



Committee D-2 ON PETROLEUM PRODUCTS AND LUBRICANTS

*Chairman:* N. DAVID SMITH, North Carolina Dept. of Agric., 2 West Edenton St., P.O. Box 27647, Raleigh, NC 27611 (919-733-3313)  
FAX: 919-715-0524

*First Vice-Chairman:* SUSAN E. LITKA, UOP Research Center, 50 East Algonquin Rd., P.O. Box 5016, Des Plaines, IL 60017-5016  
(708-391-3390)

*Second Vice-Chairman:* KURT H. STRAUSS, 69 Brookside Rd., Portland, ME 04103 (207-773-4380) FAX: 207-775-6214

*Secretary:* KENNETH O. HENDERSON, Castrol North America, Automotive Div., 240 Centennial Ave., Piscataway, NJ 08854  
(908-980-3630) FAX: 908-980-9519

*Assistant Secretary:* W. JAMES BOVER, Exxon Biomedical Sciences, Inc., Mettlers Rd., CN2350, East Millstone, NJ 08875-2350 (908-873-6318)  
FAX: 908-873-6009

*Staff Manager:* EARL R. SULLIVAN (215-299-5514)

Reply to: Michael S. Griggs  
The Lubrizol Corporation  
29400 Lakeland Boulevard  
Wickliffe, OH 44092-2298

February 25, 2002

To: Members of the Single Cylinder Oil Test Engine (SCOTE) Surveillance  
Panel and guest participating in the February 7, 2002 teleconference.

Enclosed are the minutes of the SCOTE Surveillance panel teleconference. Please  
forward any corrections or additions to my attention.

Michael S. Griggs  
Secretary, SCOTE Surveillance Panel

## **TELECONFERENCE MINUTES**

### **SINGLE CYLINDER DIESEL SURVEILLANCE PANEL**

HELD FEBRUARY 7, 2002  
VIA TELECONFERENCE  
At 13:00 CST

THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT AN ASTM STANDARD; IT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION WITHIN AN ASTM TECHNICAL COMMITTEE BUT HAS NOT RECEIVED ALL APPROVALS REQUIRED TO BECOME AN ASTM STANDARD. IT SHALL NOT BE REPRODUCED OR CIRCULATED OR QUOTED, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, OUTSIDE OF ASTM COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES EXCEPT WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE HAVING JURISDICTION AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY. *COPYRIGHT ASTM, 100 BARR HARBOR DRIVE, WEST CONSHOHOCKEN, PA 19428-2959. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED*

#### **1.0 CALL TO ORDER**

- 1.1 This teleconference was previously scheduled during the 1-23-02 SCOTE Surveillance panel meeting held at PerkinElmer.
- 1.2 Chairman Jim McCord began the teleconference with a roll call of voting members. The list of participants is attachment 1.

#### **2.0 1M-PC REFERENCE OIL REBLEND**

- 2.1 Jim McCord opened discussions with a recap of the SCOTE panel's recommendations to the HDEOCP regarding the reblending of the 1M-PC 873 oil batch and a request to consider a more modern technology oil.
- 2.2 Mike Zaiontz commented that the panel's request to identify a current technology oil has been forwarded to Jim McGeehan for future HDEOCP action.
- 2.3 Scott Parke advised the panel that blending of oil 873-2 was in the works and is expected in the May-June timeframe. He responded to some concerns about delivery times, saying that the requested oil quantity does not impede it. Thirty drums, which is a five year supply, have been ordered. The existing 873 batch is expected to last until the reblended batch is available. Scott Parke reassured the labs that oil would continue to be equitably distributed.

- 2.4 Bob Campbell expressed concern that the introduction of a new technology oil would take too long to prevent interruption of scheduled calibrations. Scott Parke reiterated that the 873-2 batch is going forward and scheduled calibrations should not be interrupted. He also advised the panel that if the new batch is deemed unnecessary, then he would like specific direction from the Surveillance panel to stop the reblend process. All in attendance agreed to instruct the TMC to proceed with the reblend.

### **3.0 INDUSTRY CORRECTION FACTOR**

- 3.1 Jim McCord opened discussion on the first 1M-PC industry correction factor proposal which corrects labs back to target.
- 3.2 Al Hahn expressed concern that one lab would have a passing TGF limit of 100 with this proposal. He emphasized that this is not acceptable to Caterpillar.
- 3.3 Bob Campbell suggested that the proposal to apply a full correction back to target could work by setting a cap on the upper limit. Al Hahn reiterated his concerns with this proposal.
- 3.4 Mark Sutherland commented that he was concerned in general over the use of correction factors and that severity adjustments are addressing the severity issue. Bob Campbell reminded the panel that lab severity adjustments don't help with calibration severity problems. Scott Parke added that all labs have severity adjustments and all labs are severe.
- 3.5 Bob Campbell suggested a compromise to the application of a full industry correction factor by capping the TGF correction to a maximum of 90. Scott Parke suggested a maximum of 88 TGF. Bob Campbell made a motion that a 90 TGF ceiling be applied following the application of a full industry correction factor. This motion does not include WTD considerations. The motion failed by a vote of 2-5-2 (for/against/waive).
- 3.6 Jim McCord introduced the second industry correction factor proposal which corrects labs to the EWMA action limit. The panel was in unanimous disfavor of this proposal and moved on.
- 3.7 Jim McCord introduced the third proposal which is to declare the test out of control. Ed Outten motioned for this proposal at this time. Mike Griggs seconded the motion with the caveat that panel discussion would be required. There was quite a bit discussion on why the test should or should not be declared out of control. Scott Parke noted that precision was good but the test could be characterized as out of control by virtue of its unrelenting severity. Phil Scinto commented that, in view of the severity, one would not want to

stick with the test as is. He also questioned whether labs could ever get back to the correct severity level. Steve Kennedy advised the panel that the industry needs the 1M-PC. Ed Outten commented that the industry won't be forced to look for a replacement test without compelling action. Jim McCord agreed to ask the HDEOCP to find a replacement test for the 1M-PC. Having covered the pros and cons of declaring the test out of control, the panel voted on the motion. The motion failed by a vote of 1-7-1 (for/against/waive).

- 3.8 At this point in the teleconference, the discussions focused on the severity with respect to lab's ability to successfully calibrate stands. Following lively discussion, it became apparent that two of the four labs were being affected by severity because of high incidences of failure to calibrate. Mike Griggs expressed his opinion saying that there are not dramatic differences in TGF severity for labs routinely running just under the upper TGF acceptance limit of 69 and labs running just over this limit, however, the real issue is that one lab can calibrate while the other can't. When asked if the acceptance bands could be widened, Phil Scinto commented that widening the acceptance bands would not really take care of the problem. The panel did agree that it would provide some relief for labs having difficulty calibrating. Following discussion on what the upper limit should be, the panel finally accepted a motion to move the LTMS k value from 1.75 to 2.0 by a vote of 6-1-2 (for/against/waive). This effectively raises the upper TGF acceptance limit to 73. Scott Parke asked the panel for clarification as to whether this motion includes changing the k value for WTD. The panel amended the motion to include WTD. Attachment 2 is the TMC memorandum implementing this change. Secretary's note- PerkinElmer later expressed regret over their vote and requested that it be amended to an affirmative vote, however, rules prohibit changing a vote after the fact.

February 7, 2002

**SCOTE Teleconference Participants**

Mark Sutherland- Chevron  
Scott Parke- ASTM TMC  
Riccardo Conti- ExxonMobil  
Al Hahn- Caterpillar  
Jim McCord- SwRI  
Bob Campbell- Ethyl  
Jim Gutzwiller- Infinium  
Ben Weber- SwRI  
Jim Rutherford- Chevron  
Jennifer Van Mullekom- Lubrizol  
Phil Scinto- Lubrizol  
Lew Williams- Lubrizol  
Mike Griggs- Lubrizol  
Ed Outten- Infinium  
Elisa Santos- Infinium  
Chris Mazuca- PerkinElmer  
Mike Zaiontz- PerkinElmer  
Steve Kennedy- ExxonMobil  
Beto Araiza- TEI



## Test Monitoring Center

6555 Penn Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15206-4489  
(412) 365-1000

**MEMORANDUM:** 02-006

**DATE:** February 12, 2002

**TO:** Single Cylinder Diesel Surveillance Panel

**FROM:** Scott Parke

**SUBJECT:** Change to Stand Shewhart Severity K Value

During a February 7, 2002 conference call to address 1M-PC test severity, the Single Cylinder Diesel Surveillance Panel voted to change the stand Shewhart severity K value from 1.75 to 2.00. This change is effective for any 1M-PC calibration test ending on or after February 8, 2002 and will be reflected in the next regular update to TMC memo 94-200 (the "LTMS Document", posted on the TMC web site at: <ftp://tmc.astm.cmri.cmu.edu/docs/ltms/ltms.doc>).

SDP/sdp/ m02-006.sdp.doc

c: F. M. Farber

J. L. Zalar

<ftp://tmc.astm.cmri.cmu.edu/docs/diesel/scote/memos/mem02-006.sdp.pdf>

distribution: Email