INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality $6^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}$ black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.



A Bell & Howell Information Company 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA 313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

SIMULATION-BASED METHODOLOGY FOR THE DESIGN OF WORLD-CLASS MANUFACTURING CELLS

by

Maria de Los A. Irizarry

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of North Carolina State University in partial fulfillment of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING

Raleigh

1996

APPROVED BY:

aue, R. Mean

Ør. James R. Wilson Go-chair of Advisory Committee

Dr. Wilbur L. Meier,

Dr. Jaime Trevino Co-chair of Advisory Committee

- chy tu

Dr. Jye C. Lu

UMI Number: 9736833

UMI Microform 9736833 Copyright 1997, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

UMI 300 North Zeeb Road Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ABSTRACT

IRIZARRY, MARIA DE LOS A. Simulation-Based Methodology for the Design of World-Class Manufacturing Cells. (Under the direction of Dr. James R. Wilson, and Dr. Jaime Trevino.)

The objective of this research is to develop a comprehensive simulation-based methodology for the design and evaluation of world-class manufacturing cells that will provide enhanced flexibility to cope with highly demanding product and customer trends. Cell performance is measured with an annualized cost function that encompasses ten major cost components: inventory carrying cost, setup cost, material handling cost, storage equipment cost, production labor cost, maintenance cost, quality cost, layout, and floor space cost. A manufacturing cell simulator with a modular structure is developed so that the proposed celldesign methodology can be readily applied to a wide variety of cell scenarios. The first phase of the methodology involves factor-screening experiments for the identification of design and operational factors that have a significant impact on cell performance. In the second phase of experimentation, (regression) metamodels are constructed to describe the relationship between the significant cell design and operational factors (the inputs) and the expected value of the resulting annualized cell cost (the output response). Canonical and ridge analyses of the estimated response surface are used to estimate the setting of the cell design and operational factors that minimize the cell's expected annual

cost. The methodology is applied to an assembly cell for printed circuit boards. Compared to the current cell operating policy, the metamodel-based estimate of the optimum operating policy is predicted to yield average annual savings of approximately \$440,000; and this represents a 20 percent reduction in annual cost. Similar savings should be achieved in other applications of the proposed methodology for manufacturing cell design and evaluation.

DEDICATION

I want to dedicate my work first to my husband Pedro. For being a wonderful husband, father, and friend. His love, support, and encouragement were my strength and motivation.

I also dedicate my work to my son Pedro Javier for his love, patience, and understanding. You certainly helped to make the completion of my graduate work a reality.

I would also like to dedicate my work to my parents who in many occasions traveled to lend a hand with the kids. My long working hours were peaceful knowing my home was filled with their love.

I also dedicate my work to Kum Souk Lee for being so special to my daughters. I thank the Lord for her love and friendship.

BIOGRAPHY

Maria de los A. Irizarry was born on December 20, 1954 in Bronx, New York. She graduated from the University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez campus, in May 1977 where she received a degree of Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering. In May 1980 she completed a Master of Engineering in Industrial Engineering degree at Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas.

Maria worked as instructor for the Industrial Engineering Department at the University of Puerto Rico from January 1982 until May 1987. On Spring 1987, she was awarded the Industrial Engineering Department Academic Excellence Award. As an independent consultant between 1987 and 1992, she worked on projects at Baxter Healthcare Corporation, Allergan Medical Optics, Avon Mirabella, Stryker P.R. Inc., and AT&T Atlanta Works. Maria has served as instructor on APICS-sponsored seminars in the areas of Production Activity Control and Capacity Management.

On June 1992, she moved to Raleigh, North Carolina with her husband Pedro and her eleven year old son Pedro Javier. She began her Ph.D. program in Industrial Engineering at North Carolina State University in the Fall of 1992. While in graduate school, she gave birth to two lovely daughters, Agnes and Alexandra. Maria has participated in research projects as a member of the World-Class Manufacturing Research Team at North Carolina State University.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank Dr. James R. Wilson for his academic guidance, support, and enthusiasm throughout the development of this work. I have been very fortunate to perform this research work with a leading expert in the area of computer simulation.

I would also like to express my gratitude and appreciation to Dr. Jaime Trevino and Dr. Wilbur L. Meier, Jr. Their support, friendship, and encouragement have made my graduate work highly enjoyable.

I am also grateful to Dr. Jye C. Lu. His guidance and assistance are highly appreciated.

Thanks to Carlos Gonzalez, Sanjay Nair, Troy Mullen, Ahmet Yigit, and principally Barbara Hurley, who preceded me in the research of part family formation and manufacturing cell design.

Thanks to Diana Silva and David Velazco for their many hints on using the Microsoft office software.

Thanks to the current members of the World Class Manufacturing Research Team who did not complain for the long hours the equipment was unavailable ("do not touch - simulation running") in our office at Park Shops.

I want to thank the National Science Foundation who partially funded this research work under Grant number DDM-92-15432.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

-

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi ii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Importance of the Study	2
1.3 Scope and Objectives of the Research	4
1.4 Organization of the Dissertation	7
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Definition of Manufacturing Cells	8
2.3 Benefits of Cellular Manufacturing	10
2.4 Frameworks for the Design of Manufacturing Cells	12
2.5 Methodologies for the Design of Manufacturing Cells	15
2.5.1 Probability Models	16
2.5.2 Mathematical Programming Models	18
2.5.3 Heuristics	19
2.5.4 Discrete Event Stochastic Simulation	20
2.5.5 Metamodels	27
2.6 Conclusions	35
3. DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENERIC COMPUTER SIMULATION MODE	L37
3.1 Introduction	37
3.2 Cell Size and Material Handling Equipment	37
3.3 Machine Types	39
3.4 Characterization of Product Flow	42
3.5 Cell Design and Operation Issues	45
3.5.1 Cell Design Issues	46

۷

3.5.1.1 Layout and Space Requirements	. 46
3.5.1.2 Material Handling and Storage	.47
3.5.1.3 Unit Load Sizing	.47
3.5.2 Cell Operation Issues	.48
3.5.2.1 Maintenance Practices	.48
3.5.2.2 Quality Practices	.49
3.5.2.3 Changeover Practices	. 50
3.5.2.4 Multiskilled Operators	.51
3.5.2.5 Inventory Buffers between Processes	.51
3.5.2.6 Lot Sizing	. 52
3.5.2.7 Machine Minor Stoppages	. 52
6 Cell Performance Measurement	. 53
3.6.1 Inventory Carrying Cost (IC)	. 53
3.6.2 Lateness Cost (LT)	.55
3.6.3 Setup Cost (SU)	.57
3.6.4 Maintenance Cost (M)	.60
3.6.5 Quality Cost (Q)	.61
3.6.6 Material handling (MH)	64
3.6.7 Storage Cost (ST)	65
3.6.8 Production Labor Cost (PL)	66
3.6.9 Layout Cost (L)	67
3.6.10 Floor Space Cost (FS)	67
3.6.11 Total Annualized Cost	67
3.7 Computer Simulation Model	68
3.7.1 Modular Characteristics of the Simulation Model	68
3.7.2 Execution Speed	74
3.7.3 Statistical Capabilities	74
3.7.4 Simulation Input	75
	3.5.1.1 Layout and Space Requirements. 3.5.1.2 Material Handling and Storage 3.5.1.3 Unit Load Sizing. 3.5.2 Cell Operation Issues 3.5.2.1 Maintenance Practices. 3.5.2.2 Quality Practices. 3.5.2.3 Changeover Practices. 3.5.2.4 Multiskilled Operators 3.5.2.5 Inventory Buffers between Processes 3.5.2.6 Lot Sizing. 3.5.2.7 Machine Minor Stoppages 6 Cell Performance Measurement 3.6.1 Inventory Carrying Cost (IC) 3.6.2 Lateness Cost (LT) 3.6.3 Setup Cost (SU). 3.6.4 Maintenance Cost (M) 3.6.5 Quality Cost (Q) 3.6.6 Material handling (MH) 3.6.7 Storage Cost (ST). 3.6.8 Production Labor Cost (PL) 3.6.10 Floor Space Cost (FS) 3.6.11 Total Annualized Cost 3.7 Computer Simulation Model 3.7.1 Modular Characteristics of the Simulation Model 3.7.2 Execution Speed. 3.7.3 Statistical Capabilities 3.7.4 Simulation Input.

3.7.5 Simula	ation Output	77
3.8 Conclus	ions	80
4. CELL DESI	GN METHODOLOGY	82
4.1 Introduct	tion	82
4.2 Selection	n of Cell Design and Operation Factors	83
4.3 Develop	ment of a Cell Performance Measure	
4.4 Setting ti	he Lateness Ratio RA	
4.5 Identifica	tion of Critical Design and Operation Factors	
4.6 Optimiza	tion of Cell Performance	97
4.7 Conclusi	ons	115
5. CONCLUSIO	ONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	116
5.1 Summar	y of Research Work	116
5.2 Conclusi	ons	117
5.3 Recomm	endations for Future Research Work	118
REFERENCES		120
APPENDICES		128
APPENDIX A	SLAM II SIMULATION CODE	129
APPENDIX B	EXAMPLE OF SIMULATION OUTPUT	
APPENDIX C	SAS OUTPUT FOR THE SCREENING EXPERIMENT	
APPENDIX D	SAS OUTPUTS FOR EXPERIMENTS 1 THROUGH 4	
APPENDIX E	SAS OUTPUT FOR TRANSFORMATIONS AT	
	EXPERIMENTS 2 AND 4	

LIST OF TABLES

Page

•

TABLE 3.1 CHARACTERISTICS OF MANUFACTURING CELLS EXAMINED IN THIS STUDY 38
TABLE 3.2. CELL DESIGN AND OPERATION ISSUES
TABLE 3.3. DESCRIPTION OF SIMULATION EVENTS
TABLE 3.4. INPUT DATA FILES
TABLE 3.5. COST COMPONENTS ON THREE SCENARIOS FOR THE ASSEMBLY OF P-C
BOARDS
TABLE 4.1. PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL COST REPRESENTED BY EACH COST COMPONENT89
TABLE 4.2. DESCRIPTION OF FACTOR LEVELS
TABLE 4.3. RESULTS FROM SCREENING EXPERIMENT
TABLE 4.4. BREAKDOWN OF THE ANNUALIZED COST RESULTS FROM THE SCREENING
EXPERIMENT

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

ix

FIGURE 3.1. GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF MACHINE TYPES	9
FIGURE 3.2. GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF THE BURN-IN OVEN	1
FIGURE 3.3. STAGES OF PRODUCT FLOW	2
FIGURE 3.4. SCENARIOS AT STAGE ONE OF PRODUCT FLOW	4
FIGURE 3.5. SCENARIOS AT STAGE THREE OF PRODUCT FLOW	5
FIGURE 3.6. COMPONENTS OF THE CELL ANNUAL COST FUNCTION	5
FIGURE 3.7. ACTIVATION OF MODULES TO SIMULATE A DEPARTURE	3
FIGURE 3.8. ACTIVATION OF MODULES TO SELECT AND PROCESS AN ENTITY	2
FIGURE 3.9. COST COMPONENTS FOR THREE CELL SCENARIOS	3
FIGURE 4.1 BUILDING BLOCKS OF THE CELL DESIGN METHODOLOGY	3
FIGURE 4.2 CELL DESIGN METHODOLOGY	5
FIGURE 4.3 CELL FOR THE ASSEMBLY OF PRINTED CIRCUIT BOARDS	3
FIGURE 4.4 LAYOUT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF QUALITY AT THE SOURCE	7
FIGURE 4.5 COST COMPONENTS FOR VALUES OF RA)
FIGURE 4.6 MEAN PLOT OF CELL ANNUALIZED COST BY QUALITY SCENARIO	3
FIGURE 4.7 MEAN PLOT OF CELL ANNUALIZED COST BY MAINTENANCE SCENARIO97	7
FIGURE 4.8 LAYOUT OF THE MACROEXPERIMENT	3
FIGURE 4.9 ESTIMATED RESPONSE SURFACE FOR EXPERIMENT 1	I
FIGURE 4.10 ESTIMATED RESPONSE SURFACE FOR EXPERIMENT 2101	ł
FIGURE 4.11 ESTIMATED RESPONSE SURFACE FOR EXPERIMENT 3102	2
FIGURE 4.12 ESTIMATED RESPONSE SURFACE FOR EXPERIMENT 4	2
FIGURE 4.13 ESTIMATED RESPONSE SURFACE FOR THE LOGARITHM	
TRANSFORMATION104	1
FIGURE 4.14 ESTIMATED RESPONSE SURFACE FOR THE INVERSE TRANSFORMATION 107	7

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Shrinking product life cycles, an increasing product mix, and continuously increasing customer expectations are redefining competitiveness in world markets. Customer orders occur more frequently, in smaller lots and with increased variety, all required in a shorter time window. Companies thus must design manufacturing systems with the flexibility to respond to this new reality, ensuring superior quality, quick response, and competitive costs. Traditional manufacturing systems lack the characteristics required to cope with rapidly emerging technological and social trends while remaining competitive in global markets.

An alternative approach to manufacturing that offers a potential for high flexibility, superior quality, on-time deliveries, and low production cost is a hybrid system called cellular manufacturing. This approach is one of the cornerstones for the implementation of just-in-time concepts and for becoming a world class manufacturer. Cellular manufacturing is a production system that provides the economic advantages of flow production lines while retaining the flexibility of job shop production systems. The basic building block of a cellular manufacturing system is the manufacturing cell [BLAC88].

Cellular manufacturing entails the processing of similar parts by a group of dedicated machines arranged in close proximity. These machines are grouped based on production requirements or part-geometric characteristics. Numerous case studies found in the literature reveal the benefits achieved through the implementation of manufacturing cells. Typical results include reductions in work-in-process inventories and lead times as well as improvements in throughput, quality, and on-time delivery. Although numerous success stories are found in the literature, many companies are still reluctant to transform their facility layout from a job shop to a cellular configuration.

1.2 Importance of the Study

The design of manufacturing cells is a highly complicated process. It entails the consideration of many factors having complex relationships [MCGI91]. Grouping machines into cells does not ensure that the benefits associated with cellular manufacturing will be achieved [STEU92]. Implementation of manufacturing cells without careful analysis can result in a highly inflexible manufacturing system with poor results.

Manufacturing cell issues can be divided basically into the following two major categories: (1) cell formation, and (2) cell design and operation. Cell formation entails the grouping of parts into families and machines into cells. Cell design includes issues such as layout, configuration of the material handling and storage system, and unit load size. Cell operation encompasses issues such as quality control, equipment breakdowns and preventive maintenance, machine setup time, product lot sizing, operator assignment, operator movement rules, product scheduling, and sizing and placement of inventory buffers. Machine

2

stoppages due to material replenishments, lot sequencing, and demand variability represent other operational issues of interest.

Most of the research work in cellular manufacturing has focused on cell formation, material handling system design (especially automated guided vehicles), and cell layout. Wemmerlov, in a survey performed with U.S. industries that are users of cellular manufacturing, found that most problems faced by these companies are operation-related [WEMM89]. Another significant finding from the survey was that feasibility studies and cell design were the second highest expense category.

Performance of a manufacturing cell can be measured in numerous ways. Throughput, work-in-process, manufacturing lead time, material handling cost, machine setup cost, and inventory carrying costs are some examples found in the literature. Every decision made during the design process has an impact on cell performance, whether related to cell formation or cell design and operation. A weakness of the procedures developed so far is the consideration of only one or, at best, a few performance issues [WEMM89].

Companies working towards becoming world class manufacturers need to evaluate the impact of implementing just-in-time elements on the performance of cells. Issues such as total productive maintenance (TPM) and quality at the source (QAS) require substantial investments and may not have a significant benefit in the manufacturing process performance. Smaller lots and smaller unit load sizes may impact labor and machine utilization. The impact of teamwork and multiskilled workers on cell operation are other issues of interest. Cell design methodologies addressing the impact of world class elements on cell performance are seldom found in the literature.

In summary, research to date does not provide: (a) methodologies with a comprehensive performance measure to assess design decisions, (b) methodologies addressing cell operation issues during the cell design process, and (c) methodologies for evaluating the impact of implementing just-in-time and world class elements on cell performance. The development of comprehensive cell design methodologies will help industries to improve their understanding of cellular manufacturing by being able to measure cell performance under a wide variety of scenarios prior to implementation. The willingness of continuous improvement practitioners to migrate to cellular manufacturing should increase sharply if such methodologies and tools are available.

1.3 Scope and Objectives of the Research

The first objective of this research is to develop a manufacturing cell design methodology with the following characteristics:

 The methodology encompasses cell design and operation issues at the design stage. Design issues to be addressed are cell layout, configuration of the material handling and storage system, and unit load size. Operation issues to be addressed are lot size, setup times, machine breakdowns and maintenance, machine minor stoppages, part scheduling, sizing of inventory buffers, number of operators, operator assignments, and operator movement rules. Other issues that can be evaluated are demand variability and lot sequencing.

- 2. The methodology incorporates a comprehensive performance measure. The performance measure will be a total annual cost model capable of evaluating the impact of multiple cell design and operation issues. The components of the total annual cost function are: (a) inventory carrying cost, (b) setup cost, (c) material handling cost, (d) storage cost, (e) direct labor cost, (f) maintenance cost, (g) quality cost, (h) layout cost, (i) floor space cost, and (j) lateness cost.
- The methodology accounts for just-in-time and world class elements such as multiskilled workers, quick changeover teams, autonomous maintenance, total preventive maintenance, and quality at the source.

The second objective of this research is to develop a generic manufacturing cell computer simulation model to facilitate the implementation of the cell design methodology. The focus will be in the design of manned manufacturing cells.

The manufacturing cell design methodology entails:

- 1. Selection of cell design and operation factors of interest.
- 2. Use of a comprehensive annualized cost function to track cell performance.
- Execution of screening experiments using the generic manufacturing cell computer simulation model to determine significant design and operation factors.

- 4. Execution of follow-up simulation experiments to estimate a (regression) metamodel describing the expected performance of the simulation model, with cell design and operation factors as independent variables and cell total annual cost as the dependent variable.
- 5. Optimization of cell performance using the developed metamodel to estimate the settings of the design and operation factors that minimize the cell's expected total annual cost..

The development of a generic manufacturing cell computer simulation model requires:

- 1. Plant visits for the characterization of manufacturing cells. This encompasses machine types, product flows, configurations of material handling and storage equipment, cell layouts, and cell sizes.
- 2. Selection of design and operation factors of interest to manufacturing cell users.
- 3. Selection of just-in-time and world class manufacturing elements to be included in the simulation model.
- 4. Development of a total annual cost function to measure cell performance under a variety of cell design and operation scenarios.
- 5. Design, implementation (coding), and verification (debugging) of the manufacturing cell computer simulation model.

The manufacturing cell design methodology will be tested using the generic manufacturing cell simulation model with data from an actual industry case.

In summary, the design methodology in conjunction with the generic cell simulator should help industries to improve their understanding of cellular manufacturing. Resources could be optimized to achieve a competitive advantage.

1.4 Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter 2 presents a literature review on cellular manufacturing. It includes definition and benefits of cellular manufacturing, and frameworks and methodologies for the design of manufacturing cells. Chapter 3 describes the research work for the design of a generic cell simulator. The main issues discussed are the characterization of machines types and product flow, the selection of world class manufacturing practices, the development of a comprehensive annualized cost function, and the design of the generic cell simulator. Chapter 4 presents the proposed simulation-based methodology. The methodology is applied to a cell which assembles printed circuit boards. Chapter 5 contains a summary of the research work with conclusions and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter expands on the definition of manufacturing cells. Benefits expected from the implementation of cellular manufacturing are presented in Section 2.3. Manufacturing cell design frameworks found in the literature are reviewed in Section 2.4, with strengths and weaknesses discussed in Section 2.5. Some conclusions are presented in Section 2.6.

2.2 Definition of Manufacturing Cells

Cellular manufacturing is an approach for the redesign and reorganization of a manufacturing facility that exploits the sameness of parts and processes to achieve the benefits of flow production systems while retaining the flexibility of job shop layouts. A manufacturing cell is a collection of machines, processes, and/or workstations dedicated to producing a collection of similar parts or products. This collection of similar parts is called a part family.

Product flow within the cell can be either jumbled (as job shop layouts) or straight (as in flow lines). However, world class manufacturing cells are usually flow line cells. Cells could be used either for parts fabrication, assembly, or a combination of these activities. Similarities between parts within the family allows manufacturing in small lot sizes with quick changeovers. Another characteristic of manufacturing cells is that unit load size is small and the material handling effort to move parts between machines is significantly less than in job shop environments.

The manufacturing lead time is the time it takes a product to be completed (from beginning to end). In job shop environments a large percentage of the lead time is spent waiting (for machines or material handling resources), being transported (by a material handling resource), or sitting idle (in a storage area). That percentage in some cases can be as high as 95 percent [BLAC88]. Dedicating machines to families of parts and locating machines in close proximity to one another, as with cells, significantly reduces waiting, handling, and storage times. The intention is to keep the products moving through the process until completed.

Manufacturing cells can be considered as single entities for production scheduling. The need to plan and schedule each single operation for each one of the parts is eliminated with the implementation of cells. Cell capacity is adjusted to deal with changes in demand by increasing or decreasing the number of operators in the cell. Cell operators can perform any of the operations within the cell since they are usually trained to be multiskilled. The functions of quality control and preventive maintenance are integrated into the manufacturing system. Cell operators are responsible for product quality and machine

9

performance. Quality control and preventive maintenance personnel act as facilitators.

2.3 Benefits of Cellular Manufacturing

The concept of manufacturing cells is promising, and the benefits to be achieved from the implementation of a well conceived cell are many. Droy [DROY87] contends that a properly designed cell may achieve "benefits beyond everyone's expectations". He claims that a cell should realize lead time reductions of 60 to 90 percent, and cost reductions of: (1) 30 to 50 percent for quality, (2) 50 to 80 percent in inventory, (3) 30 to 50 percent in direct labor, (4) 30 to 50 percent for engineering support, (5) 50 to 90 percent for material handling, (6) 80 to 90 percent for supervision, and (7) 50 to 80 percent for production control.

Greene and Sadowski [GREE83] list some of the benefits and disadvantages of cellular manufacturing. The benefits to be expected are reductions in the following: control requirements, material handling, setup time, tooling requirements, in-process inventory, and expediting. On the human side, benefits include broadened operator expertise and human relations. On the other hand, the disadvantages include reduced shop flexibility and machine utilization, with a possibility of increasing lead times and job tardiness.

Steudel and Desruelle [STEU92] present a list of the benefits reported by many companies, and they explain how and why those benefits can be achieved.

Some of those benefits are: (1) a reduction of 70 to 90 percent in production lead times and work-in-process inventories, (2) a reduction of 75 to 90 percent in material handling, (3) reductions of 20 to 45 percent in the amount of factory floor space required to produce the same number of products, (4) decreases in machine setup times by 65 to 80 percent, (5) reductions of 50 to 80 percent in quality-related problems, (6) simplification of shop-floor control, and (7) better communication between personnel in product design and manufacturing engineering. Steudel and Desruelle recognize that cellular layout configurations have some disadvantages when compared to job shop layouts. They list three as the most common limitations: (1) reduced machine utilization, (2) less flexibility than job shop layouts, and (3) equipment failure as having more costly and damaging effects in throughput capacity.

Wemmerlov and Hyer [WEMM89] reported the results of a survey involving 32 firms that have implemented the concept of cellular manufacturing. Some of the reported benefits involved reductions in the following: throughput time, work-in-process inventory, material handling, numbers of fixtures, setup times, finished goods inventories, and labor costs. In addition to these benefits, Wemmerlov and Hyer reported improvements in operator job satisfaction and part quality. A survey was performed by Trevino [TREV94] involving 13 companies in North Carolina, all of them users of cellular manufacturing. Some of the benefits reported by these companies include: (1) reductions in work-inprocess, raw materials, and finished goods; (2) improvements in product quality, throughput, and delivery performance; (3) reductions in product lead time, floor space requirements, and setup times; and (4) cost reductions. Koelsch [KOEL90] and Al-Qattan [ALQA89] present other claims of benefits attributable to cellular manufacturing.

The claims of benefits attributed to cellular manufacturing provide evidence of the advantages to be expected from its implementation. However, as many researchers recognize, the benefits can only be achieved with a wellconceived cell incorporating the dynamics of cell performance. An overview of frameworks for the design of manufacturing cells is presented in the section that follows.

2.4 Frameworks for the Design of Manufacturing Cells

Wemmerlov and Hyer [WEMM87] view the design of cells as an iterative process consisting of three basic steps: design, evaluation, and justification. Design issues are divided into two categories, those that relate to system structure and those that relate to system operation. Issues considered under system structure are: the selection and grouping of parts into families, the selection and grouping of machines into cells, selection of material handling equipment, and choice of cell layout. System operation, on the other hand, considers typical problems related to the operation of cells, such as: maintenance policies; inspection policies; production planning, scheduling and control; assignment of responsibilities to operators and staff; reporting mechanisms; and reward systems. Wemmerlov and Hyer emphasize that decisions related to system structure cannot be evaluated independently of decisions related to system operation since both affect system cost and performance.

Kinney and McGinnis [KINN87] describe the cell design process as consisting of five steps, namely: (1) part selection, (2) machine selection, (3) layout, (4) selection of material handling equipment, and (5) staffing. Part selection involves the determination of the group of parts to be processed in the cell. Machine selection involves the determination of how many machines of each machine type to include in the cell. Decisions must then be made regarding layout, selection of material handling equipment, and staffing. The success of the cell design should be determined from the evaluation of preselected cell performance measures. Kinney recommends evaluating cell performance with respect to planned production rates for the family of products to be processed in the cell. If cell performance is not acceptable, then another iteration of the whole process should follow until a satisfactory design has been obtained.

Another framework for the design process is presented by Steudel [STEU91]. The whole process consists of two basic steps: (1) parts and machine grouping; and (2) detailed cell design, testing and evaluation. A third step described in his methodology focuses on the implementation phase. Parts and machine grouping consists of: (1) selection and grouping of parts into families, (2) selection and grouping of machines into cells, and (3) the assignment of part families to machine cells to form workcells. Cell design is divided into five categories of design parameters. These are: (1) workstation configuration, (2) shift conditions, (3) operator assignment, (4) work-in-process storage, and (5)

operating policies. A workstation is defined as the collection of machines required to perform a specific operation in the cell. Under this definition, workstation configuration means the number of machines per workstation. Shift conditions, the second parameter category, deals with the number of shifts per day and the number of hours per shift. Design decisions related to operator assignment are number of operations in the cell, operator cross-training, and operator assignment to workstations. The only work-in-process storage parameter mentioned by the author is buffer size. The last category of design parameters encompasses operating policies. Design decisions under this category are lot sizes, transfer batch sizes (or unit load sizes), and setup policy.

In spite of the fact that the three sources cited offer slightly different frameworks for the design of manufacturing cells, they all agree in three areas. First, all of them view the design process as being iterative. The whole design cycle is repeated until a superior design is identified. Second, their description of the design process contains the same set of activities. In general those are: selection of parts and machines, physical configuration of the cell, and decisions related to operational issues such as quality control and maintenance policies. Last, the generation and evaluation of design alternatives should consider design and operational issues simultaneously since both affect cost and cell performance. The most commonly cited cell design and operation factors in research papers, case studies, and surveys of cell users are:

- number of parts per cell
- number of machines per cell

- product mix
- demand variability
- lot size
- setup times
- transfer batch size
- storage policy (centralized vs. decentralized)
- configuration of work-in-process buffers (size and location)
- cell layout
- material handling equipment
- production control policy (push vs. pull)
- scheduling policy (FIFO, EDD, SPT)
- quality control policy
- maintenance policy (breakdown maintenance vs. preventive maintenance)
- number of cell operators
- operator assignments

Some of the factors listed above are quantitative while others have a qualitative nature. Quantitative factors are those whose levels can be associated with points in a numerical scale. Examples of quantitative factors are number of parts in the cell, number of operators in the cell, and setup times. On the other hand, qualitative factors are those for which the levels cannot be measured on a numerical scale. Maintenance and quality policies are some examples.

2.5 Methodologies for the Design of Manufacturing Cells

The objective of this section is to present an overview of methodologies for manufacturing cell design. The modeling approaches include: probability models, mathematical models, heuristics, simulation, and metamodels.

2.5.1 Probability Models

Probability models use basic principles of probability or stochastic processes to study system performance. Since they incorporate the stochastic and dynamic nature of the system, they represent an improvement over deterministic models. One class of a probabilistic model is provided by discretetime Markov chains. A Markov chain may be represented by nodes symbolizing the state of the system that are connected by directed arcs (branches) showing the transitions between the states of the system. The state of the system can be defined in terms of the number of parts in the buffers, the number of machines processing parts, or the number of busy operators. Steady-state probabilities are obtained by solving a set of simultaneous linear equations developed using the Markov chain describing the states of the system. These probabilities are then used to obtain performance measures such as steady-state operator and machine utilization, and steady-state system throughput rate. Markov chains have been applied to the design of transfer lines [BUZA67, DALL88, GERS83, GERS87].

Although Markov chains can account for the uncertainties and dynamics of the system, they assume time-invariant inputs. This is a major drawback in mimicking real-life situations. For this reason, Markov chains are typically used to compare different system configurations early in the design process. Markov chains are most suitable for small or simple manufacturing cells since the number of states often grows exponentially with the size of the system [LEUN90].

A second class of probabilistic models is provided by queuing models. These models are used to study system performance under steady state conditions. System performance measures are usually steady-state averages. Queuing models have been used in the design of nonautomated as well as automated cellular manufacturing systems. Solberg was among the first to formulate a queuing network model of a flexible manufacturing system [SOLB76]. Buzacott and Shanthikumar used queuing concepts to predict performance of a flexible manufacturing system under various work-in-process storage policies [BUZA80]. Case studies on the application of queuing theory for lead time reduction are presented by Suri [SURI89] and Suzanne [SUZA92]. O'Grady and Menon [OGRA86] present an extensive review on the use of queuing models for the design of flexible manufacturing systems.

Queuing models are simple and quite efficient. They do not require a large amount of input data and can be executed quickly using a computer. That is why they are called rapid modeling tools [SURI93]. Some of the software packages currently available for general use are CAN-Q, QNA, and MANUPLAN [SNOW88]. A survey of software packages for manufacturing is presented in Snowdon and Ammons [SNOW88]. The primary limitation of queuing models is in the simplifying assumptions required to have analytically tractable models.

One fundamental assumption is that processing times are exponentially distributed, which is not true for complex cellular manufacturing systems. However, given their simplicity and efficiency they are recommended in the early design stages to explore and select a subset among a large number of alternative designs.

2.5.2 Mathematical Programming Models

A mathematical programming model consists of a set of equations relating system performance to system decision variables. It is formulated as an objective function subject to a set of constraints. A solution to the set of equations is obtained to either maximize or minimize the objective function. For example, an objective function could be the total annualized cell manufacturing cost, which is to be minimized over all feasible combinations of the decision variables. Constraints on the decision variables could be limits on machine capacities, numbers of operators, buffer sizes, and hours per shift.

Mathematical programming models have been used for production planning and scheduling of both nonautomated and automated manufacturing cells. Stecke constructed a nonlinear integer programming model to solve production planning issues for a flexible manufacturing system [STEC81, STEC83]. A conclusion of her work was that such models were too large to be computationally feasible [OGRA86]. Wilson proposed an integer programming model for the assignment of tooling in automated manufacturing cells [WILS84]. Mathematical programming models have been used by researchers to determine the optimum number of kanbans [BITR87, BERK92, LI91]. Mathematical programming has also been used for the machine cell layout problem. Sunderesh developed a methodology to solve the machine cell layout problem which involves three stages [SUND89]. In the first stage a clustering algorithm is used to identify machine cells and part families. In the second and third stages, the machine cell and machine layout problems are solved using a mathematical programming model. The model's objective function to be minimized is the total cost of performing the required trips between cells and machines.

The objectives of probability and mathematical programming models differ somewhat. Markov chains and queuing theory guide the design process by evaluating system performance. Mathematical programming on the other hand is used to obtain the design which optimizes system performance. The latter models, however, cannot generally deal with the stochastic and dynamic nature of manufacturing cell operations.

2.5.3 Heuristics

Heuristics are methods developed to quickly obtain good feasible solutions. The widespread use of heuristics is mainly due to the computational difficulties of mathematical programming and probabilistic models. Heuristics have been used to solve machine cell layout, lot sizing, and cell scheduling problems. Sunderesh developed a mathematical programming model for cell layout and employed a heuristic algorithm to obtain a solution to the mathematical programming model [SUND89]. A heuristic was developed by

19

Sundaram and Sundrarajan to solve the lot sizing problem in cellular manufacturing systems. The objective of the heuristic was minimization of setup and inventory carrying costs. Dessouky and Mackulak developed a heuristic solution to the problem of scheduling jobs when a changeover penalty exists [DESS90]. Other works on the development of heuristics for manufacturing cell scheduling are presented in Logendran [LOGE91] and Sundaram [SUND88]. O'Grady and Menon cite several surveys on the application of heuristics to manufacturing systems [OGRA86].

Researchers recommend the use of heuristics to overcome the computational difficulties of mathematical programming and probabilistic models. These provide approximate but good solutions to complex problems.

2.5.4 Discrete Event Stochastic Simulation

Simulation has been used for years to model manufacturing and production systems. However, it was not until the 1980s that simulation became a tool commonly used by researchers and practitioners in the manufacturing and production areas. One of the factors contributing to this trend was the introduction of the personal computers, with capabilities that were previously available only on large mainframes. Other factors were the introduction of new simulation languages specifically designed for manufacturing simulation and software packages that do not require any computer programming by the user. Nevertheless, caution should be exercised when selecting "canned" packages since convenience of use is at the expense of losing some flexibility and level of detail in the simulation model. A simulation software buyer's guide was published recently in <u>Industrial Engineering</u> [INDU96].

Gunasekaran describes simulation models as "the best known method to evaluate performance of just-in-time systems" [GUNA93]. Simulation models are very flexible. They can be tailored to a specific objective and made as general or detailed as required to achieve a desirable level of accuracy. Simulation is applicable to all manufacturing systems.

Simulation studies of cellular manufacturing systems have appeared only in the recent literature. Some researchers have focused on the effect of conversion from a job shop system into a cellular manufacturing system. Morris and Tersine examined the influence of several factors in a firm's operating environment on cellular layout performance [MORR90]. The factors analyzed were: (1) ratio of setup to process time, (2) material transfer time between workstations, (3) demand stability, and (4) flow of work within cells. Although none of the operating variables produced a clear advantage for cellular layouts, Morris and Tersine were able to postulate the "ideal" environment for cellular layouts.

Suresh also investigated the effects of partitioning job shops to implement cellular manufacturing [SURE92]. He studied the effects of lot size, setup reduction, cell size and allowance of intercell movements. He showed that partitioned systems with an insufficient degree of setup reduction are inferior to unpartitioned systems.

Another researcher who studied the conversion from job shops to cellular manufacturing systems is Durmusoglu [DURM93]. The objective of his study was to compare a job shop system with large lot sizes and a cellular system with smaller lot sizes using SMED (Single Minute Exchange of Dies). He used simulation and economic analysis to justify the conversion. His conclusion was that setup time reduction is a key step for conversion.

Alexander et al. proposed a macro/micro approach to the simulation of cellular manufacturing systems [ALEX90]. A "macromodel" was used to simulate the overall production system. This includes the manufacture of batches of parts and their assembly into end items. A "micromodel" was used to simulate the processing of units, one at a time, over the individual machines in the cell. The focus of this study was on cell layout.

Several recent papers have addressed the issues of sequencing and scheduling. Taylor and Taha evaluated buffering strategies for cellular manufacturing systems [TAYL93]. They simulated a cellular manufacturing system with decentralized buffers associated with each manufacturing cell, and central buffers at key routing decision points. They concluded that decentralized buffers facilitate the use of push dispatching rules, while centralized buffers facilitate the use of push dispatching rules. The results of the study emphasize the need to consider physical and conceptual CMS design, product design, and control policies concurrently throughout the design process.
Shenoy and Kasilingam developed a simulation model to analyze the performance of a hypothetical cellular manufacturing system under various combinations of dispatching and loading policies [SHEN91]. The performance criteria used were machine utilization, tool utilization, cell utilization, part waiting time, and automated guided vehicle (AGV) utilization. The dispatching rules studied were first-in first-out (FIFO), shortest processing time (SPT), longest processing time (LPT), and last-in first-out (LIFO). Results showed that equipment utilization depended more on the number of the AGVs and their speed rather than the dispatching rules.

Three approaches for assigning workers to tasks and controlling the flow of jobs through a cellular manufacturing system were analyzed by Askin and Lyer [ASKI93]. The scheduling approaches considered were: (1) individual machine loading with batches sequenced on a FIFO basis, (2) cell dedication wherein the cell was dedicated to a single product at a time, and (3) assignment of each batch to a single cross-trained operator responsible of performing all batch operations. Queuing theory was used to obtain analytical approximations for the first two strategies, and simulation was used to confirm the analytical approximations. The results obtained showed that the approach selected to schedule a manufacturing cell can make a significant impact on throughput time. When the cell consisted of only one machine, the choice of policy was not important. For larger cells, the best scheduling policy was highly dependent on service time distributions, machine utilizations, and lot sizes. In most cases multiple product cells were the best choice. The effect of product mix on cell performance was studied by Kekre [KEKR87]. He studied the impact of increasing the number of items made in the cell and also the effect of job sequencing by shortest setup time. Kerke used queuing theory and validated the results obtained with simulation. Optimum lot size and queue time were found to increase as product mix increased up to a certain point beyond which adding more part types had very little effect. Sequencing by shortest setup time was found to have small benefits when items were very similar.

Simulation has been extensively used for the design of material handling systems. Savory et al. [SAVO91] developed a simplified approach for the design of nonaccumulating conveyors in flexible manufacturing systems. He assumed that conveyor movement was continuous and that part movement was FIFO. Another assumption in the model was that the conveyor is available at all times. A large amount of literature can be found in the area of automated guided vehicles (AGVs). Savory [SAVO91] studied the impact of AGVs on the performance of flexible manufacturing systems. He developed a simulation model to estimate the performance of AGVs, robots, and conveyors. Conveyors were found to consistently outperform both robots and AGVs.

In comparison to the design issues covered above, a very limited amount of simulation work has focused on other cell issues such as machine preventive maintenance programs, quality control strategies, and cell balancing.

Hurley developed a simulation-based methodology for estimating and optimizing the effects of design and operation factors on the performance of

24

manufacturing cells [HURL94]. Her methodology was applied to a specific manufacturing cell scenario dealing with the assembly of service parts for the electric power generating industry. She considered operational issues such as: lot sizing, number of cell operators, setup times, machine processing times, and material handling distances. Other factors included in the study were: maintenance programs, quality control strategies, and scheduling policies. Central to the methodology is an annualized cost function to measure cell performance. A metamodel describing the relationship between quantitative factors and cell performance was developed for each combination of qualitative factors. Hurley determined the optimum levels of quantitative factors by evaluating the metamodels at various levels of the factors and selecting those that yield the lowest cost. The optimum level of qualitative factors was determined using the Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsh multiple comparisons procedure.

One of the major sources of variability in a production system is machine breakdowns. However, some studies assume that machines will never break down. Product quality is another element that can have a significant impact on the performance of manufacturing systems. Dyck et al. describe a simulation study performed to analyze the impact of changes in the level of quality on system performance [DYCK91]. They found that as quality deteriorates, system utilization declines at an increasing rate under the JIT environment. Nevertheless, as with breakdowns, many studies assume perfect systems with zero scrap and rework.

Cell balancing impacts cell productivity, work in process, and cell capacity. Very few papers were found dealing with these issues. Steudel

25

[STEU91] studied the impact of operator assignment strategies at a cell used to manufacture gears. He found that cell output rate could vary as much as 24 percent with different operator assignment strategies.

Simulation is considered by some researchers as the best method to evaluate performance of manufacturing systems. It is highly flexible, can be applied to any manufacturing system scenario, and can be programmed to capture any desired performance measure. Simulation can be used to model job flows and routing, machine behavior, and complex control and sequencing rules. For this reason, predictions of performance made by the model can be very accurate [BUZA85]. However, simulation has certain limitations that merit some discussion. Those can be summarized as follows:

- 1. Simulation is time consuming. A significant amount of the analyst's time must be devoted during model development, and a significant amount of computer time must be devoted to achieving a desired level of accuracy in results.
- 2. The results from simulation do not lend themselves to easy interpretation. Since a wide variety of results can easily be generated, it is a challenge to differentiate the vital few from the trivial many.
- 3. Evaluating modeled system performance at factor levels other than the ones used in the experiments requires rerunning the simulation.
- 4. Simulation does not give direct guidance as to ways of optimizing performance. It does not provide hints on how to change factor values to improve performance.

2.5.5 Metamodels

As stated before, simulation is considered the best modeling tool when the objective is to imitate the complexity and dynamic behavior of the system of interest. Gunasekaran et al. [GUNA93] describes simulation as "the best known method used to evaluate performance of JIT." Metamodels on the other hand, are an excellent mechanism of simplifying the interpretation of results from the simulation by explaining the relationship between cell design and operation factors and cell performance. Yu et al. [YU93] explain that "there is consensus among researchers that metamodels are easier to manage and provide more insight than simulation alone".

Metamodels are defined by Friedman as "any analytic auxiliary model which is used to aid in the interpretation of a more detailed model" [FRIE88]. One type of metamodel is the linear regression model. A set of experiments based on the factors of interest (independent variables such as cell design and operation issues) is designed and carried out with a simulation model. The output from the simulation experiments is used as the dependent variable to perform linear regression analysis. The result is a regression model relating system response to the set of factors or predictor variables of interest. Since the metamodel is built using the results from another model (the simulation model), Kleijnen [KLEI79] defines a metamodel as "a model of a model".

The identification of factors that influence cell performance is vital to the design and operation of manufacturing cell systems [BUZA85]. Metamodels can help to identify significant factors as well as to understand the relationship

between those factors and system performance. A metamodel can be represented as:

$$Y = f(X_1, X_2, X_3, ..., X_n) + \varepsilon$$

where:

Y = Response variable of interest;

 X_i = level of the ith predictor variable (a design and operation factor) of

interest (i=1,...,n); and

ε residual error representing the inability of the (regression)
metatmodel to predict Y exactly.

The response variable (Y), which is the output of the simulation, is expressed as a function of the design and factors (X_i) , which are inputs to the simulation. Therefore, the data used by the metamodel are the inputs and outputs of the simulation model.

Metamodels have many uses [FRIE88]. First, they minimize the need of the simulation analyst for answering "what if" questions, during both design and operation of the system under study. Metamodel predictions can be accurate as long as the predictor variable values are within the range used for the simulation experiments, provided the functional form of the metamodel is a reasonably accurate approximation to the expected simulation response. Metamodels can be used to understand the interrelationships among the design factors of interest. They also provide a mechanism of simplifying the interpretation of results from the simulation model. The use of metamodels in postsimulation analysis has been steadily increasing in popularity since the late 1980s. About 57 percent of all reported work relates to manufacturing applications [YU94]. However, the focus of metamodels in manufacturing has been on shop floor control rather than on design of manufacturing systems.

Jothishankar and Wang [JOTH92] used metamodels to study the effect of eight predictor variables on the throughput of a JIT kanban system. They simulated a manufacturing system with two assembly cells, one fabrication cell, and one incoming receiving cell. A 2⁸⁻⁴ fractional factorial design with resolution IV was used to reduce the number of design points required to estimate the effect of the predictor variables on system throughput. The simulation model was written in SIMAN, and MINITAB was used to develop the regression metamodel. The latter was validated by comparing predictions using the metamodel with results from a new set of 16 simulation runs. The average deviation of the metamodel-based prediction from the simulation-generated result was found to be within 1.38 percent. Their conclusion was that metamodels can yield good predictions of throughput time, and thus could be used to identify the combination of variables to achieve minimal throughput time.

Other authors discuss the application of metamodels to flexible manufacturing systems. Kleijnen and Standridge describe the use of metamodels to study the impact of four inputs on system throughput [KLEI88]. The metamodels were constructed using the results from a deterministic simulation model of the flexible manufacturing system under study. Two approaches were used to build the metamodels: (1) based on an intuitively selected fraction of input combinations, and (2) based on a formal 2⁴⁻¹ fractional factorial design. The formal design gave more accurate estimates of the input effects based on the variance of the estimated effects. The metamodel was used by the authors to better understand how the flexible manufacturing system works.

Lin and Chiu used metamodels to study the behavior of a fixed flow automatic robotics cell [LIN93]. Their interest was first on cell behavior under steady state conditions, and second on dynamic performance under the influence of machine breakdowns and job changes. The input variables of interest were the number of machines in the cell, the utilization level of the cell, variations in process time, variations in time between arrivals, and the speed of a robot. Cell performance was based on part flow time and work-in-process inventory level. The steady state metamodels were validated by comparing predicted values with simulation results. The results were satisfactory, with an average difference of 2.3 percent. The authors recommend (a) using the cell steady state metamodels to estimate the cell capacity in production planning, and (b) using the dynamic metamodels to provide feedback.

Hira and Pandey [HIRA83] developed regression models to study the efficiency of a manual flow line having finite intermediate storage. The regression models were used to predict the output from a balanced production line and to study the effect of buffer distribution on the performance of the line.

The manual flow line was considered balanced when the processing time distribution for all stations were identical and the interstage buffers had equal capacity. They assumed no machine breakdowns, and no work rejects or reworks at any of the stages in the line. Predictions from the linear regression models were compared to simulation results, and the difference between the two were found to be insignificant at the significance level $\alpha = 0.01$. The regression models revealed that a balanced line is generally the most productive. Also, the work-in-process inventory remained low in lines having interstage buffers of smaller size at the beginning of the flow line and of larger size toward the end.

The four cases presented above show how metamodels have been applied to manufacturing environments to gain insight into system behavior and predict performance. The emphasis on those metamodels applications was for shop floor control. However, there was no attempt by any of the authors to optimize system performance.

Optimization of system performance was the objective of three studies found in the literature review. One was on the application of metamodels for the optimization of a maintenance float problem. The second paper used metamodels for the bottleneck station of a printed circuit board fabrication line. The last one, a very comprehensive study, applied metamodels and response surface design to optimize performance of a computer-integrated manufacturing system. These studies are now discussed. Lin and Cochran studied the behavior of a complex flow line for the fabrication of printed-circuit boards [LIN87]. Their effort was focused on lamination, which is the bottleneck operation. Boards are batched prior to this operation and unbatched into smaller lots appropriate for the machine capability of the next operation. The objective of the study was to find the quantitative relationship between batch size and product lead time for different types of boards, and to determine the batch size that would minimize product lead time. Empirical equations from the between-board and within-board analysis of simulation results were developed to show the relationship between batch size and product lead time. The set of empirical equations were used to predict product lead time without actually making simulation runs. A procedure of seven steps was developed by the authors to predict or minimize lead time. Optimization is actually achieved by evaluating an empirical equation which uses batch size as the independent variable.

Metamodels were applied by Madu and Chanin to a maintenance float system with an Erlang-2 failure distribution [MADU92]. The objective of the study was to determine the number of standby units and repair persons needed to minimize the cost of lost production. The input variables of interest were the number of units required to be working at all times (N), mean time to repair (MTTR), mean time between failures (MTBF), number of standby units (F), and number of repair persons (S). The response variable of interest was equipment utilization (EU), which is to be minimized subject to a constraint on the minimum acceptable service level. A metamodel showing the relationship between the input variables and the response variable was constructed by applying ANOVA

32

and regression analysis to the simulation results. Validation of the metamodel was achieved by comparing predictions from the metamodel with results from a new set of simulation runs. The average absolute percentage error was 6.25 percent, which is considered appropriate by the authors. The optimum levels of F and S were obtained by evaluating the metamodel at all possible combinations of these two variables. Only those combinations for F and S that satisfied the constraint on service level were used to determine the minimum cost combination using a total cost function defined in terms of N, S, and F.

Response surface methodology is used to find the settings of the input variables of interest that optimize the system response. It is a sequential procedure in which the initial objective is to move rapidly to the general vicinity of the optimum by estimating the gradient of the response surface; then in the final stage, the procedure estimates the optimal settings of the input factors by a more refined approximation to the local curvature of the response surface. The set of values for the input variables that optimize the predicted response is called the stationary point.

Response surface methodology was used by Shang and Tadikamalla to optimize the output from a computer-integrated manufacturing system of an automated printed circuit board manufacturing plant [SHAN93]. The input variables of interest were lot size, line balance, MTBF, MTTR, time limit of the paste life, and capacity of the input buffer. A screening experiment was designed and the simulation runs for each design point were performed to determine which of the input variables of interest had a significant impact on the response (plant yield). Response surface methodology was used to (a) investigate the relationship of the yield to the significant factors, and (b) find the factor levels at which the system yield was optimized. The authors recommend the integration of simulation and statistical methods to "improve a factory's operating efficiency and effectiveness."

Hurley proposes a methodology for the design of manufacturing cells [HURL94]. She uses metamodels to determine the setting of design and operation factors that minimize a cell annualized cost function. A metamodel describing the relationship between quantitative factors and the cell's annual cost was developed for each combination of qualitative factors considered. Each metamodel was evaluated to identify the quantitative factor values yielding the lowest cost. The global minimum was then identified from these results using the Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsh multiple comparisons procedure.

Hurley's methodology has several shortcomings. The simulation model she developed to study the impact of implementing world class manufacturing practices is not generic, since it only applies to the assembly cell she used as case study. The annualized cost function can be improved by: (1) eliminating the assumption of zero investment costs on some cost components, (2) adding costs associated with the implementation of new layouts or changing existing layouts, (3) costing space requirements with cost per square feet times cell size in square feet instead of focusing on space requirements for work-in-process, and (4) relaxing the assumptions on team work to reflect a wider variety of approaches for cost reduction projects. Her methodology does not incorporate screening experiments to identify significant design and operation factors. The nature of the response surface (simple minimum, stationary ridge, rising ridge, falling ridge, or saddle system) was not determined since canonical and ridge analysis were not part of the methodology. The fact that the optimum setting for cell design and operation issues was always at the perimeter of the design region suggests that additional experimentation outside the selected region should have been considered. The magnitude of the standard error of the metamodel's prediction at the stationary point suggests that metamodels of higher order (higher than second-order) should have been examined in search for an improved estimate of the response surface.

Simulation and metamodels can help in the design and operation of manufacturing systems. However, most of the applications so far have been oriented towards shop floor control rather than manufacturing system design [YU94]. Few authors have worked on the use of response surface for the optimization of system performance.

2.6 Conclusions

In summary, most of the research work has been focused on cell formation. Research in the area of cell design and operation focused primarily on production planning and scheduling, cell layout, product lot sizing, product sequencing, and material handling. The factors most frequently addressed were: (1) setup time, (2) cell size, (3) lot size, (4) sizing and placement of inventory buffers, (5) dispatching and loading policy, (6) product mix, (7) variability in process times, and (8) demand stability.

Relatively little research has concentrated on cell operation issues such as unit load (batch) size, machine minor stoppages (such as material replenishments), machine breakdowns, machine repair, machine preventive maintenance, product quality, operator assignments, operator movement and destination policies, and cell balancing. Papers addressing the impact on cell performance of implementing world class concepts are rare. Elements of interest in this research work are: (1) multiskilled workers, (2) quick changeover teams, (3) autonomous and preventive maintenance, and (4) quality at the source.

The performance measures most commonly cited were: (1) operation and machine utilization, (2) product flow time, (3) cell throughput, (4) material handling cost, (5) work-in-process inventory levels, (6) setup cost, and (7) inventory carrying costs. Each research paper usually addressed only or two of the above.

There is a need for research work on the development of methodologies addressing cell operation issues at the design stage. Furthermore, there is a need for the development of a comprehensive cell performance measure, capable of addressing multiple aspects of cell design and operation issues.

CHAPTER 3

DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENERIC COMPUTER SIMULATION MODEL

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses in detail the elements addressed in the design of a generic computer simulation model for manufacturing cell environments. As part of the output the user obtains an annualized cost based on design and operational issues relevant to world-class scenarios. Chapter 3 constitutes the first of two archival journal articles developed by the author.

In preparation for the development of the generic manufacturing cell simulation model, we studied manufacturing cell environments to identify which cell characteristics deserved attention in the construction of the model. Our objective was to build into the model the capability of simulating cell behavior with a reasonable level of detail. Key elements addressed in the cells studied include: (1) cell size and material handling equipment, (2) machine types, (3) product flow, (4) cell design and operation issues of interest to cell users, and (5) cell performance measure. The following sections present a brief description of each element.

3.2 Cell Size and Material Handling Equipment

The study of cell characteristics was performed by collecting data from four manufacturing cells. These cells encompass a wide range of products, equipment characteristics, cell size, staffing requirements, and degree of automation. The industries chosen for the study include: (1) printed circuit board assembly, (2) service part fabrication for computer peripherals, (3) service-part machining for electric power generation, and (4) equipment assembly of electric power meters.

Some specifics about these cells are provided in Table 3.1. The machines in use range from highly automated equipment to automated machine operations with manual product loading and unloading. Material handling at cells consisted basically of combinations of powered and gravity conveyor systems, transfer cars, and manual handling. Cell size ranged from six to fifty machines.

Based on this analysis the material handling options to be included in the model are: powered conveyors, gravity conveyors, transfer cars, and manual handling. On all options the user can define the need for containers, container types, container capacity, and carts. Cell size will be limited to fifty machines and fifty operators.

Cell	Product	Manufacturing operations	Operator tasks	Material handling	Cell size	No. of operators
1	Printed circuit boards with surface-mounted and thru-hole components	Combination of: automated machines for component assembly, paste curing, wave soldering, and hand- loading operations.	Inspection, assembly, and testing operations.	Combination of automated and manual handling: powered conveyors, transfer cars, and carts.	19	19
2	Service parts for computer peripherals	Automated machines for assembly, inspection, and testing operations.	Few product inspections and packaging operations.	Highly automated: powered conveyors.	50	9
3	Service parts for power generation units	Automated machining operations with manual product loading and unloading.	Machine loading and unloading and product inspection.	Manual: carts.	10	13
4	Electric power meters	Automated machining operations with manual product loading and unloading.	Machine loading and unloading and product inspection.	Manual: pallet jacks.	6	10

Table 3.1 Characteristics of manufacturing cells examined in this study

3.3 Machine Types

The machines used in the cells were studied to identify modeling requirements to simulate the production of units. The characteristics of interest are those that regulate product flow and define simulation events. The analysis of 85 machines led to the identification of four types of machines commonly used in cells. Figure 3.1 describes how parts are serviced in these four machine types.

Machine type 1 is the most common machine type. It represents 67% of the population sampled. Only one part can be processed at a time. The total processing time consists of part loading, machine cycle, and part unloading.



Figure 3.1. Graphic representation of machine types

Machine type 2 is one in which n parts of the same type can be processed simultaneously. This type of machine represents 20% of the population sampled. Total processing time consists of loading n parts, one machine cycle, and unloading n parts. All parts exit simultaneously.

Machine type 3 allows a finite number of parts to reside in the machine simultaneously. Part interarrival times are random, residence times are fairly constant, and parts exit the machine one-at-a-time following a first-come first-served discipline. Examples of this type of machine are conveyor-based cleaning systems and wave solders used on the assembly of printed circuit boards. It represents 5% of the population sampled.

Machines of type 4 are a special case of the previous type and apply to index tables and turn tables. In this scenario all parts move through the same pre-defined sequence of steps. The pace of the table is set by the longest process step, so a part exits the machine at that rate. When the table is full of parts, a new part enters at the same time a new part exits. This scenario represents 7% of the machine population.

Machine types 1 through 4 represent 99% of the population studied. The remaining 1% corresponds to a burn-in oven used in the testing of printed circuit boards. The burn-in oven (depicted in Figure 3.2) can process many parts of different types simultaneously. Machine capacity is defined for each part family and all parts exit simultaneously. This machine can be classified as a specialized piece of equipment, being used in specific types of industries.



Figure 3.2. Graphic representation of the burn-in oven

Machines used in cells will consist of combinations of machines type one through four and some highly specialized equipment. The development of a fully generic cell simulator, capable of modeling all types of machines used in cells, is not practical due to the proliferation of highly specialized types of machines that can be used in some cells. A feasible approach is the development of a model capable of emulating the behavior of the most frequently found machine types, with flexibility for including specialized machines of interest to the user. For the four machine types considered, a desirable model characteristic is the user's ease of machine definition. Selection of a machine type is done by using a machine type number, which is used internally to access the appropriate software module.

Another modeling issue critical for mimicking the way products flow through the cell is the interaction between operator and machine. The types of interactions identified in this study are: (1) operator not needed, (2) operator not needed while the machine is running, and (3) operator needed at all times. The first option is used for completely automated machines. The second option is used on those machines where the operator is needed for setup, part inspection, or machine maintenance, while the operator is not needed for loading, unloading and processing. The last option is used on those machines were the operator needs to be present at all times. Machines at cells 3 and 4 described in Table 1 fall in the last category. Even though the machine operations are highly automated, the operator is required to remain in the area while the machine is processing parts. Selection of options is done through a machine-operator code number.

3.4 Characterization of Product Flow

The number of parts that move at once, better known as unit load size, is a key modeling issue for product flow. Strategies for product flow depend on product characteristics, machine types, and the material handling approach. The analysis of product flow strategies for the ceils covered in this research led to the conclusion that product flow within the cell needs to be defined at each machine. Product flow at each machine can be divided into three stages, as depicted in Figure 3.3.



Figure 3.3. Stages of product flow

Product flow at stage one defines the unit load size upon arrival but prior to machine processing. Product flow at stage two focuses on the number of parts to be processed simultaneously. Product flow at stage three considers the different scenarios before the processed part(s) move to the next machine in the product routing. The result of the analysis of product flow strategies was the identification of four scenarios for stage one and six scenarios for stage three. Stage two only requires the selection of a machine type and definition of machine capacity.

The possibilities for stage one of product flow are presented in Figure 3.4. In the first two options units arrive one by one and are ready for processing (branch 1) or accumulate before processing can begin (branch 2). In the two other options, a batch of units arrive and are processed one by one (branch 3) or processed in groups until the batch has been completed (branch 4).

The selection of an option is done through a machine arrival scenario code. Any machine type can be combined with any of the machine arrival scenarios as long as the combination is feasible. For example, it would not make sense to select option number four, process in sub-batches, if the machine can only process one part at a time. The combination of a machine code and an arrival code is used internally to access a module designed for that specific combination of machine-arrival scenario. Currently the model contains only those machine-arrival combinations of interest in this research work. The simulation model is highly modular. Therefore, it can be expanded by adding modules to address other machine-arrival scenarios of interest to the user.



Figure 3.4. Scenarios at stage one of product flow

The possibilities for stage three of product flow are presented in Figure 3.5. Departure scenarios define the action to be taken with the entity(s) once processing has been completed. Entities departing from a machine can represent one or various units of a given product. The number of units is constrained by machine capacity. The departing entity can be allowed to flow as it exits (branches 1 and 3), or it might be accumulated until a desired number of units has been reached (branches 2 and 4). Branches 5 and 6 are used for cases in which each entity is transformed into more than one end item. This happens in the assembly of printed circuit boards. The product starts with panels which at a certain point in the product routing are cut into one or more printed circuit boards. A departure scenario is chosen through a departure code number which is used internally to access the machine-departure module needed to address that combination.

The definition of arrival and departure scenarios at each machine gives the user a lot of flexibility to model manufacturing cells in which the unit load size is constantly changing. This modeling capability is particularly appropriate for cell scenarios 1 (printed circuit boards) and 2 (computer peripheral service parts).



Figure 3.5. Scenarios at stage three of product flow

3.5 Cell Design and Operation Issues

The selection of cell design and operation issues to be addressed by the simulation model was based on the results from the literature review and interviews with users of manned manufacturing cells. These are presented in Table 3.2. A discussion of cell design and operation issues follow.

3.5.1 Cell Design Issues

Cell design issues include: (1) layout, (2) selection of material handling and storage system, and (3) unit load size. A brief review of each issue is now presented.

Design	Operation	
Cell layout Material handling equipment Storage system Unit load size	Maintenance policy Quality policy Scheduling Inventory buffers Number of operators Operator assignments Operator movement rules Operator destination rules Setup time policy Lot size	

Table 3.2. Cell design and operation issues

3.5.1.1 Layout and Space Requirements

One expected benefit from the implementation of cells is a reduction in space requirements. Steudel reports reductions of 20 to 45 percent in floor space requirements [22]. Space requirements are determined by the cell layout. Cell layout is defined using a vector of linear distances between pairs of machines. Since it is not generally possible to characterize all relevant aspects of a cell layout by a single number, cell layout is considered as a qualitative

factor for experimentation purposes. Different layouts can be examined by changing the vector of linear distances.

3.5.1.2 Material Handling and Storage

The efficiency of the material handling activity is improved by reducing distances between machines. This translates into reductions in indirect labor (assigned to move parts around), handling equipment, and storage requirements. Steudel reports reductions in material handling costs of 70 to 90 percent with the implementation of manufacturing cells [22].

The options on the material handling and storage system were presented in Section 3.2. Selection of an option is done through an option code. A material handling option needs to be defined for each pair of machines. This gives the user a lot of flexibility to model cells with wide variety of material handling alternatives. Currently the user can choose among combinations of powered conveyors, gravity conveyors, transfer cars, and manual handling. The use and characteristics of containers and carts is defined through input data.

3.5.1.3 Unit Load Sizing

The close proximity between machines in a cell results in reduced handling distances and allows the implementation of smaller unit load sizes. The simulation model can be used to analyze the impact on cell performance of different unit load sizes. The model has the capability of simulating cells where the product unit load size is constantly changing. Unit load sizes are input using a vector of values, defined only at those machines where changes in unit load size are expected to occur. Unit load size is a quantitative factor in the design of simulation experiments.

3.5.2 Cell Operation Issues

One of the objectives of this research work is the design of a simulation model capable of representing world class manufacturing environments. Some of the manufacturing practices adopted by world class manufacturers are: (1) autonomous and preventive or predictive maintenance, (2) quality at the source, (3) quick changeovers, (4) multiskilled workers, (5) small inventory buffers, (6) small lots and (7) the reduction of minor machine stoppages. The simulation model has been designed to study the impact on cell performance of adopting those world class practices.

3.5.2.1 Maintenance Practices

Case studies reviewed in the literature show an 80 percent reduction in the rate of machine failures with the implementation of a preventive maintenance program [20,12]. This translates to an average time between failures that is about five times longer if the mean time to failure is much larger that the mean time to repair (MTBF>>MTTR). Studies also show a reduction of more than 50 percent in unscheduled machine downtime (repair time) [12,13]. For modeling purposes, the time between breakdowns could be based on calendar time or accumulated run time. The model can emulate two major scenarios of machine maintenance: (1) breakdown maintenance, and (2) autonomous with preventive maintenance. Under the first scenario machines are given maintenance only when they break down. The second scenario has a combination of autonomous maintenance and preventive maintenance. Autonomous maintenance is given by operators on a daily basis. It represents activities such as machine dusting, oiling, and minor adjustments. Preventive maintenance is under the responsibility of maintenance personnel. It could be weekly, monthly, or as desired based on a user defined maintenance schedule. Autonomous maintenance has been modeled to occur during regular shift hours. However, preventive maintenance is assumed to occur after working hours. The impact of implementing a preventive maintenance program can be studied using data files reflecting the current and expected breakdown-repair scenario.

3.5.2.2 Quality Practices

The quality control strategy traditionally used by companies consists of an inspection point close to the end of the production process, performed by quality assurance personnel. Quality at the source is a concept aimed at detecting quality problems as early as possible after they occur. It can be implemented in different ways, such as self and/or successive inspection performed by the operators, the use of mistake-proof devices positioned right after value-adding processes, and through better control of the key variables that impact machine behavior (better known as source control). Case studies reviewed in the literature show reductions of 80 to 90 percent in the number of defects per month with the implementation of such approaches [19].

Currently, the simulation model offers the following options: (1) traditional inspection with or without QA stations, (2) self and successive inspection at value-adding processes, (3) self inspection only at value-adding processes, (4)

49

pure inspection stations, and (5) test stations. Selection of a quality option is done through a quality code defined for each machine in the cell. Quality is a qualitative factor for experimentation purposes. Different scenarios can be tested by changing scrap and rework data files, and adding files on inspection times. In some cases cell layout, operator assignments and other issues change with the implementation of quality at the source. In those cases it is necessary to change those data files accordingly.

3.5.2.3 Changeover Practices

Quick changeover has been proven to be a key factor for the efficient operation of cells [KEKR87,AURR93]. It requires training and involvement of cell operators. A team consisting usually of cell operators, setup people, maintenance technicians, and engineers is created to work on areas of opportunity for setup time reduction. Setup time reductions of up to 50 percent are readily achievable with little or no investments on equipment just by planning and organizing before the setup is performed.

In the traditional scenario an operator working at a machine center is moved to perform other operations when a setup is needed. Only the setup personnel are involved in the setup activity. The setup team under quick changeover includes the machine operator as well as other individuals if needed. In this scenario the setup activity is divided into external and internal setup. External setup consists of those setup activities that, as identified by the setup team, can take place while the machine is running. Therefore, machine downtime is reduced. The machine operator is not typically involved during the external setup. Internal setup consists of those setup activities that cannot take place until the machine has stopped. The entire setup team is involved during the internal setup activities. Selection of a setup scenario is done by choosing a setup code: (1) zero if the machine does not require setups, (2) one for traditional setup, and (3) two for quick changeover.

3.5.2.4 Multiskilled Operators

Multiskilled operators can be developed through cross-training and coaching. Since they can be assigned to more than one process in the cell, this practice provides greater flexibility if the cell needs to react to changes in product mix and demand patterns. Availability of multiskilled operators can be simulated through the use of an operator assignment matrix. Different assignment scenarios can be studied by changing the assignment matrix. Issues related to multiskilled operators include: when should the operator move, and where should he/she move to. With respect to when, two rules have been coded: (1) move when one unit load has been completed, and (2) move when idle (no parts waiting in queue). With respect to where to go, two rules have also been coded: (1) move to the next machine assigned, and (2) move to the machine assigned with the longest queue. The user has available a total of four combinations of when/where rules. Each one can be tested with a variety of assignment matrices.

3.5.2.5 Inventory Buffers between Processes

One of the expected benefits of implementing manufacturing cells is a significant reduction in the levels of work-in-process. Reductions of 70 to 90 percent have been reported in the literature [22]. Levels of work-in-process in a manufacturing cell will be the result of the adopted combination of design and operation strategies. An approach for the control of work-in-process levels is the

implementation of finite inventory buffers. In pull production systems, machines up the line are blocked from production once the buffer has reached its maximum level. The simulation model represents this environment with finite inventory buffers. The model allows the selection of finite or infinite buffers between processes.

3.5.2.6 Lot Sizing

The concept of manufacturing cells has been used by companies to respond quickly to an increasing product mix and remain competitive in global markets. This increasing product mix translates into smaller lot sizes. Shifting to smaller lot sizes might require reductions in setup, changes to the material handling system, quality policy, or any other operation factor that may have a negative impact on cell performance under this new environment. The impact of smaller lot sizes can be studied under any combination of cell design and operation scenarios. Lot sizes are input using a file in which the following items are specified: (1) part number, (2) lot number, (3) lot size, (4) release date, and (5) order due date. Each record in the stream of numbers represents an order of a customer or a group of customers. Release dates are used to calculate lateness cost.

3.5.2.7 Machine Minor Stoppages

Machine minor stoppages are those caused by material replenishments, machine adjustments, or any other activity that requires stopping the machine for short periods of time. Frequent machine stoppages can deteriorate cell performance. The simulation model has been designed with the capability of including minor machine stoppages. A machine code number is used to signal the need for such stops. The time between stops and downtime duration are input using vectors of data.

3.6 Cell Performance Measurement

Performance of a manufacturing cell can be measured in numerous ways. Throughput, work-in-process, manufacturing leadtime, material handling cost, machine setup cost, and inventory carrying costs are some examples found in the literature. Every decision made during the design process has an impact on cell performance, whether related to cell formation, or cell design and operation. A weakness of the procedures developed so far is the consideration of only one or, at best, a few performance issues [WEMM89].

Comparison between cell scenarios in this research work is done using a comprehensive annualized cost function. It has the capability of reflecting the expected benefits of manufacturing cells: (1) reduced levels of work-in-process, (2) shorter manufacturing leadtime, (3) improved on-time delivery, (4) reduced material handling, (5) less space requirements, and (6) improved quality. The function consolidates ten cost components: inventory carrying cost (IC), lateness cost (LT), setup cost (SU), material handling cost (MH), storage equipment cost (ST), production labor cost (PL), maintenance cost (M), quality cost (Q), layout (L), and floor space cost (FS). The sources of such costs are summarized in Figure 3.6. Each cost component is discussed in detail in the following subsections.

3.6.1 Inventory Carrying Cost (IC)

The inventory carrying cost measures the opportunity cost associated with having funds tied up in inventory. It includes work-in-process and finished

goods inventory. The inventory carrying rate represents the interest that could be earned if the funds were invested elsewhere. Setup, lot size, unit load size, inventory buffers, and quality strategies are some of the cell operation issues that may have a significant impact on the levels of work-in-process and finished goods inventory. The formula used to measure inventory carrying costs is presented in equation (3.1).

$$IC = \sum_{j=1}^{OP+1} \sum_{n=1}^{NP} [\bar{I}_{nj} * PNCOST_{nj}] * ICR$$
(3.1)

where;

IC	= annual inventory carrying cost,
n	= index for product number,
NP	= number of different products,
j	= index for operation number,
OP	= number of operations performed in the cell,
OP+1	= index for finished goods inventory.
Ī _{nj}	= time-averaged inventory of product n at operation j,
PNCOST _{nj}	= value of product n at operation j,
ICR	= inventory carrying rate,

The time-averaged inventory of each product at each operation is a random variable whose value is captured as part of the simulation results. All other values are user inputs.



Figure 3.6. Components of the cell annual cost function

3.6.2 Lateness Cost (LT)

The lateness cost component measures the cell's level of customer service. Cells with a high customer service level are those with a high on-time delivery rate. An order is considered to be completed on time only if the entire order is completed by the due date. Hurley proposed a lateness cost based on a late charge rate and the value of the part [HURL94]. The function for late charge rate is presented in equation (3.2):

$$Rate_{mn} = \min\left\{ \exp\left[\frac{\ln 2}{RA} * \frac{Late_{mn}}{CLT_n}\right] - 1, 1 \right\}$$
(3.2)

where;

Rate_{mn}= late change rate of the mth late order of product n,

m = index for late order,

n = index for product number,

- RA = ratio of lateness to manufacturing lead time at which an order is canceled or charged a penalty cost equal to the full product cost,
- Late_{mn}= (completion date of the mth late order of product n) (due date of order m for product n),
- CLT_n = cell manufacturing lead time for product n.

The late charge rate represents the fraction of the product cost that is charged on late orders. As a function of the order lateness Late_{mn} for the mth late order of product n, the charge rate is exponential between zero and RA, with a maximum charge rate of one. As RA increases the late charge rate decreases. The ratio RA is arbitrarily set by the user.

A lateness cost is also calculated for outstanding orders, those released for production not completed by the end of the year. These are charged the full cost of the product. The total lateness cost function is presented in equation (3.3):

$$LT = \sum_{m=1}^{NLO} \sum_{n=1}^{NP} Rate_{mn} * PNCOST_{n,OP+1} * LS_{mn} + \sum_{k=1}^{OD} \sum_{n=1}^{NP} OP_{kn} * PNCOST_{n,OP+1}$$
(3.3)

57

where;

LT	= annual late delivery penalty cost,			
Ratemn	= late charge rate on late order m of product n,			
$PNCOST_{n,OP+1}$ = cost of product n at finished goods,				
LSmn	= number of units in late order m of product n,			
NLO	= number of late orders in one year of simulation,			
k	= index for outstanding orders,			
OD	= total number of outstanding orders, that are released			
	orders but not completed at the end of the year.			
OP _{kn}	= number of units in outstanding order k of product n,			

Order lateness (Late_{mn}), number of late orders (NLO), and number of outstanding orders at the end of the year (OD) are time-averaged random variables. Observed values come from simulation runs. All other values are user inputs.

3.6.3 Setup Cost (SU)

Costs associated with setups include: changeover labor (operators and other employees involved), operator training on quick changeover concepts, and investments in equipment, tools, and fixtures for the implementation of quick changeover. Setup costs are determined using the function presented in equation (3.4):

$$SU = \sum_{k=1}^{HS} TRINT_{k} * SUCS * CWG + \sum_{k=1}^{HS} (WCINT_{k} + EXTSU_{k}) * SUCS * CWG + \sum_{k=1}^{HS} WCINT_{k} * WG + (SUTR + SUINV) \left\{ \frac{i(1+i)^{NYRS}}{(1+i)^{NYRS} - 1} \right\} + TWORK \left[\frac{1}{(i+1)} \left\{ \frac{i(1+i)^{NYRS}}{(1+i)^{NYRS} - 1} \right\} \right]$$
(3.4)

where;

- SU = annual setup cost,
- k = index for machine,
- WS = number of machines in the cell,
- TRINT_k = setup time (minutes/year) on machine k under the traditional system of long setup times,
- SUCS = setup crew size (does not include the operator),
- WG = operator wage (\$/minute)
- CWG = crew wage (\$/minute),
- WCINT_k = internal setup time (minutes/year) on machine k under the scenario of quick changeovers,
- EXTSU_k = external setup time (minutes/year) on machine k under the scenario of quick changeovers,
- SUSC = setup code: 0 for traditional, 1 for quick changeovers,
- SUTR = total operator training cost for setup time reduction, incurred at the beginning of the study,
- TWORK= total labor cost for the team's work on setup time reduction projects, incurred at the end of the first year of the study,
- SUINV = total investment costs, incurred at the beginning of the study, for the implementation of quick changeovers,
- i = annual interest rate,
- NYRS = period of the study (years).
TRINT_k accumulates machine downtime due to setups on the traditional setup scenario in which the machine is stopped during the entire setup activity. The setup activity with quick changeovers is divided into two phases: external and internal setup. EXTSU_k and WCINT_k accumulate external setup times (machine is running) and downtime due to internal setup (machine is stopped), respectively. Only one setup scenario can be tested in a given simulation run. Therefore, if WCINT_k, and EXTSU_k are greater than zero, then TRINT_k will be zero since nothing is been accumulated in that variable. SUTR, SUINV, and TWORK are zero under the traditional setup scenario.

The crew size (SUCS) represents the number of employees involved in the setup activity, not including the machine operator. It is assumed that the machine operator is not involved in the traditional setup activity. Therefore, the changeover labor cost is based on the setup crew size only. The operator is involved during the internal portion of the quick changeover activity. Therefore, the changeover labor cost consists of two components: crew labor during internal and external setup, and operator labor during internal setup.

Training and investment costs are assumed to occur at the beginning of the first year and are annualized over the period of the study. Teamwork activities for the implementation of quick changeovers are assumed to occur throughout the first year of the study. Labor cost for teamwork activities are accrued at the end of the first year and annualized over the period of the study.

Since teamwork and training hours represent a small percentage of the total working hours, they were assumed to occur during overtime. Some companies prefer using outside consultants instead of project teams. In those cases teamwork cost is replaced by consultant's cost. The equation has the flexibility to accommodate different project strategies.

Machine setup times $(TRINT_k, WCINT_k, and EXTSU_k)$ are random variables with values obtained from simulation results. All other values are input by the user.

3.6.4 Maintenance Cost (M)

The implementation of a preventive maintenance program requires training operators and in many cases investments to upgrade machine conditions. Costs included in this component are: labor and part replacement during breakdown maintenance, operator training, investments in equipment, labor and replacement of parts during preventive maintenance, and labor during autonomous maintenance. The function used to calculate maintenance costs is presented in equation (3.5).

Autonomous maintenance is performed by machine operators on a daily basis. Machine preventive maintenance and breakdown maintenance are under the responsibility of maintenance personnel.

$$M = \sum_{k=1}^{WS} LTA_{k} * WG + \sum_{k=1}^{WS} (RT_{k} * MCS * CWG + PC_{k} * NBKD_{k}) + (MTR + MINV) \left\{ \frac{i(1+i)^{NYRS}}{(1+i)^{NYRS} - 1} \right\} + \sum_{k=1}^{WS} PMCOST_{k}$$
(3.5)

where;

M = annual maintenance cost,

LTA _k	= total downtime on machine k due to autonomous
	maintenance (minutes/year),

- RT_k = total downtime on machine k due to repair (minutes/year),
- MCS = maintenance crew size,
- WG = operator wage (\$/minute)
- CWG = crew wage (\$/minute),

PC_k = part replacement cost at machine k,

- $NBKD_k$ = number of breakdowns per year at machine k,
- MTR = total operator training cost incurred at the beginning of the study for the implementation of autonomous maintenance,
- MINV = total investment cost incurred at the beginning of the study for the implementation of preventive and autonomous maintenance,
- $PMCOST_{K}$ = preventive maintenance expected cost for machine k (\$/yr.) including labor and scheduled replacement of parts.

Labor spent by operators on autonomous maintenance activities (LTA_k) , machine repair times (RT_k) , and the number of machine breakdowns $(NBKD_k)$ are random variables with values obtained from simulation runs. Costs on training, equipment investment, and preventive maintenance interventions are estimated and input by the user.

3.6.5 Quality Cost (Q)

Product quality has a significant impact on manufacturing performance in environments handling low inventory levels. Achieving a high customer service level greatly depends on the ability to manufacture a quality product. The quality cost component includes costs associated with product inspection, scrap and rework, training on quality concepts, and investments in equipment to ensure quality at the source (e.g. mistake-proof or source control of process).

Inspection and rework costs are divided into two major categories: those incurred under traditional inspection and those incurred under quality at the source. It is assumed that inspection and rework under the traditional inspection system are performed by quality assurance (QA) personnel and off-line rework operators, respectively. Machine operators are not involved on those activities. Therefore, labor costs associated with the traditional system are: QA inspectors down the line and off-line operators needed for rework. For product n QAIT_n is the annual accumulated QA inspection time and RWK_n is the annual accumulated off-line operator rework time. It is assumed there is only one QA inspection station and one off-line rework station in the cell. However, there could be more than one QA inspector and off-line rework operator. The simulation model determines the number of QA inspectors and off-line rework operators needed.

Operators perform inspection and rework activities under the quality-atthe-source scenario. Thus, labor costs associated with this scenario include: operator inspection and rework times for product n at operation j, which are respectively accumulated by the simulation in variables OIT_{nj} and $ORWKT_{nj}$.

A quality scenario could consist of a combination of quality at the source and a QA inspection station down the line. Therefore, $QAIT_n$, RWK_n , OIT_{nj} and $ORWKT_{nj}$ could all be greater than zero simultaneously. $SCRP_{nj}$ accumulates the number of scrapped parts of product n at workstation j under both environments. Quality costs are determined using equation (3.6).

$$Q = \sum_{n=1}^{NP} QAIT_{n} * QAWG + \sum_{n=1}^{NP} RWK_{n} * WG + \sum_{j=1}^{OP} \sum_{n=1}^{NP} OIT_{nj} * WG + \sum_{j=1}^{OP} \sum_{n=1}^{NP} ORWKT_{nj} * WG + \sum_{j=1}^{OP} \sum_{n=1}^{NP} SCRP_{nj} * PNCOST_{nj} + (QINV + QTR) \left\{ \frac{i(1+i)^{NYRS}}{(1+i)^{NYRS} - 1} \right\}$$
(3.6)

where;

QAIT_n = inspection labor (minutes/year) on product n performed by QA personnel under the traditional inspection system,

- QAWG = quality assurance personnel wage rate (\$/minute),
- OIT_{nj} = operator inspection labor (minutes/year) on product n at machine j under quality at the source,
- ORWKT_{nj} = operator rework labor (minutes/year) on product n at machine j under quality at the source scenario,
- SCRP_{nj} = scrapped parts of product n at workstation j accumulated annually over either quality scenario,
- QTR = total operator training cost in quality concepts incurred at the beginning of the study,
- QINV = total investments in equipment to ensure quality at the source incurred at the beginning of the study.

Costs associated with the implementation of quality improvement strategies are: labor during inspection and rework operations, scrap, investments, and training on quality concepts. The investment component can be used to account for investments such as machines, tools, fixtures, and computer software for the collection of quality data. QAIT_n, RWK_n, SCRP_{nj}, OIT_{nj},

63

and $ORWKT_{nj}$ are random variables with results captured during the simulation runs. All other components in the equation are user inputs.

3.6.6 Material handling (MH)

The elements considered under material handling costs are: labor during handling activities, and investments on equipment. Material handling could be performed by operators or material handlers. For product n at operation j, OHT_{nj} and $MHHT_{nj}$ represents annual accumulated operator and material handler handling time, respectively. Material handling costs are evaluated using equation (3.7).

$$MH = \sum_{j=1}^{OP} \sum_{n=1}^{NP} OHT_{nj} * WG + \sum_{j=1}^{OP} \sum_{n=1}^{NP} MHHT_{nj} * HWG + MHINV\left\{\frac{i(1+i)^{NYRS}}{(1+i)^{NYRS}-1}\right\}$$
(3.7)

where;

- MH = annual material handling cost,
- OHT_{nj} = operator handling time (minutes/year) for product n at machine j,
- MHHT_{nj} = material handler time (minutes/year) for product n processed at machine j,
- MHINV = total investment on material handling equipment incurred at the beginning of the study,
- HWG = material handler's wage rage (\$/minute).

 OHT_{nj} and $MHHT_{nj}$ are random variables with values captured from simulation runs. All other values are user inputs.

3.6.7 Storage Cost (ST)

Storage costs include investment in storage equipment. Cell storage space cost is captured by the floor space cost (FS). The types of storage equipment covered in this research are containers and carts. Container types are defined by product and product destination. This results in great flexibility to change container types as the product flows through the cell. Container capacity is defined for each container type. Carts in the cell are assumed to be of one type only with capacity to handle the entire product unit load in one trip. Storage costs are evaluated using equation (3.8).

$$ST = \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^{NCONT} (MAXCO_s * COCO_s) + (MAXCA * CACO) \right\} \left\{ \frac{i(1+i)^{NYRS}}{(1+i)^{NYRS} - 1} \right\}$$
(3.8)

where;

ST	= storage annua	i cost,
----	-----------------	---------

s = index for container type,

NCONT = total number of container types,

MAXCO_s = maximum number of container type s in use,

COCO_s = cost of container type s (\$/unit) incurred at the beginning of the study,

MAXCA = maximum number carts in use,

CACO = cart cost (\$/unit) incurred at the beginning of the study.

The cost of carts and containers is based on the expected maximum number of carts and containers in use over one year of cell operation. It could also be based on the average number in use. MAXCO_s and MAXCA are random random variables with values obtained from simulation runs. All other values are user inputs.

3.6.8 Production Labor Cost (PL)

This cost component accounts for labor spent on cell activities not accounted for in autonomous maintenance, setup, material handling, and product inspection and rework. It includes processing parts, replenishing materials, waiting for parts, and idle time. Production labor cost is determined using equation (3.9).

$$PL = (MPEMP * NOP - \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{WS} (WCINT_k + LTA_k) + \sum_{j=1}^{OP} \sum_{n=1}^{NP} (OHT_{nj} + OIT_{nj} + ORWKT_{nj}) \right\} * WG$$
(3.9)

where;

- PL = annual production labor cost,
- MPEMP = available minutes per year per operator,
- NOP = number of cell operators,
- WCINT_k = labor (minutes/year) at machine k during internal setup under quick changeovers,
- LTA_k = labor (minutes/year) at machine k during autonomous maintenance,
- OHT_{nj} = labor (minutes/year) on material handling activities for product n at operation j,
- OIT $_{nj}$ = labor (minutes/year) on inspection for product n at operation j, ORWKT $_{nj}$ = labor (minutes/year) on rework for product n at operation j.

All of the above except MPEMP, NOP, and WG are random variables with values determined by the simulation.

3.6.9 Layout Cost (L)

Layout costs are those incurred in changing the cell layout, including labor and materials needed to change the shop-floor arrangement. Personnel involved during layout changes include engineers, mechanics, line supervisors, operators, and inspectors. Materials needed depend on facility requirements. Examples are pipes, tubing, cables, and machine and product covers. The layout cost is estimated and input by the user.

3.6.10 Floor Space Cost (FS)

Total floor space cost is obtained by multiplying the cell size in square feet by space cost in dollars per sq. ft. per year. Space requirements are a function of machine dimensions, expected inventory levels, material handling equipment in use, and number of operators. Cells with high levels of work-inprocess and finished goods inventory typically require more floor space.

3.6.11 Total Annualized Cost

The cell annual cost is calculated by adding the cost components discussed above as presented in equation (3.10).

$$TAC = IC + LT + SU + MH + ST + PL + M + Q + L + FS$$
 (3.10)

The total annual cost function summarizes the result of the chosen cell design and operation strategies, and offers a comprehensive mechanism for the evaluation and comparison of alternative strategies.

3.7 Computer Simulation Model

The simulation model was designed using SLAM II, an advanced Fortranbased simulation language [14]. SLAM II provides network, discrete-event, and continuous modeling capabilities. The simulation model contains approximately a total of 20,000 lines of source code. It is discrete-event oriented with Fortran user-written subroutines.

Model development was performed sequentially, starting with only a few cell design scenarios. Model verification was performed after addition of each new scenario. Programming errors and logic flaws were found using DBX, a source-level debugger available on most UNIX platforms. The following sections discuss software modularity, execution speed, and statistical capabilities for the model that has been developed by the author.

3.7.1 Modular Characteristics of the Simulation Model

The simulation model handles the occurrence of 25 event types which are identified in Table 3.3. User input codes and data files are used to activate simulation modules upon the occurrence of an event. An example of the interaction between modules is depicted in Figure 3.7. The figure illustrates how modules are activated when a part processing is completed (departure). This logic sequence applies to the case where an operator is needed at the machine at all times. Therefore, he is available for activities such as part inspection, material handling, or machine setup. Boxes shaded in gray represent the occurrence or scheduling of events. The pound (#) sign denotes that more than one module of that kind were developed to address the machine types, arrival scenarios, and departure scenarios identified during the characterization of

machines and product flows. For example, DEPSC1 is activated when the machine departure code is 1. D1M1 is activated from DEPSC1 to deal with the combination of departure scenario 1 and machine type 1.

Event	Activated	
Number	module	Event description
1	LARRVL	Arrival of a lot for production
2	CSUCIN	Completion of a successive inspection
3	CSUCIR	Completion of successive rework
4	DEPART	Completion of machine processing
5	CSELIN	Completion of self inspection
6	CSELIR	Completion of self rework
7	ULARRL	Arrival of a unit load
8	CMHOP	Completion of an operator handling activity
9	CTRASU	Completion of traditional setup
10	CWCSU	Completion of world class setup
11	CQAINS	Completion of inspection by QA
12	CTRARW	Completion of rework on the traditional scenario
13	AUTOMT	Request for an autonomous maintenance
14	CAUTOM	Completion of autonomous maintenance
15	GATHER	Collection of output statistics
16	BREAKD	Occurrence of a machine breakdown
17	CREPAI	Completion of machine repair
18	CLRSTA	Clearing output statistics
19	CSCRAP	Completion of scrapped parts (to complete lot)
20	MINSTP	Occurrence of a minor machine stoppage
21	CAUTOM	Completion of minor stoppage (same as cautom)
22	TCRET	Return of a transfer car
23	CLOAD	Completion of machine loading
24	CULOAD	Completion of machine unloading
25	THRUPT	Collection of throughput statistics

 Table 3.3. Description of simulation events



Figure 3.7. Activation of modules to simulate a departure

The departure event activates a departure scenario module. This module calls the departure-machine (DM) module needed to simulate the activities expected to occur for that combination of departure scenario and machine type.

DM activates a module called departure quality code (DQC), a generic quality module, that activates specific modules designed to deal with quality scenarios. A machine quality code is used at DQC to determine the quality module to be activated. DQC calls TRADQ or SRCINSP for traditional and source inspection quality scenarios, respectively.

FINGDS is called within TRADQ if the current machine is the last one in the part routing. Otherwise, it calls BUFFCK to determine it there is space available at the next machine's buffer. If the buffer is full, the current machine is blocked, and MOVEMT is called to move the operator to another machine. When there is space available, TRADQ calls MATHAN, a generic material handling module. MATHAN activates the material handling module needed to allocate handling resources and schedules the arrival of the departing part (ULARRL) to the next machine in the routing. When handling is manual, it also schedules the completion of a material handling activity by an operator (CMHOP). Under source inspection, SRCINSP activates a module designed to generate inspection times and schedules the completion of inspection (CSELIN).

Once the simulation model has taken care of all activities associated with the departing part, it activates those modules needed to process parts waiting in queue. The interaction between those modules is presented in Figure 3.8. MQPUL is called within DM to verify if there are enough parts in queue for one machine cycle. If there are not enough parts, a machine operator code is used to determine if he is dedicated or shared (assigned to more than one machine). DESTIN is activated to find the destination of shared operators.

The simulation model contains two movement rules for shared operators. Therefore, even if there are enough parts in queue for a machine cycle, it needs to be determined whether he will stay or move to another machine. This decision is made at MOVEMT. This module activates DESTIN when the decision is to move the operator.



Figure 3.8. Activation of modules to select and process an entity

MSETUP is activated within DM when the next part number to be processed is not the same as the last part number processed at that machine. MSETUP is a generic setup module that activates specific modules designed to deal with setup scenarios. A setup code is used at MSETUP to activate either TRADSU or WCSU for traditional and world class setup scenarios, respectively. TRADSU and WCSU schedule the completion of a setup. Operators are not involved in traditional setups. Therefore, if the operator is shared, TRADSU activates DESTIN to move him to another machine.

PQC is activated within DM when the next part number does not require a machine setup. The machine quality code is used at PQC to activate NOINSP or SCRINS for traditional and source inspection quality scenarios, respectively. SCRINS schedules the completion of a successive inspection (CSUCI). NOINSP activates MACHIN, a generic module designed to deal with the different machine types included in the model.

A machine code is used at MACHIN to activate M, the module designed to simulate processing of parts at that specific type of machine. This module activates CONTAI to allocate storage resources and PROCES to generate the processing time. It pulls parts waiting in queue and schedules the completion of machine processing (DEPART).

The simulation model contains a total of 126 modules. This modularity characteristic gives modeling flexibility to reflect many combinations of cell design and operation scenarios. It also provides model adaptability, since other scenarios of interest to the user can be incorporated by adding new modules. A listing of the source code has been included in Appendix A.

3.7.2 Execution Speed

Execution time for the simulation of 243,000 minutes of production at a cell for the assembly of printed circuit boards was approximately 25 minutes (using a DECstation 5000/25 with 28 megabytes of RAM). This run length represents one year of production working two eight hour shifts per day, five days a week. A few of the cell scenarios studied resulted in high levels of work-in-process inventory with poor cell performance (high annual cost). Simulation time on those cases increase to close to five hours.

3.7.3 Statistical Capabilities

The statistical characteristics are those that describe the model's ability to deal with the stochastic nature of the system under study. Some of the elements that define the statistical capabilities of a model are: standard probability distributions, warm-up period, and random number generators.

An important activity in a simulation project is the collection and statistical analysis of cell data to model system randomness such as machine processing times, part inspection times, time between machine breakdowns, machine repair times, and machine setup times. Accuracy of simulation results is a function of the ability to replicate system randomness. The simulation model contains nine standard probability distributions to sample values for random variates: exponential, uniform, Weibul, triangular, normal, lognormal, Erlang, Gamma, and beta.

The statistical capabilities determine the model's efficiency and accuracy of results. Model efficiency is measured in terms of number of replications needed to achieve a desired level of accuracy in the simulation output. The number of replications needed is a function of the output variance. Variability of the simulation output on any one replicate ("within" variation) is reduced by allowing a warm-up period. The model allows a user defined warm-up period, at the end of which output statistics are reset to zero.

Common random numbers and synchronization of random numbers are two variance reduction techniques used for the comparison of alternative system configurations ("between" variation). They ensure that differences in performance are due to system configuration and not to variability on the sequence of random numbers. Implementation depends on the number of random number generator streams available. The user has access to 100 random number generator streams.

3.7.4 Simulation Input

A list of input data files is presented in Table 3.4. The pound (#) sign indicates that one file is needed for each scenario tested. For example, the study of three scenarios of quick changeovers requires three files (exsu1.dat, exsu2.dat, and exsu3.dat) to describe external machine setup times.

Not all the files listed are needed to execute the simulation model. As an example, a traditional quality scenario does not include inspections by operators. Therefore, a machine quality code of 1 prevents opening files related to product inspection times.

Table 3.4. Input data files

File	Description
auto#.dat	Probability distributions for autonomous maintenance.
brck#.dat	Probability distributions for times between breakdowns.
cius#.dat	Machine codes to request and/or return containers.
coca#.dat	Containers capacity.
coco#.dat	Containers cost.
cont#.dat	Container types.
conv#.dat	Conveyor speed and length.
costf.dat	General data: customer lead time, simulation run length,
dem#.dat	Stream of numbers representing product demand.
exp#.dat	Description of the experiment (factor levels).
exsu#.dat	External setup times.
family.dat	Part numbers contained in each family of products.
insu#.dat	Internal setup times.
lay#.dat	Layout cost, floor space cost, and cell layout.
mach#.dat	Machine characteristics: number, type, operator code,
masc#.dat	Arrival scenario code for each machine.
mbuf#.dat	Machine buffer size.
mcrew.dat	Maintenance crew size and wage.
mdrl#.dat	Operator movement and destination rules.
mdsc#.dat	Departure scenario codes for each machine.
mhop#.dat	Material handling option between pairs of machines.
mqcd#.dat	Quality codes for each machine.
msto.dat	Probability dist. for time between stoppages and stop time.
msut#.dat	Setup codes per machine: 0=no setup, 1=traditional, 2=quick .
mtyp2.dat	Mach type 2: capacity by part number.
mtyp3.dat	Mach type 3:Number of families, capacity by family, cycle time.
opas#.dat	Operator assignments.
opcd#.dat	Operator codes: 1=dedicated, 2=shared.
parts.dat	Number of parts, number of families, number of lots.
pmcd.dat	Preventive maintenance codes.
pnco.dat	Part number cost at each operation in the part routing.
pnrt.dat	Part routing and probability distribution for processing times.
prepc.dat	Part replacement cost during machine maintenance.
prwkc.dat	Part rework cost.
qins#.dat	Probability distributions for Inspection times.
qrte#.dat	Scrap and rework rates by part number and machine.
rep.dat	Probability distributions for times to repair.
sucr#.dat	Setup crew size, wage, teamwork cost.
ul#.dat	Unit load size by part number and machine.

3.7.5 Simulation Output

The simulation output report includes the observed total cell annual cost, and a detailed breakdown of each component on the cost function. A sample of the simulation output has been included in Appendix B. The results as presented can be used to perform further analysis.

Breaking down the total cell annual cost into its individual components facilitates understanding differences among cell scenarios. As an example, a cell for the assembly of printed circuit boards was studied under three scenarios: current design, and alternatives one and two. The simulation results are summarized in Table 3.5 and a bar chart of the cost components is presented in Figure 3.9.

Current	IC 25687	LT 523294	SU 39920	M 3558	Q 1057394	MH&ST 29790	PL 289242	LO	FS 192000	TAC 2160886
%	0.01	0.24	0.02	0.00	0.49	0.01	0.13	0.00	0.09	
Alt. 1	6202	26389276	76326	358746	695843	29577	264685	25000	192000	28037656
%	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	
Alt. 2	27698	68291	57908	4095	705975	11486	277827	25000	192000	1370279
%	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.00	0.52	0.01	0.20	0.02	0.14	

Table 3.5. Cost components on three scenarios for the assembly of p-c boards

The total annual cost under the current cell design is \$2,160,886. The most significant cost components are quality and lateness which represent 49 and 24 percent of total cost, respectively. These results stress the need to address product quality and the cell's level of customer service.

Alternative one evaluates the impact of implementing quality at the source, machine preventive maintenance, smaller lot sizes, and smaller unit load size. The total annual cost on this alternative is \$28,037,656 — an increase of 1300 percent over the current scenario. Analysis of the cost components show a significant increase in lateness, where \$25,124,360 (not presented here) is due to late orders. This is primarily the result of processing in smaller lot sizes without addressing the issue of machine setup time.



Figure 3.9. Cost components for three cell scenarios

Alternative two assesses the impact of implementing quality at the source and smaller lot sizes while reducing setup times by 75 percent and addressing minor stoppages at strategic machines. This combination of world class manufacturing practices result in a cell annual cost of \$1,370,279 — a reduction of 37 percent over the current scenario. Compared to the current cell configuration, alternative 2 yielded a 77 percent reduction in lateness cost and 33 percent reduction in quality cost.

The results presented above demonstrate the need to assess the impact of design and operation strategies prior to implementation. The best combination of manufacturing strategies is unique for each cell.

A comprehensive cost function has been formulated for the evaluation and comparison of alternatives. Nonetheless, the generic cell simulator includes in the output report other statistics of interest to users of cellular manufacturing (see Appendix B). Those are:

- Total cell production by part number,
- Cell weekly throughput,
- Requirements on storage equipment,
- Requirements on QA inspectors and off-line rework operators,
- Total scrap by part number,
- Machine utilization,
- Levels of work-in-process inventory,
- Number of setup and maintenance crews needed.

The simulation output report includes the SLAM II standard summary report with statistics on waiting times and manufacturing lead time.

3.8 Conclusions

An objective of this research work was the design of a generic manufacturing cell simulator capable of evaluating the impact of implementing world class manufacturing practices. The research focused on manned manufacturing cells. Four cells were studied to identify those characteristics to be included in the model: machine types, product flow, material handling and storage equipment, and cell size. World class manufacturing practices included in the model were chosen based on the literature review and interviews with users of cellular manufacturing.

Machines at four manufacturing cells were studied to identify those characteristics that regulate product flow and define simulation events. The review of 85 machines identified four main types. Cells consist of combinations of those machine types plus some highly specialized equipment, used in specific types of industries.

Product flow in manufacturing cells depend on product characteristics, machine types, and the material handling approach. To emulate product flow effectively it is vital to model three critical stages (arrival, processing, and departure) at every machine. The analysis of manufacturing cells identified four scenarios at arrival and six scenarios at departure. The scenario at part processing is defined through the selection of a machine type.

Development of a fully generic cell simulator, capable of modeling all machine types and combinations of arrival and departure scenarios, is not practical due to the development time requirements. The modular structure of the simulation model allows flexibility to reflect a wide variety of cell scenarios and results in model adaptability, since other scenarios can be incorporated by adding new modules.

The model includes approximately 20,000 lines of source code, 126 modules, and 25 event types that activate the appropriate modules. Exercising the model requires a significant amount of cell information (times, costs, machine performance, etc.). This is the trade-off cost to obtain accurate simulation results.

A second objective of this research work was the development of a comprehensive cell performance measure. The author proposes an annualized cost function that allows the evaluation of implementing relevant world class manufacturing practices. The impact of cell design and operation issues can be easily evaluated by comparing the resulting cost breakdown between scenarios.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 4

CELL DESIGN METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

The methodology proposed herein provides users with a systematic and analytic procedure for the design and evaluation of manufacturing cells. It can be used in the design of new cells and in the reconfiguration of existing ones. The methodology addresses cell design and operation issues with focus on the impact of implementing world class manufacturing practices. Chapter 4 constitutes the second of two archival journal articles developed by the author.

The building blocks of the methodology are depicted in Figure 4.1. It includes: computer simulation to emulate cell behavior under alternative configurations, engineering economics for the development of a cell performance measurement, design of experiments for the efficient collection and analysis of data, analysis of variance (ANOVA) to study the impact of design and operation factors on cell performance, and regression analysis and metamodels for the optimization of cell performance.

By far the most important building block is the computer simulation software developed by the author which incorporates the economic analysis concepts in the calculation of a total cost function for the evaluation of proposed manufacturing cells. The software allows for the design of statistical experiments and the subsequent use of ANOVA and regression analysis which permits the development of metamodels, predictors of the simulation response (total cost) based on relevant world class manufacturing practices.

82

The proposed methodology is presented in Figure 4.2. It consists of four major steps: selection of design and operation issues, development of a comprehensive performance measure, identification of critical design and operation factors, and optimization of cell performance. A description of each step is presented below.



Figure 4.1 Building blocks of the cell design methodology

4.2 Selection of Cell Design and Operation Factors

The factors affecting cell performance have been classified into design and operation factors. Design factors are those that characterize the physical arrangement of the manufacturing cell. This includes layout, material handling equipment, storage system, and unit load size (the number of units moved at once between machines). Operational factors describe those management practices adopted to control cell operations. Included among operational factors are maintenance policy, quality policy, scheduling approach, inventory buffers, number of operators, operator movement and destination rule, setup time policy, and lot sizing.

The decision of which design and operation issues to be addressed in a study is case specific. All the issues mentioned above may be considered relevant for the design of a new manufacturing cell. When the objective of the study is the reconfiguration of a cell, the relevant issues are only those that address the need to restructure.

The methodology proposed herein was applied to a cell for the assembly of printed circuit boards (PCBs). A description of the cell is presented in Figure 4.3. The squares represent processes, and the circles represent operators. The objective of the study was to analyze product quality and the cell's customer service level. The study focused on evaluating the impact of implementing quality at the source, quick changeover, autonomous and preventive maintenance, smaller lots, smaller unit load sizes, and minor stoppages at the pick and place machines. The cell material handling system, manning requirements, inventory buffers, and part scheduling practices remained constant throughout the study.

Analysis of scrap and rework data identified paste, glue, and the pick and place machines as the major sources of quality problems. One scenario for the implementation of quality at the source is depicted in Figure 4.4. Inspection points have been placed after the paste, glue, and pick and place operations. Manning requirements remain the same since inspections are highly automated and were assigned to the operators already in charge of those processes. Minor cell layout changes were needed to accommodate the new equipment. Thus, layout was not treated as a major issue during experimentation.



Figure 4.2 Cell design methodology



Figure 4.3 Cell for the assembly of printed circuit boards

The impact of implementing quick changeover techniques was only relevant at the pick and place machines. Setup times under quick changeover are represented as a percentage of current setup times. Autonomous and preventive maintenance are implemented at all machines. Cleaning, lubrication, and minor machine adjustments (these activities are better known as autonomous maintenance) are performed by operators on a daily basis. Preventive maintenance is under the responsibility of maintenance personnel. Minor stoppages at the pick and place machine are caused by the part replenishment frequency (mainly resistors, capacitors, memories, and specialized integrated circuits). The alternatives under study are small versus large rolls of such components.

The last two operational issues are unit load size and lot size. Unit load size is defined as a percentage of the lot size. A production lot represents a group of customer orders. The impact of smaller lots is studied by releasing customer orders as they arrive (small lots) versus combining orders before the release occurs (large lots).

The cell operational issues addressed in this study (i.e., quality policy, maintenance policy, setup policy, lot size, unit load size, and machine minor stoppages) become factors for experimentation.



Figure 4.4 Layout for the implementation of quality at the source

4.3 Development of a Cell Performance Measure

The second step of the methodology is the development of a cell performance measure. Performance of a manufacturing cell can be measured in many ways. Throughput, work-in-process, manufacturing leadtime, material handling costs, and machine setup costs are some examples found in the literature. The author proposes a performance measure capable of addressing multiple aspects of cell performance. It reflects differences in performance among alternative cell configurations in terms of the expected benefits of manufacturing cells: reduced levels of work-in-process inventory, improved service levels, reduced throughput times, less costly setups, simplified material handling, reduced storage requirements, improved quality, and reduced space requirements.

The performance measure proposed herein is an annualized cost function that consolidates ten cost components: inventory carrying costs (IC), lateness cost (LT), setup cost (SU), material handling cost (MH), storage equipment cost (ST), production labor cost (PL), maintenance cost (M), quality cost (Q), relayout (L), and floor space cost (FS). A detailed description of each cost component is presented in Section 3.6.

4.4 Setting the Lateness Ratio RA

The late charge rate (Rate_{mn}) proposed in equation (2), of Section 3.6.2 represents the fraction of the product cost that is charged on late orders. As a function of the lateness of an order, the charge rate increases exponentially between zero and RA, with a maximum charge rate of one. RA is defined as the ratio of lateness to manufacturing lead time at which an order is canceled or

88

charged a penalty equal to the full product cost. As RA increases, the late charge rate decreases. The ratio RA is arbitrarily set by the user.

Different values of RA were tested by simulating the PCB assembly cell depicted in Figure 4.4. Table 4.1 summarizes the results obtained for RA = 1 through 5. The values in Table 4.1 are the percentage of total cost represented by each cost component. The lateness cost with RA = 1 represents 46.97% of the total cell annual cost. Lateness has a significant weight in the cost function when compared to other issues such as product quality. With RA = 3 the lateness cost represents 24% of the cell annual cost, with the simulation results showing a cell service level of 81 percent. It was agreed by representatives of the printed circuit board assembly cell that RA=3 (with 24.33 percent of the cost caused by lateness and 81% on-time delivery) to be representative of reality. A bar chart of the results is depicted in Figure 4.5. The bar heights represent the percentage of total cost for each component. They facilitate the comparison between scenarios.

	Inv.	Late	Setup	Maint.	Quality	H & St	Labor	Layout	Space	
RA=1	0.83	46.97	1.29	0.11	34.29	0.96	9.34	0.00	6.20	
RA=2	1.08	31.23	1.67	0.15	44.47	1.25	12.11	0.00	8.04	
RA=3	1.18	(24.33)	1.84	0.16	48.93	1.37	13.33	0.00	8.85	
RA=4	1.24	20.45	1.93	0.17	51.44	1.45	14.01	0.00	9.30	
RA≠5	1.28	17. 9 7	1.99	0.18	53.05	1.49	14.45	0.00	9.59	
Total numb Number of On time de	per of orde late orders livery:	rs processec Si	3374 649 81%							

Table 4.1. Percentage of total cost represented by each cost component

4.5 Identification of Critical Design and Operation Factors

The identification of factors with a significant influence on cell performance is vital to the design and operation of cellular manufacturing systems [BUZA85]. Since it is likely that only a few of the selected cell design and operation factors will have a significant impact on cell performance, screening experiments have been incorporated in the methodology. Only these significant factors should be considered in further experimentation.



Figure 4.5 Cost components for values of RA

Factors for experimentation can be classified into two groups: quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative factors are those whose levels can be associated with points in a numerical scale, such as setup times (SU) and unit load size (UL). Qualitative factors are those whose levels cannot be associated with a numerical scale. The PCB assembly cell covered in this study operates in a manufacture to order environment. A production lot at the PCB assembly cell represents one or more customer orders. The size of a production lot is determined by the number of units requested by customers. Customer orders could be released for production following two strategies: (1) release individual customer orders (small lot size), and (2) release a group customer orders (large lot size). Since the actual size of the order cannot be controlled, lot size (LT) is treated as a qualitative factor. For the PCB assembly cell, quality (QL), maintenance (MA), lot size (LT), and machine minor stoppages (ST) are qualitative factors. The levels used for the screening experiment are presented in Table 4.2. Each factor is studied at two levels. Level one represents the current condition at the printed circuit board cell and level two the proposed cell operating policies.

Factor	Level 1 (-)	Level 2 (+)
SU	Long setup times	Quick changeovers (75% reduction)
UL	Large (\approx 50% of lot size)	Small (≈ 10% of lot size)
QL	Traditional inspections	Quality at the source
MA	Breakdown maintenance	Autonomous and preventive maint.
LT	Large lots (groups of customer orders)	Small lots (individual customer orders)
ST	Small rolls of components	Bigger rolls of components

Table 4.2. Description of factor levels

The design for the screening experiment is a 2⁶⁻¹ fractional factorial design, in two blocks of 16 design points each as shown in Table 4.2 [MCLE95]. This is a resolution V design (no main effect or two factor interaction is confounded with any other main effect or two factor interaction). The objective of the screening experiment is to obtain an estimate of important one factor effects and two factor interactions. Cell performance at each design point was evaluated using the generic cell simulator presented Section 3.7.

The cell runs two shifts per day (450 minutes each), five days a week, 52 weeks per year. This represents 234,000 minutes per year. The cell's weekly throughput was analyzed to determine the length of a warm-up period. The simulation was considered in its steady state when the simulated weekly throughput was approximately the average cell's weekly throughput based on historical production data. Steady state was achieved after 9000 minutes of simulation time. The total simulation length is 243,000 minutes to compensate for the warm-up period of 9000 minutes.

Each design point was simulated for one year of production except design points 1 (all factors at low level) and 28 (all factors at high level). Ten independent repetitions at each one of these two experimental conditions were performed to obtain an estimate of the experimental error.

The resulting total annualized cost (TAC) figures for each experimental condition in the screening experiment are presented in Table 4.3. The simulation output includes a breakdown of the total cell annual cost into its individual components. The TAC breakdown is presented in Table 4.4 to facilitate the understanding of the differences between experimental conditions.

The statistical analysis of results was performed using the general linear model (GLM) procedure of the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) software [DELW96]. The report generated by SAS is presented in Appendix C. Residuals were tested for normality. The skewness and excess kurtosis were both approximately zero. A stem and leaf and normal probability plot of residuals are included in Appendix C to document the compliance with normality assumptions.

The significance probabilities were analyzed to identify significant main effects and two factor interactions. For a confidence level of 95%, the significant main effects were lot size (LT), unit load size (UL), setup times (SU), maintenance (M), and minor stoppages (ST). The significant two factor interactions were: lot size and unit load size (LTxUL), lot size and setup times (LTxSU), lot size and minor stoppages (LTxST), and setup times and minor stoppages (SUxST).

The results obtained from the screening experiment merit some discussion. An analysis of the breakdown of cost components presented in Table 4.3 shows that quality represents more than 40 percent of the total cost in 60 percent of the scenarios evaluated. In some cases it represents as much as 63 percent of the annualized cost. However, quality was not identified as a critical operational factor.

mdiriza	røc	5003	0-		g	1m2	.dat		
Design point	LT	UL	Fac SU	tors QL	ма	ST	BLOCK	Cost \$/YEAR	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1	-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1	-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1	-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1	-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1	$\begin{array}{c} -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 $	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	2170280. 2166304. 2176116. 2197316. 2197316. 2142670. 2181240. 2184299. 2173688. 2186503. 2180851. 1391530. 2274293. 16267381. 2029203. 2168647. 15328751. 1617552. 26517870. 1676204. 2028651. 2087279. 2311724. 28037656. 2077920. 1370279.	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\$	-11111111111111111111111111111111111111	1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1	-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1	-1111111111111111111111111111111111111	-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1	$ \begin{array}{c} -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\$	1736158. 1773894. 21696176. 2007732. 2442737. 1718942. 2034498. 12242492. 1985830. 24392574. 2492354. 1735281. 1736043. 1735491. 173878. 1740264. 1738834. 1737445. 1742127. 1739344. 1738027. 29063736. 1962582. 1736615. 1807899.	

Table 4.3. Results from screening experiment
Table 4.4. Breakdown of the annualized cost results from the screening experiment

	TAC	2170280.	1391530.	2274293.	16267381.	2029203	2168647	15328751.	1617552.	26517870.	1676204.	2028651.	2087279.	2311724.	28037656.	2077920.	1370279.	1736158.	1773894.	21696176.	2007732.	2442737.	1718942.	2034498.	12242492.	1985830.	24392574.	2492354.	1735281.	29063736.	1962582	1736615.	1807899.
	SPACE	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000.	192000	192000.	192000.
	LAYOUT	0.	25000.	.0	25000.	.0	25000.	.0	25000.	.0	25000.	•	25000.	.0	25000.	.0	25000.	.0	25000.	0	25000.	0	25000.	.0	25000.	0	25000.	.0	25000.	0.	25000.	.0	25000.
	PROD. LAB.	289190.	261682.	272878.	279504.	257583.	282913.	285818.	277091.	270954.	285244.	273579.	274782.	281053.	264685.	281021.	277827.	278820.	280349.	265556.	279785.	276209.	272291.	286251.	268986.	277872.	285493.	284239.	256193.	281840.	271577	262876.	288432.
dat	HW	29789.	30938.	16659.	11215.	30894.	29728.	11287.	16659.	29589.	30014.	11480.	16567.	29856.	29577.	16668.	11486.	11582.	16595.	29958.	29787.	16545.	11478.	29888.	30282.	16658.	11235.	29761.	30806.	10994.	16625.	30923.	29876.
tcost.	QUALITY	1062026.	705581.	1055682.	699635.	1063858.	705184.	1036901.	703910.	1018848.	706130.	1067264.	709431.	1051812.	695843.	1060480.	705975.	1092825.	703831.	1054634.	699911.	1088489.	705240.	1083017.	706209.	1095693.	697665.	1088346.	700735.	1030155.	705906.	1089248.	706052.
	MÀINT	3559.	4093.	330026.	358780.	330177.	358641.	3564.	4116.	3594.	4085.	330330.	358674.	330058.	358746.	3604.	4095.	3646.	4130.	329176.	358796.	329060.	358881.	3623.	4106.	3633.	4109.	329192.	357930.	329003.	358888.	3625.	4113.
.e. I	SETUP	39936.	57836.	29954.	77870.	57894.	39863.	77863.	30003.	76392.	29954.	57942.	39961.	29930.	76326.	39848.	57908.	57954.	39786.	77382.	29866.	39777.	57933.	29906.	78295.	29900.	76658.	39822.	57923.	75932.	29925.	57872.	39817.
030-201ps.j	LATE	528102.	86807.	347321.	14617101.	69209.	509341.	13715171.	338745.	24920274.	375252.	68600.	443467.	368981.	26389276.	456893.	68291.	72081.	485224.	19741092.	363909.	473799.	68638.	381429.	10929912.	340572.	23094870.	503052.	86719.	27139372.	333138.	72344.	496247.
zar@c50	ICC	25677.	27593.	29773.	6276.	27588.	25978.	6147.	30029.	6219.	28525.	27456.	27398.	28034.	6202.	27407.	27698.	27250.	26979.	6378.	28679.	26860.	2/482.	28384.	7702.	29503.	5542.	25943.	27975.	4441.	29523.	27726.	26362.
mdiri	RUN	-	2	m ·	4	5	9	~	ω.	יי אינ	01			۲. ۲.	7 1	12 12	16 16	17	18	19	20	21	77	57	4 L N 0	2 V 2 V	26	27	28	56	30	31	32

A mean plot of the cell annualized cost by quality scenario is presented in Figure 4.6. The mean annualized cost for the current quality scenario (-) is \$5,500,631. The mean annualized cost with the implementation of quality at the source (+) is \$4,715,975., which represents yearly savings of \$748,656. The proposed quality at the source scenario requires investments in training, relayout, and equipment. The annualized cost of these investments, over three years with an interest rate of 15 percent, is \$472,635. The benefit cost ratio for the proposed scenario is only 1.66. Benefit cost ratios for significant factors were much higher. For example, setup had a benefit cost ratio of 3,206.



Figure 4.6 Mean plot of cell annualized cost by quality scenario

Another interesting result relates to the maintenance policy. The regression coefficients of the regressor variables are presented in Table 4.5. The regression coefficient of maintenance policy is positive. Maintenance is a factor that does not interact with any other factor. Therefore, maintenance should be set at its low level to minimize costs. A mean plot of the annualized cost by maintenance scenario is presented in Figure 4.7. The average annualized cost for the current scenario (-) is \$4,777,973. The average annualized cost with the implementation of autonomous and preventive

maintenance (+) is \$5,438,633. Hence, the investments and interruptions caused by maintenance have a negative impact on cell performance. Maintenance should therefore be set at its low level for further experimentation.

The screening experiment has identified four significant factors, which should be considered in the next stage of experimentation. Two of the factors are qualitative (lot size and machine minor stoppages) and two are quantitative (setup times and unit load size). These four factors will be considered in the optimization of the cell performance (next step in the design methodology).



Figure 4.7 Mean plot of cell annualized cost by maintenance scenario

4.6 Optimization of Cell Performance

After the screening experiment results were obtained, a second experiment was needed to analyze the response surface for cost and identify the optimal factor settings. A response surface design was used to achieve this task. The experiment includes two qualitative factors (lot size and machine stoppages) at two levels each for a total of four combinations. A response function on quantitative factors (setup time and unit load size) is estimated at each combination of qualitative factors with a 3² full factorial design. A layout of the macroexperiment is presented in Figure 4.8.

mdirizar@c	:50030-201;		glm2.out		
	G	mer	al Linear Model	s Procedure	
Dependent	Variable: TRAC	2	Total Annual Co Sum of	Mean	
Source		DF	Squares	Square F	Value Pr > F
Model		22	2.8331E+15	1.2878E+14	47.10 0.0001
Error		27	7.3825E+13	2.7342E+12	
Corrected	Total	49	2.9069E+15		
	R-Squa	ire	c.v.	Root MSE	TRAC Mean
	0.9746	04	32.36995	1653555	5108303
			T for HO.		Std Frror of
Parameter	Estin	ate	Parameter=	0	Estimate
INTERCEPT LT	6881023. 4941840.	722 350	24.2 17.9	3 0.0001 6 0.0001	283969.7975 275156.0991
UL	211566.	288	0.7	7 0.4486	275156.0991
OL	-372870.	337	-1.3	6 0.1866	275156.0991
MA	756282.	788	2.7	5 0.0105	275156.0991
ST	-1213668.	525	-4.4	1 0.0001	275156.0991
BLK	-162853.	163	-0.5	9 0.5589	275156.0991
1.T*SU	-4957541	966	-17 A	S 0.6684	283969./9/5
LT*OL	-321410	591	-1.1	3 0.2677	283969.7975
LT*MA	477047.	659	1.6	8 0.1045	283969.7975
LT*ST	-1324426.	028	-4.6	6 0.0001	283969.7975
UL*SU	-103989.	528	-0.3	7 0.7171	283969.7975
	-129620.	153	-0.40	0.6517	283969.79751
UL-MA III.*ST	100344.	347 784	0.5	0.5582 0 0.5582	283969./9/3
SU*OL	323849.	097	1.14	4 0.2641	283969.7975
SU*MA	-481765.	778	-1.70	0.1013	283969.7975
SU*ST	1330247.	159	4.68	B 0.0001	283969.7975
QL*MA	-32182.	403	-0.12	1 0.9106	283969.7975
QL*ST	-168431.	716	-0.59	0.5580	283969.7975
ri w 9 I	1340/1.	223	0.4	/ U.6406	203203.1212

Table 4.5. Regression coefficients of the regressor variables



Figure 4.8 Layout of the macroexperiment

The macroexperiment consists of four 3^2 factorial experiments (branches 1 through 4 in Figure 4.8). Three independent simulation runs were performed at each design point of each 3^2 factorial design for a total of 27 runs, for a total of 108 independent simulation runs in the entire macroexperiment. A description of factor levels is presented in Table 4.6. As with the screening experiment, a factor level of (-1) represents the current cell operating policy.

Simulation results at each of the four branches were analyzed using SAS response surface regression (RSREG) procedure with a significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ [SAS90]. The response surface was estimated using a second-order model. The optimum setting of the regressor variables, the stationary point, was found with a canonical analysis of the metamodel (estimated response surface). The results obtained are summarized in Table 4.7. Plots of the estimated response surface are presented in Figures 4.9 through 4.12.

Factor	Level 1 (-1)	Level 2 (0)	Level 3 (+1)
Setup	Long setup times	Quick changeovers (37.5% reduction)	Quick changeovers (75% reduction)
Unit Ioad	Large (\approx 50% of lot size)	Medium (≈30% of lot size)	Small (≈ 10% of lot size)
Lot size	Large lots (groups of customer orders)		Small lots (individual customer orders)
Mach. stops	Small rolis of components		Bigger rolls of components

Table 4.6. Description of factor levels for the macroexperiment

The residuals were analyzed using the SAS univariate (UNIVARIATE) procedure which includes moments, quantiles, stem and leaf plot, box plot, and normal probability plot [SAS90]. SAS output reports for each of the four experiments are included in Appendix D.

Table 4.7. Results from the statistical analysis of the macroexperiment

Experiment	Significant Regressors	Predicted Value at Stationary Point (\$)	Residual Skewness and Excess Kurtosis	Std.Error of Estimate
1	UL,SU,UL ² , SU ²	1,954,912	-0.0071 , -1.0607	5,136
2	SU, SU ²	-1,425,522	0.6259 , 1.7765	82,588
3	UL,SU,UL^2,SU^2	1,967,606	0.0677 , -0.5288	5,396
4	SU, SU ²	-161,371	-0.6946 , 5.3033	2,290,592



Figure 4.9 Estimated response surface for experiment 1





Figure 4.11 Estimated response surface for experiment 3



Figure 4.12 Estimated response surface for experiment 4

Experiments 1 and 3 exhibit similar behavior in the shape of the estimated response surface. The predicted mean response at the stationary point is similar for both metamodels, and have the same significant regressor variables. The p-values for the lack of fit test were .9475 and .9643, respectively. The observed skewness and excess kurtosis of the estimated residuals show that the residuals follow an approximately normal distribution. The standard error of the estimated mean response at the stationary point is relatively small at both branches. Therefore, simulation results are well-behaved around the stationary point of the estimated response surface.

The metamodels developed for experiments 2 and 4 resulted in negative predictions (for total annual cost) at the stationary point and other regions of the estimated response surface. The skewness and excess kurtosis of the estimated residuals show these do not follow a normal distribution. The standard error of the estimates at the stationary point are significantly high. Therefore, the annualized costs obtained from the simulation are not well-behaved (in fact, meaningless) around the estimated response surface.

Several transformations of the response were studied in search for a metamodel with a better fit. Design points were added to the experiments to allow estimation of higher order models. The statistical analysis of transformations was performed using the general linear model (GLM) procedure which gives flexibility to test higher order models [SAS90]. The optimum setting for regressor variables was obtained by evaluating the metamodel at additional factor levels within the design region. SAS output reports for the response function with the best fit are presented in Appendix E. The predicted mean response at the stationary point and the standard error of the predicted mean response are presented in Table 4.8.

	Experiment 2	Experiment 4
Significant Regressors	UL,SU,UL ² , SU ² ,UL ³ ,SU ³	SU,UL ² , SU ² ,SU ³
Predicted Annual Cost $\hat{Y}(\hat{X}^*)$ at		
the stationary point $(\hat{X^*})$	\$1,647,899	\$1,730,651
Residual Skewness and Excess		
Kurtosis	0.2690 , 1.4656	-0.0404 , 0.5606
Standard Error of the Estimate	26649	12453
Normalizing Transformation Z=f(Y)	Z = In(Y)	Z = 1/Y

Table 4.8. Results on transformations of the response for experiments 2 and 4

The logarithm transformation:

$$Z(X) = f[Y(X)] = \ln \left[Y(X)\right]$$
(4.11)

for every point X=(SU,UL) in the two dimensional region of interest for experiment 2 provided the best fit to the simulation responses in this experiment. The response surface was estimated by fitting a cubic model to the transformed data. The estimated response surface is presented in Figure 4.13.



Figure 4.13 Estimated response surface for the logarithm transformation

The standard error of the prediction at each design point X is estimated using the Delta method approximation [HUIT71], yielding

$$Var\left[\hat{Z}(X)\right] \equiv \left\{f'\left[\hat{Y}(X)\right]\right\}^2 Var\left[\hat{Y}(X)\right].$$
(4.12)

Now if D denotes the design matrix describing all of the design points in the experiment used to estimate the metamodel for the predicted transformed response $\hat{Z}(X)$, then we have predicted the standard regression result:

$$Var\left[\hat{Z}(X)\right] \cong \hat{\sigma_{z}} X(D'D)^{-1} X'$$
(4.13)

where $\hat{\sigma_z}$ is the standard error of the estimate for the regression involving the transformed responses. Combining (4.12) and (4.13) and inserting our final estimate \hat{X}^* of the stationary point into the result, we obtain our final estimate of the predicted optimal untransformed response

$$\hat{Y}\left(\hat{X}^{\bullet}\right) = f^{-1}\left[\hat{Z}\left(\hat{X}^{\bullet}\right)\right] = \exp\left[\hat{Z}\left(\hat{X}^{\bullet}\right)\right]$$
(4.14)

and the associated standard error

$$SE\left[\overset{\cdot}{Y}\left(\overset{\cdot}{X^{\bullet}}\right)\right] \cong \left|f'\left[\overset{\cdot}{Y}\left(\overset{\cdot}{X^{\bullet}}\right)\right]\right|^{-1} \overset{\cdot}{\sigma_{z}} \sqrt{\overset{\cdot}{X^{\bullet}}\left(D'D\right)^{-1}\left(\overset{\cdot}{X^{\bullet}}\right)'} = \exp\left[\overset{\cdot}{Z}\left(\overset{\cdot}{X^{\bullet}}\right)\right] \overset{\cdot}{\sigma_{z}} \sqrt{\overset{\cdot}{X^{\bullet}}\left(D'D\right)^{-1}\left(\overset{\cdot}{X^{\bullet}}\right)'}.$$
(4.15)

Predictions of the response function are all positive with a significant reduction in the standard error of the estimate. Residual skewness and kurtosis show these follow an approximately normal distribution.

The transformation that offered the best estimate of the response surface for experiment 4 was

$$Z(X) = f[Y(X)] = 10000/Y(X).$$
(4.16)

The response surface was estimated by fitting a cubic model to the transformed data. The estimated response surface is depicted in Figure 4.14. Proceeding along the lines of (4.14) and (4.15) for the transformation (4.16), we obtain for experiment 4

$$\hat{Y}\left(\hat{X}^{\star}\right) = 10000/\hat{Z}\left(\hat{X}^{\star}\right)$$
(4.17)

and

$$SE\left[\hat{Y}\left(\hat{X}^{\bullet}\right)\right] \cong \left\{ \left[\hat{Z}\left(\hat{X}^{\bullet}\right)\right]^{2} / 10000 \right\} \hat{\sigma}_{z} \sqrt{\hat{X}^{\bullet}\left(D'D\right)^{-1}\left(\hat{X}^{\bullet}\right)^{2}}.$$
(4.18)

The skewness and kurtosis of the residuals for the transformation (4.17) show that these follow an approximately normal distribution. There was a significant reduction in the standard error of the estimate at the stationary point. Therefore, the annualized costs obtained from the simulation are well-behaved around the estimated response surface at the stationary point.

The metamodels developed to estimate the response surface of total cell annual cost are presented in equations 4.19 through 4.22.

$$\hat{Y}_1 = 1986904 - 34686 * UL - 66788 * SU + 23320 * UL^2 + 49268 * SU^2$$
 (4.19)

107

$$\hat{Y}_{2} = EXP(14.3672 - 0.0214 * UL - 0.4604 * SU + 2.89x10^{-4} * UL^{2} + 1.3625 * SU^{2} + 0.0245 * UL^{3} - 0.9146 * SU^{3})$$
(4.20)

$$\hat{Y}_3 = 1967606 - 31675 * UL - 66290 * SU + 22845 * UL^2 + 51536 * UL^3$$
(4.21)



Figure 4.14 Estimated response surface for the inverse transformation

$$\hat{Y}_{4} = \frac{10000}{\begin{bmatrix} 5.75X10^{-3} + 8.87X10^{-4} * SU + 3.20X10^{-6} * UL^{2} - \\ 2.55X10^{-3} * SU^{2} + 1.71X10^{-3} * SU^{3} \end{bmatrix}}$$
(4.22)

where;

$$\dot{\hat{Y}}_i$$
 = predicted mean response at branch i,

UL = coded value of unit load size,

SU = coded value of setup time.

Confidence intervals for the predicted mean response at the stationary point were obtained using equation 4.23. The results are presented in Table 4.9. The confidence intervals are mutually exclusive, showing no overlapping of predicted values.

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}\left(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{\bullet}\right) \pm t_{1-\alpha/2,\nu} \mathbf{SE}\left[\hat{\mathbf{Y}}\left(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{\bullet}\right)\right]$$
(4.23)

where;

$$\begin{split} \hat{Y}(\hat{X^*}) &= \text{the predicted response at the stationary point,} \\ \hat{X^*} &= \text{estimated values of regressor variables at the stationary point,} \\ t_{1-\alpha/2,\nu} &= \text{value from the Student's t distribution for a significance} \\ &= \text{level } \alpha = 0.05 \text{ and } \nu \text{ degrees of freedom,} \\ \alpha &= 0.05, \\ \nu &= \text{error degrees of freedom,} \\ \text{SE}\left[\hat{Y}(\hat{X^*})\right] &= \text{standard error of the predicted response at the stationary} \\ &= 0 \text{ point.} \\ &= \begin{cases} \hat{\sigma}_{Y} \sqrt{\hat{X^*}(D^*D)^{-1}(\hat{X^*})^{\vee}} \text{ for experiments 1 and 3} \\ &= \begin{cases} \hat{\Gamma}\left(\hat{Y}(\hat{X^*})\right) \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \hat{\sigma_{z}} \sqrt{\hat{X^*}(D^*D)^{-1}(\hat{X^*})^{\vee}} \text{ for experiments 2 and 4} \end{cases} \end{split}$$

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Experiment	$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}})$	95% Confidence Interval	UL.	sû.
1	1,954,905	1,944,837 , 1,964,972	0.6378	0.6268
2	1,647,899	1,594,601 , 1,701,197	0.5	0.2
3	1,967,606	1,957,029 , 1,978,183	0.6175	0.6091
4	1,730,652	1,706,242 , 1,755,061	0.7	0.2

Table 4.9. Confidence intervals for the predicted optimal mean response

UL^{*}= coded value of unit load size at the stationary point. SU^{*}= coded value of setup time at the stationary point.

Predictions from the metamodels offer a clear distinction between the scenarios described by the four branches. Since there is no overlapping of the confidence intervals, it can be concluded that the predicted mean responses are significantly different from each other. The optimum setting for regressor variables, representing the minimum expected total annual cost, is found at experiment 2.

For experiment 2, the optimal unit load size and setup time coded values are 0.5 and 0.2, respectively, as shown in Table 4.8. The setup value suggests a 45 percent reduction in setup time. The unit load size value suggests seven units for products 1 through 7, and 3.5 units for products 8 through 13. Since the number of images per panel for products 1 through 7 is an even number, it is not practical to force a unit load size of 7. In this case 6 and 8 were evaluated. The factor settings implied by experiment 2 include the use of small rolls of components at the pick and place machine (machine stoppages = -1) and small lot sizes (lot size = +1). Factors that were decided from the screening experiment include traditional inspection (quality) and breakdown maintenance.

The metamodel was evaluated at the modified factor settings (i.e., unit loads of size 6 versus 8 for products 1 through 7, and unit loads of size 3 versus 4 for products 8 through 13) to understand the impact on the total annual cost prediction. The maximum difference observed (\$286) is negligible when compared to the annual cost figures presented in Table 4.8. This sensitivity of the response to changes in unit load size at the vicinity of the stationary point shows there is a collection rather than one setting for unit load size that optimizes the response. Therefore, the company has flexibility in operating conditions to achieve optimum response.

The results from twenty independent replications of the simulation model at the feasible stationary point are presented in Table 4.10. The average annualized cost was \$1,736,067 with a standard deviation of 14,091. These results were used to determine the number of observations needed to estimate the true mean response at the stationary point with a confidence level $(1-\alpha)$ of 95 percent and a maximum relative error (γ) of 5 percent. The number of observations needed are estimated using equation 4.24.

Table 4.10. F	Replications	at the e	stimated	stationary	point
---------------	--------------	----------	----------	------------	-------

1726629	1747379	1747734	1738990	1726639
1738612	1723641	1731353	1733981	1742187
1761489	1705611	1714731	1739189	1727024
1758168	1752466	1739750	1723256	1742506
Average :	1736067			
Std. Dev.:	14091			

$$N = \left[\frac{t_{(1-\alpha/2),(n-1)} \bullet S_{y}}{\gamma \bullet \overline{Y}}\right]^{2}$$

(4.24)

where;

N

= number of observations needed,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

n = sample size,	
------------------	--

(n-1)	= degrees of freedom,
t _(1-α/2)	$_{(n-1)}$ = value from the Student's t distribution for a significance level
	of α =.05 and a maximum relative error of γ =.05,
у	= annualized cost from simulation runs,
Sy	= sample standard deviation,
γ	= maximum relative error (0.05),
Ŧ	= estimated average annualized cost.

The number of observations needed is n=.1154. Therefore, the actual relative error of the estimated response is γ =0.36%, determined by substituting n in equation 4.24 and solving for γ .

Validation of the metamodel is performed by determining the statistical and practical significance of the difference between the predicted mean response and the simulated mean response at the feasible stationary point. The statistical significance can be determined by building a confidence interval for the difference between means using equation 4.25 [SNED80]. The results obtained are summarized in Table 4.11.

$$\left[\hat{Y}\left(\hat{X}^{\bullet}\right) - \overline{Y}\left(\hat{X}^{\bullet}\right)\right] \pm t_{df,(1-\alpha/2)} \sqrt{SE^{2}\left[\hat{Y}\left(\hat{X}^{\bullet}\right)\right] + S^{2}_{\overline{Y}}}$$
(4.25)

where;

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}})$$

= the predicted mean response at the estimated stationary

point X[•],

$$\begin{split} \overline{Y}(\hat{X^*}) &= \text{the simulation mean response at the estimated stationary} \\ &\text{point } \hat{X^*}, \\ SE^2[\hat{Y}(\hat{X^*})] &= \text{variance of the predicted mean response,} \\ S^2 \overline{Y} &= \text{variance of the simulation mean response,} \\ n &= \text{number of independent replications used to compute the} \\ &\text{simulation-based estimate } \overline{Y}(\hat{X^*}), \\ df &= \text{approximate degrees of freedom} \\ &= \frac{\left(SE^2[\hat{Y}(\hat{X^*})] + S^2 \overline{Y}\right)^2}{\left[SE^4[\hat{Y}(\hat{X^*})] + S^2 \overline{Y}\right]^2}, \\ &\left[SE^4[\hat{Y}(\hat{X^*})] + S^4 \overline{Y} - 1\right], \end{split}$$



= standard error degrees of freedom.

Table 4.11. Confidence interval for the difference between means

$$\begin{split} \widetilde{Y} &= 1,736,060 & \widehat{Y} &= 1,649,538 \\ S \ \overline{v} &= 14091/\sqrt{20} = 3151 & S_{\widehat{v}} &= 30492 \\ n &= 20 & df_{error} = 31 \\ df &= 32 \\ \alpha &= .05 \\ t_{d1,(1-\alpha/2)} &\equiv 2.042 \\ 95\% \ Cl : (1,736,060-1,649,538) \pm 2.042\sqrt{30492^2 + 3151^2} \\ &: [23926 , 149118] \end{split}$$

The confidence interval for the difference between the predicted mean response and the mean response from simulation runs does not contain zero. Therefore, it is concluded that there is a statistically significant difference between the two. This result leads to the conclusion that the metamodel does not give valid predictions of the simulation response. However, of greater importance is the practical significance of the difference between the two means. The practical significance is measured by calculating the percentage of deviation from the mean response of simulation runs. This is determined using equation 4.26.

% deviation =
$$\left[\hat{Y}(\hat{X}^{*}) - \overline{Y}(\hat{X}^{*})\right] / \overline{Y}(\hat{X}^{*})$$
 (4.26)

The developed metamodel is used to measure differences between cell scenarios during the cell design and evaluation process. In this environment, deviations of less than 10% from the simulated mean response are not of practical significance. The observed difference represents a 4.9% deviation from the mean response of simulation runs. Therefore, it is concluded that the metamodel provides reasonable estimates of the simulation response and can be used to evaluate cell performance under other scenarios within the region of experimentation.

The optimum setting of regressor variables identified through the evaluation of the metamodel includes: traditional inspections, breakdown machine maintenance, small rolls at the automatic insertion machines, small lot size, unit load sizes of 6 for products 1 through 7 and 4 for products 8 through 13, and a 45 percent reduction in machine setup times. The expected cell annual cost of this setting based on simulation runs is \$1,736.060.

The expected cell annual cost at the optimum setting of regressor variables can be used to estimate the expected savings of implementing the cell design and operation scenario identified by the methodology. The expected savings are determined by comparing the average annual cost of the current cell scenario with the estimated annual cost under the optimum scenario, both estimates from simulation runs (since simulation results at the feasible stationary point are available). The results are presented in Table 4.17. The expected savings from the implementation of the design and operation strategies identified by the methodology are within \$426,890 and \$452,945 per year.

Table 4.17 Expected savings at the optimum cell scenario

Optimum setting per simulation	Current cell scenario		
$\overline{Y}(\hat{X}^{\bullet}) = 1,736,060$	$\overline{Y}(X_c) = 2,175,927$		
$S = 14091 / \sqrt{20} = 3153$	$S = 14634 / \sqrt{8} = 5174$		
n=20	<i>n</i> = 8		
approximate df = 13*			
α = .05			
$t_{\text{df},(1-\alpha/2)}\cong 2.16$			
95% CI: (2,175,927 – 1,736,060) ± 2.16√ ∶ [426,890 , 452,945]	$3151^2 + 5174^2$	1111111	
* and a setting 4 05			

* see equation 4.25

The methodology proposed herein provides users with a systematic and methodical tool for cell design. It facilitates the design process and the allocation of resources by focusing on those cell design and operation issues with a significant impact on cell performance as identified by a screening experiment. The methodology incorporates response surface analysis to identify the setting(s) of cell design and operational factors that optimize cell performance. The availability of simulation tools with capabilities similar to those included in

the generic cell simulator should motivate more companies to combine simulation and optimization techniques for better results.

4.7 Conclusions

The generic cell simulator provides a means of evaluating cell performance under a wide variety of cell scenarios. Cell performance is measured with a comprehensive annualized cost function which addresses many aspects of cell design and operation issues simultaneously.

The metamodels provide a simple way of performing "what-if" analysis in the vicinity of the optimum. Canonical and ridge analyses of the estimated response surface determines if there exists a collection rather than one optimum setting for cell design and operation issues. This results in greater flexibility in operating conditions. Validation of a metamodel is based on the statistical and practical significance of the difference between the predicted mean response and the simulation mean response. Validation in this research work was based on the practical significance of the deviation.

The methodology proposed herein provides users with a systematic and methodical tool for cell design. It facilitates the design process and the allocation of resources by focusing on those cell design and operation issues with a significant impact on cell performance as identified by a screening experiment. The methodology incorporates response surface analysis to identify the setting(s) of cell design and operational factors that optimize cell performance. The availability of simulation tools with capabilities similar to those included in the generic cell simulator should motivate more companies to combine simulation and optimization techniques for better results.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

5.1 Summary of Research Work

This research work expands the boundaries in cellular manufacturing by developing a comprehensive simulation-based methodology for the design of world class manufacturing cells. It entailed the development of a comprehensive performance measure and the design of a generic cell simulator for the evaluation of cell performance.

The performance measure proposed by the author is an annualized cost function that consolidates ten cost components. It has the capability of reflecting the expected benefits of manufacturing cells. The annualized cost function is used to evaluate the impact of implementing world class manufacturing practices and to compare alternative cell scenarios.

The development of a generic cell simulator required the identification of common machine types, product flow strategies, and world class manufacturing practices at cells. This was achieved through plant visits and interviews with users of cellular manufacturing. Four manufacturing cells were studied which includes a total of 85 machines. These cells represent a wide variety of product types, cell size (number of machines and operators), and product flow strategies.

The proposed methodology combines engineering economics, design of experiments, simulation, analysis of variance, regression analysis, and response

surface methodology. Engineering economics was used in the development of the cost function to account for the time value of money. Investments and training costs are annualized over the period of the study. Screening experiments and analysis of variance are incorporated to identify relevant cell design and operation issues. Simulation is key in the evaluation of performance under alternative cell scenarios. Metamodels estimating the response surface are developed with regression analysis applied to results from simulation experiments. Optimization of cell performance is achieved with a canonical and ridge analysis of the response surface or evaluation of the metamodel at multiple factor levels within the region of experimentation.

5.2 Conclusions

The proposed annualized cost function, as demonstrated by the case study, is sensitive to changes in cell throughput, product quality, manufacturing lead time, work-in-process and finished goods inventory levels, machine reliability, lot sizing, unit load size, machine setup times, space requirements, and operator assignment strategies. This performance measure considers training and investment costs required for the implementation of design and operation strategies. The annualized cost function consolidates a series of widely used performance measures into one comprehensive measure of performance. It provides a highly effective means to evaluate and understand differences between cell scenarios.

Plant visits allowed the identification of four common machine types. Manufacturing cells consists of common machine types plus highly specialized equipment, used in a specific type of industry. Product flow at cells can be divided into three stages: arrival to machine, machine processing, departure from machine. Flexibility to reflect a variety of product flow strategies within a cell requires modeling the three stages of product flow at each machine.

The generic cell simulator developed in this research work provides a mechanism of evaluating the impact of implementing world class manufacturing practices such as: quality at the source, quick machine changeovers, multiskilled operators, small lot sizes, small unit load sizes, autonomous and preventive maintenance, and finite inventory buffers. Development of a fully generic cell simulator is not practical due to the development time requirements. The cell simulator is highly modular with flexibility to reflect a wide variety of cell scenarios. It can be adapted by incorporating new modules to reflect specific user needs.

The methodology proposed herein provides users of cellular manufacturing with a systematic and methodical tool for the design and evaluation of cells. It allows management to focus on the relevant design and operation issues as identified by the screening experiment. The methodology identifies the optimum cell design and operation strategies with response surface analysis. As demonstrated by the case study, companies can benefit from improved performance and better profit margins.

5.3 Recommendations for Future Research Work

The following recommendations for future research are provided.

- 1. Development of a database environment with a user friendly front-end to ensure data integrity. This improved data structure facilitates the eventual linking of the simulation tool to the plant's MRP-II database.
- 2. Integration of statistical tools to achieve the following tasks automatically:

- Design of needed screening experiments,
- Design of needed response surface experiments,
- Analysis of screening experiment results,
- Evaluation of the response surface and identification of optimal factor settings.
- Currently, the core of the simulation model is based on Slam II. A future project could involve the development of an object-oriented environment for event handling. This eliminates the dependency on a vendor-specific software system.
- 4. The lateness cost component was highly sensitive to some of the combinations of design and operation factor levels within a given experiment. The magnitude of this component at those combinations of factor levels was as much as ten times its magnitude at other combinations of factor levels. This behavior was responsible for increased variability in the response and error variance. It adds complexity to the process of estimating the response surface. The lateness cost should be studied further to determine the degree at which it complies to management expectations and reflects the reality of manufacturing operations.

REFERENCES

- [ALEX90] Alexander, S.M., Biles, W.E., Evans, G.W., and Zahran, I.M. (1990). A Macro/Micro Modeling Approach to the Simulation of Cellular Manufacturing Systems, <u>Proceedings of the 1990 Winter Simulation Conference</u>, 646-652.
- [ALQA89] Al-Qattan, I.Y. (1989). Systematic Approach to Cellular Manufacturing Systems Design, <u>Journal of Mechanical Working</u> <u>Technology</u>, Sept., 415-424.
- [ASKI93] Askin, R.G., and Iyer, A. (1993). A Comparison of Scheduling Philosophies for Manufacturing Cells, <u>European Journal of</u> <u>Operational Research</u>, 69, 438-448.
- [AURR93] Aurrecoechea, A., Busby, J.S., Nimmons, T., and Williams, G.M. (1993). The Evaluation of Manufacturing Cell Designs, <u>International Journal of Operations and Production Management</u>, 14, 1, 60-74.
- [BERK93] Berkely, B.J. (1993). Setting Minimum Performance Levels for Two-Card Kanban-Controlled Lines, <u>International Journal of Production</u> <u>Research</u>, 31, 5, 1003-1021.
- [BITR87] Bitran, G.R. and Chang, L. (1987). A Mathematical Programming Approach to a Deterministic Kanban System, <u>Management</u> <u>Science</u>, 33, 4, 427-441.
- [BLAC87] Black, J.T. (1987). Cellular Manufacturing Systems, <u>Just-In-Time</u> <u>Manufacture</u>, Edited by C.A. Voss, IFS Publications, LTD, UK.
- [BLAC88] Black, J.T. (1988). The Design of Manufacturing Cells (Step one to Integrated Manufacturing Systems), <u>Proceedings of the 1988</u> <u>Symposium on Manufacturing Systems-Design</u>, <u>Operation</u>, and <u>Control</u>, III, 143-157.
- [BLAC93] Black, J.T., and Schroer, B.J. (1993). Simulation of an Apparel Assembly Cell with Walking Workers and Decouplers, <u>Journal of</u> <u>Manufacturing Systems</u>, 12, 2, 170-180.
- [BLAN75] Blanning, R.W. (1975). The Construction and Implementation of Metamodels, <u>Simulation</u>, June, 177-184.

- [BUZA85] Buzacott, J.A. (1985). Modeling Manufacturing Systems, <u>Robotics</u> and <u>Computer-Integrated Manufacturing</u>, 2, 1, 25-32.
- [CONR85] Conroy, P.G. (1985). Cellular Manufacturing, <u>American Production</u> and Inventory Control Society 1985 Conference Proceedings, 477-479.
- [DESS90] Dessouky, Y.M., and Mackulak, G.T. (1990). Scheduling to Minimize Makespan When a Changeover Penalty Exists, Journal of Manufacturing Systems, 9, 2, 139-150.
- [DROY87] Droy, J. (1987). Tips on Developing Cells, <u>Production Engineering</u>, March, 34, 3, 67-68.
- [DURM93] Durmusoglu, M.B. (1993). Analysis of the Conversion from a Job Shop System to a Cellular Manufacturing System, International Journal of Production Economics, 30-31, 427-436.
- [DYCK91] Dyck, H., Varzandeh, J., and McDonnell, J. (1991). Quality Impacts on JIT Performance Measures: A Factory Simulation, <u>IEEE</u>, July, 452-455.
- [GELD94] Gelders, L., Mannaerts, P., and Maes, J. (1994). Manufacturing Strategy, Performance Indicators, and Improvement Programs, International Journal of Production Research, 32, 4, 797-805.
- [GREE83] Green, T.J. and Sadowski, R.P. (1983). Cellular Manufacturing Control, Journal of Manufacturing Systems, 2, 2, 137-146.
- [GUNA93] Gunasekaran, A., Goyal, S.K., Martikainen, T., and Yli-Olli, P. (1993). Modeling and Analysis of Just-In-Time Manufacturing Systems, International Journal of Production Economics, 32, 23-37.
- [HERA89] Heragu, S.S. (1989). Knowledge Based Approach to Machine Cell Layout, <u>Proceedings of the 11th Annual Conference on Computers</u> and Industrial Engineering, 37-42.

- [HIRA83] Hira, D.S., and Pandey, P.C. (1983). A Computer Simulation Study of Manual Flow Lines, <u>Journal of Manufacturing Systems</u>, 2, 2, 117-150.
- [HOOD93] Hood, S.J., and Welch, P.D. (1993). Response Surface Methodology and its Application in Simulation, <u>Proceedings of the</u> <u>1993 Winter Simulation Conference</u>, 115-122.
- [HUIT71] Huitson, A. (1971). <u>The Analysis of Variance: A basic Course</u>. Great Britain, Latimer Trend & Co LTD.
- [HURL94] Hurley, B. (1994). Simulation-Based Optimization of Design, Operation, and Control Factors for a Manufacturing Cell, Ph. D Dissertation, Department of Industrial Engineering, North Carolina State University.
- [IIE96] (May 1996) Simulation Software: Buyers Guide. IIE Solutions.
- [INDU93] Simulation Software Buyer's Guide compiled by staff of IE magazine, Industrial Engineering, July, 46-57.
- [JOTH93] Jothishankar, M.C., and Wang, H.P. (1993). Metamodeling a Just-In-Time Kanban System, <u>International Journal of Operations and</u> <u>Production Management</u>, 13, 8, 18-36.
- [KEKR87] Kekre, S. (1987). Performance of a Manufacturing Cell with Increased Product Mix, <u>IIE Transactions</u>, 19,3, 329-339.
- [KINN87] Kinney, H.D., and Mcginnis, L.F. (1987). Design and Control of Manufacturing Cells, <u>Industrial Engineering</u>, 19, 10, 28-38,
- [KIRA89] Kiran, A.S., Scholffer, A., and Hawkins, D. (1989). An Integrated Simulation Approach to Design of Flexible Manufacturing Systems, <u>Simulation</u>, 52, 2, 47-52.
- [KLEI79] Kleijnen, J.P.C. (1979). Regression Metamodels for Generalizing Simulation Results, IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, smc-9, 2, 93-96.
- [KLEI88] Kleijnen, J.P.C., and Standridge, C.R. (1988). Experimental Design and Regression Analysis in Simulation: A FMS Case Study, <u>European Journal of Operational Research</u>, 33, 257-261.

[KOEL90] Koelsch, J.R. (1990). Flexible Cells Take Control, <u>Manufacturing</u> Engineering, Sept., 75-77.

- [LAW89] Law, A.M., and McGomas, M.G. (1989). Pitfalls to Avoid in the Simulation of Manufacturing Systems, <u>Industrial Engineering</u>, May, 28-31.
- [LAW89] Law, A.M., and Wali Haider, S. (1989). Selecting Simulation Software for Manufacturing Applications: Practical Guidelines and Software Survey, <u>Industrial Engineering</u>, May, 33-46.
- [LAW91] Law, A.M., and Kelton, W.D. (1991). <u>Simulation Modeling and</u> <u>Analysis</u>, New York, McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- [LEUN90] Leung, Y., and Suri, R. (1990). Performance Evaluation of Discrete Manufacturing Systems, <u>IEEE Control Systems Magazine</u>, 10, 4, 77-86.
- [LI91] Li, A. and Co, H.C. (1991). A Dynamic Programming Model for the Kanban Assignment Problem in a Multistage Multiperiod Production System, <u>International Journal of Production Research</u>, 29, 1, 1-16.
- [LIN87] Lin, L. and Cochran, J.K. (1987). Optimization of a Complex Flow Line for Printed Circuit Board Fabrication by Computer Simulation, Journal of Manufacturing Systems, 6, 1, 47-57.
- [LIN93] Lin, L., and Chiu, F. (1993). Manufacturing Cell Operating Characteristics, <u>European Journal of Operational Research</u>, 69, 424-437.
- [LOGE91] Logendran, R., and Nudtasomboon, N. (1991). Minimizing the Makespan of a Group Scheduling Problem: A New Heuristic, International Journal of Production Economics, 22, 217-230.
- [MADU92] Madu, C.N. and Chanin, M.N. (1992). A Regression Metamodel of a Maintenance Float Problem with Erlang-2 Failure Distribution, International Journal of Production Research, 30, 4, 871-885.
- [MASK89] Maskell, B.H. (1989). Performance Measurement for World Class Manufacturing: Part I, <u>Manufacturing Systems</u>, July, 62-64.
- [MASK89] Maskell, B.H. (1989). Performance Measurement for World Class Manufacturing: Part II, <u>Manufacturing Systems</u>, August, 48-50.

- [MASK89] Maskell, B.H. (1989). Performance Measurement for World Class Manufacturing: Part III, <u>Manufacturing Systems</u>, September, 36-41.
- [MCGI91] McGinnis, L.F. (1991). Rapid Prototyping of Manufacturing Cells, ASME, PED-Vol. 53, <u>Design, Analysis, and Control of</u> <u>Manufacturing Cells</u>.
- [MCLE95] McLean, R.A., and Anderson, V.L. (1995). <u>Applied Factorial and</u> <u>Fractional Designs</u>, New York, Marcel Dekker Inc.
- [MEID92] Meidt, G.J. (1992). PCRSM: A Decision Support System for Simulation Metamodel Construction, <u>Simulation</u>, 59, 3, 183-191.
- [MONT91] Montgomery, D.C. (1991). <u>Design and Analysis of Experiments</u>, New York, John Wiley and Sons.
- [MORR90] Morris, J.S., and Tersine, R.J. (1990). A Simulation Analysis of Factors Influencing the Attractiveness of Group Technology Cellular Layouts, <u>Management Science</u>, 36, 12, 1567-1578.
- [MYER95] Myers, R.H, and Montgomery, D.C. (1995). Response Surface Methodology: Process and Product Optimization Using Designed Experiments.
- [NAJA93] Najarian, G. (1993). Performance Measurement: Measure the Right Things, <u>Manufacturing Systems</u>, Sept., 54-57.
- [NAKA88] Nakajima, Seiichi, <u>Introduction to TPM Total Productive</u> <u>Maintenance</u>, Productivity Press, Cambridge MA.
- [NAKA89] Nakajima, Seiichi, TPM Development Program: Implementing Total Productive Maintenance, Productivity Press, Cambridge MA.
- [OGRA86] O'Grady, P.J., and Menon, U. (1986). A Concise Review of Flexible Manufacturing Systems and FMS Literature, Computers in Industry, 7, 155-167.
- [OZDE93] Ozdemirel, N.E. and Mackulak, G.T. (1993). A Generic Simulation Module Architecture Based on Clustering Group Technology Model Coding, <u>Simulation</u>, 60, 6, 421-433.
- [PANN89] Pannesi, R.T. (1989). Promoting Manufacturing Strategy Implementation Through the Right Measurements, <u>American</u>

Production and Inventory Control Society 1989 Conference Proceedings, 263-266.

- [PRIT86] Pritsker, A.B. (1986). <u>Introduction to Simulation and SLAM II</u>, New York, John Wiley & Sons.
- [REED89] Reed, R.M. (1989). New Frontiers in Cost Management, <u>American</u> <u>Production and Inventory Control Society 1989 Conference</u> <u>Proceedings</u>, 362-363.
- [ROSS89] Ross, S.M. (1989). Introduction to Probability Models, Academic Press Inc., Boston.
- [SAS90] <u>SAS/STAT User's Guide: Volume 2, GLM-VARCOMP</u>. Version 6, Fourth Edition. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC.
- [SAVO91] Savory, P.A., Mackulak, G.T., and Cochran, J.K. (1991). Material Handling in a Flexible Manufacturing System Processing Part Families, <u>Proceedings of the 1991 Winter Simulation Conference</u>, 375-380, Washington, D.C., B.L. Nelson, W.D. Kelton, and G.M. Clark, Editors.
- [SCHM84] Schmidt, J.W. (1984). Introduction to Simulation, <u>Proceedings of</u> the 1984 Winter Simulation Conference, 65-74.
- [SCHR87] Schroer, B.J. and Tseng, F.T. (1987). Modeling Complex Manufacturing Systems Using Simulation, <u>Proceedings of the 1987</u> <u>Winter Simulation Conference</u>, 677-682.
- [SHAN93] Shang, J.S., and Tadikamalla, P.R. (1993). Output maximization of a CIM system: simulation and statistical approach, International Journal of Production Research, 31, 1, 19-41.
- [SHEN91] Shenoy, S.M., and Kasilingam, R.G. (1991). Performance Analysis of Machine Cell Configurations Using Simulation, <u>Proceedings of</u> <u>the 13th Annual Conference on Computers and Industrial</u> <u>Engineering</u>, 21, 1-4, 279-283.
- [SHIN85] Shingo, S. (1985). <u>A Revolution in Manufacturing: The SMED</u> <u>System</u>. Productivity Press, Stamford CT.
- [SHIN89] Shingo, S. (1989). <u>A Study of the Toyota Production System from</u> <u>an Industrial Engineering Viewpoint</u>. Productivity Press, Cambridge MA.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

- [SNED80] Snedecor, G.W., and Cochran, W.G. (1980). <u>Statistical Methods</u>. The Iowa State University Press, Iowa.
- [SOLB76] Solberg, J.J. (1976). Optimal Design and Control of Computerized Manufacturing Systems, <u>American Institute of Industrial Engineers</u>, Boston, MA.
- [STEC81] Stecke, K.E. (1981). Production Planning Problems for Flexible Manufacturing Systems, Ph. D. Dissertation, Purdue University.
- [STEC83] Stecke, K.E. (1983). Formulation and Solution of Nonlinear Integer Production Planning Problems for Flexible Manufacturing Systems, <u>Management Science</u>, 29, 3, 273.
- [STEU87] Steudel, H.J. (1987). Star*Cell: A Flexible Manufacturing Cell Simulator, <u>Proceedings of the 1987 Winter Simulation Conference</u>, 230-234.
- [STEU91] Steudel, H.J. (1991). The Role and Design of Workcells for World-Class Manufacturing, <u>The Journal of Applied Manufacturing</u> <u>Systems</u>, Winter 1991, 47-55.
- [STEU92] Steudel, H.J., and Desruelle, P. (1992). <u>Manufacturing in the</u> <u>Nineties</u>, New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- [STEI93] Steinbacher, H.R. and Steinbacher, N.L. (1993). <u>TPM for America:</u> <u>What It Is and Why You Need It</u>. Productivity Press, Cambridge Ma.
- [SURE92] Suresh, N.C. (1992). Partitioning Work Centers for Group Technology: Analytical Extension and Shop-Level Simulation Investigation, <u>Decision Sciences</u>, 23, 267-290.
- [SURI89] Suri, R. (1989). Lead Time Reduction Through Rapid Modeling, <u>Manufacturing Systems</u>, July, 66-68.
- [SURI93] Suri, R., and Suzanne, T. (1993). Rapid Modeling: The Use of Queueing Models to Support Time-Based Competitive Manufacturing, <u>Operations Research in Production Planning and</u> <u>Control</u>, 21-30.
- [SUZA92] Suzanne, T. (1992). Time is Money, <u>OR/MS Today</u>, October.

- [TAYL93] Taylor, G.D., and Taha, H.A. (1993). A Comparison of Buffering Strategies for the CMS Routing/Sequencing Problem, <u>European</u> <u>Journal of Operational Research</u>, 69, 450-466.
- [TREV94] Trevino, J. and Irizarry, M. (1994). Design, Operation, and Control of Cellular Manufacturing Systems: Results from a Survey to North Carolina Industries, Unpublished Paper, Industrial Engineering Department, North Carolina State University.
- [WEMM87] Wemmerlov, U, and Hyer, N.L. (1987). Research Issues in Cellular Manufacturing, International Journal of Production Research, 25, 3, 413-431.
- [WEMM89] Wemmerlov, U., and Hyer, N.L. (1989). Cellular Manufacturing in the U.S. Industry: A Survey of Users, <u>International Journal of</u> <u>Production Research</u>, 27, 9, 1511-1530.
- [WILS84] Wilson, J.M. (1984). Formulation and Solution of a Set of Sequencing Problems for Flexible Manufacturing Systems, <u>Working Paper, Dept. Management Studies</u> (Loughborough University of Technology.
- [YU94] Yu, B., and Popplewell, K. (1994). Metamodels in Manufacturing: A Review, International Journal of Production Research, 32, 4, 787-796.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A SLAM II SIMULATION CODE






13143 6/220 1211) 01(4, (1011) 0124 EMD((1, -) 601.0 EMD((1, -) 70.0 EMD((1, -) 70.0 10 (11 5-1, max EMD((1, -) 10.0 EMD((1, -) 10.0 ETF2(119, MCM), ETF2(119, MCM) 17 (194716), PD. 9.5) 1988 Origi(auti-4, Filk- Akten/Innu64, Ant', #FATON-'042') Or DO 138 DD19 17 (PART(6), B), 6, 73) 9788 6750(19176), 91(2)+ (Alton/Innel3), (Alt', 1973(19+, 002)) 800 10 138 1903 17 (1%71(6), 80, 6, 6, 13) 1968 0720(1979), 71(13-40,00/1,001), 46(1, 1974704-042)) 0700 113 1017 17 (1965):180. - 1313) 1980 0020(0015-8,7148-'4100-(100011,441',197419-'010') 00 10 139 100 IF (1847(6).80,-1) 9400 0928(0919-6,7168-'datee/Ineu61.dat',978706-'022') 00 90 131 MDIT 17 (34/21(6).30.0) 71111 COLU(1117-0,7118-'4100/(11048).441',714/010-'010') 20 00 118 1001 17 (1947) (s). 20.1) 1918 COTRICULIT-0, 71(17-4 Loo/(1004)2.4at', 774704-70201) 20 10 129 2010 129 IP (7Acr(6).69.0.13) THE OPEN(U17-6,7118-'datoo/j.nu06.dat',FFAFO6-'040') 00 TO 138 2010 official and the state of the stand by due to state out of the state o addillaria (1911), "aton fatyal, Aat', Bhhfae - GLD') RAJA(), "J (197, Ab 11 (197, Ab) (1948) RAJA(), "J (194) RAJA(), "J (194) Q (197) (18 cell6. 0958 (1015 ± 6, 7 1.6 ± ' da too / hetyp), dat ', 844 708 ± ' 0.0 ' | 1840 j. j. j. j. añon 19 (1800 j. j.d. A) = -----PORMATILE, "BOOGIDID NOT OFFIC AN EXAU FILE" 17 (PACT(6).80, 0.38) THEM COTALCOLOGY 0.38) THEM COTALCOLOGY 0.38) THEM COTAL 13 MOLF 32 Louid (mdirisar8450039-201ps. CLOBING TO 113 1017 CLOBE (B) CLOBE (*) CLOBE(B) 1 .e . 52 126 2 -2 12 12 2 10/17/96 13:43 7/220 17 (1967) (a), A), A) 1988 01911(0117-4, 7114-'48100/mand?, Aut', 978,706-'020') 0190 114 1007 17 (PACT(6), 20, 6, 4375) FACE OFEL(UNIT-6, FILE="dates/anould.dat", FTATU9="0LD") 00 FO 114 2001 F 17 (1967 (s). mp. - .1313) 1968 0650 (1917 - 6. 7114 - 'dateno/menili, dat', gihyry- .020') 1801 - 1914 1801 - 1 17 (PACT(1), 20, -1) 1027 2010 (DIT(-0, 2) 112- 42000/apod81, 441', 691070-1020') 2018 (DIT(-0, 2) 12- 4200/apod81, 441', 691070-1020') 2018 (DIT(-0, 2) 12- 44100/apod81, 441', 691070-1020') 17 (1967-16), 10, 6) (1011 0 (1961-1011-1, 7)), 41 (-41 (40 (40 (40 (4)), 41 (-7, 7))) 0 (10) (11) 100 (11) 19 [PMC913], 20.-1] 1929 2016 [UN15-1, PLA-'4400/spand], Ant', PhATUR-'02.0' 2028 [UN15-4, PLA-'4400/spand], Ant', PhATUR-'02.0' 2020 [PML94-'21.13-'4400/spand], Ant', PhATUR-'02.0' 10 (PACT(6), 20.0, 23) PACP OPEN(UN19-4, PILL="dates/mead6, 4at", FNNT06="0.0" 00 TO 114 MOLF 00111 (0119-0, 7118-14100/mdr101.4at', 011/101-1010') READ(0, -) REAL(74, EDEPTA CLOBE(0) 0721 (IN17-4, FLZ='dates/parta_dat', #PATUH='040'] REDO[6,) BFN, RENTAN, FLOTO CLOBE(6] 6a) 16 19 (PACT(6), NO.1) PKM OPM(PN19-1, P114-'dates/mew03.dat', 00 00 114 MOLF DO 116 1-1, MOP ALMO(6,*) 10958, 201-00 (10958) COMPTING CLOBE(8) 17 (PACT(6), NQ.-1) TIGH 00 TO 119 MOLT mdiri aarec50030-201ps. MIAND(4, ") MIAND MIAND(4, ") MUMCP MIAND(4, ") MUMCP MIAND(4, ") MUMCP MIAND(4, ") MUMCP CLOMM(4) RITE(6,113) 2 112









10/11/96 13:43 10/120 COMPORTONIC / JFF78 (19), JCPCD (19), WCCD (19), MCCD (39), MARGE (19), DCMPORT (31), MARGE (19), JCPCD (19), JCPCD (30), JCPCD (30), JCCD CCDD (30, 30), D1077 (31), JCPCD (40, 31), MCLD (31), JCD CCDD (31, MCD (31), JCPCD (31), MCLD (31), JCD COMPARTONNAL TALL MANYAR, CONTRY, REPRIN, MALIALD COMPARTONNAL PATTER, IMANYAR, CONTRY, MALIALD COMPARTONNAL PATTER, ISAN, SCOORT (34), ICOLAR (18, 24), CARDAR COMPARTONNAL (CONTRY) (34), SCOORT (34), ICOLAR (18, 24), REAR MARCAR (18), MARCAR (182), MARCAR (182), TREJOTE "/nc.w/ yet low_res/Phabal. JR". Draw/scont.httl (nimb. do: negr., doi.(mgr.). drao4. [11, MPA. Mayor, Rel.m., Joslan, Rever, Januar, Hausry, Franz, Sajinagri, . COMPORT/ POCONZ / MAACH COMPORTON (1974), MARTA, MAATA, MALEY, FRANKA COMPORTON (1715)(1915) COMPORTON (1715)(1915), PRODER (181, 1902)(191 COMPORTON (1715)(181, 54), PRODER (181, 51) COMPORTON (1715) NUS INTRUMUCE BY CELL OFFICERS comon/ucom/ secore (se) , #UP1 (se) , gUP2 (se) , gUP2 (se) cell6.f FOCH AN INTERIAL REPLACEMENT (SAME AS CAUTOM) AND COUNTRA **BORFIOR** PONTED THEFE FICE OF FINTON THING I CAN mdir1sar8050030-201pa. CONFLIPTION OF AUTO PURPORTING LANKVL 2 NUMBER OF STREET CONTRACTOR OF CONFICTION OF COLLECT STATI TIME MAD RETURN OF THE CALL CRUMD CALL CREMP CALL OFFICE CALL MEALD CULL CLARTA IN SI S CALL CAUTOR OLL OF MIN CALL MINT CALL CAUTOR ALEX OF US CALL CLOND NUT OF OR -: i ŝ 3 100 2 3 ž 100 Ξ 022/11 09:01 36/11/01 00 70 (1131, 1132, 1139, 1134, 1139, 1137, 1139, 1139, 2000, 2001 2. 2001, 2001, 2001, 2001, 2001, 2005, 2005, 2015, 2013, 201 MANUAL OF A GUT LOAD TO THE MET MANUAL OF LINE AND ADDRESS INTERNAL ADDRESS UNDER THE ADDRESS IN THE POINT OF ADDRESS INTERNAL OF ADDRESS PARTING LOCATION CHILD OF ALL AND CUMBINIC THE PARTY OF THE P COMPLETION OF SUCCESSIVE INSPECTION ADMINI INTERIAL NAMOLING BY CILL CONFLICTOR OF ARLY IMPRETICE MANOR COMPLETION OF SUCCESSIVE INSPECTION PROCESSIES MELEASE OF A LOP FOR PRODUCTION 1 CONFLICTION OF Q.A. IMPRCTION INTROLIGIE THIN & LOWIT CONFLICTION OF NUMLE CLASS UTOROHOUS HALIFTERAHCE BY 2 1 Mar #dirts#rec50030-201ps.1 Ì CONFLICTION OF POLA OWN 40 TRAININ ON THE LAND COMPLETION OF 0 101417400 CONFLICTION OF 10 1011171400 CALL CIR.IN CALL CTTIN CALL COALE Call Crucia CALL CERTE COLL OF ANALL COLL CTIME CALL CTANE 0107 CALL LANN. CALL DEMAT CALL NTANG 0107 CACO CALL CRUCIA CALL CHICK 1 pure 195 197 191 1199 ï ž 191 -----194 1196 1 Ĩ -----







26/320 13 (43 IF THE UNITE IN MID, AND MOT BROOM TO COURTY WITH THE DEPARTING UNIT LOAD SITE THEN CHANG INSTOL TO MART CAN BE BATCHED. NAME A UNIT LOAD IS REPORTED FROM QUEUE IF COME TO THE DOMANY INFUT BUTTER ONLY IF THE UNIT LOAD SIEN IS ONEATER THAN ONE. THE FIRST FORTION OF THE 17 APPLIES NAME THE FOR 18 CALLED FROM A MATIVAL OF A REPARATOR, FOR EAR APPLIES ONLY NAME THE OR 18 Called From A DEFARTOR SCIENALO. guality of Each unit is that usit load minds to be derived merces flacting the deriv is the deer liver gover. President and a set of the set of the set of the processing course from the down't feature supples. FIND IF WHE UNIT TO ME PROCESSED IS FROM A MEM OR PARTIA PROCESSED UNIT LAUD. IF 13 FROM A FIND WILL LOUD CALL TO UNTERMINE IF COMPANYING ON CAMPIN ANY HERDED. 17 (MUDITO). 10, 114. MD. MD (MOD). 10, 0. MD. 137. M. MDQ (MCH5 (123), 1231, JMC, ARTIFF (137), 10, 0) THM CALL CLOWF (123, 134, 134, 137) (50) 10. Mainte (50) , until (50) , forue (50) IF (CONSTITUTION) FOR THE STATE OF THE STATE 0e116. F(IA7)-0 1 3 701.100(1.17) -ATR (8 (4) 21 1807 (1.17) - 21 1807 (1.17) - FULLDQ (1.17) AND THE STRATE OF ADDRESS WI THOU HE TRATE CALENDAR TO STRATE AND IS FLACTO IS THE DUBRY INTO COUNT IN AND AN FOR CONTRIANS WHE TAUF WA THOU THE FURTHER MADE AND FURTHER THOU THE FURTHER CALENDAR ANY FURTHER 5 1000 IT THE UNITE IN ADD AND ALMA DIA NI SALISO TYP DO 2000 J-1, IA4 ATRIB(11) -0 CALL PILAN(BTDQ, ATRIB) CLUM NOT 11 LIV. MOUT 11 LIV. M IN THE REAL OF BOIF CALL MOVE (1, NTDQ, ATNED) LAS CHES/FULLDO(19) CHES/ETART (54) CHES/HEMUL (44, 54) CHES/HAXE IF (IA10.BQ.0) THE 1214 (L.GL.M.) 11 IF (JMD(MIDD).07.0) MIN*-MUTE(NIDD) LA2-QSHT(MTNY+2) LA2-QSHT(MTNY+4) LA4-QSHT(MTNY+4) LA4-QSHT(MTNY+4) PTDQ-IAT+MADE 01 10010 00 70 2015 md/r/sarec50030-201 100-147-14101-2 001018-6 2 E 10/17/96 12:43 25/220 17 FIG DRIFE IN MIDD AND NOT DECOME TO COMPLY WITH THE DEPARTING DWIT LOAD MIDE FREM CAMPER DEPORT FO MARY CAN BE AMPCHED. 105.00) IF (LIMOVIA), FULLO(LAT), OL. MOVF(LAT) .AND. ZIMOV(LAT) 1.4. MALTACIAT)) FULL 3.4. CHALTATIAT) STITU ONE ONE OFFE 17 (100596(14.1).40.4) TRUM 1243-171410()-131(14.1).16.40404(14.1.4.1)) TRUM 17 (140(110)-131(14.1).16.40404(14.1).14.1) 18017 18017 ДДВ - / унс им. / ун 11 анл. _ тим/ МААМ. ; 110° аки/ оссол, исстратизать Сотарата, годи (шорт), Срепси, 11, ША, Он Англии, Исстон, Итурат, Манси, Макту, ИтАРВ, на (шорт), (шорт), тактит, граси, да (настити) 000/100719 (44.54), 000007 (34), 1000AP (44.54), 000007), #UBBCA, 100004 (34), 100AP, #0007, #00000 (34), #00000 ,#1#000(34), #A.RCA, #1#00A / UCCMS / # | 11 # 4) / UCCMS / # | (48) , YOTAL (48, 589) , WHI, IL/OT 8, MPANT 8, FOTLOI (156), moure(56), moure(56) (160, 50), ronga, figamer, pricore(60, 51) (96) (402 (50) , 402 (50) , 402 (50) , 403 (50) 0all6.f LITT, KPARTZ, KPARTJ, KPART4 2009 (54) L/ MALLAND, GAP1, GAP3, GAP3 5/ GAPGAP5, THAL71, THAL72, THAL73 7/ THOM 2 (40), THUMMO (40) 2/ THOM 2 (40), THUMMO (40) 8 2439 (05) 1438 (05) 1433 (05) 1433 139 (05) 144403 (05) 1440 139 (05) 14443 (05) 1463 (05) PHE UNIT LOAD HAS A COMPARISON DO 2005 J-1, IA10 AML2(11)-11 (A10 AML2(11)-11 (A10) AML2(11)-11 (A10) B-1A4-1A10 DO 2000 J-1, M DO 2000 J-1, M CALL FILM(MTOQ, AML8) CALL FILM(MTOQ, AML8) (40.30). (40.30). D(40.30). CALL MCHIN(1A7, MDQ) CALL MACHIN(IA7, NTOQ) 00 TO 2069 MOUP In succession. 1111 THE (MILLAL. MAI) 41 FUNDOTISE K1 (LAT, HIDQ) mdirt sar 8c50030-201ps. COMMON GENTILEADADD /DCORD/mmCH CLARK COLOR Ì 5 1 ī











10/17/96 13:43 36/220 IN THIS SCIENTIC PARTY AND IT ANTOING AND LEAVE ONE BY ONE. Not verify if the theytong barton has confleted and their confleteme cutics. If the main must to an processio blioning to a particity. Processio unit load, mild rendering the domin lanct bury notyge of 147 IP NIS STATUS IS FTILL LUNG IT MANN NE MAN SUT INVLATE IN MATERIAL MANDLING ACTIVITIES IF (MORTHAN), CAL CONTRACTOR (CAL), CAL CONTRACTOR (CAL) OTLAG-1 MANNE THE QUINE ON DOMAY LINCE MUTTER OF MACHINE 1A7 MOULD BE CHICKED FOR PARTS MALFING TO BE PROCEEDED. APLAGAT IS UPED AT THE FIG REMOVEME TO POINT OF THE FIEL POLY YOUR TO BE IS MICH CLUED FORM A DEPAYOR FEDALLO IS MICH FIE DEPARTING ONLY MOULD BA ALLOWED TO MOULD IS MICH FIE THE MAT'S BOTTON. IF (187, GL.2, AND, MO(HIDO), MO.8, AND, MULA(187), MO.1) THEN CALL FRENCH (183, 147) 11 00-117 - 41 02 19 (1717, 03. 3. AND. A.E./00(1171) - 190. 1. AND. MNQ (11100) - 190. 10 19 (1717, 03. 3. AND. A.E./00(1171) - 190. 1. AND. MNQ (11100) - 190. 10 / (1940) (19) // 1940) (19) // 1940) (19) // 1940) (19) / 1971 (19) / 1970 (19) // 1941 (19) / 1942 (19) cell6. 007 [H2 [[27] -077 [H2 [[27]) + (7404- 57407 | [27])) 707 (27 | 27] -707 (27]) + (7404- 57407 | [27]) } 575 ([27]) -908066 IF (MALDAC. 20.2) FIER SUCCEDING (1.2) OF MALLER (1.2)) FIER CALL THRACO(1.27) MADIP MADIP F (#40(#100).47.4) Mut 17 (#0400(100(137)).40.2) FMM #0017(10(137)).40.2) 2011 #00114(137,#100) HYDM THE (E.OR. (LAI) (DODD) 41 CHANGE DELY LOAD SILE TO 1. MILL DC(11)-147 IF (MOCD(LAT). NO. 2) THEN HOPFTA(IOP(LAT))-0 MOLF 17 (ATMUN(11), 20.1) THEN ATMUN(10)-101 CONNOM/UCCH11/RIABUT (54) CONNOM/UCCH48/JAAUTO CALL FILTCO(LA1, IAT) mdirl xarec50030-201pe, 1 IT (OTIAG. M. 1) THE ATTACION-0 PPATU(IA7)-0 VIR.73 (4) -1.0 (E) - WIND (3) -----Ĩ 1-0410 1 . 0/11/96 13:41 31/220 Commod/(DC)(DC)(DC)(14), actro1(14), actro1(14), actro1(14), actro1(14), Commod/(DC)(DC)(14), actro1(14), actro1(IF FOD METER ACTIVITY AF THE MACHINE IS AN INSPECTION ON PART PART OF UNIT JACAN ARA EMBORING PARK THE QUERT PART PART PART OF UNIT JACAN ARA BADRED CARACITY PART PART AND DARFED BADAR CANACITY AFT FOR RELEVAL. common/ transf/ foot17 (se 2 a), coccer (se 1 a), / coccer (se 2 a), coccer, isotaco(se), search (coccer (se 2 a), colorada, and coccer, search (se), secret that transford(se), at the coccer (search 1942.002 */ncw/jeilam_rov/MAM.jac* 1942.002 scont.statamtrai.joulusopi.joolusopi.joolusopi.joma. 1840.0.2020.ucton.ittern.atolu.asisty.frikat.es.(1867). composit occurs / major composit (occurs / major composit (occurs / major composit (occurs / major) , composit (44, 344) , major a , mantes , top Lop .OMA. (TAI) TTOM. COMPACTION (1994), 1994,11, 1994,11, 1994,11, 1994,14 COMPACTION (1, 1994,1934), 1994,1994, 1994,1994, COMPACTION (1, 1994,1934), 1994,1994, 1994,1934 COMPACTION (1, 1994,1934), 1994,1994,1994,1934 COMPACTION (1, 1994,1934), 1994, 1994,1994,1934 COMPACTION (1, 1994,1934, 1994,1934), 1994,1934 COMPACTION (1, 1994,1934, 1994,1934), 1994,1934 200000/00006/100208(56), 0001(56), 0002(56), 0023(56) 0e116. COMPONING CONTINUATION, MANYE, OPHICE, NOTION, MALALID COMPONING COMPONING SUFER, SUFFIC 17 ((1119907(147),041100(147)).48.) 319807(147).14.18077(147)) 7108 2111.0124(147) 21019 CALL POC (APLAO, DPLAO, PPLAO, LAT) RIDO-IA7.HARM LTR, MORETH 17 (PPLAG. BQ. 0) THEN R, wdir1 sarec50030-201ps. FURNOUTINE DINI (1A7) COMICAL GETT (688888) /ucout/int) NOIN CONTRACT computer (Condity computer (Condity computer (Condity computer (Condity 1, Phop) ((0, 59) NTAQ-1 1100































70/220 131.46 INTERNACE DELAYED. IF THERE ARE, TYCHIA MIG. THEN DDTATA AFLAA-1 SCH THAT AF POC FAN MODEL CHOCKS FOM OFFIAN Maillanility. Offianter frantis and lart maching and microfine 1990: 1990:1991: After and thatistogal strup, the afful unter of TICH. IP T ON. (TAT) TOP IF FILE REFEATIVITY AF THE MACHINE IS AL INDUCTION MARY MACHERISAL ANTI LUAN AL BEDRON PROM FILE OF FILETONL, IF BROULD AN CHARLEN IF THE GUERT WAL AND CANALITY PALLON TO BREAVEL AND DROVATED BREAM CAPACITY FILE BROAML. DELATED. 10 61160 17 (11.10 - R0.3) THEM 17 (microst): 00.31 THEM 18 (microst): 00.31 THEM 19 (microst): 00 THEM 19 (microst): 00 19 (microst): 00 19 (microst): 00 10 17 (1974-10) 19, 948 17 (1916-14), 19, 50 2020(137), 42 2118-212, 12, 2020(137), 718-2024, 0384(137) 2024, 0384(137) 2024 THE REMOVAL OF THE DET J THE REMARIO IS SUCCES DEDMALO IS TYAD OR PT T AND IT IS REMOVED AT MAC common/uccent/1ff1 common/cocent/1ff1 common/cocent/1/mismp199) common/cocent/1/mismp199) common/uccent/1/mismp199) common/uccent/1/mismp199) Although the second sec CALL POC (AFIAO, DFLAO, FELAO, 1A7) ALL ANY 77 (MAUPO, RQ. 1) 71111 77140-14 711, MUCCT (137, FF140) 71 (FF140, RQ. 8) 7102 00 TO 3114 2017 2017 CHECK IF THERE AND ANY GIVE THICKEN CRECK FIRST IF THERE AL PPLAG-4 CULL BREG(1A7, PPLAG) 17 (1PLAG, BQ, 4) TNEM 20 TO 3110 MOTP mdiriareo50030-201pe. IF (PFLAG. BQ. 6) THE 1111-1021(117) (110-0027(1177-10) 10-147-111 1-94-14 Ĩ 3 10/17/96 13:46 69/220 ATTEN AND (05)0TATE 00(130) Fill Service (17) 143, 2000 139, 2000 143, 29), 2000 04, 1000 1431, 10, 1000 140, 1000 05 159, March Siling 1 IP (HOPPTA(IOP(IAT)).BQ.6.OH. (HOPPTA(IOP(IAT)).BQ.1.AHU 1.Lanthan(IOP(IAT)).BQ.IAT)) THEN 1961,005 * / Accar/ jei 1 and _ Too/ MAAAA * 1 gc* comout accord / Scott / Statial institution / Dol (1997) * Dol (1997) * Dol (1997) * Dol (1997) * 1 arba, 1 astroo, actual, accob, artister, mactor, and ref arbade, and (1971) * NON' UCCHA /A (198) NON' UCCHA /A (198) (POTAL (48, 384) , NW, ITLOFE, NWAITE, TOTLOF I GRIVING R AN SUCH. Phone demanding this summorphing is called only if is available, thos the 'Elds' does for Apply. uche(54) , matter(54) , matter (34) uche(54) , matter (54) , matter (34) THE CALLED FROM MARYAL, MACHINE FRATOS (8 5500 Ē 39. COMPOR/UCCAME/LIGEDIG (20), BUTL (50), BUTL (50), 2009) (50) 3.116.5 IF (MONCOLLAT), MO.4) THEM MITFIE(1, 1904) POMARTIX, TBROCH A MONTHE WITH MONCO-4 DOFF OPMARTIX, TBROCH A WORLIN') OPERATOR TO PERTORM A WORLIN') MOLE MERADOR (1A7) BOOLF MERICALLED PROM AN AURIVAL SCHWAIO, FREE FLACED IN QUEUE AT THAT SCH. MICH CALLED FF FRE MATTY WAS ALMEADY IN QUEUE. MOR/ UCORT / MALATIM, MANYE, OPHDF, HDPM, MALALD MOR/ UCOM6 / STYTE, SUT IN MOR/ UCOM6 / STYTE, 40, 50, 200001158) I TATATA 00000/0001/0778(34),40000(34),40000(34), 00000/0001(34,34),50100(34),5010(34,34), 1000(34,34),5010(34,34),5010(34,34),501 1000(34,34),5010(34),5010(34),5010(34,34), 1000(34,34),5010(34),1010(34),5010(34),5010 1000(34,34),5010(34),1010(34),5010(34),5010 1000(34,34),5010(34),1010(34),5010(34),5010 1000(34,34),5010(34),1010(34),5010(34),5010 1000(34,34),5010(34),5010(34),5010(34),5000 1000(34,34),5000(34),5000(34),5000(34),5000 1000(34,34),5000(34),5000(34),5000(34),5000 1000(34,34),5000(34),5000(34),5000 1000(34,34),5000(34),5000(34),5000 1000(34,34),5000(34),5000 1000(34,34),5000(34),5000 1000(34,34),5000(34),5000 1000(34,34),5000(34),5000 1000(34,34),50 comical (com) / (com) COMPOSITION OF A MARKET, STRAFT, STRAFT, MARKET, MARKET HETATU (1.2.7) -5 DOTATICOE (1.2.17) -5 CULL PTPROE (1.2.7) - (1.2.7) LATTRE (1.2.7) -45018 LATTOR HETOR LAFTM (10P(LAT)) -LAT BETUP-0 CALL BUTIM (1AT, MUTH, STTUP) CALL BOOL(11, STTUP, ATALB) CALL COPY (1, 1A7, ATRID) X00000/UCORD/MAACH X00000/UCORD/MAACH mdiri sarecs0030-201ps, ustico(50), surged, 1 Auro(50), strato(50) COMMON QUEF(688888) 1, PROP) (44, 54) FUNCTINE CRAME 10 Î 8 88888


























13:49 98/220 NTO(50) Lec (50) L, MINNE, GRUDF, KOPNA, MLLELD 1993 1994 - St. Coccore (391, Koccare (39, 501, Caccore 1994 - St. Caccure, (391, Koccare (391, MISBECA, 1, MLCL, 61 MEA A/DOOMA/A (186) A/DOOMA/ INF (46) , TOTAL (46, 384) , INN, ILOTS , INALTS , TOTLOT 00 70 (3341,3342,3343,3344,3345,3345,3347,3347,3342,3351 1) QAIMD 12 JIICLUUB '/neou/jetises_tes/paaal.jIIC' comou/souristia (attra) (attra) (attra) (attra) attro: rcian, locial, attra) (attra), lociary (attra) attiaty) ; teart, from, attron, andre, atta?, so (attry) ; 1001/100006/10010(30), 4091 (30), 4092 (50), 409 (30) 00116. /000415/1000-04/1000-04/1 /000415/74040-04/1 /000415/74040-04/1 /000417/740419(1), 14044-1401 /000415/740518, 1401418, 140044,1 #02/000019/8242014 (34), 629 (34), #03/000020/982840 (34), 925427 (34) #03/000021/982840 (34), 925427 (34) #03/0000214/9780020 (44, 34), 94097 (P [IAG. IN. MACHS[IA1]) 900 CALL GEOMP(IA2, IAG, IAG, IA7) DIP ALL BOID (13, 507188, ATALB) LIMUT (147) - LIMUT (147) - ATALB (4 SUPPOTING ON (PERCENTING) (C. (CAD. FUND. (CAD). GATH-MILD SELE OT OD SELECTION (66. -**619149 - 8161) (141 - 83188** COLL CALER (MILL, FOTIM) SOLD CALL CALER (MILL, FOTIM) FOTQA-TOTOR-FOTIMS 00.114-141104(04-1,04-1,1) 00 10 1151 CALME-RLOOM (DAP1, DAP2,) COMPOR/DOORD2/KINBUP (58) mdiriantec50039-201pe. 04188-22709(0471,3) 00 70 3352 COMPANY DOOM / MARCH COMPANY MARCH /UCONT/WALKED DERCO(50), NUMBCA, 1 MECO(56), MERCO(56) COMDM/ 000024 / IITer 1, 1909 1 (46, 59) 000001/ 00004 / IEE BINN, I-1 5210 00 2 Ĩ 3 2 ž 5 346 022/16 23:45 31/230 **2017 (COTTP (4, 54), COCORT (54), 1 (COCAP (4), 54), CACORT** , INVERCA, 1 CONTR (39), 1 CALERIE, INCORTY, INDECC (36), JOCH , IC INCO (36), MARCA, IL INCA con/occon/a/100) con/occon/a/100) con/occon/art(40), forma/(40, 500), mm, store, meares, forlor omou/10com/(contry (4), 50), cocome(50), (cocom/(50), coco astoc(50), sumsca, (cocou(50), (caston, scorr, streeco(50), jaca astoc(50), streec(50), (astoc, streeco, streeco) /UCOMA/A (198) /UCOMA/HP (48) , TOTAL (48, 504) , MML, SLOFS, MMART 8, TOFLO CON(56) , PROUTE (54) , PROEUE (56) ECR(46,56) , FOTQA, FQARME, PROOF (48,51) (50), MoUTP(50), MOED (50) (40, 50), TOTOA, TOAMA, MECOT (40, 51) MUCD (54), MCCD (54) COMPON/UCCAM / INFUDIA (56) , INCUT (56) , INCUT (56) , INCUT (56) MART, UTATI, 26 (MQT) //UCCMM/HSGD19(59), SUP1(50), SUP2(50), MUP3(50) Call6. METPAC (39), MARTY (30), MARTY (30), MARY (30, 30), CLARTY (32, 30), LOUGH (34, 30), MARY (31), MAR (31), MARY (34, 30), MARY (31), MARY (31), MAR (31), MARY (31), MARY (31), MARY (31), MALAC (31), MARTY (30), MARY (30), LANTHA (31), MALAC (31), MARTY (30), MARY (30), LANTHA (31), MALAC (31), worker (35), Janier (35), Janie CON/DOORT/MAILER, MANYE, CONDY, NOTES, MALELD CON/DOORT/MARKET, BOT 18 UTCORT ANTARN, MANY, OPHDP, NDPM, MURU INCOMPANY INCOMPANY scord of Mariet 1, Intrast2, Intrast3, Mariets Scord 1/1 Scord # (5 8) PERSONAL COMPLEX CONTRACT (PERSON) O DOC /041 MD. 0491. 0492. 0493 (001, 001, 001) (100, 110, 100) 7/90000 (40) , 90000 (40) (05) (10) (20), S N.P.(40), ThOMP(40) CIN, TBEL(IN, THOMP(40) 1051 (1051 (100) (54), MOPCD (54), 38), 18077719(34), VUTCHII / MTYPE (50) , MORED (50) , C (50) , MAUPY (50) , MUTYP (50) , 10101, 1011, 1011 10101, 1011, 1011 1011, 1011, 1011, 1011 /www.intint/man/. PHONE, XX (MORY encer/uccent 9/ stitut a (5 9) , a encer/uccent 9/ stitut a (5 9) , a encer/uccent 1/ jetterat(5 9) , a encer/uccent 1/ jetterat(5 9) , a (METOP, MCLAM, MCMCM, MITMAT, B (MEL(MACT), STELTY, STOW, KE(M ALC: NO. FUNCTING ATM (EAT) wdiri tarec50030-201pe KOR/ UCCUID / MARCH KOR/ UCCUID / MUE., M COMPANY UCCUS / MARCH 2000010000247000 190073 (44,54) 190073 (44,54) ULUI DIDAN/ CALL ATM (LAT) SECO(50) -

0/17/96 13:49 100/220 IL NUMBER OF VED TO Q.A. W/S ALL ANRIVAL DIRON, 11, MEA. (1997). /4(100) /#6 (00), 508AL (00, 300), 1878, 18.078, 18.075.07 Call6.0 Ę MUE THOSE CONTAINED IN MAICH THE PARTS ONCE INFECTION MAS MER CONFLICTO. 507801113, (A13) -907801(1A2, (A13) -988.90 8048 ((A1) -8048 ((A1) -486.90 Leony ((A1) -6048 ((A1) -486.90 SCIEDCLS ŝ LAK-AMIRI(6)-1 AMURI(15)-LAN MURI-AMURI(14, LA) 17 HINNAL (1812)10, 20, 5) THE 12 LOCA COLL MUNICAL (187, 09-LAC) COLL MUNICAL (187, 09-LAC), MURI LEG CALL PIMODE IF THIS IS THE LAFT TO THE MARY MACHINE IN THE THE POTEL OL. W/S SHOULD MAY BODE MARKALL, IT IS PERFORED BY A MAY MITTLE CALL CALL STARK (MMC, 1313, GARGE) TOAME -TOAME, OAMET CALL SCOLUTION (14, GAMET, ATT 13) IF THERE IS ABACK TO BE DOTI. 1944 (242, 1412) - 1944 (242, 2412) +1 Artis (16) - 4ft (210) - 26230 (2 (21405(16) - 07.6) - 1923 Aft (2 (11) -1 NUMBER OF STREET, OF S IF (146.90.MCH0(1A2)) CALL PSHODE(1A7) IP (NECA(117). BO.1) THE CALL PRECA(121,137) MDIP ELAB IF (OUTING, LF, (B+R)) -MME-MME,1 (ALLCO(147), BQ.1) THE CALL PRESCO(142, 147) DO 3368 J-1, #8118 001186-08978(0.0,1.0,5) IF (OUTINE.LF.S) THEN INGUICHTENBC+1 mdirisared50030-201ps. (MAR. OL. 4) THEN DATE (- THEN L(10, 10) Ì Į Ē . h 00000 10/11/196 13:49 99/210 COMPORTO DO CONTINUES IN ANY CONTO, INDIA, MILELO COMPONICONTINTE (18, 30) COMPONICONTINUES (18, 30)) aon_rao/Palkaki ; jic' (akirte) , do(atiqt) , dok(akigt) , dfaqa, 11, afa iriatr, akirik, akiatr, arkart, akiatiqt) , 04/0006/A1200 04/0006/A72(40), 907A3(40, 500), MW, A1070, MAATA, 507409 10) , Muttye (50) , Mustar (50) 10, 50) , Fottar, Factor (40, 51) (06) (409) (26) 2403 (26) 2404 (26) 2403 (26) 2403 (20) MHN0. 04116. Ês Q(50,40), 10, (0) Q(50,40), 100 , 100, 10), 100 109CD(50), 16UCD(50), 10TY2(50), 180CD(50, 50 PARTE, CTANTE, STRATE, у Англи У Алтер, амт. амг. амг. амг. / телиа, теаг. таане (а) 7/теан (а), таане (а) 9/теог. таан. 2) [428 , (65) [428 , (65) 5 70,23 / 4 10/20 / 100 1005 , (165) [70,421 / 10,00 / 10,00 / 100 1015 , (165) [70,421 / 10,00 / 10,00 / 10,00 / 100 1025 , (65) [70,421 / 10,00 / OR/ UCORDS/ ACTUA (46) . LACTUA (46) . OR/ UCORD 3/ MANALL (56) . MALE (16.5 191 22-197 (1A4-2MI-191) 01111-1110(011.017.3) 00 50 3333 COMMON/ UCCNED / WINE, MAREAUL CALINE-CAMA (QAP1. QAP2, 3) CATHERDRAN (CAP1, CAP1, 3) L'ANAMA / O PA odiriantec60030-201ps. (0,30) 1(0,30) 1111 BALIND-BULLOS-BALINO-HICLORE / No mu/ Jul SCHOOTINE COATHE LAL-4710(1) (A)-47710(1) (A)-47710(1) (A)-47710(1) (A)-47710(1) (A)-47710(1) 0 IVI-1910 201 00 00 CALCOLOGY OF **Internation** 56 1 1 5 22







108/220 13:49 DELAYID. 17 TIGHT ML. ally interficien occurs once the original was mere completed. A machine its willing the original its interest at all yield, the on its assumed to the available. cumical/ucomi/(corre)(a), 5000m; (si), 1000.01(a), 30), 5000m; Rubico(si), Rubico, 1000m(si), 100m; Roberto (si), Rubico Imatoo(si), Ritheo(si), Matela, Rithea a/uccess/A(188) 8/uccess/m/(48), scrau(48, 588), min, m.ors, maarte, forl.or 1 */ neov/ jut loen_ree/PAAAN. 180* Poom/ Arte (antria). Do (neor). Do (neor). Ecom, Parte (antria). Neoroy. Neory. Neory. 181: 2071, 181. Metro, 181 (neory). Neory. Neory. (16.61) (UCOMA) (PAREDAC, INCANDA? (54), UPP1 MB (54), FOFUP (54) (POCOMA 2 / MAXEM acadrocom / Jarren (sa), acadoo (sa), acadoo (sa), acoo (sa), aco (sa), acoo 000 (000 (000 (00) , 0001 (00) , 0001 (00) , 0001 (00) , 000) (00) Cell6. . ШАЛТ 2, ИПАЛТ 3, ИРАЛТ 4 139) 138) - РИССР (58) , ИЛСП 7 (58) 138- 39) , ТОТСА, ТОДИНС, РИССР 1 138- 39) , ТОТСА, ТОДИНС, РИССР 1 NT. OPNER, NETTAL, WLALE JALD DILLO, CAPT, CAPT, CAPT UNLO, FINLESI, FINLESI, FINLESI DALIP (44), FINCHAP (46) DOLIP, FILLIR, FINCHAP, FARLAN NECK IF FILDE ME ANT NEVLENISHED NOTTIN MUPIQ(LAT, OPLAG, NOPLAG) 1001 (30) . 74/100001 \$ / 661.01 (15) , 669 24/100002 \$ / 860.00 (5) ; 600 24/100001 / 10.0000 (5) ; 620 24/100001 / 10.0000 (4) ; 59 / , 1 NICK 17 THERE AND ANY AUTO Princes Call Miroch (147, Princ) (Princ, 10, 6) Princ (177, 10, 15) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) 00000 /TLATT (30) NOPSTA(LOP(IA7))-0 CALL DEPTIN(LA7) ELSE (F (INDP(IAT).BQ.1) THEM CALL MYCE (1A7, PPLAO) IP (177440, BQ, 0) THUN SO TO 3530 MON/UCOND/ MAACH MON/UCOND/ MUL, MAELAL CALL MACHIN(1A7, #100) MOPETA(100(1A7))-1 15/04/mb mdiriareo50030-201ps. PTA(10P(1AT))-0 100001 12 -107/22 67:01 36/17/0. IT THE ALL THE coment/promity/contry (46, 36), occome (36), (foocale (46, 54), (accoment strategroups), transfer, footoent (36), (clariful, incomer, incomer, incomer), income strategroups), instrategrap, instrate, instrate 22 IND ON THE M(56) , MOUTP(56) , PROERT (56) M(46, 56) , TOTQA, TQAME, PHOOFT (46, 51) **CONNEXT UTCOMA 1/ ANNEXNEXT (3 0) , UPPE INT (30) , FOOTOP (30)** CONNEXT (2006 / 1/ AUTO cell6.f RIATO. CONDY, NOTIN, MALELD V (CCM1) / SEL.D1 8 (5 0) , SEP (5 0) , SEP (2 0) , V (CCM2 / NEPHOL (5 0) , SEVAT (5 0) , SEVAP 2 / (CCM2 / NEPHOL (5 0) , SEVAP 1 (3 0) , SEVAP 2 / (CCM2 / NEPHOCC ((4 0 , 5 0) , PACP 1 (4) , 5 0) , / (CCM2 / NEPHOCC ((4) 5 0) , PACP 1 (4) 5 0) , / (CCM2 / NEPHOCC ((4) 5 0) , PACP 1 (4) 5 0) , / (CCM2 / NEPHOCC ((4) 5 0) , PACP 1 (4) 5 0) , / (CCM2 / NEPHOCC (4) 5 0) , / (CCM2 / NEPHOCC (4) 5 0) , / (CCM2 / NEPHOCC (4) , / (CCM2 / NEPHOCC) , / (CCM2 / NEPOCC) , / (CCM2 / NEPHOCC) NUT INTEGED UNITS IN DUMIT INFUT BUTTEN DUMOUTINE TO PROCEED THE UNITS. and the second of second 1, second 2, second 4 and the second 1 / 1 action is a 1 5/ 04/1950, 0491, 0492, 0493 6/ 190940, 1914421, 1946793, 1914679 7/ 190442 P (48), 19151449 (48) 4/ 1920218, 2481218, 7400244, 19812444 NH ((141)-100-10 ALL WITS 18 THE UNIT LOND AND BOOD ALL CHITS IN THE UNIT LOAD AND MAL BAD. 8 THE DIT LOAD MAR & COMPLANTION 71100-0 CLL BECK(1A7, PF1A0) 17 (PF1A0, A0, 0) 7123 17 (1000(100(1A7)) - 30, 2) 75 CIRCL FIRD IF THEME AND MY OF THOME. Do 3946 J-1. [A119 Anila - [] Anil Filiano, Am (3) Do 3945 J-1. [] Amula (3) - 6 Amula (3) - 7 Amula DO 3496 J-1, IA4 AMIR(1)1-6 CAL FILM(RIDQ, ATTID) 00 TO 3538 DO 3495 J-1, 144 ATRUB(11)-1 CALL FILM(INTO, ATRUB) 00 TO 3328 17 (1711) 111 (1711) 111 (1711) CALL PILER(#100. ATR 18) 40 To 3529 IF (MMCDAC.RQ.2) \$4400 IF (UPTIME[IAT)..97.00 CALL UTMAND(IAT) IMOLP NUTLES OF 17 (1416.3Q.1A4) THIM IF (1410.14.14) THE IT (LALO. BQ. 0) THEFT mdiri zarec50930-201pe 191/peon/uneed/1ff1 LA 4-ATRES (4) LA 7-ATRES (7) LA 10-ATRES (7) LA 10-ATRES (10) PIDQ-LA 7-MARK 10 3565 100 1135 -1

110/320 12149 127/96 18110(50,50), 0 (40,50), m(50), 100), 121(40), 1212, mrhru(30), 1212, mrhru(30), AMBJC (50). comment/coom// control e4, 54), coocer (34), coocer (44, 54), carcer reserved (34), acteria (24, coorer (34), carcer, acter reserved (34), attraction (34), reserved (34), acteria IRCIUM '/MOU'JATI LOOL TO ANALS' IN' Common/Social Matter (1993) Co (1967) Cox (1967) Comov, II, at a. INCO: F.C.JAN, ACAN, ATHON, INDIA ', ATA', 56 (1967) . Ed. (1971) , for Tr., Todar, J.C. (19620) совпожутоског) / Мака Совожутоского / Мака Совожутоского / 1181 Совожитоского / 1881 (1881 , 1882) - 1883 , 1883 / 1885 / 1895 / 1895 / 1895 / 1895 / 1895 / 1895 / 1895 / 1 comport/some/iconfields/se/,se/,cocoff(361,icocafi(36),cacof housecolse/submit/iconfields/iconfields/iconfields/iconfields/imo haveolse/,niteol(361,acoc,itied) 0) , 52/2 (30) , 529 (50) (30) , 50%-2 (50) , 50%-20) (31) , 50%-2 (50) , 53%-20) (32) , 52%-2 (50) , 53%-20) an to (3681, 3682, 3483, 3484, 3485, 3486, 3487, 3489, 3699, 3631, 3 () studis(187) (10.31) compositores (1940) (40, 34) , forgal, goanne, groopp (46, 31) compositoros (7/9400479 (44) , forgale (46) compositoros (7/9400479 (44) , forgale (48) Ē 000000/00006/10016(50) , 6091 (50) , 6092 (50) , 6093 (50) COMDOC/000018/794471, IRMART, IRMART, IRMART, IRMART, COMDOCH 2/794471, IRMART, IRMART, IRMART, IRMART, IRMART, COMDOCH 2/7942241(3), PROCEED 159) COMDOC/000013/7942241(3), PROCEED 159) COMDOC/000013/7944524(4), 50), PROCEED 159, COMDOC/000013/79445241 0e116. 22100-70100(4211(121), 6221(121), 622)(121), 9) 00 70 3612 COMPACTORY/VALATIN, RAVIE, OFICE, ROTAL, MALALO COMPACTOROMI/ ADTES., ADTES., ADTES 821865-099 m(8891 (147), 6293 (147), 9) 00 TO 3612 0211111-1111, (1211, (1211, 1211, 131), 9) 00 10 10 111 421145-ANDM (4271 (1471, 4572 (1471, 5) 60 To 3612 (MP1 (147), 602 (147), 9) REMOVER MEN (MEN (147), MEN (147), 9) 00 TO 3612 CAN, CAN, CAN 10, 107-0000 (127), 1272 (127), 9) 00 10 3612 # (141) 5033, (141) (503) 410-417 (141) , 91 COMMOR/UCCMT 9 / 8 IL/D 18 (39) , 8 IP COMMON/UCCMD 8 / 18 CUMD (39) , 8 UN COMMON/UCCMD 1 / 18 IIP COMMON/UCCMD 1 / 18 IIP COMMON/UCCMD/ 1 f f 1 61 MEN-EROM (6271 (1471, 9) 00 10 3412 TOP [H6-POP | M6+8% | R0P COMMON (0447 (69999) mdirisarec50030-201pe SUBSORTING CSTLIN (TA2) 1920-04415 DO 3612 J-1, 1A10 MINIMUM (almetrib(2) ş 5 513 ŝ ĩ 9 ŝ ŝ ŝ 5 E 13149 109/220 17/96 FACE A FORMETICAN WITH MACHINE DEPRICUSE IS FAMPE BACH REFIET IN FAIL COFFOR BACTER MAINEMENTS A CONTRACTION OF OTHER WITH IS TO OFFORM MALUE IN THEIDURE IS REPAREMENTED FOR MANAGE OF BACOD UNITS IN FAIL CONTRACT the association with department scenario 4 is that back matter is orthot butten hermestate con unit with a cancer value on Attellar 19. THE ORL RECEIPTOR TO THE ADOUT IS WHE ADOUT IS THE ADOUT IMPECTION IN MITTE-) MIGHT BE COINT IN PARLIEL NUMCESSING 30, 30) 01, **m**(50), 1 (01), 1 . **m**(30), In March (50) 1902.008 * / ycc w/ jul 1 am_ zw/ MAMM * 100* 1902.008 / com / yrt 11 jun ym y Dollwyd y 104 (1909) , Driwaw 11, mfa, 1909 / actim, Jicson, Jinter, Jindary (1907) , 1914 (1909) , 1914 (1907) : Yenzir , Piccon, Jal (1902) (1907) comical (recoit / march) comical (recoit / march) comical (recoit / march) comical (recoit / march) , fortal (40, 500) , mm, march, marth, fortar COMMON/UCCUM//INSTIDIA(54), MOP1(54), MOP2(54), MOP3(54) 04116.1 IF (MDEPSC(1A7).BQ.18 .OR. MDEPSC(1A7).BQ.4) THE li ig ŝ Martin C. M. Martin (19), Ma 17 (HTTR (1A7), HR.)) - 100H 077140 (1A7) - 077140 (1A7) - 1707140 19709 (1A7) - 170709 (1A7) - 1707146 FURNOUTING SELING (IA10, IA7, TOTING) 118-47418(19) 2.42. 41.188 (2.10, 4.7, 407.189) 2.42. 40.60.4(5, 707.189, 7.71.19) 0.71.18 (1.27) -407.189 0.71.18 (1.27) -407.189 1.70.19 (1.21) -407.189 ROOD-IAY-MART III-STORIES FORDIES FORD CALL BIREIP (11/2), EEPELU CALL BIREIP (11/2), EEPELU FIELLA-FIEL (# FOULD FIELLA-FIEL (# FOULD) CALL BOOD(15, FOULD) IF (NCPLAG. 20. 8) THEN BOOG-LAT-HAZH'S CALL FILMS (NOOQ, ATRIB) MOUT IF (MTTH (LAT), 20, 9) THEM TASTS (LAT) - THOM-TOTIME MOLT NOPETA((0P((A7))=7 1P (NOPCO((A7), NG.3) 74034 NETATO((A7)=7 MOLP COMPOSITI UNCORT / MAURINAL COMPACITY OF COM mtiri sarec50030-2010 NOT OT 0-111 JOJ A LOU Ĩ ļ 3330



































\$117/96 13:53 146/320 ing(50) ab 70 (9421,9422,542),3624,5429,5436,9427,5420,5429,5639,3431 1,5442,5443) #09274(1) 00 70 (3631,3632,363),3634,3634,3634,3634,3639,3639,3669,3641 1,3662,3661] MTRAPULS 100-150, MACH (19, 39), 100-00 (30), MACH (30), 100 (40), 111 (40), 101-02 (40, 50), MACH (30), 24 (50), MACH (20, 40), MACH (30), MACH 101-02 (40, 50), 144 (20), 24 (50), MACH (20), MACH (30), 144 (20), 14 Common/cooses/ / mark/ common/cooses / mark/ common/cooses / mark/ common/cooses / mark/ , process/ common/cooses / mark/ , process/ common/cooses / mark/ , mark/ common/cooses / mark/ common/coos 0e116.1 ME IL AT CATCHES! IP (MORTA(I). IQ. 0) THEM ROMOP (1, 14)- INDOP (1, 14)-1 00 TO 3644 BHDIP 17 (MATATOLS). 20. 0) 7404 ROMA (1, 14)-80164 (1, 14)-1 00 10 3664 ROMP mirte((, 543) Point(11, 'finon noeth Can Call menad(1) 20 to 544 1+(11,11)-manue(1,11)+1 20 70 5444 1+([1,1])-B080+([1,1])+1 #CBOP(1,1)-#CBOP(1,1)+1 00 70 5644 1+([,])40000-([,])40000 10809 (1, 4) -10809 (1, 4) +1 00 To 5644 11000(1,5)-#0000(1,3)+1 00 70 5664 100000 (1, 6) -#00000 (1, 6) +1 00 70 5644 1+16'1140000*11'31+1 REALS (1, 1) - FORMA (1, 1) +1 20 TO 5664 1. (1.1) ANNUAL (1 1. ((' 1) Marca- ((' 1) Marca () . () . (1+(1,4)-4044(1,4)+1 1-15.11 mdiritarec50030-201pe. DO 5464 [-1. HAND D0 3644 1-1, POP COPY I HUL 5 3 3 3 5 2 5 3 12 3 2 2 2 2 2 22 2 13153 145/220 omear/orcan /mrtf#1(9), worco(34), worco(34), worco(34), manaec(34), cratero(15), worcy (34), worcy (34), worco (35), 34), aforo(35), 34), cratero(35), 35), 261 Pr(35, 36), genue (35), amorto(35, 34), PUT FILMT IN GUTUE FAIT CARLE FAIT THE QUEUE PRIORITY CHOREN BY THE USEN. GNOT GIRD AND DIA HI SAIND GOOD P), DOL (MOT), DERON, 11, MPA, MIT, FTATE, SQ (MOT). TRIAD-5 WITH AFLAD-1 TELLS THE PCC BURNOFINE THAT THE CALLING MACHINE MICHT MICHT MEED AN OPENATOR. ACLUDY THE ji k 0e116. (#1.44, 10, 1.40, 1.400 (#1.1), (#.8) Manual Manua Manual Manu Manual Manua CALL POCIATIAS (FLAG, FTLAG, MLK(I.J)) 18 (FTLAC, NJ, 4) THEN 00 TO 5550 MULT (1000)(1011(1,J)).30.1) 7100 17 (122.10.144794(1004(1,J)) 7100 THERE IS ROTHING MITTING IN QUEUE RELACION Calis OPULL (MELE (1, J), QRLAO, RELAO) VIALTY IF A STITUT IS STUDIO DETENDED IN THEME AND ANY TO BE PROCEEDED. ((('I)) THE ACEDA (TTC)) CALL INCOMPONING (I. J. , ITDQ) P. NCLAR, MCHCR., NPART, MCP1, THERT, THOM, EX wdiri sarec60030-201ps. 17 (OTMO. 10.0) THEM PTDQ-HBLK (1, J) +HAJBY 80 TO 3399 11017 11017 /mem/jut (00000) ALIO 10 PURNOUT IT AATOM 00 70 3376 CONT INUT 10114 . 102 i 0000


0/11/96 13:53 150/220 MATE WATER IN THE DUMP MATE WATTHO IN THE DUMP MATE WATTHO IN THE MAIN DUFTER. Ē IF THING ALL IF THE REAL IS A CHANGE IN UNIT LOAD BILL THE PARTS AND REAVY TO GO IF THE RUMMER IN THE RUPPEN IS THE AME AN IDENVL(113,117). THE OFFICE METTER MAR TO MANAGO. MARINE FOR COMMUNICATION OF DATA TO COMPLETE THE DUTY LOOP, IT THEY AND THEY NO TO 3349 MINES FOR SHORE CHIEFE FOR AND OF OF OPENITOR AND FAILED FO PROCEED MARY. comercy constrict / france (se) comercy constrict / france (se) comercy constrict / france (se) comercy (constrict / france (se) comercy Mairre (1.5940) FROM.IAT POMMAF(11, "MAMBING AT CHEMAIARD(HOOQ) -0 AF 9-",710.2,11, "M-" 1,11) ATU(50) THEME ME. AC (50) DELATED. CHECK FIRST IF THERE ARE ANY INCLUDED DELAYED. IF . GIVE FULKETY TO THOSE. **Cell6.** DILAYED. IF (100000,112,121).07.0) THE IF (10000,127) THE IF (10000) 16.1000000 (123,127)) THE WTTPL-1 IS A SPECIAL CASE WERE PARTE AT METHO IMPROVED WILLS THE MACHINE IS BUILD 10001303 2 WE TO PROCEAS PARTS, VERLY FIRST FOR A XEPUT BUFTRA, RECORD PALOALTY 15 POR P INFOT GUIDI, LAFT PALOALTY 15 GIVEN TO CODIC IP PHERE AND ANY REPLEMENTS IP PHERE AND, GIVE PHICALITY TO THORD. ĩ 1 WEEPEC (19), WUTY (19), WATY (19), W CEAMING, 94, 10197 (19), 14077 (19), 14 1 COT(19), WAT (10, 19), 10100 (19), 24 1 COT(19), WAT (10, 19), 10100 (19), 24 1 COT(19), 101, 101 1 COT(19), 101 1 17. (MIQ (MIDQ). GT. 0) THE 102/02/02 IP (MTTR(IAT). NQ.3) THEM METATO(IAT)-4 40 TO 5938 MOLP TF (MARFO, NO.1) THEN PFLACAS TOTAL ANTOCK(LAT, FFLAG) TF (FFLAG, NO.1) THEN TO TO 3100 TO TO 300 TO 200 TO 2 COCK IF THINE AND ANY ANY BIVE PRICENTY TO THORE. HENG (0'LO' (DODA) DAMA) 41 100001/101775(50) PPLAG-0 CALL BUCK (1A7, PPLAG) 17 (P7LAG, RQ, 6) THEM 20 TO 3900 MD17 141-1004 (1, 1000) 141-0411 (1711-1) 14-0411 (1711-1) mdiriserecs0030-201pe. NTDQ-1A7.46429 NDQ-1A7.46429-2 NPATO(1A7)-0 COMPONING (11/1 COMPONING (11/1 COMPONING (11/1) COMPONING (11/1) COMPONING (11/1) [1]4122-LEI 5760 0000 149/220 tsitt 201711 DIV REAVE THE BUTTY BELIED PROCESSED FROM THE SYERY CALENDAR AND MACH IT READER ONE IN THE DUMMY LEVER QUEUT. FIGT SCHEDULE THE REPAIR SOCH THAT THE ATTRUSTES OF THE REPAIR BAFTY AND ALL GROUP EXCEPT ATALE(1)=(A). Particle Control (19) (2014 STREAME THE MEANDORN DEED THE CHARGET ATTACHORED IF THE MEANDOWN REMARKS IN MARD ON CALENDAR FIRE. liktudi "/ncav/yul)an...rav/MAM.INC" comodofor //statistica/comodofi.com/mort/...the arton...tocka...trant.matter...matter.matter..matter. tet.imc?).fratr.reuk.at(encav) MAR. 180' 1809: J. Dis. (1809) , DPROM. 11, 187. (J. 1809: J. 1810) , 18 (1809) , Gel 16. CALL NEW IN (117, NT) CALL REDUCTS, W. ATALDI CALL FILME (MARLIN,) 17 (Instruct. Rg. 1) FIRM Brid Calif Mediate (137, BF) Calif Science (19, BF, Africa) Real F MPATULAT)-11 CALL REPAIR(IAT, FF) CALL REMOL(19, FF, ATRIB) 00 TO 5734 10012 (11.02.12.12) THEM 17 (10.00. (141) THE 147-41115(7) AND(147)-41405(147)+1 KOR/ UCCAR2 / PRIMICH KOR/ UCCAR3 / PRUELUT mdiri sarec50036-201ps. CALL OFF (LAT)-11 (CONNOM QUITE (CONNOT [146/14034/. DIMONTIN'S MEMO NUMOTINE CHEMI 1000) LE (1000) 40 TO 5730 HILL MOT , THEFT Ì 2 ŝ





206

156/220 13.62 MALFING IN THE DUMPY MALFING IN THE DUMPY MALFING IN THE MALE BOTTER TANTA AND PEADY TO GO NG. TOU (#000) =0 AF T=1, F10.2, 'No' Contraction of the local division of the loc 2 2 GLAND. MINE IS NOT A CHANGE IN UNIT LOAD AIRE IF (IDEPUL(IA).IA).OF.0 THEN IF (BHO(BODQ).IF.IDEPUL(IA),IA)) THEN Ē PRIOR TOTAL OF THOM COTTON MUTT Manch fire point liefor game i IP (10PCD(10P(1A7)).NQ.2) CALL DEPTH(1A7) MOIP AND IF THEN AND ANY HEPLENISMED IP (MAG(MITCO). CF.(4) PARA 00 TO (4)5 MORT 40/19/00(50), 1829 (50) 13/9/00(50), 1829 (50) 2/9/00 IP (MQ(1A7).07.0) THE CO TO 6010 ELAE MITTELS, 6955) PHON, IA7 PORMAT(IX, "NAMING AT CAUTOR 211 March (147, Prizo) 1 (1745) (191, 191, 191, 191, 191 1 (1945) (191(147)) 1 (191) 1 NY TO PROCESS MATTE, VIELTY F 27507 BUFFIN, ERCORD PRIORITY (MEUT QUEUT, LAST PRIORITY 18 ş 1971 4100 4100 Z Primo-4 Cald WTCK (147, Primo) 17 (Primo, 4) Thom 20 TO 6114 NUME (0.76. (pochijomi) () 17 (1.04. (7A1) 4011) 1 3 200 10 (1013 1777-10031 (1, 1000) 183-0617 (1777-2) 184-0617 (1777-4) INDER TO THE PARTY OF THE PARTY miriared\$0030-20108. 00-147-4409-3 77470(147) -4 9974(109(147)) -4 7-459(10(7) 5 0/17/96 13:63 155/220 Ş THE APPRUMUM OF [[[[0][20][147]], NQ.2 .0N. [[00][20][147]], NQ.1 .MID. [[0][[[0][147]]), NQ.0]] THUN **Cell6.** 144' (101) Ther BORDULA THE CARTON FOCH THAT NOV REMOVE THE BATTLY MELED AND WE AND THAT AND THAT IN THE PARTY AND THAT IN THE PARTY AND THAT AND T MUPTN [109[117]]) -4 Lartnn [109[127]) -[A7 Lartnu [109[127]) -4 Call Antono[17, Atim], Call Actor(16, Atim, Athla) CALL MUTOROLAT, ATIRT CALL MUTOROLAT, ATIRT CALL MUTOROLAT, ATIRT CALL ATILL (CATING, ATALD) ELSE CALL PILM (RAUFOQ, ATALD) CALL PILEN(MOTOQ.ATELE) NI 9/11.4079 (50) 244 9/12007 (50) 2447/102207 (50) , 2017.01 IF (HOPPTA (ICP (IAT)), RQ. HOPPTA (ICP (IAT)) - RQ. TATA (ICP (IAT)) - 14 CALL FILM (MUTO, MAID) IF (MATATU(LAT). BQ.1) THEM MMT (4.95. (TAI) OTATAN) CALL BORD (15, BUTT, A) CALL OUT (1A7) mdir1sarec50030-201pa PORTURE THE MERT NOT THE CAPTOR 147-415(3)(7) MUTOQ-16.25*3+3 110 22 08 CIN/UCOM Ì 1 Ì 39 55





162/22 100013/1184.86(19), MARAK (19), MALK (34, 34) 100015/178014.0418 1000013/178014 (35), 17871 (36), 17872 (36), 17873 (36), 18873 100013/178014 (35), 17872 (36), 17842 (36), 17873 (36), 10038 MO(50). IC (50). comace/rocoar/mailater, mover, amair, surma, malalo comace/rocoar/rotarister; comace/rocoar/rotarister; comace/rocoar/rocarister; comace/rocarister; comace/rocarister; mailatorister; datacarister; comace/rocarister; comace 1801.000 ' / neuv/ jer/ leen_ ree/Nakai, 180' 1800.4000 / South Jerra (Autria), 10018001 , 1004.0001 , 11, MA, 1810.9, Jackai, Johan, Jerra, Jeruni, Jenes', 171A2 , 55(1207) , 181.61201 / Tearra , Teor, 20 (160201) COMPARTON DOCARY MAACH Company (UCCARY / MAACH Company (UCCARY / 118) Company (UCCARY / 118) , VCFAL (4) , 549) , JPPA, JACTA , VCFL/F , 500), TL (40, 500), ILL (40, 30), ITL (40, 30) , ILL HATT (30), UPT INE (30), TOPOP (30) 100 E CORRECAT (TOTAL), RAJATI, RAJATITI, RAJATI coment/cooks12/11/80/8159) coment/cooks12/11/80/81, prima (19. 54) construct/cooks14/80/81/59, 16), prima (19. 64), primace (59, 14) 1, prima (19. 14) (00) (40) (10) (10) CRUERS IN MOCESS xxxxxxx/xxxxxx/xxxxx16(50), x071(50), x072(50), x07)(50) 00116.1 Comment/Dooms / ABL/15 (56) , 457 (156) , 467 (156) , Comment/Dooms / ABL/15 (156) , 476 (. moco (5e) . ([PH. PQ. 1A2 . AND. 1LOT. BQ. 1A3) THE comack/bcould/recturd (et) , LaCture (et, 5ee) comack/bcould/recture comack/bcould/recture comment/sector compar/ucceds/asses, gues, guese compar/ucceds/arter; as deset compar/ucceds/arter; as compar/ucceds/readias UNIVERSE FOR THEM DE ALEVAND 1 dirizared50030-201ps. (00000) Land monetor NUMBER OF STREET LOTQ-IBLUT)+) 0/11/96 13:57 141/220 Marting (14) Ma 01(01), 1971(50), 19772(50), 19773(50), 19772(50), 19700(50) 016(50), 19702(50), 197022(50), 197023(50), 2010 PECOFF (1A1, 1PG) 33 comercur/occar) 2/ 21 margr (3 0) comercur/occar) 2/ 21 margr (3 6) , jmaargr (3 6, 3 6) comercur/occar) 2/ margr (3 6, 1 4) , jmaard (3 6, 4 6) , jmarcor (3 6, 1 4) 1, Pancar (3 8, 1 4) cell6.f OI/(UCOR) 5/ [NLKEC(50), INVALK (50), INKLK (30, 50) FOR A MITLE. 190-WAN-1 Bratts-Brate Locond (1.2, 1.4.) Bratts-Brate Locond (1.2, 1.4.) Pertal (1.4.) - 40714 (1.4.) (1.4.) - 4.40049 (1.4., 1.4.) comecet/ucceff 3/ stillor s130 / stillor 1501, stillor 1201, st comecet/ucceff 1/ stillere(131), stillere(131), studer 131 comecet/ucceff 1/ stillere(131), stillere(131), stellere(131) stellere(231), stellere(231), stillere(231), stellere(131), s COMMON/UCONT \$/QAT HED, QAP1, QAP2, QAP3 COMMON/UCONT \$/YEDAND, FAMANT, FAMAR2, FEMER2 COMMON/UCONT \$/YEDAND \$/41, FAMAMER5 (41) COMMON/UCONT \$/YEDAND \$/410,111, FEMAMER (41) Patcc(1A2) =Patcc(1A2)+(APA2B(5)-FWOM) IA0+CS Rownor1 Tarta / 1900-1911) Mara / 1900-1911 (AA1* (FLAFZ/COBLP))-1 17 (AAT-2011-1 LO-CPCLO-RATH" PECONT (1A3, 1PG) * 1A8 THE LOF IS LATS, CALCULARS LATENSES connext uncerts / schare (40) , Lachare (40, 500) points/uncerts / rate , ith connext / uncerts / rate connext / uncerts / rith POINT(IA3)+POINT(IA3)+LeCLAP(IA3,IA3) IP (POINT(IA3)-OT.MATPOILA3)) THEN MATPO(IA3)+POINT(IA3) COMPACT (COLD) / 2005, 2015, 2014, 2014 COMPACT (COLD) / 11111, 1124, 2014 COMPACT (COLD) / 112472 (39) COMPACT (COLD) / 12042 (39) IVALUATE MAXIMUM UNITE OF PO 18 18V TROTAL D THE LOT WILL BRAY IN LEV CALCULATE CALCULATE CALCULATE CONT. MLANDT-TROM-ATALD (1) CALL COLCT(PLANDT.1) TOTLOT-FOTLOT-1 IP (ATELD(5).07.THOM) THUR Poliry (LAJ) ~ Poliry (LAJ) ~ LAI NECOCE POINT IN LOP SIGN mdiri sarec50030-201ps.1 14)-4713(2) 14)-4713(2) 14)-4713(2) Ĩ 10 88888888888 000





0/17/96 13:57 166/220 THERE WILL BE DO IMPECTION AT THIS PRATICM. IMPECTION IS MODELLED. As a reprare ordination before and/on after this station. אסף דאם באירוידי וא קטורטים הערא דאטיפיט כש אביני לא מעור 15 פוטנאנטרט ראל דאר ארידונארוס טיר דא באירוידי לאנא אפעויינט 24 ראל טאן דארי אשה אנאנגערין וא קטונים FIANT THE UNIT 19 ((1)1900(137))-9444.00(137)).48.19079(137) .480. X19907(137) .17.3079(137)) 1918 .014.4347(137) 2019 CHECK FIRME (P PHONE AND ANY MALADONNE DELAYED, 19 THEM And, from 0145 failonity to frome. DELATED. IP DIPPERDENT PARTS AND BUIND PROCESSED. THEN LOND IN QUEUE CAFLY. CHICK IF THERE ARE ANY ADDULED INHERTS DELAYED. IF THERE AND, GIVE PRIORITY TO THORE. 17 (molian), er. 9. (n. canvitan), aq. 0) turn cull film(ian),atur) molp molp cel16. IF (MPTATU(LAT). BQ.0.00. MPTATU(LAT). BQ.1) THEN DEFINITION IF THE UNIT ADDUATE A MACHINE RETU CHECK IF THERE ARE ANY AUTOROMOUS MAINT IF THEME AME, GIVE PRIORITY TO THOSE. LF (CAJAV(IAT), IQ, MCAP(IAT)) THEN CALL REBTOP(MOVE, IAT) REDIP IF (MCCD(1A7) .BQ. 1) THEN RECENTLAN IP (IA) .M. LAFFM(IA7)) THE 17 (1741). 10.1) TWEN 17.10.0 17.11.11.17.17.10.0 17.11.11.10.10.0 10.10.01.0 10.10.01.0 10.10.00 1 CALL FILEN(1A7, APRIS) CLIL MACK(LAT, FFLAD) 1 (1971AA) (10, 31 % 1 (1971AA) (10, 31 % 1 (1971AA) (10, 31 % 1 (1971AA) (10, 10) 1 (10, 10) (10, 10) (10, 10) 1 (10, 10) (10, 10) (10, 10) 1 (10, 10) (10, 10) (10, 10) 1 (10, 10) (1 CALL UPAND(1A7) PFLAG-0 CALL AUTOCK (187, PFLAG) 17 (PFLAG. EQ. 0) THEN CALL FILM(IA7, APUB) FIDS-IA7, HARE CALL INCHIN(IA7, BIDQ) mdirisared50030-201pe.\$ ALL FILM(IA7, ARE) 00 TO 6360 77.40-0 17771 (147) -0 00 70 6351 00 TO 6368 10 55 0/17/96 13:57 167/220 ANTE UPPLICE AND DEFINITION 1P 19 18 91144 TO POINTOULE THE MEET INCOME , armoise, se), 101 (40, 50), Mu(50), 1401, 221 (40), 1974 (50), Marayaro(50), IN STAR (5 0) 17 (44, 34), 00087 (34), 100487 (44, 54), 040087, 100604 (34), 104604, 100877, 100600 (34), 100803, 1), 104804, 101804 180,000 * / Acou / Jul 1 and _ Tow / Alaka . (RC anound score) / Arata (alaka) . Johana . (RC 188702, Actaa, Inctoa, Ilfard, andry, andry . Brhay, as (algr) , 346.(algr) , rearry, aratw, andry . (andry) COMICAL (VICUT / MAILCT) COMICAL (VICUT / MAILCT) COMICAL (VICUT / MAIL) COMICAL (VICUT / MAIL) COMICAL (VICUT / MAIL (4) , YOTAL (4), 3491 , MMI, MILOTA, MAIRTA , YOTLOT COMICAL (VICUT / MAIL / MAIL / MAIL / MAIL / MAIL / VICUT / MAIL / VICUT / MAIL / VICUT / MAIL / VICUT / VICUT Comment/(Coccal)/(Limetry (34) Common/(Coccal)/(Marky (34) Common/(Coccal)/(Marky (36) Common/(Coccal)/(Marky (36) Common/(Coccal)/(Marky (36)) Common/(Coccal/(Marky (36)) Common/(Coccal/(Marky (36))) Common/(Coccal/(Marky (36))) Common/(Coccal/(Marky (36))) Common/(Coccal/(Marky (36))) Common/(Coccal/(Marky (36)))) GN(56), MACUTP(36), MACUTP(36) CN(66, 56), TOTQA, TQAMME, PECONT (40, 51) IT THE MACHINE IS WAITING FOR THIS PART SCHOOL DO . CORCE QUEUE STATUS. GIVE MICHINE TO THIS PART. IP (MTATO(147).50.18 .AND. IA1.50.147794(147)) 742 COMMON/ UCCMI / INSTUTIA (56) , BUDY (56) , BUDY (56) , BUDY (56) 04116 17 (BMIDBC, 80.2) THEN 17 (UPF146 (1A7). 07.500107(1A7)) THEN comerce/ uccart y/ studi # (30) , why (30) , state # (30) comerce/uccarts / stormer (31) , stored [36] , a toned comerce/uccart / state (31) , stored [30] , a toned comerce/uccard # (whole (31) , stored [40, 50) , p COMMON/UCCUID/ HEARTL, HEARTZ, HEARTD, HEARTS Month of the second of the sec And a second (merrat (s) and a second (s FTBLZ -TBOM-ML 1774 (1.17) UPT 116 (1.147) - UPT 116 (1.47) → FTBLZ FOFUP (1.17) - FOFUP (1.17) + FTBLZ ML 1774 (1.17) - 4 IF (MAD(LAT). OF.1) THEM DO (LA TAL, MAD(LAT).-1 CALL MODELL, LAT. ANTER CALL FILM(LAT, ATTER) COLL FILM(LAT, ATTER) COLL FILM(LAT, ATTER) MODE COLL FILM(IA7, AMID) FURNOUTINE A1H5(1A7) mdiri aarec50030-201pa NUNCO(50), NUNCO, 1 MARCO(50), NUMCO(50) COMMON GERT (699999) 4/1003 [A1-ATHID (2) LA4-ATHID (4) LA10-ATHID (10) (1) LONGL-10 0111 88888 888 ã 5

170/226 13ict 3617710. 1315 IF (CANAVILAT). 20.0.00. (CANAVILAT). 07.0.200. 2002 10.01) - 20.01) 9023 00 00 00 0100 2007 10 0100 (8)) 17 (##0(#000).80.0.40.247.45.4450(#20).142) (#24 044.040041(14).144.144.141) 1401. vrocent/matchu, mivrer, cener, storma, matcuo vrocens/scents (es) ; vrocens/scents (es) ; vrocens(scents) ; vrocens (es) ; zoocas (es) ; mascu (es) ; miroc(es) ; matcu, mixe '/ncou/juileer_ree/PABAN.INC' con/Aftile(Hayria), ib)(HC(f), ibc.(HC(f), iprox, 11, HPA, con/Aftile(Hayria), ibc.(HC(f), ibc.(HC(f)), ibrox, con/Aftile(Hayria), index, ifrag.(HC(f)), ibrox, i #/000#//A|146) #/000#//A|146) #/000#//#(44), TOTAL(44, 546), WPA, MOATE, TOTLOT IF THE PART ADDRESSION A POLATIO UNIT, THESE IT SOULD THE MACHINE OFTANTION AVENUE IF IS OF A DIFFERENT FOR. CALL FOR A PROCESSING FIRE ONLY 17 THE PART 18 8000 COMPON/UCOM4/MB/UDIS(58), SUP1 (58), SUP2(58), SUP3 (58) 00116.1 (10, 50), MIN 211 (50), 101 (2(30, 40), 101 (2(30, 40), 101 ((05) COOM Constant/rooms/rifting (34), useful (34), us CALL RECORT(1, 137, ATRID) 19 (CADAV(137), BQ.HCAP(137)) THE STATT(137)-THOM PULLOQ(1A7) + PULLOQ(1A7) +AFRIB(4) (141)001104-(141)400018+(141)400018 ATALIB (13)-6 CALL SCHOL (4, 180, ATALIB) CALMY (147) -CAMY (147)-ATALIB (4) 20 70 6375 IF (ATAID(11).BQ.1) THEN CALL PROCES(IA1,IA7,IEF) mdirianreo59039-201ps.1 IF (LALL DQ. 4) YAUN 00 TO 6399 MDIF INCOMINE DIS (1A1) 8787-0877 (15.7) 153-0887 (19787-2) 153-0887 (19787-2) 1541-0887 (19787-1) US BCO(50), NUMICA, I MICO(50), MIMOO(50) [Jac / neou/) 2017 141477510(1) 141477510(1) 1414477520(1) 1418477520(1) (M-(14)-000 M QGE7(6H0H0) 1 Ì . 5 169/220 13161 2617110 us can be called to Peoceas Units Memory for a Auculum Propried of UNITA A Democrade To Val. Unit's Peon Gutte of Peon Hat Alakiva. Gutte Ta Tara Flat Call Party Ala Escold Ford of Peon Hat Democrade Memory. Hat Rate Good as Record Cabicity For Others Peon Analyze While Het Raccille Mas Propred. IT COULD ALSO ME CALLED PROM CHORD OR CPARED IN WHICH CARE FOR FIREF MART EXPERIENT IN QUEDE WILL BE FILE RAME AN LARTHWILLAY . AF MACHINES FTME 3, KILOR MAS MEET RESERVED FOR THAFFE REACOND FACH Inclusion for machine transfirmational, finded encould be reacond Caractive For Proceede All, marke 18 MING. IF FURE IS CANCITY AVAILABLE, CHECK FOR PARTS MARFING IS DURING C(Sel. (N) (N) (N) l NCLOR * / New/jeilan_re/MANN.jEC New/Jecon/Artialin/Artialin/Len_re/ Lattor/Artialin/Artialin/Artialin/Artialin/Artialin/Artialin/Artialin/Artialin/Artialin/Artialin/Artialin/Artia aan/ 00041/3 (118) aan/ 00041/3 (118) , 70141 (18, 389) , **mu**, more, **maare**, 401404 1, 1000 (30), Mu (36), 17100 (30, 1 (30, 13), 17100 (30, 1 (30, 13), 121 (30, 1 (30, 13), 121 (30, 1 (30, 13), 121 (30, 1 (30, 13), 121 (30, 1 (30, 13), 121 (30, 1 (30, 13), 121 (30, 1 (30, 13), 121 (30, 1 (30, 13), 121 (30, 1 (30, 1), 121 (30, 1 (30, 1), 121 (30, 1 (30, 1), 121 (30, 1 (30, 1), 121 (30, 1 (30, 1), 121 (30, 1 (30, 1), 121 (30, 1 (30, 1), 121 (30, 1 (30, 1), 121 (30, 1 (30, 1), 121 (30, 1), 121 (30, 1 (30, 1), 121 (1004(58), 140019-(36), 240402 (56) 2004(58), 26), 70404, 70444, 24002 (56, 53) comercial (access) / (11 millary (34) comercial (access) / (11 millary (34) comercial (access) / (11 millary (34) comercial (access) / (11 millar) (34) comercial (access) / (11 millar) 100 (100) (1 COMMON/UCOMS/IPSUD18 (54), 8091 (54), 5092 (54), 5073 (54) Gel 16. COMPACTIVECTOR / MITTPE [30], MODECO [30], MODECO [30], A MODECO [30], MODECO [30], MUDICIDE [30], MODECO [30], MOD MODECO [30], MODECO [30], MUDICIDE [30], MODECO [30], MOD LOLTINGI [30], MODECO [30], MODECO [30], MODECO [30], MOD LOLTINGI [30], MODECO [30], LANDING [30], MODECO [30], MODE ATTACTO, STANTO, STRATT, LETA cont (occur) (state), cash, cash, cash controcont 5/ chi seb, cash, cash, cash controcont 7/ second (state), state), state controcont 7/ second (state), state), state (mu)(LID0). Gr. 9) WHEN COLUMONICAL MONITORY COLUMNICAL MONITORY ANNUALINAL
(1) COLUMNICAL ANNUALINAL ANNUALINAL
(1) COLUMNICAL ANNUALINAL CONTINUE
(1) COLUMNICAL ANNUALINAL CONTINUE
(1) COLUMNICAL ANNUALINAL CONTINUE
(1) COLUMNICAL ANNUALINAL COMMON/ UCCUT/ / MAACH COMMON/ UCCUT/ / MAELUL COMMON/ UCCUT/ / (199) COMMON/ UCCUT/ / (199) an/ucand/1ff1 at/ucan36/71A#79(36) 7 ((1,7) - 474(16(1)) 14 ((1,7) - 474(16(2)) 1 ((1,7)) - 7504 ROMOUTINE INS (1A7, #100) ediri serecsoo30-201ps. COMMON QEATP(688808) CODQ=LA7+IMUD*2 PULLEQ (1A7) -0 5 100 3





022/921 25°C1 96/21/0 VELOD IN TOTAL 3 (1) Programs Activity At the maxima is an isometrica on A part Processing. A mark from the factors provided grams. Transports. It month an original to the provided gram we about an callerity price particula and original to the provided grams. Callerity price or about, and independ backer callerity artes the provided. **MAJED OFFICE** VERIFY 17 THE OPERATOR WILL FIRY AT THAT MACHINE OR MEEN TO HOVE TO AMOUNT MACHINE PTAG NTLL IN t DPLAGEL WITH ATLACE FILLS FUR POC REMOUTIRS FURE FUE Calified Generative is a DEPARTME. 17 (ucreta (104(147)), 19,6, AMD. TOPOL(GP(147)) . AQ.2)7155 . AML DEFIN(147) MOLP 17 ((211110-1117), 1911.00(131)), 48. 18079 (131), MD. 211809 (131), 12. 18297 (131)) 7415 2014, 0344 (131) E SHOT OFFICATION TO ANOTHING INCOMENT IF HE IS A ON FAULT HIS IS A DEDICATED OFFICATION. FUT FIRST IN QUEUE THE UNIT LOAD WITH CHORES BY THE UNIT. 3 0ell6.1 17 (\$\$140.80.1 .MD. 16009(1A). (0.6) 1P (100C0(100(1A7)), 20,2) FNGM CALL MOTERILAT, 2001 1. No. 1001, 20, 1012 1. No. 1012, 2012 1. No. 1012 1. No. 10 CALL POC (APLAN, CPLAN, PPLAN, LAT) 8 IP ((1A), M. LAFTPH((AT)) THE MUTH-1A3 CALL METTP((BOUR, 1A7) IF (IONCOLOR/LAT), NO.3) THEN CALL DEFTH(LAT) ENDT SHOT OF 6315 CHARTER 19 A SETUP 19 PERSONS PETERWINE IF FIGHU AND ANY TO BA PROCESSED. IF (MUCD(IAT). TQ.1) THE CALL OPUL(IA7, OFLAO, SPLAO) CALL BOILDP(IAT) IF (LA10.80.0) THEN 00 TO (505 SHDIP 40 40 415 ENDIY ENDIY #187-48-28 (147) 142-0629 (#187-2) 1410-0687 (#187-2) IF (CFLAG. 30.0) 11 ILDO-LAT-MAI mdir1sarec50030-201pe.1 1-0-1-4 h 1300 1/17/96 13:57 175/220 CARGE IF THERE AND ANT AUTOMOROUS MAINTEINANCE DELAYED. IF THERE AND, SIVE MIGHTER TO THORE. check first if there are and and and delayed delayed. If there are, there are alve an contry to those. IP NIS STATUS IS STILL SENG IT MEANS AN MOP INVELVED IN MATERIAL MANDLING ACTIVITIES את אמרין ון (נרגום, וון) במש את כמורושראוד את הכנוסוות כטנו נרגום, אמרכין וו, מששעה את את את את את את אור או או ארגום וו אמרעניו כווסר וז ז אי עני דומא, אמרעניו איז ארגום אשטנוים וו אמרעניו כווסר וז ז מהוארא זו אמענוים איז ארכונסט אאר, וז אאר ווז לא כווסר באת, OTAN-1 MEAN THE QUILL ON DOWN INTO DUFFER OF MACHINE INT MOULD BE CHECKED FOR PARTY METERS TO BE PROCEEDED. CALE IS MALCH THE MACHINE MACHINE THE MACHINE THE MACHINE IN MACHI 17 (MARCELIAR), Mo. 21 THEN THE MARCHARTIN - No. 1. AND. LANTMILLOP (LATI), -NO. LATI THEN OF TO 5315 MODE 19 (NOPPER(109(1A7)).3Q.0 AND. 1090(1A7)).5Q.2) 1021 Call Duffik(1A7) 1001 CHICK IP THERE AND ANY MERLERI MARRYED DELAYED. If THERE AND, GIVE PRICEMENT TO THORE. **cell6** CALL MAGGINI, PELAGI Tr (PTLAC) PELAGI Tr (PTLAC)(14) TALA Tr (COSCILAT), PALA Tr (COSCILAT), PALA Tr (COSCILAT), PALA MOLP MOLP MOLP MOLP FIE FOLLOWING '17' COVER FIRE FIE IN LEQUENS A CHEATOR TO PROCESS THE I "LLAR" COVER THE CASE IS WICH AN OU PROCESS A PART. CALL DOC(1A7, OFLAO, BOPLAO) IP (BRO(BTDO), W. 6) THER INTERNICO (LAT))-47 LAFTMA(100 (LAT))-147 CALL BACHTR(1AT, BTDO) 00 TO 6515 BROIP IF (NOPCD(IA7).8Q.2) THE CALL APPOCT (1A7, PF140) 17 (PF140, N0, 4) THEN 00 TO 6315 MOIP 17 (MOPCD (1A7) . BQ. 2) THEM CALL MINTER (1A7, PFLAO) 19 (PPLAO, DQ. 0) THEN 00 TO 6515 17 (MAUTO. BQ. 1) THEM IF (OFLAQ.M.1) THE rdirisarec60030-201ps. ##7470(LA7)-0 00 TO (515 100 0-04140 h







104/220 19 ML PARTS IN THE UNIT LOAD ME AND, DO NOT CALL FOR AN INSTRUCTION FOR THE UNIT LOAD IN THE DUMAN COTTOY QUERE AND EXERCUTE CARLIN MINIMUMENT OF THE OF MENO. QUEUR MAD POSIDIOLE THE CONFLICTION AND STATE AND TO THE TAY T) (50) MCCBP (40, 51) (/111000 (30) //TPAULL (30), MIGS(10, 30) A MANDOC, MANILT (30), UTT (36), 'FOTUP (36) dell6. (LAI) PULLOQ (147) - AFR.(9 (4) 11 1907 (147) - H1 1907 (147) - PULLOQ (147) 14 1779 (147) - AFR.(9 (1) NOL VOLOL (105 00) DOL 1880, 0891, 0492, 0492, 049 0800, 1980,01, 1984,02, 19 0849 (40), 1980,88 (40) 0018, 1981,18, 1980,084, 19 19 ((EIIMOP(IAT)+PULIDO(IAT)). 0 EIMOP(IAT). 14. MOP(IAT)| THEF (96) (20) \$ EF (MOPPTA (EOP(LAT)), ML.0) THEN CALL PILM(EAT, ATALD) METONI 2002 NON/ VOCON 9 / BELO 18 (34) , NON NUN / COUNTRY / COUCH / SOURCE SER / 145 CONTRY / DEVOUS / SOURCE SER / 145 COUNTRY / DEVOUS / 44 , 54) , JF (REPART(LAT) . ME. 0) THE Call Film(LAT, ATALE) Metuu Molf PUT THE CALLY LOAD IN THE | OF CALLY LINETICALCON. 10, 34) ucond/1111 000008/71Anty(50) 17 (mo(147) .Gr. 0) free CALL FILM((17), AFALD) AFTURN ROQ-137-44127-2 CALL 71.441(9000, ATUS (APTA(100(1137))-147 ROPPTA(100(1137))-147 ROPPTA(100(1137))-7 NUD-IA7-HAMP'S ML SELFIGITAT, OTAS. ACTIM (100 (1A7)) -1A7 MIN STAD DATE MILL (0.0.0E.01A1) 80 70 (SM (66, 30) MALT INFOOD 0/17/96 13:57 103/220 VCCON35/TBLARC(50), , MAAALA(50), , MALA(20, 59) VCCON35/TBLAR, VCTM VCCON35/TBLAR, VCTM VCCON36/TFRUGA (58), , TBVP1 (58), , TBVP2 (18), , MARCD (58) VCCON36/TFRUGA (58), , TBVP1 (58), , TBVP2 (18), , TBVP2 (18), , ECMM), AUTOPI (58), AUTOPI (58), AUTOPI (58), FOTAUT), CANLER . 000017 (54) , 100040 (46, 54) , 040097, . 300) , 91 (00, 300) , M. (0, 30) , MT. (0, 30) , MURER (50) , UPT (0, 30) , TOPUP (50) 1001), 001, (1007), 07109, 11, 121 12041, 171472, 84 (1007), comercur (access) 2/ 11 mercy (34) Comercur (access) 2/ 11 mercy (34) , merch (18, 34) Comercur (access) 2/ 14/ merch (34, 14) , merch (34, 14) 1, Precent (34, 14) 1889 (30) . (1983 (30) . (1982) (30) 1982 (30) . (1982 (30) . (1982) (30) 1982 (30) . (1982 (30) . (1982) (30) (M), POCC (M) MORV UTCOME (NEWDIO (So), WWO (So), SUP2 (So), WUD) (So) UCCORD / WP (40) , TOTAL (40, 500) , HTU, HLOTE, MAARTS Gal16.5 ALC: NO 141, CR 17, PT.O. DPCT.O. R1.BOCH (44, 54) , RCBMTP (44, 54) LOCIAL (40, 340) COMMON/ UCCATOR / 428-CP. 429-CP. 429-0000 /07775 (50) , M000 (50) , (30) , (30) , (10.30), 10.10 1, WENP (50), 1457 2 COMPORT UTCACTS / RCMAP (48) . 1 COMPORT UTCACTS / RCMAP (48) . 1 COMPORT UTCACTS / RCM COMPORT UTCACTS / RCM COMPORT UTCACTS / RTL COMPORT UTCACTS / RTL ş (MITT (30) "/meau/juillan CALL FILM(NOO, ATIC) mtirizarec50030-201pa, UNIOUTINE ALL'S (LAT) (000009) J.220 C-107-11-1000 1. 71073 (44,54) CL (40, 50 72 (50) , L (40, 500) , L l

106/22 13:57 IF ALL PARTS IN THE UNITY LOUD AND AND, DO NOT CALL FOR AN INVESTIG for find unity tous in the commen output guing and schoold chelle Winnestign find of anno. 180' 11.001 (8801), DEBON, II, MA, 189, MAN, SS(1007), FOR THAN CARD IN THE DUMAN COTTON QUALUE AND OF RELP INDESCION. 701.100(117) - 418.10(4) 11807 (117) - 41800 (117) - 701.100(11/7) CHICK IF THEME AND ANY MOVILARI griages Rolages Call Buryonat, griag, ngrag / war_ wat he live / ware / . 17 (17427(147).30.1) THE 1000-147-14381-3 Call Pilan(1000, Anis) Lasta(100 (121))-127 Lastyf((27)-478(28(3) 27 (1A10.00.0.0.0) THEM Call Scint. 1, 9071 Call Scint.(1,1)-CPTIM Detro(1,1)-CPTIM Nortw(1,1)-ADDA(1,1)-LAFTM(1,1)-ATDA(1,1)-TLANTN((1,1)-ATDA(1,1) TLANTN((1,1)-ATDA(1,1)-TLANTN((1,1)-ATDA(1,1)-TLANTN((1,1)-ATDA(1,1)-TLANTN(1,1)-ATDA(1,1)-TLANTN(1,1)-ATDA(1,1)-TLANTN(1,1)-ATDA(1,1)-TLANTN(1,1)-ATDA(1,1)-TLANTN(1,1)-ATDA(1,1)-TLANTN(1,1)-ATDA(1,1)-TLANTN(1,1)-ATDA(1, mdirisareo50030-201pe. CALL MOVE (S. 1A7. AT COLL PILAR (2000, A CALL FILAR (2000, A CALL FILAR (2001, A));-LANTATU(2011, A));-MATATU(1A);-7 CALL BOMAL;-7 CALL BOMAL;-7001 CALL BOMAL;-7001 (TA1) (LA7) (MAUTO, MD. 1) THEN ALL MUCHIEV TO TH COLOR (M MA COUNTY-INTERNAL IN-AMIN(O) IN-AMIN(O) IN-AMIN(O) Ę N'00041/1 PC(50), H Ì 12.20 13:57 185/220 3617110. THE ALL THE 1 (40). 1. MATATO(50). (50). ILING (IA7) NM., (192' 1921) - Itol. (1920) - Official, 1976 194079 - Ittaly, 44 (1959) comical occentrices (a) 591, coccentrates (a) , 2000a Restroctors (a) ana ana (coccentrates) , coccentrates (a) , 391, cocce particors (a) , ana access (a) , coccentrates (a) , and cor/ uccord /A (198) Kor/ uccord / hy [48] , yotal [48, 588) , inters, inters, yotlof 22 116.04)1 Ē / access 1/ E118079 (19) / cccess 1/ E118079 (19) / cccess 1/ BELOC. 2 į (96) (409) (2005 (30) , 601 (30) , 603 (30) , 603 (30) GILAND. cel16. (CHELIN) LON(54), MOUTP (54), MOETS (54) ACR (54, 54), FOTOA, TQAIME, MECOFF 17 (121007(127)+701400(127)).08.18077(127) . 1.12-18077(127)) ?1128 2.014 CRUA(127) 2.014 CRUA(127) M/ UCCHT/MALAIM, MANYP, OMUP, NDYM, MALALZ M/ UCCHF/RUTAL, SUT 18 AL PROJECTION (MORE) (N. MOLEC AL VICTORIAN (N. MOLEC) AL VICTORIAN (N. MOLECH (N. MOLECH AL VICTORIAN) (N. MOLECH (N. MOLECH ARTI, KIMARZ, MMETJ, MMETA CKOP(50) RUB IS ONLY CALLED UPON A DEPATURE LOW ON PROM CARLER. PULLOQ (147) -- **brais** (4) 21 MBU# (147) -- XI MBU# (147) -- MULLOQ (147) 14 Briffel (147) -- Arbits (3) (MCLUDE '/ndow/julloom_roo/MA DOMON/ACON1/ATNL0 (MATM), DO(N 65709, ACLAR, MCNOS, BYNNY, MANUN, 6410, (MDCY), THEAT, THON, XX (MAENV) CHECK FLAPE IF THERE AND MAY I //TAPP (30) COMPANY DECARD / IMMACH UNACUTINE AP(LAT, STOQ) Ì UCK (117, PF144) (MO. 90, 9) 7408 (WOCO (117), 90, (1 07CD (107), 90, (1 07CD (107)) miltrisarec50039-201ps. ł COMMON GALFT (68 848 8) PULLOQ(1A7)-9 DOX 17 THERE To 6394 8. ALLE STREET E. ĮĀ Ā i

















4/11/96 14:02 204/320 (00)OLM PC (5 01 1 comportocom/malifing moyer, constr, ilona, malific comportocom/iontry (st) 33, cocorr (39), ilonar (34), cacorr comportocom/iontry (st) 33, cocorr (39), ilonar (34), solar serencist), settaci (34), succe, ilonar (34), more and and (34), market inauci (34), stravci 34), succe, ilona 1801.005 //ncav/yrilan_rav/NAMM.105' Common/scont/staticurva/includy), 001.003/10,109. 18100, 101.04, 101.04, 18840, 101.04030, 101.04030, 101.040 1810, 18020, 1,19147, 1900, 201.040200, 201.040200, 101.040300, 101.04030, 101.040300, 101.04030, 101.04030, 101.04030, 101.04030, 101.04030, 101.040300, 101.040300, 101.04030, 101.040300, 101.040300, 101.040300, 101.040300, 101.040300, 101.040300, 101.040300, 101000, 10000, 101.040300, 101.040300, 101.040300, 101.040300, 101.040300, 101.040300, 101.0403000 COMPUT UCONEY / MAACH COMPAN/UCONEY / MUL, MAALAL COMPAN/UCONE/ / 1861 COMPAN/UCONE/ / 1861 , YOTAL (04 , 3461 , JPF, ML/PT , JPARTS , YOTLOT COMPAN/UCONE/ / JP (64) , YOTAL (04 , 3461 , JPF, ML/PT , JPARTS , YOTLOT 13 ao to (6114, 6141, 6141, 616), 6144, 6145, 4144, 4147, 6147, 6141 1) Loudo(127) 1, NGCD (50) . (#2 (46, 56) bit/uconf1 / f.cazac(56) , #1 La (56) , #2 La (56) , #3 La (56) bit/ucond/ (5 E1 compet/bcont/mt0b1s(54), #091 (54), #092 (54), #093 (54) 10, 102) 54047 (02, 04) 5 (05) 54047 (02, 04) 5 Gel16. Composition of A BLUD IS (34), (40) (40), 1910001111 100107-(1110(147)+710(147)+710(147))/3 00 70 6818 Common/Cooms / MTTPE (50), and C0 (50), and the common of the common of the common of the common of the common common of the common of the common of the common of the common common of the com CALL BENGL(4. CTCLFF(127), ATNUD) FLAFF(127) - THOM-CTCLFF(127) FLAFF(127) - FHOM-CTCLFF(127) 20107-(7110(141)+7110(141))/1 FUNCTINE LOAD (LA7, EDILD7) MATATU(LAT) -6 CANAV(LAT) -6CAP (LAT) CANAV(LAT) -8CAP (LAT) mdir1amred50030-301pm.1 200 10 1010 00101-110(1A1) 00 70 6010 COMONO C6093 ŝ i Ĩ 1 0/11/96 14:03 203/330 ar completion of Unitability Schedule celler to Setermines non mart units Schedul IP MULTICO -4 19 MANAS THAT MATE WARE LONDED FOR ANDMAR CTCLE OF MAN-14. THEREPORE, SCHEDULE THE COMPLETION OF BONG-14. NERIA ANN MAR' DIFFRANT PARTA AT MODO, PART MICHT ANYE DIFFRANT Lottinga, moderna, qua Astrontinga in the from this more than for Li chara fereia in call can from the car Analysian criteria. (19) (48) , CAP (38, 48) , MANCAP (58, 48) , MANPAN, CYCLAP (58) ED(50.50). 0.50). Mr(50). 111 (40). (50). M81ATO(50). Km (50). MARING (50) comact/occof/malifer, mwr, centor, horm, malalo comact/occof/strift, mwr, centor, horm, malalo comact/occof/strift, sa, 38, coccer comact/occof/sorts, sa, 38, coccer strateco(sa), strateca(sa), sa, coccer, sedeco(sa), strateca strateca(sa), strateca(sa), sa, sc, strateca 1,800,000 * / no ev / yell son_ov/ NAMA / INC* 1900, social social / Antalia (anti) - Dol Rappi / Dol Ingy / Denov, 11, MA, 1800, social, Incon, Intern Rective, Battier, MrANS, Gol (BAD) , 1844, (BAD) , Mattier, Battier, Battier, Di Santier, Denov, 21, ABA, COMPACTOR / UNCOT / PRIME/CI COMMAX (COMPACTOR / PRILID/ COMMAX (COMPACTOR / PRILID/ COMMAX (COMPACTOR / PRILID/ COMMAX (COMPACTOR / PRILID/ comecutorcat 9/rst.016(59), rstP1 (59), rstP1 (59), rstP1 (59) comecutorcat 9/rstPanc(59), rstPart (39), rstPart (59), rstPart (59), comecutorcat (1478:hstP2 (58), rstPart (38), rstPart (59), rstPart (58), rstPar commonly (cost) / (12) COMPERTY CONTRACT, FINANT, FINANT, MALAN, MALAN COMPERTY (CONTACT) (FINANT), MALAN, MALAN COMPERTY (CONTACT) (FINANT, MALAN, MAL COMMON/UCOMS/INSTID18(34), STUP1(34), STUP2(54), STUP3(34) CHICK FIRE IP THING AND ANY BEAMDONING DELAYING upt im (147) - Upt imp (147) + (Thom- Prant (147)) Fotup (147) - Fotup (147) + (Thom- Straft (147)) Start (147) - 598 998 CALL DOC(LAT, OFLAG, HUTAO) (100 (1100) . 01. 0) THEN PFLACHE CALL MUCCE(187, PFLAG) 27 (PFLAG. BQ.0) 74234 RETURN mdiri tarec50030~201pe (00000) JESO JONNOC 101-14 (100 (147)) -0 MURICUTINE CULOND LA7-ATRID (7) #100-1A7+MACH #000-1A7+MACH 5 0000 00000 00

1	triser@c50030-201pe.j cell6.£ 0/17/96 14:02 205/220	adiri aranda 11.42 (1.42 2011), 2011), 2011), 2011)
0		
Ξ.	13 EEPLOF-MID(1A1) 00 To 6010	C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
		c 1(ach (111)+622(112))
U		
j,	0	
<u>,</u> ,	81 P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P	
	() TITUTE PLATER ()	
		JACLOOD '/ ASCU/ JATI Jac. Pa/JAMJ. JIC' COMONDA TATLE (AATTE). VD (1927). DUL (1927). UMADA. 11. JEA. J 197703. ar: Jac. Ascur. Vankar. Vanka. Rati (1924). Article J. 11. JEA.
		Satu (Marry), Satury (Satury (Satury))
<u>v</u> (CURACIFIER ELERE, (IA), ELEREL	common(/acount /mthtmg (se), warea (se), warea (se), warea (se), warea ac (se), 1. warea (se), warute (se), wartte (se), woo (se, se), act ta (se) (se), se)
·	Comedual Version / Frank and Marken J Stor. Comedual Version (Harvest) Look (Harvest) Dock (Harvest) Dock (Harvest) (Harvest) Static (Harvest) - Frank and	
υ	Commad/record /printed (39) . Modeco (34) . Matcro (34) .	C common(rocat/filmers) conson(rocat/filmers) conson(rocat/filmers) common(rocat/filme(film), vorta.(filmers), mers, meants, vorta. common(rocate/film(film), vorta.(filmers), mers, meants, vorta.
	S LATTRISS), LARCH (59), LANTAR (50), MLLAC (50), MLLAC (50), MLLAN (50),	common(recons / metables(54) , etcp1 (56) , etcp2 (56) , etcp2 (56)
·	COMMONU VECKES / PRIMACES COMMONU VECKES / FILLER COMMONU VECKES / A (1848) COMMONU VECKES / A (1848) - ROPEL (448, 504) , JURN, ENLARGE , FORLARGE , FORLAR	0.000001/00001//#ALEAL, MAYR, GPAGP, KUTHA, MALELLO 0000001/000001/10071P1(81, 38), COCODEF(39), 100CLP(85, 38), CACOPF, 0000001/000001/10071P1(81, 38), COCODEF(39), 100CLP(85, 38), CACOPF, 2000001931, ADDRECL, 1000001(35), 100LAU, ACOPF, PAGBECO(39), PAGBECO, 2000001931, ADDRECL, 1000001(35), 100LAU, ACOPF, PAGBECO(39), PAGBECO,
<u>u</u> (composity account /matapia (34) , attent (54) , attent (54) , puts (54)	C COMMON(VOCOUT) # / INTRAFT 2, URANT 2, URANT 2, URANT 4
<u> </u>	COMMON/COURT/MALLER, MANNY, CANUER, NOYMA, NALALD COMMON/COURT/TUTTL, NOYIE COMMON/COURT/TUTTL, NOYIE COMMON/COURT/TOTTLE (19, 1, 1, 000001134), 1, 000001134), 1, 000001, COMMON/COURT/TOTTLE (19), 1, 000001134), 1, 000001134), 1000001,	Common/count // Facily () () Common/count // Facily () () Common/count // Facily (4), 34), Yorty, Fyzhet, Facoart (4, 31) Common/count // Author, Quar., Quar., Quar., Quar.
<u>v</u>	Constal/UCCULD / FIGURE 2, FIGURE 2, FIGURE 4,	Common/coccurt 7/FreeAu.9 (a) 1/FreeAu.9 (a) 1/FreeAu.9 (a) 2/FreeAu.9
	comedu vocat zy Preducti (3), Priority (3), Priority (3), Priority (3), Comedu vocat zy Priority (4), 5), Priority (4), 5), comedu vocat zy Priority (4), 5), Priority (4), 5), comedu vocat zy Priority (4), 5), Priority (4), 5), comedu vocat za s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s	Common(control / retrol ret (s) = . arbit (s) = .
	COMMERCY (FOCUME A) FORMAND, FORMERD, FORMERD, FORMERD, FORMERD, FORME FORMERD, FORMERD, FORMERD, FORMERD, FORMERD, FO FORMERD, FORMERD, F	1, mody toomad/ (rest sa), work (tal. sa) , work (tal. sa) common/comad/ 18 (1)
·	Commed/Concert / Mailing (199), Mary (199), Mary (199), Mary (199) Commed/Concert / Markano (199), Markano (199), Markano (199), Markano (199) Commed/Concert / Markano (198), Markano (198), Markano (198), Markano (198) Commed/Concert / Markano (198), Markano (1	c wers formed and no units whitting is control, ortado menalize as taino I (unglich). BQ.41 Films 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1
<u> </u>	00 to 1011, 611, 611, 611, 611, 614, 615, 614, 617, 617, 617	BADIF C BATCAU
	10 ED0E-ED1(LUT) 20 F0 61)6	
	11 ECONEL-(182) (187) - 6821 (127) 1/1 20 To 61)	C C COMPOSITION FOR THE CONTRACT OF CONTRACT.
1000	133 ELPART-11111 60 70 63)	ISTUDE //sev/ yet teeres/?MANINC. common/econd.rffith(INFR), DOIMOF/, DOLMOF/), DFMOH, 11, MPA, jumter, RcLM, ACCAF, Arent, Ment, Jient, R.M.B, 16 (1027), j
, <u>ë</u> ,	1) EXPOSE-(1829) (187) + 5223 (187) + 529) (187) //) 20 To 61)6	2 100. (12)77) 17027, 17028, 22 (102277) C COMIDIA QART (466 668)
<u>, </u>	14 ED964-MEN(121) 20 To 61)6	C 2011 - 2012 - 2012 (1912), 1912 (24), 1912 (24), 1912 (24), 1922 (24), 1923 (24), 1934 (24)
<u>, 5, </u>	1 ADVARGAMIN (1.1.1) 60 TO (1.1.5)	2 Campan (54, 19), Direr (34, 54), Scanap (164, 19), March (164, 90), March (164, 19), March (164, 194, March (164, 194), March (164, 194), March (164, 194), March (194), Lingdo(194, 44), March (194), March (194), March (194), March (194),
<u>, </u>	1 2008-420 (121)-420 (121) 20 70 6015	5 1447711191), 1441147 (391), 1447744 (391), 144144 (391), 1441447 (391), 1441441 (391), 1441447 (391), 144144
,ë	11	COMPOSITIV DOCIDE / 48), TOTALI (48), TOTALI (48 , 348), MATE, MANTE, VOTAF COMPOSITIV DOCIMAT/THEDRADY (54), TANYAN





14.02 212/220 M.J. According (F.J.M. J. 6.5., 0.)
M.J. According (F.J.M. J. 6.5., 0.)
M.J. According (F.J.M. Accord)
M.J. According (F.J.M. Accord)
M.J. According (F.J.M. Accord)
M. According (F.J.M. Accord)
< LA 1-2011 A 1-2 MLTER(6, 5401) J.MTTBR(J.), MTRTB(J.) PORMATIC: MACU. 9(...1),1%, "TTB1.',12,1%, "PMTUN.',13) MLTER(5, 943) MUOTTBR(J.),1%, "TTB1.',12,1%, "PMTUN.',13) PORMATIC: 9431 MOUTTBR(J.',12) DO TO 5519 MCHINE FRATUS IS SIT, UNSTA SUCCESSIVE INFRATION (a)]6. MACHINE FRATUR IS SEVEN, UNDER STUP ISSUECTION MCNIM FRATO IS BIGHT, UNDER FOCTIMITY IF (HTYPE(J) AD 3) FACE POTENTIC 3433 CANNUS) POTENTIC 3433 CANNUS) POTENTIC 2435 CANCUT MANILAMER', P3.0) POTENTIC 2535 CO 5378 AUTOROHOUS MAJET. ') DTEL ANDRO MCHIN STATUS IS PIVE #dir1sar0050030-20108. 1056 04 1001.11(1).1 5 3525 7527 9528 13 13 13 14 3166 *** 9256 -----1951 111 1682 Ş ij 311/220 14,02 1100 TW: MOLTCIAN) THEM MILLING CONTROL MENALO() MILLING CONTROL MOLTCIAN, 11,11, 1947001,13) MILLING CONTROL TO THE STITE 18 THE PURP CALENDARY MILLING SAID CONTROL TO THE STITE 18 THE PURP CALENDARY MILLING SAID CONTROL TO THE STITE 18 THE PURP CALENDARY MILLING SAID CONTROL TO THE STITE 18 THE PURP CALENDARY MILLING SAID CONTROL TO THE STITE 18 THE PURP CALENDARY / fryreib 20.3 (2) 70.2 (17 (MTTRE), 20.3) TADR MATTRES (1945) (JUTRES), MENATOLJ) MATTRES (1945) (JUTRES), MENATOLJ) MATTRES (1944) (JUTRES), JUTRES, (JL, 713) MATTRES (JAN) (JUTRES), JA, 77.6) MATTRES (JAN) (JUTRES), JA, 77.6) MATTRES (JAN) (JAN) (JAN) (JAN) (JAN) MATTRES (JAN) (J 17 (mrym(1), 50.7) That Mained 2013) (John (1), mrwyrold) Mained 2013) (John (1), mrwyrold) Mained 2013 (John (2), 13, 14, Terefor (12, 12, Ferder, 11)) Mained 2013 (John (2014)) Maine 2010 (2014) \$1 J. HTTM (J. HUNTO(J) MACH. NO.11, 13, JK, 191951, 12, JK, 1947051, 13) MATRI(, 9401) - . ATTRI(), MATATU() Possatis. * Nach. - No. - * . 13. 13. * 1751 - * 13. 13. * 574705. 1 MAURA AFT/RO[1, FLAM, 2], 0, 4, 0, 1 104, CONT (1994) 117-1481(1) 948 117-1481(1) 948 117-1481(1) 948 1187, 1048 1187, 1048 1187, machine phyrus 18 Pochi chemin ni py offin (MTYPE (J) . PQ.9) . THERE METPE (6, 9469) . CANN (J) POWMAT (JE, "CUNNCITY" AVAILANCE . ", P3.0) INCITING STATUS 16 ONLY PROCEEDING PARTY MACHINE PTATUS IN THUSIN CAMPOF BAIN MACHINE FTATUS IS THON BLOCKED 0000-4-181012 CALL COPT(1, 1000, ATALB) 143-ATALB(2) MITTE(6, 9453) _J, MITTE(3) mdirf sarec50030-201ps. 1017 00 10 3579 1040 00 10 3431 1001 1001 80017 9570 00 TO 3516 017 00 To 9370 00 70 9378 TANKI T Ī= 1 9636 3 241 Į 9 **§** 192 192 11 I 5 643 1446 555 3 121 3 15 103

214/320 14.62 Doubst) Multis (601) Doubst)i. Vonk in Photese at the mud of the sintaation' Aditai (608) Pounst) (. INCIDE BEARDER.) 20 969 1-1, MATE 17 (2004)1141, 141, 1402 11736(, 957)117900011, 131, (2004)11, 31, 3-1, 131 200449(18, 184, -1, 18, 18, 195, 3, 18, 131(95, 3, 181) 11.1.1.1.11 cell6./ MUTTE(5,9695) POMMAT(3K, "MACH.NO.", 1K, "MALE B", 2K, " DIB "} Ì 8 PONNAT(15, 966) (1,1-1,12) PONNAT(15, "57ATUB"," 9, "15,12(13,331) DO 9419 [-4, NUP MILTELS 9663] [.P.MOOR([.14], (PMOOR) POMMAT(1K'ON, ', 12,11, P5.3,1K,12(P5. CONTINUE ġ I. INIMIN ON SMOONI MUTTE(6, 9733) POUNNTIA, 'ANLAYED MELANDONE' POUNTIA, 'ANA SINGLAPION') MULTE(6, 9743) MULTE(6, 9743) MALTR(6,9636) Poimar(11, "Pratierics on Optimpon Maltr(6,9635) Poimar(1 (501)0 (91 bo 9639 [-],809 bo 9610 J-J,904 bo 9610 J-J,4 bo 9610 J-J,400006[,J]+2.0/91480 continent continent 1 2-1, MARY 1, 9760) 1, MARD(1), MA (11, 'MACH, '14, 1), 24, '1 MA WATTER, ', 14, 13) 1+ (1 MI) 100 MALTE (6, 9700) I. HIMBUR. POMMAT(33,13, 33,16,13,1 CONTINUE adiriant@050030-201ps.1 DO 9440 1-1, MAR DO 9610 J-1,14 PERCARIT, J)-4040 CONTINUE CONTINUE 00 9720 1-1, MARN E MALTY (6, 9731) POMMAT(14, "MALA MALTY (6, 9732) POMMAT() (1016,2) #1100 PORUMT() MATTE (6, 9730) PORUMT() MUTT (6, 9667) PORMAT() MUTE (6, 9725) MULTE (6, 9662) PORMAT() . 韻 5721 164 8114 8114 8114 £99 Ę Į Į 22 299 <u>.</u> 3 ŝ Ę ĉ 100 0/17/96 14:02 213/220 111.11. 184 WILL . 131 3 IF [135.8[2]] NEE IF [132-88[2]] NEE HIL-ARTO-2013 HIL-ARTO-201 ALAL CONTINITION () METARO(J) METERICS (2013), METARO(J) METERICS (2013), METARO(J), METARO(J) METERICS (2013), ALC, (15,114, (1784, 1,12,114, 1984)) METERICS (2013), ALC, (2014), (2014) METERICS (2014), (2 MATER(S, 5533) J. MTER(J.), METRU(J), POWAR(S, 5533) J. MTER(J.), METRU(J.), 12, 14, "ENVOIL", (J) NOVAS(S, 553) MALLANCT NOVAS(S, 5534) TERMAN METRU(S, 553 METER(5.956) J. METER(2), METATU(2) DOMATEL2, MACH. PD. 17.13, 17.17791 1.12, 11. 20147041 1.13) METER(5.956) DOMAT(13. 000001 MACH105 IGPACTEMENTET) MACHINE STATUS IS THE MATTING POR MARY TO COMPLETE UNIT MR172(6,956) J.WT772(7), MR122(2) POMMR11, MACH. 20.1.13, 13, 1756.13,13, "STATUS!",13) MR1216(5954) cel16.1 manifie is aling indicate after a pola-pole si Sec. 1, F10.21 UNTIL, COUR ELFLETENENT) UNTIL, COUR ELFLETENENT) HITTEL, 1963) HITTEL, 2000 CANUTY AVILANEN', P.O. ACHINE STATOR IS HIRE, UNDER SELF REPORT MONTH STATUS IS SLAVEN, ONDER REPLY Incuring is depth http://www. **Man** WITELG, 9571) FLAFF(J) FOMAT(JE, 'FINE OF LAFF MITELG, 9572) FOMMAT(J 200-1+101-2 call. corr(1, 2000, ATAUS) mdiri sarecsoo36-201ps. 1141 00 00 9511 00 10 9511 WALTER (5, 9604) PORMAT (1 WITE(6, 9501) POWAT() 00 70 3378 moly 40 10 111 CONTINUE 1166 ì 355 1554 9334 9364 1367 337 572 1 Ĩ 5156 3516 3 1166 355 9360 1164 1116






APPENDIX B EXAMPLE OF SIMULATION OUTPUT







APPENDIX C SAS OUTPUT FOR THE SCREENING EXPERIMENT

7 - 7	1000.0				51 00 101	31. 1996			7 - 24			0.1125	0. M02 0. 55 f 9	222		IMMINI	1				1110.0	0.000	6.6395			0.5761			21, 1996			7 - 7	113.				111	1000.0		•
r value	61.18			£		v. Aumust			and the	163.50		2.3 7 . 3	17.9	22.22	5					Walter	0.01	::		8.1	10.0	2			r. August			value :	227.57	1.1			22	F. 1		
	1.30782-14	2.736367.5		ī	1631555	1.48 Medine edin	Precedura		and Asuara	4.51738-14	4. 77865.13 1. 03321+15	6.95198+12 1.35708+13	5.27401.13 9.57798.11	6. 40302-13 1. 00222-15	1.1511.13			President.		inter Bauare	3. 62 602+10	7.66168.00 2.63412.12	6.11778+11 9.14718+12	5.24938-12	4. 83 362-10	11.1164.0			Interneting	Procedure	•	Bean Bauare	0.01901-14	0.71692+14 5.02112+12	5. 11961-13	5.12098-11	3. 5020E+12	5.94778+13		
tal Amual Cont	1.0311.0.1	7.36258+13	2.96698+15	C.V.	21.36995 	-	Limar mobi-	tal Amual Ceal	1 = 1 = 1	4.5173E-14	6.9706E+13	6.95198+13 1.35708+13	5.32408+15 9.57796+11	6.40105-13 1.00228-15	7.25572+12		-	Linear module			3.42402+10	7.66168.00 2.65838.12	6.13775+11	5.24932+12	4.9358+10	0.75938-11			-	Linear Hodele	tal Annual Cost		1.61963-14 1.61655-12	9.71608+14 5.02112+12	(1+B)(1(-S	5.12095-11 4.11155-14	3.5828E+12	3.94778+13		
in the second	: 3	"	•	R-Square			Chine Cal	blei TMC Tel	ł		~~		* ••		• • • • •					8				-	• •	-				(Limera)		<u>k</u> '		et en e			, en en	-	144 M M M M M M M	
			d Tetal					mt Varia											-											:	nt Varia									
Dependent	1	Brrer	Correct					Deservé		.51	38	81	1	10-41						Beurros	0.10	10.10	10-01		41.70	QL-87						Bouling .	551	281	123	10-11	10-11			
Beyndent	1	litter.	Certeac					Desard	Beautra	<u>_5</u> i		301	2	10+47 10+47					1	Beautros	0.0.10	10. In	10-03		VM70	Q(1+87								281	112	10-41	10-11			-
Bagendent Dependent Bagendent	wjust 21, 1996	The level	1170200 21562304	3176116 2197316 219262				2140647 Demonds	15120751 1617552					16511110 [17-01]	2007279 2311724 127-97	2077556 2077520 1277520	1736130	21696176	1110111 1710111	20)4490 12362492			upust 21, 1996 [[U2.67		41.70	24322574 QL-87 2432254 MA-87	1735201	1735491	1769266	1707445		1962582			agunt 21, 1996		10-41 10-41	18-67		
IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	monday, August 21, 2536	BLK THAC	1 2179296 1 2166396	1 2176116 1 2197316 1 2197316				1 2150647 Deserve	1 15120751 1 1617552					1 26517970 LT+UL 1 267620 LT+UL 1 202451 LT+OL	1 2007279 1 2011724		-1 173636	-1 21696176 -1 2007732	-1 2442777	-1 2014490 -1 12242492			101-07 [U-07] [U-07] [U-07] [U-07] [U-07]		VN. 10	-1 24592574 QL*87 -1 2492054 MA***	-1 175201	-1 173409	-1 170026						anday, August 21, 1996		- 30			
	idt Mechanockay, August 31, 1996	PT BLA TAKE	-1 1 2170200 -1 1 2160200 -1 1 2166304					-1 1 242225 -1 1 2150647 Deserve	1 1 15120751 5eerree					-1 1 26517876 -1 1 27-01 -1 1 2575266 -1 1 1 23-05 -1 1 23-05536 -1 1 1 23-05	1 1 2007279		-1 1716150 -1 1716150 -1 -1-		-1 -1 111011	1 -1 201459 5 -1 12202492			18 Wednesday, August 21, 1996		41.70	-1 -1 2432374 1 -1 2432354	1 -1 1735201	1 1 1713491	1 -1 1740264						40 Machinedary, August 21, 1996	10+47) al 10+67)	La set - 39 [LP-QL			
	llide Wednesday, August 21, 1996	IL OF BUE TAKE	-1 -1 1 2170206 Correct						-1 1 1 15120751 -1 1 1 161752					-1 -1 1 24517970 -1 -1 1 1474290 1 1 1 2824620	1 1 2001279			1 1 -1 21656776	1 -1 -1 10000	-1 1 -1 2014490 -1 1 -1 12262492			11:48 Medineeding, August 21, 1996		W1. ,10	-1 -1 -1 24392574 1 1 -1 2432354		1 1 - 1 1713491 1 1 - 1 1713470	P10011 1- 1 1						11:40 muchronday, August 21, 1996	teis Presedure	b is data set - 30	40-47		
	Ilide Wednesday, August 21, 1996	GL NA OF BLAK TRAC	-1 -1 -1 1 3179390 -1 -1 -1 316594					-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -	-1 -1 1 1 15120751 -1 -1 1 1 2617352										-1 1 -1 -1 100117	-1 -1 1 2014450 1 -1 1 11242452			11:48 Wednesday, August 21, 1996			1 -1 -1 24372574 [0[-07 -1 1 -1 2432554 [0]-07		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1							11:40 Muchanowy, August 21, 1996	ast Medals Precedure (2000)	vatione in data set = 30	40-47		
	11:40 Mechanoday, August 21, 1996	at our an aux marc	-1 -1 -1 -1 1 1171200 -1 -1 -1 1 1 1161300					-1 1 -1 1 2140407	-1 -1 1 1 15120751 -1 1 1 -1 1 1 1617552 -1 -1 1 1 1617552											-1 -1 -1 2014490 -1 -1 -1 112202492			11:48 Wechneeday, August 31, 1996			-1 1 -1 -1 -1 24392574 -1 -1 -1 -1 24392574 -1 -1 1 -1 2439256	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1								11.00 Muchooday, August 21, 1996	ral Linear Medals Precedure	r deservations in data set = 30			
	11:40 Mechanology, August 21, 1996	The set of the set and these	-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 1 2170200 -1 -1 -1 -1 1 2166300						-1 -1 -1 1 1 19120191 -1 1 1 1 1 1617952 Beauros										-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -	-1 1 -1 1 2014010 -1 2014010 -1 12202010			11.48 Wednesday, August 21, 1996												11.40 Mediconday, August 21, 1996	Ceneral Linear Medale Precedure	mber of abservations in data set = 30			
	11:40 Muchanoday, August 21, 1996	The off and off the set and the set	1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 1 1111100 						1 -1 -1 -1 1 1 10100101 6001000														11.40 thedreeday, hugant 21, 1996												11:00 Muchanday, August 21, 1996	Constal Linear Medsis Presedure	Rumber of absorvations in data set - 30			





Potal Cell Annual Coot by Chit Load Reemarie 25 11:140 Macheeday, Amnust 31, 1994	Analysis Variable : THC Tetal Annuel Cost
and the state (provide the state) and a state of the st	PU LA II Chee II Mean Bud Dav
	-1 17 17 215329.24 17379.62
U. H. Che Ji thean Std. Dev Ministeria	1 0 0 21693329.50 6374003.65
-1 25 25 5126391.00 7561045.06 1370279.00	1 -1 0 1303001.00 346191.15
1 25 25 Sevents, 52 TyteSter 1 TyteSter 1	1 17 1720713.47 163693.00
CG. II Obs. Mextimum	RU LF R Chen Minisem Maximum
-1 35 29963716.90	-1 -1 17 173094.00 2402354.00
1 29 21037454.00	
***************************************	Tetal Call Annual Cost by Patty and Lot
Fotal Call Annual Coot by Maintenance Scenarie 26 11.46 Wednesdar, Annual 11.194	technics Mariatia - make Assal Assaud; August 21, 1996
belvets Variable : The fotal branel cast	toot tootic total that a contract
	RU LY B Cho Minimum Maximum
In the I have by the thinks	-1 1 0 12242492.00 2963736.00
In 10 Chen Haart, Imaan -1 25 26317979, 00	
1 25 29663716.40	
fotal Call Annual Cost by Satus Bonnaria 11, 1994	
Amalysis Variable : That fotal Annual thet	
10 II Che II Ibeen II ca Dev Kinimaan	
40 300 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	
1 25 331174.00	

Peral Coll Annual Cost by Droppedoe Aconario 18 11:40 Mechanoday, Manual 31. 1996	
Analysis Variable : TAAC fotal Annual Cost	
of K dhe K man did Dav Kinima	
-1 25 25 6810742.16 9166571.18 1391519.00	
1 25 25 417764.24 5416773.34 5416773.94	
1 23 21666176,00	
Total Call Annual Cost by Scup and Let. 39 11:48 Madhanday, Angust 31, 1996	

APPENDIX D SAS OUTPUTS FOR EXPERIMENTS 1 THROUGH 4

.

adiriare660030-201re. 4		14/13/44 14-12 3/1
	Second Sho + Youndo	
The results correspond to appendent (practs) 91:	80-60 1,45648-10 1,45648-10 65.0	1
	BOWTON DE TYPE III DE MAAA BEWARD 7 Val	
19:30 Mechaeday, October 2, 1936	UL 1 2.16378+10 3.16378+10 97.1 \$60 1 0.02338+10 360.1 360.1	
COMP 13 C2 13 14 15 15 15 15 14 15	ULTER 1 7.43578+00 7.45578+00 7.45578+00 3.1 ULTU 1 3.24308+09 3.36308+09 34.1	100 0.0010
	19130 Rednesday, Cc	111 (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)
	General Linear Bedale Procedure	
	Dependent Variabie: Thet Annualiged cost	
	Source DP Type 111 88 Maan Square 7 Wal-	
	50-60 1.43648+10 1.43648+10 63.	tee.e ++.

	9 for 161 - 72 - 191 - 844	f liter of
accontentation and a second and a second sec	Parameter Betlante Parameter-9	lot imate
	pred. at op 1934944.78 388.60 8.0001 3	5136.43914
	Partementer Botimate Partmeters v v v B	
	117720227 1906964,015 309.59 0.0041 64	419.001914

		3
	Decomparty Variable: Phys. Bauelland Sont	
	Permenter Settante Parmeter-0 Fright	a arran or Bet imate
	20 1000.0 00.0. Q000.00000. JU	516.27012)
Constral Linear Hodele Presedure	40 -10.99 0.001 13 01-001 13 1.0.91 0.001 13 01-001 13 1.0.3 0.001 13 01-001 13 1.0.3 0.001 13 01-001 13 1.01 0.001 13	316.27032)
		(50057.44
		•••••••••••••••
19.58 Muchanday, October 2, 1996	19:50 Marchine aday, Oc	taber 3, 1996
General Litanar Bredela Proceedure	Gameral Linear Hodals Procedure	
Dependent Variabie: The Ammulised cost	Observation Chastred Predicted	Peetduel
bource DP Agurte Gquare Yvalue Pr - P	Value Value	
1000-1 0.00120-11 2.41030-10 100.31 0.0001	1 21/200.0000000 216030.707070 1429 2166304.9000000 216034.707070 - 2366	
Errur 31 4.67175-09 2.22535-00		
Currected Patal 26 1.23208r11		41401401.4 10014010.0
R-Aquara C.V. Amet Hill Place Aman	1 2001522 0000000 2019509 401413 05 -1777 0 2022109: 0000000 2019500: 40145140 2600	
0.942670 0.732970 14010.) 2032277		
	2001 101010,0000000 1900000 1000100 100000 100000 100000 100000 1000000	
19:59 Medicarday, Ostober 2, 1996		
General kinear Medels Procedure	19.98 modmoday, Co	ttebar 2, 1996
Dependent Variable: TWC Amutilsed cost	General Linear Models Procedure	
Bearton DP Type 1 30 Heart Squarts 7 Value Pr - P	Cheerval ton Cheerved Fredicted	Real dual
00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	value Value	
102.400 1 7.63578.66 7.63578.60 3.35 0.0014 102.400 1 3.33388.69 1.23588.69 14.46 0.0019	1 15 1942411.0040000 1946904.41481441 -409	3.01481481 9.01481481









7] [adiritar@50030-201pa.1 88 112 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Persontar Product Latinates Britanterel Prob 191	Partmaniar Dartamiar Dartamiar Partmaniar Darta		01.13 Anturday, October 3, 1996	Parameter Batimate Parameter Data		per realized	Tector Provden Squares Mean Square P-Matio Prob - P	The 3.7356666666 136616153 3.130 0.1017 0.1017 0.1017 50 3.735667673 1.3451351313 3.0079 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000		99:23 Miturilly, Octaber 5, 1996 Cenenical Analysis of Despense Britaco (Daved en coded data)	Pactor Centrical Palue	020.36739 -0.36739 Unit Joed 00 0.07335 0.35735 0.0753	Predicted value at statimary point -1413.437 วินนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนนน	09.33 Inturday, October 3, 1396 Cananical Analysis of Response Durface (based an octad data)	ligenvectors 11.	10010	Stationary Paint is a sinisma.	09.13 Anturday, October 5, 1996 Matteriot atten af Minister Menseens for Variable Phat. Annual and son	Contact Designation Designation	
adirisare650030-203ps.i opexpå.out 10/17/96 1	21 27176412.000000 2694591.7017017 469119.2962963	9115 Miurtay, October 3, 1396	ten of horidanis and the formation of the source of horidanis (1993) (1994) (19			114 09125 Auturney, Ottohar 3, 1394	Cading Contribution for the Indupendent Part all on Parton Dubtracted off Divided by 1.00000		0113 miuray, acamar 1, 194	Beepmee Burface for Variable 1960: Annualised cost	Responses Maan 19844444 Maact 1981 21313 Responses 0. 5957 Cool. of Variation 3. 2195	Am of Bouered Residuals 1.0477127812 Producted Resid BS (194289) 1.7553003813	Degraes	Magneticat Freedom Of Squares Of Squares	ниминаниналалиналалалалалалалалалалалалала 97.39 жен ту , остоят 5, 196	Degrees of type i Aun hegreeien Prode of Squarts B-Squarts F-Batio Freds - F	Petal Magrees 3 3.735625815 0.9997 15607 0.000		Decidemal Prevente Equation Beaust Squares P-Initia Prevente P Lamt af Pit 1 94401327113 24140199444 1.401 0.4047 Lamt af Pit 1 944013327114 3345994444 1.401 0.4047 Lamt af Pit 1 944013337114 9335994494 1.4017 0.401713412 0.401713412 0.401713412 0.401713412 0.401713412 0.401713412 0.401713412 0.401713412 0.401713412 0.401713412 0.401713412 0.401713412 0.401714412 0.40171444 0.4017444 0.4017444		01:25 Maturday, October 3, 1996





10/11/96 14:12 2/7	0.4401	4 - 1		e.1)15 e.ee2		e 2, 1996			24									r 2, 1996			5	21215 21215 21215 21215 21215		r 2, 1996		1			99998 35555		33356			e 1, 1996		1	_
opexp3, out	1.59348+10 101.33	Man Square 7 Value	1.00598+10 114.03 7.90378+10 502.96	3.8736648 2.46 3.1314849 19.91		19138 Madnesday, October	· Procedure		Man Bquare 7 Value	((.101 01-89C65-1			5 8.0001 6321.7			0.0001 5356.35		19:56 Madmaday, October	e Procedure	N - 191 - 64 Ers		10.000 2935.01 10.001 2935.01 10.001 2945.01 10.002 2919.15 10.002 2191.65 10.002 2191.65 10.002 2191.65		19-38 Monaday, October	a Procedura	Predicted Real				.19444444 -1796.194	.1944444 1)97.8955 .8888888 - 782.8881 .4484888	1111,000 000000 0000000. 1111,000 0000000 0000000000000000000000		19:58 Medinesday, Outobal	· Procedure	Tethotad Mai	
01pe, 1	1 1.59368+10	111 mart 10	1 1.60393-10 1.7.90972-10	1.17362-00			deneral Linear Muchia	Take Annuals and cost	11 11 11 10	1-19646.1 1	7 Cor 101	timate Nermotorel	7637.72 648.3		tiante Permeter-f	197.34E 364.6I			deneral Linear Webl			174, 722 189, 500 189, 500 184, 50 185, 167 195, 103 193, 103 193, 103			Constal Linear Model	Other Tred Value	12.0000000 2145633	14.0000000 2145633 16.0000000 2145633	76.6500056 2022125 76.6500056 2022125 13 6860566 2022125	13.0000000 2001691 13.0000000 2001691	19.0000000 2001691 29.000000000 2005011 212.000				General Lines Model	Cheerved	
2-000000141110m	012	Bource	10	10.10 06.10				Dependent Variable: 7	Bource	08-08					Parameter B	1961 1961										Others rvat 1 cm	1 21459(5 203021 6 203021	191000	119002 01111	12 19991	*****			Other Evel 1 an	_
10/17/96 14:12 1/7			33																		1976			101			•]	1134	I	10				
arp3.out	•1.	*****	50 Madesday, Ottaber 2,	GL BE FINC	-1 -1 2145942	-1 -1 -1 -1					0 1992493 0 1967753 1939990			50 Widnesday, Oxtobar 2,		1 -1 207561	1 -1 2073427				38 Medicadey, October 2,	waadura iia aat = 17		38 Michaeley, October 3,	an adura	Ĩ	Figure P Value Pr			Root ISE 99MC	12546.5 241		38 mbacky, october 3,	a l'hered a			
4·1	to experient (branch)		1941	5 5 6							777 				5 -						19.0	meral Linear Models Fr r ef ebestvations in de	*******************	19-	meral Linear Models Pr	C Annualised cost	DP Rqueres	2 1.5001.1 2	26 1.19918-11	Are C.V.	459 6.621602		191	eneral Linear Models Fr	C Ammaigned Colf	1 1.00501010	
terec50030-201p	Its cerrespend	******		2 2 2						177 128 128	777 223 223					177 122 122	***	777 82:				đ	,		8	t Variable: TMA				Ja-Regul	4.9724						







	12 2/													-													
	17																										
	Ē																										
	11/96																										
	10	5	•	221		51			;			I						ii.						1 3			
		:	2							89.EQ	Ĭ	1.512 MMMM	* 5, 1		Ĩ										laid la		
						8			3	8622	7.0		8					58	ž	1000	5765			100 M			
	.out		-	-		A pun	2	13	Ē	145	E		- Angle I	g	E	55695	••••••	A La La	2	772	,,,,,		12				
	Dexto	1.00	1						k	2	ż		- 27		ż			8.8							indexed in	/al	
	•	2		ii:			Ĭ		Ĩ		ij		•	i	įij			1	E	1 4474.5 1 4474.5							
		1966	Ē		1000			111 1	į	•						•				555	1112		1222		Image	:	:222 2 ;
			F '					2 - 2 -	. 3		\$			13 199												Value	
	-20106		þ				i y	•	Bt in	6.77CI				ł.				1	8	11176.1		27026. 22256. 20259.			1.6		17426. 17426. 17496.
	50030						uri abio			Ŧ						7 F " E				351	2222	2233	522			:	:555 <u>8</u> ;
	lante		•	_			Ĭ	x	13	1	ŝ	-		į		0.10			ration		***	••=	:223				12528
	Ĩ	5		68	5		1		Par	Į		Ę				55555			Î					:	ł		
	-	—						<u></u>																			
Multical (6019-2019, 1) Operation (1011), 101 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N.1 N																											
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	1411																										
Multi-large (560302-201)g. A. Operation (neuron) (s) The rewrite an environment (neuron) (s) $n_1 $ (s) (s) (s) $n_1 $ (s) (s) The rewrite an environment (neuron) (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) The rewrite an environment (neuron) (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) The rewrite an environment (neuron) (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) The rewrite an environment (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) The rewrite an environment (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) The rewrite an environment (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) The rewrite an environment (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) The rewrite an environment (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) The rewrite an environment (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) The rewrite an environment (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) The rewrite an environment (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s) The rewrite an enviroment (s) $n_1 $ (s) $n_1 $ (s	96/11																										
) o c			22																							
Multi-List Cec(0010-201)ps.() Operation (Incurst) No. 71.1 results correspond to constrained (Incurst) No. 0.1.1 means, calcadded (Incurst) No. 200 70 70 70 70 1 20 70 70 70 70 1 20 70 70 70 70 1 20 70 70 70 70 1 20 70 70 70 70 1 10 70 70 70 70 1 10 70 70 70 70 1 10 70 70 70 70 1 10 70 70 70 70 1 10 70 70 70 70 1 10 70 70 70 70 1 10 70 70 70 70 1 10 70 70 70 70 1 10 70 70 70 70 1 10 70 70 70 70 1 10 70 70 70 70 10 70 70 70	10		3								1 81	1				1 31		Ĩ	22				5 3		ž		7253
Multificarrescondel 2. Approximate (Primoto) 14. The neurity correspond to corresp	а 		1													. 3. 1996		••••••••	r 5. 1996				1400 Mman 6433242	9(1	r 3, 1996		6.1576 8.0001 6.0707
Multi-lacreds0019-2013pa.1 [Franch! 14. [Pranch! 14.] 11. rewite correspond to constraint (Franch! 14.] 21. rewite correspond to correspond to constraint (Franch! 14.] 21. rewite correspond to			********	October 3, 19	THAC	200246 2799558 2710407 2717999	1720.092 1737026 1742356	5416559 6970772 6965886	1765920 1713093 1746205	17239226			1778894 598713 5128211 7848941	1718769 1718191 17181748	1710151	1111111111111111 October 3, 1996		•••••••••••••	1)9 October 3, 1996		1000.0 56.33		19 40 Hea n 6433242		October 5, 1996		2.39 0.1376 35.37 0.0001 3.62 0.070
Multitacrec600106-20196.4 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	out		************	tur day , October 3, 19	10 THAC		1 172092 1 172092 1 1742356	-1 15410339 -1 1477772 -1 16965080	0 1705920 0 1713093 0 174205	1 1723928			1 1774094 -1 1509971) -1 150111 -1 1704004		1 175555 1 1720257 1 1762610	14144111111111111111111111111111111111		~~~~~~	115 tur day , October 5, 1996	. 1		1	126 7945 Mean 126 6433242		turday, October 3, 1996 •		14 3.39 0.1376 14 945.37 0.0901 15 3.00 0.0707
Multi-targe 6500106-2010ge.1 This results or respond to accordinate 1 This results or respond to accordinate 1 This way to the the transmission of the transmission	arps.out		******************	129 Anturday, October 3, 19	CL FT TTAC			e -1 194859 e -1 1497972 e -1 169690	0 1705920 0 1713093 1746205	e 1 1717426 0 1 1723920			177054 1750571 11120112 11120112 11120110		1 1735552 1 1720257 1 1762610	1) 134 Anumary, October 3, 1996	ucadura iz oot - 11		115 Antur day , October 5, 1996		1000'0 56'992 91-2866''		Bant H SB 79 0C Mean 948126 6433242		1,15 Saturday, October 3, 1996 recedure		1,142,141 1,142,141 1,942,142 1,129,942,13 1,129,142 1,129,142 1,129,142 1,129,142 1,129,142 1,129,142 1,129,142 1,129,142 1,129,142 1,120,142 1,1
Multi-face e50010-2015 with a constrained in a constraine	operthe. out	imich) 04:	***********************	89:25 Anturday, October 3, 19	Let de po maio			1 0 -1 13416339 1 0 -1 14978772 1 0 -1 1595990		1 0 1 1717476 1 0 1 1723920					1 1 1735991 1 1 1735951 1 1 1762610	19113 ALUMAN CONTRACTOR 1996	kie Procedure • in data eet = 27		1)15 Baturday, October 3, 1996	ble Presedura at men	1000'0 56'39' States	1. 8.99948-11	r, Buat H 12 79 45 Maan 12 948126 6433262		09,35 Baturday, October 5, 1996 dele Precedure		
Multi-face of 60101-20104 The results or respond to the results or results or respond the results or results or results the results of results of results the results of results of results of results of results the results of resu	opertpå. out	mat (branch) 04:	***********************************	09:25 Raturday, October 3, 19				1 1 0 -1 13410539 1 1 0 -1 1470772 1 1 0 -1 259590									war Nodele Precedure vations in data sot = 37		09:35 Antur day , October 3, 1996	iest Nodels Precedura Land and Ban of Hann	1000'0 56'35 51'3005' 51'30'5'		C.V. Root HSE 794C Hean 14.73792 948136 6453142		1912 Anturday, October 3, 1996 war Hodele Presedure	lised cont	
	1 percent operate, out	auperiment (brach) 04:		89:25 Raturday, October 3, 19				-1 1 1 0 -1 1541959 -1 1 1 0 -1 1542977 -1 1 1 0 -1 1595900								0.000000000000000000000000000000000000	ral Linear Hodale Precedure E ebservations in data oot - 27	**********************************	09:13 Saturday, October 3, 1996	rai Linear Nedels Precedura Annualised cost Ban of News		1.8178615 9.79746111 1.2188615	C.V. Acost H 58 79 45 Moren 14.73792 948126 6433242	***************************************	99:35 Seturday, October 3, 1996 sel Lineer Nodele Presedure	Annualised coot Over 1 M Theorem 7 Value Dr. 7	
Miltiardis Mile reulis Mile r	Otpe.1 openp4.out	and to apperiment (branch) P4:	***************************************	89:25 Anturday, October 3, 19				-1 -1 1 1 0 -1 1341939 -1 -1 1 1 0 -1 1347972 -1 -1 1 1 0 -1 1595990								114	General Linear Nodels Presedure also et absorvations in data set = 27	*****	09.13 Matur day , October 3, 1996	General Linest Nachola Presedura 1966 Annual Led Cast 1966 Annual Led Cast	7 - 24 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25	11-10-00-01-01 (1-10-01-01-01-01-01-01-01-01-01-01-01-01	-Bularv C.V. Acost HER Pact Mean 94511 14.73792 948136 6431242		09/13 Anturnay, October 5, 1996 Omeani Linear Modele Presedure	TMC Annualised cost to Souri A Tex Annual Villia Dr. P	
MILLE T MILLE	0030-201ps.1 operp4.out	serrepond te auguriment (branch) 04:		99:25 Returday, October 3, 19												11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.	Constal Linest Hodels Presedure Rudher of absorvations in data sot = 27		09.15 Matur day , October 3, 1996	Generil Linear Hadele Presidure Lable: PhAC Annualised cost Ban 6	a and a source advance of a called at the source of the so	1	B-Bquara C.V. Acost MB 79AC Mean 0.34431 14.7373 948136 6431342		09:13 Anturday, October 3, 1996 Omneral Linner Modelo Presodure	iable: TMC Annualised coot ne over 18 Annual Value Pr 17	
	lar de50816-201ps.1	eulte cerrepond te augeriment (branch) 04:		89:25 Seturday, October 3, 19												นการระบบการการการการการการการการการการการการการก	Constal Linear Hodele Presedure Rudher of abservations in data oot = 17		99,35 Batur duy , October 3, 1996	Oswarzi linar Madala Freeddira mt Veriabia: PMC Annulland cost Bean	7 4 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 2	at here a feet a state of the second se	B-Benatra C.V. Mont HR Thic Mean 6.944311 14.73793 948134 6431342		89.15 Saturday, Outober 3, 1996 Omeeni linear Modele Presedure	ant Variable: TMC Annualised coot ne over 18 Annualised Solits Print	

_	_					_	_									_				
adirisar805030-201pa.1	Paranstar Proodin Intianto Error Mirmotored Prob.» [9]	Permaneter Bertanator Francesconder		1	Person ber Bellate Person ber Person ber	10-10 20-10 20-10 20-10 20-10 20-10 20-10		Derres 1 un af Pactor Freedan Gentry F-Antije Fred - P			91.23 decurday, Catober 3, 1996 Cananical Analysis af Angenas Butface (taxeed an coded data)	Partor Critical Value	00 2.313319 2.913319 Calt land 00 0.06131 0.00131 Datupa	Predicted value at atailogary point10137 Innonnummunummunummunummunummun	09:13 Maturchy, Octoher 3, 1996 Cennical Analysis of Regense Burface (stated an coding Suis)	Eigenvalues U. Bigenvectors au		Bratimary point is a minima.	19/23 maturiday, October 9, 196 Batimated Ridge of Kinlaum Response for Variable TRAC: Annualised cost	Actual Restantion Pranduct Decoded Pactor Values Reducts Responses France B
adiri serecs0010-201ps.i oparp4.out 10/17/96 14:12 1/7	1111111 10100 00000 101101. 001001 00000 000001 11 11 11 11 11 11 1		Owners! Linner Brdnie Precedurs Am ef Breidwis Dan of Grund Breidwis Am of Grund Breidwis - Erry B	Pirst Order Autocertrelation Durbin-Mteon D 1.031137		09.25 Anturiay, October 9, 1996	Conting Conflictionics for the Indometer Variables Paster Outstrated off Divided by		MARANANANANANANANANANANANANANANANANANANA	Response Burface for Variable TNAC: Annualized cost	Despenses theory (1)202 Despenses (1)202 Ladjuares (1)202 Coult of Variation (1,7)79	hum of Beuured Roordauls 1.007700313 Predicted Roord 59 (19424) 3.412434413	Degrees 6 Type I Am Provins Demons Defension Debris Park . 0	Liner 2 1.960159114 0.7359 01.0 0.000 Liner 2 1.960159114 0.7359 144.7 0.000 Graeperdect 1 1.2379129112 0.0027 1.424 0.0787	00000000000000000000000000000000000000	Dayraad Magraadan Pradam of Square B-Square P-Matio Preks-P	Tetal Berress 3 1.199076415 0.9465 247.0 0.000	Delives be of	Maria Maria Maria	Degree Degree Degree Street Standay, October 5, 1996





APPENDIX E SAS OUTPUT FOR TRANSFORMATIONS AT EXPERIMENTS 2 AND 4.

adiri sare650036-201ma.1 Inch2.cut 10/17/96 16	116 1/22 Addressessessessessessessessessessessessess	14.16 2/21
Mis multicommend to the actural location of americant fleacht 43.		
31:143 Mendary, October 7, 1996 1	21.182 Hunday, Ortober 7, 1996 6	
case the first and the first and the state	Construit Linnare Andria Proceedure	
	Dependent Variable: TDAC Antwaliaed cost	
	Bource IP hype I M Mean Mource P Value Pr = P	
	21.103 Hamiley, October 7, 1994 7	
	General Airmar Hodels Proceeding	
	Compositions Variable, The Annualized cost	
24 17 -1 -1 -1 1 1 000 0.0 1.0 14.1250 24 17 -1 -1 1 1.000 0.0 1.0 14.1750 25 10 -1 -1 1 1.000 1.00 1.0 14.1750		
	Central Linear Inchia Presedure	
11 10 -1 -1 -1 1 0.000 0.25 14.151 14.161 1 1 0.000 0.25 14.161	Dependent Variable: Pak: Annahltand cont	
	Permanter Bethaute Permaneter-0 Bethante	
	pred. at ap 14,3134110 735.62 0.0001 0.0139221	
126 126 -1 -1 -1 1 0 0.25 10.1011	prover at ap 14.1144455 774.45 9.4001 0.4149275 prover at ap 14.1161780 559.64 0.6001 0.01492755	
	Presidente Berlande Parmaterel Pr 191 Ded Bruer of Parmaterel Berlande Parmaterel Brights	
	110000000 14.36710111 1333.03 0.0001 0.00037337 01.01000000000000000000000000000000000	
211.02 Hendiny, October 7, 1996 4	31:03 Honday, October 7, 1996 9	
ALL AND A	General Linear Models Proceedure	
the stand by an international terms	Dependent Variable, PMAC Annualized deet	_
	Parmeter Botlanto Parmeterol Botlanto	
21.162 Mondary, October 7, 1996 5	UL'SU -0.002)7667 .0.36 0.7282 0.00457373	
Langenerant Vatiable: The Annual Ised cost Annual Ised Cost Inc.		
1000'0 01'10'11'91'00'10' 0'00'10'0' 0'00'10'0' 0'00'10'0'0'0'	DL-4D-4D 0.0429000 0.77 0.714 0.1139954	
Brrur 31 0.016055 0.005109		
Currected Petal 69 32.523655	31:03 Bunday, October 7, 15M 10	
A-Bquare C.V. Reet #50 79AC Nean		-
6.994694 0.152214 0.02278 14.9652	Construction construct tradition of the construction of the constr	



6/31																									
14116																									
11/96																									
101 14151 16181			11.131	11 MANNA	8		15290	11.900 11.900 11.900 11.900		1 , 1996–24	1 1. 36251 1. 36251	1. 36291 1. 36251 1. 36251	1.16131 Mubicy	14.6311			er wei 'i	16230.			14.9473	14.1499 14.1499 14.0053	14.00%		7, 1014 24 B
out 1930916 1. 1920916 1.	R			· Outober 3	1		110100				1002001	1142000 1142000 11420016	31(1)[4					1 9169106							, ottomr
1nch2.c	R				1		191010	8 3933 8 3933			800000	0013767	B 8					023767 .0.	022767 .0						21.02 Monda
1.404	1		120200.	WI WI WINI I WI	2					1++++++++++++			-	1. 7102200. 7105200. 7105200. 7105200.			2	0.46000			7502400.	7282680. 7282680.	120200. 		2
0.021405	ii				Ħ					****	HE 600110.0-	-0.021405 -0.021405 -0.021405	-0.021405 87				ĩ		0.021405		-9. 2163	-1.7155 -1.7155 -1.7155			Ĩ
14.3672	X	1.01015 1.01015 1.01015 1.01015	0.01215		1		550		0.024515		•		14.)672 M	0.024315 0.024515 0.024515	0.016515		1	14. 3672	11.117		0.024515	0.024515	0.024515 0.024515 0.024515		1
2 22		2255	185		8	aa a aa	52	, 222	1255		8 22	522 X	2 8	2222		-	8	25	123	== į	<u> </u>	-12	353		
10/11/74 14114 4									***	1	2222	a h	825		12 1				. 5	9 83	32	212 272	1 11		
			. 7, 1994		•	I			. 1, 19H			1296.1 81			. 1, 1994	2							MUMUM	8	1.36291
					ž	• .		-	11. AU	A	1682900. 1682900. 1682900.				Manual Marine	X							Innumum May, Octob	1	1202000. 1202000. 1202000.
ur		7	11.02	Lipeopl			:	•		N														2	737(100 737(100
				hiveriale P.	ng jang		•	-		2 33		5 5 7	7101240. 11012400.	102600 1002000		R				1202000. 1202000. 1202000.	1202000			7	
110001		Itiply Ptm.		ں د			• •			-0.021405		-1.01105				8	-0.021005	-0.021405 -0.021405 -0.021405				-0.91659		ä	-0.021405 -0.021405 -0.021405
	777	1		Ve-BUSIDUAL	0.055.					N		17.70 M	0.024515	0.024515		x	11. 367			0.024515 0.014515 0.014515	0.014515	0.026515		1	11. 3672
				de l'						8	~~~~					1	••=	===	: ;	•••	::2:	22	Ĭ	1	525

		_																											-		-							
14116	ľ																																					
6/11/01									11				1	t .	322'	127	;2	:	:										•	2					•	***		
a the second	12	1.36251			14.6373	14.936	14. 391		7. 19%		1929(1	1.36251	1.5636) I CHING				10000000	1	1.26231	1.16251	1.56251	1.56291	ENCOLC.	17.205	16.070	15.035	11.00	INITIME I	r 7, 19M	1.56251	1.16291	1,16251	1.56251	MUD1C	14.517		1 14.035
111	3	91692001	7164200		-0.2000				Y. Ottaber		9160200	0120916 0120916 020916	0020916	8 -						91662000			91692990	B	10000'I-	-0.0001	10005.0-	-0.4000			91602000	00020916	91602000 91602000		B	10002.0-		0.3000
lach2.c	2	1. 73765M			i ž							023767 .0 023767 .0	1. 19121	8					4	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	191110	191(100	M15767	5	1042 -0.6			1042 -0.6	Internation			M11767	M10767	H11/61	5		:::: []]]	1042 -0.6
	2	500			HO. TEALE	10- 12026				22 2000 - 10				1	1012027	0052027 1092027 10022027	120200		3					2	0. 120200 19. 120201	02027	0. 12020			a					X	992027		1. 720260
01pe.f	I				H. 6216	- 44 - 44			,					5				********	ĩ					2	1.11439	1.91659				ä	500 (CO				2	1.1169		4. 91639 .h
1050030-21	1				20215 -0.								1111 - F.F.	*			1015		1					*	11010	124515 -0	124515			1					X	11011		1- 216920
diriart		223 FRF	::::: :::::	:: 1 :: 1	- - -		F2F		:				3	-				10000000	1		111 161	:::	:: ::	2	23		:::			1	: 2	zi: sz:	zź: cz:	13 18	ł	223	::::: :::::	-
Le '		-	100 C	-		-		ے۔		<u>e</u> _'	_	-	_	8		585	_	<u>.</u>			_	_		8	_		-	_	<u>.</u>			_	-	-	_	-		
								<u> </u>		<u> </u>				8				<u> </u>						<u> </u>		•••			<u>-</u>									
116 7/21								<u> </u>		<u></u>								<u></u>																				-
7/96 44:16 7/21								<u> </u>		<u></u>				<u>8</u>																			~~~					
10/17/96 Acile 7/21	16231			100-11 100-11	12.300	14.0390	1996 27	2	1000 LEAN	16251 16251			14.654	14. 3719		10 mmmm	1916 28			14291	16291		14.249	14.1971 14.1921	14.4973			1996 29		- 16251 16251 15251	36251	.36251	President of the second s	17.1014	16.0737		14.017 Immun	
T 10/11/96 14:16 1/21	11016 1. 36331 120016 1. 36331						00000000000000000000000000000000000000	-	12016 1. 36231	1020916 1.16251 G			-0.1000 14.6541	-0.10000 14.4317			Catalans 7, 1996 20			191615 1.36251 191665	120916 1.36251 \20916 1.36251		0.4 14.3490 2.4 14.3490					. Onteither 7, 1996 29	2	1020916 1.36231 1020916 1.36231 1020916 1.36231	192916 1. 36251 192916 1. 36251	4020316 1. 36251 V020916 1. 36251		-1.00000 17.1014				Cottohar 7, 1996 30
nab2.out 10/17/96 44:16 7/21	1111 - 0001011 - 11111 11111 - 11111 - 11111		Participation of the second se	110-11 0000-1- 1-1- 110-11 0000-1- 1-1-			10000000000000000000000000000000000000		1245					-0.0 -0.10000 14.017 -0.0 -0.0000 14.0719			02 Hondary, Outobar 7, 1996 20			1222 . 0002001 1.0221 1222 . 0002001 1.0222	7567 .00020916 1.36251 \767 .00020916 1.36251		142 -0.0 0.4 14.3400					163 Mondary, Ostabar 7, 1396 29		21767 .00020916 1.36291 13567 .00020916 1.36231 1757 .0002016 1.36231	19207	23767 .0020916 1.36291 13767 .00020916 1.36291	ot so menter	1 -0.7 -1.0000 17.1014			1	(12 Herdiny, October 7, 1996 30
Inch2.out 10/17/96 44:16 7/21	1427 1 14				11 .001 -0.0 -0.000 15.2500		21:02 20:02 20:02 20:02 21 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	-	44				17				21.02 Mondary, Catobar 7, 1996 20	8 1 1		10	46002)767 .00020916 1.36291 160023767 .00020916 1.36291		1027 .0042 -0.0 0.4 14.3400					21:42 Mondary, October 7, 1996 29	2 2 2	0400023757 .00020916 1.36281 3444023757 .00020916 1.35253 4444023757 .00020916 1.35235	140	0400023767 .00020316 1.36251		127 .004 -0.7 -1.0000 17.1014 107 .004 -0.7 -0.9000 16.1300			1117'1	21:03 Hondary, Ostatus 7, 1996 30
.i	1 -0.000 - 00217(7 -000001 1.26251 - 0000-0- 1				1 1002021 1002 -0.1 -0.7000 15.5565				10000-0-0000-0-000000-0-000000-0-00000-0-	15 -0.464400023757 .00020916 1.36291 0.46.46400023757 .00020916 1.36291 1.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4		Be By CL. FO PREDICT	9 .4002027 .0042 -0.0 -0.10000 14.454	(a) .0092027 .0042 -0.0 -0.10000 14.4317 9 .009207 .0042 -0.0 -0.0000 14.3719		20	21.02 Houding, Outobar 7, 1996 20			1629(1 910000, 7571500, 000000).	1 -0.446400021767 .00020916 1.36251 -0.446400021767 .00020916 1.36251		9 .002027 .0043 -0.0 0.4 14.3000					21:02 Mondary, Ostadaur 7, 1996 29		13 -0.4644002)77 -0022014 1.54231 134.4644002317 -0022014 1.54231 14.4644002317 -0022014 1.54231	15 -0.40400023177 .00022116 1.34251 5 -0.40460023177 .00022116 1.34251	15 -0.46040002)747 .0020016 1.34251	be by UL an Manice	19 .069207 .0042 -0.7 .0.0000 10000 110010 0		10 100 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10		21:102 Hondary, October 7, 1996 30
30-201ps.1 Inch2.out 10/17/96 14:16 7/21							11111111111111111111111111111111111111		162.04 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	-0.021405 -0.4644040220757 -0002016 1.36251 -0.411405 -0.464401022017 -0012141 1.36251 -0.411405 -0.46440402514 - 123421				-0.51459 .0002027 .0042 -0.2 -0.10040 14.4517 -0.51459 .002272 .0042 -0.0 -0.0000 14.3719		10	21.02 Hordiny, Ostobar 7, 1996 20			1629C.1 31002000, 7371500 00030.0- 1629C.1 31002000, 7371500 00030.0-	-0.021405 -0.460400023767 .00020916 1.36251 -0.021405 -0.460400023767 .00020916 1.36251		-0.1143 (1992)7 (1942) -0.0 0.4 14.1401					21:42 Herediny, Outober 7, 1996 29				-0.021409 -0.460400023777 -0002014 1.36251 -0.021409 -0.460400023777 -00039916 1.34251	BY BO DO UL BU MUDICE	0.21430 .002127 .0042 .0.7 .0.0000 17.1014				21:102 Mondary, October 7, 1996 30
tar#c50030-201ps.i	14.1472		Access a second on to de se fet second				11111111111111111111111111111111111111		14.3472 -0.401409 -0.464400.001747 -0.40140 1.34250	14.1472 -0.021405 -0.464400023747 -00022014 1.14251 1.1472 -0.021405 -0.464400023747 -0002014 1.14251 1.1472 -0.021442 -0.464400023747 -0002014 1.14251			1.01015 -0.71059	0.024515 -0.91459 .00227 .0042 -0.0 -0.000 14.417 0.024515 -0.91459 .00227 .0042 -0.0 -0.0000 14.41719			21.02 Mondary, Ostobar 7, 1996 20			14.7572 -0.021485 -0.46440 002540 002540 002541 0025	14.3672 -0.021405 -0.460400023767 .00020916 1.36251 14.3672 -0.4010 -0.400400425767 .00020915 1.36251		0.024515 -0.21459 .005207 .0042 -0.0 0.4 14.3400					21:62 Invediny, Outoinar 7, 1996 29		14.3672 -0.401485 -0.466404043797 -00426916 1.34251 14.3672 -0.40148 -0.444484043397 -00428916 1.34253 14.1672 - 4.42148 -4.44448444484444844431444248444844484488444844884488448844484488	14.3573 -0.01405 -0.4640 -002377 -0022114 1.3622 14.3673 -0.01409 -0.4640 -0023767 -0002016 1.36251	14. 3672 - 0. 021409 - 0. 46040 00237670023016 1. 36251 34. 3672 - 0. 021403 - 0. 46040 00237670023916 1. 36251	at by be by the particle	0.0215 -0.01459 .0003427 .0042 -0.7 .0.0000 17.1024 A.20147 -0.1459 .00127 .0042 -0.7 -0.2010 14.2500			118-141	21:12 Mondary, October 7, 1996 30

Ĩ	1241005003	10-201pe.1		Jaob	3.out	6/21/01	1 24:26 9/22		ri sareosoc	130-201pe.1		Inch:	1.out		10/11/96	1116	16/01
										-1-21455		-					Γ
	1	1	1	# 11:1	nday, October	7, 1996 14		83	0.024515		7585 600. 7585 600.		•••				
				8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8													
								<u>38 8 8888</u>	14.161 14						10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1		
i	8	A	2		nday. October	1, 1996 15 26			. 02 4215								
	14, 547 14, 54714, 547 14, 547 14, 54714, 547 14, 547 14, 54714, 547 14, 54714, 547 14, 54714, 547 14, 54		******		B			8 333533	14.5675 14.5755 14.57555 14.57555 14.57555 14.57555 14.57555 14.57555 14.57555 14.57555 14.57555 14.57555 14.575555 14.575555 14.5755555 14.5755555555555555555555555555555555555	A	a 11111 11111 11111				s • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
111111																	
8	1	4	2		ndry, october M	. 7, 1916 M											_
	14. 3672 14. 3672 14. 3672 14. 3672 14. 3672 14. 3672 14. 3672		3333333 5555555 1						8 22222 22222 22222 22222 22222 22222 2222	B1 -0.021405 -0.021405 -0.021405 -0.021405	2 33335 7 4 4 4 4 4	4 10.11 4 10.110 10.11 1			; *		
												4					
	1	ł	2		anthy. Grata	r 7, 1996 37 Ba	_				1202 600 . 1202 600 .)624)624		
1222323	14.)(1) 14.)(1) 14.)(1) 14.)(1) 14.)(1) 14.)(1) 14.)(1)					1,9691 1,9629 1,9629 1,9629 1,9629 1,9630 1,9630		J 1983		M	2 333			s 8 5555	5		
1 355	M 1.01615 1.01615 1.01615	1910.1- 1810.1- 1810.1-	1	-	8	14.1512 14.1512 14.1722											

Ĩ	ri sar 0c500.	30-201ps.1		Jno	b3.0	1 1 1	1/01	7/96 14:16	11/21	Ţ	isareosot	30-201pe.1		100	b2.out	1. N. N.	10	127/96	14,16	12/21
1993	212920.0 212920.0 212920.0		720200. 720200. 720200.	3333 8.8.8			17.1077 16.5556 16.7556			<u>=</u>	11.01 11.01 11		33 I 33 I		. B	B	36131 36251 96251			
										<u>SEEE</u>			110100 110100 110100							
	1	1	1		Å	0.1	7, 1996 42				0.026315	-0.91659								
		······································		101116 101116 101116			1:56351				1	1	1	10-11 10	° 1	,, ,	*			
	11.100 11.100 11.100 11.100	-0.021405 -0.021405 -0.021405 -0.011405			•••• ••••															
22222			1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 100										101201 1201200 1201200	8 9999	8	e 1913				
<u> </u>	1	4	3	1			1. 1946 (S				••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••		1000000 				14.060 14.3599 14.3599			
333	110.01	-0.021405 -0.021405				1 916916	16231				1	1	2	20.15	Ì	crahar 7.	5 MA			
																	1500			
8 33	B6 0.024515	-1.91459	1	2 3 3	6 99	R	14.3487 14.3487			iisi										
11353	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••				****		14.055			1 1555					•••• ;;;;;		17.1061 11.5535 16.5735 16.6724			
i							7. 19% &			111	0.026515 0.026515	····		11			14.029			
					••••		2011 1993 1993 1993				1									
5555						9160200 9160200 9160200	1.16251					0.011405								
8 255		10 -1-3163 -1-3163	94 7292699 7292699	a 233	8	R	REDICT 17.1912 16.3366 16.0707													
5555												720200. 720200. 720200.	82333				3263			
<u>;</u> i	1	1					7, 1994 65								100.0	121	112			
8 5	14. J472	-9. 023 405	-0.46040	1	•	X	162)(.)			<u>.</u>			******	20-12			. 1994 49			
5551	14.061			7(200 7(200 7(200		0020316 0020316 0020316 0020316	1. 36251 1. 36251 1. 36251 1. 36251			11	M 14.161	14 CONTEN-O-	11 I.	CH			8			

-ID	1 zar 8 c5003	30-201pe.1		lach?	Lout	101	7/96 14:16 15/2	1 Badkri	141 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	0-201pe, 5		1nob2	.out	10/1	11 36/2	1	15							
									0.024515		1202000			11.201			Γ							
				21.02 Mor	day, October	7, 1996 57			0.024515					14. 1146										
8	2	ä	2	2	1	2		-			********	********												
11	14.3673	-0.021485	-0.46040 		.00020916	1.06291						21 (0) IL	tay. October	r 7, 1996 41										
33	14. 3672	-0.421405		0023767	.00020916	1.16251		8	X	Ħ	2	2	1	8										
	14. 3672			0013767		16191			14.2672	-0.021405	-0.44040	0023747	.00020914	1.36751										
32	14.3672	-0.021405	-0.46040		.0020016	1.36291			11.762				.0020916	1. 36251										
l	X	2	8	2	R	PLEDICT			11.167				91602000.	1.56251										
1	0.024319	-0.91439	720200.		1.10000	14.6407			11.367			191110.	A1002000.	1.16231										
22	0.026515					14.4237		ł	X	5	2	2	5											
			0092027			14.3296		2	0.024515	-0.91459	1202680.	.0462		11.0.17										
iž	0.024515					14. 3239			0.024315		1202600.			14.1379										
-					********	*********			0.01615	1.916.1	1202600			11.077										
					utery. Outerbar	7. 1996 36		1		10.01	. 002027			14.3503										
8	8	a	2	â	I	2		-					******											
55	14. 3673	-0.021405	-0.45944	0023767	, 11121111 11121111	1.36291						21.15 Mar	1. of 1	r 7, 1996 43										
	5	-0.021405				1. 16151		8	1	1	1	2	X	2										
E	14.967		-0.46045	0125767	91682989	1. 36351			14. 3672	-0.021405	-0.46040		. 89920316	1. 36291										
56	16.9672	-0.01145		0023767	.002000.	1. 36231		- 294	14. 1472	-0.021405	-1.46048	0023767	.00020916	1.16251										
đ	1	â	1	R	R	MUDICA			14. 3672	-0.021405	-4.46948	797114	.00020315	1. 16251										
									14. 3672	-0.021405	-0.46040	002)767	.00028916	1.16291										
2	.024515	-0.91659		1		14.3593			14.91	cm120.0-		1416294.		10746.1										
i.	0.024515	-0.91659	7202000.			14.3950			X	1	I	5	3	MULTICA										
<u>EE</u>	0.024515	-0.91459	7202000. 7202000.		 	14.3989		11	0.024515	-0.91459	.0052027		4 -1.000	0 17.000 0 16.3459										
6	0.024315	-0.91459	. 0012027	.0142	0.2	14.3313		52	0.024515		7202400.		4 -0.000	11.001										
						*********			0.024515	-0.91639	0012027		0009.0-	15. 3249										
_					aday. October	7, 1016 59		1	0.020515	-0.016				11.011										
8	*	4	2	2	I	1				*****			*****	**********										
řĘ	11.1472	-0.021405	-1.46940	0423767	.00020916	1.36291						21.101 Man	day, Octobe	e T. 1996 63										
<u> </u>	14.1672	-0.021405	-0.46949	0023767	.00020916	1.36251		8	8	a	2	1	z	2										
55	14.1472	-0.021405	-4. 46040 -0. 46040	0023767	.0020316	1.36291			14.9672	-0.021405	-0.46040	002)767	01002000.	1.36251										
ă.	14.3673	-0.021405	-0.44040	-, 0023767	.00021936	1.36251			14. 3671	-0.021405	-1.46041		.00010916	1.16251										
	X	6	1	8	R H								.0020016	1.1631										
<u> </u>	0.024515		7101600.			17.1002			14. 3672	-0.021005	-0.46040	0023767	91602000.	1.36231										
E.	0.024515		720200			15.657		i 	*	1	1	8	2 2 3	MUDICE										
55	0.024515		7202690.			15.0463		11	0.024515	10.91459	.0072027		4 -0.3040	14.6457										
2	0.024515	1 -0.91459	7192600.	-		14.0223			0.020515		120200		444.4- 4											
Ī				MILLING		*******			0.024515					14, 1170										
_					nday, October	7, 1996 60			0.024515	-0.91459	.00200	.0042	A 0.3000	14.3203										
8	8	ī	2	2	I	2		····		NIMININ	MUMMM													
	14.3672	-0.031405	-0.46040	0023767	11412000. 11412000.	1.36251							day. Octobe	r 7, 1976 64										
			-0.61010	1911100	1102000.	12090-1		8	1	Ħ	2	2	1	2										
	14.3673	-0.011405	-0.4600	0023767	.00020016	1.36251			14. 3672	-0.011405	-0.46940	0023767	21602000.	1. 36351										
	11.3672	-1.021465			002001	1.16251						0023767		1.36231										
	*	54	X	2	B	MILDICT.			11.3673	-0. D21 485				1.26291			_							
	0.024515	0.01030	7102000	5 5 5 7		14.6470		- iii	11.3673	-0.021405			91697990	1.36251										
	0.024515	1 -0.91459	720200			14.4228		-	X	3	1	2	10											
10/17/96 14:23 1/22 [mdirimer0650030-20100.1]	at experiment (branch) 04: Cerrected Total 04: 0.0010710 (0.138-0)	19:39 Medicanday, October 2, 1996 0.0440 0.0440 0.0440 0.0440 0.0440 0.0440	1 1	Dependent Variabies Prac. Annualised cost 5 provident Variabies Prac. Annualised cost 5 provident Variabies Prac. Annualised cost			1. PT LF 12. EU TTAC 1 1 0 1.00.005430 Denoral Linear Backells Proceeding	1 1 1 1 0.0013 1 1 1 -1.00 .00013 1 1 1 -1.00 .00013 1 1 1 -1.00 .00013	1 1 1 0.00 .001110 Beautron DP Type III M Manu Squares P Yalue Pr = P			DAURANAMAMAMAMAMAMAMANA 311 1914 Manday, October 2, 1994	1919 meteoday, Other 2, 1914	PP LF DL BD FINC	1 0.000 0.7 0005 0.000 0.7 0005 0.000 0.7 0005 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.000000 0.00000000	1 0.5525 0.28 .0004136 1 0.5525 0.20 .00535 1 0.5525 0.20 .00535	MUIIIIIMMIMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMM	19150 Machanary, October 2, 1996 UL - 100130127 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 1191021 11910 0.0001 0.0001 0.000101	1 Lines Medels Presedure 5.40 0.0011579 1 Lines Medels Presedure 5.90011579 11.000 - 00021901 - 1.07 0.1946 0.0003155		19:50 Monorary, October 3, 196	19:10 Wednesday, October 2, 1994	Linest moneys Freedours humilised cost 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	
---	---	---	------	---	------	--	---	---	---	------	------	---	------------------------------	------------------	--	--	--	---	---	---------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	--	---
cub4-3. out	15 3		 	,et	 		5 " E "		~~	 	 			5 ·			 		Linear Ned	observat lans			humitend on	Í



11	Irt seroc50	030-201ps.		ALC ALC	1-3, out		10/17/96 14,	2/5 5/2	ায়	liri mrad	10030-201pe.	a siyaa s	eub4-	3.out		96/11/01	14:23	6/33
3) 4) 141111111111		:		ام نی ام ام 							222823		
			Chiverlate	11:150 Precedure	a the state of the	stober 2, 15	5							-1.6 6.1-				
\$	rishie-aldrin R			•	Ĩ	Ĭ				1	8	2		j I				
			. :			;- 1 ;					11 0015565 12 0015565 12 - 10015565 12 - 11 12 - 12 - 12 12					2222		
	•	-1 3110 -1 63 Mittply 86	A lest									1		B		122		·
				95°61			ē 2X				101101 101101 101101 101101 101101 101101	· · • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •						
\$	1999)	i		411199	Plot 	ţ					14							
	-0,00011	;		-														
		:								1	ĩ	1	2	5 5		ţ		
5	1144.00, 1	1010000000 12 13					5 3 5					-, 1980 4374 -, 1980 4374 -, 1980 4374 -, 1980 4374 -, 1980 4374 -, 1980 4374 -, 1980 4374						
									<u> </u>						Nummu Zohr 1, 1			
			1						8		M				8 22222 8 22222 8 22222			
	16051000. 2			ST(1000)					8	12250. 12 12250. 12	00000	1		с::		<u>t</u>		
: 8				1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.			5 GX									2265323		
						- 0025476 - 0025476 - 0025476 - 0025476			<u>.</u>			Immmut						
•		14	1				F				M 00013363	3	a) 	10000	R	21		

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

12										
14:23										
111										
Ĭ		*******					. 33333		1 A <u>1</u>	
	្មុំន									
	3	******			P				8	
불	Į z				*******	i i		******	1.	
1			8		B ••••••			******		S S S
A										
	- 1									
	_				5555555				. 11	
	3		1						1	
The last			6666666		2222222				333	
0-20	ä								1	
0200		******							555	
li	1	51500 51500 51500 51500 51500								
1 In		1935567	8 202000F	8 FEF7F7F	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	44 6		FF16262	8 223	
R										
27/2						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
14:23 7/22						<u> </u>				
96 14123 7/22										
22/1 42:41 34/21/0						<u> </u>		<u></u>		
10/17/96 14:23 7/22	55555									
10/17/96 14:42 1/22			83007 10111111 11. 12. 12. 11. 12. 11. 12. 11. 12. 11. 12. 11. 12. 11. 12. 11. 12.		. 10401100 111111111111111111111111111111					
10/17/96 14:23 7/22	1000 - 10				1111 . 1144339 2014-1-1 . 1316 2014-1-1 . 1316 201-1-1315			Cortear 1, 1315 Cortear 1, 1316 Bit - 18145		
27/1 121/1/01 10/1/1/02 3M			9 1.0 .005007 100000000000 000. October 2, 196 24 25 24 25 2012290023476					ADDUMINIUMUNIA ADV. October 1, 1996 M B5 M111194 M13476		
-3.0ut 10/17/96 14:23 7/22			1 -6.9 1.0 .05007 1000000000000000000000 1000000, acceler 2, 1996 1000011290013475		-1.11.4000 (000330 000000000000000000 000000100 -0001201 00000120 -0013010			Manadary, actober 3, 1916 Maraday, actober 3, 1916 Maraday, actober 3, 1916		
aub4-3.out 10/17/96 14:23 7/22			12230 - 0.9 1.0 .062007 ANNININININININININININI 19.10 Mahandy, Octaber 2, 1296 1 - M - BS 1279 .000011291 - 0112975		1120 -1.1 -1.4000 .049339 ANNOLOGONA ANNOLOGONA 1918 Mahaday, Gerahar 3, 136 1929 - Montaliza043545			19/30 Mahamanya Catabar 3. 1996 19/30 Mahamanya Catabar 3. 1996 10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/1		
cub4-3.out 10/17/96 14:23 7/22			.0002)339 -0.9 1.0 .013007 101111010111111111111111111111111					11.10 maharawa arawa 1, 115 11.10 maharawa , atalar 1, 115 12 maharawa , atalar 1, 115 12 - 4444174 , 44441144 - 444444		
cub4-3,out 10/17/96 14:23 7/22			0,74 .000,255 -0.5 1.0 .005007 10,100 mmanuturuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuu		774 .00001259 -0.0 -0.4000 .044239 11000 -00001259 -0.0 -0.4000 .044239 19.48 minutestary, October 3, 1995 B) B/ B/ B/ 201000127900102129001243			1990-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-		
cub4-3, out: 10/17/96 14:23 7/22			-0004374 -00413359 -0.9 1.0 .053067 		0004174 .00041259 -0.5 -0.4010 .0043190 11111111111111111111111111111111111			11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.		
ps.1 cub4-3.out 10/17/96 14:23 7/22			790000.574 .00013254 -0.5 1.0 .005007 11.000000000000000000000000000000000		79 0004174			11.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1		
1-201ps.1 cub4-3.out 10/17/96 14:23 7/22			.0170190006374 .00023359 -0.9 1.0 .0051007 10111111111111111111111111111111		011209 - 0000174 .0001250 -0.0 -0.0000 .000200 0000000000000000000000000			R1 R		
50010-201ps.1 cub4-3.out 10/17/96 14:22 7/22			019 ,0017079 - 10000374 ,00003339 -0.9 1.0 ,005007 101010101010101010101010101010101010		14. 4017179 - 4004174 - 10041259 - 4.1 - 4.4000 - 444339 14.1 - 14.1 - 19.1 - 1			II		
arecs0010-201pa.1 cub4-3,out 10/17/96 14:22 7/22			1001001, 0.11 (2. 00012)23. 0.1. 0.1. 0.101201, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.10101, 0.101001, 0.10101, 0.1010001, 0.100000000, 0.1000000000, 0.10000000000		101599 -0177790004174 -00041259 -0.0 -0.4000 .044239 10141111111111111111111111111111111111			1911		
11rt are 650010-201ps.1 cub4-3. out 10/17/96 14:21 7/22			42 .0013099 .0170790000374 .00023359 .0.9 1.0 .013007 101101010101010101010101010101010101		00 -0011010 -011707 -0001174 -0001120 -0.1 -0.4000 -004010 00000000000000000000000000000000			19		

					220.2			1					110.6	LISTIN	
				19:01	a designed and	steber 3	100		1000- 19 1000- 19	101100. 00		.000020290		1427200.	
ē	1	2	2	2	1	-			51000 · 59		00004374			1677200.	
11	1227200.		64346000°	00002700	201690900.		476					047474946.		74 (1) 500 .	
11	1227200.				241200000.		476	<u>.</u>							
	11257 200.						-676					19:41	8	1)15 Laimer 2., 1996	
12	1124200.				\$61(00000.		676	8	1	1	7	1	X	1	
8	X	5	2	1	ß		ŀ		1527200. 0	00015563	609030BQ.	00002700	0561 (M0000.	273 2100	
10	06051000	62 84 1 88 .		.00023256	-9.4	.0004				C9651000					
	96951998.	101100.				1200 ·						0002700	1261(10000. 1261(10000.	0025476	
11	10012090. 10012090			. 000023250		.00576			12 0057521		60000000.		1261(10000).	0125476	
3	14051500	0417675							1		1	1			
											1	1	1		_
-									10 . 0001501 10 . 0001501			052620100.		00 .0010112	
									100130. IT			.000020330		113510 TO	
						ļ			1051000 C	1101100 B		.000001256			
8	2	ä	2	2	1	2			10 . 000150 100150	1071M. 1	00004)74 00004074	. 000202000		00 . 00 4405) 00 . 00 4902	
12	1227200.	00019563		00002700	144 ((0 H M M		176 176					MININA	19499999999999		
2	1227500.	00019363			.00001175	5200-	176								
12	1251200.	19551900					26					19:41	8 .X-	teter 1, 1996	
22	1227200.	00015563 00015563		00002780 00002780			176 176	8	1	1	2	1	1	1	
	1	2	1												
	t	à	R	ì							C19191949.		1241(00000°.	0425476	
3	.0015090	.001707	00000374	.000123290			Meta		12 12 10 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12		6000000	00002700	056160000.		
2	.0051000.						5726		105150	10651000 1					
151	.00015098	.0017079	00004)74 00004374	.000023250	2.9- 9-9-		13336		1257200. 11 1257200. 11	()		0002700	.0000011950	00 25 476 00 25 476	
22	06051000	6107100.	94804)74 98804)74	000023250			14972		7	5	2	1	Ē		
<u> </u>								-	77 . 000150		00004374	.000021250		1512CM, PH	
				19:50			1996		70 . 001150 71 . 000150	0101100. 01 0101100. 01	00004374 80004374	022(20000.		100 .0056659 100 .0057022	
1	1	ł	1						00.190	.001707	9000374	.000023250	-0.2	00 .0050474	
		-	2	2	X			<u>.</u>		101100. H		000010000.		00 . 0050650 00 . 0050650	
22	1257500.	0015563		00012700	. 0000011750			-					199 M 199 199 199		
5	1227500.	C) 551000 -	(0)10000 .	0002790			10								
2	1222200.	0015563		00002700		2						19:39	S. Values	10 1 11 1996	
5	1121200.								1	ï	a	1	ä	2	
	X	â	1	â	r B				27200. 201	1000 12	(1)11110. C		166 1 C 0 0 0 0 0 .	0023476	
155	101510 00 .	6797100.	00004374	662620000.	16.0- 16.0-	10.000	32516		111 . 00575 105 . 00575	110001556			.000001195		
2	. 00013090	.001 7079	00004374	.000033250			55000	_	106 .00375		6090000 ·		1561(00000.	0015476	
1		6101100					23958		54500	1000 10	4190000.		156 I C 000 00 .	0025676	
	10051000.	6191180.	00004374	052520000.			59949		51200. 41	SELOOD - 11			561(
161	.0011000.	.0017079		.000023250	···		58786	-	1	â	1	1	5	MUDICI	
ŝ			WINNING	IMAGAMAN		MINIM		-	51000° CU15	101100 . 040	00004374	.000023250	-0.1 0.4	14(05W).	
_							334		S1000. 201			.066623250		192160.	
				19:38		Ĭ	. 1996		100 . 0015	1707100. 910 Pratica		.000023250 272720104		.0057409	
8	1	ı	7	2	X	-	-							111/200	
1	1527200. 1	M015563	(B30000° .		1010H0000		3476		CT					1171CM	
22	1121200.	00015563	(1)10000.	10120000	CICOLOGIC	22	5476	•			******	NMUMM			-
	1257200.				.00040119	2	9476								
									1	ï	1				
			1	1	1							-			
							5		162500.16	9551000	6898868			379 52 90	
	10001000. 1	. MITTY		. 00002325		1999	12		121200. 59				8561(89889.	272 2102	

14/22															
6219															
1.36/1															
1/01	me 2, 1996	88 878500			21 - 1		100000 		br 2, 1996 BS		C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C			0025476 0025476 0025476 0025476 0025476	Parto CP
) . out	Annaly, Old	M			ž ž		19		daarday, Octol BA		B				B 110
-bduo	19:40	(# 1070000					ea 		19:01 19		ea 1000000000000000000000000000000000000				ed
2.2.4.2.2		1			2		X		2		3	*****			N
30-201pe,1		n			I				1						A 100
SAT BOSO		M 1567600.			I		1		8			1	1257200	1257200. 1557200. 1557200.	M
1-1pm		1			8	<u> 2252255</u>	1 9353		8	222222	1 222225		- 22	22232	1 81
5	r											<u> </u>	. <u> </u>		<u> </u>
112 221															
1. 10/11															
10/	015476	113476 Televice			13114 13114 13114 13114 13114			88 9819476 9819476	015476 015476 015476	9057246 9057802 9057802 9057364 9057315					
101. . (55					8				B		???????? 2222223	R		
-3. out								1		B			8		
oub		0002700	452(1966) 952(1966) 952(1966) 952(1966) 952(1966)	86.61 58 57 50 57 50 57 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50		B 052(2000)		E)		11 92(2000- 922(2000- 922(2000- 922(2000- 922(2000-			2		
4	603100 00 -					1		2					2		******
		-	******		11111	EE666		9955						*****	
130-201pe.													5		
1 1ar 0 c60030-201ps	.005752100015563	.005752100015561 ac a7		IN				1000 11227200.		A			a X		10110. 10051000.

R								~				-					_							_		_	-	-	-	_	-	_								-		-					-	-		_	_		1	-
14:21																																																						
36/1																																																						
10/13	0015476 0025476	10101	101146	519450	02(7)0	056993					2	0025476	0025476				MUDICE	7905000	. 0016197		6(1))00.				;;;;	2		-,0025476 -,0025476	0025476	0015476 0025476		MADIC!	727220.	9619599	. 0055952	1011200	. 0657096		197		2			0025476 0025476		9/9C296'-		627625	1057254 1054210	026629	1036841	115150		
-J.out	156 1 (1000 0 . 156 1 (1000 0 .	1 1 1							Contraction on the		Ă	.00000110000	056160000.		0561100000.	. 000000	R B	1.3 -1.0000	0.9 -0.9000			0.0 -0.4000		0.10	 	ž	1561100000	1561500000.		. 00000 11 950 . 00000 11 950		8	0.1 -0.3000			0.1000			•		I	0561C00000.		. 00000 11 950 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 1	.000031956	10410 10 100 10 ·	2 2	1. 1.1 1.1 1.1 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.						
-Pqno	0002758	1	952(20000.	442424444	.00021250	.0100023259 022220000			19.91		â	00012700		69982798			â	.00001150	000023250		052120000.	.00023250		19:90		î						2	.00001250	.000013256	000023250 022220007	.010123350					2			00002766			1		.010023256 					
	(1)11040 ·	1	PTEABOO		00004374	00000174					2	. 00000000	699868888. 6998688888			. MUBERS	1	00004374	00004374 00004374	0004374		00004374			1	1			61311110 ·			2	00000174				0000174				2	60798886		53997000°			2							MMMMM
030-201pe.	19551000	B 7	6101 100°		. 0017079						ä	·. 00013363		00013363		C9551000	14	STOT 100.	0107100.	001707			munum		1	1	00015363	·· ••••15563		00013563			9787180 . I	e101100.		CL02.100.		~~~~~			ä		() (5100		0013361	TREETAND	i	COT100.				6101100.		3 3 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9
r1 Inr 050	1667600.	X	16921999.	1015/11M	14051000.	. 04013494				;	1	1227500.	1257500.	1121200.	1257500.	ILETEN.	*	.0015096	10121010.	10011000	16051000	14051000. (I MANARARI		1	ł	1121200-	1257200.	1657540	1227200.	11267200.	*	A CO2 1990.		16051000.	10051000	10013094	Imminit			1	1267500.	1252500		10657521	176/644	*	16921090.	16051000. 0	16051000. 1		16051000. 1		
	EE	8	5	1	5	ĒĒ			_			ŝ	52	E	ŝŝ		ł	22	£Ĕ	E!	1	1	<u>;</u>		_		E:		ž		i i	ł	201	Ĩ		11	202	ş					i.	-	2	<	l		i.	5	12			
PALITIZE TELES	0057367 81598514 12158242	6210500		I. I	· 1334	2	825476	925476	823676	025476		5	11	55		135			147	2, 1976	8	121474	929476	025476 025476	025476		Matter i ca	6 16 500 8	6529100	0012746	2019101				1, 1996	2			025476	035476	9/ BC7 A	Million C.L.	6691639	0056072	0057223	0020102	0650835			. 2, 1996	8	025476		929474
310016	0.1 -0.0000 0.1 0.10000					I	0 0561600000.	0 0561500000.	0 056100000.	0 0100000	A'- BEATEAAAAA.		7200, 9.0 1.0	0.1 0.5 .0057	0.1 0.7 .0056		0.1 1.0 .0057				I	0 0201100000.	0 0561600000. 0 0561600000.	0 024100000, 0 024100000,		**- ACATEMANA.	ß		0.2 -0.90000	0.2 -0.70000 -		0.1 -0.4000			whenter, October	1			0261(00060.	0		8 13	0.2 -0.30000 .		0.2 -0.0000		0.2 0.10040 .	10000000000000000000000000000000000000			I	0000033350		056150000°
- mp	052(20000, 052(20000, 052(20000)			:		8			0002700		11/200A0'-	2	052522000.	.000023250		052(20000.	. 000033250			19:41	2	0002784					1	962(20000.	.00023250	000023250	06223390				19:39 1	1						2	. 004123250		. 000023250	.000123250	. 1008265396			19161	2			
						7	10000000000000000000000000000000000000			1010000. 1		X	A7434444				00000374				2	(1). (1)(1)(1)	1000000. E	(1)(1)(1)(1)(1)(1)(1)(1)(1)(1)(1)(1)(1)(1		P10900				Macconne			a			100000			1		ACCOUNT.				MMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMM			2	(3)0000 . C		·3 .00000609
			*****			E	0001556		10001556	9551000 - 1		ä	4107.00. 01	12100. 1			et 01100. 16	MIMININ			H	t	1 0001554	1 0001556	1 0001556	BCCTAAN'- 1	2	erur:00. 04	12100.00	et 0/100. 04	F107100. 04		Mentered			1		1 0001556	1000-1	10001	HCCIAAA 1	5	ELLINO. 14		101100 . BU	84.04.100 . 04	101100. 06	MINIMIN			H	10001556		
ri sarêcî						1	1751 500 · · ·	1057201	1257200. 0	1252500. 1		X	100100. 3	7 .0001501		1051000. 1	1051000. 2	JUDGU UNDOW			1	1257200. 1	1267200. 4	1251200. 1	1002120		*	100100. 6	1 .000150	6 .0001501	1001000		100000000000000000000000000000000000000			1		1251200. 1	121200	5 .00572		*	101100.0	1061000. 5	1000 · C	900120					1	1.005753		
a 1.)	***	1	3			8			;A	27	3	8		22		12	2	E			U	2	22	22	22	:	8	2	2:	٩Ż	21	12	i			8	2	122	22	23	5	8	23	. 2	22	2	7	ī	_		8	2	2	1

÷.	114000	330-201pm		auba	-J.out	101	17/96 14:23 17/22		rizared500	30-201pe, J		-bdub	3.out	A NAMES	10/17/96 141	23 . 1ê	1/22
8	2	8	2	2	1	2		22	1001000.	107110.		1000010000.	1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9	11) 11)	1000		
22	1267 200.	0013563	60900000.	00002788	.00000110000	0025476							10.11- C.7				
686	11267200. 11267200.		499999999. 49999999.		1541(10000. 1541(10000.	,						M 05/61			181 1996		
Ĩ	1227 200.		68948048°			0025476			1	ĩ	2	1	3	-			
8	1	i.	X	8	25 75	PROJET		-	1127200.	19651000	(1)0000	00002700	56100000.		111		
22	.00013090	11110-		.000023250	0.4 -1.000	120500.00			1227200.		40900000°		14 1(000 00 ···		5476		
	16051000.			00111111111111111111111111111111111111		100CZ00. 00			121200.	0013356)		0002700			5476 5476		
12						11(100)				1							
	1000000000								0001100	8787788.	ATCAGG6	022224040.	1.4- 2.4		91919		
						956			00012090	101 707 100		0.1023250			54065		
				95162	Manday. 8	to h ar 3, 1996			1005100. 1	001707		000023250	0.9 - 0.0		96940		
	X	Ħ	2	2	X	2		22	10051000.	0117079 017075	00044374	.000023250		11	57706		
	1227200					0025476								ļ	150		
i.	11247 200.	0001554)	(1)(1)(1) (1)(1)(1)	00002700		0025476			1	1	2						
đ	*	S	1	8	5				ICHCAMP (TRANSPORT	feftense					
-	04051000	6787199.			0.6 -0.300	4991540. 00							1000000.		5676 5676		
<u>.</u>	.00015090			052(2000.		1105500. 00			1057500. 0		(1)11000. (1)11000.	00002700	261(00000.		3476		
<u>.</u>	.00015090.			05202000.		00.0057001		22	1227200. 1			00002700	16100000		3476		_
	.00015090					101100.00		ł	X	1	3	1	8		r		
1011			*******					<u>.</u>	1001200. 0	61 M 100.	00004374	.000023259		10574			
				19156	Mahanday, Oct	tabar 2, 1996						.000021250		.00566			
i	1	Ħ	2	2	X	8		22	16051000	0102 100. 0107 100.	00004374	.000023250					
£	11247200.	0015565	(1)1100 .	10120000	8561100000. I	0023476			Itociano. I			955(59999.					
22	1267200.	·· M015563	48988000 ·			0025476	-	<u>}</u>							651		
22	1257 200.	00015563	. 00010469		0561(00000.	0025476						19:55	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	October 1	. 1996		
-	1267 200.	00013563	609000 0 .			0025476		8	1	1	2	â	i	-	2		
	*	5	1	8	B B	H ant C			11257200. 7	00015561	(0)00000°.		. 100000 .		3476 13476		
	16051000.			162((20000.		((11200.		27	1257200. 0				161(00000°		13 47 6 13 47 6		
	0.051000.					. 0036302 . 0036302			1257500. 1		6030000.		.00000.		5016 5476		
12	14051000.		11(100000			. 0054710 2047209.											
									10021000. 7	e101.100	A76A000	05262000.	.1				
				:		196		22	14051000. 0			.000023250			116161		
_	1	1	1						10051000. 1	101100.	00004374	.00023259			136671		
									16051000. 2			.000021220					
53								<u>:</u>	mmmu			IMMIINI					
222					0541(00000° 1	0025476						N 85.61	, vitera de la compañía	Octohir .	1, 1996		
12	1164 500		64 74 844 9	. 000270				8		ä	2	â	z	-	2		
8	X	ĥ	8	2	r B	HEDICA		**	1257200. 0	0013363	(0)0000°		CICOM00.		13476		
253	.001501								6 .0057521 7 .0057521			0002700	61(00000.		5476 5476		
119	00012030	1 .0017079		. 000023250	1 6.5 -6.700	00 0032621			1227520.	19551000	990000		6100000		5475		

20/32					
14123					
PE177/91	8				
.out	X				
c-pqno					
1 100 11 100	2			*	
30-201ps,	=				
Lardo500	z				
MIL	8	EEZEZEE 8 EEZEZE	A CARLER & REALER &	I INIMAL I INI	
14:23 19/22					
1 96/17/01	2	e smare i X			FFFFFFF & HILLEF # H
	1 00254				
3.out	1561(M000.				
-bdua					
1	6130000				
30-201pe.	00015563				
1 ar 6 c5 00.	1667200.				· FFFFFF · MANNA
15	•	1 1010101 1 1			8 33535EE 8 33539EE 8

.

r0c50030-	161 %	2010e.		Adura 92222999	-J.out	1	10/11	196 14/23	1 7/17		Irlantoo	20010-20	Olps. I		oubd	-J.out		10/1	1/96	123	12/21
1015020 - 0017070 - 0000017			- Ī	952(200 4 .	•.• •.•		225 Aunum			8 3	1 1			1	44 FERENCE	- 8		410)1			
:	; ;	1			Ì	1												017272 026904 031572 019010			
191010. (192100 12210) 191010. (19210 12210)						37	N 29476 N 29476 N 25476														
75721 001252 00000 157512 - 0011252 00000 157521 0. 102120 15752 00112552 000005 157521 00012552 000005 15752 00012555						*****	M 25476 M 25476 M 25476 M 25476 M 25476			5	I	•	7	2		Ĭ	8	21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 2			
X X	1 1	1		8	B	P					57500. 00			6090000			1- 1561	929476			
			222222															023474 023475 023475 023476			
		HUMMIN	1								1000 1000 1000			1004374	.00021250	† †		02020			
: : :	1	i			ľ	at a	R Z								.000023259			056422 057507			
	90000- (9551000		22	141100														050142			
1221 - 12	10000 (1551000 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		::::			: : : : 1333	N15476 N15476 N15476								95.91						
12721 0015561 .00010			22			177 183	M19476 M29476				1	-	I	2	1	Ă		1			
			;	1	5						51500. 21 51200. 31							025476			
10000			222															023474			
			22				1144500.							1		E B		MUDICE			
	*****	****	Ŧ			INNI					2000. 20 2000. 20			12(100000000000000000000000000000000000	10000000000000000000000000000000000000	•••		057822 057487 057888			
				8 5' 61	İ	QC C	r 1, 19%				51000 · 00			11(10000	122(2MM.			0199500			
1	1	2		2	1		2						11019	74(74 H	100020254			1056840 1057496			
	70000 (0000) 		2222222																		
2	8	8		8	B	ł	510														
			22222				266835														
			5 F				731 MMMM			<u> </u>											
7	1	ä	_	19191	İ	OCT III	. iii														
10000 - 1001000 - 115150	10000 (19551000		- 223	000271		22	ATACE M														
19999. [9551990.] . 115/201 19990. (9551908.] . 115/201 19999. (95519.] . 115/201 19999. (9551990.] . 115/201			19929																		