

Draft Minutes
JOINT ILSAC/OIL AND ASTM PASSENGER CAR ENGINE OIL
CLASSIFICATION PANEL (PCEOCP) MEETING

October 23, 2008
GM Worldwide Travel Services
Detroit, MI

Bob Olree, ILSAC/Oil Chair
Thom Smith, ASTM PCEOCP Chair

1. Introduction of Attendees

Sign-In and Introductions: ILSAC/Oil Chair Bob Olree called the ILSAC/Oil Committee Meeting to order and asked attendees to introduce themselves and sign the committee roster included as Attachment 1.

Review Minutes from September 3 Meeting: Kevin Ferrick reviewed the open action items from the September 3 meeting. These items and their status (**in bold**) are provided below:

- Jim Linden will recommend to the PCEOCP that it begin the development of the Sequence VID test. **[completed]**
- Oil-side members of ILSAC/Oil agreed to review the latest changes to the draft GF-5 specification with the API Lubricants Committee and ACC. **[in process—discussion on phosphorus volatility below]**
- Gail Evans will ask ACC PAPTG and Lubricants Committee members to send any data that they might have on the five GF-5 elastomers in SF105 (TMC 1006) to TMC for statistical analysis for precision statement development. **[limited data provided to date—more needed]**
- Ted Selby will work with the ASTM surveillance panel he chairs to survey the labs running TEOST 33C tests and report on their status at the next ILSAC/Oil meeting. **[discussed below]**
- ASTM PCEOCP Chair Thom Smith will inform the class panel that ILSAC/Oil wants the Emulsion Retention Test considered for adoption as an ASTM test method. **[completed]**
- Kevin Ferrick will survey the ILSAC/Oil Committee members to determine if they could meet on October 23 in Detroit. **[completed]**

Membership Changes: Bob Olree reminded members of the committee that this meeting would be his last as ILSAC/Oil Chair. Tracey King succeeded Mr. Olree when New Business and the next meeting date were discussed.

2. ROBO Update

Bernie Kinker provided an overview and update on ROBO (see Attachment 2): round-robin testing is essentially complete; the ASTM Test Monitoring Center (TMC) statistical analysis is complete; the latest revisions to the test method have been incorporated and

the research report is being written; and the ASTM ballot on the method is expected to be issued on November 3 with a closing date of December 5.

3. Sequence IIIGB Limits

Chris Castanian recommended on behalf of the Oil-side a 78% phosphorus retention limit for the Sequence IIIGB. His justification for the limit is included in the presentation under Attachment 3. During and after the presentation, ILSAC/Oil members offered comments and raised questions:

- Would the 78% limit permit the use of more volatile phosphorus?
- How does the 78% limit equate with ILSAC's desire for a net effect of 0.05 maximum phosphorus?
- There are currently no viscosity grade read across guidelines for the IIIGB.
- Does the IIIGB method being balloted in ASTM D02 include the changes to the ICP method recommended by ESCIT?

Discussion closed with ILSAC's agreement to consider the 78% limit. Additionally, Mr. Castanian agreed to investigate whether the improvements to the ICP method recommended by ESCIT have been incorporated into the IIIGB test method being balloted in D02.

ACTIONS:

- **ILSAC will consider Oil-side's recommendation for a 78% limit in the IIIGB.**
- **Chris Castanian will determine if the changes to ICP recommended by ESCIT have been incorporated into the IIIGB test method.**

4. Sequence VID (ASTM PCEOCP portion of agenda)

Thom Smith called the ASTM PCEOCP portion of the meeting to order and asked participants to sign the class panel roster. Mr. Smith noted that Jerry Wang has replaced Bill Kleiser as the Chevron Oronite member on the panel.

Final VID Research Report: Jim Linden reported that the research report from the Consortium to Develop a New Sequence VID Fuel Efficiency Test for Engine Oils has been made available on the ASTM TMC website at www.astmtmc.cmu.edu/docs/gas/sequencevi/VIDConsortium/.

VID MOA: Kevin Ferrick reported that the Sequence VID MOA is being reviewed by the interested parties, and he planned to ask for final comments by October 30.

Assignment of VID Supervisor: Kevin Ferrick reported that the Administrator of the ASTM TMC traditionally serves as Project Supervisor (currently John Zalar) for precision test matrixes. Panel members raised no objections to Mr. Zalar taking on the role of VID Project Supervisor.

Matrix Oil Status and Agreement on Mapping: Dennis Bachelder briefed the panel on the recommendations made by the BOI/VGRA Task Force related to the VID precision

and BOI/VGRA test matrix, matrix base oils, blending targets, and mapping of the test oils. His presentation is included as Attachment 4. The class panel considered the task force's recommendation on mapping and voted to accept it.

Matrix Run Order: Meeting participants suggested that the Sequence VI Surveillance Panel determine the run order. The panel agreed and subsequently charged the Surveillance Panel with the action item to determine the run order.

ACTION: The Sequence VID Surveillance Panel will determine the run order for the VID precision matrix.

Baseline Oil Status: Andy Ritchie reported that the baseline oil will be in place before the VID precision matrix begins.

Lab-to-Lab Precision: Charlie Leverett updated the class panel on recent efforts within the Sequence VI Surveillance Panel (see Attachment 5). These efforts include steps taken by the surveillance panel to address concerns related to lab-to-lab precision. The class panel accepted the report and asked for further information on the lab-to-lab precision effort when it is completed.

Matrix Timeline: Jerry Wang reported that the matrix start date cannot be determined until more is known about the availability of the matrix test oils. Dennis Bachelder agreed to consult with the technology suppliers to determine when the test oils will be ready for use.

ACTION: Dennis Bachelder will ask the VID matrix test oil suppliers when they expect to deliver the test oils to the TMC.

At the conclusion of the VID discussion, Thom Smith adjourned the PCEOCP meeting and turned the floor over to Bob Olree for the resumption of the ILSAC/Oil meeting.

5. Draft GF-5 Specification

Latest draft specification: Ron Romano provided an updated version of the draft GF-5 specification (see Attachment 6) to correct an error under 3h. No other changes were made.

TEOST 33 Update: Ted Selby provided an overview on the TEOST 33C test (see Attachment 7). The members of the ILSAC/Oil Committee thanked him for the background information but noted that they also wanted a survey of the labs currently running the test. Mr. Selby agreed to assemble the information.

ACTION: Ted Selby will work with the ASTM surveillance panel he chairs to survey the labs running TEOST 33C tests and report on their status at the next ILSAC/Oil meeting

Emulsion Retention Request to ASTM: Tracey King reported that ASTM has been asked to develop a test method for the Emulsion Retention Test.

Elastomer Compatibility: Matt Snyder updated the committee on the efforts of the group looking at amending ASTM D7216 to cover GF-5 elastomers. A brief synopsis of the group's efforts follows:

- An appendix to ASTM D7216 has been written to add the GF-5 elastomers to the test method.
- Task group comments on the appendix are due October 24.
- The task group still needs data on the five GF-5 elastomers in SF105 (TMC 1006). Only one lab has provided data so far. If more is not forthcoming, a round-robin will be necessary.

D892 Foam: Intertek ran D892 foam tests on a 20W-50 oil. The results are included as Attachment 8. Mr. Olree repeated his comment that a 10-minute settling time is meaningless and should be 1-minute if the test is to remain in GF-5. The Oil-side members agreed to review the issue and provide a response at the next meeting.

6. GF-5 Timeline

Ben Weber and members of the ILSAC/Oil committee commented that delays related to the VID have certainly impacted the GF-5 timeline. To understand better how the schedule could be adjusted, the committee made the following suggestions:

- Obtain an estimate of VID stand availability and estimate the number of VID tests that might need to be run, perhaps using the VIB as a guide.
- Display the timeline by month rather than by quarter.
- Determine how much time is required between GF-5 approval and API first licensing. The Lubricants Committee will be asked to review whether this can be shortened.

ACTION: The API Lubricants Committee will review whether the amount of time between GF-5 approval and API first licensing can be shortened.

Ben Weber updated the timeline during the meeting. His revised version is included as Attachment 9.

7. Next Meeting

Members of the committee suggested that the next meeting be held on December 11 during the ASTM meetings in Tampa. However, the committee recognized that Tracey King might not be able to travel, so a meeting date of December 2 in Detroit was also suggested.

Ms. King has since learned that she cannot travel to Tampa, so API is now working to find a meeting location for December 2 in Detroit.