# b2bOptic Meeting 12 October 2026

Overview

**Participants:** Katrin Wurdinger, Nicole Spaeth, Gerd Bernau, Britta Neustadt, Avijit Rastogi, Malte Neumann, Matthias Reinhardt, Richard Martinek and others.

# Management Summary

The meeting focused on technical enhancements to the LensCatalog/LensOrder standard, the handling of prism and cylinder additions, and an in-depth discussion on the future use and expansion of edging types. Organisational matters, Wiki access and status updates were also addressed.

# Decisions & Outcomes

• The next meeting has been postponed from 9 November to 16 November.
• JobData has been updated to version 1.6.6 and is due to be released following a brief review.
• Four-digit colour codes will not be pursued further.
• Wiki access will be set up for new participants.
• The issue of frame provisioning and edging types remains open and will be discussed further in the forum.

# Discussion on prism and cylinder surcharges

- SF6 continues to contain fixed prism and cylinder surcharges with IT codes.
- In LC7, surcharges can be modelled flexibly using options and combinations.
- There was a discussion on whether surcharges should be represented via additional price ranges or via surcharge options.
- There was agreement that surcharges do not necessarily have to be transferred to the ordering interface as an IT code.
- For options, the SendCode concept was confirmed: Mandatory, Optional or Not Allowed.
- Documentation on prism and cylinder handling already exists on the Wiki, but is to be expanded and clarified.

# Detailed discussion: Use and further development of edging types

The longest and most important discussion centred on the question of how future frame provisioning

processes should be modelled in the standard. This was prompted by the Vorschlag by Avijit Rastogi to introduce additional information on the origin of a frame (Frame Provisioning). The background to this is a new business process whereby frames and lenses can reach the lens-fitting workshop via different supply chains.

Zeiss needs a way to identify whether a frame is supplied directly by the optician (ECP – Eye Care Professional), by the frame manufacturer, or via other supply channels. To this end, a proposal for a new frame provisioning concept was put forward. In addition, a reference number (Frame Order Reference) should be used to link the frame order and the lens order.

A key point of discussion was the existing 'Third Party Frame' edging type. Avijit took the view that this extension no longer offers any added value and could be replaced by the new frame provisioning concept. From Zeiss's perspective, this would enable a clearer and more flexible description of the supply chain.

Nicole Spaeth objected to the direct removal of the edging type. The attribute had already been introduced in a published version of the standard. Removing it without replacement could affect existing implementations and would therefore need to be at least announced or phased out over the long term.

Malte Neumann emphasised the perspective of the software companies. For PMS providers, a uniform implementation across all lens manufacturers is crucial. Different implementations for Zeiss and Essilor would lead to increased complexity, special logic and long-term maintenance problems.

During the discussion, it became clear that different companies use the term 'third-party frame' in different ways. One participant described a real-world use case in which customers originally order a complete pair of spectacles but later decide to have the lenses fitted themselves. In this scenario, the frame and lenses are delivered separately. The existing 'Edging Type' is actively used for this purpose.

This led to the realisation that the existing 'Edging Type' is by no means obsolete, but is still required in certain business processes. At the same time, however, it does not meet the requirements that Zeiss needs for the unambiguous identification of the frame source.

There was also intensive discussion as to where in the data model the new information should most sensibly be incorporated from a technical perspective. Several participants considered it more logical, from a business perspective, to assign this information directly within the frame data section. However, this was countered by concerns about altering existing implementations and creating inconsistencies.

Another important aspect was backwards compatibility. Nicole Spaeth argued that a complete restructuring of elements that had evolved over time was unrealistic. Instead, new information should be introduced in a way that is as supplementary and optional as possible.

Matthias Reinhardt asked whether the optional fields could not simply be provided in addition to 'Given Frame'. This would preserve the existing semantics whilst still achieving the desired extensibility.

Towards the end of the discussion, a consensus emerged: the existing concept should, in principle, be retained. Frame provisioning is to be investigated further as an optional extension. The information should only be used if it is actually provided by the optician or the PMS system. This ensures the solution remains compatible with existing processes whilst simultaneously enabling new business models.

It was expressly agreed to continue the discussion within the forum. All arguments, objections and use cases should be documented so that the basis for decision-making remains traceable even several years from now.

# Open issues

- Evaluation of the final frame provisioning concept.
- Documentation of use cases for third-party frames and given frames.
- Definition of the link between frame order reference and lens order.
- Assessment of potential impacts on PMS manufacturers and existing implementations.

From:
http://wiki.b2boptic.com/ - **wiki.b2bOptic.com**

Permanent link:
**http://wiki.b2boptic.com/en:meeting:online:20261012**

Last update: **2026/10/26 01:38**