

HEAVY-DUTY ENGINE OIL CLASSIFICATION PANEL
OF
ASTM D02.B0.02
May 10, 2007
Teleconference

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. Send letter to API declaring T6 unavailable | Chairman McGeehan |
| 2. Investigate T12 to T9 and ISM to M11 ballots | Lew Williams |
| 3. Propose wording for Sequence III situation in D4485 | Steve Kennedy |
-

MINUTES

- 1.0 Call to order
 - 1.1 The Heavy Duty Engine Oil Classification Panel (HDEOCP) was called to order by Chairman Jim McGeehan at 10:30 a.m. EDT on Thursday, May 10, 2007, by teleconference.
 - 1.2 There were 11 members present and 5 guests present.
- 2.0 Chairman Comments
 - 2.1 The panel will need to resolve the T12 to T6 situation. The exit criteria ballot had 12 affirmative votes and 5 negative votes. API would like to keep CF-4. Is there any way forward?
- 3.0 Membership
 - 3.1 There were no membership changes.
- 4.0 T-12 back to T-6 test
 - 4.1 Lubrizol re-stated that they are prepared to run a T12 test on the T6 reference oil. Lew has talked with the TMC and there is not a CF-4 reference oil available. Lz has an oil, but it would only have one run on it. If more than one T12 test were conducted on the T6 reference oil, then a better data set would exist. If the oil has not been found by now, then it is probably not available.
 - 4.2 The T6 and T12 are very different tests. If there is no way forward, do we tell API that CF-4 is an obsolete category? Steve Kennedy corrected the panel and said we say there is no way to support the T6 or an alternate and let API decide what to do about the category.
 - 4.3 CF-4 oils are still needed, but the quality of these oils may deteriorate without a category. Instead of just eliminating the category, information should be published suggesting that marketers switch to CH-4.
 - 4.4 API has an ongoing issue of handling obsolete categories.
 - 4.5 The HDEOCP has no disagreement with dropping the T6. Chairman McGeehan must send a letter to API (Kevin Ferrick). API Lubes committee is meeting June 5. The letter will be sent before June 5.

5.0 ISM to M11

- 5.1 The exit criteria ballot had 16 positive votes and one negative vote. Within the rules set in the committee, the action will go forward with a 75% approval. Afton's negative requests that the Surveillance Panel investigate getting more data. Afton will vote negative at B and D02. Since there was a 75% positive vote, B sent it on.
- 5.2 A B ballot was sent concurrently with the exit ballot. There is no way backward. The B ballot process will happen. If Afton votes negative, then that will be addressed at B. The understanding was that the HDEOCP was trying to resolve this with an exit ballot. There is some question how this went to B ballot. B minutes reflect a recommendation by Jim McGeehan to send the T12 to T9 to a ballot. The T12 to T6 will go to exit ballot and the ISM to M11HST will go to exit ballot. Jim McGeehan reported 15 votes affirmative, 1 vote negative, and 0 waives to send the ISM to M11 to exit ballot. Someone may have interpreted the report as results of the exit ballot and sent it to B ballot.
- 5.3 Lew will call Joe Franklin to confirm what happened and will get Joe to correct it. Check with Joe on T12 to T9. Jim's report to B at the December meeting, shows to ballot the T12 to T9 limits. That is what should have been balloted. (Secretary's notes: The T12 to T9 was balloted correctly. The ISM to M11 ballot already has votes submitted. To stop it, a negative is needed; then a document stating the ballot was removed due to an error can replace the ballot.)

6.0 Sequence III in D4485 for C categories

- 6.1 Steve Kennedy pointed out that for the Sequence III test requirements in D4485, everything through CI-4 has IIIF, but there are equivalent IIIG limits that can be developed. Should limits be developed? Bob Olree said there is no reason the IIIF will go away before the IIIG. When they go away, they will go away together. On paper, there are two oxidation limits. Could a better way be developed to express the alternate? At least recognize that it is not the same performance level. All the way back to CH-4 shows an easier IIIF than a IIIG. One perception is that if the IIIG passes, then the IIIF is not needed to be run too. D4485 does not show it any different than other alternates. If a footnote explaining that they are not equivalent, but that passing a more severe test means a IIIF does not have to be run was included, that would solve it. They are not meant to be equivalent. In the beginning, this should have been in API. Steve will propose wording and Jim will include it on the agenda for the June HDEOCP meeting.
- 6.2 While we're at it, is there any reason to run a T-8 if one has a passing T-11. The Surveillance Panel will discuss and report to the HDEOCP.
- 6.3 EMA will state their position again before the June 5 API meeting. EMA needs to draft a letter and send it to Kevin Ferrick.

7.0 Agenda planning for June meeting

- 7.1 Learning look-back update. Steve, Greg, and Lew will discuss.
- 7.2 EMA update about the 2007 rollout. Are 2007 engines making penetration after the 2006 pre-buy? EMA will provide a bio-diesel fueled lubricant needs
- 7.3 Mack T-11 pass as an alternate to the T8.
- 7.4 Report on the ballot issue.
- 7.5 ISM to M11HST. Afton will make a new proposal for the OFDP limit.
- 7.6 Sequence III alternate test wording in D4485.

8.0 Next meetings

- 8.1 The next meeting is June 19, 2007 at 1:30 pm at ASTM in Miami.

9.0 The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 EDT.