

HEAVY-DUTY ENGINE OIL CLASSIFICATION PANEL OF

ASTM D02.B0.02

June 18, 2002

Fairmont –The Queen Elizabeth Hotel

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.

ACTION ITEMS

1. **Bring data on using CI-4 tests (1R, M-11 EGR, T-10) in place of CH-4 tests.** **All**
-

MINUTES

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Chairman Jim McGeehan called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. on June 18, 2002, in the Marquette Room of the Fairmont – Queen Elizabeth Hotel of Montreal, Canada. There were 10 members present or represented and there were approximately 45 guests present. The attendance list is shown as Attachment 2. Note: There were a large number of guests present who missed the attendance list because it was not passed from one side of the room to the other.

2.0 Agenda

2.1 The published agenda (Attachment 1) was reviewed, with no suggested changes.

3.0 Previous Meeting Minutes

3.1 The minutes from the December 3, 2001 meeting were approved as distributed and posted on the ASTM Test Monitoring Center web site.

4.0 Membership

4.1 Chairman McGeehan reviewed the membership list and corrected his slide after input from the audience. Matthew Urbanak will replace Aimin Huang for Shell. See Attachment 3.

5.0 Chairman's Comments

5.1 Chairman McGeehan thanked the group for their teamwork in bringing the CI-4 category in on time (See Attachment 4) and then asked for observations and thoughts about how the PC-9 process went and what we could do to help make the PC-10 process even better.

5.2 Lew Williams observed one of the key elements in delivering PC-9 was that all parties took a "what we could live with" approach, and worked out compromises.

5.3 Greg Shank noted that when issues arose, people expended the effort to meet and deal with them expeditiously and thus were able to keep close to the overall timeline. In response to a comment about early delivery of the tests, Greg said it was just the nature of the business...that production like hardware was never going to be available until close to actual production and consequently, not all problems would be known very far ahead of time.

- 5.4 Dave Stehouwer remarked that the spirit of the group was to work through the problems as they occurred and he encouraged the group to keep the dialog going during PC-10.
 - 5.5 Tom Cousineau felt the "exit" ballots were a good process to help expose potential problems and Greg Shank added especially when no "abstentions" were allowed.
 - 5.6 John Zalar noted his appreciation of people working to meet the timeline for PC-9 and his disappointment in how long it took to get the matrix oils blended and delivered.
 - 5.7 Pat Fetterman observed that the T-10A test and the T-10 merit system were added at the last minute through extraordinary effort. He would have liked for those efforts to have started earlier.
- 6.0 Cummins M-11
- 6.1 Jeff Clark presented background and data on why the Cummins Surveillance Panel adopted a correction factor for the M-11EGR filter delta-P parameter. See Attachment 5.
- 7.0 APBF-DEC Program
- 7.1 Jim McGeehan informed the group of a government funded program looking at lubricant effects on emissions control systems (aftertreatment devices). See Attachment 6.
- 8.0 PC-10 Timeline
- 8.1 Greg Shank presented the EMA view of what the PC-10 timeline should look like. See Attachment 7.
 - 8.2 John Shipinski asked about the possibility of an ash limit for PC-10 oils. The response indicated it would be mid-2004 before sufficient data would be available to know.
- 9.0 Demonstrating CH-4 Performance with CI-4 Tests
- 9.1 Don Marn presented data from T9 & T10 , M-11HST & M-11EGR tests on the same oil showing that the CI-4 (T-10 & M-11 EGR) tests were more severe than the CH-4 (T-9 & M-11 HST) tests, supporting the position that oils could be qualified for CH-4 by running the CI-4 tests with relaxed limits.
 - 9.2 Greg Shank reminded the group that the CH-4 tests are still specified for ACEA categories and Pat Fetterman indicated Infineum had already presented data similar to the Lubrizol data.
 - 9.3 The question was raised about using the 1R for the 1P also, but no data has appeared.
- 10.0 Award
- 10.1 Jim Bover, Chairman of Committee D.02, presented Jim McGeehan with an ASTM Award of Excellence for his and the panel's efforts in delivering CI-4 on time.
- 11.0 Caterpillar Single Cylinder
- 11.1 Jim Wells notified the group that the SCOTE Surveillance Panel is considering a request to the HDEOCP to remove "Loss of Side Clearance" as a pass/fail parameter for the 1M-PC test, since it appears to be a random occurrence.
- 12.0 Next Meeting
- 12.1 The next meeting is planned for December 2002, in Anaheim.
- 13.0 Adjournment
- 13.1 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:25 p.m.

Submitted by:

Jim Wells
Secretary to the HDEOCP