

August 10, 2004 meeting

This meeting was focused on reviewing the GF-4 process from each stakeholder's perspective and discussing enhancements to the process for the next category development. An overview of the stakeholder comments follows.

←
8/04

ILSAC:

They were disappointed that they did not get what they wanted. DaimlerChrysler wanted better low temperature pumpability and MHT TEOST. General Motors thought they got everything they wanted except a 4.0 merit minimum WPD in the Sequence IIIG. However, during the process they came to appreciate DaimlerChrysler's position on low temperature pumpability. Ford voiced that they did not get the fuel economy or phosphorus (0.05% max.) level desired.

API:

It was suggested that future test development could be improved via shared development from the beginning. It was proposed that the process could learn from the 'European model' – ILSAC/Oil define test needs and subscribed consortium picks engine and develops the performance test at one laboratory. They also felt that a more equitable distribution of meeting locations is needed to better distribute travel costs among all stakeholders.

ACC:

Several enhancements were proposed in three areas: new test development, meetings and general issues. For future specification development ACC believes:

- that the "needs" should be addressed early in the process
- test development should utilize ASTM Surveillance Panels or Test Development Task Forces
- there should be a clear consensus on "Decision Criteria" of test acceptance for precision matrices
- there should be more involvement of the ASTM PCEOCP and
- the voting structure of ASTM PCEOCP should be changed to be more equally weighted among the contributing trade organizations.