

Unclassified SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

AD-A179766

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE					Form Approved OM8 No. 0704-0188 Exp. Date - Jun 30, 19
1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		16. RESTRICTIVE	MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION	AVAILABILITY	OF REPORT	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SC	HEDULE	Approved for public release. Distribution unlimited.			se.
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) 86-07		5. MONITORING	ORGANIZATION	REPORT N	JMBER(S)
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATIO Systems and Cost Analysis Directorate	N 65. GFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) AMSTA-VSM	7a. NAME OF M	IONITORING OR	GANIZATION	l
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Warren, MI 48397-5000	Command	7b. ADDRESS (C	ity, State, and 2	(IP Code)	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMEN	IT INSTRUMENT	IDENTIFICA	TION NUMBER
8c. ADDRESS (City. State, and ZIP Code)				······	
,,,		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.	WORK UNI ACCESSION
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Albert Van Horm 13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final 16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION	име covered м <u>5/86</u> то <u>2/87</u>	14. DATE OF REP 87/2/28	ORT (Year, Mon	ith, Day) 1	5. PAGE COUNT 26
17. COSATI CODES	18. SUBJECT TERMS	(Continue on reve	rse if necessary	and identify	by block number)
FIELD GROUP SUB-GROU	Mortality Multi-Cens	ored.	ability, W	dis T	auks (Comba
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if new This report presents data base. The methods p of multi-censored data. and M60A3 tanks and for The method presented ments recorded in the SD of this type. Causeds	essary and identify by block methods for analy presented used orde The analysis devel the M2/M3 vehicles. d is applicable to C data base and sho	number) zing data fr r and extrem ops mortali a broad clas buld provide	om the Sam e value st ty curves s of compo a useful b	ple Data atistics for road nent fai ase for	$\sqrt{\epsilon}(n/\ell_{-}), <$ Collection (: in the analy wheels of the lures or repl further analy
20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABS	IRACT ME AS RPT. DTIC USER	21. ABSTRACT S	SECURITY CLASS	IFICATION	

Table of Contents

			j-
Objecti	ves		1
Introdu	ction		1
Conclus	ions		3
Methods	of Analysis		3
	Weibull Distribution		3
	Order Statistics		5
	Hazard Plotting		8
	Extreme Value Distribution		12
Armored	Vehicle Road Wheel Mortali	ty Curves	13
	Sample Data		13
	M60A3 Data		14
	Ml Data		16
	M2/M3 Data		16
	Samples Used in Road Wheel	. Analysis	17
	Hazard Analysis of Tracked Replacements	Vehicle Road Wheel -	19
	Estimation of the Paramete Weibull Cumulative	ers of the Population Distribution	22
Cost an	d Effectiveness of Block Cr Road Wheels	anges Tracked Vehicle	23
	Analysis	1	23
	Bibliography	Accesion For NTIS CRA&I N DTIC TAB [] Unannounced [] Justification By Distribution/ Availability Codes Dist Avail add/or Dist Special	26

Page

Mortality Curves for Road Wheels

of Tracked Vehicles

Objectives

1. Develop mortality curves for the road wheels of the Ml Abrams, the M2/M3 Bradley, and the M60A3 Patton.

2. To use the mortality curves developed to evaluate the cost and availability impact of road wheel block change policies.

3. To determine whether or not block changes of road wheels of tracked vehicles such as Ml tank reduce maintenance cost and increase combat effectiveness.

Introduction

The development of failure or mortality curves requires a reliable source of failure data. Ideally one such source should be the Army's sample Data Collection (SDC) program. The purpose of the SDC program is to determine the performance of military equipment under actual field operating conditions. The intent is that this data would be used to estimate reliability and durability characteristics of the equipment under study. The SDC program maintains an M1, M2/M3, and an M60A3 data base. However, SDC is statistically an unstructured data source, and is subject to many biasing effects that would normally balance out in a well designed experiment.

Some characteristics of SDC that contribute to this biasing are: vehicles leave SDC before failures occur, SDC is a continuing program and not all the vehicles in the sample will have experienced failure, vehicles entering SDC may have different ages, and vehicles in SDC are not driven a set number of miles which results in the wide variation in usage. In addition the length of time a vehicle is included in SDC varies. Vehicles enter and leave individually and by units. Few if any vehicles are in SDC for the entire duration of the program.

These conditions and other biasing effects within SDC make accurate estimation of road wheel mortality under field conditions a difficult or inaccurate process. Estimates based on straight line averaging are likely to produce erroneous answers.

Methods of estimating failure distributions that account for these biasing effects and fit the inherent nature of the SDC program have been developed in recent years.(3)(5)(8). These methods include both graphical and analytical techniques. For the analysis of road wheel mortality data only the graphical techniques will be used in this report. The advantages of the graphical method are that linearizing transformations can be made to fit the data to a straight line so that linear regression can be used to estimate the distribution parameters, and that it can be used to analyze both complete and incomplete Complete data are the data generated when observations. the failure times of all the units in a test sample are known. When the failure data includes the running times of both failed and unfailed units, the data is said to be incomplete. Incomplete data is also known as censored The censoring times are the running times of the data. unfailed units. Failure data such as the SDC data is known as multi-censored data when the censoring times of the unfailed units are different.

In addition to the problem of incomplete multi-censored data there is the problem of tracking failure times when more than one component is used in a system. In the case of road wheels 28 to 32 wheels are used on each vehicle.

It is difficult to identify secondary failures from SDC data, because it does not consistently report road wheel position data. To overcome this problem only the are considered, subsequent first failures mileage accumulated after the first road wheel failure is not considered. If in conducting a reliability test N groups of n components are subjected to a test, and the time to the first failure of each group is recorded, a prediction of the distribution of time to first failure can be made. Then using the Extreme Value (EV) method the failure distribution of the individual components can be estimated after N failures instead of Nxn failures. Since n can take all values from one to a very large number the methods developed in this report provide a general method for analyzing SDC data.

The Extreme Value method generates a mortality curve (failure curve) over time by fitting the first failure of a set number of tested samples to a cumulative failure distribution. SDC data can be used with the EV method by selecting those vehicles that have entered SDC and recording the miles to their first road wheel failure. This restricted vehicle sample data should be tested for biasing effects such as vehicle demographics, base environment, road wheel location on the vehicle, (i.e. inner or outer, fore or aft, left or right.), however, because of the limitations of the SDC data positional effects can not be tested, although there is collateral evidence that a strong front to back bias exists. The EV method assumes that the failure distribution remains constant throughout the life of the test sample since only the first failures are considered. The EV approach as developed in this report will provide the best possible estimate of the mortality curves for road wheels within the constraints of the SDC data.

Conclusions

1. The values in Table XII represents the best estimate of the parameters of the failure distributions of the road wheels current Army tracked vehicles. These values were developed using the smallest extreme value distributions of road wheel failures and results in the mortality curves in Figure 12. MMBF values are:

M 1	6051	Miles
M 6 0 A 3	6480	Miles
M 2 / M 3	7831	Miles

2.Block changes of tracked vehicle road wheels increase the life cycle maintenance costs and do not substantially increase the vehicle readiness characteristics such as mean-miles-between unscheduled replacement and availability.

3. The SDC data does not permit analysis of mortality curves for the two aluminum road wheels used on the M60A3.

4. There is no significant base effect for road wheels for M1, M2/M3, and the M60A3.

5. There is no significant differences in road wheel mortality between the M2 and the M3.

Methods of Analysis

The methods used in this report to generate the road wheel mortality curves are based on several reliability techniques that have been developed for the analysis of test data. These methods can be broadly classified as order statistics and the statistics of extremes or Extreme Value theory. Order statistics can be used to fit the data to a linear transformation of cumulative distribution functions when the data are complete. If the data is not complete as in the case of SDC other methods must be used. The distribution function most often used and the one used in this report is the Weibull cumulative distribution.

Weibull Distribution

The Weibull distribution is widely used in reliability for life testing applications. Before it was used in life testing the Weibull distribution was known as the Fisher-Tippett Type III distribution of smallest values or as the third asymptotic distribution of the smallest Extreme Value. It became known as the Weibull distribution after Waloddi Weibull used it as a probabilistic characterization for the breaking strength of materials.

The Weibull distribution was introduced to the reliability community by the work of J. H. K. Kao in life-testing electronic tubes. Kao also developed Weibull probability paper as an aid in estimating the parameters of the distribution. The Weibull cumulative distribution function can be written as

$$F(x) = 1 - exp(-(x/theta)^{Deta})$$
 (1.1)

and the Weibull probability density function as

 $f(x) = (beta/theta)(x/theta)^{(beta -1)} * exp(-(x/theta)^{beta}) (1.1a)$

where

beta = scale parameter

theta = shape parameter

The methods of analysis using Weibull probability paper are used in this analysis, however with the availability of digital computers and modern software the laborious plotting can be eliminated. The method of analysis was extended to mechanical devices by C. Lipson at the University of Michigan. The main advantage of the Weibull distribution is its flexibility.

If beta, the scale parameter, is equal to one the Weibull distribution reduces to the exponential distribution, and as beta approaches four the Weibull distribution approximates the normal distribution. The linear transformation used in the design of Weibull probability paper is:

 $\ln(\ln(1/(1-F(x))) = beta*ln(x) - ln(theta)$ (1.2)

From the parameters beta and theta the mean and variance can be computed using the equations:

Mean = theta * gamma(1 + 1/beta) (1.3)

Variance = $(\text{theta})^2 [\text{gamma}(1+2/\text{teta}) - \text{gamma}^2(1+1/\text{beta})]$ (1.4)

Order Statistics

Equation 1.2 is used to transform the data to permit the application of the linear regression procedure. From the slope and intercept of a linear equation the parameters of the Weibull distribution can be easily stimated. The method of ordering data and assigning cumulative probabilities used in this report is called median ranking. Other ranking methods such as mean ranking are some times used, but median ranking is preferred by most sources. An approximation to the median rank value is given by

$$m.r. = (j - .03)/(n - 0.4)$$
 (1.5)

where

n = number of units in the sample

j = the rank of the sample value when ordered

The linear transformation in equation 1.2 is then applied to prepare the data for regression analysis. The regression analysis that was performed using a statistical software package called the SCSS Conversational System. The scale parameter of the Weibull distribution is the slope of the regression line. The shape parameter is obtained by taking the inverse transform of the intercept of the regression line.

In the case of incomplete data several extra steps must be taken. Incomplete data, sometimes called suspended data, are handled by assigning an average order number to each of the failure times. The suspended items are not given increment numbers, but do contribute to the average order of the failed data. Accounting for this can be a time consuming task, however, a simplifying formula can be used to produce what is known as a new increment. The new increment I is given by

 $I = \frac{(n + 1) - (\text{previous order number})}{1 + (\text{number of items following suspended item})} (1.6)$

To illustrate the method consider the following example.

	Hours on Test	Sequence	Status
	544	F 1	Failure
	663	F 2	Failure
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	802	S 1	Suspension
 Exclusion 	827	S 2	Suspension
	897	F 3	Failure
	914	F4	Failure
	939	S 3	Suspension
	1094	F 5	Failure
	1099	F6	Failure
	1202	S 4	Suspension

Table I Suspended Test Data

The first two failure times have the order numbers 1 and 2 respectively. For the third failure a new increment must be calculated. Applying equation 1.4 yields

$$I = \frac{(10 + 1) - 2}{1 + 6} = 1.29$$

Adding I to the previous order number, 2, gives the order number 3.29 to the third failure time. The same increment value is used until the next suspended item is encountered, thus, the order number for the fourth failure is 3.29 +1.29 = 4.58. Applying the formula to the fifth failure gives

 $I = \frac{(10 + 1) - 4.58}{1 + 3} = 1.60$

The position for the fifth failure is 4.58 + 1.60 = 6.18 and the position for the sixth failure is equal to 7.78. The final data for plotting is given in Table II.

Hours on Test	Position	Median Rank	
544 663 897 914 1084	1.00 2.00 3.29 4.58 6.18	0.067 0.163 0.288 0.411 0.565	
1099	7.78	0.707	

Table IJ Kanks for Suspended Test Data

The data in Table II is transformed using the linearizing transformation

 $x = \log(Hours on Test)$ (1.7)

 $y = \log(\log(1/(1 - Median Rank))) \quad (1.8)$

Hours on Test	log(Hours on Test)	Median Rank	log(log((1/(1 -M.R.)))
544.00	6.30	.07	-2.67
663.00	6.50	.16	-1.73
897.00	6.80	.29	-1.08
914.00	6.82	.41	64
1084.00	6.99	.56	18
1099.00	7.00	. 72	•24

.

The results of transformation are given in Table III.

The data in Table III is then used to estimate the parameters of the Weibull Distribution. The graph of this data is shown in Figure 1. DOWN-L.Median Rank ACROSS-L.Hours

.

WN-L.Median	Kank	ACKOSS	-L.Hou	IS S		
I					SYMBO	LS :
. 24+				•	. = 1	
I.				R \$:= 2	
I.				-	* = 3	
I		•			-	
I					•	
62+			•			
I ·						
I .						
I			٠			
-1.30+		•	•			
I			-		•	
I				•		
I	•	•				
-1.98+						
1						
<u>.</u>						
-2.6/KL						
+ K1	· + · `			7 002	-++	
0.295	,	0.001		1.002		
Slope -	- 3.72	Inte	rcept	= -26.06		

beta = 3.72

-

.

theta = $\exp(26.06)^{(1/3.72)}$ = 1102.544 Hours

Figure 1. Scatter Plot of log of miles versus log of median plotting position with estimate of Weibull parameters.

· .

Hazard Plotting

A second method of handling incomplete multi-censored data is called 'hazard plotting'. The name originates from the fact that the cumulative hazard function is used in the plot instead of the cumulative distribution function. The hazard function is also called the instantaneous failure rate, and is given by the expression

 $h(x) = (beta/theta)*(x/theta)^{(beta - 1)} (1.9)$

In a complete sample of n failure times there is a probability of 1/n associated with each failure time. Similarly, for an arbitrarily censored sample of failure times, there is a conditional probability of 1/K associated with each failure time which is the proportion of the K items that have experienced an observed age and then have failed at that time.

Data are prepared for hazard plotting in the following way

Step 1. Order the n values in the sample from smallest to largest without regard to whether they are observed or consored values. In the list of ordered values, the observed data are each marked to distinguish them from the censored values. If some observed and consored items have the same value, they should be listed in a random order.

Step 2. Number the order values in reverse order with n assigned to the smallest data value, n-1 to the second, etc. The values so obtained are called K values, or reverse order numbers.

Step 3. Obtain the corresponding hazard value for each observed value and record it. The hazard value for the observed value is 100 divided by its K value. Censored values do not have corresponding hazard values.

Step 4. For each observed failure value calculate the corresponding cumulative hazard value. This is the sum of the hazard value of that observed value and all preceding observed values.

Step 5. Perform a log transformation on both the observed failure value and its corresponding cumulative hazard value. The values of x and y for performing a linear regression are

log(H) = log(cumulative hazard value) (1.10)

log(y) = log(observed failure value) (1.11)

Perform a regression analysis on the values of log(y) and log(H). The expression for the resulting regression line is

log(y) = (1/beta)*log(H) + log(theta) (1.12)

The Weibull parameter beta is the inverse of the slope of the line, the parameter theta can be found by setting the cumulative hazard function H to 100. As an example of this type of analysis consider the previous problem.

Hours on Test	Sequence	ĸ	Hazard Function	Cumulative Hazard Function
544	F 1	10	10.00	10.00
663	F2	9	11.11	21.11
802	S I	8		
827	S 2	7		
897	F 3	6	16.67	37.78
914	F 4	5	20.00	57.78
939	S 3	4		
1084	F 5	3	33.33	91.11
1099	F6	2	50.00	141.11
1202	S 4	1		,

Table IV Data for Hazard Plotting

The data in Table IV is transformed using the linearizing transformations in equations 1.10 and 1.11. The results of this transformation are given in Table V.

Table V	Plotting	Posítions	for	cumulative	hazard
	distributi	αο			

Hours on Test	log(Hours on Test)	Cumulative Hazari Rate	log(C.H.R.)
544.00	6.30	10.00	2.30
663.00	6.50	21.11	3.05
897.00	6.80	37.78	3.63
914.00	6.82	57.78	4.06
1084.00	6.99	91.11	4.51
1099.00	7.00	141.11	4.95
The data in Tab regression analysi	le V is s is perfe	plotted in a ormed to find	scatter plot and the parameters of

regression analysis is performed to find the parameters of the regression line as shown in equation 1.12. The graph of this data is shown in Figure 2. The results of the two methods of calculation are shown in Table VI. The difference between the two estimates is due largely to the different methods used in developing the average order of the data. With small samples such as that used in the example the error is larger than when applied to large samples which are typical of the SDC program.



theta = exp(.28 * log(100) + 5.68) = 1065.64 hours

Figure 2. Scatter Plot of log of miles versus log of cumulative hazard function with estimate of Weibull parameters.

Table VI	Comparison of the Cumulativ the Cumulative	Weibull Par e Distributi Hazard Plot	rameters on Plot (C.H.P.)	Derived from (C.D.P.) and
Meth	od beta	theta (hours)	mean (hours)	standard deviation
C.D.F	3.72	1102.54	995.29	298.14
С.Н.Р	2. 3.57	1065.64	959.82	298.37

Extreme Value Distribution

The usual life test consists of n components subjected to some specific operating environment until the units fail. If times to failure are recorded, an estimate of the parameters of the failure distribution can be made after all n components have failed. Testing time and cost can be reduced by terminating the test after a certain specific time or after a certain preassigned percent of the components have failed. If the test components are divided into N groups of n components each and the Nth group is removed from the test after the first failure of one component in that group the test data will consist of times to first failure. In the case of the SDC data each vehicle can be considered to be a group of n components and although during the SDC program more than one component has failed only the first failure time is chosen. Vehicles are frequently removed from the SDC program before experiencing a particular failure and, since the SDC is a continuing program, some units will still be under test without having had a failure. These vehicles will be treated as censored groups and analyzed using the methods for multi-censored data. These data will then form a distribution which will depend on the parent population from which the original group data is drawn. Extreme Value statistics will then be used to estimate the parameters of the parent distribution for the test component.

Consider a random sample of size n from a large population having as a parent distribution a cumulative distribution function F(x) where x is a continuous random variable. Let the sample be denoted as x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n . Define the random variable

$$y_n = \min(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$$
 (1.13)

The random variable y is termed the smallest Extreme Value.

Since material or equipment failure is related to the weakest component, the Extreme Value distribution for the smallest value is the one usually encountered in reliability work, and is the one considered here. The cumulative distribution for y is given by

$$G_{n}(y) = 1 - [1 - F(x)]^{n}$$
 (1.14)

Rearranging the terms of equation 1.14

$$F(x) = 1 - [1 - G_n(y)]^{1/n}$$
 (1.15)

In the case of the Weibull distribution

$$G_n(y) = 1 - \exp(-(x/theta)^{beta})$$
 (1.16)

Armored Vehicle Road Wheel Mortality Curves

Sample Data

The SDC program collects data from selected organizations that are performing their regularly assigned duties without any special test procedures or plans. This results in data that is difficult to analyze. Although the sample size tends to be constant vehicles leave and enter the sample for a variety of reasons. In some cases entire organizations are replaced. The result is that the sample consists of a constant number of vehicles with widely varying usage. The number of vehicles and their location is shown in Table VII.

Table VII SDC SAMPLE SIZE AND LOCATIONS M1 TANKS

START	STOP	LOCATION	SITE	SAMPLE
DATE	DATE	MAJOR COMMAND	CODE	SIZE
JAN 82	MAR 84	FT. HOOD, TX.	H	58
JAN 82	CONT.	SCHWEINFURG, FRG.	S	116
MAR 82	SEP 82	SCHWEINFURG, FRG.	R	58
APR 84	CONT.	FT. HOOD,TX.	С	58
OCT 84	CONT.	BAMBERG, FRG.	T	53
		•		
		TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE		343
		M60A3 TANKS		
START	STOP	LOCATION	SITE	SAMPLE
DATE	DATE	MAJOR COMMAND	CODE	SIZE
<u>OCT 79</u>	JUN 82	FRIEDBERG, FRG.	F	110
NOV 79	DEC 80	WEISBADEN, FRG.	W	54
JAN 81	JUL 84	BAMBERG,FRG. ⁻	В	53
JUL 32	JUN 86	FT. STEWART,GA.	S	62
AUG 82	SEP 85	KIRCHGOENS,FRG	ĸ	59
	•	TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE		338
		M2/M3 BRADLEY		
START	STOP	LOCATION	SITE	SAMPLE
DATE	DATE	MAJOR COMMAND	CODE	SIZE
FEB 84	OCT 85	F1. HOOD,TX.	A	60
NOV 83	CONT.	FT. HOOD,TX.	В	60
OCT 83	CONT.	KITZINGEN, FRG.	С	60
JAN 84	CONT.	KITZINGEN,FRG.	D	6
JAN 84	CONT.	KITZINGEN, FRG.	E	. 6
MAY 84	CONT.	ASCHAFFENBURG, FRG.	F	60
NOV 85	CONT.	FT. HOOD, TX.	G	60
		TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE		312

Note: Data used in this report is as of 5/1/86.

All sampling inquiries are aimed at learning something about a particular parent population. In order to properly analyze the data there must be some assurance that all the data is from the same population. In the case of the M1 and the M2/M3 the samples are drawn from new vehicles and we can be reasonable sure the that the only biasing factor is the various base locations. In the case of the M60A3 there are several other factors that could bias the data. Some of the M60A3 tanks are new, some have been converted at depots, some at Mainz and some at Anniston. The road wheels on the converted tanks may not have been replaced at the depot. There are also three type of road wheels one of steel, and two of aluminum. The effects of these factors on road wheel failure times must be determined and removed before the mortality curves can be developed.

The demographics of the vehicles in SDC may also bias the data, in Figure 3 the distribution of miles per vehicle are shown, and it is easily seen that the miles driven in SDC vary widely. Another factor biasing the data is due to the variations in the time the vehicles were in the sample. The distributions of the vehicles by the time of arrival and departure are shown in Figures 4,5 and 6.

M60A3

The M60A3 program was initiated in September 1979. The program proceeded unsteadily until December 1982 when new forms were developed and the program assumed a degree of stability. The data collected prior to Dec. 82 at the Weisbaden and Friedberg sites has generally been considered unreliable. For this reason the data at these sites was not considered in the current analysis. The distribution of new and converted tanks between the remaining bases was not uniform. The tanks at Bamberg were all new. The tanks at Ft. Stewart were all converted at Anniston. The tanks at Kirchgoens included 10 new tanks and the remainder were converted at Mainz. Because of this distribution of tanks the Base and the New or Converted effects are not independent and cannot be separately removed from the data to allow other less significant effects to be studied. To confirm that the effects are not independent the results of a Contingency Test for Independence are shown in Figure 7.

The history of the road wheels on the converted M60A3's isn't known. Some road wheels may be new, but most of them are probably the same wheels the tanks had prior to conversion. These significant effects cannot be removed because of their interdependence. Consequently only the SDC data on the new M60A3 tanks that have only steel road wheels was considered in this analysis.

	NEW	CONV.	TOT	AL		
BAMBERG	50.0	0.0	:	50	-	ACTUAL
	18.6	31.4	:		-	EXPECTED
FT. STEWART	0.0	58.0	:	58		
	21.6	36.4	:			
KIRCHGOENS	10.0	43.0	:	53		
	19.8	_33.2	:			
TOTAL	60.0	101.0	:	161		

Figure 7. Contingency test for independence of Base and New Effects. If effects were independent actual values would more closely equal expected values.

Analysis of the significance of the Base Effect on the replacement times of road wheels is shown in Figure 8. A useful index for quantifying the amount of total variability that can be attributed to differences between groups is the Eta statistic:

 $Eta^2 = \frac{Between Groups Sum of Squares}{Total Sum of Squares}$

The maximum value of Eta-squared is 1, while the minimum is 0. An Eta-squared of close to 1 indicates that most of the observed variability is due to differences betweer groups, not within the groups. An Eta-squared value of .04, shown in Fig. 8, indicates that the variation in replacement time is not significantly affected by the vehicle location, and the data from the two bases can be pooled to develop the road wheel-mortality curve. This conclusion is supported by the analysis of variance (ANOVA) also shown in Figure 8.

PLOT OF MILES BY BASE * = MEAN U/L = MEAN + / - 1 STD DEV 3200 υ : U Μ 2700 -Ι : Ľ U Ε 2200 -* * S : * 1700 -L L L 1200 ---.--: _____ BAMBERG KIRCHGOENS TOTAL BASE-> Figure 8. Analysis of Base Effects on Replacement times of road wheels of new M60A3 tanks. Eta SQRD = .044 The Eta Squared Statistic shows that only 4 percent of the variation can be attributed to the base effect and therefore it can be concluded that the Base Effect is not significant.

Ml Data

The M1 SDS began in January 1980 and is still continuing. Some of the factors that confound the M60A3 data are also present in the M1 data, however analysis of the M1 data produces an Eta-squared value of .09. This would indicate that the Base Effect contributes more variation than in the M60A3 case, however since there are more bases from which the data is collected, this increase in Eta could be expected so that the data from these bases can also be pooled to develop road wheel mortality curves.

M2/M3 Data

The M2/M3 SDS began in October 1983 and as a result benefited from the experience of the M60A3 and the M1. This enabled the SDC teams to achieve a higher degree of reliability than had been evident in the previous data collecting efforts.

Samples used in Road Wheel Mortality Analysis

The sample data used in the road wheel analysis is summarized in Tables VIII,IX, and X. The number of vehicles leaving the SDC sample during a 250 mile interval and the number of first replacements occurring in the interval for each of the three vehicles are listed. The vehicles leaving the sample with out exhibiting a road wheel failure are listed as censored data. In the case of the M1 and M2/M3 all the available data was used. In the case of the M60A3 only the data from newly manufactured tanks was used.

Table VIII D Used	istribution o in Road whee	f M60A3 Tank Data 21 Analysis
Miles In SDC	Censored Vehicles	lst Road Wheel Failure
250 500 750 1000 . 1250 1500	0 1 2 1 2 4 4	0 0 1 0 1 2 2
2000 2250 2500 2750 3000 3250 3500 3750	2 2 0 2 0 1 1	0 3 2 3 9 10 10 7
4000 	23	57

Used in	Road whee	l Analysis
• Miles	Censored	lst Road
In SDC	Vehicles	Wheel Failure
250	4	0
500	2	1
750	10	2
1000	9	0
1250	26	16
1500	20	20
1750	5	25
2000	12	20
2250	15	33
2500	8	35
2750	4	17
3000	0	16
3250	0	12
3500	0	6
TOTAL	115	203
Table X Distrib	nution of M	2/M3 Bradley Data
Used in	Road whee	l Analysis
Miles	Censored	lst Road
In SDC	Vehicles	Wheel Failure
250 500 750 1000 1250 1500 1750 2000 2250 2500 2750 3000 3250 3500 3750 4000 4250 4500 4750 5000	3 3 4 5 6 27 14 15 15 11 12 12 16 7 8 9 3 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 7 7 7 4 10 7 10 20 25 18 12 11 10 20 25 18 12 11 10 10 20 25 18 12 11 10 0

Table IX Distribution of Ml Tank Data Used in Road wheel Analysis

ĥ

· .

.

-

.

There are two factors that require investigation before developing the mortality curves. These are the Base Effect and the M2/M3 Effect. The Eta-squared analysis was performed on the M2/M3 data. The results of this analysis produced an Eta-squared value for the variation due to the difference between the M2 and the M3 of .0001, a value which is clearly not significant. The Base Effect produced an Eta-squared value of .095, some what higher than the M1, but again with the increased number of bases and the resulting decrease in sample size such a value can be expected without being significant.

Hazard Analysis of Tracked Vehicle Road Wheel Replacements

The method of analysis used to estimate the parameters of the road wheel mortality curves is called 'hazard analysis' The term 'hazard analysis' originates in the analysis of the instantaneous failure or replacement rate. This is the failure or mortality rate in a population at a specified level of stress or at a specified time. The hazard function is an algebraic relationship of two probability functions: the density function and the survival function. The hazard function is defined as:

$$h(x) = \frac{f(x)}{1 - F(x)}$$

Where h(x) = the hazard function

f(x) = the probability density function

F(x) = the cumulative distribution function

1 - F(x) = the survival function

A separate road wheel data base was generated from the SDC data. From this data base two files were created for each vehicle. One file is a historical file containing the date that the vehicle entered SDC and the latest data that it appeared in the quarterly or monthly report. The second file is a list of all the replacement reports for the vehicle road wheels. To simplify the analysis several utility programs were written to prepare the data for regression analysis. The regression analysis was then performed using an interactive statistical software software package. The curves in Figures 9 through 11 show the results of the calculations for the M60A3, the M1, and the M2/M3, which were developed using this program. From the slope and intercept of the curves estimates of the shape scale parameters of the associated and Weibull distributions shown in Table XI were developed.

		Daram	atara	Table	e XI	romo Valu	-	
	Wei	bull Dis	stribut	ions of Tr	cacked Veh	icle Road	Wheel	S
Vehicl	Le	N S N	Ar	my Ordnan Number	ce Mean (Miles)	Standard Deviation	Beta	Theta
M 1	2530	-01-063-	-5824	12274492	2158.04	777.368	3.03	2158.0
M60	2530-	-00-701-	-3976	7013976	3107.98	871.92	4.00	3428.9
M 2/M 3	2530	-01-801	-6702	10919004	3207.89	1060.30	3.33	3574.4
DOWN-LOG OF MILES ACROSS-LOG OF CUMULATIVE HAZARD FUNCTION I RP SYMBOLS: 8.53+ RM . = 1 - 2 I . : = 3 I * ::. I ***: 7.96+: I								
	1 7.06 1	t RP ++ .25 eta = e:	+ 3 SLOPE txp(.25	.18 = .25 INT Deta = 1/.2 * log(100)	6.12 ERCEPT = 25 = 4.00 + 6.99) =	-++ 6.99 3428.92	miles	

Figure 9. Scatter Plot of log of miles versus log of cumulative hazard function with estimate of Weibull parameters for road wheels of M60A3 tank.



for road wheels of M2/M3 Bradley.

Estimation of the Parameters of the Population Weibull Cumulative Distribution

In Table XI the parameters of the smallest Extreme Value distribution of the vehicle road wheels are listed. When these values are known the parameters of the population distribution can be estimated using the following expressions. The cumulative distribution of y_n where y_n is the smallest Extreme Value is:

 $G_{1} = 1 - [1 - F(y)]^{n}$

F(y) the population cumulative distribution. where is Rearranging and substituting $(y/theta)^{beta}$ 1 - exp

for $G_{n}(y)$ the population distribution becomes:

F(y) = 1 - exp

The parameters for the distribution F(y) are:

slope parameter = beta shape parameter = theta * n 1/beta

Using the values of the smallest Extreme Value parameters Table XI the parameters of the population distribution ín functions can be developed. The values of the population parameters are given in Table XII. Substituting these parameters in the equation for the Weibull probability density function, shown in equation 1.1a, the density functions for the road wheel distributions as shown in Figure 12. can be developed.

> Table XII Parameters of the Population Weibull Distributions of Tracked Vehicle Road Wheels

Vehicle	e N S N	Mean (Miles)	Standard Deviation	Beta	Theta
M 1	2530-01-063-5824	6051.09	2179.72	3.03	6773.3
M 6 0	2530-00-701-3976	6480.25	1818.00	4.00	7149.4
M 2 / M 3	2530-01-801-6702	7830.95	2591.17	3.33	8726.0

The probability density functions shown in Figure 12 have been normalized for easy comparison. From these curves it can be seen that there is little difference between the M60A3 and the M1 road wheel mortality curves, while the M2/M3 road wheels show a some what higher expected life.

Cost and Effectiveness of Block Changes of Tracked Vehicle Road Wheels

Road wheel mortality curves developed from SDC program data have been used as input to a life cycle cost simulation model developed by the Systems and Cost Analysis Directorate of the U.S. Army TACOM. The life cycle costs of road wheel changes have been developed for a variety of block change cycles and useful life policies. The effect of these policies on the mean-miles-between unscheduled replacements and road wheel availability have been calculated.

Analysis

The Life Cycle Costs (LCC) of various Block Change policies were developed using the mortality data developed in this report and the values of the cost and maintenance parameters in Table XIII. This data was used in a LCC simulation model developed for the TACOM Systems and Cost Analysis Directorate. The LCC costs were developed for different combinations of miles between block changes and tank operation miles. The LCC results are presented in Figure 13, which shows that block change policies do not provide any cost benefit over unscheduled replacement. Even though there is no direct cost advantage in block replacement, there might be some increase in systems effectiveness. The elements of system effectiveness which will effect readiness are the times between maintenance actions such as wheel replacement and the elements of availability contributed by the road wheels.

Systems availability may be computed using the following expression: -

As	z	(total o	perating	time)		
	(total	operating	time) +	k*(total	down	time)

where

As = Systems availability.

if 0 < k < 1, free time exists

if k = 1, no free time exists

The case where no free time exists represents a situation where there is no possibility of performing maintenance during time when operation of the system is not required. The factor k would only equal 1 when the system would be operating continuously(ie. 24 hours per day). Since this would generally not be the case for wheeled vehicles the value of k would be much less than 1 and the reduction of down time would not have a large impact on the availability of the vehicle.

"你是是不不不可以可以你?""你们,你不可以不知道我?""你?""你?""你?""你?""你?""你?""你?""你?""你?""你	*****************
TABLE 1.	
EXAMPLE OF VALUES OF FARAMETERS USED	IN M1 SIMULATION
COST PER MAN HOUR	\$9.92
BLOCK CHANGE RECOVERY RATE	1.00
COST OF REBUILT WHEEL	\$153.00
FAILURE RECOVERY RATE	C.64
COST PER ROADWHEEL	\$252.72
MAN HOURS PER BLOCK CHANGE	24.00
MAN HOURS PER FAILURE	1.00
NUMBER OF ROAD WHEEL POSITIONS	8
CONFIDENCE LEVEL 0.00 AND INDEX	3
MILES BETWEEN BLOCK CHANGES	1000
MAXIMUM COST CONFIDENCE INTERVAL	\$500.00
TANK OPERATION MILES	15000
RANDOM NUMBER SEED	59873
MAXIMUM ITERATIONS	120

Another measure of effectiveness is called the intrinsic availability. The formula for calculation the intrinsic availability is given by the ratio:

> Ai = (total operating time) (total operating time) + (total down time)

This expression is similar to the expression for systems availability with the omission of the k factor. The effect of of reduced downtime due to block changes increases intrinsic availability and it can be seen that the intrinsic availability peaks between 3000 and 4000 mile block change interval. The increase in Ai , however, is very small and its impact on tank availability would probably not warrant the increased costs.

The effect of road wheel replacement policies on mean miles between unscheduled replacement (MMBUR) is much more dramatic as shown in Figure 15. This shows that the MMBUR with 1000 mile block change policy is over 3000 miles but in this 3000 mile period there would be 3 block changes resulting in a MMBR as shown in Figure 16. There is still a substantial increase in MMBR but not nearly as dramatic as that increase in Figure 15.

The increase in intrinsic availability shown in Figure 14. results from a decrease in total downtime. The relationship of downtime to the block change interval is shown in Figure 17. With a block change policy between 1750 and 2000 miles the downtime is higher than that of random replacements, above 2000 miles the downtime with block changes is less than that with random changes, with a minimum at 4000 miles.

There are many factors to consider in deciding which policy is the best, block change or unscheduled random replacement. In every case the block change policy cost is greater than the unscheduled replacement, however the block change policies can result in a longer time between replacement and a lower downtime. These factors can not be evaluated without consideration of their effect on system performance. If the downtime resulting from failure of other tank systems is large and the mean time between failure is substantially less, then the advantages of block change will be lost in the noise. The increase in cost however can not be ignored. Within the limits of this study we can not conclude that block change policies provide any advantage over an unscheduled replacement policy. Therefore we can not recommend the block change policy.

Bibliography

- ARINC Research Corporation, Reliability Engineering, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964.
- 2. Gumbel, E. J.; Statistics of Extremes, Columbia University Press, New York, 1958.
- 3. Kapur, K.C. and L. R. Lamberson; Reliability in Engineering Design, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1977.
- 4. Kao, J. H. K., "A Summary of Some New Techniques on Failure Analysis," Proceedings of the Sixth National Symposium on Reliability and Quality Control; Washington, D.C. January 11-13, 1960.
- 5. King, J. R., Probability Charts For Decision Making, Industrial Press Inc., New York, 1971.
- Lipson C., Kerawalla, J., Mitchel, L., and Krafus, A.; Engineering for Reliability, Unpublished Lecture Notes, University Of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1962.
- Loyd, D. K. and M. Lipow, Reliability: Management, Methods and Mathematics, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962.
- Nelson W., "Hazard Plotting for Incomplete Failure Data Journal of Quality Technology, vol. 1 no. 1, January 1969.
- 9. _____, "Hazard Plot Analysis of Incomplete Failure Data", Proceedings of 1969 Symposium on Reliability.
- 10. Sarhan A. E. and B. G. Greenberg; Contributions to Order Statistics, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1962.
- 11. SCSS, A Users Guide to the SCSS Conversational System, Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1980.



.



















DISTRIBUTION LIST

- 3 Commander US Army Tank-Automtive Command ATTN: AMSTA-M Warren, MI 48397-5000
- 1 Commander US Army Tank-Automtive Command ATTN: AMSTA-MS Warren, Mi 48397-5000
- 1 Commander US Army Tank-Automtive Command ATTN: AMCPM-M113 Warren Mi 48397-5000
- l Commander US Army Tank-Automtive Command ATTN: AMCPM-M60 Warren, Mi 48397-5000
- 1 Commander US Army Tank-Automtive Command ATTN: AMCPM-M1 Warren Mi 48397-5000
- l Commander US Army Tank-Automtive Command ATTN: AMSTA-TSL Warren, Mi 48397-5000
- 1 Commander US Army Tank-Automtive Command ATTN: AMSTA-M2 Warren, MI 48397-5000
- 1 Commander US Army Armament Command ATTN: AMSMC-SA Rock Island, IL 61229
- 1 Commander US Army Aviation Command ATTN: AMDAV-BA 4300 Goodfellow Blvd. St. Louis, M0 63120

- Commander US Army Communications Electron: Command ATTN: AMSEL-POD-SA Ft. Monmouth, N. J. 07703
- 1 Commander US Army Depot Systems Command ATTN: AMSDS-X Letterkenny Army Depot Chambersburg. PA 17201
- 1 Commander US Army Electronics R&D Command ATTN: AMDEL-PO-SA Ft. Monmouth, N. J. 07703
- 1 Commander US Army Belvoir R&D Center ATTN: STRBE-HA Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060
- 1 Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: ANSMI-DS Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898
- 1 Commander US Army Natick R&DD Center ATTN: STRNC-O Natick, MA 01760
- 1 Commander US Army Test & Evaluation Command AMSTE-AD-S Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 210
- l Commander US Troop Support Command ATTN: AMSTS-B 4300 Goodfellow Blvd. St. Louis, Mo. 63120
- 1 Commander US Army Material Systems Analys Activity ATTN: AMXSY-RV Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 210

1 Chief Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange US Army Logistics Management Center ATTN: AMXMC-D Ft. Lee, VA 23801

2 Commander Defense Technical Information Center ATTN: DDC-TC Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314