Questions from implementation

1. Test starts versus valid tests
   * Changing to valid tests in the LTMS document is acceptable. If a surveillance panel chooses to make the interval such that a test stand will begin a reference oil test after no more than 18 non-reference test starts, it will meet the maximum of no more than 18 valid non-reference tests. CLOSED
2. Maximum reference intervals
   * The LTMS TF SS has revisited the issue and our consensus is unchanged. CLOSED

Hot Issues for Discussion

1. Chance of extending and reducing reference interval should be equal or just drop level 2 versus your test is only as good as your worst (primary) parameter. CLOSED
   1. The LTMS TF SS has revisited the issue and our consensus is unchanged.
   2. Version 2 reference frequencies are intended to obtain the right amount of reference data. If we are unsure where a lab is relative to target, then we need more data. If a lab is very predictable and on target, then we can proceed with less frequent referencing.
2. Are we allowing people to not move toward target? CLOSED
   1. Not really. There are incentives from interval increase and reduction. The best way to avoid Zi level 2 alarm is to be on target no matter what the level 2 limit is. If you want more incentive for being on target, tighten the limit.
   2. A move toward target could result in surpassing an ei limit. This would be appropriate if the lab had a severity adjustment and the new reference indicated that something might have changed at the lab.
3. Should we just use the Sequence III type LTMS for everything? CLOSED
   1. No. Some of us believe that we probably shouldn’t use it for Sequence III.
4. ~~K values~~ => limits CLOSED
   1. We have removed the references to K values since they imply invalid probability interpretations. The LTMS TF SS has revisited default limits and our consensus is unchanged.
5. Reference intervals and spacing CLOSED
   1. The LTMS TF SS has revisited the issue and our current consensus is unchanged.
6. Replacement for the term “undue influence”
   1. The LTMS TF SS current consensus is “excessive influence”.
7. Application in the presence of merits
   1. The LTMS TF SS is currently studying this issue.
8. SP determination of a lab too far – can it change? CLOSED
   1. Yes. Setting Zi level 2 limits will be difficult. As with any of the LTMS parameters, improvements should be made when justified.
9. C13 example? CLOSED
   1. The C13 example was shared with the surveillance panel.
10. Racing fastest in HD CLOSED
    1. Other test areas might catch up. The industry is engaged.
11. Critical/Noncritical versus Primary/Secondary
    1. We are now using ei and Zi designations.
12. Incentive for being on target CLOSED
    1. See 2a above
13. Continuous adjustment
    1. The LTMS TF SS has revisited the issue and our current consensus is unchanged in general. One member said if certain approaches were used in merit situations we should consider propagation of error.
14. Plug in for test types CLOSED
    1. Our basic approach is stated as default with decisions appropriate for the surveillance panels designated. We are working with the various groups toward maintaining a common default.
15. Do it in the middle of GF-5?
    1. The LTMS TF SS will discuss further.
16. Industry charting
    1. The LTMS TF SS is currently studying this issue.