

ASTM-HDEOCP EXIT CRITERIA BALLOT
Mack T11 Proposal for PC10 (CJ-4)
Due: January 23, 2006

Company	Name	Affirmative	Negative	Comments
Afton Chemical	Charles Passut	X		
BP	Steven Goodier	X		
Caterpillar Inc	Abdul Cassim			
Chevron Oronite LLC	Wm. Kleiser	X		
Chevron	Jim Mc Geehan	X		
Ciba Specialty Chemicals	Scott Harold			
Comcast	David Stehouwer	X		X
ConocoPhillips	David E. Taber			
Cummins	Warren Totten	X		
DDC	Mesfin Belay	X		
Dana Corporation	Howard Robins			
Deere & Co	Ken Chao	X		
EMA	Roger Gault	X		
ExxonMobil	Steven Kennedy	X		X
GM	Robert Stockwell	X		
Infineum	Pat Fetterman	X		X
Int'l Truck & Engine	Heather DeBaun	X		
Lubrizol	Lewis Williams	X		X
PerkinElmer	Thomas M. Franklin			X
RohMax USA	Steven Herzog			
Shell	Matthew Urbanak			
Valvoline	Wm. Runkle Jr.	X		
Volvo Power Train	Greg Shank			
	Totals	15		5 comments (see below Page 2)

COMMENTS:

1. Lewis Williams Lubrizol

The fresh oil limit applies to the new oil MRV read from the core technology that passes the T-11 used oil MRV. The T-11 API BOI/VGRA rules apply.

2. Charlie Passut Afton

Afton believes that this ballot is incorrect. The fresh oil limit of 20,000 mPa*s is for base oil interchange and not an appropriate item for D 4485. This limit belongs in the API BOI rules for the T-11. If this item remains as stated for CJ-4 we will reconsider our position.

3. Pat Fetterman Infineum

I just noticed what I suspect is one emission from Chris' draft bench test list. In the PC-9/CI-4 category we put in an HTHS limit of 3.5 cP minimum, and although I don't recall specifically addressing it in PC-10, my assumption is that it should carry forward to this category.

4. David M. Stehouwer Comcast

Greg and I have discussed this with Steve Kennedy. It is our intent that no oils worse than a 15W @ -20C be considered "passing" in the T11, and that no more rigorous requirement be placed on lower viscosity oils.

As Steve points out this leaves unanswered the case of 20W, 25W and single grades.

If, as Greg suggests, we remove the limits applies to XW viscosity grades, then insert Limits applied independent of viscosity grades.

That would make the ballot: Mack T-11 or T-11A

"Low Temperature Pumpability (CJ-4)".

Used oil sample from T11 180 hrs. (5% Soot)

Used oil Limit @ -20 C 25,000 mPa s max

Yield Stress Oils used Modified D4684 < 35

Recommend BOI/VGRA Task Group use Current T11 Rules

Independent of viscosity grade

Fresh Oil Limit @ -20 C 20,000 mPa

Could you re-issue the Exit Ballot on this issue prior to the HDEOCP?

I note the use of the term Anchor in the merit systems. We might as well change that to "Target" to keep Lyle from casting a negative.

More from Dave: I note the use of the term Anchor in the merit systems. We might as well change that to "Target" to keep Lyle from casting a negative.

5. Steven Kennedy ExxonMobil

I can not open the attachment, but based on the text in your message, ExxonMobil votes affirmative with comment for the addition of the proposed MRV limits to the Mack T-11 test.

Application of the MRV limit relative to the specific viscosity grades mentioned needs to be clarified. Should it be interpreted as xW- grades other than those mentioned do not need to meet the MRV requirement, and therefore can be acceptable T-11 oils if they meet the high temperature viscosity limits? Or is there another interpretation that would preclude oils with higher xW- grades (20W and 25W) from being acceptable T-11 oil for the CJ-4 category?