

Sequence V Surveillance Panel Meeting October 31st, 2022 10 AM EST, via Webex

Roll Call:

Afton: B. Maddock
ExxonMobil: P. Rubas
Ford: M. Deegan
General Motors: B. Cosgrove
Haltermann: E. Hennessy, I. Mathur
Infineum: D. Boese, C. Laufer, A. Ritchie (Chair)
Intertek: A. Lopez
Lubrizol: J. Catanese, G. Szappanos
OHT: J. Bowden
Oronite: J. Martinez
Chris Taylor
Shell: J. Hsu
SwRI: D. Engstrom, T. Kostan, P. Lang, M. Lochte
TMC: R. Grundza

Meeting Summary:

- Haltermann's lab results from the new fuel batch is expected this week. Once RVP is confirmed, they will communicate with the labs re: scheduling delivery. The SP will reconvene on Monday 11/7 to review side-by-side comparisons of the fuel CoAs.
- There was discussion on a tabled motion re: RAC target setting for RO 940 and its impact on the matrix design with the new fuel batch. The group will reconvene on Thursday 10/10 to discuss further, facilitated by a document that the statisticians will prepare to outline the options.

Next meetings:

- Webex: November 7th, 2022 at 2 PM EST, back up on Tuesday Nov 8th to review fuel CoAs
- Webex: November 10th, 2022 at 2 PM EST to discuss matrix composition and impact on RAC target setting
- F-2-F: November 16th, 2022 at 8 AM CST in San Antonio
- Task Force session to agree next steps (not fixed)

Meeting Details:

Re: Fuel status, Ed Hennessy (Halterman) relayed the message from William Hairston (Haltermann) that all the raw materials have been introduced to the tank and they are in the process of adjusting the RVP by tomorrow. Haltermann is expecting results of their lab tests on Thursday this week and once the RVP is confirmed, they will be ready to communicate with labs re: scheduling delivery. The SP group will reconvene on Monday, Nov 7th at 2 pm to review the CoAs (back-up date of Nov 8th).

The letter communicating the unavailability of the VH test was circulated to Angela Willis and Joe Franklin (see Appendix). Mike Deegan (Ford) confirmed it was not discussed during last week's meetings. The Chair will follow up and make sure API is taking the appropriate actions.

Re: current fuel inventory: Both IAR and SwRI will be out of fuel after the next couple candidates. Ben Maddock (Afton) reported that they have a couple candidates remaining but are not starting anything yet. Tony Catanese (Lubrizol) reported the same status as Afton's. Valvoline may also have a number of weeks' worth of fuel remaining (unconfirmed).

There was some discussion on the logistics of the new fuel batch distribution and whether the labs should prepare for a full truck load. Indresh Mathur (Haltermann) expects that each lab would be receiving a full truck load of fuel each. He will follow up offline with Afton as they are running less tests in the matrix and may not need a full truck load.

Al Lopez (Intertek) raised two old business items:

- 1) Negative ballot on the RVP item
- 2) Motion to reset RAC targets for RO 940

The Chair reminded the group that the negative was deemed to be persuasive and that it was agreed that the panel would discuss again but until then RVP measurements should be made as had been the case before the ASTM ballot was taken. Note, due to the current situation with the new fuel batch, the discussion on RVP measurements would be deferred to a future panel call. No objections were raised.

The motion to update the RAC target for RO 940 and subsequent discussion can be seen starting from the June 2nd SP minutes

(<https://astmtmc.org/ftp/docs/gas/sequencev/minutes/VMinutes20220602ConferenceCall.pdf>).

Al Lopez (Intertek) highlighted the importance of resolving this motion before the current matrix with the new fuel batch completes. The plan is for the motion to be deferred to the F2F meeting on the 16th.

A separate but related item, Jo Martinez (Oronite) reported that there was consideration during TGC to drop RO 940. Travis Kostan (SwRI) commented that we would like to know about the future of 940 in order to design the fuel matrix itself. Discussion/questions are listed below, to be raised again when the group reconvenes to discuss in further detail:

- Al Lopez (Intertek) raised several comments and questions for the group to think about: If we don't have enough 940 in the current matrix, we won't have confidence in its performance with the new fuel. We removed some 940 tests because we were more interested in 931 and 1011-1. Would we use 940 as a reference oil when only a few matrix tests are run? Why even run 940 in the matrix if it will not be used as a RO going forward? On the other hand, if we don't observe sludge with 940 and the current fuel, that's a problem too, so 940 does have a role to play here.
- Rich Grundza (TMC) said it depends on the intent. If the intent is to estimate the severity around the category pass limits, then running 940 would probably not be necessary.
- Al added: how would we know if the test is discriminating at a poor performance level if we don't have a reference oil at that performance level? Would a couple of scoping tests be enough?
- Rich remarked there is a precedent (VIE) for the frequency of reference oils being weighted differently. Instead of a third/third/third RO allocations, it could be a 20/40/40 allocation for example.

- The proposed matrix was shared on the screen from the October 11th minutes:

• Proposed new 15 VH test matrix was endorsed but it was agreed that it would be reexamined when the 5 Row 1 test results are available.

Run	SwRI1	SwRI2	IAR1	IAR2	Afton	RO	n-size
1	931	1011-1	931	1011-1	1011-1	940	3
2	1011-1	931	1011-1	931	931	931	6
3	931	940	940	1011-1	940	1011-1	6

• Concern expressed at the ability to set good 940 targets with the new fuel, if only 3 (Row 3) 940 data points are available. Group agreed to revisit this concern when Row 1 and 2 VH data is available.

Al asked if we have enough 940 in the matrix. He recalled that some 940 tests were removed from Row 1 because the goal was about seeing 931 performance at around the limits and separation from 1011. Jo added that at a minimum, we would need 6 tests of each RO. Al asked if there's a way to increase the size of the matrix and run 3 more tests since the current matrix may not be big enough or if there's a way to run more 940 after the matrix and set the targets after more tests. Doyle Boese (Infinium) clarified that in order to set initial targets, we would need 6 for each oil at a minimum and explained that in this case, 6 may not be necessary because we're using the data to come up with a correction factor that is either the same for each oil or different because it is a linear adjusted CF.

- The Chair reminded the group of Al's point that the RAC does need to be set properly so that the new fuel batch can be best evaluated.

Once the group makes a decision on RO 940 with the new fuel batch in the next couple weeks (ie: Should 940 be included in the matrix? How should it be tested less than the other 2 RO oils? How should the targets for 940 be set?), the item that Jo raised about whether or not 940 is included as one of the calibration oils can be discussed, potentially at the F2F on the 16th. Travis Kostan (SwRI) offered to put together a document, with input from the other statisticians, clearly laying out the options with their pros and cons. This will very much help facilitate future discussion and is scheduled for the November 10th.

Al Lopez (Intertek) mentioned that the Severity TF is still an open item. The test sponsor has requested for completion of the task, with a summary of what was accomplished and what needs to be done. He noted that labs visits were planned but were put on hold due to travel restrictions at the time. The Chair stated this can be discussed at the F2F but the minutes and notes would need to be reviewed to prepare for the discussion.

Meeting adjourned at 10:52 AM EST.

Appendix: VH test is unavailable communication



VH test is
unavailable commur