SAE International SAE Standards Works

Home » AMS B Finishes Processes and Fluids Committee »

GAB14AA - General Agreement Ballot on Adhesion Testing

Overview	Summary
Type: 28 Day Issued Start Date: Jul 24, 2014 Due: Aug 20, 2014 Sponsor: Kevin Groeneveld View Final Draft **To:** AMS B Finishes Processes and Fluids Committee	Please respond to the 28 Day ballot below. Respondents to this ballot are acting as individuals and are not representing any group or organization. A statement explaining the basis for disapproval must accompany all negative ballots. Ballots close at 12:00 midnight (9:00pm Pacific) on due date.

Ballot Results

Approve	Disapprove	Waive	Participation
16	3	6	25/31
51.6%	9.7%	19.4%	80.6%

Ballot Responses View Summary of Replies

Members List View Voting Members

Chet Blum	AMSB	08/20/2014 20:36 PM	WAIVE
Fred Cone	AMSB	08/20/2014 16:46 PM	DISAPPROVE

Technical Comment on Section/Paragraph: 4.2.1 et al

Add Reply

Retain adhesion as an acceptance test.

Allison Warren	AMSB	08/19/2014 17:59 PM	

Technical Comment on Section/Paragraph: All

Add Reply

Disapprove

Testing on a per lot basis should capture variation in the actual processing -- intended or not. This proposed change creates risk for escape of parts that may not meet adhesion requirements.

Shlomo Ramati	AMSB	08/19/2014 00:44 AM	DISAPPROVE

Technical Comment on Section/Paragraph: all

Add Reply

I agree wholeheartedly with Rankin, a few years ago we dealt with flaking chrome plating on a NLG which came from an airline, the problem was definitely poor surface preparation, but the consequence could have been disastrous

Daniel Graves	AMSB	08/18/2014 13:29 PM	WAIVE
James Oshea	AMSB	08/18/2014 09:59 AM	APPROVE

Informational Comment on Section/Paragraph: 4.3.2

Add Reply

Please add the frequency of testing for the periodic test. I believe that was to be **daily**.

Tim Boysen	AMSB	08/15/2014 19:09 PM	WAIVE
Kevin Rankin	AMSB	08/15/2014 16:59 PM	DISAPPROVE

Technical Comment on Section/Paragraph: All

Add Reply

I strongly disapprove of this change and agree with Mr. Himmelblau's comments. UTAS has extensive experience with plating processes where root cause of poor adhesion was traced back to cleaning or surface preparation. These are operator-dependent processes to varying degrees which are currently assessed by the per-lot adhesion test, but would not be captured under the proposed change. The change also does not address how parts processed between a failed adhesion test and the last acceptable adhesion test should be dispositioned, but this is beside the point. As a user of these specifications, my opinion is that the cost of per-lot adhesion testing is well worth the level of quality control it provides. I view this change as a downgrade and cannot support.

Vishwanath Sahay	AMSB	08/15/2014 14:03 PM	WAIVE
Jacque Bader	AMSB	08/14/2014 17:06 PM	APPROVE
Craig Willan	AMSB	08/13/2014 08:54 AM	APPROVE
Gregory Haataja	AMSB	08/13/2014 08:46 AM	APPROVE
Colister Dickson	AMSB	08/12/2014 15:55 PM	APPROVE
Ray Kremer	AMSB	08/12/2014 10:05 AM	APPROVE
Roger Sines	AMSB	08/11/2014 11:44 AM	APPROVE
Robert Steffen	AMSB	08/11/2014 11:18 AM	APPROVE
Timothy Freehling	AMSB	08/11/2014 08:43 AM	APPROVE
Rebecca Wyss	AMSB	08/08/2014 10:59 AM	WAIVE
Hitoshi Takeda	AMSB	08/04/2014 23:42 PM	

Technical Comment on Section/Paragraph: all

Add Reply

Waive

Ken Sabo	AMSB	08/03/2014 21:33 PM	APPROVE
Stan Biernat	AMSB	07/30/2014 10:01 AM	APPROVE
Cheryl Lewis	AMSB	07/26/2014 10:53 AM	

Informational Comment on Section/Paragraph: 4.3.2

Add Reply

Approve

Michael Niedzinski	AMSB	07/25/2014 12:35 PM	WAIVE
Bohdan Hasiuk	AMSB	07/25/2014 08:12 AM	APPROVE
Charles Himmelblau	AMSB	07/24/2014 23:49 PM	

Technical Comment on Section/Paragraph: 4.2

Add Reply

I cannot support this change. Adhesion testing is more than a simple demonstration that some chemical process is in control but rather is a demonstration that the actual parts have been fabricated, cleaned, prepared, and chemically processed in a manner such as they will perform in a dependable manner. There are too many variables to limit such verifications to simple, and idealized test panels which present few of the complexities of actual parts. Were I so empowered, I would strongly DISAPPROVE this proposal.

Mary Ann Forrest-Woodward	AMSB	07/24/2014 14:39 PM	APPROVE
David Satlawa	AMSB	07/24/2014 14:35 PM	APPROVE

Informational Comment on Section/Paragraph: 4.3.2

Add Reply

Typo: 2nd line; replace "... that have been be processed ..." with "... that have been processed ..."

Daniel Backus	AMSB	07/24/2014 11:34 AM	APPROVE
Roger Eybel	AMSB	07/24/2014 10:52 AM	APPROVE
Keven Kudelka	AMSB	07/24/2014 10:27 AM	

Informational Comment on Section/Paragraph:

Add Reply

Approve

©2014 SAE International. All rights reserved.