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
Web www.astm.org

Committee D02 on PETROLEUM PRODUCTS AND LUBRICANTS

Reply to:

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

July 11, 2006

To: Single Cylinder Diesel Surveillance Panel

Enclosed are the minutes of the SCOTE Surveillance panel teleconference held June 1, 2006. 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%202006-06-01.pdf

distribution: Email

TELECONFERENCE MINUTES

SINGLE CYLINDER DIESEL SURVEILLANCE PANEL

HELD JUNE 1, 2006

13:37cdt STATUS OF 1M-PC SDTF2 RUNS

Chairman Jim McCord (Southwest Research) called the teleconference to order at 13:37cdt. The participant list is shown as attachment 1.

Jim began the meeting by surveying the labs regarding the status of their 1M-PC runs on SDTF2 fuel. Intertek and Southwest Research have received fuel and started runs; Lubrizol and Afton expect to start runs next week.

Bob Rumford (Dow/Haltermann) reported that they have produced 64,000 gallons of SDTF2 fuel. He also reported that he will be retiring and Jim Carter will replace him.

Scott Parke (TMC) was asked to add TESTFUEL to the 1M-PC data posted on the TMC website. Scott also agreed to contact Elisa Santos (Infineum) to do a statistical analysis on fuel type and liner p/n whenever the recent round of tests completes.

13:48cdt FUEL APPROVAL PROCESS

Scott Parke reminded the group of the email he distributed asking for comments on the fuel batch approval process (attachment 2). Bob Campbell (Afton) moved to remove this process from the procedure and leave it to the labs to verify fuel batch compliance. The motion unanimously passed.

13:51cdt INTRODUCTION OF SDTF2 TO 1K

Afton and Lubrizol both need to calibrate a 1K stand and so would like to avoid delay. Scott Parke reminded the panel that, when the 1Y3998 liners were introduced, the panel declared that testing volume for 1K was too low to warrant any sort of involved introduction scheme and so elected to just introduce the new part at the earliest opportunity and monitor the test for any coincident shift. He suggested that the panel might consider the same here.

Jerry Brys (Lubrizol) estimated that the potential for a fuel-induced shift was much lower than that for a liner-induced shift. Jim McCord agreed.

There was discussion as to what severity adjustments would be used for any candidate tests conducted under calibration extensions. Once the analysis of the new runs was complete would new severity adjustments apply to candidates retroactively? Scott Parke reminded the panel of the long-standing proscriptions against retroactivity.

After brainstorming a number of introduction schemes, the panel decided to table any action on 1K testing until after the 1M-PC runs complete in the hope that those runs might provide some data on

which to extrapolate. The panel tentatively scheduled a teleconference for this purpose for 13:30cdt on June 13.

14:13cdt 1P LINER STATUS

Britt Pulley (Caterpillar) was asked for an update on the status of a 1P liner replacement. He reported that the latest batch was not good enough to be used. There continue to be problems with micro-breakout (graphite pullout or gas pockets).

Britt asked the group for a tally of liners available to industry. Across all labs, 37 are available. Bob Campbell felt that this constituted a parts shortage that would merit a cessation in reference testing and extension of existing stand calibrations. He asked whether other labs might be willing to redistribute liners to labs in need. Britt asked for a more detailed description of current liner distribution. Riccardo Conti (ExxonMobil) reported having 2 liners; Bob said Afton had 4; Jerry Brys said he has 1. Jim McCord and Chris Mazuca (Intertek) declined to provide exact numbers but did both say they would be unable to part with any they had.

Britt was asked for more detail on what was being done to attempt to correct the problems they are seeing. He said that they have tried several different casters but so far have used the same machining on all attempts.

Jim McCord felt that the panel needed to know what the liner consumption rate was across the industry before they could make an informed decision as to just how dire the current parts situation is. Scott Parke agreed and suggested that a decision be postponed and another teleconference be set up for the following day to allow RSI to be contacted for candidate figures. Jim Gutzwiller (Infineum) offered to try to get the additive companies to provide an estimate of their testing needs for the near term. The call was adjourned a approximately 14:45cdt and scheduled to reconvene the next day at 09:10cdt.

JUNE 2, 09:10cdt RECONVENE 1P LINER

Attendance this day was the same as the previous day with the exception of Bob Rumford and Mark Sutherland being absent and Frank Farber (TMC) being added.

Scott Parke reported that the RSI figures for registered 1P and 1R candidate testing for the past year was 25 tests. With 37 liners available and Britt projecting the next batch available in from 18 to 24 weeks, and while recognizing that some individual labs are depleted, Scott could not see how the panel could call the situation an *industry* parts shortage.

Bob Campbell again asked if any labs would consider selling liners. Jim McCord explained that his lab is generally not disposed to do so because they have already added value to the liners by subjecting their stock to screening and measurement. Riccardo Conti said that his lab is not averse to reasonably compensating re-selling labs for the added value but in past situations he has been told that the re-sale price will be the full cost of a test (the reasoning being that the re-selling lab is giving up a customer test when they lose a liner). Jim and Chris Mazuca both said that they would have to check with their management to see if re-selling was an option.

Bob Campbell moved the following:

> Extend all calibrations set to expire on or after May 8, 2006 until more parts become available or November 16, 2006, whichever occurs first. Jerry Brys seconded.

The motion passed 4-3-2 (Lubrizol, Caterpillar, ExxonMobil, and Afton in favor; Intertek, Southwest, and TMC opposed; and Infineum and TEI waiving).

Britt Pulley was asked again to recount the current liner projection. He said that the batch currently being produced will be small; he expected to have about 9 liners in approximately 18 to 24 weeks. If that batch is acceptable, the next (larger) batch will follow in another 18 to 24 weeks.

The teleconference was ended at 09:58cdt.

Attendance:

Representative	Organization
Jerry Brys	Lubrizol
Mike Griggs	Lubrizol
Chris Mazuca	PerkinElmer
Bob Rumford	Dow/Haltermann
Bob Campbell	Afton Chemical
Mark Sutherland	Chevron
Riccardo Conti	ExxonMobil
Jim Gutzwiller	Infineum
Jim McCord	Southwest Research
Britt Pulley	Caterpillar
Ron Buck	TEI
Scott Parke	Test Monitoring Center

From: Scott Parke
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2006 11:43 AM
To: 'burnett'; 'carterjim'; 'cobb'; 'wendling'; 'brys'; 'buck'; 'campbell'; 'carlson'; 'cassim'; 'conti'; 'domonkos'; 'dutart'; 'fetterman'; 'franklin'; 'griggs'; 'gutzwiller'; 'hillman'; 'kennedy'; 'mazuca'; 'mccord'; 'pulley'; 'rumford'; 'rutherford'; 'scinto'; 'sutherland'; 'vandam'
Cc: Frank Farber; Jeff Clark
Subject: fuel batch approval process for lsrd4/pc9/sdtf/sdtf2

i would like some feedback regarding the fuel batch approval process for fuels used in the scote test areas.

for the old lsrd4 and sdtf fuels, the fuel dow/haltermann submitted a certificate of analysis for each fuel batch to tmc for approval (examples attached). before any fuel could be sold to labs for testing, tmc had to verify that each parameter of the fuel met specification. if it met spec, tmc issued a "tmc number" that was included at the top of the c-of-a. in theory, a lab was not supposed to purchase any fuel that did not include a "tmc number" and tests on fuel that didn't have a "tmc number" weren't valid.

with the replacement fuels, this system has broken down somewhat. my question to this group is, do you feel that this is still something that needs to be done? does tmc need to verify each fuel batch or is this something the labs can do (were you even aware that this was something tmc did)?

depending on the level and type of feedback, i will either ask jim mccord to make this a discussion item for our next meeting/teleconference or perhaps we can email ballot some action. whatever.

thanks for your input...

Scott Parke
ASTM Test Monitoring Center
6555 Penn Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15206
Voice: 412-365-1036
Fax: 412-365-1047
Email: sdp@astmtmc.cmu.edu

LSRD4

Product: _____

Product No.: _____

Batch No.: _____
TMC No.: _____
TMO No.: _____
Tank No.: _____
Analysis Date: _____
Shipment Date: _____

TEST	METHOD	UNITS	SPECIFICATIONS			RESULTS °C	RESULTS °F
			MIN	TARGET	MAX		
Distillation - IBF	D-86	(°C) °F	(177) 350		(199) 390		
10%		(°C) °F	(210) 410		(232) 450		
50%		(°C) °F	(249) 480		(277) 530		
90%		(°C) °F	(299) 570		(327) 620		
Distillation - EP		(°C) °F	(327) 620		(360) 680		
Recovery		vol%		REPORT			
Residue		vol%		REPORT			
Loss		vol%		REPORT			
Gravity	D-4052	°API	32.0		36.0		
Pour Point	D-97	(°C) °F			(-17) 0		
Cloud Point	D-2500	(°C) °F			(-12) 10		
Flash Point	D-93	(°C) °F	(54) 130				
Viscosity @ 40°C	D-445	cSt	2		3.2		
Mercaptan Sulfur	D-3227	wt %		REPORT			
Sulfur	D-2622	wt %	0.030		0.050		
Composition, Aromatics	D-1319	vol%	28.0		35.0		
Composition, Olefins	D-1319	vol%		REPORT			
Composition, Saturates	D-1319	vol%		REPORT			
Basic sediment & water	D-2709	vol%			0.05		
Ramsbottom Carbon, 10 % residue	D-524	wt %			0.35		
Ash content	D-482	wt %			0.01		
Total Acid Number	D-664	mg KOH/g		REPORT			
Strong Acid Number	D-664	mg KOH/g		REPORT			
Accelerated Stability	D-2274	mg/100 ml		REPORT			
Copper Corrosion	D-130				3		
Cetane Number	D-613		42.0		48.0		
Aliphatic paraffins	D-2425	wt %		REPORT			
Monocycloparaffins	D-2425	wt %		REPORT			
Dicycloparaffins	D-2425	wt %		REPORT			
Tricycloparaffins	D-2425	wt %		REPORT			
Alkylbenzenes	D-2425	wt %		REPORT			
Indanes/Tetralins	D-2425	wt %		REPORT			
Indenes	D-2425	wt %		REPORT			
Naphthalene	D-2425	wt %		REPORT			
Naphthalnenes	D-2425	wt %		REPORT			
Acenaphthenes	D-2425	wt %		REPORT			
Acenaphthylenes	D-2425	wt %		REPORT			
Tricyclic aromatices	D-2425	wt %		REPORT			

Approved by: _____ Analyst _____

Product: _____

Product Code: _____

Batch No.: _____
TMC No.: _____
TMO No.: _____
Tank No.: _____
Analysis Date: _____
Shipment Date: _____

TEST	TEST METHOD	UNITS	SPECIFICATION			RESULTS
			MIN	TARGET	MAX	
Distillation - IBP	D86	°F		REPORT		
10%		°F		REPORT		
50%		°F	500		530	
90%		°F	590		620	
Distillation - EP		°F	650		690	
Gravity	D4052	°API	33.0		35.0	
Density	D4052	kg/m³		REPORT		
Pour point	D97	°F			20	
Cloud point	D2500	°F		REPORT		
Flash point	D93	°F	140			
Viscosity,40°C	D445	cSt	2.0		4.0	
Natural Sulfur	D4294	wt %	0.38		0.42	
Natural Sulfur	D2622	wt %		REPORT		
Composition, Aromatics	D1319	vol %		REPORT		
Composition, Olefins	D1319	vol %		REPORT		
Composition, Saturates	D1319	vol %		REPORT		
Cracked Stocks				None		
Basic sediment & water	D1796	vol %			0.1	
Ramsbottom carbon, 10% residue	D524	wt %			0.20	
Ash content	D482	wt %			0.01	
Acid Number	D664	mg KOH/g			0.15	
Copper Corrosion	D130				2	
Cetane Number	D613		47.0		53.0	
Aliphatic paraffins	D2425	wt %	45.0		65.0	
Monocycloparaffins	D2425	wt %		REPORT		
Dicycloparaffins	D2425	wt %	0.0		15.0	
Tricycloparaffins	D2425	wt %		REPORT		
Alkylbenzenes	D2425	wt %	5.0		10.0	
Indanes/Tetralins	D2425	wt %		REPORT		
Indenes	D2425	wt %		REPORT		
Napthalene	D2425	wt %		REPORT		
Napthalenes	D2425	wt %	5.0		15.0	
Acenaphthenes	D2425	wt %		REPORT		
Acenaphthalanes	D2425	wt %		REPORT		
Tricyclic aromatices	D2425	wt %		REPORT		

Approved by: _____ Analyst _____