



HAL
open science

Performance measurement using overall equipment effectiveness (OEE): Literature review and practical application discussion

Liliane M-y A Pintelon, Peter Nganga Muchiri

► **To cite this version:**

Liliane M-y A Pintelon, Peter Nganga Muchiri. Performance measurement using overall equipment effectiveness (OEE): Literature review and practical application discussion. *International Journal of Production Research*, 2008, 46 (13), pp.3517-3535. <10.1080/00207540601142645>. <hal-00512968>

HAL Id: hal-00512968

<https://hal.science/hal-00512968v1>

Submitted on 1 Sep 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization



Performance measurement using overall equipment effectiveness (OEE): Literature review and practical application discussion

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Production Research</i>
Manuscript ID:	TPRS-2006-IJPR-0559.R1
Manuscript Type:	State-of-the-Art Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Nov-2006
Complete List of Authors:	Pintelon, Liliane; KULeuven, CIB muchiri, peter; KULeuven, CIB
Keywords:	MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT, PERFORMANCE MEASURES
Keywords (user):	



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **Title:** Performance Measurement Using Overall
9
10
11 Equipment Effectiveness (OEE): Literature Review
12
13
14
15 & Practical Application Discussion
16
17
18
19

20 **Article Type:** Review Article
21
22
23
24

25 **Authors:**
26
27

28 *Peter Muchiri*, Liliane Pintelon,*

29
30 *Centre for Industrial Management (CIB)*

31
32 *Katholieke Universiteit Leuven*

33
34 *Celestijnenlaan 300A*

35
36
37 *3001 Heverlee, Belgium*
38
39
40
41

42
43 *Tel: +32 16 32 28 44*

44
45 *Fax: +32 16 32 29 86*
46
47
48
49

50 **Corresponding Author: peter.muchiri@cib.kuleuven.be*

51
52 *liliane.pintelon@cib.kuleuven*
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

The quest for improving productivity in the current global competitive environment has led to a need for rigorously defined performance measurement systems for manufacturing processes. In this paper, OEE is described as such kind of performance measurement tool that measures different types of production losses and indicates areas of process improvement. Analysis is done on how OEE has evolved leading to other tools like TEEP, PEE, OFE, OPE and OAE. Two industrial examples of OEE application are discussed and the differences between theory and practice analysed. Finally, a framework for classifying and measuring production losses for overall production effectiveness is proposed. The framework harmonises the differences between theory and practice and makes possible the presentation of overall production /asset effectiveness (OAE) that can be customized with the manufacturers needs to improve productivity.

Keywords: Performance Measurement, Overall Equipment Effectiveness, , Manufacturing

1. Introduction

The evolution towards a global economy has expanded the base of competition for virtually all businesses. By the very nature of the word competition, it is implied that someone out there is always keeping score. The tally on the scorecard may be a measure of more sales, increased profit or a growing customer base. Regardless of the criteria of measurement used, to remain competitive, you have to put up more points on the board. In order to beat competition, there is a basic business demand to get better at what is done and at meeting customers' expectation.

As noted by Fleischer *et al* (2006), the competitiveness of manufacturing companies depends on the availability and productivity of their production facilities. Huang *et al* (2003) also states that due to intense global competition, companies are striving to improve and optimize their productivity in order to remain competitive. This would be possible if the production losses are identified and eliminated so that the manufacturers can bring their products to the market at a minimum cost. This situation has led to a need for a rigorously defined performance measurement system that is able to take into account different important elements of productivity in a manufacturing process.

The total productive maintenance (TPM) concept, launched by Nakajima (1988) in the 1980s, provided a quantitative metric called Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) for measuring productivity of individual equipment in a factory. It identifies and measures losses of important aspects of manufacturing

1
2
3
4 namely availability, performance and quality rate. This supports the
5
6 improvement of equipment effectiveness and thereby it's productivity. The OEE
7
8 concept is becoming increasingly popular and has been widely used as a
9
10 quantitative tool essential for measurement of productivity especially in the
11
12 semiconductor manufacturing operations (Huang *et al*, 2003). Manufacturers in
13
14 other industries have also embraced it to improve their asset utilization.
15
16
17

18
19
20
21 The industrial application of OEE, as it is today, varies from one industry to
22
23 another. Though the basis of measuring effectiveness is derived from the
24
25 original OEE concept, manufacturers have customized OEE to fit their particular
26
27 industrial requirements. Furthermore, the term OEE has been modified in
28
29 literature to different other terms with regard to the concept of application. This
30
31 has led to broadening of OEE to overall factory /plant effectiveness (OFE) /
32
33 (OPE), overall throughput effectiveness (OTE), production equipment
34
35 effectiveness (PEE), overall asset effectiveness (OAE) and total equipment
36
37 effectiveness performance (TEEP).
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 It is the objective of this paper to investigate how the OEE tool has evolved with
45
46 time and how it has been applied to fit the individual needs of the industries.
47
48 Two industrial examples are analysed to show how OEE concept is applied to
49
50 enhance productivity in industries and the different types of production losses
51
52 measured. To harmonise the different OEE concepts in literature and practice, a
53
54 general framework with different categories of production losses has been
55
56 developed. This framework gives different categories of losses that are
57
58 important in measuring overall production effectiveness. Finally, this paper
59
60

1
2
3
4 discusses the benefits and challenges of using OEE measurement tool and the
5
6 type of processes where its benefits is significant.
7
8
9

10 11 **2. The OEE Measurement Tool - Overview** 12 13

14
15
16 OEE measurement tool was developed from the TPM concept launched by
17
18 Nakajima (1988). The goal of TPM is to achieve zero breakdown and zero
19
20 defects related to equipment. The consequence of reducing breakdowns and
21
22 defects is improvement on production rate, reduction in costs, reduction in
23
24 inventory and eventually, increase in labour productivity. The TPM concept puts
25
26 much attention to production equipments since they have a high influence on
27
28 quality, productivity, cost, inventory, safety and health, and production output.
29
30 This is especially true for highly automated processes.
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 OEE is defined as a measure of total equipment performance. That is, the
39
40 degree to which the equipment is doing what it is supposed to do (Williamson,
41
42 2006). It is a three-part analysis tool for equipment performance based on its
43
44 availability, performance, and the quality rate of the output. It is used to identify
45
46 for an equipment the related losses for the purpose of improving total asset
47
48 performance and reliability. It categorizes major losses or reasons for poor
49
50 performance and therefore provides the basis for setting improvement priorities
51
52 and beginning of root cause analysis. It can point to hidden capacity in a
53
54 manufacturing process and lead to balanced flow. OEE is used to track and
55
56 trace improvements or decline in equipment effectiveness over a period of time
57
58
59
60 (Bulent *et al*, 2000).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Confusion exist as to whether OEE indeed measures effectiveness (as depicted
8 by its name) or it is an efficiency measure. In literature (US department of
9 Energy, 1995), effectiveness is defined as a process characteristic that indicates
10 the degree to which the process output conforms to the requirements. It tells
11 whether right things are done. Efficiency on the other hand, is defined as a
12 process characteristic indicating the degree to which the process produces the
13 required output at minimum resource cost. It tells whether things are done right.
14 The three measures (availability rate, performance rate and quality rate)
15 captured by the OEE tool indicates the degree of conformation to output
16 requirements. Therefore, indeed the OEE tool is a measure of effectiveness.
17 This is in agreement with the definition in literature that OEE measures the
18 degree to which the equipment is doing what it is supposed to do based on
19 availability, performance and quality rate. (Williamson, 2006).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 The OEE tool is designed to identify losses that reduce the equipment
41 effectiveness. These losses are activities that absorb resources but create no
42 value. According to Jonsson and Lesshammar (1999), the losses are due to
43 manufacturing disturbances that are either chronic or sporadic. Chronic
44 disturbances are small, hidden and are as a result of several concurrent causes.
45 Sporadic disturbances on the other hand, are more obvious since they occur
46 quickly and have large deviations from the normal state. It is a bottom-up
47 approach where an integrated workforce strives to achieve overall equipment
48 effectiveness by eliminating six big losses (Nakajima, 1988). The six big losses
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 are given below with some examples from a palletizing plant in a brewery as
5
6 analysed by Pintelon *et al* (2000).
7
8
9

10 11 Downtime losses

- 12
13
14 (1) Breakdown losses categorised as time losses and quantity losses caused
15
16 by equipment failure or breakdown. For example, a breakdown of
17
18 palletizing plant motor in a brewery leads to downtime and thus
19
20 production loss.
21
22
23 (2) Set-up and adjustment losses occur when production is changing over
24
25 from requirement of one item to another. In brewery plant, this type of
26
27 loss is encountered during set-ups between different products, testing
28
29 during start-ups and fine-tuning of machines and instruments.
30
31
32

33 Speed losses

- 34
35 (3) Idling and minor stoppage losses occur when production is interrupted by
36
37 temporary malfunction or when machine is idling. For example dirty
38
39 photocells on palletizing machines cause minor stoppages. Though they
40
41 are quickly fixed, much capacity is lost due to their frequency.
42
43
44 (4) Reduced speed losses refer to the difference between equipment design
45
46 speed and actual operating speed. In a palletizing plant, use of
47
48 unadapted pallets cause longer processing time for the same number of
49
50 bottles leading to speed losses.
51
52
53

54 Quality Losses

- 55
56 (5) Quality defects and rework are losses in quality caused by malfunctioning
57
58 production equipment. For example, some pallet types get stuck in
59
60 between depalletizer and unpacker and are damaged.

(6) Reduced yield during start-up are yield losses that occur from machine start-up to stabilisation. For example in the brewery, poor preparation for morning shift by night shift leads to problems with the filling taps and thus leads to reduced yields.

The six big losses are measured by OEE, which is a function of availability (A), performance (P) and Quality rate (Q). Therefore:

$$OEE = A * P * Q$$

Where,

$$\text{Availability Rate (A)} = \frac{\text{Operating Time (hrs)}}{\text{Loading time (hrs)}} \times 100$$

$$\text{Operating Time} = \text{Loading Time} - \text{Downtime}$$

$$\text{Performance Efficiency (P)} = \frac{\text{Theoretical Cycle time (hrs)} * \text{Actual Output (Units)}}{\text{Operating Time (hrs)}}$$

$$\text{Quality Rate (Q)} = \frac{(\text{Total Production} - \text{Defect Amount})}{\text{Total Production (Units)}} \times 100$$

The OEE measurement tool has its strength in the way it integrates different important aspects of manufacturing into a single measurement tool. The perspectives integrated in the OEE tool are the maintenance effectiveness, production efficiency and quality efficiency as shown in figure 1.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

‘[Insert Figure 1 here]’

3. Evolution Of OEE

Though the OEE tool has become increasingly popular and has been widely used as a quantitative tool essential for measurement of productivity, it is only limited to productivity behaviour of individual equipments (Huang *et al*, 2003). Scott and Pisa (1998) have pointed out that the gains in OEE, while important and on going, are insufficient because no machine is isolated. They points out that manufacturing process is a complex web of interactions among process tools, materials, machines, people, departments, companies and processes. However, too often these inter-dependent activities are viewed in isolation and there is lack of coordination in deploying available factory resources (people, information materials and tools) to manage work efficiently. It is therefore necessary to focus one’s attention beyond the performance of individual equipment toward performance of the whole factory. The ultimate objective of any factory is to have a highly efficient integrated system and not brilliant individual equipments (Oechsner *et al*, 2003).

This insufficiency of OEE tool has led to modification and enlargement of original OEE tool to fit a broader perspective as deemed important in the manufacturing systems. With the modification of OEE, different terminologies has also come up in literature and in practice, coupled with their modified formulations. Some of the modified formulations are limited to effectiveness at equipment level (e.g. PEE and TEEP) while others have been extended to

1
2
3
4 factory level effectiveness (e.g. OFE, OTE, OPE and OAE). This paper looks
5
6 into these different terminologies and formulations developed in literature.
7
8
9 Further, two industrial examples are discussed as an illustration of industrial
10
11 practice concerning OEE. This has been done using examples from 2 Western
12
13 European companies. The different terminologies and consequent formulations
14
15 are as follows:
16
17

20 **3.1 Total Equipment Effectiveness Performance (TEEP)**

21
22
23
24
25 Total Equipment Effectiveness Performance (TEEP), proposed by Invancic
26
27 (1998), is very similar to OEE. The main difference lies in the inclusion of
28
29 planned downtime in total planned time horizon. In order to show clearly how
30
31 maintenance contributes to the bottom line productivity of the plant, a clear
32
33 distinction is made between planned downtime and unplanned downtime.
34
35 Minimising unplanned shutdown, sometimes called technical downtime, is a
36
37 common goal in maintenance. Unplanned downtime is a function of the number
38
39 of breakdowns within a specified time period and related measures such as
40
41 mean time between failures (MTBF) and mean time to repair (MTTR) (Pintelon
42
43 *et al*, 2000). MTBF and MTTR are claimed to be measures of equipment
44
45 achievement and are related to objectives such as functional performance and
46
47 process capability (Wilson, 1999).
48
49
50
51
52

53
54
55
56 With the help of TEEP, planned and unplanned downtime can be measured.
57
58 Thorough analysis of these two elements enables the maintenance function to
59
60 improve equipments availability by either increasing the mean time between

1
2
3
4 failure (MTBF) or reducing the mean time to repair (MTTR). The other elements
5 included in the TEEP measure are the speed losses and quality rate, which are
6 also in OEE. The TEEP is calculated by dividing the valuable operating time
7 (VOT) with the total available time (T_T) as shown in figure 2. The constituent
8 elements (losses) in TEEP are analysed and measured as shown in figure 3.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

‘[Insert Figure 2 here]’

The TEEP measure, like OEE, is limited to equipment level productivity. It is also applicable to a processing plant or a flow shop where the production process can be treated like a single production entity.

‘[Insert Figure 3 here]’

3.2 *Production Equipment Effectiveness (PEE)*

Production equipment effectiveness (PEE), formulated by Raouf (1994), is similar to OEE. The main difference with OEE is the allocation of weights to the various items in the overall effectiveness. It assumes that quality has different weight from performance and different from availability contrary to the basic assumption in OEE that the three elements have the same weight. It also makes a distinction between two different types of production operations namely:

1. Discrete-type production operations and
2. Continuous process operation.

For discrete-type production operation, PEE is calculated as follows:

$$PEE = (A^{\kappa_1}) (E^{\kappa_2}) (Q^{\kappa_3})$$

Where, A = Availability

E = Performance Efficiency

Q = Quality efficiency

κ_i is the weights of the PEE elements (for $i=1$ to 3), $0 < \kappa_i \leq 1$ and $\sum \kappa_i = 1$

For continuous process operation, PEE is defined as function of availability (A_1), attainment (A_2), performance efficiency (E), quality rates (Q), product support efficiency (PSE) and operating utility (OU). These losses are outlined in PEE diagram as shown in figure 4. Therefore:

$$PEE = (A_1)^{\kappa_1} (A_2)^{\kappa_2} (E)^{\kappa_3} (Q)^{\kappa_4} (PSE)^{\kappa_5} (OU)^{\kappa_6}$$

Where,

κ_i is the weights of the PEE elements (for $i=1$ to 6), $0 < \kappa_i \leq 1$ and $\sum \kappa_i = 1$

'[Insert Figure 4 here]'

The availability rate considers the planned or scheduled downtime and is similar to the planning rate in TEEP. The attainment rate considers the unscheduled downtime and is similar to availability in TEEP. The other additional factors included are the product support efficiency and operating utility, which considers the transaction losses and no demand time respectively. It is assumed that there

1
2
3
4 is no setup time needed for the continuous process operation and therefore,
5
6 setup time loss has not been included in the PEE diagram.
7
8
9

10 11 **3.3 Overall Factory Effectiveness (OFE)** 12 13

14
15
16 The overall factory effectiveness (OFE) was developed to measure the factory
17
18 level effectiveness, where several production steps or machines are installed to
19
20 form a production process. While OEE is about achieving excellence in
21
22 individual equipment, OFE is about the relationships among different machines
23
24 and processes. As noted by Scott and Pisa (1998), OFE seeks to integrate the
25
26 many activities and information systems that production process entails. OFE is
27
28 therefore a term about combining activities, relationships between different
29
30 machines and processes, integrating information, decisions, and actions across
31
32 many independent systems and subsystems (Oechsner *et al*, 2003). Among the
33
34 issues that OFE seeks to accomplish is; to synchronize the production schedule
35
36 with planned downtime, setup time and qualification time through tighter
37
38 connectivity to enterprise planning systems and infinite capacity schedule;
39
40 optimize the sequence of orders, works or jobs; ensure a balanced line and
41
42 smooth flow of work by integrating micro-scheduling with overall plant
43
44 scheduling (Williamson, 2006).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Up to now, there is no common approach for the OFE metrics. However, some
55
56 proposals are given in literature of which two are discussed. The approach of
57
58 Scott and Pisa (1998) considers the fact that different plants have different
59
60 goals and so there can be no single indicator. They suggest creating a

1
2
3
4 composite metrics (e.g. cycle time efficiency, on-time delivery, capacity
5 utilization, rework arte, yield rate etc) that ask for specific key goals. The
6
7 important thing is to define measuring criteria for success and application of
8
9 weight factors as desired to meet corporate goals. For these metrics, an overall
10
11 result is computed.
12
13
14

15
16
17
18 Another approach proposed by Huang *et al* (2003) considers simulation analysis
19
20 as the most reliable method in studying the dynamic performance of
21
22 manufacturing systems. It defines an OFE metric, overall throughput
23
24 effectiveness (OTE), developed on the basis of OEE metrics analysis, for
25
26 complex connected manufacturing systems. These metrics are integrated with
27
28 simulation analysis for manufacturing productivity improvement.
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 From the OEE formula and the OEE diagram (see figure 1), OEE is calculated in
36
37 terms of production units as;
38
39
40
41

$$42 \quad OEE = \frac{\text{Number of good parts produced } (P_g)}{\text{Theoretical number of parts produced in total time } (P_{th})}$$

43
44
45
46 Where,

$$47 \quad P_{th} = \text{Theoretical production rate } (R_{th}) * \text{Total available time } (T_T)$$

48
49
50
51
52
53 By extending the expression of unit-based OEE to factory level, the overall
54
55 throughput effectiveness (OTE) during period T_T is defined as;
56
57
58
59
60

$$\text{OTE} = \frac{\text{Good product output (units) from factory } (P_{g(F)})}{\text{Theoretical attainable product output (units) from factory in total time } (P_{F(th)})}$$

Similarly,

$$P_{th(F)} = R_{th(F)} \cdot T_T$$

Where,

$R_{th(F)}$ = The theoretical processing rate for actual product output from factory.

Using these formulations, OFE for any manufacturing system can be calculated.

Since many manufacturing systems are parallel and/or series the OTE formulation for these two systems have been developed.

It is however noted that the OFE metric are in development stage and simulation analysis is considered the most reliable method to date in studying the dynamic performance of manufacturing systems (Huang *et al*, 2003). The under laying concept behind simulation is that manufacturing systems can be treated as a combination of a number of simple subsystems, which in turn are the combination of individual production equipments (Huang, 2002). Productivity metrics are then integrated in the model to measure system performance and help identify productivity improvement opportunities.

3.4 OAE and OPE

1
2
3
4 OAE (overall asset effectiveness) and OPE (overall production effectiveness)
5
6 are measurement tools that have been developed from OEE tool. Though the
7
8 terms have limited application in literature, they have been applied extensively
9
10 in the industries. They are applied to identify and measure all the losses
11
12 associated with the overall production process. The two terms have the same
13
14 meaning with regards to industrial application. However, the elements or losses
15
16 measured differ from one industry to another. Production losses are measured
17
18 by either measuring time losses or production output losses.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 Two industrial examples of OAE/OPE application are discussed. The two
27
28 companies are multinationals located in western Europe and their identities are
29
30 left anonymous in this paper. For the two industrial examples, a study was done
31
32 on the structure of their OAE diagram and the type of production losses it
33
34 measures. However, the study did not involve detailed case study on the
35
36 dynamics of data collection.
37
38
39
40
41

42 **4.0 Industrial Examples of OAE Application.**

43 **4.1 Company A**

44
45
46 Company A is a chemical processing company. The OAE tool is used with the
47
48 objective of maximizing the production output and minimizing losses of all types.
49
50 The company, therefore, use the production output (tonnage) approach in the
51
52 OAE tool to identify the losses.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The maximum output that the company is able to produce at optimum capacity is
5 defined as the theoretical maximum tonnage (T_T). This is the maximum
6 production capacity that the plant is able to attain expressed as a quantity
7 related to time unit: an hour, a day, a week, a month or a year. The optimum
8 operation of a plant is reduced in several circumstances by production losses
9 (PL). Instead of the anticipated theoretical tonnage T_T , the plant delivers an
10 actual tonnage T_{ACT} corresponding to the tonnage actually produced within the
11 commercial specifications. Therefore,
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Production Losses, $PL = T_T - T_{ACT}$
27
28
29

30 The identifiable production losses are grouped in the following categories;
31
32
33

34 **1. PL_{com}**

35 These are production losses related to commercial demand. These are the
36 result of plant shutdowns, lower production rates, or production overcapacity
37 compared to commercial demand. They also include the quantity of out of
38 specification product attributable to adjusted operating rate.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **2. PL_{ch}**

50 The production schedule provides for consecutive production of products with
51 different characteristics. The changeover entails slower production or stoppage
52 to adjust the operating parameters, or swap equipments and tools. The result is
53 a production loss (PL_{ch}) compared to continued operation with the same
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 product. In addition, this situation frequently results in quantities of product that
5
6 don't meet quality specifications and are also entered under PL_{CH} .
7
8
9

10 11 3. PL_F

12
13 These are the production losses resulting from poor reliability. Two different
14
15 types of poor reliability may occur:
16
17

18 (a) PL_{FE} - These are production losses due to external causes that are
19
20 totally outside the company's control. This may be due to:
21
22

- 23 • Third party failure to supply
- 24 • Shortage of energy (electricity, gas, etc.)
- 25 • Supply problems resulting from logistics (e.g. railways,
26
27 road haulers, sea or waterway transport).
28
29
- 30 • Exceptional poor weather conditions
31
32
33

34 (b) PL_{FI} - These are production losses due to internal causes for which
35
36 the company is accountable. These production losses result from
37
38 production slowdowns or stoppages as a result of the following
39
40 occurrences:
41
42

- 43 • Equipment failure.
- 44 • Utility shortage.
- 45 • Labor unrest.
- 46 • Organization problems.
- 47 • Safety, health and environmental problems.
- 48 • Mandatory planned shutdowns.
- 49 • Operation errors
- 50 • Planned shutdown due to capital expenditure work
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4. PL_{OP}

These are production losses related to poor operation performance. Causes may be due to problems relating to process, equipment performance degradation through aging or losses associated with shutdown or start-up difficulties (especially after major shutdowns).

5. PL_Q

These are losses due to quality of the products (failure to produce product within specification). It includes all products out of specification due to technical or commercial reasons (except out of specification products related to PL_{COM} and PL_{CH}), as well as quantities of recycled product.

The production losses are presented in the OAE diagram as shown in figure 5. From the OAE diagram, overall asset effectiveness (OAE) and operating asset utilization (OAU) are calculated as follows:

$$\text{Overall Asset Effectiveness, } OAE = \frac{T_{ACT}}{T_T}$$

$$\text{Operating Asset Utilization, } OAU = \frac{T_{ACT}}{T_T - PL_{COM}}$$

'[Insert Figure 5 here]'

The various categories of production losses, as outlined in the OAE diagram, help to highlight the possible areas where losses can be reduced. From the OAE

1
2
3
4 diagram the other production loss rates are calculated. The asset effectiveness
5
6 results are reported on monthly basis, and from the monthly report, yearly
7
8 performance can be calculated.
9

10 11 **4.2 Company B**

12
13 Company B is a packaging industry. OEE metrics are used to identify the major
14
15 drivers of packaging line manufacturing performance and identify areas of
16
17 process improvement. The defined drivers of manufacturing performance are
18
19 equipment utilization based on 24 hours per day availability, capacity utilization,
20
21 overall equipment effectiveness (OEE), and overall production effectiveness
22
23 (OPE).
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 The manufacturing performance measurement is based on the equipment
32
33 timings, and therefore the losses are measured in terms of time losses. It is
34
35 assumed that the equipment is available to be run for 24 hours per day and 7
36
37 days per week. The time usage for the equipment is measured as follows:
38
39
40
41

42 **1. The Unscheduled time**

43
44 This is defined as the time the equipment is available to run more production.
45
46 This is the available time due to holidays, mid-week idle time, weekends, and
47
48 reduced rate due to lack of scheduled demand.
49
50
51

52 **2. The Scheduled downtime**

53
54 This is the time allocated to scheduled activities on the equipment due to
55
56 planned maintenance or shut downs, meetings, training or breaks, planned
57
58 cleaning and standby state.
59
60

3. The 7 major losses

Seven major time losses can be encountered during the production process.

These are due to:

- (i) Major stoppages due to machine failure or due to production defect. The stoppage is said to be major if it takes more than 10 minutes. Major stoppages may also result due to supplier related downtime or warehouse downtime.
- (ii) Change over from one product to another or from product of one size to another.
- (iii) The cutting blade loss, which is the time lost in replacing routine wear parts.
- (iv) Start up and shut down losses occurring after annual shutdown, after holidays or weekend, and after lunch and breaks.
- (v) Minor stoppages. These are the stoppages that are less than 10 minutes for example due to equipment jams.
- (vi) Speed losses, which is the lost equipment capacity resulting from operation at a reduced speed.
- (vii) Quality losses due to products that fail to meet specifications.

4. Running time

This is the time that is left for production and it is also referred to valuable operating time. Manufacturing losses are presented in the OAE diagram as shown in figure 6. From the OAE diagram, asset (capacity) utilization, OEE and OPE are calculated.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Asset (capacity) utilization defines how effective an asset is being utilized. The
8
9 inverse reveals how much more output is available from the current asset if
10
11 needed today. Thus;
12
13

$$14 \text{ Asset Utilization} = \frac{15 \text{ Loading Time}}{16 \text{ Total Available Time}} \\ 17 \\ 18$$

19
20
21
22 The OEE measure is defined as the ability to run equipment at the designed
23
24 speed with zero defects. In order to maximise OEE, the 7 major losses should
25
26 be reduced. Thus;
27
28
29

$$30 \text{ OEE} = \frac{31 \text{ Valuable Operating Time}}{32 \text{ Operating Time}} \\ 33 \\ 34$$

35
36
37
38 **'[Insert Figure 6 here]'**
39
40
41

42
43 Finally, the overall production effectiveness (OPE), measures how well the
44
45 supply chain is effectively utilizing the manufacturing assets. Thus, the OPE
46
47 measure considers planned downtime and unscheduled time in addition to 7
48
49 major losses, as supply chain losses. Thus;
50
51
52

$$53 \text{ OPE} = \frac{54 \text{ Valuable Operating Time}}{55 \text{ Total Available Time}} \\ 56 \\ 57$$

58 59 60 **5. Discussion on the existing tools**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 The literature review on OEE evolution reveals a lot of differences in formulation
8 of equipments' effectiveness. The main difference lies in the types of production
9 losses that are captured by the measurement tool. Though the original OEE tool
10 identifies six major losses in a production set up, other types of losses have
11 been found to have a significant contribution to the overall production loss.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18
19
20
21 In the TEEP tool (see fig. 2 & 3), a lot of emphasis is given to the influence of
22 machine failure and maintenance on plant productivity. Planned downtime is
23 included to show the percentage time and production lost due to shutdown
24 maintenance. Specialised attention is given to unscheduled downtime and the
25 related metrics like the mean time between failure (MTBF) and mean time to
26 repair (MTTR). The analysis and improvement of the plant based on these
27 metrics enables the maintenance function to improve the functional performance
28 and process capability of the plant. Like OEE, it also includes losses related to
29 quality and speed. However, the tool only considers losses in the operational
30 level of the plant. It is therefore limited to individual equipment or continuous
31 process effectiveness.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The PEE tool for continuous process (see fig. 4) also measures the scheduled
50 and unscheduled downtime due to maintenance. However, it goes further and
51 measures losses to due commercial demand and transaction losses. These
52 losses are included to show the percentage of time the machine is down due to
53 lack of demand. In total, it measures both operational and commercial related
54 losses.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 The industrial examples of OAE application also reveal a big difference in
8 elements included in production loss identification. For example in company A,
9 different categories of losses have been defined (see fig.5). These includes
10 losses related to commercial, internal and external reasons, changeovers,
11 speed losses and quality problems. It groups, for example, all internal losses in
12 one category without giving specialised attention to individual causes. This may
13 not be effective means of measurement because each type of loss requires
14 special attention and corrective action. Company A considers all types of
15 production losses but lacks a clear method of classifying the individual losses
16 and therefore, the measurements cannot effectively support continuous
17 improvement. Company B, on the other hand, has a complete breakdown of all
18 the operational type of losses (see fig 6). It identifies seven major losses, which
19 together with scheduled and unscheduled downtime constitute all the
20 operational production losses. However, it does not consider production losses
21 due to commercial demand fluctuation or losses due to other internal business
22 or external reasons. These differences lead to development of overall production
23 effectiveness framework.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **6. In search of general framework for OAE /OPE measurement**

51
52
53 The differences in the measurement of equipment's effectiveness, in both
54 literature and practice, leads us to two important and enduring research
55 questions in performance measurement cited by Neely *et al* (2005). These
56 questions are:
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 (1.) What needs to be measured?
8

9 (2.) How will it be measured?
10
11

12
13
14 The first question seeks to know the various factors that influence performance
15 that need to be monitored through a measurement system. The second question
16 includes issues such as measurement scale being used, the data source, and
17 the frequency of measurement. It is noted in literature that the way in which
18 these questions are answered can influence the validity, reliability, and
19 practicality of any measure (Thorndike and Hagen, 1969).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **6.1 Factors to be measured**

31
32 A framework for identifying different types of losses for overall production /asset
33 effectiveness is proposed as shown in figure 7. The framework classifies
34 production losses into different categories depending on the cause of loss. This
35 classification helps the decision maker to measure different causes of
36 production losses so that attention can be given to the relevant causes. It also
37 gives a standardised way of measuring asset effectiveness. The following
38 production loss categories are defined:
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 **'[Insert Figure 7 here]'**
53
54
55

56 **Losses due to external reasons** - These are production losses caused by
57 factors that are beyond the control of the company. Among them is:
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 (a) *Commercial Demands* - This is the production loss encountered when
5
6 there is no demand in the market. This may result to plant shutdown or
7
8 lower production rates.
9
10
11 (b) *Logistic Problems* - These are production losses caused by logistics
12
13 related problems. Among them is third party failure to supply, transport
14
15 problems resulting to delay in raw material arrival and shortage of
16
17 utility like electricity, gas or water.
18
19
20
21
22 (c) *Environmental Regulations* - These are losses related production
23
24 quotas due to environmental degradation. For example restriction on
25
26 the amount of carbon dioxide emissions can limit the production
27
28 quantity. This forces the plant to produce below capacity and therefore
29
30 amounts to production loss.
31
32
33 (d) *Natural causes* - These are production losses that result from natural
34
35 causes like poor weather condition.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Losses due to internal reasons** - These are production losses caused by
43
44 factors within the control of the company. These causes should be analysed and
45
46 corrective action taken to minimise the losses. Two major categories of these
47
48 types of losses are business related and operation related losses.
49
50

- 51 (a) *Business related losses* - These are production losses resulting from
52
53 problems at entire business level. Among them is:
54
55
56
 - 57 ■ Internal logistics problems like shipping and storage of the
58
59 finished goods. This may cause production to slow down or shut
60

1
2
3
4 down for a while. Production can also be slowed to control the
5 amount of finished goods stocks.
6
7

- 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
- Organization problems or labour unrest will cause the production to shutdown leading to production loss.
 - Environmental, health and safety problems cause production to be slowed down or stopped.
 - Capital projects within the plant forces production to be stopped until they are finished.

(b) *Operation related losses* - These are production losses encountered in the cause of running the plant. They are the most regular problems encountered in production and therefore, they are the most analysed losses. They include the six major losses cited in literature (Nakajima, 1988) and the scheduled downtime. Due to their chronic nature of occurrence, much of the study on equipment effectiveness is directed towards them.

Among the operational related losses is the unscheduled downtime due to machine failure. The equipment failure downtime determines the equipment availability and this is defined as the period of time a machine can actually be used for production purposes. The availability rate is determined by three factors namely reliability, maintainability and maintenance readiness (Fleischer *et al*, 2006). The reliability factor is the length of time equipment is able to run without failure and is measured by mean time between failure (MTBF). Maintainability is the length of time an equipment can be brought back to

1
2
3
4 operating condition after it has failed and is measured by the mean time to
5 repair (MTTR). Since it is the responsibility of maintenance function to ensure
6 the availability of production equipment, the availability rate is related to
7 maintenance effectiveness.
8
9
10
11
12

13
14
15
16 The other important time loss is changeover time and replacement of routine
17 wear parts time. Though the changeover time varies from one operation to
18 another, it takes considerable amount of time that requires analysis and
19 reduction. The other major losses are minor stoppages, idling time, reduced
20 speed and quality defects that have been discussed in the literature review.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Specialised measurement, analysis and reduction of each of these losses is key
in improving the equipment effectiveness.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The inclusion of all these causes of production losses in the OAE calculation
gives a complete picture of overall production effectiveness and supports
decision makers in identifying areas where improvement is necessary. The
unscheduled time is included to show the unutilized capacity and the available
output from the current assets. Clear differences between OEE, TEEP, PEE
and OPE are also shown in figure 7 and the type of losses each of them
includes.

54
55
56
57
58
59
60
As shown in figure 7, effectiveness measures can be analysed from equipment
level (OEE), operation level and at overall production or factory level. OEE is
defined as a measure of ability to run equipment without failure, at the designed
speed and with zero defects. It is therefore concluded that only the production

1
2
3
4 losses related to equipment should be used to calculate the overall equipment
5 effectiveness (OEE). Scheduled downtime should therefore not be used in OEE
6
7 calculation.
8
9

10 11 12 13 **6.2 How to measure OEE** 14

15
16
17
18 This is an important aspect that addresses the measurement scale, data source
19 and measurement frequency. The validity and usefulness of OEE measure is
20 highly dependent on the data collection and accuracy. Data collection is an
21 important phase of performance measurement and continuous improvement
22 since what has not been measured cannot be improved. It has been claimed that
23 many manufacturing companies measure efficiency of their lines in such a way
24 as to 'mask' many of the causes of lost efficiency (Parsec, 2005). This is due to
25 inadequate data collection or inaccuracy in data recording. Data collection and
26 accuracy is a big challenge for many companies. It is reported in literature
27 (Ericsson, 1997) that accurate equipment performance data is essential to the
28 success and long-term effectiveness of TPM activities. If the extent of
29 equipment failures and production losses are not entirely understood and
30 measured, then TPM actions cannot be deployed optimally to solve major
31 problems or arrest deteriorating performance.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53
54 Jonsson and Lesshammar (1999) propose that data collection should be at such
55 detailed level that fulfils its objective without being unnecessarily demanding of
56 resources. The difficulty of data collection is dependent on the complexity of the
57 manufacturing system and whether the data collection is manual or automated.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 For manual data collection, accuracy is very low since recording of some minor
5 stoppages or downtime can often be forgotten. Though the cost of manual data
6 collection is minimal, detailed manual data collection may demotivate the
7 personnel and lead to reaction against the measurements. With the use of MES
8 (manufacturing execution system) and ERP (enterprise resource planning),
9 collection of OEE related data is automated in some manufacturing enterprises.
10 Though the cost associated to these installations is considerable, the data
11 accuracy is high and the data collection process is simplified. Introduction of
12 these modern software tools is being leveraged to produce sophisticated real
13 time reports that allow manufacturers to fully understand all their sources of lost
14 productivity (Parsec, 2005). With the adoption of these new automated
15 technology of data capturing, the areas of lost production time will be easily
16 identified.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 To measure production losses using OEE, two units can be used: the production
38 output (tonnage) loss and production time loss. Quality and speed losses are
39 calculated using production output while availability is calculated using
40 downtime. Recording of individual production time loss is the most practical
41 measurement method in many production systems. The frequency of
42 measurement varies from one industry to another. For automated data
43 collection, OEE values can be calculated on real time. The values can then be
44 summarised on hourly and daily basis. For manual data collection, losses
45 (production time and rejects) should be recorded on real time. Then OEE values
46 can be summarised on daily basis. From the daily values, weekly and monthly
47 values can be calculated. A current survey on manufacturing companies

1
2
3
4 (Aberdeen Group, 2006) indicates that best in class companies are not only
5 more vigilant and persistent in their measurement efforts but also monitor and
6 measure their performance more frequently. The survey indicates that
7 operational measures such as OEE, for such companies is monitored daily, at
8 minimum, in order to trigger effective corrective or preventive action.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **7. Conclusion**

19
20
21
22
23 From the analysis of the OEE tool, its evolution and application in the industries,
24 it is concluded that OEE is a valuable measure that gives information on the
25 sources of lost time and lost production. Many companies routinely hit capacity
26 constraints and immediately consider adding overtime for existing workers,
27 hiring worker for new shift or buying new production line to boost their
28 production capacity. For such companies, OEE tool can help them to optimize
29 the performance of the existing capacity. It is a valuable tool that can help
30 management to unleash hidden capacity and therefore reduce overtime
31 expenditures and allow deferral of major capital investment. It aids in reducing
32 process variability, reducing changeover times and improving operator
33 performance. These are measurable benefits that substantially improve the
34 bottom line of production operation and enhance the companies' competitive
35 edge.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55
56 It is shown that OEE has evolved to include others production losses that were
57 not originally included. This has lead to development of new terminologies like
58 TEEP, PEE, OPE, OAE and OFE. The difference between these terminologies
59
60

1
2
3
4 or tools is based on the type of production losses included as shown in figure 8.
5
6
7 It was also found that the industrial application of OAE varies from one factory
8
9 to another. This is dependent on the types of production losses important to
10
11 each company. From industrial examples analysed, it was found that specialised
12
13 attention of important losses was lacking. In some cases, some important types
14
15 of losses were completely left out.
16
17

18
19
20 To harmonise the differences in literature and in practice, a framework for
21
22 measuring the production losses has been developed. This framework proposes
23
24 three levels of effectiveness measurement namely equipment level effectiveness
25
26 (based on original OEE), operational level effectiveness (based on TEEP) and
27
28 business level effectiveness (OAE/OPE). Due to the chronic nature of the
29
30 operational causes of production losses, pertinent rates like availability,
31
32 performance rate, quality rate, scheduled downtime rate, etc needs to be
33
34 highlighted to enable specialised attention to the particular losses. The
35
36 framework also identifies losses due to business related problems like stock
37
38 control, storage or shipping problems and other non-operational related causes.
39
40 It proposes measurement of production losses due to external reasons. This
41
42 may be due to lack of demand, logistics problems (e.g. supplier or transport
43
44 failure, utility shortage), environmental regulations or natural causes. The
45
46 framework leaves room for customization with respect to losses that need
47
48 specialised attention. The inclusion of all types of losses in the OAE tool gives
49
50 management complete information for well-informed decision making.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 It is also concluded that the OAE tool is best suited in measurement of individual
5 equipments, discrete-type processes and in continuous processes effectiveness.
6
7
8
9 This is beneficial in high volume process based manufacture where capacity
10 utilisation is of high priority and stoppages or disruptions are expensive in terms
11 of lost capacity (Bulent *et al*, 2000). However, deployment of OEE in low volume
12 job shops and some batch processes is not very beneficial. Due to the nature of
13 these processes, the unscheduled production time is high and thus planned
14 maintenance can take place then. Also, failure of one machine does not have a
15 big impact because production can be re-routed to another machine. The
16 change-over time is not relevant since set-up can be done on one machine as
17 production continues on the other. For production processes with buffers in
18 between, OEE would need to be redefined since downtime on one process stage
19 does not directly affect the next stage.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Finally, the accuracy of the OEE data is very important. The use of OEE as a
38 production measure necessitates accuracy in the performance data collected.
39 Without accurate data, the OEE measure can easily lead to lack credibility. It is
40 therefore important to invest time and money in improvement of data collection.
41 Data collection can also be highly improved by embracing new automated
42 technology of data collection.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Elements of further research**

55
56
57

58 The performance elements measured by OEE tool, though important, are not
59 sufficient to describe the effectiveness of a product system. Some important
60

1
2
3
4 measures (e.g. cost and flexibility) are not measured in the OEE. Further
5
6
7 research should explore the dynamics of translating equipment effectiveness or
8
9 loss of effectiveness in terms of cost. Though this possibility is on case-to-case
10
11 basis, the cost translation of OEE will have more significance to management.
12
13 Due to importance of data accuracy in OEE calculations, further research should
14
15 include cost and benefits of investing in automated data collection methods.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

Aberdeen Group, The manufacturing performance management benchmark report, Aberdeen group Inc, Boston, MA, June 2006

Bulent D., Tugwell P., Greatbanks R., Overall equipment effectiveness as a measure of operational improvements - A Practical Analysis, Internal Journal of Operation & Production Management, Vol. 20, No. 12 pg 1488-1502, 2000

Ericsson J., Distribution analysis - An important tool in lean production, Dept of Production & Material Engineering, Lund University, Lund, 1997

Fleischer J., U. Weismann, Stephen Niggenschmidt, Calculation and Optimisation Model for Costs and Effects of Availability Relevant Service Elements, Proceedings of LCE2006, 2006

Huang S.H., Dismukes J.P, Mousalam A., Razzak R.B., Robinson D.E, Manufacturing Productivity improvement using effectiveness metrics and simulation analysis, International Journal of Production Research, Vol 41, No. 3 Pg 513 - 527, 2003

Huang S., Manufacturing System Modelling for Productivity Improvement, Journal of Manufacturing System, 2002 issue, pp 1-9, 2002

Ivancic I., Development of Maintenance in Modern Production, Euromaintenance '98 Conference Proceedings, CRO, 1998

Jonsson P., Lesshamar M., Evaluation and Improvement of Manufacturing Performance Measurement Systems - The Role of OEE, International Journal of Operations & Production Management, Vol. 19, No.1, pp 55-78, 1999

1
2
3
4 Nakajima,S., Introduction to TPM: Total Productive Maintenance, Cambridge, MA,
5
6 Productivity Press, 1988
7
8

9
10 Neely A., Mike Gregory, Ken Platts, Performance Measurement System Design: A
11
12 Literature Review and Research Agenda, International Journal of Operations &
13
14 Production Management, Vol. 25, No 12, pp 1228-1263, 2005
15
16

17
18 Neely, A.D, The performance measurement revolutions: Why now and where next,
19
20 International Journal of Operation & Production management, Vol 19, No 2, pp 205-
21
22 228, 1999
23
24

25
26 Oechser R., Pfeffer M., Pftzner L., Binder H., Muller E., Vonderstrass T., From Overall
27
28 Equipment Effectiveness to Overall Fab Effectiveness (OFE), Material Science in
29
30 Semiconductor Processing, Vol 5, Issue 4-5, pp 333-339, 2003
31
32

33
34 Parsec Automation Corp, The hidden pitfalls of doing back of the envelope calculations
35
36 to determine your current OEE, Available online at: www.parsec-corp.com, CA, 2005
37
38 (accessed June, 2006)
39
40

41
42 Pintelon L., Gelders L., Puyvelde F.V, Maintenance Management, Acco, Leuven,
43
44 Belgium, 2000
45
46

47
48 Porter M., The Value Chain and Competitive Advantage, New York Free Press, 1985
49
50

51
52 Raouf A., Improving Capital Productivity Through Maintenance, International Journal
53
54 of Operations & Production Management, Vol. 14, No. 7 pp 44-52, 1994
55
56

57
58 Scott D., Pisa R., Can Overall Factory Effectiveness Prolong Moore's Law?, Solid State
59
60 Technology, Vol 41, No 3, pp 75 - 82, 1998

1
2
3
4 Thorndike, R.L., Hagen E., Measurement and Evaluation in psychology and Education,
5
6 Third Edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1969
7
8

9
10 Williamson R.M., Using Overall Equipment Effectiveness: the Metric and the
11
12 Measures, Strategic Work Systems, Inc. Columbus, Available online at:
13
14 www.swspitcrew.com, (accessed June, 2006)
15
16

17
18 Wilson A., Asset Maintenance Management - A Guide to Developing Strategy &
19
20 Improving Performance, Conference Communication, 1999
21
22

23
24 U.S Department of Energy, How to Measure Performance: A Handbook of
25
26 technics and Tools", 1995
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

List of Figures

Figure 1: The OEE measurement tool and the perspectives of performance integrated in the tool

Figure 2: Constituent elements used in the calculation of TEEP

Figure 3: The TEEP diagram and its constituent elements

Figure 4: The general outline of PEE diagram for continuous process

Figure 5: The OAE diagram of company A showing the production losses

Figure 6: The OAE diagram of Company B

Figure 7: Classification of Production losses for calculating overall production effectiveness

Performance Measurement Using Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE): Literature Review & Practical Application Discussion

Figures




Figure 1: The OEE measurement tool and the perspectives of performance integrated in the tool




Figure 2: Constituent elements used in the calculation of TEEP




Figure 3: The TEEP diagram and its constituent elements

For Peer Review Only




Figure 4: The general outline of PEE diagram for continuous process




Figure 5: The OAE diagram of company A showing the production losses




Figure 6: The OAE diagram of Company B




Figure 7: Classification of Production losses for calculating overall production effectiveness