

COAT Email Ballot 8/21/2017

Motioned by Sean Moyer:

To suspend COAT candidate oil testing with no tests starting on or after 8/21/2017. This suspension of testing activity is on the basis of labs currently reporting different micro-motion RTD temperatures that are used to calculate final density values. While the test is suspended the panel will work to refine the measurement system setup and RTD measurements and communize the platform between labs. The suspension of candidate testing will include no net gain or loss in calibration time for the labs.

Second: Mark Cooper

TEI:

waive

Intertek:

Negative

“After further consideration of the small group’s discussion, Intertek votes AGAINST this motion for the reasons listed below.

- The process spelled out in the “Test Out of Control” document: **“AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND INDUSTRY WIDE LABORATORY CALIBRATION STATUS WHEN A TEST IS JUDGED TO BE GIVING UNINTERPRETABLE PERFORMANCE”** was not followed.
- The issue is not affecting all labs; one lab has been and is on-target with good precision and discrimination. The test can still be available to all users.
- The COAT procedure D8047-17 does not have a requirement that all labs have the same Micro-Motion RTD temp. This is new and important information, but not a procedural requirement that all labs have the same or similar MM RTD temperature.
- Two labs had been reporting very similar Micro-Motion RTD temperatures until one of those 2 labs started running the test different (and possibly outside the procedural requirements) than the other 2 labs.
- Part of the justification this morning was to create a sense of urgency to remedy the situation with the test (which is needed). This is not a technical reason to shut down the test. The panel needs to have the discipline to work this urgently regardless of the test status.

Intertek is fully supportive of resolving the issues and improving the test. The evidence of commitment is there.”

Afton:

Affirmative

John Deere:

Affirmative

**Volvo:
Negative**

“Volvo is voting against suspending the COAT test. We believe implementing the changes identified by the work group - changes to the engine or micro motion setups, etc . should be done ASAP”

**Infineum:
Negative**

“Infineum respectfully votes Negative on the e-mail motion below for the following reasons:

- 1) The Caterpillar Surveillance Panel does not have the authority to suspend candidate oil testing. The Surveillance Panel can make the decision to recommend to the appropriate Classification Panel that a test be declared out of control. Then the HDEOCP will then meet to determine if the test is out of control. If the Classification Panel decides the test is out of control it may temporarily suspend calibrated testing. This is all stated in the guidance document on the ASTM TMC website: [**AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND INDUSTRY WIDE LABORATORY CALIBRATION STATUS WHEN A TEST IS JUDGED TO BE GIVING UNINTERPRETABLE PERFORMANCE.**](#)
- 2) The above referenced document defines the first step for suspending industry wide laboratory calibration status as, 1) An action alarm at the industry level must trigger on the Exponentially Weighted Moving Average (EWMA) plots, for either precision or severity, using the ASTM Reference Monitoring System. No action alarms have been triggered and there are 1 or more labs today which are in calibration status and can run the test per the defined procedure ASTM D8047, so by definition the test is available to be run.
- 3) The basis for suspension, *“labs currently reporting different micro-motion RTD temperatures”*, is not a requirement of the COAT procedure ASTM D8047. While it may be an improvement over the current test procedure, two labs have reported similar RTD temperatures and still had very different results indicating that other factors may be influencing results.

Infineum supports improving the repeatability and reproducibility of industry engine tests. This is a continuous process carried out by all the surveillance panels, but tests are not declared unavailable, out of control, or candidate oil testing suspended, while improvements are implemented. The Surveillance Panel should consider directing the labs to proceed with collecting all the necessary hardware parts they need to implement the recommended changes. During this time there is no reason to suspend testing, as labs can run the procedure as defined today and are in calibration status. This prevents any long delays of COAT test unavailability, in case there are any unforeseen part availability issues (eg: back orders). Once the labs have all the hardware they need, they can all implement the changes simultaneously and immediately follow with a calibration test. This ensures labs are motivated to bring the improved test back on line as quickly as possible and minimizes any disruption to candidate testing based on the current procedure ASTM D8047.”

ExxonMobil:

Negative

“ExxonMobil likes to vote against suspension of candidate oil testing in the COAT.

We believe test development is a continuous improvement process and takes several iterations to get consistent results across multiple laboratories. The suspension of the test on the basis of inconsistent report of micro-motion RTD temperatures is not a requirement of the COAT procedure. Hence at this juncture, we believe candidate oil testing should continue as the test precision improves.”

TMC:

Affirmative

Southwest Research:

Negative

“SwRI votes negative with comment.

Candidate testing should be allowed until labs have a direction and hardware to implement whatever change to the system is required.”

Oronite:

Affirmative

Caterpillar:

Negative

“My vote is negative.

Upon more consideration of the ballot, I am voting negative for the following reasons:

- the working group has an improvement plan that is clear, feasible and of defined timelines.
- the test is still available per the "Out of Control" definition given in "AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND INDUSTRY WIDE LABORATORY CALIBRATION STATUS WHEN A TEST IS JUDGED TO BE GIVING UNINTERPRETABLE PERFORMANCE" document
- The test is still available and does not fit the definition of unavailability given in "ASTM Sub Committee B Test Availability Guidelines"

An expedited process to implement any changes the work group agrees to may require changes to the engine or micro motion setups. This will render the test unavailable while the changes are ongoing, which can be a limited time. This action will satisfy the desire of the Work group to disallow running of candidates tests while changes are ongoing and at the same time may be for a very limited time. It is also not clear whether all the labs will be down at the same time and for the same duration. Again supporting potential limited time where test is unavailable, if any.

For the reasons above, I am voting negative and offering any help we can provide to support the Work Group and move the planned improvements forward.”

**Lubrizon:
Negative**

“Lubrizon votes against.

Comments:

With the test in its current condition there are two labs that have qualified stands to run candidate tests, according to the LTMS reference guidelines. The TMC has already mandated collecting the RTD temperature for the test. There could potentially be a limit set in place requiring that all candidate tests run at a similar RTD temperature as the reference test. This will effectively eliminate the ability to manipulate the severity of the test, while keeping the test available during future procedure refinement. If the test is deemed unavailable for a large period of time, then provisional licensing must be addressed.”

Final Vote Tally

4-Affirmative

7-Negative

1-Waive

The motion does not carry.