**LTMS TF STG 20101202 Teleconference**

**'Rajakumar, Allison'**; **'Jeff Clark'**; **'Arthur.T.Andrews**@ExxonMobil.com'; 'Bob Mason'; 'Dan Worcester (dan.worcester@swri.org)'; **Chadwick, Martin** (Intertek); Martinez, Jo G. (jogm); 'Janet Buckingham'; **'todd.dvorak**@aftonchemical.com'; **'Doyle Boese'**; 'Scinto, Phil'; **Jim Rutherford**; **Rich Grundza; Dave Glaenzer**

**Review Notes (20101123) –** correction to meeting time

**Previous action items –**

* All continue consideration of Ee and EZ. Come to next meeting prepared to resolve.
* Come to next meeting prepared to discuss introduction of 1010 for IIIG in preparation for Sequence III Surveillance Panel conference call week of December 9
* Jim send note to surveillance panel with proposal and test method excerpts

**Latest draft documents –**

* ltms2ndEditionDraft17.9 (abridged) 20101019.docx
* ltms2ndEditionDraft17.1c 20100722.docx

**HD –**

* ~ best ways to calculate Ee and Ez limits by parameter and test type.

Some options –

* Number of criteria
	+ No adjustment for number of criteria
	+ 1, 2, & ≥3
	+ Principal components dimensionality
* Starting points
	+ Function of other limits
	+ 1.05, .66 for dimensionality 2

We had much more discussion and with still some shifting opinions. We acknowledge that (although enlightening and entertaining) further discussion will probably not bring consensus. Jim will draft something for the guidance document that captures the diversity of opinions.

* ISB implementation

Panel plans a face to face meeting early after the New Year to continue discussion

Review ISB PCA dimensionality? There being inadequate time and probably inadequate interest, we did not discuss the details of the first PC accounting for 79% variability. Jim will detail this example and at least one higher dimensional example (VG or T12) for examples in the guidance document.

* T-11 and T-12

Review current situations

**IIIG –**

* Face to face surveillance panel meeting to consider Version 2 proposal in San Antonio January 19
* RO 1010 targets –
	+ General consensus that Rich Grundza’s analysis was probably about the best that could be done with the data at hand.
	+ We had several concerns about the data. There is high variability for viscosity increase that could be related to variability in oil consumption. The way these tests were run could bias both the targets and the standard deviations.
	+ Although we don’t recommend incorporating data from RO 1010 into the severity adjustment standard deviations today, standard deviations should be reviewed soon.
	+ Doyle will do a pretend analysis to see if targets for existing reference oils were created in the same way as Rich did for 1010 whether they would come close to current targets. He will send directly to Dave with a copy to LTMS TF STG.

**VID –** Face to face surveillance panel meeting to consider Version 2 proposal in San Antonio January 18

**Next?** We will have our next web conference January 6 at 10:30 AM eastern. We will consider whether we need to do anything additional for the surveillance panel proposal meetings.

**Action items:**

* Jim will draft something for the guidance document that captures the diversity of opinions.
* Jim will detail this example and at least one higher dimensional example (VG or T12) for examples in the guidance document.
* Doyle will send an analysis of IIIG reference oil targets directly to Dave Glaenzer with a copy to LTMS TF STG.