Eric Herman

Second Donna Howland

