

Reply to: William M. Nahumck
The Lubrizol Corporation
29400 Lakeland Boulevard
Wickliffe, OH 44092
Phone: 440-347-2596
Fax: 440-347-2377
Email: wmn@lubrizol.com

Unapproved Minutes of the February 11, 2004
Sequence III Surveillance Panel Teleconference

This document is not an ASTM standard; it is under consideration within an ASTM technical committee but has not received approval from the specified ASTM committee. 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.

Attendees on 2-11-04: Sid Clark, Mike Kasimirsky, Bill Nahumck, Phil Scinto, Larry Hamilton, Monica Beyer, Gordon Farnsworth, Andrew Ritchie, Jason Bowden, Adam Bowden, Charlie Leverett, Jo Martinez, Dave Glaenzer, Tim Caudill, Rick Oliver

Meeting was called to order at 11:10 ET on 2-11-04. The chairman apologized for his tardiness. The agenda consisted of the following items.

Motion for unanimous consent put up by Monica Beyer related to IIIG Referencing Reporting changes for MRV results in the Sequence III GA

Motion for unanimous consent by Monica Beyer related to IIIG Referencing

The Surveillance Panel Chair sent out the following text to the Surveillance Panel members in an email on 2/4/04 that relates to the Sequence III teleconference minutes of 1-20-04. The lines that are in bold print are highlighting the area of concern that has prompted this email and is provided for background information.

Motion 1: *For oil 438 ACLW use the raw data (non-transformed) to determine mean and standard deviation. SA calculations for ACLW only will use the pooled standard deviation of oils 434 and 435. **The targets and standard deviations will be updated using current data for these oils prior to calculation of the pooled standard deviation.** If this motion is accepted PerkinElmer will agree to run a reference oil test on 434 ~~or~~ 435 in their stand 5. For clarification, the raw data is only for ACLW. Vis increase (PVIS) and WPD will still use currently assigned transformed data.*

A brief discussion indicated that although the above motion will help the lab in question, another lab will have a result change from a B1 alarm to a B2 alarm.

The motion passed with a vote of 6 for, 1 against and 5 waives. *The negative vote was reflecting that the action to positively address a situation in one lab should not have negative consequences in another lab.*

Motion 7: By Charlie Leverett, seconded by Gordon Farnsworth. To have the effective date for Motion 1 as 24:00 (Midnight) on 1-20-04.

The motion passed with a vote of 11 for, 0 against and 1 waives.

Monica Beyer has made a **motion for unanimous consent** via email “to apply the un-transformed RO 438 ACLW limits to the ACLW Test Target, ACLW standard Deviation and ACLW SA Pooled Standard Deviation using all valid, completed reference tests through the effective date of midnight of January 20, 2004 as was intended in Motion 1 of the January 20, 2004 Sequence III teleconference.” The point of her motion is to clarify the intent of the motion with respect to the effective date. The panel had indicated during a later discussion that the intent of the motion was use all available data, not just the initial 13 points used to set the original targets. This will also relieve the concern voiced by Sid Clark with his negative vote that the action taken with Motion 1 was not intended to cause a problem for another laboratory. This will change effective date of ASTM TMC Memorandum 04-006 from February 1, 2004 to January 21, 2004 while still using the same 24 points of data.” An objection to the motion was received, killing it, so the chairman convened a conference call to address the issue.

This email and motion for unanimous consent was discussed by Monica Beyer at the beginning of the teleconference. Monica stated that this in effect has shortened their labs reference period even though she has cleared the precision alarms. She is asking for relief by resuming a normal referencing period as all of her current indicators show that her lab is on target and under control.

Sid Clark stated that he did not want the Surveillance Panel to begin the practice of manipulating the data every time there is an alarm at a lab. Gordon Farnsworth stated he believed that the panel and TMC should consider using some engineering judgment to determine if the reference test in question was in control by looking at other reference tests run around the same time frame.

Mike Kasimirsky noted that he did not like this motion as it currently reads because everyone knew that a lab would be changing from a B1 alarm to a B2 alarm when the motion was voted on during the 1/20/04 teleconference call and there was no issue brought up at that time. He also questioned why the panel is willing to make changes (i.e. not using transforms) when it will help labs, but wants to make engineering judgments to ignore alarms when the data puts a lab into alarm status. He also stated his concerns that we should not be manipulating data when we are not sure if there is an actual affect on test results.

The initial motion outlined above required PEAR to conduct a reference oil test on oil 435 in stand 5 and Dave Glaenzer asked about the results of that test. Mike informed those in attendance that PEAR had completed their run on RO 435 with mild results. However, the test was declared invalid by the laboratory due to a 5 L/min offset in the coolant flow meter calibration. The test returned results that were 4.66 standard deviations mild on ACLW results which are consistent with the Yi results on the previous two tests that prompted the concerns in the first place. Based upon this result, the lab has requested that the TMC allow them to move to the next stand in the laboratory so that they can further evaluate this test stand. Mike noted that while the test is invalid, and therefore not charted in the laboratory control charts or subject to the same level of scrutiny as a valid test, the laboratory’s plan to investigate the stand indicates that the lab places enough confidence in the results to warrant additional investigation into the matter.

This issue led to further discussion related to the lab-based LTMS we have adopted for the Sequence IIIG. This is a departure from what we have traditionally done with regards to the previous Sequence III test procedures. Some of the comments made during the discussion are noted for information.

1. The earlier decision of the panel assumed that the data was correct and that no stand problems existed in the laboratory. These assumptions are in question with the lab investigating the stand. Corrective action for RO 438 may have taken based upon a potentially flawed assumption that the problem was how the data was analyzed, rather than the actual data itself.
2. It was felt that one fundamental assumption of the new Sequence IIIG LTMS was that no stand specific problems could exist in the IIIG test. If this assumption is incorrect, then as it stands now, the system has no provisions to identify problem stands in the industry and also has no provisions to remove them once identified.

The panel discussed forming a small group to look at the current IIIG LTMS system to see if the system we put into place is giving the desired results. The current system's inability to identify stand problems is a concern. In addition, the alarm repercussions from the new precision control charts may also need additional refinement. The Chairman agreed to contact Ben Weber to reconvene an LTMS group to review our current situation. It was requested that a small group consisting of statisticians, TMC, and other relevant parties be formed to evaluate the LTMS procedure.

To alleviate the laboratory problem created by the previous action and give the Task Force time to complete its task, the following motion was made by Bill Nahumck and seconded by Charlie Leverett.

Motion 1: *The Sequence III Surveillance Panel looked at the reference test in question at Lab B and has concluded that the change in status from a B1 precision alarm to a B2 precision alarm was an unintended consequence of our action of January 20, 2004 and is not appropriate for this specific case. The Sequence III Surveillance Panel is hereby directing the TMC will write an engineering judgment that states the B2 precision alarm it should be reduced to a B1 alarm for this specific case.*

The motion passed with a vote of 5 for, 0 against and 2 waives.

Change to reporting the MRV result in the Sequence IIIGA Test

Rick Oliver brought to the panel's attention of an issue related to how "no yield stress" is reported for the Sequence IIIGA test for the D4684 MRV TP-1 test. The following was sent out to the Surveillance Panel prior to the teleconference.

The procedure states:

"If a Yield Stress is obtained at the designated temperature, report the Yield Stress in Pa and note the Apparent Viscosity as not measured (NM). If a Yield Stress is not obtained at the designated temperature, report the Yield Stress as not measured (NM) and record the Apparent Viscosity in cP."

Earlier, we (RSI) found in Seq. IIIG Surveillance Panel minutes that some test sponsors want the Apparent Viscosity recorded even when a Yield Stress (greater than zero) is measured. This is counter to the first sentence in the portion of the procedure quoted above; but since this is covered in the minutes of the SP meeting, RSI will accommodate this.

The second sentence that says: "If a Yield Stress is not obtained at the designated temperature, report the Yield Stress as not measured (NM) and record the Apparent Viscosity in cP" is the situation for passing oils. In this case, however, some labs are putting in a "0" for Yield Stress

(instead of "NM" as specified by this sentence from the procedure) and then recording the Apparent Viscosity. The way the procedure is written "Not obtained" has to mean that it was measured and gave a "0" result rather than meaning that it was not actually measured because if you consider a "0" as an obtained yield stress, it would be covered by the first sentence quoted from the procedure above that says: "If a Yield Stress is obtained at the designated temperature, report the Yield Stress in Pa and note the Apparent Viscosity as not measured (NM)."

In the same email, Rick Oliver made the following which was seconded by Bill Nahumck. This puts our reporting of the MRV results consistent with D4684. (Report one or the other, NOT both.)

Motion 2: "If a Yield Stress greater than zero is obtained at the designated temperature, report the Yield Stress in Pa and note the Apparent Viscosity as not measurable (NM). If a Yield Stress greater than zero is not obtained at the designated temperature, report the Yield Stress as not measurable (NM) and record the Apparent Viscosity in cP."

Labs still have the discretion, as decided at our 10-29-03 meeting, to report the Apparent Viscosity when Yield Stress has occurred or show the designation of NM. No yield stress must be reported as NM. The chairman noted during the discussion that the ASTM committee headed by Chris May is currently investigating improvement to the test method and further changes may be forth coming related to how to report the results of D4684.

The motion passed with a vote of 7 for, 0 against and 0 waives.

IIIG Research Report

The Chairman reminded the panel a ballot to approve the IIIG Research Report will be issued soon.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:20 pm. The next meeting will be at the call of the chairman.