

Minutes
Technical Standards Committee
Wednesday, 18 November 2009
Rosen Plaza Hotel
9700 International Drive
Orlando, Florida

Chairman: Mike Garl; James Thomas Engineering; P

Recording secretaries: Ron Bonner, Louis Bradfield, and Lori Rubinstein

Members attending:

William Conner; Bill Conner Associates LLC, representing the Amer. Society of Theatre Consultants; P
James Niesel; Arup; P
Larry Schoeneman; Designlab Chicago, Inc.; P
Steve Terry; Electronic Theatre Controls, Inc.; P
Ken Vannice; Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.; P
Mike Wood; Mike Wood Consulting LLC; P
Mitch Hefter; Entertainment Technology (Royal Philips Electronics); P
Bill Sapsis; Sapsis Rigging, Inc.; P
John Johnston; The PERA Council; P
Bill Groener; Tim Hunter Design, LLC; P
Richard Cadena; Projection, Light & Staging News (Timeless Communications Corp.); P
Louis Bradfield; representing USITT; A
Lori Rubinstein; ESTA; ex officio

Visitors:

Roger Lattin; IATSE 728
Alan M. Rowe; IATSE 728
Martin Moore
Michel Lay; Philips Strand Lighting
Harvey Sweet; ETC
David Saltiel; K&L Gates
Joseph Champelli; ZFX Inc.
Richard Nix; Entertainment Structures Group

1 Opening remarks

Mike Garl called the meeting to order at 13:00.

2 Attendance and membership

2.1 Taking attendance

A hot pink attendance sign-in sheet was circulated. Mike Garl announced that a quorum was present.

2.2 Welcome to visitors

Mike Garl thanked people for taking time out of their busy schedules to work in the Technical Standards Program.

2.3 Introductions

Those present introduced themselves.

2.4 Consensus body

The consensus body during this meeting, including those not present, was:

Name	Company or representation	Voting status
William Conner	Bill Conner Associates LLC, representing ASTC	P
Eugene Leitermann	Theatre Projects Consultants, Inc., representing ASTC	A
James Niesel	Arup	P
Larry Schoeneman	Designlab Chicago, Inc.	P
Steve Terry	Electronic Theatre Controls, Inc.	P
Edwin S. Kramer	I.A.T.S.E. Local 1	P
Mike Garl	James Thomas Engineering, Inc.	P
Ken Vannice	Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.	P
Mike Wood	Mike Wood Consulting LLC	P
Matthew Griffiths	PLASA	P
Ron Bonner	PLASA	A
Mitch Hefter	Entertainment Technology (Royal Philips Electronics)	P
Bill Sapsis	Sapsis Rigging, Inc.	P
Bill Groener	Tim Hunter Design, LLC	P
Richard Cadena	Projection, Light & Staging News (Timeless Communications Corp.)	P
Jerry Gorrell	Theatre Safety Programs, representing USITT	P
Louis Bradfield	representing USITT	A
John Johnston	The PERA Council	P
	Total votes possible	15

3 Approval of minutes from the previous meeting

Larry Schoeneman moved that the draft minutes be accepted as written. The motion was seconded and then approved with a show of hands.

4 Call for patents, to be read aloud to the assembly

The following statement was read aloud to the assembly by Mike Garl:

"ESTA intends not to publish any standard that contains protected intellectual property, unless that information can be licensed by anyone for a reasonable fee. ESTA uses a process of open patent and copyright disclosures to implement its intent. ESTA does not conduct patent or copyright searches and does not warrant that its standards contain no protected intellectual property.

"In keeping with the open disclosures policy, I ask if anyone present wishes to notify the Technical Standards Committee of the existence of a patent or copyright or other intellectual property that might protect material in a standard being developed by a working group. You need not be the holder of the patent or copyright to notify the Technical Standards Committee of its existence."

5 Anti-trust statement, to be read aloud to the assembly

The following statement was read aloud to the assembly by Mike Garl:

"The ESTA Board of Directors and the leadership of this Technical Standards Committee will reject or nullify any actions that unlawfully restrain trade. Anyone who feels that such an action is being or has been taken is requested to bring that matter to the attention of the chair immediately. Anyone who feels that actions in restraint of trade have been taken and not properly annulled is requested to notify the ESTA president immediately.

"ESTA legal counsel has informed us that violations of the anti-trust laws can have serious consequences. Individuals engaged in certain unlawful conduct can be found criminally liable. An individual convicted of a criminal violation of the Sherman Act may be fined as much as \$1,000,000 and imprisoned for up to ten years. An easy to read pamphlet describing restraint of trade issues is available from the Technical Standards Manager."

No restraint of trade issues were reported.

Mike Garl reminded everyone to read Karl's article in *Protocol* regarding anti-trust.

6 Approval of agenda

Bill Sapsis moved that the draft agenda be accepted as modified by Bill Conner to add "working group documents being published on the website 9.3." The motion was seconded and then approved with a voice vote.

7 Reminder about ESTA contact information on the website

Lori Rubinstein reminded people to check their contact information on the ESTA website and to alert ESTA staff if changes need to be made.

8 Old business and standing reports

8.1 Financial reports

8.1.1 Treasurer's report

Mike Wood reported that TSP document sales were bringing in more income than had been projected. Sponsorships are very high because we received three PLASA VAT refunds this year. We approached all the ESTA Pavilion exhibitors at PLASA to give. Some people gave the full refund, some gave a part, and some gave nothing.

On the expense side, meeting expenses will end up over budget. Staff expense and travel are slightly over budget. Legal is much higher than budget because of the Wiki issue and the new P&P. We ended up with a notional net revenue, which means the support from ESTA can be reduced by that amount.

Next year, we will receive only one VAT refund, at the most.

8.1.2 Status of contributions and pledges

There was no updated report other than the VAT refunds Mike Wood mentioned in 8.1.1.

8.1.3 Accounting of TSP documents sold [Lori Rubinstein]

Lori Rubinstein directed people to look at TSP_Publication_Sales.pdf for an accounting of the sales.

8.1.4 TSP Marketing [Lori Rubinstein]

Lori Rubinstein reported no news on the marketing project.

8.2 Old Business

8.2.1 TSM's report

8.2.1.1 Report on status of documents: ones in process, ones stable, ones needing action or of concern

See PrjctsSmmry2009-11.pdf, which is appended at the end of these minutes.

8.2.1.2 Working group documents or projects requiring action by the TSC

Possibly a motion for a second public review of BSR E1.6-1. See E1-6-1_2006-2011r2.pdf, E1-6-1_2ndRvwLtrBlit-Totl.pdf, E1-6-1_1stRvwRplyLtrBlit-Totl.pdf, and E1-6-1_1stRvwReply.pdf. These items were acted on in 8.2.2.8.

8.2.2 Optional reports by working and task group leaders on active projects (14:30)

8.2.2.1 Camera Cranes

No report.

8.2.2.2 Control Protocols

Mike Lay said CPWG members sent personalized email messages to theatre consultants to invite them to visit the Interconnectivity Pavilion at LDI. The response in general was good, and some asked for boiler plate for specifications. Maybe we should create a place on the TSP website for wording for all standards relevant to specifications, suggested Lay. Each working group could do this. Mike Garl said he will raise this at the WG Chair meeting in January. It was also suggested that Karl Ruling, the Technical Standards Manager, needs to come up with a format for all the working groups to use.

Bill Groener said that having people receive information from members of the TSP is a very good thing. This is what we should be doing for marketing, so we should bring this idea of communication to the other working groups, e.g., "Here is an example of what this standard can do for you and your end-user client."

Mitch Hefter received feedback that the email could have provided even more information.

8.2.2.3 Electrical Power

Mitch reported they have 200 plus comments back on E1.18 and they have comment resolutions and a draft document based on the current resolutions. The luminaire inspection guidance document has been distributed to the working group, but past the two-week rule so the group will have to decide whether to vote on it. The work on the pin connector standard work is ongoing, and the task group may have something for the working group in January.

Steve Terry said Karl Ruling had filed the BSR E1.18 project as a bi-national project. Terry said there needs to be some direction for the working group on what is the TSC view on US, Canadian, and bi-national standards. Is it a mandate to create bi-national standards? The standard has been turned into a mess in attempting to respond to the Canadian commenters. It is difficult to harmonize if there are two electrical codes that are not harmonized. Steve Terry requested we change the filing on E1.18 to be a US standard only, not a bi-national standard.

Mitch Hefter stressed that it shouldn't be forgotten that the application and commitment to this standard is voluntary.

Richard Cadena explained the problem the Canadians have in having to learn differing codes for the US certification. Harvey Sweet agreed and explained that there similar issues with rigging.

Steve Terry reminded everyone the question came up early in the TSP about writing international standards and the answer was no because of the difficulty involved and that we would write North American standards.

We need an action item to have an international policy, said Terry. How does the PLASA merger affect this? We might want to be able to write regional standards rather than international standards.

Ron Bonner stated that the merger won't affect standards writing in a major way. He stated he can't see the program changing because of the merger. He gave a compare-and-contrast explanation on how standards writing in the UK/EU and how it differs from the ANSI model.

Ken Vannice said he felt that standards need to be bi-national, but on this particular project we should either take the Canadian-specific material out or get the Canadian representatives to participate effectively and figure out how to make the BSR E1.18 standard truly be bi-national. More and more standards in North America are becoming tri-national standards, he said. Ultimately this should be the goal.

Mike Lay pointed out that some working groups are writing standards that are international. The Control Protocols Working Group is one.

Mike Wood asked if we could file BSR E1.18-1 as a US standard and E1.18-2 a Canadian standard. One could follow the other, or they could be worked on in parallel.

The consensus was that this topic should be on the agenda for the next meeting. We should come up with a policy statement.

8.2.2.4 Flame Resistance Task Group

No news or additional report.

8.2.2.4 Floors

No news or additional report.

8.2.2.5 Fog and Smoke

Larry Schoeneman said the general fog standard, BSR E1.23, came back with one comment, which the working group will address. They are trying to determine if they want to write a safety standard for dust effects. Mike Wood has created an initial document.

8.2.2.6 Followspot Position

No news or additional report.

8.2.2.7 Photometrics

Mike Wood reported that Photometrics will be meeting and will look at the possibility of going forward with developing a standard for LED-based luminaires.

8.2.2.8 Rigging

Bill Sapsis said that the letter ballots for BSR E1.6-1 were re-circulated, and the ballots closed last night with a few No votes. Thus, the majority had agreed to set aside addressing each of the earlier comments in the resolutions document because the draft standard had changed so much. The motion was passed to send the document to the TSC to be approved for public review, with the understanding the reasons for the objections would be treated as comments gathered in the next public review.

Bill Sapsis moved that the revised BSR E1.6-1 (document number Rig/2006-2011r2) be offered for public review. Larry Schoeneman seconded the motion.

Steve Terry asked Sapsis if there was consensus in the working group on the contents of the new draft document and whether a technical debate occurred in the working group on the contents of the draft document. Bill Sapsis said the room was pretty quiet the previous evening. His assumption is that few people have actually read the document. There has not been any terribly substantive debate on any document in the working group.

Steve Terry suggests the Rigging Working Group should have a technical debate on the draft document first. Sapsis said he doesn't know how to force people to read document.

Harvey Sweet said the document had been sent to the working group membership by the task group for review and comment before this last draft and the task group had received minimal comments. The task group members believe that because there was minimal feedback they needed to go out into the world for

more comments. They believe they will get many comments because the document presents a different way of looking at things.

Steve Terry agreed that since the likelihood of getting comments and debate in the working group is low, then we should offer it for public review.

Joe Champelli commented that everyone in the working group who cares about the document has been on the task group.

Bill Conner said that the review by the working group was two weeks over the course of USITT, which was not enough time to review the document. Also, public review comments don't allow for the kind of debate that should happen in the working group meeting.

Bill Sapsis said he had disbanded the E1.6-1 task group and intends to form a new task group based on direction received from the TSC, and that this task group will have only six or seven members.

Steve Terry commented that we have raised the issue of the diverse working group before. The fact that the work is happening in the task group is okay if the consensus body is working as well, but this is not happening.

Jim Niesel stated one possibility would be to make the full working group deal with the public review comments, or to have the new task group deal with only the simple comments and to have the major ones be dealt with by the working group.

Steve Terry commented that debate has to be triggered, and he now feels that public review is the way to do that. Otherwise nothing will happen between now and January.

Bill Sapsis made a motion to remove the pending motion from the table until he has finished his report. Steve Terry seconded the motion, and it was unanimously passed with a voice vote.

Sapsis summarized the working group's other projects and lack of discussion:

E1.6-2. The working group accepted the comment resolutions with little or no discussion and voted to send the document to the TSC.

E1.6-3. A document was brought to the working group which the working group accepted with little or no discussion.

E1.38. There is no movement on this document.

E1.39. There is no movement on this document.

A discussion was held about splitting the working group: temporary rigging versus permanent rigging, or powered versus manual. The working group was sent home with homework to come up with ideas about separating the working group.

Mike Wood said this plan would be problematic if a person had interests in both rigging working groups.

Bill Conner commented that the issue might be more a matter of how many projects there are under the working group rather than the number of people in the working group.

Jim Niesel disagreed with Conner on this point and added that he thinks the lack of discussions on the varying projects slowed the process

Bill Sapsis stated that he gave the RWG opportunity time to discuss any of the projects but the group didn't enter into any debate. Steve Terry voiced his opinion that the lack of debate was confirming his belief that the size and makeup of the Rigging Working Group remains a problem. Is it the responsibility of the TSC to make a management decision about the RWG?

Bill Conner stated that Bill Sapsis's plan of asking the RWG its thoughts on the makeup of the group should be allowed to continue until completed.

Harvey Sweet stated there is very little crossover between task group people. There is such a diversity of interests in the working group. Trying to get people to read and respond to documents that are not in their area of interest is virtually impossible.

Mitch Hefter said that he feels the TSC needs to hear a recommendation from the current leaders of the RWG. Bill Sapsis said he would like the opportunity to come up with a plan by January.

Jim Niesel pointed out that public review is the place where people can comment on documents. They don't have to sit on the TG or even the working group.

Mike Wood said that adding an additional working group will have an impact on Karl Ruling, but the RWG is very important to the program, and he feels that we can absorb any additional costs that might come from a split. We will need to be careful with scheduling meetings, or we will need to get others to assist with minutes and will need to prioritize Ruling's time. Ron Bonner said this is an area where they can bring PLASA's help to the process.

Bill Groener reminded everyone that the merger with PLASA is still subject to a vote, and so it is a *proposed* merger at this time. Also, all discussions have clearly talked about the TSC being the lead organization for the TSP, and the program will continue to be driven by this group.

Bill Sapsis reiterated that he has disbanded the task groups for E1.6-1 and E1.6-2. New task groups will be of six to seven members maximum, and with one or two exceptions no one will sit on more than one task group. Steve Terry commented that there is value in having new and fresh task groups doing comment resolutions.

Bill Sapsis made a motion to put the original public review motion for the revised BSR E1.6-1 (document number Rig/2006-2011r2) back on the table. Mitch Hefter seconded the motion. It passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Steve Terry spoke in favor of the motion for the reasons previously stated. The standard will be mired if it is not approved for public review. The motion was accepted by a supermajority on a roll call vote.

Name	Company or representation	Voting status	Yes	No	Abstain
William Conner	Bill Conner Associates LLC, representing ASTC	P			A
Eugene Leitermann	Theatre Projects Consultants, Inc., representing ASTC	A			
James Niesel	Arup	P	Y		
Larry Schoeneman	Designlab Chicago, Inc.	P	Y		
Steve Terry	Electronic Theatre Controls, Inc.	P	Y		
Edwin S. Kramer	I.A.T.S.E. Local 1	P			
Mike Garl	James Thomas Engineering, Inc.	P	Y		
Ken Vannice	Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.	P	Y		
Mike Wood	Mike Wood Consulting LLC	P	Y		

Matthew Griffiths	PLASA	P			
Ron Bonner	PLASA	A	Y		
Mitch Hefter	Entertainment Technology (Royal Philips Electronics)	P	Y		
Bill Sapsis	Sapsis Rigging, Inc.	P	Y		
Bill Groener	Tim Hunter Design, LLC	P	Y		
Richard Cadena	Projection, Light & Staging News (Timeless Communications Corp.)	P	Y		
Jerry Gorrell	Theatre Safety Programs, representing USITT	P			
Louis Bradfield	representing USITT	A	Y		
John Johnston	The PERA Council	P			A
	Total votes	15 possible	11	0	2

Bill Sapsis moved that BSR E1.6-2 (document number Rig/2005-2040r6) be offered for public review. Steve Terry seconded the motion. Sapsis said that the Rigging Working Group had accepted the motion the previous night, and that the document had not been modified from the version that the TSC has. Steve Terry asked if there was any dissent on the R6 draft or the comment resolutions. Bill Sapsis stated there was opportunity for dissent to be expressed, but there was little at the meeting.

The motion was accepted by a supermajority with a roll call vote.

Name	Company or representation	Voting status	Yes	No	Abstain
William Conner	Bill Conner Associates LLC, representing ASTC	P			A
Eugene Leitermann	Theatre Projects Consultants, Inc., representing ASTC	A			
James Niesel	Arup	P	Y		
Larry Schoeneman	Designlab Chicago, Inc.	P	Y		
Steve Terry	Electronic Theatre Controls, Inc.	P	Y		
Edwin S. Kramer	I.A.T.S.E. Local 1	P			
Mike Garl	James Thomas Engineering, Inc.	P	Y		
Ken Vannice	Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.	P	Y		
Mike Wood	Mike Wood Consulting LLC	P	Y		
Matthew Griffiths	PLASA	P			
Ron Bonner	PLASA	A	Y		
Mitch Hefter	Entertainment Technology (Royal Philips Electronics)	P	Y		
Bill Sapsis	Sapsis Rigging, Inc.	P	Y		
Bill Groener	Tim Hunter Design, LLC	P	Y		
Richard Cadena	Projection, Light & Staging News (Timeless Communications Corp.)	P	Y		
Jerry Gorrell	Theatre Safety Programs, representing USITT	P			
Louis Bradfield	representing USITT	A	Y		
John Johnston	The PERA Council	P			A
	Total votes	15 possible	11	0	2

Martin Moore stated he was confused about how someone brings up issues at a Rigging Working Group meeting and asked how he should raise questions or issues.

Steve Terry explained that anyone can initiate a discussion by making a motion, but there must be a second for the motion for a discussion to take place.

8.2.3 Review of action items from last meeting not covered above

No action.

8.3 Reports of affiliated organizations (16:00)

8.3.1 ASTC

No report.

8.3.2 PLASA

Ron Bonner had nothing to report, but he let Lori Rubinstein use his report time to explain that meetings will be taking place during LDI regarding the PLASA/ESTA merger and that the membership will be voting in the spring/summer of 2010 on the merger. Rubinstein invited comments.

8.3.3 USITT

Mitch Hefter stated that USITT has been looking at their future direction. There are proposed changes to the bylaws for a change in the governance model. Also, there is controversy about hiring an executive director. Many feel that change needs to happen to allow the Institute to grow.

8.3.4 VPLT

No report.

9 New business

9.1 Setting up the Editorial Review Committee

Mike Garl reported that Richard Cadena, Jerry Gorrell, and Charles Swift have accepted positions on the editorial review committee. Garl will go over the process with the working group chairs at their meeting in January.

9.2 Encouraging the NFPA to cite our fog standards

Larry Schoeneman said there has been conversation for over a decade about restructuring the NFPA special effects technical committee's standards portfolio. The technical committee will not have to ask for permission for new subjects if the standards are made part of one special effects code; they will simply insert a new chapter for any new subject. A straw poll has been taken of the Technical Committee and it looks like it will move forward. It was proposed that a section on fog be included and that it reference ESTA fog standards. NFPA has a group charged with seeing there is no overlap of standards. They would reference the standard or write an agreement where language from our standard would be inserted (an extract).

Schoeneman said that Karl Ruling was concerned that this would limit our sales of standards and that NFPA would be viewed as the expert, not ESTA. Schoeneman said that people on the committee are knowledgeable about ESTA standards and understand our expertise in certain areas. Schoeneman said he feels there is a great deal to be gained and little to be lost from working with the NFPA special effects committee. Schoeneman said he is conflicted because he has been told that he should be cautious in dealing with NFPA.

Steve Terry said that the incorporation of ESTA standards by reference in NFPA standards could only be a good thing. Ken Vannice said to make sure that any wording that is extracted is a clean extraction to avoid future problems.

9.3 Other new business

Bill Conner said it was brought up at the RWG that members were looking for documents from the RWG meetings, so minutes and agendas need to be posted where they can find them. Lori Rubinstein suggested that David Sam or Ryan Swearingen could be added to the distribution lists for the working groups so they will receive them and post them.

10 Other business

11 Schedule for future meetings

It was announced that the next TSC meeting is scheduled for 24 January 2010 in Westlake, Texas. The following meeting will be 30 March 2010 in Kansas City, Missouri.

12 Adjournment

Larry Schoeneman moved that the meeting adjourn. The motion was seconded. Hearing no objections, Mike Garl declared the meeting adjourned at 3:25.

TSC Membership and Contact Information as of 20 December 2009

Name	Company	Representation or parent company	Voting status
William Conner	Bill Conner Associates LLC	representing Amer. Society of Theatre Consultants	P
Eugene Leitermann	Theatre Projects Consultants, Inc.	representing Amer. Society of Theatre Consultants	A
James Niesel	Arup	Arup	P
Larry Schoeneman	Designlab Chicago, Inc.	Designlab Chicago, Inc.	P
Steve Terry	Electronic Theatre Controls	Electronic Theatre Controls, Inc.	P
Edwin S. Kramer	I.A.T.S.E. Local 1	I.A.T.S.E. Local 1	P
Mike Garl	James Thomas Engineering, Inc.	James Thomas Engineering, Inc.	P
Ken Vannice	Leviton Manufacturing	Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.	P
Mike Wood	Mike Wood Consulting LLC	Mike Wood Consulting LLC	P
David Johnson	Live Design	Penton Media	O
Marian Sandberg	Live Design	Penton Media	O
Matthew Griffiths	PLASA	PLASA	P
Ron Bonner	PLASA	PLASA	A
Mark Engel	Rosco Laboratories	Rosco Laboratories	O
Mitch Hefter	Entertainment Technology	Royal Philips Electronics	P
Bill Sapsis	Sapsis Rigging, Inc.	Sapsis Rigging, Inc.	P
John Johnston	The PERA Council	The PERA Council	P
Bill Groener	Tim Hunter Design, LLC	Tim Hunter Design, LLC	P
Richard Cadena	Projection, Light & Staging News	Timeless Communications Corp.	P
Jerry Gorrell	Theatre Safety Programs	representing USITT	P
Louis Bradfield	Louis Bradfield	representing USITT	A
Florian von Hofen	VPLT	VPLT	O

**TSM's Report on TSP Projects
For the 18 November 2009 TSC Meeting**

1 PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS WITH NO WORK NEEDED AT THIS TIME

1.1 Application Guide for ANSI E1.3 - 2001 Entertainment Technology Lighting Control Systems 0 to 10V Analog Control Specification (CPWG)

1.2 Camera crane operator's handbook (CCWG)

1.3 Introduction to Modern Atmospheric Effects, 4th edition (FSWG)

1.4 ANSI E1.1 - 2006, wire rope ladders (RWG)

1.5 ANSI E1.2 - 2006, aluminum towers and trusses (RWG)

1.6 ANSI E1.3 - 2001 (R2006), 0-10V analog control specification (CPWG)

1.7 ANSI E1.4 - 2009, manual rigging systems (RWG)

1.8 ANSI E1.5 – 2009, Entertainment Technology - Theatrical Fog Made With Aqueous Solutions Of Di-And Trihydric Alcohols

1.9 ANSI E1.9 - 2007, reporting photometric data revision (PHWG)

1.10 ANSI E1.11 - 2008, DMX512-A revision (CPWG)

1.11 ANSI E1.14 - 2001 (R2007), recommendations for inclusions in fog equipment manuals (FSWG)

1.12 ANSI E1.15 - 2006, boom & base assemblies (RWG)

1.13 ANSI E1.16 - 2002 (R2006), configuration standard for metal halide ballast power cables (EPWG)

1.14 ANSI E1.19 - 2009, recommended practice for use of Class A GFCIs (EPWG)

Keith Woods withdrew his appeal and changed his vote to accept the document, but he says he still has things he wants changed. However, he hasn't attended the last two working group meetings, and the EPWG hasn't been disposed to undertake revising the document without Woods showing up at a meeting and making a motion to that effect.

1.15 ANSI E1.21 - 2006, portable roof systems (RWG)

1.16 ANSI E1.22 – 2009, fire safety curtain systems (RWG)

1.17 ANSI E1.25 - 2006, flat-wall photometry basic conditions (PHWG)

1.18 ANSI E1.26 - 2006, floor energy absorption (FLWG)

1.19 ANSI E1.27-1 - 2006, portable DMX512 cabling (CPWG)

1.20 ANSI E1.27-2 – 2009, Entertainment Technology -- Recommended Practice for Permanently Installed Control Cables for Use with ANSI E1.11 (DMX512-A) and USITT DMX512/1990 Products (CPWG)

1.21 ANSI E1.29 – 2009, Product Safety Standard for Theatrical Fog Generators that Create Aerosols of Water, Aqueous Solutions of Glycol or Glycerin, or Aerosols of Highly Refined Alkane Mineral Oil (FSWG)

1.22 ANSI E1.30-3 – 2009, EPI 25, Time Reference in ACN Systems Using SNTP and NTP (CPWG)

1.23 ANSI E1.30-7 – 2009, EPI 29, Allocation of Internet Protocol Version 4 Addresses to ACN Hosts (CPWG)

1.24 ANSI E1.30-10 – 2009, EPI 32 Identification of Draft Device Description Language Modules (CPWG)

1.25 ANSI E1.31 – 2009, Lightweight streaming protocol for transport of DMX512 using ACN (CPWG)

1.26 ANSI E1.34 - 2009, Entertainment Technology-Measuring and Specifying the Slipperiness of Floors Used in Live Performance Venues (FLWG)

1.27 ANSI E1.35 - 2007, lens quality measurements for pattern projecting luminaires intended for entertainment use (PHWG)

1.28 ANSI E1.36 - 2007, model procedure for permitting the use of tungsten-halogen incandescent lamps and stage and studio luminaires in vendor exhibit booths in convention and trade show exhibition halls (PHWG)

2 PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS WITH WORK NEEDED BUT NOT YET STARTED

2.1 Recommended Practice for Ethernet Cabling Systems in Entertainment Lighting Applications and The Supplement to the Recommended Practice for Ethernet Cabling Systems in Entertainment Lighting Applications (CPWG)

These two documents are listed together because we now sell them bundled. The first is old and covers obsolete systems. The supplement builds on the first, so we haven't gotten rid of the first. The supplement also is old, and the working group has discussed revising it, but it's not obsolete yet for what it covers, which is 100 megabit/second systems.

2.2 ANSI E1.8 - 2005, speaker enclosures for overhead suspension (RWG)

There has been some talk in the Rigging Working Group about some speaker manufacturers wishing to join to work on a revision of ANSI E1.8-2005, speaker enclosures for rigging standard. It is getting close to renewal, revision, or withdrawal time, and the original proponent for the project is no longer in the industry. No one active in the RWG now seems to feel he has a material interest in speaker enclosure structural integrity.

3 ACTIVE PROJECTS AND PROJECTS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Things meriting possible action by the TSC at this meeting are highlighted in green.

3.1 Camera Cranes Working Group

3.1.1 BSR E1.12, camera crane standard

This project is moving slowly. I can report no measurable progress.

3.1.2 Other camera cranes working group projects: none

3.2 Control Protocols Working Group

3.2.1 BSR E1.17, ACN

We've started a project to correct errors in the existing ANSI E1.17. A motion was made to offer some revised parts of the standard for public review at the July CPWG meeting, but the documents were not presented there. A few days after the meeting I received some documents, but they were a dog's breakfast. I edited them (It took days!) and sent the source files back to Dan Antonuk and Philip Nye with notes about the problems I saw, and sent PDFs to the CPWG, also with a cover note about the problems. Dan and Philip are trying to straighten them out. The main problems are that the interlinked documents reference the the existing editions of each other, so as we revise these documents and accept them as the new version of ANSI E1.17, they will require compliance with the obsolete versions.

3.2.2 BSR E1.20, a revision of ANSI E1.20-2006, Remote Device Management

The revised document was offered for public review through 19 October 2009. It received one response, a "No with reasons," and the reasons being that we'd used the symbol for "Seimens" for "seconds," "S" when we should have used "s." The E1.20 task group leader in an email to me suggested that the commenter should get a life, but I changed the draft E1.20 document so that seconds are shown as "s" rather than "S" and sent it to the CPWG for consideration. If changing "S" to "s" is all that needs to be done, this can be DONE!

3.2.3 BSR E1.30-1, EPI 23 Device Identification Subdevice

Review comments need to be resolved.

3.2.4 BSR E1.30-2, EPI 24 Internet Protocol Properties Subdevice

It received one comment in the first public review, which ran from 11 July through 25 August 2008. The comment needs to be resolved.

3.2.5 BSR E1.30-4, EPI 26, (DDL) Extensions for DMX512 and E1.31 Devices

Review comments need to be resolved.

3.2.6 BSR E1.30-5, EPI 27 Operation of SDT on Wireless Networks

It received one comment in the first public review, which ran from 11 July through 25 August 2008. The comment needs to be resolved.

3.2.7 BSR E1.30-6, EPI 28 Independent Device Location Properties

It received one comment in the first public review, which ran from 11 July through 25 August 2008. The comment needs to be resolved.

3.2.8 BSR E1.30-8, EPI 30 Time Code Properties

It received one comment in the first public review, which ran from 11 July through 25 August 2008. The comment needs to be resolved.

3.2.9 BSR E1.30-9, EPI 31 MIDI System Exclusive Properties

It received one comment in the first public review, which ran from 11 July through 25 August 2008. The comment needs to be resolved.

3.2.10 BSR E1.33-200x, Extensions to E1.31 for Transport of ANSI E1.20 (RDM)

Work needs to continue on a first draft. At the July meeting Scott Blair predicted a "real document" by the November meeting, but it hasn't been submitted yet.

3.2.11 BSR E1.37-200x—Additional Message Sets for ANSI E1.20, Remote Device Management

Peter Willis and Scott Blair said that the task group is making progress on the first draft. The message sets are largely focused on dimmer-specific commands. Blair said he expects to offer a motion for a public review at the November CPWG meeting. The document hasn't been submitted yet.

3.2.12 Possible New Project: Control desk task light connector standard

There was discussion at the July CPWG meeting about a standard for the task light connectors on lighting and sound control desks. The consensus seemed to be that some research needs to be done to see if there is a connector type that is used more often than others, so we could codify what is almost already a standard, if this is a project the TSC would want to add to the CPWG's agenda.

3.3 Electrical Power Working Group

3.3.1 BSR E1.18, Recommended practice for selection, installation, and use of portable feeder cable

The E1.18 project is split into two parts: an E1.18-1 covering conventional star-topology distribution systems and an E1.18-2 part covering ring systems. The second has been put on hold indefinitely. This part, E1.18-1, was in public review from 9 January through 23 February 2009. A set of possible comment resolutions has been submitted to the working group by a task group headed by Jerry Gorrell.

3.3.2 BSR E1.24, pin connector intermatability standard

Work has started to revise ANSI E1.24 – 2006 and to make it more palatable to the UL 498 standards panel. This includes stripping out the informative, non-mandatory material and reformatting it to look like a NEMA connector configuration standard and will be submitted to ANSI for acceptance as an ANS.

3.3.3 BSR E1.32, luminaire maintenance guidance

The document was offered for public review which ended on 25 August 2008. The EPWG had a set of comment resolutions and a revised draft standard to consider at the March 2009 meeting, but the discussion at the meeting was mostly about what the draft standard should cover, a topic over which there was some disagreement. A revised scope statement was drafted and voted on by letter ballot after the meeting, and it was accepted by a majority of the working group's voters. Work on revising the document continues with this new scope.

3.4 Fire Resistance Task Group

The task group members had been meeting regularly to refine the problem, to break it down into specific issues, and to then write some document or documents to address the issues, but work has stalled. They settled on two projects: one to draft a fire resistance information document along the lines of the Introduction to Modern atmospheric effects, and the second project—one of more immediate concern—to work with the State of California Flame Retardant Committee on its revision of the California flame retardant regulations. Tom Andrews had put himself forward as the main author of the information document, but he has found himself putting his efforts into the California issue and his business, Turning Star.

3.5 Floors Working Group

No active projects

3.6 Followspot Position Working Group

3.6.1 BSR E1.28, followspot position planning guidance document

The document was offered for public review from 10 April through 25 May 2008, and received 35 comments. The working group drafted resolutions to them and I sent them back to the commenters with a deadline of October 30 for objections to be filed. No one replied. The document is now posted for its third public review through December 28. So far one person has commented—a theatre consultant urging us to put in "shall" clauses to

ensure that followspot positions favor right-handed operators rather than left-handed operators and that egress paths are marked with glow-in-the-dark tape for safety during power failures.

3.6.2 Other Followspot Position Working Group projects: none

3.7 Fog & Smoke Working Group

3.7.1 BSR E1.23, general fog effect planning standard

The revised standard is in public review through November 9. One comment suggesting changes has been received as of November 3.

3.7.2 Possible dust effect standard

A possible dust atmospheric effect standard was discussed at the last Fog & Smoke Working Group meeting. Mike Wood was assigned the task of doing some research on what standards or guidance documents exist. He didn't find much, but I think he found enough that we could codify a best practices document for planning dust effects, although not a standard for exactly what would be okay for a dust effect along the lines of ANSI E1.5. This project, if undertaken, might not change the industry as much as our work on fog, but it would help our reputation as the organization that works for standards that benefit all of us: performers, as well as technicians, manufacturers, and vendors. It might also curb some of the most egregious practices, which will help protect people in the short term and avoid complications to doing business in the long term. The Las Vegas Convention Center's ban on tungsten-halogen lamps is based partially on the story of a fire at another convention center that was started by a tungsten-halogen lamp. Such a fire did happen and the source of ignition is indeed believed to have been a tungsten-halogen lamp, but the fire was caused by the use of organic dust for a mine cave-in effect for a movie that was being shot at the convention center. The mixture of flammable dust and air could have been touched off by anything but it happened to be a tungsten-halogen lamp. See <http://www.azstarnet.com/sn/related/52959>. We cannot eliminate stupidity, but standards can be used to discourage it and to clearly label it "stupidity" when it is practiced despite our best efforts.

3.8 Photometrics Working Group

The Photometrics Working Group is considering a project to write a standard to describe the output of LED-based luminaires. There is really no good way at this time to measure their output in color and to compare their efficacy with that of conventional white-light luminaires.

3.9 Rigging Working Group

3.9.1 BSR E1.6-1, powered winch hoist systems

The last public review ran from 10 November 2006 through the end of the day 25 December 2006. The task group developed a set of comment resolutions and a revised draft document, which were described to the working group at the July2009 meeting but were not available then. Motions were made to approve the resolutions and to offer the revised document for public review. I issued letter ballots, and the majority of the votes on both motions were Yes, but there were No votes, and those have triggered a recirculation that times-out at the working group meeting, which is scheduled for the evening before the TSC meeting. Therefore, there might be a motion for the TSC to approve the second public review of BSR E1.6-1. Moving E1.6-1 forward to public review at this time and sending the proposed resolutions back to the commenters would ultimately not be the fastest way forward with this draft standard, I think.

First of all, one of the No voters on the resolutions acceptance motion is one of the previous review commenters, so I would have to send back to him the resolutions he has voted against and ask him if he accepts them. Unless he changes his mind, he won't, so then I'll have to forward his rejection back to the working group for reconsideration. Now, sometimes you just can't make people happy, but I think he has point. He offered suggested changes to the scope statement, and the response was that E1.6-1 has been changed so much that there is no way to respond to the specific comments. However, as much changed as it is, it still has a scope

statement. I can't defend this resolution to auditors as a good faith attempt to resolve objections, it just looks like we're brushing off objections. So, the working group will sooner or later have to come up with specific resolutions to his comments. Later is later.

Secondly, while some of the No-vote reasons against offering the revised standard for public review are ultimately unresolvable (We have a letter to the editor of TD&T about a the ignorance of people at USITT conference session as a No vote reason), some are reasonable and will come back in the public review. Most of the public review comments with this working group come from within the working group or from the staff of the companies that have representation on the working group. A public review cycle takes about a year; it needn't take that long to work things out in the working group. I think sending this off to public review right now without resolving working group objections will ultimately slow the document and certainly result in more busy-work for me, but I leave it to the TSC to decide what to do.

3.9.2 BSR E1.6-2, powered serially produced chain hoist systems

The document was offered for its fifth public review from 10 April through the end of the day 25 May 2008 and gathered over 80 comments. A set of draft comment resolutions and a revised draft standard have been sent to the working group. I don't have a sense of what the working group will do with these documents.

3.9.3 BSR E1.6-3, safe use of serial manufactured electric chain hoists in the entertainment industry

The working group has voted by letter ballot to offer the first draft for public review, with most voting in favor, but there were negative votes, which increased during the recirculation. The final vote was enough to move the document forward to public review, but the task group took it back and has worked to resolve the objections. A new version of the document has been forwarded to the working group for consideration at this LDI meeting.

3.9.4 BSR E1.6-4, Control of Serially Manufactured Electric Chain Hoists in the Entertainment Industry

This project was created at the Summer 2007 RWG meeting as a split-off from the BSR E1.6-3 project. The task group is still working on a first draft.

3.9.5 BSR E1.38 - 20xx, Temporary Ground-Supported Structures Used to Support Equipment in the Production of Outdoor Entertainment Events, Excluding Stage Roofs

This is a new project to establish basic requirements for the structural design, manufacture, use, and maintenance of temporary ground-supported structures used to support equipment, such as video walls, followspot towers, and audio mixing platforms. Structures for the public are outside the scope. The working group hasn't seen a draft yet, but the project has only existed since the July 2009 meeting.

3.9.6 BSR E1.39 - 20xx, Entertainment Technology – Recommendations for the Use of Fall Protection on Temporary Suspended and Ground-Supported Structures

This is another new project, intended to establish minimum requirements for the selection and use of personal fall arrest systems on temporary structures in the entertainment industry. It also establishes minimum requirements for manufacturers and owners of these structures being used as work platforms. The working group hasn't seen a draft yet, but the project was just voted into existence at the July 2009 meeting.

Respectfully submitted,



Karl G. Ruling
Technical Standards Manager