



Address 100 Barr Harbor Drive  
PO Box C700  
W. Conshohocken, PA  
19428-2959 | USA

Phone 610.832.9500  
Fax 610.832.9555  
e-mail [service@astm.org](mailto:service@astm.org)  
Web [www.astm.org](http://www.astm.org)

---

**Committee D02 on PETROLEUM PRODUCTS AND LUBRICANTS**

*Chairman:* W. JAMES BOVER, ExxonMobil Biomedical Sciences, 1545 Route 22 East, PO Box 971, Annandale, NJ 08801-0971, (908) 730-1048, Fax: (908) 730-1151, e-mail: [w.j.bover@exxonmobil.com](mailto:w.j.bover@exxonmobil.com)  
*First Vice Chairman:* KENNETH O. HENDERSON, Cannon Instrument Co., 30 Doe Dr., Port Matilda, PA 16870, (814) 353-8000 ext:265, Fax: (814) 353-8007, e-mail: [kenohenderson@worldnet.att.net](mailto:kenohenderson@worldnet.att.net)  
*Second Vice Chairman:* SALVATORE J. RAND, 221 Flamingo Dr., Fort Myers, FL 33908, (239) 481-4729, Fax: (239) 481-4729, e-mail: [sjrand@earthlink.net](mailto:sjrand@earthlink.net)  
*Secretary:* MICHAEL A. COLLIER, Petroleum Analyzer Co. LP, PO Box 206, Wilmington, IL 60481, (815) 458-0216, Fax: (815) 458-0217, e-mail: [macvarlen@aol.com](mailto:macvarlen@aol.com)  
*Assistant Secretary:* JANET L. LANE, ExxonMobil Research & Engineering, 600 Billingsport Rd., PO Box 480, Paulsboro, NJ 08066-0480, (856) 224-3302, Fax: (856) 224-3616, e-mail: [janet.l.lane@exxonmobil.com](mailto:janet.l.lane@exxonmobil.com)  
*Staff Manager:* DAVID R. BRADLEY, (610) 832-9681, Fax: (610) 832-9668, e-mail: [dbradley@astm.org](mailto:dbradley@astm.org)

Reply to:

Scott Parke  
ASTM Test Monitoring Center  
6555 Penn Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

March 11, 2004

To: Single Cylinder Diesel Surveillance Panel

Enclosed are the minutes of the SCOTE Surveillance panel teleconference held March 3, 2005. Please address any corrections during the time allotted for minutes approval at the next meeting.

Scott Parke  
Secretary SCOTE Surveillance Panel

Attachments

cc: <ftp://ftp.astmtmc.cmu.edu/docs/diesel/scote/minutes/TELECONFERENCE%202005-03-03.pdf>

distribution: Email

## TELECONFERENCE MINUTES

### SINGLE CYLINDER DIESEL SURVEILLANCE PANEL

HELD MARCH 3, 2005

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.

#### **13:00cst CALL TO ORDER**

The teleconference began at 13:00 cst; the participants are listed in attachment 1.

#### **13:01cst ADOPTION OF DYED PC-9 FUEL**

Scott Parke (TMC/secretary) recapped the results of the recent email ballot containing the following motion: AT THE LAB'S EARLIEST CONVENIENCE, BEGIN USING DYED PC-9 FUEL FOR ALL 1N, 1P, AND 1R TESTING. The motion was passed by a vote of 8 for, 0 against, and 1 waive.

#### **13:15cst IN LINER INTRODUCTION STATUS**

The February 23 HDEOCP meeting is now past. This panel hoped that that meeting might bring a firm decision as to whether or not 1N would be included in PC-10 and thereby bring some clarity the future expected 1N testing volume. Jim McCord (Southwest/chairman) and Tom Franklin (PerkinElmer) were both at the HDEOCP meeting and concurred that though there was much discussion of 1N's inclusion in PC-10, nothing firm was decided.

Jim summarized that the task remaining before this panel is to determine if the current +7% TGF correction factor was appropriate or if it should be revised to 11% (as the analysis of untransformed data suggests) or if more data should be generated before any further decisions are made.

Scott Parke outlined what he felt were the three possible futures for 1N testing:

1. Devise some scheme to generate additional 1N testing right now. This might mean labs contributing donated runs or some rescheduling of calibration expiration dates as has been done in the past.

The problem with this path is that there are currently only 3 referenced 1N stands all of which just referenced in November. Furthermore, and as already discussed, a PC-10 future for 1N is not firm at this point. Both facts make it difficult for anyone to increase their commitment to 1N at this time.

2. Given the uncertain 1N future, labs could decide to just completely sit on their hands and refuse to do *anything* until PC-10 is finalized.

This path is also impractical because it is not true that there is *no* demand for 1N testing presently. In fact, Bob Campbell (Afton) is interested in referencing a stand right now.

3. The third option is to just continue on the present path with no transformation and +7% and gradually accumulate data as it comes and re-examine the situation as the data allows.

This path puts both customers and Cat at risk if +7% is not correct. However, given the current state of affairs, it is probably the only viable way to proceed.

Chuck Dutart asked what was driving the timeline for 1N liner introduction. The labs want to be sure of an adequate liner supply should 1N be included in PC-10.

Jim McCord returned the discussion to a second oil to gather data on. The targets for the current reference oils were reviewed. The goal is to select another oil that performs different from 1004-3 but not unreasonably so. This would rule out 810-2 as a candidate. 809-1 performs very similarly to 1004-3 and is thus also probably not worth running. 811-1 seemed the most reasonable choice.

### **13:36cst 1P LINER STATUS**

Abdul Cassim (Caterpillar) was asked what Cat's plans were should 1P not be included in PC-10. He said that, in that case, Cat would require 1P for the Cat OEM spec ECF-2. At this point, Cat doesn't know if C-13 and 1P share the same oil "appetite" and so they want to see data from both tests.

Jim McCord asked what the current estimated delivery date was for the 1P liners. Chuck Dutart said 2 months.

### **13:42cst 1M-PC LINER STATUS**

Abdul Cassim reported that API has been asked to begin the process of terminating licensing for the CF category.

Returning to the thought from the past few meetings, Chris Mazuca (PerkinElmer) asked how many 1M-PC liner orders would have to appear to trigger a production run at Cat. Chuck Dutart's reply was that Cat's system will respond to whatever orders are placed. If, say, 60 liners are ordered, Cat will schedule a run of 60 liners. Chuck estimated that it would take an order of 200 or so liners to trigger an appreciable run on the order of what the surveillance panel would like to see (which is 200 to 300 liners).

Chuck reported that there are currently 56 old stock liners remaining in the system (there were 63 at the time of the last teleconference; Lubrizol purchased 5 of those 63). He added that there are currently 12 liners slated for production in August.

Jim McCord again suggested the possibility of all labs pitching in to buy out the 56 liners to scrap and trigger an order. Bob Campbell didn't feel that this was a viable option given the size of order required to trigger the desired production run. He suggested that the issue be referred to ACC and that it be explained to them that if they needed the test to continue then they would need to devise a way to fund the required liner purchases.

### **13:54cst NEXT MEETING**

Bob Campbell is preparing to run a 1N test on the 1Y3998 liner and PC-9 fuel that his lab will dye according to instructions from Phillips. This panel will reconvene when that run completes to discuss the results.

The teleconference ended at 14:00cst.

## Attendance:

### Representative

Chuck Dutart  
Abdul Cassim  
Jerry Brys  
Jim McCord  
Bob Campbell  
Chris Mazuca  
Brad Carter  
Tom Franklin  
Scott Parke

### Organization

Caterpillar  
Caterpillar  
Lubrizol  
Southwest Research  
Afton Chemical  
PerkinElmer  
PerkinElmer  
PerkinElmer  
Test Monitoring Center