Cat Aeration test Task Force meeting Oct 26, 2015

Participant	Name	Email	
1	Caroline Laufer	caroline.laufer@infineum.com	Infineum
	<mark>Elisa Santos</mark>	elisa.santos@infineum.com	
	Pat Fetterman	pat.fetterman@infineum.com	
	<mark>James Gutzwiller</mark>	james.gutzwiller@infineum.com	
	Bob Salgueiro	bob.salgueiro@infineum.com	
5	Jeff Clark	jac@astmtmc.cmu.edu	ТМС
	<mark>Sean Moyer</mark>	sam@astmtmc.cmu.edu	
6	<mark>Zack Bishop</mark>	zbishop@tei-net.com	TEI
	Dan Lanctot	dlanctot@tei-net.com	
7	<mark>Jason Bowden</mark>	jhbowden@ohtech.com	OHT
	Matt Bowden		
8 Yes	<mark>Mark Jarrett</mark>	jarrett_mark_w@cat.com	Caterpillar
	<mark>Hind Abi-Akar</mark>	abi-akar_hind@cat.com	
10	<mark>Greg Miranda,</mark>	greg.miranda@lubrizol.com	Lubrizol
	<mark>Kevin O'Mally</mark>	Kevin.OMalley@lubrizol.com	
	Chris Mileti	Christopher.Mileti@Lubrizol.com	
	Michael Conrad		
	Ravi Tallamraju		
11	Bob Campbell	bob.campbell@aftonchemical.com	Afton
	Christian Porter		
12	James McCord	jmccord@swri.org	SWRI
	Martin Thompson	martin.thompson@swri.org	
14	<mark>Timothy Griffin</mark>	tim.griffin@intertek.com	Intertek
	Jim Moritz	jim.moritz@intertek.com	
	Adam Roig		
16	<mark>Jim Rutherford</mark>	jaru@chevron.com	Chevron
	Mark Cooper	MAWC@chevron.com	
	<mark>Robert Stockwell</mark>	Robert.Stockwell@chevron.com	
18	<mark>Mike Alessi</mark>	Michael.l.alessi@exxonmobil.com	ExxonMobil
	Ricardo Conti		
19	<mark>Barb Goodrich</mark>	GoodrichBarbaraE@JohnDeere.com	John Deere
<mark>20</mark>	Heather DeBaun	Heather.DeBaun@Navistar.com	Navistar
21	Greg Shank	greg.shank@volvo.com	Volvo
22	Dan Arcy	Dan.arcy@shell.com	Shell

Attendees: Names Highlighted in Yellow attended the meeting

Agenda:

1- The test limits were accepted in the NCDT meeting last week. At this stage we need to work on transferring the test from TF to SP.

The necessary steps are:

- The test completes the Matrix and is accepted for use (Done)
- Task Force draft of the research report is submitted in process
- Task Force requests to be disbanded at completion of their objectives (basically to develop the test)
- The SP will vote to update their Scope and Objectives to include the new test and start monitoring.

2- We need to transfer the EOAT into the SP of the new aeration test. The group needs to discuss and agree.

3- Any aeration test related topics

Meeting results:

Actions:

Actions for the Labs: determine how much 1004 retains the labs have

Action (Jim Gutzwiller): Set up a SP meeting to work on the Backwards Compatibility plan.

- <u>Request that SP members bring forward oils of available data on EOAT to be tested</u> in COAT. The oils have to be of CH-4/CI-4 categories
- The labs should contact Frank Farber, TMC, directly for anonymity.

Meeting discussions:

Disbanding COAT task Force:

The test completed the Matrix and was accepted into the category. The Research Report is in process. This request has been asked since last year (Martin asking Joe Franklin)

Motion by Hind Abi-Akar:

Disband the TF for the Cat oil aeration test (COAT) and include the new COAT test in the Cat Surveillance Panel and change the Scope and Objectives of the Cat Surveillance Panel to reflect the addition of COAT.

Second by Greg Shank.

Discussion: Jim McCord proposed to send this motion to Joe Franklin to include in D02.0B

No objections.

The motion passed.

During the meeting Heather DeBaun sent a note to Joe Franklin that included the following: ."My understanding is that we need approval from you to disband the EOAT SP and move the EOAT test under the authority of the CAT SP. Do you need to issue a ballot in B or just indicate your approval? Thank you!"

Joe Franklin's response (Oct 23, 2015, 10:58 AM CST): l approve the transfer. Joe Franklin Chairman, ASTM D02.B0

Based on the above, the EOAT TF is now disbanded and the test will be moved to the Cat SP.

Backwards compatibility:

The limits for the backwards compatibility have to be determined. It is recommended to run older categories for the backwards compatibility

Actions for the Labs: determine how much 1004 retains the labs have

Retains are "old". 1004-2 was received at TMC in 1994. 1004-3 received May 1996 Concern: running an "old" oil where the Anti-Foam additive may have settled may not be representative. This oil, however, will be used only for generating correlation and as a failing oil.

How many oils are needed for the backwards compatibility/correlation?

- 1005-4 has data on both tests (confirm if there has been a ref run recently on EOAT).
 1005-5 is a recent re-blend which has not been run on EOAT or COAT.
- 832/833 oil: both are potential test oils
- 830/820 potential test oils. Volume available are: 830-2: >300 gallons available since April 2002; 820-3: no more volume
 - Concern: these oils are references for other tests and using them for this study may be a concern.

Action (Jim Gutzwiller):

Set up a SP meeting to work on the Backwards Compatibility plan.

- Request that SP members bring forward oils of available data on EOAT to be tested in COAT. The oils have to be of CH-4/CI-4 categories
- The labs should contact Frank Farber, TMC, directly for anonymity.

Note: Barb Goodrich corrected a prior note on the change from 10% to 8% limit for the EOAT. This change was implemented ~1996. The change was driven by the lack of failures at 10%. Robert Stockwell also stated that changes in the procedure for sample transfer was implemented earlier. This should have not impacted the severity of the test.