



100 Barr Harbor Drive ■ PO Box C700 ■ West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959
Telephone: 610-832-9500 ■ Fax: 610-832-9555 ■ e-mail: service@astm.org ■ Website: www.astm.org

Committee D02 on PETROLEUM PRODUCTS AND LUBRICANTS

Chairman: W. JAMES BOVER, ExxonMobil Biomedical Sciences Inc, 1545 Route 22 East, PO Box 971, Annandale, NJ 08801-0971, (908) 730-1048, FAX: 908-730-1197, EMail: wjbover@erenj.com
First Vice Chairman: KENNETH O. HENDERSON, Cannon Instrument Co, PO Box 16, State College, PA 16804, (814) 353-8000, Ext: 0265, FAX: 814-353-8007, EMail: kenohenderson@worldnet.att.net
Second Vice Chairman: SALVATORE J. RAND, 221 Flamingo Drive, Fort Myers, FL 33908, (941) 481-4729, FAX: 941-481-4729
Secretary: MICHAEL A. COLLIER, Petroleum Analyzer Co LP, PO Box 206, Wilmington, IL 60481, (815) 458-0216, FAX: 815-458-0217, EMail: macvarlen@aol.com
Assistant Secretary: JANET L. LANE, ExxonMobil Research and Engineering, 600 Billingsport Rd, PO Box 480, Paulsboro, NJ 08066-0480, (856) 224-3302, FAX: 856-224-3616, EMail: janet_l.lane@email.mobil.com
Staff Manager: DAVID R. BRADLEY, (610) 832-9681, EMail: dbradley@astm.org

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 March 23, 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: Sid Clark, Mike Kasimirsky, Pat Lang, Bill Nahumck, Phil Scinto, Larry Hamilton, Monica Beyer, Gordon Farnsworth, Andrew Ritchie, Dwight Bowden, Jason Bowden, Adam Bowden, Charlie Leverett, Martin Chadwick, Jo Martinez, Dave Glaenger, Tim Caudill, Mark Mosher

Meeting was called to order at 11:03 ET on 3-23-04. The agenda consisted of the following items.

Approval of the Sequence IIIG Research Report
Motion for Unanimous Consent for Intake Manifold Gasket Change
Recent Referencing Issues with RO438 and Subsequent Changes to the IIIG LTMS

Approval of the Sequence IIIG Research Report

Bill Nahumck had issued an e-ballot for Surveillance Panel approval of the Sequence IIIG Research Report. As only 7 votes were cast by email (all affirmative), a final vote was conducted at the start of this teleconference.

Motion 1 (from email of 2-24-04): The Sequence III Surveillance Panel approves the Final Sequence III G Research Report that is posted on the ASTM TMC website as of 2-24-04.

The motion was approved unanimously by the panel. The chairman will notify the chairman of Subcommittee B1 and B to move the motion to a joint Subcommittee B ballot.

Motion for Unanimous Consent for Intake Manifold Gasket Change

There is a new Intake Manifold to Cylinder Head Gasket part number. The old part number is 12480830 (kit), which contained intake gasket part number 24507975. The new part number is 89017399 (kit), which contains intake gasket part number 12580779. It is a more robust gasket that has better sealing ribs around the ports and holes for the fasteners, in an effort to dry up the 3800 engine. **Motion for Unanimous Consent from Michael Kasimirsky** is to approve for use the new intake gasket part numbers detailed above in all Sequence III (F & G) testing. Implement the use of these new gaskets when current old stock is depleted. The Panel also tasks the TMC and Test Developer with revising the Test Procedure and Engine Assembly Manuals as appropriate.

As no objection was noted for the above motion, the motion is approved.

IIIG Referencing and LTMS Issues Related to Recent Actions with RO 438

The chairman sent out with the teleconference notice the following information.

As you are fully aware of the recent teleconferences related to referencing issues with RO 438, subsequent testing has been done by Lab G with the stand in question. The results, I think, have confirmed more of a stand related problem and not a laboratory problem. Mike Kasimirsky has provided the following summary (noted below) of the results of those teleconference actions and all of the related testing. Based on continued mild results in one stand, I believe it is pertinent to review the actions we took and the recommendations noted below from the TMC.

“As part of the actions taken by the Sequence III Surveillance Panel during the last teleconference, Lab G was to conduct a reference oil test on stand 5 on reference oil 435. That has been completed at this time.

To recap, stand 5 had produced two very mild ACLW results on reference oil 438 (6.4 and 9.0 micrometers, respectively) and as a result of those two tests the panel approved a motion to remove the transformation on ACLW results on reference oil 438. The test targets were also reset, based upon all available data and with no transformation on ACLW results.

Since that time, stand 5 has conducted two tests on reference oil 435. The first test (EOT 2/8/04) produced an ACLW result of 14.1 (ACLW target for 435 is ~35.1 micrometers), but that test was deemed to be invalid because of a coolant flow offset. However, the coolant out temperature QI results were positive and the laboratory gave sufficient credence to the result to begin an investigation into the test stand. No major problems were found.

The test was rerun (EOT 3/13/04) and the rerun produced an ACLW result of 12.0 on reference oil 435. This test was deemed invalid by the laboratory because it is not representative of the overall laboratory performance on ACLW. The lab has also pulled this stand from IIIG testing, as well as IIIF testing, because they feel the data indicates that they have a stand problem.

As such, this indicates that the actions taken by the panel in regards to transformation on reference oil 438 were based upon questionable data and are therefore worthy of review. The first two data points on this stand were used to justify the removal of the transformation on ACLW results on this reference oil. Also, this data has been included in the test targets for reference oil 438.

As a result, several actions are needed by the Surveillance Panel at this time. First and foremost, is the disposition of the recent data from Lab G Stand 5. According to the IIIG LTMS, once a stand has been used for registered candidate testing, no reference oil data may be removed from the laboratory control chart. The TMC's opinion is that the previous two data points on stand 5 should not be included in the laboratory control charts and should also not be used in the generation of test targets. Along the same lines, while we do not agree that "not being indicative of overall laboratory performance" is an acceptable reason to invalidate a test, we do agree that this data should not be included in the laboratory's control charts or the test target data set. As such, we would recommend the following course of action by the Sequence III Surveillance Panel:

- 1) Approve of the removal from the chartable database of the two previous tests on reference oil 438 on stand 5 (assuming no candidate oil testing was conducted on that stand since 12/27/03, the EOT date of the first test in question) as well as this most recent result on reference oil 435.*
- 2) Approve of the reinstatement of the transformation on reference oil 438 for ACLW results, effective back to when it was removed, i.e. "undo" our previous decision.*
- 3) Approve of the resetting of reference oil 438 test targets, excluding the above data and including the ACLW transformation, effective on February 1, 2004. I.e. recalculate the previous update to the test targets, which took effect on February 1st.*
- 4) Task the LTMS Task Force with providing a recommendation for a new IIIG LTMS by April 15th. If no recommendation is forthcoming by that time, implement the IIIF LTMS into IIIG use (using IIIG test targets) at that time until such a recommendation is made."*

The chairman reiterated his comments that were sent with the meeting notice. Please note that no motions have been made at this point. But we as a Surveillance Panel need to confirm what direction we want to pursue to the TMC and ourselves. I think we are at one of those points where we need to step back, take a look at what we have done and determine what our best technical option is. It will be imperative that the LTMS task Force meet and review everything that is related to the IIIG LTMS and provide the Surveillance Panel with their best recommendation. As I have noted before, the lab based LTMS for Sequence IIIG may need to go through some evolution to really get it where we feel that it is doing what is best for all.

Michael Kasimirsky started the discussion by a quick review of the recommendations that were distributed. Many agreed with the recommendations that we need a more thought out resolution to what we just went through. Although the use of non-transformed data for wear with RO 438 has merit, it appears that the original log transformed data may have properly identified a problem. The

criteria that have been established in the LTMS for dealing with failed reference oils may not have been adequate to flush out the mild results in one stand in one lab. There needs to be additional guidelines for dialogue between the test lab and the TMC related to the impact of the failure. We also discussed whether a rolling block of 4 results is desirable for setting SA's. Other topics such as how to deal with and calculate the B2 and B3 precision alarms; if a stand is pull from the system, how many runs should be required to bring back into the system; how and when to use transformations were discussed. The general opinion was that we should reset the targets for the industry charts and the laboratory charts back to where this issue started, but no changes to existing SA's would be implemented at this time. The Surveillance Panel would also request that the LTMS Task Force convene to thoroughly review what happened with this situation and develop a comprehensive recommendation to the Surveillance Panel for improvements over the existing IIIG LTMS lab based system requirements. The Task Force needs to meet soon so the Surveillance Panel can implement corrections to the system as soon as possible.

Motion 2: By Gordon Farnsworth, seconded by Sid Clark. *Move to accept the first three (3) recommendations from the TMC related to the IIIG LTMS. Approval of this motion would apply to Severity Adjustments (SA), effective March 23, 2004.*

The motion approved unanimously by the panel.

Motion 3: By Gordon Farnsworth, seconded by Sid Clark. *Task the LTMS Task Force to convene and provide a recommendation to the Sequence III Surveillance Panel for necessary revisions to the IIIG LTMS and report them to our next face-to-face meeting or no later than May 31, 2004.*

The motion approved unanimously by the panel.

New Business

1. We are still having issues with the proper reporting of MRV results as they are receiving different ways of reporting issues, such as how to report MRV results that are from samples that are basically solid at the test temperature. Solid, 999,999 and NM have been used. RSI would like this aspect clarified. The chairman will work with O&H and bench test group headed by Chris May to attempt to bring these MRV reporting issues to closure.
2. The Surveillance Panel would also like some feedback from Chris May as to what MRV results and conclusions his group has developed with the Sequence IIIG test oils that were sent for round robin testing.

Adjournment

The meeting was recessed at approximately 11:55 AM and we agreed to resume on 1-15-04 at 3:00 pm ET.