

The Sequence III Surveillance Panel met via conference call on February 11, 2009. Chairman Glaenzer called the meeting to order at 2:00pm and reviewed the membership in attendance.

The first item for discussion was the availability of a GF-5 capable reference oil for the Sequence IIIIG test. It is desired to have an oil capable of passing all GF-5 requirements. To date, no oil has been offered. Jim Linden and Ron Romano representing ILSAC will carry our request forward and contact oil companies.

Discussion then moved to the proper mix of calibration oils for future testing. At the Sequence IIIIG LTMS meeting in San Antonio on January 29, 2009 the group felt that the SP should consider discontinuing the use of oil 438 due to performance level and formulation make-up. The group also thought it prudent to hold the remainder of oil 434 (4 tests) for future comparison testing. Bruce Matthews of GM, indicated that they wanted to continue to use oil 438 as it was performing "on target" for WPD. Richard Grundza provided data from the last six months indicating that all three of the current oils were performing at about the same normalized results. Discussion moved to the target value of oil 434. This target value has been fixed since June 1, 2004 at a 23 test average. Several members indicated that they felt the WPD target was incorrect. Discussion on how to set targets for replacement oil 434-1 were held with no consensus opinion expressed. At this time the ASTM-TMC is gathering initial data on oil 434-1 with 5 data points so far. The Sequence IIIIG LTMS requires new or re-blended reference oil targets be established with at least eight data points. We should have eight data points within the next two months and the subject of setting the proper 434-1 targets will once again be discussed. A motion to discontinue assigning oil 434 was made by Greg Seman, seconded by Dwight Bowden and passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Two items were discussed that have potential of bringing insight into the shift of WPD performance seen since October, 2004. At the November, 2008 SP meeting held in Detroit it was requested that a thorough analysis of available fuel data be conducted. Todd Dvorak of Afton Chemical has been working with Haltermann Fuels and the ASTM-TMC to gather all the available data from production and quarterly lab analysis of fuel in storage at the labs. His analysis may lend insight into degradation of fuel over time. At the November, 2008 SP meeting, it was requested that a Unified Engine

Build (UEB) be conducted following a format similar to the one conducted in 2005, but using oil 434-1. Afton Chemical Corporation was to set up the UEB, but constraints at their lab have prevented scheduling. Greg Seman of Lubrizol has volunteered to take on the task and will host the UEB in Wickliffe, Ohio. Greg has been forwarded information from the 2005 activity. Prior to UEB activities it is requested that all lab secure the use of the Sunnen honing machine load meter dynamometer and calibrate their machines. Several labs have recently completed this activity with other scheduled. It is also requested that the labs forward copies of the calibration reports to the ASTM-TMC who will be asked to provide a summary of the data. The SP Discussed requiring calibration at a fixed frequency; however, no motion was brought forward at this time. The members felt they needed to review the data that was being generated by the current round of calibrations.

At the Sequence IIIIG LTMS meeting in San Antonio the group thought it appropriate for the SP to consider modifications to the IIIIG LTMS that deals with the application of severity adjustments. The trigger value for application of severity adjustments is tied to lambda and K values. The K value would be set to zero if a lab exhibited a fixed number of operationally valid tests in a row on one side of the target for the parameter. This would trigger severity adjustments even though the lab had not reached the LTMS threshold Zi value. Due to the complexity of the motion and the length of the conference call thus far, it was decided that the SP chairman, along with the industry statisticians would draft such a motion encompassing all of the details for letter ballot.

Several weeks ago it was noticed by a lab that the Sequence IIIIG test procedure did not document the allowable action of oil filter and/or oil cooler replacement as is available in the IIIF procedure. A motion was made by Dwight Bowden, seconded by Sid Clark to allow replacement. The exact wording of the motion to be included in the IIIIG procedure Section 6.10.5 is:

6.10.5. The oil cooler, oil filter, or both may be replaced once per test if bypass operation is detected. No new or retained used oil shall be added to the engine to replace any lost during the parts change. Note replacement in the Comments Section of the test report.

Several editorial clean-ups were made including:

1. The addition of a note to the IIIIGB LTMS manual pertaining to target data being interim and not produced by the IIIIGB procedure.
2. Wording in the IIIIG LTMS dealing with test starts in the grace period following the start of a calibration test.

Labs were encouraged to follow the recommendations for calibration of the EGO sensors. At our November, 2008 meeting we agreed to review this in six months with the possibility of removing the requirement for verification of Air-to-Fuel ratio using exhaust gas analysis.

David L. Glaenzer  
Sequence III Surveillance Panel Chairman  
Afton Chemical Corporation  
Phone: 804-788-5214  
Email: [dave.glaenzer@aftonchemical.com](mailto:dave.glaenzer@aftonchemical.com)

The information contained in this transmission is confidential and intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above and those properly entitled to access to the information. This transmission may contain information that is privileged and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this transmission is not the intended or an authorized recipient, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized disclosure, dissemination or duplication of this transmission is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by return email and delete the original message. This message (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communication Privacy Act, 18 USC sections 2510-2521, and is CONFIDENTIAL.

--

This message was scanned by ESVA and is believed to be clean.

[Click here to report this message as spam.](#)