

Attach3.2

From: michael.l.mcmillan@gm.com
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2002 1:22 PM
To: felockwood@ashland.com; Kevin Ferrick
Cc: robert.olree@gm.com
Subject: ILSAC response to November 7th API response

Got an out of office reply for Jim Williams. I am forwarding this to the two of you in case you wish to do something with it before next week's meetings.

Mike

----- Forwarded by Michael L. McMillan/US/GM/GMC on 11/08/2002 01:15 PM -----

Robert Olree
11/08/2002 12:47 PM

To: Williams@api.org
cc: Michael L. McMillan/US/GM/GMC, csherwoo@ford.com, tek1@daimlerchrysler.com, Shipinski@ttc-usa.com
Subject: ILSAC response to November 7th API response

Jim,

Thank you for your e-mail of 11/07/02 containing the API response to the ILSAC response of 10/10/02. ILSAC can agree to the Needs Statement as you have proposed except we feel that there is no need for the note referencing the phosphorus level. I suspect that it may have been included somewhere along the line because of my insistence that ILSAC/OIL agree on a compromise phosphorus level at the same time as agreeing on the Needs Statement. Cliff correctly pointed out several times that no mention of the phosphorus level is required in the Needs Statement. My insistence on converging on a maximum phosphorus level for the proposed GF-4 was to bring focus to both our discussions and test development work, not to imply that the specific value of the phosphorus level or any reference to its critical or noncritical nature be included in the Needs Statement. Again, ILSAC suggests that the note simply be dropped and we all get past the Needs Statement.

ILSAC also appreciates the clarification regarding a fleet test in older vehicles. As the Seq. IIIG test is the only new test proposed, we certainly understand that it will be the focus of discussion both within ILSAC/OIL and ASTM. ILSAC also agrees that, "These statements should provide a basis for continued ILSAC/OIL work on GF-4." Unfortunately you did not stop with this statement.

We simply cannot agree to all of the requirements packed into the last two paragraphs. Just as we believe that it was unnecessary to tack these requirements on, we also believe that it would be ill-advised to respond to them in this e-mail. They will be addressed as the process progresses.

ILSAC is prepared to accept the Needs Statement (without the unnecessary note) and, with the understanding that we have converged on a 0.08% maximum phosphorus level, is ready to get back to working to develop GF-4 within the new process.

Mike and John Shipinski (and perhaps also Hanna Murray from Toyota) will be attending the API Lubricants Committee meeting next Monday, and can answer any questions regarding this proposed plan of action.

Attach3.2

Best regards,
Bob Olree