

LDEOC/EOEC SURVEILLANCE PANEL

A LDEOC/EOEC conference call was held on February 26, 2013, at 9 am central standard time. The following members were on the call:

Jennifer Keiter – Lubrizol
Monika Duda – Lubrizol
Rick Hartman - LKubrizol
Mike Kasimirsky – TMC
Kevin Rettmann - Intertek
Joe Franklin – Intertek
Mike Lopez - Intertek
Mike McMillan – Infineum
Doyle Boese - Infineum
Geifu Wu – Ashland
Mike Birke – SwRI
Michele Holzer – SwRI

The purpose of the teleconference was to discuss the status of batch 10 data submittal and workshop observations. Several teleconferences ago, Doyle Boese suggested that the method used to calculate targets can allow severity to drift and allow labs to operate at different levels and still have calibrations pass. Mike Kasimirsky stated that results coming from the different labs are statistically **significantly different** and that these lab differences need to be looked at. It was noted at the workshop that the most probable cause of lab to lab variability is the bath. From the workshop minutes:

All labs are using borosilicate glass with cork stoppers aluminum foil. Everyone uses stainless steel hangers that are bent in the lab. There is no standard size, nor standard heating elements, no standard way to circulate the oil. SwRI uses multiple baths with various configurations. The number of cells may affect the temperature control. Lubrizol has a ± 1 degree tolerance with their baths. LZ baths hold up to 70 samples. SwRI hold up to 100, but normal baths around 30. Ashland baths hold around 50. Intertek holds around 128 slots. Ashland always puts 48 to keep the oil level the same. No lab uses heating blocks. LZ, SwRI, and Ashland uses Dow 550. Intertek uses Clearco. Intertek measures temp in bath and the tube, LZ uses dummy tube, Ashland measures actual bath temperature. SwRI uses bath temp. All labs assert that the tubes are maintained at test temperature.

Along with the hardware survey and baseline measurements, Mike Birke will get more detail on each of the labs baths. Results will be tabulated and potential areas of improvements discussed. With respect to Batch 10 results, no action will be taken to adjust limits. **All references will continue to be evaluated against current published limits, including new material batches, as no batch qualification or approval process has been adopted by the Surveillance Panel**

There was discussion as to whether or not the class panel needs to be alerted to the “test variability”. Labs assert that the test is inherently variable, as has always been inherently variable, and that the test does provide information to the customer. If problems do exist out in the field, the surveillance panel is not aware of it. It should be noted that the surveillance panel will strive to improve the method either way, whether there are filed problems or not. Before the class panel is contacted, the surveillance panel will attempt to reduce test variability by addressing the bath issues. Mike McMillan did say that there have been problems in the past, however the issues were never reported to the surveillance panel. Although several OEMs are on the panel, very few if any have ever been on any of the past teleconferences. Mike Birke was interested in knowing how many candidate samples actually fail, as opposed to the TMC 1006 oil. That data is not available. Geifu Wu suggested that one reason there may not be any field problems reported is due to the fact that the test is so severe.

The call ended at 10 am

Since the teleconference, it has been made known that in addition to the donated tests on batch 10 materials that were discussed on the teleconference, there were also two reference oil tests conducted on the new batch prior to the call. These tests completed on 2/21 and 2/22 and used batch 10 elastomer materials, but were not reported to the TMC until after the teleconference on 2/26.

Several panel members were operating under the assumption that the batch 10 materials were not acceptable for use in testing until the panel took some action on the issue during the 2/26 teleconference. The lab that conducted these tests, however, contends that these tests are valid reference tests and should be evaluated based upon the existing targets, as was decided at the teleconference.

As there does not seem to be clear direction either way, the TMC has reviewed the tests as valid reference oil tests, but this issue should be discussed by the panel at its next meeting.