



**COMMITTEE D02 on PETROLEUM PRODUCTS, LIQUID FUELS, AND LUBRICANTS**

**CHAIRMAN:** Scott Fenwick, National Biodiesel Board, PO Box 104848, Jefferson City, MO 65110-4898, United States (800) 841-5849, Fax: (537) 635-7913, e-mail: [sfenwick@biodiesel.org](mailto:sfenwick@biodiesel.org)

**FIRST VICE CHAIRMAN:** Gregory C Miiller, Tannas Co, 4800 James Savage Rd, Midland, MI 48642, United States (989) 496-2309, Fax: (989) 496-3438, e-mail: [gmiiller@savantgroup.com](mailto:gmiiller@savantgroup.com)

**SECOND VICE CHAIRMAN:** James J Simnick, Bp Global Fuels Technology, 150 Warrenville Rd, BP Technology Center Mail Stop 603-2W, Naperville, IL 60563, United States (331) 702-4071, Fax: (630) 420-4831, e-mail: [simnicj@bp.com](mailto:simnicj@bp.com)

**MEMBERSHIP SECRETARY:** Ian P Mylrea, Stanhope-Seta, 70 Bramley Drive, Hampshire, RG27 8ZF, United Kingdom (193) 2 5-4589, e-mail: [im@stanhope-seta.co.uk](mailto:im@stanhope-seta.co.uk)

**STAFF MANAGER:** Alyson Fick, (610) 832-9710, e-mail: [afick@astm.org](mailto:afick@astm.org)

## SEQUENCE IX TASK FORCE

Date: 3 Aug 23

### ATTENDANCE

SWRI	Christine Eickstead, Khaled Rais, Pat Lang
INTERTEK	Al Lopez, Jason Soto
LUBRIZOL	George Szappanos
AFTON	Jason Lekarich, Bob Campbell, Ben Maddock
INFINEUM	Andy Ritchie, Todd Dvorak
TMC	Rich Grundza
FORD	Mike Deegan

### ATTACHMENTS:

## MEETING:

### Test Name:

Deegan: would like to call it Aged Oil LSPI

Christine – does it need the Sequence number in the name?

Rich – don't really have strong feelings one way or another

George – where would this name show up?

Jason L. - Isn't the intent that this test type is part of the IX procedure?

Andy – so if one runs an aged oil LSPI, it is a IX? Jason L. – depends on if it's aged IAW the procedure

George – if the IX were to change in a few years, would it be a IXAB? Rich – thought about it... we didn't consider that when named IIIHA and B

Pat – should we go with IX Aged?

Rich – that might be a reasonable solution

Deegan – so IXA Aged Oil LSPI?

Rich – IX Aged Oil, if I could choose

Christine – any strong opposition to this?

Andy – not first preference but can live with it

Rich – will amend Information Letter to include "IX Aged Oil" and place in appropriate section of procedure

Deegan – can change the TMC page from "Used"?

Rich – it should all go under the IX from now on

### Report forms:

Rich – all good except need to update the test name now

Retro-active registration – date?

Pat – usually look for a point in time where the procedure was set with no more changes.

Rich – true. Maybe anything run after the matrix? On a calibrated LSPI stand?

Bob – such a messy path though, not sure we should go back that far. Line in the stand should be the date the LTMS was approved

Rich – so date = when IL and LTMS issued?

Christine = so what is the date? what was the date the LTMS was approved? (Reviews minutes...) the LTMS was approved on 2 May. The IL issued on 5 June, so which date?

Christine – so May 2, 2023 is the data for retro-active registration pending surveillance panel approval.

### BOIVGRA:

Andy – TF approves in principle that the BOIVGRA read-across tables should be approved as the same as for fresh oils

Bob – this is really simple. This is not our lane at all, someone else can figure this out. Al – agreed, just cross this item off our list.

Pat- BOI/VGRA was discussed at the June AOAP Meeting and the BOI/VGRA group was asked to look review it.

Stand number for registration?

Rich – has to be aging stand

Deegan – we track the LSPI stand number, right? Christine – yes, it's in the report

Can the two parts of the test be performed at different labs?

Rich – right now, prohibited from doing that. Report forms do not discern between labs

George and Ben Maddock – don't see why this shouldn't be allowed

Pat – right now no goal posts for aging results. So part of me sees the two stands coupled together

Todd – agrees. We assume there is no difference, but data may tell us otherwise in the future. Should go on the assumption that the two stands are in the same lab. Might change in future, but only with more data to evaluate.

Christine – the lab running the LSPI test would have to sign off (on the report) on another lab's work during the aging run. This would be tricky.

Al – if run across two labs, should calibrate the stand "couple" across labs?

Rich – would have to alter forms to accommodate lab codes

Andy – go back to Christine's point of verifying the other lab's work...

Al, Jason and Christine – report forms, signing other labs' work, brings up legal issues. Who wants to run this?

George – if you age an oil, then have trouble with LSPI stand, it makes sense to send it to a different lab for the LSPI portion

Andy – if that's the case, go to another lab, re-age the oil, run LSPI

Pat – agrees, stay conservative for now

George – if we do nix the two lab idea, what about running in same lab, but each test run by different engineer?

Christine – wouldn't that be an internal decision? We have two engineers on tests all the time with one signature on the report. But that is verifying work done in one's own lab, not a different one

Todd – if really want to split labs, would have to have some data to prove that it is okay

Christine – so, we can revisit this in a year if we need to, once we have more data.

#### **Appendix K list:**

Todd – we can go over it

Andy – do we really need to? Todd – a few things we are responsible for...

(went through several items and added notes)

## Machined pistons:

Khaled – (went through presentation)

We pulled the engine with the machined pistons out recently and ran it again. (shows results) SwRI doesn't have that many BBs left, so looking for alternative

Pistons	CMIR	Oil	Target	AVPIE
2019-BB Machined	169254	221	10.94	9
2019-BB Machined	166512	224	3.68	3.25
2019-BB Machined	179877	224	3.68	2.75

Christine – For some background: this was discussed last November at the in-person meeting at IAR. The consensus then was that the machined pistons were a viable option, and would be brought in on a reference, as the dealer pistons have been. Then the idea of the machined pistons was tabled in favor of pursuing the IMTS pistons. While the IMTS pistons are still an option, they are not available yet. So we are, in essence, picking up where we left off back in November with the machined pistons. The machined pistons would just serve as a stop-gap until we can prove-out the IMTS pistons.

Andy – any idea of engine life with these pistons? Christine – no data on this yet, we haven't gone past run 3 so far

Andy – so what are you looking for? Christine – technical approval from TF group, then we will bring this up for a vote at the SP level. The dealer pistons were brought in with an SP vote, should do these the same way

Pat – looking at this as an interim solution until the IMTS pistons are available

Andy – need to bring this to the SP

Christine – any concerns that we can address now, before the SP?

Rich – are the three run calibratable? Christine – yes. According to the LTMS, both sets of tests would pass and the engine would be calibrated. Rich – will look at the LTMS. Christine – SwRI has no problem running another reference if needed

Al – what kind of supply are you planning to make (batch size) for the short term? Let's say the IMTS pistons come in and don't work. What then is the plan for making more of the machined pistons? Al – LSPI has a short reference period, and the references will really tell you if they are good. So should be okay with multiple batches in the mix.

Andy – this is really not controversial, so bring it up for a vote at the SP and should be good to go.

Khaled – so no major objections noted here, will bring it to the SP.

**SP Meeting:**

Pat – so when can schedule SP meeting? Khaled – two weeks from now? Rich – good. Khaled will schedule it to go over the name change, retro date, and machined pistons.

***Meeting adjourned.***