

Draft
**Minutes of the Annual Meeting of
the TAG/ISO/TC172 — Optics and optical instruments
January 26, 2010, San Francisco, California
Hilton San Francisco Hotel Union Square, Golden Gate 6
333 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, California 94102**

	Attendees: (13)	Representing:	Absent Leaders (3)
Tag Leader:	Lee Shuett	Nikon Instruments, Inc.	
Admin:	Gene Kohlenberg Michele Stolberg	OEOSC OEOSC	
SC1:	David Aikens Marla Dowell Marla Dowell Allen Krisiloff Peter Takacs	Leader SC1, Savvy Optics Corp. IEEE/LEOS NIST Triptar Lens Co., Inc. Brookhaven National Lab	
SC3:	Gordon Boulton,	Leader SC 3, JDSU (Convener ISO/TC 172/SC 3/ WG 2)	
SC4:		Leader SC4, Leupold & Stevens, Inc	Fritz Kaufman.
SC5:	Lee Shuett	Leader SC5, Nikon Instruments, Inc.	
SC6:		Leader SC6,	
SC7:	Charles Campbell Amber Robinson Ken Wood The following by phone: Sharon Miller Robert Landry Carol Herman	Leader SC7, Consultant Z80, Vision Council Z80, Vision Council FDA Formerly with the FDA Director of Standards Office, FDA	
SC9:		Leader SC9, Convener ISO/TC 172/SC 9/WG 4	
	Lincoln Endelman	SPIE (Endelman Enterprises)	
General TAG:			
Observers	Donna Howland	Northrop Grumman Aerospace Systems	

ANSI/OEOSC TAG to ISO/TC 172 Minutes

1. Welcome and Introductions

L. Shuett opened the meeting at 0832 H. Each person introduced his or her self.

2. Adoption of Agenda

C. Campbell moved that the draft agenda be adopted; G. Boulton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes of January 27, 2009 TAG Meeting

D. Aikens moved that the corrected draft minutes of the previous Annual Meeting be approved; C. Campbell seconded the motion, which carried.

4. Report of OEOSC

A. Krisiloff, OEOSC Chairperson, said that OEOSC has a small positive cash balance. The Executive Director said that he wants to quit when a new person can be selected.

5. Report on ASC OP Status

TF 4 will be releasing US versions of ISO 10110.

6. Review of TC 172 Work by Subcommittee

- **SC 1 — Fundamental Standards, David Aikens**

The printed report was available online as a part of **ISO/TC 172 2009 Annual Report of the TAG**. SC 1 is having difficulty in getting technical support. The US TAG has no WG 4 participants. The US is opposed to the concept that ISO should own copyright to definitions and symbols. M. Dowell suggested that a letter from the TAG should be sent to ANSI specifying what should be done concerning the proposal. The group attending this meeting all agreed that the concept of the database is troublesome. The TAG Leader asked D. Aikens to draft a letter for the TAG to send to ANSI. D. Aikens asked if K. Wood would solicit a copy of the letter from the French delegate for the TAG to reference while writing its own document. The TAG needs to appoint a US representative to participate on the database Working Group.

The TAG has resolved to elevate its concerns about copyright ownership and control of the ISO Concept Database, and urges that ANSI request ISO to suspend work on the database until the commercial issues are resolved.

The TAG Leader asked each SC Leader if they would support the project if the issues are addressed concerning the database.

G. Boulton said that action items were assigned at the Berlin meeting where each SC will be asked to review lists of definitions in the database for each SC. SC 1 and SC 3 are the first to be approached. After discussion, the TAG directed that the US SC 1 and SC 3 experts participate technically in the definition review, but the US will continue to oppose the project until US concerns are addressed.

A. Krisiloff agreed to be a liaison to TC 172 level for concept database issues, until a person is identified to attend the Geneva meeting. D. Aikens moved that A. Krisiloff be appointed the liaison to TC 172 concerning concept database issues. M. Dowell seconded the motion, which carried.

- **SC 3 — Optical Materials and Components, G. Boulton, JDSU Corporation**

The printed report was available online as a part of **ISO/TC 172 2009 Annual Report of the TAG**. G. Boulton summarized his report.

- **SC 4 — Telescopic Systems, for Fritz Kaufman, Leupold & Stevens, Inc**

- **SC 5 — Microscopes and Endoscopes, L. Shuett, Olympus America, Inc**

The printed report was available online as a part of **ISO/TC 172 2009 Annual Report of the TAG**. L. Shuett summarized his report.

ANSI/OEOSC TAG to ISO/TC 172 Minutes

- **SC 6 — Surveying Instruments, no representative**

- **SC 7 — Ophthalmic Optics and Instruments, C. Campbell,**

The report was available online as a part of **ISO/TC 172 2009 Annual Report of the TAG**. C. Campbell summarized his report.

- **SC 9 — Electro-Optical Systems (and Lasers), T. Lieb**

The Leaders report is trapped in his computer. He hoped to have the computer repaired quickly so that he can submit the report.

The TAG recessed at 10:14 a.m. and reconvened at 10:30 a.m.

7. Selection of New TAG Leader

G. Boulton moved that L. Shuett be confirmed as the TAG Leader for 2010. M. Dowell seconded, which carried unanimously.

8. Old Business

9. New Business

ANSI/OEOSC TAG to TC/172 Balloting Procedures

L. Shuett said that the Secretary had posted the **ANSI/OEOSC TAG to ISO TC/172 Balloting Procedures** on the optstd web site. He noted that they were consistent with the **ANSI Model Procedures**.

A. Krisloff suggested that the reason for placing this topic on the agenda should be explained. S. Miller said that the FDA had filed a formal complaint because it felt that proper procedures had not been followed regarding a particular new work item proposal that was up for balloting. Although several US experts had supplied supporting comments, the US position was deemed to be negative with no mention of the positive supporting comments. The FDA felt that there should have been more transparency regarding this decision.

A second ballot issue involved the periodic reaffirmation of a standard. R. Landry stated that he voted within the time limit to revise the standard because it is defective. He was told that a decision had already been made at the ANSI Z80 meeting to reaffirm the standard.

C. Campbell replied that, where possible, ISO items up for ballot are handled at US national meetings. These are open meetings. He noted that if persons do not attend the meetings, their opinions cannot be properly heard. R. Landry said that he did submit his opinion to W. Brown before the deadline.

C. Campbell said that the original complaint was with regard to the proposed formation of a new Working Group. There was no official ballot, simply a request for opinions concerning the formation of the Working Group. The formation of a Working Group is an administrative matter, which is handled by the Secretariat. R. Landry said that the information appearing on the optstd website appeared to be a ballot. L. Shuett confirmed that the formation of a Working Group is not subject to a ballot. However, he wants everyone to understand that OEOSC wants transparency. So each TAG/SC needs to make sure that its roster is up to date. If only a few members will be attending a meeting in person, then either phone conferencing should be offered, or a ballot should be distributed. D. Aikens noted that ASC OP and OEOSC had difficulty in maintaining a quorum at meetings before they starting offering conference-call capability.

C. Campbell said that there can be 30 to 40 persons attending a Z80 meeting. L. Shuett asked if they are all members. C. Campbell replied that there are several industry groups represented on the TAG. Members of those groups attend. There are also individuals who have specific knowledge needed to make decisions. He asked if an individuals vote should have the same weight as the vote from an industry group. L. Shuett said that ANSI regards the two votes to be equal.

S. Miller asked if the proposed procedure posted on the web was going to be put up for vote? L. Shuett said that the mentioned document explains how OEOSC proposes to comply with ANSI's procedures. C. Campbell said that there is a timing issue that needs to be addressed. He has asked A. Robinson to forward comments that she has received to the Working Group Leaders as soon as she gets them, rather than waiting until they have all been collected. That way the Working Group Leader has more time to evaluate the comments.

ANSI/OEOSC TAG to ISO/TC 172 Minutes

R. Landry said that the issue is transparency. If all ballots are posted on the web, then everyone can see all comments.

D. Aikens said that there are only about two weeks allotted for him to take the ballot responses and propose the US position. Since he is a volunteer, he does not have a lot of free time to do this task. He asked if there could be some administrative help. K. Woods said that the Vision Council has volunteered A. Robinson to process the ballots for the TAG/SC 7.

M. Stolberg said that as of January 1, 2010 the results of all returned ballots have been posted in a spreadsheet on the optstd.org website. All experts for the particular group that is balloting are then notified by e-mail that the results are available. If there is a concern, then that person should contact the Working Group Leader. R. Landry asked how any differences that occur on those ballots resolved. D. Aikens said that the current two-week allotment of time is not enough to resolve issues. C. Campbell said that in the TAG/SC 7 the Working Group Leaders are familiar with the issues and have a good idea where conflicts may arise. That gives them some added time to deal with problems.

D. Aikens proposed that the return time to the SC Leader be expanded to one month by reducing the time allotted for experts to return their ballots so that there is more time to form the unified position.

M. Stolberg said that by the time an FDIS ballot wends its way from ISO through ANSI to her, there may only be two weeks left for the experts to review the document. D. Aikens replied that the expert should already be familiar with the document, so that s/he only has to look for the last agreed upon changes, before submitting a ballot. C. Campbell said that the expert should check for editorial errors in an FDIS.

M. Stolberg said that she and A. Robinson are now sending reminders to the experts that their responses are due.

There was a discussion concerning who is on the TAG and who is an expert participating on ISO Work Groups. The persons working on ISO Work Groups appear on the ISO global roster and access Work Group drafts by going to the ISO website. The TAG members are responsible for establishing the US position on ISO documents that have been drafted by the ISO Work Groups. A person can be a member of both the TAG and an ISO Work Group.

10. Objectives of TAG for 2010

- **Encourage more participation in the TAG.** L. Shuett said that the procedures allow the TAG to review participation, and if someone is not active, that person can be reclassified as an observer, so that s/he will not affect the quorum. C. Campbell said that ANSI should be contacted about their participation requirements. Some of the ANSI procedures are not the most efficient way of conducting business. L. Shuett said that this is the classical Jeffersonian as opposed to Hamiltonian view of government.
- **Encourage participants to give the TAG feedback concerning its performance.**
- **Get clarity from ISO concerning the ownership and control of the database project.** A. Krisiloff told S. Miller that he will contact her in a few weeks to discuss this issue.

11. Time and Place for Next TAG Meeting

C. Campbell moved that the TAG meet in San Francisco, CA during SPIE's Photonics West in 2011. D. Aikens seconded the motion, which passed.

12. Adjournment

Since no other business came before the committee, D. Aikens moved that the meeting be adjourned; M. Dowell seconded; the motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 1135 H.