

USAAVSCOM

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM TM 85-F-7

AD

2

AD-A164 196

**COST ESTIMATING RELATIONSHIPS FOR FIXED WING
AIRCRAFT; LIST PRICE VS EMPTY WEIGHT**

**WILLIAM JOEL DITTO
OPERATIONS RESEARCH ANALYST**

SEPTEMBER 1985

**DTIC
ELECTE
FEB 13 1986**
S B

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION IS UNLIMITED

DTIC FILE COPY



U.S. ARMY
AVIATION
SYSTEMS COMMAND

36 2 13 080

DISCLAIMER

The view, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.

COST ESTIMATING RELATIONSHIPS FOR FIXED WING AIRCRAFT

LIST PRICE VS. EMPTY WEIGHT

SEPTEMBER 1985

WILLIAM J. DITTO

U.S. ARMY AVIATION SYSTEMS COMMAND
OPERATIONAL COST ANALYSIS DIVISION
DIRECTORATE FOR SYSTEMS AND COST ANALYSIS
4300 GOODFELLOW BOULEVARD
SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI 63120-1798

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER USAAVSCOM Technical Memorandum TM 85-F-7	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Cost Estimating Relationships for Fixed Wing Aircraft; List Price vs Empty Weight		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final
7. AUTHOR(s) William Joel Ditto		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER USAAVSCOM TM 85-F-7
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Aviation Systems Command Directorate for Systems and Cost Analysis Operational Cost Analysis Division (AMSAV-BC) 4300 Goodfellow Boulevard St. Louis, MO 63120-1798		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Aviation Systems Command Directorate for Systems and Cost Analysis (AMSAV-B) 4300 Goodfellow Boulevard St. Louis, MO 63120-1798		12. REPORT DATE September 1985
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 15
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) CER Regression Analysis Fixed Wing Cost Heteroscedasticity		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This Cost Estimating Relationship (CER) for Fixed Wing Aircraft was developed to estimate the unit cost of a twin engine, commercial, turbo-prop aircraft procured "off the shelf". The Army has a limited fixed wing capability and most of this capability is procured in a commercial environment instead of through a typical rotor wing procurement cycle. The list price in the commercial market includes both engines and standard avionics, while in a typical Government rotor wing procurement these items		

20. ABSTRACT (continued)

are Government Furnished Equipment. Therefore, this CER was developed using the parameter of empty weight and aircraft commercial list price.

The data collected was analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) on the AVSCOM Scientific and Engineering Computer System. The program developed is a linear regression of the form ($y = a + bx$), and the results are shown in the report.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the help and advice from the fellow analysts in the AVSCOM Directorate for Systems and Cost Analysis. In particular, that of Mr. Bob Vavra, Operational Cost Analysis Division, for his supervision and guidance and Mr. William Waymire for his expertise in statistics and economics. Also, the author would like to thank Ms. Nancy Ware for her excellent editing and typing. Without their efforts this report would not have been completed.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. Summary	1
II. Introduction	1
III. General Approach	1
A. Selection of Candidate Variables	1
B. CER Derivation and Computation	2
C. Heteroscedasticity	2
IV. Presentation of CER Results	3
A. CER Description	3
B. CER Equations and Statistics	3
C. CER Development and Selection	3
References	7

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
1	CER Data and Source	4
2	CER Equations and Statistics	5

I. SUMMARY.

A Cost Estimating Relationship (CER) for Fixed Wing Aircraft was first developed by James P. Boxx in 1977, to estimate the unit cost of a commercial turbine engine, turbo-prop aircraft procured "off the shelf". The CER was developed relating the parameters of aircraft empty weight and aircraft commercial list price. This CER has now been updated to reflect the latest data available. The parameters chosen remain the same as in the previous model; empty weight and aircraft list price.

The CER developed using the new data is:

Commercial List Price (\$84) = 242.22 * (empty weight)

$R^2 = .97$

Coefficient of Variation = 18.96

Standard Error = 9.55

This CER is based on commercial data for the aircraft listed in Table 1. Many factors will have a bearing upon the list price and all users of this CER should be aware that the aircraft price can vary significantly depending upon the equipment purchased with the aircraft.

II. Introduction.

The CER was originally developed to improve the methods of estimating the cost to procure fixed wing aircraft. Future programs requiring "off the shelf" procurement of a twin engine, turbo-prop aircraft will be able to use this CER. A summary of the results using this CER to predict the cost is presented in Table 1.

III. General Approach.

A. Selection of Candidate Variables.

In 1976, the Rand Corporation was commissioned by the Assistant Secretary of Defense to examine the variables that they thought would explain airframe cost. Two variables, weight and speed, were found to be significant. In the CER developed for this study, only the weight variable was found to be significant. Therefore, the variable used in this study was the empty weight of the candidate aircraft selected (Table 1).

B. CER Derivation and Computation.

The Scientific and Engineering computer in the Directorate for Management Information Systems (DMIS) of the U.S. Army Aviation Systems Command (AVSCOM) was utilized to run the necessary linear regression to perform the analysis. This system has the capability to access the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) program. A test for heteroscedasticity was performed. In this test a linear regression of the residuals squared against the independent variable empty weight was performed. The results showed that the conditions of heteroscedasticity existed. The variance showed an increase corresponding to an increase in the independent variable weight. The suspected cause of this condition is related to the equipment installed in the aircraft. The increased variability of the cost as the weight increases could possibly be attributed to more or less expensive avionics, and different crew and passenger accommodations. This leads to the same airframe being built up for different levels of passenger comfort and crew work load. The SAS family of routines was used to perform the actual regressions shown in the results.

C. Heteroscedasticity

The first analysis performed showed that a problem existed with the data collected. This problem was determined to be one of heteroscedasticity. In a basic regression model, it is assumed that the variance is constant. However, in some cases this assumption is not true; i.e., the variance is non-constant. When this condition exists the model is said to be heteroscedastic and, therefore, the variance of the residuals is said to depend upon the value of one of the regressors. A standard estimation procedure can not be implemented because the value of the co-variance between the residuals and the regressor variable will not be zero. The assumption that must be made to account for the heteroscedasticity and to assume that the co-variance between the residuals and the regressor is zero, is that, whatever the value of the regressor, the mean of the variance of the residuals is constant. This assumption implies that the residuals are not correlated with either of the variables.

The effect of heteroscedasticity on the basic equation is on the the variances of the parameter estimators. The result of using normal procedures to estimate the variances is that the resulting test of hypotheses and confidence intervals will be held in some doubt.

The basic regression model assumes a constant variance and the estimation procedure produces an estimator of the constant. However, the variance of the residuals is itself a variable. The result of this is that the standard estimator will represent some average of the different variances of the residuals. This type of estimator will have little meaning and will not allow valid confidence intervals or t-ratios for the parameters of the equation. More reliable estimators of the coefficients and their variances can be obtained by incorporating into the estimation procedure information on the true properties of the residuals.

IV. PRESENTATION OF CER RESULTS

A. CER Description

The final CER developed was based on the aircraft empty weight and the catalog list price of commercial fixed wing twin-engine turbo-prop aircraft. Historical cost data was obtained for the aircraft listed in Table 1.

B. CER Equation and Statistics

The CER developed during the initial investigation showed that the y-intercept was insignificant. An examination of the scatter diagram showed that as the weight increased the cost variance increased. These conditions were corrected and the final CER was determined. Presentation of the CERs and their representative statistics are shown in Table 2. The actual and calculated values of the results are shown in Table 1.

C. CER Development and Selection

The CERs were evaluated by linear regression analysis. The first CER was modified to eliminate the effects of heteroscedasticity and to reflect the fact that the y-intercept was insignificant. These results are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 1

AIRCRAFT TYPE	DATA SOURCE	EMPTY WEIGHT	ACTUAL PRICE	CALCULATED PRICE
Pilatus B-N Turbine Engine Piper T 1040	BCA	4,295 5,167	712,340 944,810	1,040,335 1,251,551
DeHavilland Twin Otter DeHavilland Dash 8	BCA BCA	7,593 21,590	1,800,000 6,000,000	1,839,176 5,229,529
Cessna CE-406	BCA/AW	5,621	1,200,315	1,362,518
Beech C99 Beech 1900	BCA/AW BCA	6,655 9,355	1,842,000 2,842,000	1,611,974 2,265,968
Dornier GmbH 228-101 228-201	BCA/AW BCA	7,546 7,842	1,695,000 1,898,000	1,827,792 1,901,911
Embraer Bandeirante Brasilia	BCA BCA	8,350 15,068	1,943,000 4,716,000	2,022,537 3,649,771
IAI Arava	FA/BCA	9,434	1,900,000	2,285,103
Casa C212-300 Casa/Nurtanio CN-235	BCA BCA/AW	10,141 20,725	2,450,000 5,300,000	2,456,353 5,020,010
Fairchild Metro III IIIA III(H)	BCA BCA BCA/AW	9,020 9,120 9,120	2,500,000 2,600,000 2,700,000	2,184,824 2,209,046 2,209,046
British Aero Jetstream 31	BCA	9,513	2,850,000	2,304,238
Shorts 330 360	BCA/AW BCA/AW	15,100 16,900	3,355,000 4,400,000	3,657,522 4,093,518
Allsion 580	BCA	32,500	4,500,000	7,872,150
Saab-Fairchild	BCA	17,281	5,600,000	4,185,804
British Aerospace Super 748	BCA	27,234	6,000,000	6,596,619
Fokker Friendship F27-MK500	BCA	28,100	6,500,000	6,806,382
Aerospatale Aeritalia	BCA	21,272	6,680,400	5,152,503

TABLE 2

ORIGINAL
REGRESSION

DEP VARIABLE: PRICE1

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PROB > F
MODEL	1	6.720348+13	6.720348+13	210.402	0.0001
ERROR	21	6.707508+13	319404831061		
C TOTAL	22	7.391098+13			
ROOT MSE DEP MEAN C.V.		565159 3378979 16.72573	F-SQUARE ADJ R-SQ	0.9092 0.9049	
VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR HO: PARAMETER=0	PROB > F
INTERCEPT	1	74618.797	256403	0.283	0.7799
BOUL	1	255.406	17.607825	14.505	0.0001

TEST FOR HETERO-
SCEDASTICITY

DEP VARIABLE: RESIDSQ

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PROB > F
MODEL	1	1.38339E+24	1.38339E+24	12.618	0.0019
ERROR	21	2.30235E+24	1.09636E+23		
C TOTAL	22	3.68574E+24			
ROOT MSE DEP MEAN C.V.		331112937951 291630497925 113.5385	R-SQUARE ADJ R-SQ	0.3753 0.3456	
VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR HO: PARAMETER=0	PROB > F
INTERCEPT	1	-1.82750E+11	150337254483	-1.216	0.2376
BOUL	1	36646759	10315995	3.552	0.0019

TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

FINAL REGRESSION		DEP VARIABLE: PGR			
SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PROB > F
MODEL	1	1114.176	1114.176		
ERROR	22	38.11617	1.732569	643.077	0.0001
TOTAL	23	1152.292			
ROOT MSE		1.316271	R-SQUARE	0.9669	
DEP MEAN		6.938971	ADJ R-SQ	0.9669	
C.V.		18.96925			
NOTE: NO INTERCEPT TERM IS USED. R-SQUARE IS REDEFINED					
VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR NO. PARAMETER=0	PROB > F
WTER	1	242.221	9.551688	0.0001	

REFERENCES

1. "Aircraft Specifications", Aviation Week and Space Technology, March 18, 1985.
2. Parametric Equations for Estimating Aircraft Airframe Cost by Joseph P. Large, Harry G. Campbell, and David Cates, February 1976.
3. "Aircraft Directory", Business and Commercial Aviation, April 1985.