Sequence X Severity Task Force

Meeting Minutes

04/06/22

Attendance 02/08/22

- Michael Deegan
- Rich Grundza
- Ben Maddock
- Christine Eickstead
- George Szappanos
- Jason Soto
- Alfonso Lopez
- Travis Kostan

Agenda 04/06/22

- E Ballot closed 03/14/22
- Negative Vote on E-ballot D02(22-01)
- Action Item update
- Jason list of lab experiments performed to date
- TMC Reference Data
- Report to Surveillance panel
- Hardware Update

E - Ballots

- E-Ballot issued 02/28/22 - 03/14/22 has passed with no negatives.
  - Ballot covered several changes to the peocedure. Details on email to panel dated 02/28/22.
  - Rich Grundza to issue information letter.

- E-Ballot / Information letter D02(22-01)
  - A negative vote was received at Sub B.
  - The negative vote was for specifying a profilometer by brand.
- **8.13.1** *General*—Carry out deglazing after ultrasonic cleaning for both new and used engines under the
- following conditions to achieve an per cylinder average surface roughness (*Ra*) of 9 0.178 µm to 13 0.330
- µm (7 µin to 13 µin) and 30° ± 5° crosshatch using a Mitutoyo SJ-410 profilometer.
  - A response is required at Sub B to support our non pursuasive position to this negative

Lab Status

- Labs have been successful in calibrating stands using oil 270. Oil 271 has been out of assignment since 04/08/21. Oil suspension ending April 2022
- Oil 1011-1 not introduced due to mild shift
- LTMS Reference data file review – Stands calibrated
  - Lab A - 1
  - Lab B - 0
  - Lab D - 0
  - Lab E - 0
  - Lab G – 2
- Task Force to report to Surveillance Panel this month.
  - Summarize

Task Force Update

- Task Force to report to Surveillance Panel this month.
  - Summarize – Action items
  - Discuss oil 271 suspension
  - Evaluate options for mild shift – Stats group to review
  - Test severity has not improved with task force efforts / experiments
- Additional test experiment
  - IAR ran original BB piston engine chain and sprockets.
  - Severity level did not improve with oil 271

Hardware

- FCS has been contacted for a re-quote of all 2.0L hardware that was offered in 2017.
  - Hardware meetings are scheduled to discuss outages, superseded part numbers and group purchases
- Test labs are running low on non - critical hardware.
- Intertek has depleted BC pistons. Other labs also running Low.
- 2018 Engines are fitted with CA pistons.
- Jason to survey dealerships for BC piston availability.
- 2018 Engines can be used with the CA pistons. Reference testing will be required. Surveillance Panel to discuss.

Sequence X Severity
Mathematical Corrective Options

Statistics Group

June 2021

Statistics Group

- Doyle Boese, Infineum
- Jo Martinez, Chevron Oronite
- Martin Chadwick, Intertek
- Phil Scinto, Lubrizol
- Richard Grundza, TMC
- Todd Dvorak, Afton
- Travis Kostan, SwRI

Background

All 3 reference oils appear to have shifted by similar CHST amount. Therefore Ln(CHST) more greatly impacted Oil 271. Oil 271 has been temporarily suspended.



Executive Summary

The statistics group has ordered potential test severity remedies below in order from most to least preferred.

1. Return the test to traditional severity levels through an engineering solution.

2. Continue the suspension of reference oil 271.
   - The remaining 2 oils can still track test severity in both the mild and severe direction, and are not causing problems with lab calibration.
   - Some options exist for running 271 on a less frequent basis and not for calibration. This can be explored/discussed further if the panel desires.

3. If a mathematical solution is desired, the majority preference of the statistics group is to update the reference oil standard deviations as shown in the table below. To prevent an overly large influence of oil 271 on the severity adjustment standard deviation, the stats group recommends using the oil 270 standard deviation as the standard deviation for severity adjustments. This is appropriate if one believes candidate results near the performance of oil 271 have not seen as large a shift in transformed units.

Oil	Current S.D.	New S.D.
270	0.17435	0.24011
271	0.17537	0.56272
1011	0.18882	0.27434
Severity Adj. S.D.	0.17856	0.24011*

* - Standard deviation on Oil 270

Mathematical Corrective Options Considered

The following are a list of options for mathematical corrective options evaluated (in no particular order). Fixing a problem mathematically for the reference oils does not mean that the underlying problem will be fixed for candidate oils.

1. Re-evaluate the transformation based on the current data set. If different from Ln, calculate new means and standard deviations. Also consider removing the transformation from Oil 271 only. Would require new mean and standard deviation for this oil.
   - ***Result*** – A square root transformation was slightly preferred over the natural log but provided only small relief. This fix would likely be needed in addition to a standard deviation adjustment, and fewer changes are preferred to many.

2. Correction factors. This would be applied equally to all oils, candidates and references. Evaluate constant and proportional correction factors to transformed and untransformed results.
   - ***Result*** – Constant correction factors in untransformed units were reasonable, but slightly over- and under-corrected some reference oils. Proportional correction factors bring all oils back to target, but results in large positive corrections for mild oils, requiring strong belief that candidates near oil 271 performance are behaving similarly. For any correction factor options, the lack of root cause also makes starting/stopping point of correction factor implementation unclear.

3. Calculate new standard deviations. This will make the standard deviation of 271 larger and thus bring the standardized result closer to target.
   - ***Result*** – This option was chosen, as it provides relief to the test while requiring the least amount of changes to the way the test has been run historically.

When Did the Shift Occur?

When did the shift occur?

Because we have been unable to tie the shift in severity to any particular change in the test, we do not have clear guidance as to how we draw the line in the sand. The following slides will discuss each of the 3 options below.



When did the shift occur?

Line #1 is suggested as the best split according to a partition analysis (08/08/19). After this date we began to see some of the lowest results even seen on oil 270.



When did the shift occur?

Split #2 is based on the date of the first data of an extreme mild 271. The other 271 from the same day would go in the pre-shift group.



When did the shift occur?

Split #3 appears to be the split which best captures the point in time when all 3 oils were producing almost exclusively mild results.



When did the shift occur?

-Fuel Batches

The data was colored by fuel batch ID to investigate how the timeline aligns with fuel batch changes. Split #1 lines up fairly well with change to “H” batch, while split #3 lines up with change to “N” batch.



When did the shift occur?

-Lab Differences

The plot below shows Lab G showed the first evidence of the shift among labs after split #1.



Standard Deviation Update

New Standard Deviations

Below are some comparisons of options for new standard deviations. The standard deviation update using "Post #1" was preferred.

Oil	Current S.D.	S.D. Post #1	S.D. Post #3	S.D. All Data
270	0.17435	0.24011	0.21619	0.19023
271	0.17537	0.56272	0.77157	0.33291
1011	0.18882	0.27434*	0.24701*	0.21735
Pooled	0.17856	0.39913	0.46779	0.25746
Recommended		0.24011**		

* - Actual was 0.37932. However, with only 4 data points in Post #1 and Post #3, it seemed more appropriate to estimate using the ratio observed with the "All Data" standard deviation for 270/1011 (0.21735/0.19023).

** - Standard deviation of oil 270

Updating Yi Using Post #1 S.D.

Yi’s after 08/08/2019 here shown with updated standard deviations for Post #1 period.



Impact of Updated Severity Adjustment S.D.

The table to the right indicates how candidate results will be adjusted on a stand with a Zi value of -1 with the updated pooled SA of 0.24011.

CHST	Ln(CHST)	Ln(CHST)+0.24011	CHST FNL
0.010	-4.6052	-4.3651	0.013
0.020	-3.9120	-3.6719	0.025
0.030	-3.5066	-3.2664	0.038
0.040	-3.2189	-2.9788	0.051
0.050	-2.9957	-2.7556	0.064
0.060	-2.8134	-2.5733	0.076
0.070	-2.6593	-2.4192	0.089
0.080	-2.5257	-2.2856	0.102
0.090	-2.4079	-2.1678	0.114
0.100	-2.3026	-2.0625	0.127
0.110	-2.2073	-1.9672	0.140
0.120	-2.1203	-1.8802	0.153
0.130	-2.0402	-1.8001	0.165
0.140	-1.9661	-1.7260	0.178
0.150	-1.8971	-1.6570	0.191

Appendix

Re-evaluation of the Transformation

Re-evaluating the transformation

-Using All Data with “Pre” or “Post” added to Model

Partition analysis suggests best split at 08/08/19. All data in in right box labeled as “Post.” All other data labeled “Pre”. Then modeled CHST ~ Oil, Lab, Stand[Lab], Pre/Post. Square root transformation more appropriate here.



Re-evaluating the transformation

-Using All Data with “Pre” or “Post” added to Model

All data in in right box labeled as “Post” (except for first near target 271). All other data labeled “Pre”. Then modeled CHST ~ Oil, Lab, Stand[Lab], Pre/Post. Square root transformation more appropriate here.



Re-evaluating the transformation

-Using All Data with “Pre” or “Post” added to Model

All data in in right box labeled as “Post” All other data labeled “Pre”. Then modeled CHST ~ Oil, Lab, Stand[Lab], Pre/Post. Square root transformation more appropriate here.



Sqrt. Transformed Targets -Averages

In order to keep the pivot point the same for positive and negative severity adjustments, the original targets were back-transformed into original units, and then the square root transformation is applied to obtain the target Sqrt(CHST) for each oil.

Reference Oil	Target Ln(CHST)	Target CHST	Target Sqrt(CHST)
270	-2.15699	0.1157	0.34011
271	-2.60987	0.0735	0.27119
1011	-2.08191	0.1247	0.35312

Sqrt. Transformed Targets -Standard Deviations

Standard Deviation #1 – For each Oil, Calculated Std. Dev. of (Result-Target). Used $n = 71$ data set prior to any evidence of the mild shift (labeled "Pre #1" in previous slide).

Standard Deviation #2 – For each Oil, Calculated Std. Dev. of (Result-Target). Used all data.

Reference Oil	Target Sqrt(CHST)	Std. Dev. 1	Std. Dev. 2
270	0.34011	0.02784	0.03116
271	0.27119	0.02298	0.03421
1011	0.35312	0.03023	0.03343
Pooled		0.02681	0.03281
Average		0.02702	0.03293

Plot of CHST Yi Using Sqrt. With SD#1

Below is a plot of the CHSTYi when calculated using the standard deviation of the data "PRE #1" data only with the square root transformation.



Plot of CHST Yi Using Sqrt. With SD#2

Below is a plot of the CHSTYi when calculated using the standard deviation calculated using all of the data and the square root transformation.



No Transformation for Oil 271

- For Oil 271, the mean of untransformed result is the back-transformed current mean for Ln(CSHT).
- Standard deviation of (result-mean) is calculated using the 271 untransformed data from data set "Pre 1" only.
- No changes to oil 270 or oil 1011.

Oil	CHST Mean	Standard deviation
271	0.0735	0.0125

Same as current LTMS for these oils

Oil	Ln(CHST) Mean	Standard deviation
270	-2.15699	0.17435
1011	-2.08191	0.18882

271 New Yi's

The graph below shows how the 271 Yi values would change without the transformation.



Correction Factors

Pre- and Post-Transformation Options

Some Constant Correction Options

Below are some options for corrections to be applied to all tests depending on when you choose to identify the start of the shift and the type of correction factor you wish to apply (before of after transformation).

C.F. Number	Model	Pre LS Mean	Post LS Mean	Post Correction Factor (To "Pre")	Post Correction Factor (To Target)*
1.	CHST ~ Oil, Lab, Stand[Lab], Pre/Post #1	0.1047	0.0785	+0.0262	+0.0253
2.	CHST ~ Oil, Lab, Stand[Lab], Pre/Post #2	0.1021	0.0785	+0.0236	+0.0249
3.	CHST ~ Oil, Lab, Stand[Lab], Pre/Post #3	0.1024	0.0740	+0.0284	+0.0296
4.	Ln(CHST) ~ Oil, Lab, Stand[Lab], Pre/Post #1	-2.28375	-2.62183	+0.33808	+0.33073
5.	Ln(CHST)~ Oil, Lab, Stand[Lab], Pre/Post #2	-2.31325	-2.63989	+0.32664	+0.34451
6.	Ln(CHST) ~ Oil, Lab, Stand[Lab], Pre/Post #3	-2.31344	-2.68375	+0.37031	+0.39137

*Calculated by using the prediction equation to predict average performance across all lab-stands in the "post" period (did not use nested stand term here, but lab-stand).

Ln(CHST+CF) with Measurement Correction Factor #1 -Corrected To Target

Reference tests shown below on of after 08/08/2019 have the measurement correction factor of +0.0253 applied.



LN(CHST+CF) with Measurement C.F. #1

Reference tests shown below on of after 08/08/2019 have the measurement correction factor of +0.0253 applied.



Ln(CHST+CF) with Measurement Correction Factor #3 -Corrected To Target

Reference tests shown below on of after 06/28/2020 have the measurement correction factor of +0.0296 applied.



LN(CHST+CF) with Measurement C.F. #3

Reference tests shown below on of after 06/28/2020 have the measurement correction factor of +0.0296 applied.



Ln(CHST)+CF with Correction Factor #4

Reference tests shown below on of after 08/08/2019 have the post-transformation (typical application) correction factor of +0.33073 applied.

Ln(CHST)+CF with Correction Factor #4

Reference tests shown below on of after 08/08/2019 have the post-transformation (typical application) correction factor of +0.33073 applied.



What about a non-constant C.F.? -Using Post #1 & #3 Modeled Means

The below shows how the correction factor would increase with improved oil performance. This assumes candidates are showing the same trend as the reference oils by level.



Correction factors by CHST Level

The table below shows how the CHST values would adjust when using a level dependent correction factor.

CHST	Ln(CHST)	C.F. w/ Post #1	Adj. CHST w/ Post #1	C.F. w/ Post #3	Adj CHST w/ Post #3
0.010	-4.6052	0.9317	0.025	1.2995	0.037
0.020	-3.9120	0.7236	0.041	0.9755	0.053
0.030	-3.5066	0.6019	0.055	0.7859	0.066
0.040	-3.2189	0.5155	0.067	0.6514	0.077
0.050	-2.9957	0.4485	0.078	0.5471	0.086
0.060	-2.8134	0.3938	0.089	0.4619	0.095
0.070	-2.6593	0.3475	0.099	0.3898	0.103
0.080	-2.5257	0.3074	0.109	0.3274	0.111
0.090	-2.4079	0.2721	0.118	0.2723	0.118
0.100	-2.3026	0.2404	0.127	0.2231	0.125
0.110	-2.2073	0.2118	0.136	0.1785	0.131
0.120	-2.1203	0.1857	0.144	0.1378	0.138
0.130	-2.0402	0.1617	0.153	0.1004	0.144
0.140	-1.9661	0.1394	0.161	0.0658	0.150
0.150	-1.8971	0.1187	0.169	0.0335	0.155

New Ln(CHST) and Yi w/ Post #1

The table below shows how data after 08/08/2019 would change with the level-dependent correction factor.



New Ln(CHST) and Yi w/ Post #3

The table below shows how data after 06/28/2020 would change with the level-dependent correction factor.



More Standard Deviation Options

Updating Yi Using Post #3 S.D.

Yi's after 06/28/2020 here shown with updated standard deviations for Post #3 period.



Updating Yi All Data Standard Deviations

All tests below have been corrected using the updated standard deviations calculated with all data.