

**ASME B89.7.4.1-2005**  
(Technical Report)

# Measurement Uncertainty and Conformance Testing: Risk Analysis

**AN ASME TECHNICAL REPORT**



The American Society of  
Mechanical Engineers

**ASME B89.7.4.1-2005**  
**(Technical Report)**

# **Measurement Uncertainty and Conformance Testing: Risk Analysis**

**AN ASME TECHNICAL REPORT**



**The American Society of  
Mechanical Engineers**

Three Park Avenue • New York, NY 10016

Date of Issuance: February 3, 2006

This Technical Report will be revised when the Society approves the issuance of a new edition. There will be no addenda issued to this edition.

ASME is the registered trademark of The American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

ASME does not “approve,” “rate,” or “endorse” any item, construction, proprietary device, or activity.

ASME does not take any position with respect to the validity of any patent rights asserted in connection with any items mentioned in this document, and does not undertake to insure anyone utilizing a standard against liability for infringement of any applicable letters patent, nor assumes any such liability. Users of a code or standard are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any such patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, is entirely their own responsibility.

Participation by federal agency representative(s) or person(s) affiliated with industry is not to be interpreted as government or industry endorsement of this code or standard.

No part of this document may be reproduced in any form,  
in an electronic retrieval system or otherwise,  
without the prior written permission of the publisher.

The American Society of Mechanical Engineers  
Three Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016-5990

Copyright © 2006 by  
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERS  
All rights reserved  
Printed in U.S.A.

# CONTENTS

Foreword .....	iv
Committee Roster .....	v
<b>1 Scope .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Definitions and Terminology .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3 Inspection Measurements and Pass/Fail Decisions .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4 Frequency Distributions: Variable Production Processes and Noisy Measurements .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5 Probability Densities: Prior Information and Standard Uncertainty .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6 Workpiece Inspection: Measurements and Measurement Uncertainty .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>7 Gauging (or Test) Limits and Guard Bands .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>8 Controlling the Quality of Individual Workpieces .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>9 Controlling the Average Quality of Workpieces .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Figures</b>	
1 Tolerance Zone .....	3
2 Frequency Distribution of a Sample of Spacers .....	3
3 Fraction of Workpieces Conforming Versus Process Capability Index .....	5
4 Process Probability Density for the Length of a Randomly Chosen Workpiece .....	7
5 Probability Density for the Lengths of a Measured Workpiece .....	9
6 Measurement Capability Index Versus Scaled Measurement Result .....	11
7 Stringent Acceptance Zone .....	12
8 Relaxed Acceptance Zone .....	12
9 Desired Level of Confidence Defines an Acceptance Zone .....	13
10 Guard Band Chosen to Reduce the Probability of Accepting a Workpiece That Is Too Long .....	14
11 Stringent Acceptance Zone for Symmetric Two-Sided Guard Banding .....	14
12 Contingency Table for an Inspection Measurement .....	16
13 Contingency Table for the Worked Example .....	17
14 Producer's and Consumer's Risks for the Worked Example .....	19
15 Producer's Risk Versus Consumer's Risk for the Worked Example With $C_p = 0.55$ and $C_m = 2.5$ .....	20
16 Producer's Risk Versus Consumer's Risk for $C_p = 1.5$ .....	21
17 Producer's Risk Versus Consumer's Risk for $C_p = 1$ .....	22
18 Producer's Risk Versus Consumer's Risk for $C_p = \frac{2}{3}$ .....	23
19 Producer's Risk Versus Consumer's Risk for $C_p = \frac{1}{3}$ .....	24
<b>Tables</b>	
1 Fraction Conforming Versus Process Capability Index .....	6
2 Conformance Probability Versus Guard Band Multiplier .....	14
<b>Mandatory Appendices</b>	
I Properties of Gaussian Probability Densities .....	25
II Risk Calculations .....	27

## FOREWORD

The ISO Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement (GUM) is now the internationally accepted method of expressing measurement uncertainty [1]. The U.S. has adopted the GUM as a national standard [2]. The evaluation of measurement uncertainty has been applied for some time at national measurement institutes; more recently, increasingly stringent laboratory accreditation requirements have increased the use of measurement uncertainty analysis in industrial calibration laboratories. In some cases, measurement uncertainty calculations have even been applied to factory floor measurements.

Given the potential impact to business practices, national and international standards committees are working to publish new standards and technical reports that will facilitate the integration of the GUM approach and the consideration of measurement uncertainty in product conformance decisions. In support of this effort, the ASME B89 Committee for Dimensional Metrology has formed Subcommittee 7 — Measurement Uncertainty.

Measurement uncertainty has important economic consequences for calibration and inspection activities. In calibration reports, the magnitude of the uncertainty is often taken as an indication of the quality of the laboratory, and smaller uncertainty values generally are of higher value and cost. In industrial measurements, uncertainty has an economic impact through the decision rule employed in accepting and rejecting products. ASME B89.7.3.1, Guidelines for Decision Rules: Considering Measurement Uncertainty in Determining Conformance to Specifications, addresses the role of measurement uncertainty when accepting or rejecting products based on a measurement result and a product specification.

With significant economic interests at stake, it is advisable that manufacturers guard against accepting bad products and rejecting good ones. Even with a very good measurement system, there will be some risk of decision errors, with cost impacts that vary depending upon the nature of the product and its intended end use. While the evaluation of measurement uncertainty is a technical activity well-described in the GUM, the selection of a decision rule is a business decision that involves cost considerations.

ASME B89.7.3.1 provides uniform, unambiguous terminology for documenting a decision rule. It describes the relationship between the conformance zone (locating conforming characteristics) and the acceptance zone (locating acceptable measurement results). This Technical Report addresses the problem of determining the gauging limits (or test limits) that define the boundaries of the acceptance zone. The limits are chosen to balance the risks of the two types of decision errors, whose relative magnitudes depend upon product-specific economic factors that are outside the scope of this Report.

This is a free preview. Purchase the entire publication at the link below:

[Product Page](#)

- 
- [Looking for additional Standards? Visit Intertek Inform Infostore](#)
  - [Learn about LexConnect, All Jurisdictions, Standards referenced in Australian legislation](#)
-