

UNCLASSIFIED

AD 271 522

*Reproduced
by the*


**ARMED SERVICES TECHNICAL INFORMATION AGENCY
ARLINGTON HALL STATION
ARLINGTON 12, VIRGINIA**



UNCLASSIFIED

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

271 522



271522

APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS LABORATORIES

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
CALIFORNIA

SURVEILLANCE PROGRAMS FOR DETERIORATING
LOTS IN STORAGE

By

FREDERICK S. HILLIER

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 56

JANUARY 2, 1962

PREPARED FOR ARMY, NAVY AND AIR FORCE UNDER
CONTRACT Nonr-225(53) (NR-042-002)
WITH THE OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH



Best Available Copy

271522

SURVEILLANCE PROGRAMS FOR
DETERIORATING LOTS IN STORAGE

by

Frederick S. Hillier

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 56

January 2, 1962



Prepared for Army, Navy and Air Force under
Contract Nonr-225(53) (NR 042-002)
with the Office of Naval Research

Gerald J. Lieberman, Project Director

Reproduction in Whole or in Part is Permitted for
any Purpose of the United States Government

APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS LABORATORIES
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

SURVEILLANCE PROGRAMS FOR
DETERIORATING LOTS IN STORAGE

by

Frederick S. Hillier

1. Introduction.

The military and many civilian organizations require that a sufficient supply of materials be in storage at any one time to meet certain emergency needs that may arise. The fulfillment of this requirement is primarily a procurement problem. However, the procurement of an adequate supply of materials alone does not necessarily guarantee an adequate supply of usable materials when the need for them arises. Their deterioration in storage may render them unusable. Despite all precautions, at least a small rate of deterioration is inevitable for all items in storage. It is therefore essential that a systematic program for the surveillance of such stored items be maintained in order to insure that the supply of usable items is always adequate.

The development of such surveillance programs has received very little attention in the literature. Derman and Solomon [1] studied the quality of lots in storage over time when these lots are periodically subjected to standard acceptance sampling plans. Ireson [2] discussed administrative aspects of surveillance programs. Savage [3] briefly examined when a piece of equipment reserved for emergency use should be withdrawn from storage for repair; this paper considered in general terms the case where the relevant costs are those for regular repair and for repair when the emergency occurs and both these costs are known

deterministic functions of the time elapsed since the last repair.

However, no comprehensive investigation has yet been reported regarding the appropriate time for corrective action to compensate for the deteriorating quality of a lot in storage, given the cost of appropriate corrective action and the cost of an imperfect lot when the emergency occurs as functions of the number of defective items in the lot. This paper presents the results of such an investigation.

The assumption made about the lot in storage is that the storage life of each item, i.e., the time in storage until becoming defective, has a common known exponential distribution. Of course, this condition is not always met. However, the exponential distribution of life has been demonstrated and justified on empirical and theoretical grounds for numerous types of items. Furthermore, the particular exponential distribution can often be estimated by experimentation or from prior experience with the same product. Thus, this formulation will often become applicable at some time after the initiation of a continuing surveillance program for a given product.

It is also assumed that the time until the emergency necessitating the use of the lot has a known exponential distribution. This distribution should ordinarily be the appropriate one since it implies the usual situation that the emergency is a random event in time. Examples of such emergencies that might be of interest are the beginning of a war, a natural disaster, the breakdown or failure of certain equipment, the need to enter a fallout shelter, a rush order, the rejection of regular material, and the cancellation of needed deliveries by a supplier.

With the information available regarding the quality of the lot over

time, it is no longer necessary to sample the lot periodically to estimate its quality in order to determine if any corrective action is advisable. It is now practical to instead select the future time when the deteriorating quality of the lot will justify corrective action, if the emergency has not occurred yet. This corrective action might involve inspecting the entire lot and replacing or repairing those items found to be deficient. However, if inspection is sufficiently costly, or if it involves destructive testing, or if the future quality of the non-defectives in the lot is mistrusted-despite the assumption of an exponential storage life- the proper action would be to immediately replace or repair the entire lot. The formulation presented here permits both of these alternatives.

In the absence of any surveillance sampling, there remain only two types of costs that are not independent of the surveillance program selected. One type is the cost of taking corrective action periodically until the emergency occurs. Its expected value tends to decrease as the time interval between successive corrective actions is increased. The second type is the cost or the imputed cost incurred because of the defective items in the lot when the emergency occurs. The expected value of this type of cost increases as the time between corrective actions is increased. Therefore, this time needs to be carefully selected so as to obtain the proper balance between these two types of costs. To do so requires that the cost of corrective action and the cost of using an imperfect lot, each as a function of the number of the defectives in the lot, be known.

The problem considered here is the determination of the time between

corrective actions which minimizes the total expected cost from the beginning of the program until the emergency is met. Section 2 presents the formulation of the problem and the operating characteristics of a given surveillance program. The critical equation is derived for general cost functions in Section 3. It is then developed and simplified for specific cost functions of interest in the following two sections. These results are illustrated with an example in Section 6. The discussion of the results in Section 7 includes a suggestion of how they can also be applied in the initial absence of information regarding the distribution of storage life. The final section summarizes the conclusions.

2. Formulation of the Problem.

A lot composed of N items is being held in storage. It will be used only if certain emergency needs arise, as in the stockpiling of vital material. The probability density function of the time until such an emergency arises, $g(t)$, is given by

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & , & \text{if } t < 0 \\ \theta e^{-\theta t} & , & \text{if } t \geq 0 , \end{cases}$$

where $\theta > 0$ and is known. The quality of the lot can be expected to deteriorate with age. At periodic intervals, corrective action is taken. This corrective action consists either of replacing the entire lot or of inspecting each item in the lot and either replacing or repairing those items found to be defective. The known cost of taking corrective action

when there are n defective items in the lot is $R(n)$. For each item in the lot, the cumulative density function of the time elapsed since the last corrective action until the item becomes defective, $F(t)$, is given by

$$F(t) = 1 - e^{-\mu(t+t_0)},$$

where $1 - e^{-\mu t_0}$ is the known initial probability of being defective and μ has a known positive value. Thus, at time t , the defective vs. non-defective status of the respective items can be considered as independent Bernoulli trials. Hence, the probability that the lot contains n defective items at time t , the time elapsed since the last corrective action, is given by

$$P_n(t) = \begin{cases} \binom{N}{n} \left(1 - e^{-\mu(t+t_0)}\right)^n \left(e^{-\mu(t+t_0)}\right)^{N-n}, & \text{if } n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The known cost or imputed cost resulting from the presence of n defective items in the lot at the time the emergency arises is $D(n)$. The objective is to determine the value of t , the elapsed time between successive corrective actions, which minimizes the total expected cost from the beginning of the program until the emergency is met.

3. Analysis

Let $T = (t_1, t_2, \dots)$ be the sequence of positive numbers such that corrective action is taken at the times $t_1, t_1 + t_2, \dots$, unless the emergency intervenes. Let the random variable E be the time at which the emergency occurs. Thus, corrective action is taken at the times $t_1, t_1 + t_2, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^m t_i$, where $\sum_{i=1}^m t_i < E \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} t_i$.

The total cost from the beginning of the program^{1/} until the emergency is met is

$$C(T) = \sum_{i=1}^m R(n_i) + D(n_E),$$

where $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_m$ are the number of defectives in the lot at times $t_1, t_1 + t_2, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^m t_i$, and n_E is the number of defectives in the lot at time E . Let $C_0(T)$ be the cost from the beginning of the program until and including the time t_1 . Let $C_1(T)$ be the cost of the program after the time t_1 . Therefore,

$$C(T) = C_0(T) + C_1(T).$$

Since

$$C_1(T|m=0) = 0,$$

$$C_1(T) = C_1(T|m>0) P(m>0).$$

^{1/} It is assumed that the program is begun immediately after corrective action has been taken. Corrective action may be defined to include the initial placement of the lot in storage if the effect on the quality of the lot is indistinguishable.

Hence,

$$E\{C(T)\} = E\{C_0(T)\} + E\{C_1(T|m > 0)\} P(m > 0) \quad .$$

Let

$$S_1 = \{T | E\{C(T)\} = \inf_{X \in S_2} E\{C(X)\}, T \in S_2\} \quad ,$$

where

$$S_2 = \{(t_1, t_2, \dots) | t_i > 0, i = 1, 2, \dots\} \quad .$$

It is assumed that S_1 is not empty, i. e., that there exists a solution to the problem. The objective is to find a solution by determining an element of S_1 .

Notice that

$$P(m > 0) = P(E > t_1) = e^{-\theta t_1} \quad .$$

Therefore, forming the expectation for $C_0(T)$, $E\{C(T)\}$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} E\{C(T)\} = & \int_0^{t_1} \left(\sum_{j=0}^N D(j) P_j(t) \right) \theta e^{-\theta t} dt \\ & + e^{-\theta t_1} \sum_{j=0}^N R(j) P_j(t_1) + e^{-\theta t_1} E\{C_1(T|m > 0)\} \quad . \end{aligned}$$

Due to the nature of the exponential distribution, i. e.,

$$P(E > t_1 + t | E > t_1) = P(E > t) ,$$

and also because the quality of the lot after t_1 is independent of its quality before t_1 , it is clear that $C_1(T|m > 0)$, and therefore $E\{C_1(T|m > 0)\}$, is independent of t_1 . Hence, it is evident that $E\{C(T)\}$ is a function of t_1 and $E\{C_1(T|m > 0)\}$, where $E\{C_1(T|m > 0)\}$ is a function of $t_2, t_3, \dots$, and that if $(t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots)$ minimizes $E\{C(T)\}$, i.e., if $(t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots) \in S_1$, then $(t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots)$ minimizes $E\{C_1(T|m > 0)\}$. Therefore, if $(t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots) \in S_1$, then if $(t_1, t_2', t_3', \dots)$ also minimizes $E\{C_1(T|m > 0)\}$, $(t_1, t_2', t_3', \dots) \in S_1$. It also follows from the nature of the exponential distribution and the fact that the quality of the lot depends only on the time elapsed since the last corrective action that if $(t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots) \in S_1$, then $(t_1, t_1, t_2, \dots)$ minimizes $E\{C_1(T|m > 0)\}$. Therefore if $(t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots) \in S_1$, then $(t_1, t_1, t_2, \dots) \in S_1$. By repeated application of this argument, it follows that if $(t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots) \in S_1$, then $(t_1, t_1, t_1, \dots) \in S_1$. The important conclusion is that one solution to this problem is of the form that the time between corrective actions is always the same. This is the solution that will be sought. Thus denoting this constant positive time between consecutive corrective actions by t_1 , the problem now consists of determining the optimum value of t_1 .

It will prove very useful to notice that, for this newly defined problem, $E\{C(T)\} = E\{C_1(T|m > 0)\}$. Since T is now restricted to be

of the form $(t_1, t_1, t_1, \dots)$ where $t_1 > 0$, it will be more meaningful to now denote $E\{C(T)\}$ by $E\{C(t_1)\}$. The expression for the total expected cost can now be written as

$$E\{C(t_1)\} = \int_0^{t_1} \left(\sum_{n=0}^N D(n) P_n(t) \right) \theta e^{-\theta t} dt \\ + e^{-\theta t_1} \left[\sum_{n=0}^N R(n) P_n(t_1) + E\{C(t_1)\} \right] .$$

Therefore,

$$\left(1 - e^{-\theta t_1} \right) E\{C(t_1)\} = \int_0^{t_1} \left(\sum_{n=0}^N D(n) P_n(t) \right) \theta e^{-\theta t} dt \\ + e^{-\theta t_1} \sum_{n=0}^N R(n) P_n(t_1) ,$$

so that

$$E\{C(t_1)\} = \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\theta t_1}} \left[\int_0^{t_1} \left(\sum_{n=0}^N D(n) P_n(t) \right) \theta e^{-\theta t} dt + e^{-\theta t_1} \sum_{n=0}^N R(n) P_n(t_1) \right] .$$

For the particular $P_n(t)$ function for this problem, specified earlier, the conditions for Liebnitz's Rule are met and the derivative exists.

Setting the derivative equal to zero,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt_1} \left(E[C(t_1)] \right) &= \frac{\sum_{n=0}^N D(n) P_n(t_1) \theta e^{-\theta t_1}}{1 - e^{-\theta t_1}} - \left[\frac{\theta e^{-\theta t_1}}{(1 - e^{-\theta t_1})^2} \right] \int_0^{t_1} \left(\sum_{n=0}^N D(n) P_n(t) \right) \theta e^{\theta t} dt \\
&+ \frac{\theta t_1 \frac{d}{dt_1} \left(\sum_{n=0}^N R(n) P_n(t_1) \right) - \theta e^{-\theta t_1} \sum_{n=0}^N R(n) P_n(t_1)}{1 - e^{-\theta t_1}} \\
&- \left[\frac{\theta e^{-\theta t_1}}{(1 - e^{-\theta t_1})^2} \right] e^{-\theta t_1} \sum_{n=0}^N R(n) P_n(t_1) \\
&= 0 .
\end{aligned}$$

Cancelling common terms, the critical equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left[1 - e^{-\theta t_1} \right] \left[\sum_{n=0}^N D(n) P_n(t_1) + \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{d}{dt_1} \left(\sum_{n=0}^N R(n) P_n(t_1) \right) - \sum_{n=0}^N R(n) P_n(t_1) \right] \\
&= \int_0^{t_1} \sum_{n=0}^N D(n) P_n(t) \theta e^{-\theta t} dt + e^{-\theta t_1} \sum_{n=0}^N R(n) P_n(t_1) .
\end{aligned}$$

Simplifying slightly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[1 - e^{-\theta t_1} \right] \left[\sum_{n=0}^N D(n) P_n(t_1) + \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{d}{dt_1} \sum_{n=0}^N R(n) P_n(t_1) \right] \\ &= \int_0^{t_1} \left(\sum_{n=0}^N D(n) P_n(t) \right) \theta e^{-\theta t} dt + \sum_{n=0}^N R(n) P_n(t_1) . \end{aligned}$$

It is apparent that this critical equation would be exceedingly difficult to solve for t_1 for most $D(n)$ and $R(n)$ functions. But if one were unable to solve this equation, the analysis would have little practical value. Fortunately, greatly simplified equations quite amenable to solution can be obtained for certain $D(n)$ and $R(n)$ functions of great practical interest. This is especially true where $D(n)$ and $R(n)$ are linear functions of n . This case is studied and a comprehensive set of solutions graphed in the next section. The following section then studies the case where $R(n)$ is a linear function and $D(n)$ is a certain quadratic function.

4. Solution for Linear $D(n)$ and $R(n)$ Functions

Assume that $D(n) = C_D \cdot n$. In other words, the cost of having defectives in the lot when the emergency occurs is proportional to n , the number of those defectives. This would seem to be the appropriate $D(n)$ function for many situations. It should also serve as a suitable approximation for many more situations.

Assume that $R(n) = K + C_R \cdot n$, where $K > 0$. In other words, the cost of taking corrective action-whether it be the replacement of the entire lot, or more likely the screening of the lot and the repair or replacement of defective items - consists of a fixed cost plus a certain cost for each defective item in the lot. This would appear to be the appropriate $R(n)$ function, or at least a reasonable approximation, for practically every situation. The fixed cost could be the red tape cost of ordering or producing new items plus the cost of inspecting the lot. The cost for each defective item could be the cost associated only with replacing or repairing that item. If the lot is automatically replaced, the entire cost is K .

When performing the summation operations for this case, it is crucial to notice that, for fixed t , the $P_n(t)$ probabilities describe a binomial distribution with parameter $(1 - e^{-\mu(t+t_0)})$, and that the mean of this distribution is $N(1 - e^{-\mu(t+t_0)})$. The $\sum_{n=0}^N D(n)P_n(t)$ and $\sum_{n=0}^N R(n)P_n(t)$ summations are analogous to finding this mean.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=0}^N D(n) P_n(t) &= \sum_{n=0}^N C_D \cdot n \binom{N}{n} (1-e^{-\mu(t+t_0)})^n (e^{-\mu(t+t_0)})^{N-n} \\
&= C_D \cdot N (1-e^{-\mu(t+t_0)}) ,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=0}^N R(n) P_n(t) &= \sum_{n=0}^N (K+C_R \cdot n) \binom{N}{n} (1-e^{-\mu(t+t_0)})^n (e^{-\mu(t+t_0)})^{N-n} \\
&= K + C_R \cdot N (1-e^{-\mu(t+t_0)}) .
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, after the indicated differentiation and integration operations are performed, the critical equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\theta t_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_D \cdot N \left(1-e^{-\mu(t_1+t_0)} \right) + \frac{1}{\theta} C_R \cdot N e^{-\mu(1+t_0)} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= C_D \cdot N \left[1-e^{\theta t_1} - \frac{\theta}{\mu+\theta} e^{-\mu t_0} \left(1-e^{-t_1(\mu+\theta)} \right) \right] + \left[K+C_R \cdot N \left(1-e^{-\mu(t+t_0)} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Combining like terms and simplifying,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - e^{-\theta t_1}\right) e^{-\mu t_1} \left(-C_D \cdot N + \frac{C_R \cdot N \mu}{\theta}\right) + C_R \cdot N e^{-\mu t_1} - C_D \cdot N \frac{\theta}{\mu + \theta} e^{-t_1(\mu + \theta)} \\ &= e^{\mu t_0} \left[K + C_R \cdot N - C_D \cdot N e^{-\mu t_0} \left(\frac{\theta}{\mu + \theta} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying further and dividing through by N ,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\mu t_1} \left[\left(-C_D + \frac{C_R \mu}{\theta} + C_R \right) - \left(-C_D + \frac{C_R \mu}{\theta} + C_D \frac{\theta}{\mu + \theta} \right) e^{-\theta t_1} \right] \\ &= e^{\mu t_0} \left[\frac{K}{N} + C_R - C_D e^{-\mu t_0} \left(\frac{\theta}{\mu + \theta} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\mu t_1} \left[\left(-C_D + \frac{\mu + \theta}{\theta} C_R \right) + \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu + \theta} C_D - \frac{\mu}{\theta} C_R \right) e^{-\theta t_1} \right] \\ &= e^{\mu t_0} \left[\frac{K}{N} + C_R - C_D e^{-\mu t_0} \left(\frac{\theta}{\mu + \theta} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In order to simplify notation, let

$$D = e^{\mu t_0} \left[\frac{K}{N} + C_R - C_D e^{-\mu t_0} \left(\frac{\theta}{\mu + \theta} \right) \right] ;$$

$$A = \frac{-C_D + \frac{\mu + \theta}{\theta} C_R}{D} , \quad \text{if } D \neq 0 ;$$

$$B = \frac{\frac{\mu}{\mu + \theta} C_D - \frac{\mu}{\theta} C_R}{D} , \quad \text{if } D \neq 0 .$$

Thus, assuming $D \neq 0$, the critical equation can now be written as

$$e^{-\mu t_1} \left[A + B e^{-\theta t_1} \right] = 1 .$$

Notice that

$$B = - \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu + \theta} \right) A .$$

Therefore, the most convenient form of the critical equation is

$$A e^{-\mu t_1} \left[1 - \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu + \theta} \right) e^{-\theta t_1} \right] = 1 .$$

Notice that it has a positive solution only if $A > 1$. While an explicit solution for t_1 is not available, this critical equation can be easily solved for t_1 by numerical methods. This is especially true

since

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt_1} \left(A e^{\mu t_1} \left[1 - \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\theta} \right) e^{-\theta t_1} \right] \right) \\ &= - A \mu e^{-\mu t_1} + A(\mu+\theta) \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\theta} \right) e^{-t_1(\mu+\theta)} \\ &= - A \mu e^{-\mu t_1} \left(1 - e^{-\theta t_1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$< 0, \quad \text{for } t_1 > 0, A > 0.$$

Thus, if $A > \frac{\mu+\theta}{\theta}$, the critical equation has a unique positive solution; otherwise, it has no positive root. Furthermore, because the left side of the equation strictly decreases as t_1 increases, t_1 can be estimated as closely as desired by determining lower and upper bounds to t_1 by trial and error.

Figures 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 present a comprehensive set of solutions of the critical equation. For the particular values of $(A - \frac{\mu}{\theta})$ and $(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\theta})$ of interest, the value of μt_1 and therefore t_1 can be closely estimated by interpolating between the given level curves.




Figure 4.1. Solutions of the Critical Equation.




Figure 4.2. Solutions of the Critical Equation.




Figure 4.3. Solutions of the Critical Equation.

It is of course true that being a positive root of the critical equation is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for minimizing $E\{C(t_1)\}$. The sufficient condition, that

$$\frac{d^2}{dt_1^2} \left(E\{C(t_1)\} \right) > 0 ,$$

will now be investigated. Assume that $A > \frac{\mu+\theta}{\theta}$, $D \neq 0$.

Tracing through the derivation of the critical equation, it is clear that

$$\frac{d}{dt_1} \left(E\{C(t_1)\} \right) = D \frac{\theta e^{-\theta t_1}}{\left(\frac{\theta t_1}{1-e^{-\theta t_1}} \right)^2} \left(A e^{-\mu t_1} \left[1 - \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\theta} \right) e^{-\theta t_1} \right] - 1 \right) N e^{-\mu t_0} .$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt_1^2} \left(E\{C(t_1)\} \right) &= D \frac{\theta e^{-\theta t_1}}{\left(\frac{\theta t_1}{1-e^{-\theta t_1}} \right)^2} \left(-A \mu e^{-\mu t_1} \left[1 - e^{-\theta t_1} \right] \right) N e^{-\mu t_0} \\ &+ D \left(\frac{-(1-e^{-\theta t_1})^2 \theta^2 e^{-\theta t_1} - \theta e^{-\theta t_1} \cdot 2(1-e^{-\theta t_1})\theta e^{-\theta t_1}}{\left(\frac{\theta t_1}{1-e^{-\theta t_1}} \right)^4} \right) \left(A e^{-\mu t_1} \left[1 - \frac{\mu}{\mu+\theta} e^{-\theta t_1} \right] - 1 \right) N e^{-\mu t_0} . \end{aligned}$$

Assume that t_1 is a positive root of the critical equation. Hence, the second term vanishes. Additionally,

$$\frac{\theta e^{-\theta t_1}}{(1-e^{-\theta t_1})^2} \left(-A \mu e^{-\mu t_1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\theta t_1 \end{bmatrix} \right) N e^{-\mu t_0} < 0 .$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{d^2}{dt_1^2} \left(E\{C(t_1)\} \right) > 0$$

if and only if $D < 0$. In other words, if

$$\frac{K}{N} + c_R < c_D e^{-\mu t_0} \left(\frac{\theta}{\mu + \theta} \right) ,$$

then the t_1^* which is the positive root of the critical equation minimizes $E\{C(t_1)\}$. This is further verified by the fact that, for this case,

$$\frac{d}{dt_1} \left(E\{C(t_1)\} \right) < 0 \quad \text{for } 0 < t_1 < t_1^* .$$

It remains to investigate the other cases. If $D > 0$ it becomes quickly clear that this implies $A \leq \frac{\mu + \theta}{\theta}$, which in turn implies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(E\{C(t_1)\} \right) < 0 \quad \text{for } t_1 > 0 ,$$

which indicates that corrective action should never be taken, i.e., $t_1 = \infty$. This is intuitively reasonable since $D > 0$ implies that the cost of corrective action is high relative to the cost of having defectives in the lot when the emergency occurs.

It is easily seen that the case that $A \leq \frac{\mu+\theta}{\theta}$ can not occur if $D < 0$. Therefore, the only remaining case is $D = 0$. For this case, the critical equation becomes

$$\left(-C_D + \frac{\mu+\theta}{\theta} C_R\right) e^{-\mu t_1} \left[1 - \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\theta}\right) e^{-\theta t_1}\right] = 0.$$

But this equation has no positive root since

$$-C_D + \frac{\mu+\theta}{\theta} C_R < \frac{\mu+\theta}{\theta} D = 0,$$

since $K > 0$. It is similarly verified that, for this case,

$$\frac{d}{dt_1} \left(E\{C(t_1)\} \right) = \left(-C_D + \frac{\mu+\theta}{\theta} C_R\right) N e^{-\mu t_1} \frac{\theta e^{-\theta t_1}}{\left(1 - e^{-\theta t_1}\right)^2} e^{-\mu t_1} \left[1 - \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\theta}\right) e^{-\theta t_1}\right]$$

< 0

for $t_1 > 0$.

Therefore, corrective action should never be taken.

The general conclusion is that the t_1 which minimizes $E\{C(t_1)\}$ is the positive root of the critical equation if a positive root exists; if the positive root exists, it will be unique; if it does not exist, t_1 should be infinite, i.e., never take corrective action.

5. Solution for Certain Quadratic $D(n)$ and Linear $R(n)$ Functions

Assume that $D(n) = C_D \cdot n^2$. This should serve as a suitable approximation for the type of situation in which the availability of non-defective items in the lot can partially compensate for the defective items, so that the imputed cost of having only a few defectives in the lot is relatively low but this cost increases very rapidly as the number of defectives increases. Assume, as before, that $R(n) = K + C_R \cdot n$, where $K > 0$.

Proceeding as before, it needs to be recalled that the second moment of the binomial distribution described by the $P_n(t)$ probabilities is

$$(N^2 - N) \left(1 - e^{-\mu(t+t_0)} \right)^2 + N \left(1 - e^{-\mu(t+t_0)} \right).$$

The $\sum_{n=0}^N D(n)P_n(t)$ summation is analogous to finding this second moment.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^N D(n)P_n(t) &= \sum_{n=0}^N C_D \cdot n^2 \binom{N}{n} \left(1 - e^{-\mu(t+t_0)} \right)^n \left(e^{-\mu(t+t_0)} \right)^{N-n} \\ &= C_D \left[(N^2 - N) \left(1 - e^{-\mu(t+t_0)} \right)^2 + N \left(1 - e^{-\mu(t+t_0)} \right) \right] \\ &= NC_D \left[(N-1)e^{-2\mu(t+t_0)} + (1-2N)e^{-\mu(t+t_0)} + N \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, proceeding in a straight-forward fashion and simplifying,

$$\int_0^{t_1} \sum_{n=0}^N D(n) P_n(t) \theta e^{-\theta t} dt$$

$$= NC_D \left[\frac{(N-1)\theta e^{-2\mu t_0}}{2\mu+\theta} \left(1 - e^{-t_1(2\mu+\theta)} \right) + \frac{(1-2N)\theta e^{-\mu t_0}}{\mu+\theta} \left(1 - e^{-t_1(\mu+\theta)} \right) + N \left(1 - e^{-t_1\theta} \right) \right]$$

Hence, after considerable simplification,

$$\frac{d}{dt_1} \left(E(C(t_1)) \right) = \frac{\theta e^{-\theta t_1} N e^{-\mu t_0}}{\left(1 - e^{-\theta t_1} \right)^2} Q, \quad ,$$

where

$$Q = C_D(N-1)e^{-\mu(t_0+2t_1)} \left(1 - \frac{2\mu}{2\mu+\theta} e^{-\theta t_1} \right)$$

$$+ C_D(1-2N)e^{-\mu t_1} \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\mu+\theta} e^{-\theta t_1} \right)$$

$$+ C_R \frac{\mu}{\theta} e^{-\mu t_1} \left(1 - e^{\theta t_1} \right) + C_R e^{-\mu t_1}$$

$$- \left[\frac{K}{N e^{-\mu t_0}} + \frac{C_R}{e^{-\mu t_0}} + C_D(N-1) e^{-\mu t_0} \left(\frac{\theta}{2\mu+\theta} \right) + C_D(1-2N) \left(\frac{\theta}{\mu+\theta} \right) \right].$$

Thus, the critical equation is

$$Q = 0 \quad .$$

Assume that t_1^* is a positive root of the critical equation. Thus, if

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{dt_1^2} (E(C(t_1))) \right|_{t_1=t_1^*} > 0 ,$$

then $E(C(t_1^*))$ is at least a local minimum.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt_1^2} (E(C(t_1))) &= \frac{\theta e^{-\theta t_1} N e^{-\mu t_0}}{(1-e^{-\theta t_1})^2} \frac{dQ}{dt_1} \\ &- N e^{-\mu t_0} \left[\frac{(1-e^{-\theta t_1})^2 \theta^2 e^{-\theta t_1} + 2\theta^2 e^{-2\theta t_1} (1-e^{-\theta t_1})}{(1-e^{-\theta t_1})^4} \right] Q . \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{dt_1^2} (E(C(t_1))) \right|_{t_1=t_1^*} = \frac{\theta e^{-\theta t_1^*} N e^{-\mu t_0}}{(1-e^{-\theta t_1^*})^2} \left. \frac{dQ}{dt_1} \right|_{t_1=t_1^*} .$$

Thus, if

$$\left. \frac{dQ}{dt_1} \right|_{t_1=t_1^*} > 0 ,$$

then $E(C(t_1^*))$ is a local minimum. After considerable simplification,

$\frac{dQ}{dt_1}$ can be written as

$$\frac{dQ}{dt_1} = \mu e^{-\mu t_1} \left(1 - e^{-\theta t_1} \right) \left[2C_D(N-1) \left(1 - e^{-\mu(t_0+t_1)} \right) + C_D - C_R \left(\frac{\mu+\theta}{\theta} \right) \right] .$$

Let t'_1 be the value of t_1 such that

$$2C_D(N-1) \left(1 - e^{-\mu(t_0+t'_1)} \right) + C_D = C_R \left(\frac{\mu+\theta}{\theta} \right) .$$

Then, clearly, if $t_1 > 0$, then

$$\frac{dQ}{dt_1} < 0 , \quad \text{if } t_1 < t'_1 ;$$

$$\frac{dQ}{dt_1} > 0 , \quad \text{if } t_1 > t'_1 .$$

It now needs to be pointed out that Q is continuous and that $Q < 0$ at $t_1 = 0$. Therefore, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d}{dt_1} (E\{C(t_1)\}) < 0 \quad \text{if } 0 < t_1 < \epsilon .$$

Hence, since $\frac{dQ}{dt_1} < 0$ if $t_1 > 0$ and $t_1 < t'_1$,

$$\frac{d}{dt_1} (E\{C(t_1)\}) < 0 \quad \text{if } t_1 > 0 \text{ and } t_1 \leq t'_1 .$$

Therefore, if $t_1 > 0$ and

$$\frac{d}{dt_1} (E(C(t_1))) = 0 ,$$

then $t_1 > t'_1$, and hence, $\frac{dQ}{dt_1} > 0$. The implication is that if t_1^* is a positive root of the critical equation, then $E(C(t_1^*))$ must be a local minimum. Furthermore, since $\frac{dQ}{dt_1} > 0$ for $t_1 > 0$ and $t_1 > t'_1$, t_1^* must be a unique positive root. Additionally, t_1^* can easily be estimated as closely as desired. Merely proceed by trial and error while remembering that $t_1^* > 0$ and $t_1^* > t'_1$, and that $\frac{dQ}{dt_1} > 0$ for $t_1 > 0$ and $t_1 > t'_1$. Thus, lower and upper bounds for t_1^* can immediately be established and then revised closer and closer to the true value of t_1^* . The one exception to this procedure would arise when there does not exist even the single positive root of the critical equation. This could happen if and only if

$$\frac{d}{dt_1} (E(C(t_1))) < 0 \quad \text{for } t_1 > 0 ,$$

which in turn occurs if and only if

$$C_D(N-1)e^{-\mu t_0} - \left[\frac{K}{Ne^{-\mu t_0}} + \frac{C_R}{e^{-\mu t_0}} + C_D(N-1)e^{-\mu t_0} \left(\frac{\theta}{2\mu + \theta} \right) + C_D(1-2N) \left(\frac{\theta}{\mu + \theta} \right) \right] < 0.$$

For this case, the obvious recommendation is $t_1 = \infty$, i.e., never take corrective action. The final important implication of the results is that, if the unique positive root t_1^* exists, then since $Q < 0$ if $0 < t_1 < t_1^*$ and $Q > 0$ if $t_1 > t_1^*$, and since $\frac{d}{dt_1} (E\{C(t_1)\})$ has the same sign as Q for $t_1 > 0$, $E\{C(t_1^*)\}$ must be a global minimum.

In summary, if

$$C_D(N-1)e^{-\mu t_0} - \left[\frac{K}{Ne^{-\mu t_0}} + \frac{C_R}{e^{-\mu t_0}} + C_D(N-1)e^{-\mu t_0} \left(\frac{\theta}{2\mu+\theta} \right) + C_D(1-2N) \left(\frac{\theta}{\mu+\theta} \right) \right] < 0 ,$$

never take corrective action. Otherwise, select $t_1 = t_1^*$, where t_1^* is the necessarily unique positive root of the critical equation, $Q = 0$. This policy will minimize $E\{C(t_1)\}$. Before solving for t_1^* , determine if

$$\left[2(N-1) \left(1 - e^{-\mu t_0} \right) + 1 \right] C_D \geq C_R \left(\frac{\mu+\theta}{\theta} \right) .$$

If so, then $\frac{dQ}{dt_1} > 0$ for $t_1 > 0$. If not, determine t_1' , or at least a lower bound to t_1' , where

$$2C_D(N-1) \left(1 - e^{-\mu(t_0+t_1')} \right) + C_D = C_R \left(\frac{\mu+\theta}{\mu} \right) ,$$

in which case $t_1^* > t_1'$ and $\frac{dQ}{dt_1} > 0$ for $t_1 > t_1'$. In either case,

$Q < 0$ for $t_1 = \max \{0, t_1'\}$. Then, letting $\max \{0, t_1'\}$ be an initial

lower bound for t_1^* and using the fact that $\frac{dQ}{dt_1} > 0$ for $t_1 > \max \{0, t_1'\}$, proceed by trial and error or by more systematic numerical methods, to converge upon the true value of t_1^* to whatever accuracy is desired.

6. Example

A certain company in the electronics industry uses an assembly line for assembling one of its products. One of the initial inputs of this assembly line is a certain kind of electronic tube. This tube arrives from an earlier set of operations in lots of 100, usually at a uniform rate of ten lots each week. Unfortunately, due to a number of reasons such as the breakdown of certain equipment, an occasional lot is prevented from being delivered when needed. It has been observed that the failure of the lot to arrive on schedule is a seemingly random event in time, and that the average time between these events is 20 weeks. The consequence of not having any of these tubes available is that the assembly line must shut down. To safeguard against this very serious situation, a spare lot of the tubes is kept in reserve at a centralized storage station. Thus, whenever the lot in the regular flow of production is delayed or rejected, the spare lot is immediately removed from storage and used in place of the regular lot. The new spare lot is then produced during overtime work if necessary.

It has been observed that, ordinarily, the proportion of the tubes which are produced defective is negligible. From previous experience, both within and outside the company, it is estimated that the storage life of this tube is exponentially distributed with a mean of 180 weeks.

Therefore, to safeguard against using the spare lot when it contains an excessive number of defectives, it is felt that the lot should periodically be screened and the defective tubes replaced with non-defective tubes. However, it is not known just how often this corrective action should be taken so as to minimize the total expected cost.

It is estimated that the cost of inspecting the entire lot is \$100.00. The replacements for the defective items would be produced and inspected during overtime work, which would involve a cost of \$10.00 per item. Since there is not enough time to inspect the lot when it is called into service, any defective tube present would be assembled into the corresponding item of the product. The result would be that the assembled product would not test out; it would then be checked, partially disassembled, the tube replaced, and reassembled. The total extra cost involved for each defective tube is approximately \$100.00.

This data is sufficient to permit the use of the results presented earlier to provide a solution. The cost functions clearly are $D(n) = 100n$ and $HR(n) = 100 + 10n$. Letting the unit of time be the week, $\mu = 1/1800$ and $\theta = 1/20$. Since the proportion of the tubes which are produced defective is negligible, $t_0 = 0$. Thus, in the notation of the linear model of Section 4, $A = \frac{800}{711}$ and $(A - \frac{\mu}{\theta}) = \frac{721}{711}$. Referring to Figure 4.1, it is seen that μt_1 should lie between 0.05 and 0.10. Linearly interpolating between the two curves, $\mu t_1 = 0.055$. Therefore, t_1 , the elapsed time between consecutive inspections of the same lot in storage, should be about 9.9 weeks.

7. Discussion of Results

All of the foregoing results have been based on the assumption that the particular exponential distribution of storage life is known. Therefore, the following statement may at first seem surprising and contradictory. It is that the widest application of these results probably should be to the situation where the distribution of storage life must be judged to be unknown, at least at the initiation of the program. To understand why, it should be recognized that, for this situation, a program of surveillance sampling would or should be conducted which would have the effect of gradually identifying the underlying distribution of storage life. Thus, it is entirely feasible that, by the time corrective action should be taken, the surveillance sampling can sufficiently identify the underlying distribution of storage life to signal the need for this corrective action with the use of the foregoing results. In this connection, it should be noticed that when the optimum t_1 was being solved for, it was really μt_1 that was being found for a particular ratio $\frac{\mu}{\theta}$. Thus, since $1 - e^{-\mu(t_1 + t_0)}$ is the expected fraction defective in the lot at time t_1 , and since μt_0 is chosen so that $1 - e^{-\mu t_0}$ is the expected initial fraction defective, the result of the analysis is to determine the value of expected fraction defective at which corrective action should be taken. Hence, when surveillance sampling indicates or predicts approximately this fraction defective while estimating the corresponding ratio $\frac{\mu}{\theta}$, then corrective action would appropriately be taken at the predicted time. In summary, whenever the particular distribution of storage life is unknown, but assumed to be exponential, use surveillance sampling in effect to estimate

the particular distribution and then apply the corresponding results.

One limitation of the results is that the distribution of storage life is assumed to be exponential. However, this should at least serve as a useful approximation in a large proportion of the cases. Even when the distribution of storage life is known to be not nearly exponential, the results might be enlightening and instructive. It should also be recognized that, especially when corrective action will consist of replacing the lot, only the early part of the distribution of storage life may really need to resemble the exponential distribution.

Another limitation of the results is that solutions are readily obtainable only for a limited number of $D(n)$ and $R(n)$ functions. Fortunately, among these functions are the extremely important ones studied in the preceding sections. The $R(n)$ function studied appears to be at least a reasonable approximation for most situations of interest. The two $D(n)$ functions studied appear to be reasonable approximations for the two primary types of situations. One of these types is where the imputed cost of defective items in the lot at the time of the emergency is roughly proportional to the number of such defectives. This would occur, for example, where the results of the use of the items in the lot are relatively independent. The other primary type of situation is where the imputed cost of defectives when the emergency occurs increases rapidly as the number of these defectives increases. This would occur, for example, where a few defectives in the lot would be easily compensated for by the many non-defectives but the usefulness of the lot would become seriously compromised by the presence of a relatively large number of defectives. The results derived for the

quadratic $D(n)$ function should be useful for this type of situation either as a preliminary result requiring adjustments or as a final solution. The linear $D(n)$ function results should similarly be useful for the first type of situation discussed.

The model does not consider the possibility of the obsolescence of the items in storage or of the termination of the time in which the relevant emergency can occur. However, unless such an occurrence is expected soon, it does not appear that the accuracy of the results would be affected significantly.

8. Conclusions

The results presented here should be helpful in many cases in determining when corrective action should be taken because of the deteriorating quality of a lot in storage. The model does assume the knowledge of considerable information, including the common distribution of storage life of the items in the lot. However, it appears to be feasible to gather and refine this information by surveillance sampling while simultaneously applying the indicated results. Another important limitation is the assumption that the distribution of storage life is exponential. Nevertheless, this assumption should be entirely appropriate in many cases and a useful approximation in many others, at least for instructive preliminary analysis. One of the sets of cost functions analyzed and shown to lead easily to a solution should be appropriate for most cases of interest.

REFERENCES

- [1] Derman, C., and Solomon H., "Development and Evaluation of Surveillance Sampling Plans," Management Science, vol. 5, (1958), pp. 72-88.
- [2] Ireson, W. Grant, "The Surveillance of Stored Items," Technical Report No. 35, Applied Mathematics and Statistics Laboratories, Stanford University, 1957.
- [3] Savage, I. R., "Cycling," Naval Research Logistics Quarterly, vol. 3, (1956), pp. 163-177.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST
CONTRACT Nonr-225(53)

(NR 042-002)

Armed Services Technical Information Agency Arlington Hall Station Arlington 12, Virginia	10	Chief, Statistics Branch Applied Sciences Division Chemical Corps, U. S. Army Fort Detrick, Maryland Attn: Dr. Clifford J. Maloney	1	Chief, Bureau of Ordnance Quality Control Division (QCC) Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Dr. W. R. Pabst, Jr.	1
AF Plant Representative Evendale Plant General Electric Company P. O. Box 91 Cincinnati 15, Ohio	1	Chief, Dayton Air Procurement Dist. Mobile Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Building 70 - Area "G" Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	1	Chief Arizona Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Div. 2875 Sky Harbor Blvd. Phoenix, Arizona	1
AF Plant Representative Office Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area General Electric Company P. O. Box 91 Cincinnati 15, Ohio	1	Chief, Procurement-Maintenance Engineering Division Fort Monmouth, New Jersey Attn: Procurement Data Branch SIGEL-PMP-1	1	Chief San Diego Air Procurement Dist. San Bernardino Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division P. O. Box 1548 Old San Diego Station 4325 Pacific Highway San Diego 10, California	1
Ames Research Center Moffett Field, California Attn: Technical Library	1	Chief of Ordnance U. S. Army Research and Development Division Washington 25, D. C. Attn: ORDTB	1	Chief, Los Angeles Air Proc. Dist. San Bernardino Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Bendix Bldg. 1206 S. Maple Street Los Angeles, California	1
Atlanta Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Div., WRHAQ 41 Exchange Place Atlanta 3, Georgia	1	Chief Office of Ordnance Research Duke University, Duke Station Durham, North Carolina	1	Chief San Francisco Air Procurement Dist. Sacramento Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division 1515 Clay Street Oakland 12, California	1
Ballistics Section Test Branch, A & A Division Yuma Test Station Yuma, Arizona Attn: J. M. Anderson	1	Chief, Surveillance Branch Ballistics Research Lab Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland Attn: Mr. Bruno	1	Chief Atlanta Air Procurement Dist. Warner Robins Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division 441 West Peachtree Street N.E. Atlanta, Georgia	1
Boston Air Procurement Dist. Army Base (MAHBQ) Boston 10, Massachusetts	1	Chief of Naval Materiel Code M533, Room 2236 Main Navy Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.	1	Chief Boston Air Procurement Dist. Middletown Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Boston Army Terminal Boston 10, Massachusetts	1
Bureau of Aeronautics (AV-4422) Department of the Navy Room 2W96, W Building Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. H. R. Thoman	1	Chief of Naval Operations Operations Evaluation Group (OP-03EG) The Pentagon Washington 25, D. C.	2	Chief St. Louis Air Procurement Dist. Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division 1114 Market Street St. Louis 1, Missouri	1
Bureau of Ships, Code 373A Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. A. S. Marthens	6	Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: QC Division	1	Chief Indianapolis Air Procurement Dist. Mobile Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division 54 Monument Circle Indianapolis 6, Indiana	1
Bureau of Ships, Code 373B Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. P. Brown	1	Chief, Bureau of Yards & Docks Materiel Division Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. W. Wolman, Code A600	2	Chief Rochester Air Procurement Dist. Middletown Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division 20 Symington Place, P. O. Box 1669 Rochester 3, New York	1
Bureau of Ships, Code 373C Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Miss Besse B. Day	1	Chief, Bureau of Yards & Docks Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Code M400	1	Chief Cleveland Air Procurement Dist. Mobile Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division 1279 W. Third Street Cleveland 13, Ohio	1
Central Contract Management Region Attn: Directorate, Quality Control Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	1	Chief, Bureau of Ordnance Department of the Navy (Ad3) Washington 25, D. C.	1	Contract Nonr 225(53) May 1961	
Chicago Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Div., OCHQA 5555 South Archer Avenue Chicago 38, Illinois	1	Chief, Bureau of Ordnance Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Code ReUg-3	1		
Cleveland Air Procurement Dist. 1279 West Third Street Cleveland 13, Ohio Attn: Quality Analysis Section	1	Chief, Bureau of Ordnance Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: W. S. Koontz (QcF)	1		
Computation Division Directorate of Management Analysis DCS Comptroller, Hq. USAF Washington 25, D. C.	3				

Chief Dallas Air Procurement Dist. San Antonio Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Wilson Building - Room 338 Dallas 1, Texas	1	Commanding Officer S. C. Supply Agency 225 South 18th Street Philadelphia 3, Pennsylvania Attn: Chief, SIGSU-H3d	2	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Magazine (QEL) Concord, California	1
Chief Statistical Engineering Lab. National Bureau of Standards Washington 25, D. C.	1	Commander U. S. Naval Air Development Center Johnsville, Pennsylvania	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Mine Depot (QEL) Yorktown, Virginia	1
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 346 Broadway New York 13, New York Attn: Dr. J. Laderman	1	Commander U. S. Naval Air Missile Test Center Point Mugu, California Attn: Chief Scientist	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Propellant Plant (QS) Indian Head, Maryland	1
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office Navy No. 100 Fleet Post Office New York, New York	2	Commanding Officer Naval Construction Battalion Center Davisville, Rhode Island	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Propellant Plant Indian Head, Maryland Attn: Mr. Fred Frishman	1
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1000 Geary Street San Francisco 9, California	1	Commanding Officer Naval Construction Battalion Center Gulfport, Mississippi	1	Commander U. S. Naval Proving Ground Dahlgren, Virginia Attn: Technical Library	1
Commanding Officer Rock Island Arsenal Rock Island, Illinois Attn: R & D Division	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot (QEL) Navy No. 66 Fleet Post Office San Francisco, California	1	Commander U. S. Naval Ordnance Test Station China Lake, California Attn: R. Gardner - E. Fay	1 1
Director for Quality Assurance U. S. Army Chemical Center and Chemical Corp. Material Command Army Chemical Center Attn: Ass. for Quality Evaluation Maryland	2	Commander U. S. N. O. T. S. Pasadena Annex 3202 E. Foothill Blvd. Pasadena 8, California	1	Commander U. S. Naval Ordnance Test Station China Lake, California Attn: Dr. D. S. Villars Dr. F. E. McVay	1 1
Commanding Officer U. S. Army Chemical Procurement District 290 Broadway New York 7, New York Attn: Quality Surety Division Quality Assurance Section	1 1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot (QEL) Crane, Indiana	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Torpedo Station (QEL) Newport, Rhode Island	1
Commanding Officer New York Chemical Procurement Dist. 180 Varick Street New York 14, New York Attn: Quality Surety Division	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot (QEL) St. Juliens Creek Portsmouth, Virginia	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Torpedo Station Keyport, Washington Attn: Technical Library Quality Evaluation Lab.	1
Commanding Officer Diamond Ordnance Fuze Lab. Attn: Mr. N. S. Leibman Room 100, Building 52 Connecticut Ave. and Van Ness Street Washington 25, D. C.	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Ammunition and Net Depot (QEL) Seal Beach, California	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Underwater Ordnance Station Newport, Rhode Island Attn: Technical Library	1
Commanding Officer Diamond Ordnance Fuze Lab. Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Library, Rm. 211, Bldg. 92	1	Commanding General U. S. Army Ord. Arsenal, Frankford Attn: Mr. N. J. Miller (6130) Bldg. 235-1 Philadelphia 37, Pa.	1	Commanding Officer and Director U. S. Navy Electronics Lab. San Diego 52, California	1
Commanding Officer Diamond Ordnance Fuze Lab. Washington 25, D. C. Attn: H. Walter Price Chief, Branch 62.0	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory Corona, California Attn: Clayborn L. Graves, Code 63	1	Commander Materiel Laboratory New York Naval Shipyard, Naval Base Brooklyn 1, New York Attn: A. Walner	1
Commanding Officer Dugway Proving Ground Dugway, Utah Attn: Richard Janssen Materiel Testing (TD&A)	1	Commander U. S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory White Oak Silver Spring, Maryland Attn: Mr. R. E. Hightower Mr. P. B. Morgan Dr. H. Ellingson	1 1 1	Commanding Officer U. S. Navy Mine Defense Lab. Panama City, Florida	1
Commanding General Ordnance Ammunition Center Joliet, Illinois Attn: ORDLY AR-V	1			Contract Nonr 225(53) May 1961	

Commanding Officer & Director U. S. Navy Underwater Sound Lab. Fort Trumbull New London, Connecticut	1	Commander San Bernardino Air Materiel Area Attn: Assistant for Quality Directorate of Maintenance Engineering Norton AFB, California	1	Commander Rome Air Force Depot Attn: Directorate of Supply and Services Griffiss AFB, New York	1
Commander Mobile Air Materiel Area Attn: Assistant for Quality Directorate of Maintenance Engineering Brookley Air Force Base Alabama	1	Commander San Bernardino Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement and Production Norton AFB, California	1	Commander Air Materiel Force, European Area Attn: Quality Control Office APO 633, New York, New York	1
Commander Mobile Air Materiel Area Attn: Materiel Quality Division Directorate of Supply & Services Brookley Air Force Base Alabama	1	Commander San Bernardino Air Materiel Area Attn: Materiel Quality Division Directorate of Supply and Services Norton AFB, California	1	Commander Air Technical Intelligence Center Attn: (AFIN-4CI) Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	1
Commander Mobile Air Materiel Area Attn: QC Division Directorate of Procurement & Production Brookley Air Force Base Alabama	1	Commander Warner Robins Air Materiel Area Attn: Assistant for Quality Directorate of Maintenance Engineering Robins AFB, Georgia	1	Commander Air Materiel Command Attn: Quality Control Office, MCQ Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	10
Commander Mobile Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Officer, MDQ Brookley Air Force Base Alabama	2	Commander Warner Robins Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Office, WRQ Robins AFB, Georgia	2	Commander Middletown Air Materiel Area Attn: Assistant for Quality Directorate of Maintenance Engineering Olmsted Air Force Base Middletown, Pennsylvania	1
Commander Southern Air Materiel Area, Pacific Attn: Quality Control Office Clark AFB, APO 74 San Francisco, California	1	Commander Warner Robins Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement & Production Robins AFB, Georgia	1	Commander Middletown Air Materiel Area Attn: Materiel Quality Division Directorate of Supply and Service Olmsted Air Force Base Middletown, Pennsylvania	1
Commander Air Materiel Force, Pacific Area Attn: Quality Control Office FEAMCOM Air Base, APO 323 San Francisco, California	1	Commander Warner Robins Air Materiel Area Attn: Materiel Quality Division Directorate of Supply and Services Robins AFB, Georgia	1	Commander Middletown Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement & Production Olmsted Air Force Base Middletown, Pennsylvania	1
Commander Northern Air Materiel Area, Pacific Attn: Quality Control Office FEAMCOM Air Base, APO 323 San Francisco, California	1	Commander Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area Attn: Assistant for Quality Directorate of Maintenance Engineering Tinker Air Force Base Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	1	Commander Middletown Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Office, MAQ Olmsted Air Force Base Middletown, Pennsylvania	2
Commander Sacramento Air Materiel Area Attn: Assistant of Quality Directorate of Maintenance Engineering McClellan AFB, California	1	Commander Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area Attn: Materiel Quality Division Directorate of Supply and Services Tinker Air Force Base Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	1	Commander Memphis Air Force Depot Mallory Air Force Station Attn: Directorate of Supply and Services 3300 Jackson Avenue Memphis 1, Tennessee	1
Commander Sacramento Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement and Production McClellan AFB, California	1	Commander Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement and Production Tinker Air Force Base Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	1	Commander Memphis Air Force Depot Mallory Air Force Station Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Maintenance Engineering 3300 Jackson Avenue Memphis 1, Tennessee	1
Commander Sacramento Air Materiel Area Attn: Materiel Quality Division Directorate of Supply and Services McClellan AFB, California	1	Commander Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Offices, OCQ Tinker AFB, Oklahoma	2	Commander San Antonio Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Office, SBQ Norton AFB, California	2
Commander San Bernardino Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Office, SBQ Norton AFB, California	1	Commander Rome Air Force Depot Attn: Assistant for Quality Directorate of Maintenance Engineering Griffiss AFB, New York	1	Contract Nonr 225(53) May 1961	

Commander San Antonio Air Materiel Area Attn: Assistant for Quality Directorate of Maintenance Engineering Kelly Air Force Base, Texas	1	Engineering Statistics Group Research Division New York University New York 53, New York	1	Logistics Research Project George Washington University 707 22nd Street, N. W. Washington 7, D. C.	1
Commander San Antonio Air Materiel Area Attn: Materiel Quality Division Directorate of Supply and Services Kelly AFB, Texas	1	Engineering Statistics Unit Chemical Corps Engineering Agency Army Chemical Center, Maryland Attn: Mr. T. M. Vining, Chief	1	Milwaukee Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Div. 770 N. Plankinton Avenue Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin	1
Commander San Antonio Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement and Production Kelly AFB, Texas	1	Federal Telephone and Radio Co. 100 Kingsland Road Clifton, New Jersey	1	Military Medical Supply Agency 84 Sands Street Brooklyn 1, New York Attn: In-Store Quality Control Materiel Inspection Branch	1
Commander San Antonio Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement and Production Kelly AFB, Texas	1	Field Inspection Section DES Division Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency 84 Sands Street Brooklyn 1, New York	1	N. A. C. A. 1512 H. Street, N. W. Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Div. of Res. Information	1
Commander San Antonio Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Office, SAQ Kelly AFB, Texas	1	Mrs. Dorothy Gilford, Head Logistics and Mathematical Statistics Branch Code 436 Office of Naval Research Washington 25, D. C.	3	Newark Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Division 218 Market Street Newark, New Jersey	1
Commander San Antonio Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate Special Weapons Kelly AFB, Texas	1	Military Clothing & Textile Supply Agency Philadelphia Quartermaster Center U. S. Army 2800 So. 20th Street Philadelphia 1, Pa. Attn: Policy Office, Technical Division	1	New York Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Div. 111 East 16th Street New York 3, New York	1
Commander Ogden Air Materiel Area Attn: Assistant for Quality Directorate of Maintenance Engineering Hill AFB, Utah	1	Headquarters San Bernardino Air Materiel Area U. S. Air Force Norton AFB, California Attn: Chief, Planning & Control Offices	1	Office, Asst. Secretary of Defense (R&E) Room 3E1065, The Pentagon Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Technical Library	1
Commander Ogden Air Materiel Area Attn: Materiel Quality Division Directorate of Supply and Services Hill AFB, Utah	1	Headquarters U. S. Army Signal Equipment Support Agency Fort Monmouth, New Jersey Attn: SIGFMES-PPE	1	Operations Analysis Office Headquarters, Pacific Air Forces U. S. Air Force, APO/953 Attn: C. E. Thompson Senior Analyst San Francisco, California	1
Commander Ogden Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement and Production Hill AFB, Utah	1	Headquarters AMC Ballistic Missiles Center, USAF Air Force Unit Post Office Attn: E. J. Lancaster, Deputy for Quality Assurance Los Angeles 45, California	1	Office, Chief of Engineers Department of the Army Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Procurement Division Military Supply	2
Commander Ogden Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Office, OOO Hill AFB, Utah	2	Industrial Division Office, Chief of Ordnance Department of the Army Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. Seymour Lorber	1	Office of Operation Analysis DCS/Operations Elgin AFB, Florida	1
David Taylor Model Basin Applied Mathematics Lab. (Code 820) Washington 7, D. C. Attn: Dr. Julius Lieblein	1	Inspection and Quality Control Div. Office, Asst. Secretary of Defense (S&L) Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. Irving B. Altman	1	Office of the Chief (R&D), U. S. Army Arlington Hall Station Arlington, Virginia Attn: Dr. I. R. Hershner, Jr.	1
Detroit Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Div. MOHDQ W. Warren Avenue & Lonyo Blvd. Detroit 32, Michigan Attn: MOHDQPQ	1	Inspection and Quality Control Div. Office, Asst. Secretary of Defense (S&L) Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. John J. Riordan	1	Officer in Charge U. S. Navy Central Torpedo Office Newport, Rhode Island Attn: Mr. G. B. Habicht	1
Director National Security Agency Attn: REMF-1 Fort George G. Meade Maryland	1	Library Institute for Defense Analysis Communications Research Division Von Neumann Hall Princeton, New Jersey	1	Ordnance Corps Industrial Engineering Div. Diamond Ordnance Fuze Lab. Washington 25, D. C.	1
Director, Development Division Field Command Armed Forces Special Weapons Project Albuquerque, New Mexico	1	Librarian Numerical Analysis Research University of California Los Angeles 24, California	1	Ordnance Mission White Sands Proving Ground Las Cruces, New Mexico Attn: Mr. Paul G. Cox	1
Eastern Contract Management Region Attn: Directorate, Quality Control Olmsted AFB, Pennsylvania	1	Logistics Research Division Attn: MCFR Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	1	Philadelphia Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Division 1411 Walnut Street Philadelphia 2, Pennsylvania	1

Physical Research Branch Evans Signal Lab., SCEL Belmar, New Jersey Attn: Mr. Joseph Weinstein	1	U. S. N. O. T. S. Pasadena Annex 3202 E. Foothill Blvd. Pasadena 8, California Attn: Mr. S. Gaspar	1	Dr. A. Charnes The Technological Institute Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois	1
The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California Attn: Library	1	Western Contract Management Region Attn: Directorate, Quality Control Mira Loma AF Station, California	1	Mr. W. H. Clatworthy Bettis Plan, Westinghouse Electric Corporation Box 1468 Pittsburgh 30, Pennsylvania	1
Report Library University of California Los Alamos Scientific Lab. P. O. Box 1663 Los Alamos, New Mexico	1	Dr. Adam Abruzzi Dept. of Economics and Engineering Stevens Institute of Technology Hoboken, New Jersey	1	Professor Paul Clifford New Jersey State Teachers College Montclair, New Jersey	1
Rocket Development Group Redstone Arsenal Huntsville, Alabama Attn: Lt. E. L. Bombara	1	Mr. William E. Gilbert, Chief Mathematical Statistics Branch Atomic Energy Commission Washington 25, D. C.	1	Professor W. G. Cochran Department of Statistics Harvard University Cambridge, Massachusetts	1
San Francisco Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Division Oakland Army Terminal, Bldg. 1 West Grand & Maritime Oakland 14, California	1	Professor T. W. Anderson Department of Mathematical Statistics Columbia University New York 27, New York	1	Professor C. C. Cockerham Institute of Statistics State College Section North Carolina State College Raleigh, North Carolina	1
Scranton Ordnance Plant 156 Cedar Avenue Scranton, Pennsylvania Attn: Mr. Carl D. Larsen Chief Inspector	1	Professor Fred C. Andrews Mathematics Department University of Oregon Eugene, Oregon	1	Professor Edward P. Coleman Engineering Department University of California Los Angeles 24, California	1
Special Project Office SP2016 Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Dr. H. Weingarten	1	Dr. Max Astrachan Department of Logistic The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California	1	Dr. Louis Court Division 17 National Bureau of Standards Washington 25, D. C.	1
Standards Branch Procurement Division DCS Logistics, U. S. Army Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. Silas Williams, Jr.	1	Professor Robert Bechhofer Sibley School of Mech. Engineering Cornell University Ithaca, New York	1	Miss Gertrude M. Cox Institute of Statistics North Carolina State College Raleigh, North Carolina	1
Statistical Laboratory University of California Berkeley 4, California	1	Dr. R. E. Beckwith Aeronautic Ford Road Newport Beach, California	1	Dr. Joseph Daly U. S. Census Bureau Washington 25, D. C.	1
Technical Information Officer Naval Research Laboratory Washington 25, D. C.	6	Professor J. N. Berrettoni Western Reserve University Cleveland, Ohio	1	Professor Cyrus Derman Department of Industrial Engineering Columbia University New York 27, New York	1
Technical Operation, Inc. and C. O. R. G. Hq. Continental Army Command Fort Monroe, Virginia	1	Mr. Carlton M. Beyer Office of Guided Missiles Office of Asst. Secretary of Defense (R&E) Washington, D. C.	1	Mr. H. F. Dodge Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey	1
U. S. Naval Avionics Facility Indianapolis 18, Indiana Attn: Library	1	Professor Z. W. Birnbaum Laboratory of Statistical Research Department of Mathematics University of Washington Seattle 5, Washington	1	Dr. Francis Dresch Stanford Research Institute 333 Ravenswood Avenue Menlo Park, California	1
U. S. Naval Engineering Experiment Station Annapolis, Maryland Attn: Mr. F. R. DelPriore	1	Professor Russell Bradt Department of Mathematics University of Kansas Lawrence, Kansas	1	Professor Acheson J. Duncan Department of Industrial Engineering Johns Hopkins University Baltimore 18, Maryland	1
U. S. Naval Inspector of Ordnance 400 S. Belger Street Mishawaka, Indiana	1	Professor Irving W. Burr Department of Mathematics Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana	1	Professor Meyer Dwass Department of Mathematics Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois	1
U. S. Naval Inspector of Ordnance Eastman Kodak Company 50 W. Main Street Rochester 14, New York	1	Mr. G. Burrows Knolls Atomic Power Lab. Schenectady, New York	1	Professor D. A. S. Fraser Department of Mathematics University of Toronto Toronto 5, Canada	1
U. S. Naval Inspector of Ordnance Statistics Department Naval Gun Factory Washington, D. C. Attn: C. D. Hock	1	Captain A. E. Chapman AFPR Boeing Aircraft Corporation Seattle, Washington	1		

Contract Nona 225(53)
May 1961

Mr. Bernard P. Goldsmith Associate Professor Northwestern University Huntington Avenue Boston 15, Massachusetts	1	Professor W. D. Jones Department of Statistics Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan	1	D. E. Newnham Chief, Industrial Engineering Division Comptroller Hqrs., San Bernardino Air Materiel Area Norton Air Force Base, California	1
Professor Leo A. Goodman Statistical Research Center University of Chicago Chicago 37, Illinois	1	Mr. J. P. Kearney Quality Control Division General Services Administration Room 6316, Region 3 Building Washington 25, D. C.	1	Professor J. Neyman Department of Statistics University of California Berkeley 4, California	1
Mr. Leon Gifford Operations Research Inc. 8605 Cameron Street Silver Springs, Maryland	1	Professor Oscar Kempthorne Statistics Laboratory Iowa State College Ames, Iowa	1	Mr. Monroe Norden Research Division College of Engineering New York University New York 53, New York	1
Dr. J. Greenwood Directorate of Intelligence Hq., U. S. Air Force Washington 25, D. C.	1	Professor Solomon Kullback Department of Statistics George Washington University Washington 7, D. C.	1	Mr. Fred Okano National Aeronautics & Space Administration Reliability & Systems Analysis Office Room A-131 1520 "H" Street, N. W. Washington 25, D. C.	1
Professor Frank M. Gryna, Jr. University College Rutgers University New Brunswick New Jersey	1	Dr. Carl F. Kossack Statistics and Operations Research Research Center - IBM P. O. Box 218, Lamb Estate Yorktown Heights, New York	1	Professor E. G. Olds Department of Mathematics Carnegie Institute of Technology Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania	1
Dr. Donald Guthrie Stanford Research Institute 333 Ravenswood Avenue Menlo Park, California	1	Mr. Howard Laitin The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California	1	Professor E. R. Ott Department of Mathematics Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey	1
Dr. Theodore E. Harris The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California	1	Dr. E. L. LeClerg, Chief Biometrical Services Agricultural Research Service, USDA Beltsville Maryland	1	Mr. Cyril Peckham Project Globe University of Dayton Dayton, Ohio	1
Dr. Leon H. Herback Department of Mathematics New York University New York 3 New York	1	Professor Sebastian B. Littauer 411 Engineering Building Columbia University New York 27, New York	1	Dr. Richard Post Department of Mathematics San Jose State College San Jose, California	1
Professor W. Hirsch Institute of Mathematical Sciences New York University New York 3, New York	1	Dr. Eugene Lukacs Department of Mathematics Catholic University Washington 17, D. C.	1	Professor P. H. Randolph Purdue University Department of Industrial Engineering Lafayette, Indiana	1
Dr. Paul G. Hoel Department of Mathematics University of California Los Angeles 24, California	1	Dr. Robert Lundegard Logistics and Mathematical Statistics Branch Office of Naval Research Washington 25, D. C.	1	Professor George J. Resnikoff Department of Industrial Engineering Illinois Institute of Technology Chicago 16, Illinois	1
Professor Harold Hotelling Associate Director Institute of Statistics University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, North Carolina	1	Professor Frank Massey School of Public Health University of California Los Angeles 24, California	1	Dr. Paul R. Rider Chief Statistician Aeronautical Research Lab., WADC Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	1
Professor L. Hurwicz School of Business Administration University of Minnesota Minneapolis, Minnesota	1	Professor G. W. McElrath Department of Industrial Engineering University of Minnesota Minneapolis 14, Minnesota	1	Professor Herbert Robbins Mathematical Statistics Department Columbia University New York 27, New York	1
Mr. Rudolf Husser Visiting Research Mathematicians Numerical Analysis Research University of California Los Angeles 24, California	1	Dr. Paul Meyer Department of Mathematics Washington State University Pullman, Washington	1	Dr. Harry G. Romig 351 Alma Real Drive Pacific Palisades, California	1
Dr. James R. Jackson Management Sciences Research Project 65 Administration Building University of California Los Angeles 24, California	1	Dean Paul E. Mohn School of Engineering University of Buffalo Buffalo, New York	1	Dr. Harry Rosenblatt Statistical Research Division Bureau of Census Washington 25, D. C.	1
Dr. W. C. Jacob Agronomy Department University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois	1	Mr. R. B. Murphy Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc. 463 West Street New York 14, New York	1	Professor Murray Rosenblatt Department of Mathematics Brown University Providence, Rhode Island	1

Contract Nonr 225(53)
May 1961

Professor Herman Rubin Department of Statistics Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan	1	Professor Mason Wescott Editor, Industrial Quality Control Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey	1	<u>Other Foreign Addresses</u>	
Professor Norman Rudy Statistic Department Sacramento State College Sacramento, California	1	Professor S. S. Wilks Department of Mathematics Princeton University Princeton, New Jersey	1	Professor Maurice H. Beltz University of Melbourne Carlton N. 3 Victoria, Australia	1
Miss Marion M. Sandomire U. S. Department of Agriculture Western Regional Laboratory Biometrical Services Albany 10, California	1	Professor J. Wolfowitz Department of Mathematics Cornell University Ithaca, New York	1	Professor Tosio Kitagawa Mathematical Institute Faculty of Science Kyusyu University Fukuoka, Japan	1
Professor I. Richard Savage School of Business Administration University of Minnesota Minneapolis, Minnesota	1	Dr. Max A. Woodbury Department of Mathematics College of Engineering New York University New York 53, New York	1	Kenichi Koyanagi Managing Director Union of Japanese Scientists & Engineers 2, 1-chome, Cyobashi Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan	1
Professor L. J. Savage Mathematics Department University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	1	<u>Distribution via ONR London</u>		Dr. Lal Verman Director Indian Standards Institute New Delhi, India	1
Professor Henry Scheffé Department of Statistics University of California Berkeley 4, California	1	Commanding Officer Branch Office Navy No. 100 Fleet Post Office New York, New York		Professor P. C. Mahalanobis Indian Statistical Institute 203 Barrackpore Trunk Road Calcutta 35, India	1
Professor Robert Schlaifer Graduate School of Business Administration Harvard University Boston 63, Massachusetts	1	Dr. William R. Buckland 22 Ryder Street London S W. 1 England	1	N. T. Mathew, SRC Unit India Statistical Institute 8 King George Road New Delhi, India	1
Professor Seymour Sherman Department of Mathematics Wayne State University Detroit 2, Michigan	1	Professor Georges Darrois Director, Institut de Statistique University of Paris 11 Rue Pierre Curie Paris 5, France	1	Professor Sigeiti Moriguti Syoon Minamimati 6 Suginami-ku, Tokyo, Japan	1
Mr. Walter Shewhart Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc. Murray Hill, New Jersey	1	Professor R. Fortet Institut Henri Poincare Paris, France	1	R. G. Narasimhan SRC Unit Calcutta Indian Statistical Institute 9B Esplanade East Calcutta 1, India	1
Dr. Rosedith Sitgreaves Teachers College Columbia University New York 27, New York	1	Dr. Geoffrey Gregory 4, Osborne Grove Gatley, Cheadle Cheshire, England	1	H. D. Shourie Director National Productivity Council Golf Links New Delhi, India	1
Dr. Milton Sobel Statistics Department University of Minnesota Minneapolis, Minnesota	1	A. Hald Feresovej 83 Virum, Denmark	1	P. V. Sivaramkrishnan SQC Unit, Indian Statistical Inst. Queens Road, Government Offices Building Bombay, India	1
Professor Frank Spitzer Department of Mathematics University of Minnesota Minneapolis, Minnesota	1	Dr. H. C. Hamaker Philips Research Laboratories Eindhoven, Netherlands	1	Srinagabhushana SQU Unit Bangalore % SKSJ Technological Inst. Bangalore 1, India	1
Mr. Arthur Stein Cornell Aeronautical Lab., Inc. P. O. Box 235 Buffalo 21, New York	1	Mr. I. D. Hill Statistical Advisory Unit Ministry of Supply London W. 1, England	1	Professor Eduardo Valenzuela Republica 517-CIEF Santiago, Chile	1
Professor W. Allen Wallis School of Business University of Chicago Chicago 37, Illinois	1	Professor A. Walther Technische Hochschule Darmstadt, Germany	1	Mr. Cesareo Villegas Inst. de Matematica y Estadística Av. J. Herrera y Reissig Montevideo, Uruguay	1
Dr. Irving Weiss The Mitre Corporation Bedford, Massachusetts	1				
Captain Burton L. Weller AFPR Office Martin Aircraft Corporation Denver, Colorado	1			Additional copies for project leaders and assistants, office file, and reserve for future requirements	70
				Contract Nonr 225(53) May 1961 (425)	