



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

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

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: simnicij@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

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

VIE SP CONFERENCE CALL

Date: 10 Mar 22

ATTENDANCE

SWRI	Christine Eickstead, Pat Lang, Dan Engstrom
INTERTEK	Bill Buscher
LUBRIZOL	Andrew Stevens
AFTON	Ben Maddock, Christian Porter
ORONITE	Robert Stockwell
INFINEUM	Andy Ritchie
TMC	Rich Grundza
EXXON	Paul Rubas
GM	Aleise Jimenez
OHT	J. H. Bowden
SHELL	Jeff Hsu
GAGE PRODUCTS	Jim Carter
HALTERMAN	Prasad Tumati
TEI	Dan Lanctot

MEETING:

MOTION 1: Approve minutes from 1 Mar 22	
Proposed:	Andrew Stevens
Second:	Ben Maddock
Discussion:	Jason Bowden – do not see minutes from 1 Mar 22 meeting on TMC website. Rich – yes, they are missing somehow. Rich will look into this. Andrew – will suspend this vote until the next call so attendees will have the opportunity to review them.
Questions:	None
Votes:	<i>Waive:</i> 0 <i>Negative:</i> 0 <i>Approve:</i> Unanimous
Outcome:	Motion suspended until next meeting.

Andrew – Any questions about the parts spreadsheet?

Bill – Ended the last meeting with discussion of whether to remove part numbers (PNs) at all from procedure.

Andrew – Yes, that will be discussed. First, are there any questions about the specifics in the spreadsheet? Group – no.

Andrew – Will consider the parts spreadsheet acceptable as is.

Andrew –

The overall goal of this project was to have one primary PN listed in document. Other approved/alternate PNs would reside in a separate section or list. Thoughts overall? If this concept is acceptable to the group, how to proceed?

Bill – There was some concern (justified) expressed last meeting about taking too much info out of procedure, with no ASTM oversight of the external document. But, this is up to the Surveillance Panel (SP), just like other test types. The SP is responsible for maintaining procedure *and* external documents. This has been successfully done on other test types – the IIIF, IIIG had engine build manuals that were external to the procedure. Also IVB, GMOD, etc. I believe this industry, with the way we operate, we could do an adequate job, considering the III and IV test type histories.

Rich – The best way to approach this is to add another annex to the procedure with PNs. Don't see the wisdom in making another controlled document to maintain.

Aleise – How to go about changes to the document? Group – Any changes would be addressed in a SP meeting and Information Letter (IL). Would not have to modify entire procedure, just external document.

Andrew – Would avoid having to review procedure and *all* ILs... just review one spreadsheet for all approved PNs.

Jason - So will there be an IL issued with each change to the external document? No. With regard to build manuals, all PNs in the build manuals reside in the procedure also, and governed by the ASTM. Reiterate – the Task Force did a significant amount of work here, and probably long overdue. So why we can't go forward with the annex in the procedure and make changes to the procedure alone?

Andrew – Why not have an IL issued for changes in the external document?

Andy – There have been over 800 ILs issued since 1976. All were changes to test procedures. All of these were up to challenges, and the ultimate acceptance lies up the ASTM food chain. So the IL system has served us well over the years, allowing us to be both flexible and responsive. But also caution – the system does have pitfalls.

Bill – correction for my earlier comment- on the IVB, the engine build manual does include PNs, but there is also an annex in the procedure that lists these PNs. So the PNs are ultimately governed by the procedure review process.

Rich – Biggest concern – with an external document, now have 2-3 documents to try and maintain. Really want to avoid mistakes and the outrage that comes with mistakes. Don't see what we're gaining with an external document, especially from an audit standpoint.

Andrew – For example, we haven't been able to incorporate changes in today's spreadsheet until now and the original audit was back in October.

Rich – But we would have to go through same process with an external document right?

Andrew – Yes, but the external document could be updated immediately. Also concerned that someone might read procedure and miss requirements that are in ILs.

Rich – There are cautions in the procedure to refer to ILs. I'll do whatever you guys want, just don't see the point.

Andy – I encourage the group to take Rich's guidance here. The system works. We need the least disruptive, most efficient way to get things done here.

Bill – One suggestion – If the issue of removing PNs is holding up changes, let's take that off the table, and approve items in spreadsheet.

Andrew – No, these are actual changes to the procedure. Also, not suggesting taking PNs out of procedure entirely, just have primary PNs in procedure, alternates listed elsewhere. If group agrees we do not want an external document, would still advocate making an annex.

MOTION 2: Approve all recommendations in Andrew's spreadsheet. Have Rich make an annex to go in the procedure with alternate part numbers. All part numbers will remain in the procedure; there will be no external document containing alternate part numbers for the VIE test type.

Proposed: Bill Buscher
Second: Andy Ritchie

Discussion:

Pat – This came up at the last TGC meeting. Similar objections there, and lots of compromises put forth. TGC looks at things from broad standpoint - would this be a possible protocol that could be implemented across test types? With the oppositions I am hearing now, it sounds like in general the group is not comfortable with general idea of external document.

Christian – Maybe we need to add supersession chain to it. Will have same issue whether the document is in or out of the procedure. If we have an external document – is it owned by SP? If a PN changes and the OEM approves the new PN, the SP votes on it, then document is updated.

Aleise – Agree with annex being decent path forward. Stockwell also.

Andrew – other questions or discussion? No.

Votes: *Waive:* Dan Lanctot, Jeff Hsu, Jim Carter
Negative: None
Approve: Dan Engstrom, Bill Buscher, Andrew Stevens, Christian Porter, Andy Ritchie, Robert Stockwell, Rich Grundza, Paul Rubas, Aleise Jimenez, Jason Bowden, Prasad Tumati

Outcome: Motion passes: Approve – 11, Waive - 3

Andrew – Do we want to discuss how to handle the logistics of how to incorporate this stuff?

Rich – Yes. I will draft annex and reference for the procedure where appropriate.

Andrew – Do you need resources for this?

Rich – No, the spreadsheet is adequate to create the annex.

Andrew – Any other topics for discussion? Group – no. Great, Andrew will work with Rich on developing annex.

Meeting topics concluded, meeting adjourned.