

**DAHLGREN DIVISION
NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER**

Dahlgren, Virginia 22448-5100



NSWCDD/TR-07/13

**COMPUTATION OF THE CIRCULAR ERROR
PROBABLE (CEP) AND CONFIDENCE
INTERVALS IN BOMBING TESTS**

BY ARMIDO DIDONATO

WARFARE SYSTEMS DEPARTMENT

NOVEMBER 2007

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

20080206072

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, search existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE November 2007	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Computation of the Circular Error Probable (CEP) and Confidence Intervals in Bombing Tests			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(s) Armido DiDonato				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Commander Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren Division (Code W30) 17320 Dahlgren Road Dahlgren, VA 22448-5100			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NSWCDD/TR-07/13	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The objective of this report is to assess the performance of a radar bomb director (RBD) by computing its CEP (Circular Error Probable) on the basis of measurements of miss distances in actual bomb drops falling under an uncorrelated bivariate normal distribution. In addition, confidence intervals (CIs) for the CEP are established. On the basis of these results and the assignment of a nominal CEP, one can also decide whether or not the statistical accuracy requirements of the RBD have been met, or whether further testing is required. An available Fortran 95 computer program is described, which for a given set of bomb drops, generates an estimated CEP and three different CIs: a conventional interval, a minimum one, and when possible, a symmetric one. The acceptance or nonacceptance of the RBD's performance, or whether more testing is needed, is also an optional part of the output.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS algorithm, INGCE, inverse, circular error function, GCE, elliptical normal function, INVGE			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 40	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORTS UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI std. Z39-18
298-102


FOREWORD

The statistical analysis described in this report represents an extension of Dr. Milton Jarnagin's work described in a 1971 memorandum. The analysis is the basis for Fortran 95 software of important statistical functions that are not contained in the NSWC Library of Mathematics Subroutines. The software can be used in targeting studies, such as assessing the performance of a radar bomb director, where statistical confidence regions are required.

Dr. John Crigler (Q21) supplied the external distribution list, and Dr. Robert McDevitt (W32) helped clarify the presentation.

This document was reviewed by Robert G. Hill (W60), Head, Engineering and Command Environment Division.

Approved by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Reuben S. Pitts III". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the last name "Pitts" being more prominent.

REUBEN S. PITTS III, Head
Warfare Systems Department

BLANK PAGE

CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I INTRODUCTION	1
II $V(K, c)$ AND $P(R, H, K, s_x, s_y)$ PROBABILITY FUNCTIONS.....	3
III COMPUTATION OF THE ESTIMATED CEP.....	5
IV CONFIDENCE INTERVALS.....	6
V CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BY SEQUENTIAL TESTING	12
VI FORTRAN PROGRAMS FOR CEP AND CONFIDENCE INTERVALS ...	16
VII REFERENCES	18
APPENDIX A—GLOSSARY	A-1
APPENDIX B—LIST OF FORTRAN 95 SUBPROGRAMS.....	B-1
DISTRIBUTION	(1)

ILLUSTRATIONS

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Typical Bombing Pattern, $n = 22$	1
2	An Elliptical Distribution With Zero Means	4
3	90% Confidence Region For (σ_x, σ_y)	8
4	90% Confidence Region: uses (1), $n = 22$	9
5	With Confidence $(1 - \alpha)^2$, $0 \leq RT < bR$	13
6	With Confidence $(1 - \alpha)^2$, $aR \leq RT < \infty$	13

TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Normally Distributed Data of Figure 1, $n = 22$	6
2	CEPs Based on Table 1 Data	6
3	Listing of CCI, MCI, and SCI Using Data From Table 1	10
4	Listing of CCI, MCI, and SCI for CEPT Using Data From Tables 1 and 3 ..	11
5	Listing of $\overline{CLR} \geq CLR$, $\underline{CHR} \leq CHR$ Using Data From Tables 1 and 4	14
6	Listing of CIs For CEPT—Using Data From Previous Tables	15

I. INTRODUCTION

One problem, of two under consideration, is to assess the performance of a radar bomb director (RBD) by estimating its Circular Error Probable (CEP) given in units of length,¹ based on measurements of miss distances from the target at $(0, 0)$ in actual bomb drops that fall under an uncorrelated bivariate normal distribution (UBND) with zero means and unknown variances. Confidence intervals (CIs) for the true CEP (CEPT), will be needed, where the CEPT, by definition, is the radius, RT , of the circle centered at $(0, 0)$, which contains 50%, $PCEP = 0.50$, of the distribution. The computer program, CONFREG, discussed in Section VI, allows arbitrary PCEP values in $(0, 1)$.

In the second problem, it is assumed a radar contractor is to be awarded a bonus if the computed CEP is below an agreed nominal value (RT_n , for example by 10%), and is to be penalized if over the RT_n by a like percentage. Thus, it is important to know the level of confidence, under these circumstances, that can be placed on the CEP, R , computed from experimental data as an estimate of the RT .

In May 1971, Dr. M. P. Jarnagin of the Naval Weapons Laboratory at Dahlgren, Virginia, issued an informal memorandum [1] in which he described statistical procedures for addressing these problems. Because of limited computing facilities, his analysis used approximations throughout and, consequently, the work was limited in scope. Our objective is to replace the approximations with precise calculations and to generalize the results to some extent. In many parts of this report, excerpts are taken directly from his memorandum.

Other studies addressing the first problem have been carried out in [2] and [3]. Again, their analyses are based on approximations without error bounds rather than on precise calculations.

A set of hypothetical individual bomb drops is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Typical Bombing Pattern, $n = 22$

¹In this report, the unit of length will be meters.

Let n denote the total number of bomb drops. The target is a point target at $(0,0)$, the origin of coordinates. The flight path of the aircraft dropping each bomb is along the x -axis. The y -axis passes through the target, is perpendicular to the x -axis, and is positive above the x -axis. The x and y coordinates of the impact point of a given bomb drop are the components of the miss distance in range and deflection, respectively, in the usual terminology.

In Figure 1, $n = 22$, Bomb No. 21 hits at point P21 with coordinates (in meters) $x = 8.668$, $y = 23.298$.² The estimated CEP, or more briefly R , is the radius of the circle that contains 50% of the impact points. An indicated CEP in Figure 1 is $R = 26.5$. For such finite samples, R is not uniquely defined, but for a theoretical bivariate normal distribution, RT is a precisely defined unique number.

The assumption is made that the x -coordinates of the bomb drops, $\{x_i\} = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$, constitute a random sample from a normal distribution with mean zero and with unknown standard deviation σ_x . Similarly, it is assumed that the y -coordinates of the bomb drops, $\{y_i\} = y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n$, form a random sample from a normal distribution, independent of the distribution of the x_i 's, with mean zero and unknown standard deviation σ_y . Thus, the impact points (x_i, y_i) are assumed to be from a UBND. The results in an actual test may not indicate zero means. That would imply a bias in the performance of the RBD that would penalize the contractor. Subsequently, we allow for nonzero means, which extends the model in [1].

The CEPT(= RT) is a function of the standard deviations σ_x and σ_y . We compute an estimate R for RT on the basis of the experimentally determined estimates s_x and s_y , for σ_x and σ_y , where

$$s_x \equiv \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 / f}, \quad s_y \equiv \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2 / f}, \quad f = n, \quad (\text{Assume } \bar{x} = 0, \bar{y} = 0), \quad (1)$$

$$s_x \equiv \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 / f}, \quad s_y \equiv \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2 / f}, \quad f = n - 1, \quad \bar{x} \neq 0, \bar{y} \neq 0, \quad (2)$$

and where f denotes the number of degrees of freedom in the data. The means in (2) are given by

$$\bar{x} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n x_i / n, \quad \bar{y} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n y_i / n. \quad (3)$$

The pertinent function connecting the CEP and the estimated standard deviations taken from (1) is the Generalized Circular Error Function (GCE), $V(K, c)$, where $K = R/s_x$, $c = s_y/s_x$,³ [4] – [6]. If the estimated standard deviations are taken from (2), then the applicable function is the Elliptic Coverage Function (ELP), $P(R, H, K, s_x, s_y)$. Both functions will be discussed in the next section.⁴

²For clarity, numerical results will be included with the general subject matter.

³Note, in general, $s_x \neq s_y$.

⁴The arguments K in $V(K, c)$ and $P(R, H, K, s_x, s_y)$ have different meanings.

II. $V(K, c)$ AND $P(R, H, K, s_x, s_y)$ PROBABILITY FUNCTIONS

The GCE, also known as the elliptical normal function, defines a probability function $V(R/u, v/u)$. GCE gives the probability of a shot falling in a circle of the xy -plane, of radius R and centered at the origin, under a UBND with mean zero and standard deviations u, v . This probability is given by

$$V(R, u, v) = \frac{1}{2\pi uv} \int_{-R}^R \int_{-\sqrt{R^2-x^2}}^{\sqrt{R^2-x^2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[\left(\frac{x}{u}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{y}{v}\right)^2\right]\right\} dy dx, \quad (4)$$

where $u = \sigma_x, v = \sigma_y$. Transforming to polar coordinates, with $x = r \cos \theta, y = r \sin \theta$ yields

$$V(R, u, v) = \frac{1}{2\pi uv} \int_0^R \int_0^{2\pi} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[\left(\frac{r \cos \theta}{u}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{r \sin \theta}{v}\right)^2\right]\right\} r d\theta dr. \quad (5)$$

Using elementary trigonometric identities

$$V(R, u, c) = \frac{1}{\pi c} \int_0^{R/u} \int_0^\pi \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}r^2(B - A \cos \theta)\right] r d\theta dr, \quad (6)$$

with

$$A \equiv \frac{1 - c^2}{2c^2}, \quad B \equiv \frac{1 + c^2}{2c^2}, \quad (7)$$

where, without loss of generality, $v \leq u$,

$$c \equiv v/u, \quad 0 \leq c \leq 1. \quad (8)$$

Using the fact that

$$I_0(x) \equiv \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \exp(x \cos \theta) d\theta, \quad (9)$$

where $I_0(x)$ denotes the modified Bessel function of the first kind and zero order [7, p. 375], one obtains from (6) and (9)

$$V(R/u, c) = \frac{1}{c} \int_0^{R/u} \exp\left(-\frac{B r^2}{2}\right) I_0\left(\frac{A r^2}{2}\right) r dr. \quad (10)$$

Now letting

$$K \equiv R/u, \quad w = r^2/2, \quad (11)$$

(10) reduces to

$$V(K, c) = \frac{1}{c} \int_0^{K^2/2} \exp(-B w) I_0(A w) dw. \quad (12)$$

The significance of the $V(K, c)$ function in the present context is brought out in Figure 2.




Figure 2. An Elliptical Distribution With Zero Means

Suppose that x and y , the rectangular coordinates of the impact points of a series of weapons, are distributed, each with zero mean, and with standard deviations σ_x and σ_y with $\sigma_y \leq \sigma_x$. The ellipse in Figure 2 has these standard deviations for its semi-axes lengths but has no further significance. Now consider a circle of radius $R = K\sigma_x$ meters, K being a dimensionless ratio. What fraction of the weapons of this distribution hits in the interior of this circle? Or equivalently, as noted earlier, what is the probability that a single weapon from the distribution hits inside the circle? The required probability is given by the function $V(K, c)$ of (10) or (12), where K can take all values from zero to infinity and $0 \leq c \leq 1$. If $c > 1$, then σ_x and σ_y are interchanged with no loss of generality.

The problem considered here is of an inverse character. Estimates s_x and s_y , for σ_x and σ_y , are obtained from bomb drops as noted in (1). Then K is obtained from a subroutine INVGCE, [8], and hence $R(= K s_x)$, such that $V = 0.50$ and $c = s_y/s_x$. The resulting value of R , the radius of the circle, which contains 50% of the distribution, is the computed CEP. Quick estimates for K can be found from the tables included in [4], [5], and [8].

The analysis in [1] is extended here to include nonzero means ($\bar{x} \neq 0$, $\bar{y} \neq 0$). For this purpose, ELP is needed. ELP specifies a probability function $P(R, H, K, u, v)$, [6] and [9], where $u = \sigma_x$, $v = \sigma_y$, that gives the probability of a shot falling, under a UBND with mean zero and standard deviations u, v , in a circle, T , with radius R and centered at (H, K) of the xy -plane. This probability is given by

$$P(R, H, K, u, v) = \frac{1}{2\pi u v} \int_{H-R}^{H+R} \int_{K-\sqrt{R^2-(x-H)^2}}^{K+\sqrt{R^2-(x-H)^2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{x}{u} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{y}{v} \right)^2 \right] \right\} dy dx. \quad (13)$$

Introducing dimensionless variables, let $x = (\sqrt{2}u)s$ and $y = (\sqrt{2}v)t$, then (13) becomes

$$P(r, h, k, u/v) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{h-r}^{h+r} \exp(-s^2) \int_{k-(u/v)\sqrt{r^2-(s-h)^2}}^{k+(u/v)\sqrt{r^2-(s-h)^2}} \exp(-t^2) dt ds \quad (14)$$

with $r = R/(\sqrt{2}u)$, $h = H/(\sqrt{2}u)$, and $k = K/(\sqrt{2}v)$. Finally, (14) can be written as

$$P(r, h, k, u/v) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{h-r}^{h+r} F1(s) ds, \quad (15)$$

where

$$F1(s) \equiv \exp(-s^2) \operatorname{erf} [k, (u/v)\sqrt{r^2 - (s-h)^2}], \quad (16)$$

and

$$\operatorname{erf}(a, b) \equiv \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{a-b}^{a+b} \exp(-z^2) dz. \quad (17)$$

Equation (15) is used for computational purposes as described in [9], but using simple linear transformations in (13) it is easy to show that ELP can also be interpreted as a probability function $P(R, H, K, u, v)$, which gives the probability of a shot falling under a UBND with mean (H, K) and standard deviations u, v , in a circle of radius R centered at the origin of the xy -plane. It is in this context when reference is made to ELP.

The problem considered here, as above for the GCE case, is of an inverse character. Estimates s_x and s_y , for σ_x and σ_y , are obtained from bomb drops as noted in (2). Then R is obtained from the subroutine INVELP, [10], with $P = 0.50$, $u = s_x$, and $v = s_y$. The resulting value of R , the radius of the circle in meters, which contains 50% of the distribution, is the computed CEP for the case of nonzero means. Quick estimates for R can be found from the tables included in [9] and [10].⁵

III. COMPUTATION OF THE ESTIMATED CEP

The data determined from actual bomb drops and used as inputs for computing an estimate of the CEPT are the quantities s_x and s_y , the estimates of the true, but unknown, standard deviations σ_x and σ_y . If n is the number of bombs dropped, and if $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$ are the coordinates of the n observed impact points (see Figure 1), it is assumed that the x_i 's and the y_i 's constitute samples from independent normal distributions with means zero or nonzero and standard deviations σ_x and σ_y .

No attempt is made to estimate any correlation coefficient that may be indicated in the data, although such an inclusion would present no difficulty. Also, although s_x^2 and s_y^2 give unbiased estimates for σ_x^2 and σ_y^2 , the estimates for σ_x and σ_y given by (1) and (2) are not unbiased; nevertheless, they are invariably used.

Using (1) and (2), we obtain from the data given below (see Figure 1) values for the CEP by using the subroutines INVGCE and INVELP.

⁵The roles of r and R are interchanged in [10] from their use herein.

The made-up data was obtained from a subroutine that generated normally distributed random numbers with zero mean and $\sigma_x = 35$ and then run again with $\sigma_y = 15$. The data generated is shown in Table 1 and graphically in Figure 1.

Table 1. Normally Distributed Data of Figure 1, $n = 22$

i	x_i	y_i	i	x_i	y_i
1	34.281	6.5922	12	-5.7568	23.368
2	-25.493	-5.5825	13	22.839	-16.041
3	-15.329	-31.638	14	-3.3694	-5.9377
4	14.245	4.8120	15	34.301	-5.1021
5	-45.153	.9773	16	3.1264	-7.5556
6	-9.2964	7.4277	17	28.403	.8495
7	47.826	4.5984	18	-14.379	3.2486
8	22.682	-2.8901	19	-48.324	.7353
9	33.730	-16.422	20	-41.711	-19.780
10	-19.193	10.269	21	8.6679	23.298
11	-30.543	-11.832	22	14.292	-18.365

Table 2 contains the quantities required to obtain the listed CEPs using the data from Table 1. The first two columns use (1) with subroutine INVGCE; the last two columns use (2) with subroutine INVELP, where

$$c = s_y/s_x, \quad V = P = 0.50, \quad H = \bar{x}, \quad K = \bar{y}. \quad (18)$$

Table 2. CEPs Based on Table 1 Data

$\bar{x} = 0$	$\bar{y} = 0$	$\bar{x} = 0.26571$	$\bar{y} = -2.4986$
$s_x = 27.592$	$s_y = 13.322$	$s_x = 28.240$	$s_y = 13.393$
$c = .48281$	CEP=23.717	$c = 0.47427$	CEP=24.269

$V = P = \text{PCEP} = 0.50$ throughout; but, as mentioned earlier, the subroutine CONFREG of Section VI allows any value in $(0, 1)$ for V or P .

The next section contains an analysis to find CIs for the CEPT.

IV. CONFIDENCE INTERVALS

In this section, we describe three types of confidence regions: conventional (CCI), minimum (MCI), and symmetric (SCI) for the true parameter point (σ_x, σ_y) in half of the quarter plane of the σ_x - σ_y plane ($0 \leq \sigma_y/\sigma_x \leq 1$).⁶ Using these results, the three CIs (CCI, MCI, and SCI) are established for the true value of the CEP (denoted earlier by CEPT or RT, where an estimate is denoted by CEP or R). Hence, our objective is to get meaningful CIs

⁶It is assumed $\sigma_y \leq \sigma_x$ without loss of generality.

for the CEPT. The approach to achieving this objective is by analyzing the confidence that can be placed in the estimates s_x and s_y , which are quantities deduced directly from the raw experimental data. This Jarnagin idea forms the basis for all results that follow.

Also, the results in actual tests may not appear to be compatible with zero means, but we follow the discussion in [1] and proceed first assuming zero means, which makes the analysis easier to follow. Nevertheless, most of the arguments used also apply to the case of nonzero means except for obvious deviations such as using (2) instead of (1) and using the inverse of ELP, INVELP, instead of the inverse of GCE, INV GCE.

Let a confidence level $\alpha = 1 - \sqrt{PC}$, where confidence regions are determined with an assigned probability, PC; say for illustrative purposes, $PC = (1 - \alpha)^2 (= 0.90)$. Then a CI for σ_x with probability $\sqrt{PC} = (1 - \alpha) (= 0.9486833)$ is obtained by finding appropriate integration limits for the integral of the chi-square density function, the required distribution for the variate $(n s_x^2 / \sigma_x^2)$ [11, pp. 276-286], where the integral is evaluated at $\alpha/2 (= 0.02565835)$ and $(1 - \alpha/2) (= 0.97434165)$. Mathematically, we have

$$C(\chi_{\alpha/2}^2, \chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2, f) = C(0, \chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2, f) - C(0, \chi_{\alpha/2}^2, f), \quad (19)$$

where $C(\gamma, \delta, f)$ denotes the chi-square distribution function with f degrees of freedom, namely

$$C(\gamma, \delta, f) \equiv \frac{1}{2^{f/2} \Gamma(f/2)} \int_{\gamma}^{\delta} e^{-z/2} z^{f/2-1} dz, \quad 0 \leq \gamma < \delta < \infty. \quad (20)$$

Then $\chi_{\alpha/2}^2$ and $\chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2$, depending on both α and f , are determined by solving the inverse problems

$$C(0, \chi_{\alpha/2}^2, f) = \alpha/2 (= 0.02565836), \quad C(0, \chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2, f) = (1 - \alpha/2) (= 0.97434165) \quad (21)$$

and by using the subroutine DGINV,⁷ [6]. For the numerical examples, using (21), one obtains

$$\chi_{\alpha/2}^2 = 11.028377, \quad \chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2 = 36.677187, \quad \text{using (1) with } f = n = 22, \quad (22)$$

$$\chi_{\alpha/2}^2 = 10.327293, \quad \chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2 = 35.377041, \quad \text{using (2) with } f = n - 1 = 21. \quad (23)$$

Introducing the notation

$$CLx = s_x \sqrt{f / \chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2}, \quad CHx = s_x \sqrt{f / \chi_{\alpha/2}^2}, \quad CLy = s_y \sqrt{f / \chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2}, \quad CHy = s_y \sqrt{f / \chi_{\alpha/2}^2}, \quad (24)$$

with (22), (23), the CCIs for σ_x are established, [11, p. 276],

$$21.3698 = CLx \leq \sigma_x \leq CHx = 38.9711, \quad \text{use (1) with } f = n = 22, \quad (25)$$

$$21.7579 = CLx \leq \sigma_x \leq CHx = 40.2703, \quad \text{use (2) with } f = n - 1 = 21. \quad (26)$$

⁷DGINV finds x of the incomplete gamma function, $P(a, x)$, [7, p.260], [12], [13], given P and a , where $C(0, \chi^2, f) = P(a, x) \equiv \frac{1}{\Gamma(a)} \int_0^x e^{-t} t^{a-1} dt$, $x = \chi^2/2$, $a = f/2$.

Similarly, CIs are obtained for σ_y using relations in (24), so that,

$$10.3176 = \text{CL}_y \leq \sigma_y \leq \text{CH}_y = 18.8157, \quad \text{use (1) with } f = n = 22, \quad (27)$$

$$10.3190 = \text{CL}_y \leq \sigma_y \leq \text{CH}_y = 19.0988, \quad \text{use (2) with } f = n - 1 = 21. \quad (28)$$

We note that a PC of 0.9 may be fairly high; a lower level would result in smaller CIs for σ_x and σ_y .

It is assumed throughout that the α 's for the σ_x and σ_y CIs are equal. For the more general situation, they would not be required to be the same. In that case, subroutine CONFREG and a few supporting routines would require a number of changes, but the changes would be straightforward.

In the earlier discussion, the CCI with an assigned probability of $\sqrt{\text{PC}}$ was defined by

$$C(\chi^2_{(1-\alpha/2)}, \infty, f) = C(0, \chi^2_{\alpha/2}, f) = (1 - \sqrt{\text{PC}})/2, \quad C(0, \chi^2_{(1-\alpha/2)}, f) = (1 + \sqrt{\text{PC}})/2. \quad (29)$$

The CIs in this case for σ_x and σ_y are given by (25) and (27) or (26) and (28).

Referring to Figure 3, the vertical stripped region, where (25) holds and σ_y extends from zero to infinity, indicates the $(1 - \alpha)$ confidence region for σ_x . The horizontal stripped region, where (27) holds and σ_x extends from zero to infinity, indicates the $(1 - \alpha)$ confidence region of σ_y . The intersection of the two regions generates a rectangle, shown in the figure as the crosshatched area, with the lower left-hand corner having the coordinates $(\text{CL}_x, \text{CL}_y)$ and the upper right-hand corner with coordinates $(\text{CH}_x, \text{CH}_y)$.




Figure 3. 90% Confidence Region For (σ_x, σ_y)

This intersection specifies the PC ($= 90\%$) conventional confidence region for the point (σ_x, σ_y) based, in general, on the data of which Table 1 is an example. This follows because it is assumed that the x and y coordinates of the bomb drops each arise from *independent* normal distributions with unknown standard deviations, σ_x , σ_y , respectively. Hence, the product of the specified probabilities $(1 - \alpha) * (1 - \alpha) (= 0.9486833 * 0.9486833 = 0.90) = \text{PC}$.

The rectangular region for the zero means case is shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4. 90% Confidence Region: uses (1), $n = 22$

Similar arguments result in a (90%) rectangular confidence region for σ_x and σ_y , using (26) and (28), the nonzero means case.

Noting that $\chi_{\alpha/2}^2$ and $\chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2$ are not unique for a given α , they can be varied to obtain, from the subroutine CONFMS, two other CIs, namely MCI (a minimized CI) and SCI (a symmetrized CI). It is understood that $\sqrt{f/\chi_{\alpha/2}^2}$ and $\sqrt{f/\chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2}$ are the same for the σ_x -CI and the corresponding σ_y -CI. For MCI, the quantity

$$CHx - CLx \quad (\text{see (24)}) \quad (30)$$

is minimized, which means $CHy - CLy$ is also minimized. In the case of SCI,⁸ the quantity

$$\left| \frac{CHx + CLx}{s_x} - 2 \right| = \left| \sqrt{f/\chi_{\alpha/2}^2} + \sqrt{f/\chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2} - 2 \right|, \quad (31)$$

is minimized, which implies

$$\left| \frac{CHy + CLy}{s_y} - 2 \right| = \left| \sqrt{f/\chi_{\alpha/2}^2} + \sqrt{f/\chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2} - 2 \right| \quad (32)$$

is also minimized. It should be noted, however, that, for any specific data set, symmetrization is not possible for some $\bar{\alpha}$, if $\sqrt{f/\chi_{\bar{\alpha}/2}^2} \geq 2$, where $C(0, \chi_{\bar{\alpha}/2}^2, f) = \bar{\alpha}/2$.⁹

The results for σ_x and σ_y CIs, using the data from Tables 1 and 2, as well as results from the discussion above, are summarized below in Table 3.

⁸Note that with (25), the CCI is far from symmetrical; CLx is 23% below s_x , whereas CHx is 41% above s_x .

⁹Since a quantity $b \equiv \sqrt{f/\chi_{\alpha}^2} \leq \sqrt{f/\chi_{\bar{\alpha}/2}^2}$ is needed in the next section, CONFREG requires $b \leq 2$ for symmetrization.

Introducing notation similar to (24), but referring to MCI and SCI with corresponding appropriate values for $\chi_{\alpha/2}^2$ and $\chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MLx, SLx} &= s_x \sqrt{f/\chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2}, & \text{MHx, SHx} &= s_x \sqrt{f/\chi_{\alpha/2}^2}, \\ \text{MLy, SLy} &= s_y \sqrt{f/\chi_{(1-\alpha/2)}^2}, & \text{MHy, SHy} &= s_y \sqrt{f/\chi_{\alpha/2}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Table 3. Listing of CCI, MCI, and SCI Using Data From Table 1

	$\bar{x} = 0$	$\bar{x} = 0.2657$		$\bar{y} = 0$	$\bar{y} = -2.4986$
	$s_x=27.5922$	$s_x=28.2402$		$s_y=13.3219$	$s_y=13.3934$
CLx	21.3698*	21.7579*	CLy	10.3176*	10.3190*
CHx	38.9711*	40.2703*	CHy	18.8157*	19.0988*
MLx	20.5596	20.8941	MLy	9.9264	9.9094
MHx	37.6151	38.8057	MHy	18.1610	18.4042
SLx	18.3814	18.5228	SLy	8.8748	8.7847
SHx	36.8031	37.9576	SHy	17.7689	18.0020

Table 3 from the 3rd through the 8th rows and the corresponding six columns can be looked at as a 6x6 matrix with elements $a(i,j)$, where, for example, $a(1,1) \rightarrow \text{CLx}$. Hence, $a(1,2)$ lists the left endpoint of CCI for the $\bar{x} = 0$ case; the right endpoint is $a(2,2)$, thus $\text{CCI} = (21.3698, 38.9711)$. The MCI for the $\bar{y} = -2.4986$ case is, from the table, $(a(3,6), a(4,6)) = (9.9094, 18.4042)$. Asterisked quantities were given previously in (25) – (28).

We are now in a position, following [1], to determine the CIs for the CEPT. Starting with the zero means case as specified by (25) and (27), consider the $\sigma_x - \sigma_y$ quarter plane ($\sigma_y \geq 0, \sigma_x > 0$) shown in Figure 4, and note that nonintersecting curves of constant R , which are concave towards the origin, can be drawn.¹⁰ These constant R -curves, which are not circular segments, are symmetric about the 45 degree line, $c = 1$, but we need to consider only half of the quarter-plane with $\sigma_y/\sigma_x \leq 1$.

Then a straight line L emanating from the origin satisfies the equation $\sigma_y = M \sigma_x$, M a constant. For the point $\sigma_x = s_x, \sigma_y = s_y$, we have $0 \leq M = c = s_y/s_x \leq 1$. Again, see footnote 10 below; R -curves are definitely *not* segments of circles. Typical curves are shown in Figure 4. They are increasing in R as they move away from the origin. Consider a line L , then since $V = 1/2$ and c is fixed, it follows K is also constant on L . Therefore, as σ_x increases, moving along L , R must also increase on L to retain K constant on L .

¹⁰These constant R -curves, used only for illustration, can be obtained, referring to the $\sigma_x - \sigma_y$ plane, as follows: For a fixed value of R , determine a value of $K = K_1 (= R/\sigma_{x1})$ from $V(K_1, 0) = 1/2 = \text{erf}(K_1/\sqrt{2})$, [5, 8, and 7 (p.297)]. This determines the σ_{x1} such that for a given smaller $\sigma_x = \sigma_{x2}$, which fixes a $K = K_2$, a value of c_2 is found by solving the inverse problem $V(K_2, c_2) = 1/2$ that, in turn, determines σ_{y2} thus this is another $(\sigma_{x2}, \sigma_{y2})$ point of the constant R -curve in the $\sigma_x - \sigma_y$ plane.

Note that the point (s_x, s_y) is on the middle R-curve of Figure 4, with $R = \text{CEP}$, intersected by the line with slope $c = s_y/s_x = 0.483$. In addition, the R-curve containing the point (CLx, CLy) , which is also on L, $(\text{CLy}/\text{CLx} = s_y/s_x)$ has an R-value, CLR , given by solving $K = \text{CEP}/s_x = 23.717/27.5922 = \text{CLR}/\text{CLx}$. Thus, $\text{CLR}=18.3685$, where CLx is taken from Table 3. Similarly, considering the R-curve passing through (CHx, CHy) on L, with $K = \text{CEP}/s_x = \text{CHR}/\text{CHx}$, and solving for CHR , one obtains $\text{CHR}=33.4997$. Thus, we take as the CCI for CEPT, $\text{CCR} \equiv (\text{CLR}, \text{CHR}) = (18.3685, 33.4997)$. The MCR and SCR for R are obtained in the same way and defined by $\text{MCR} \equiv (\text{MLR}, \text{MHR})$ and $\text{SCR} \equiv (\text{SLR}, \text{SHR})$. The results are summarized in the first and second columns of Table 4.

In the nonzero means case, using (26) and (28), H and K are held fixed throughout. The distribution density function is lower and flatter on each L line as σ_x and σ_y increase with σ_y/σ_x constant; therefore R must increase. Also, R/s_x is not constant along an L line since the normalized variables h, k vary along L, and consequently, R/s_x also varies since $P = 0.5$; see (14). Therefore $\text{CLR}(\text{CHR})$ must be obtained using the subroutine INVELP, with arguments $P = 1/2$, $H = \bar{x}$, $K = \bar{y}$, $\sigma_x = \text{CLx}(\text{CHx})$, and $\sigma_y = \text{CLy}(\text{CHy})$. Hence the $\text{CCR} \equiv (\text{CLR}, \text{CHR})$ for the nonzero means case is $(18.7754, 34.5007)$, where, from Table 3, $\text{CLx}=21.7579$, $\text{CLy}=10.3190$, $\text{CHx}=40.2703$, and $\text{CHy}=19.0988$. Note the $\text{MCR} \equiv (\text{MLR}, \text{MHR})$ for the CEPT in this nonzero case is not precisely minimized, nor is $\text{SCR} \equiv (\text{SLR}, \text{SHR})$ precisely symmetrized. The overall numerical results are listed in Table 4.

Table 4. Listing of CCI, MCI, and SCI for CEPT
Using Data From Tables 1 and 3

CI↓ Means →	$\bar{x} = 0, \bar{y} = 0$	$\bar{x} \neq 0, \bar{y} \neq 0$
CLR	18.3685	18.7754
CHR	33.4977	34.5007
MLR	17.6720	18.0454
MHR	32.3322	33.2535
SLR	15.7998	16.0451
SHR	31.6342	32.5316

Recalling the second objective (see page 1, 2nd paragraph) of establishing whether the design contractor of the RBD is to be rewarded or penalized, two other confidence regions are introduced. They form the discussion in the next section with the idea of sequencing bomb drops. We follow the reasoning in [1].

V. CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BY SEQUENTIAL TESTING

Let us assume we are dealing with the zero means case: (25) and (27). Begin by assigning RT_n , an agreed nominal value for the CEP, and a fixed-decimal FP. Then assume that if the $CEP \leq (1 - FP)RT_n = RN$, within the assigned confidence level, the contractor is rewarded (COR) and if $CEP \geq (1 + FP)RT_n = RP$, the contractor is penalized (COP). With a numerical example, suppose $FP = 0.10$, $RT_n = 40$; then from Table 2, $CEP = 23.717 < 36$; can we conclude the contractor should be rewarded? The answer is “yes” because, from Table 4, 36 is to the right of the interval (18.3685, 33.4977), equivalently greater than CHR , which in 90% of similar test cases will contain the CEPT and will be less than 36. Instead, suppose the $RT_n = 16$. Since the $CEP = 23.717$ is greater, we try to judge if the contractor should be penalized. Namely, is $16 * 1.1 = 17.6 < CLR (= 18.3685)$? The answer is again “yes” in the numerical example, since in 90% of repeated like tests the CEPT would exceed 17.6. In either case, if the answer was negative due to a different choice of RT_n , then more testing would be indicated (MOT).

Before considering the procedure of more testing, it is important to arrive at a conclusion with a minimum of testing. Hence we ask in the COR case if we can lower CHR ; i.e., ease the requirement for a decision. Therefore, using DGINV, we ask for the value of χ_α^2 such that

$$C(\chi_\alpha^2, \infty, f) = 1 - \alpha = 0.9486833, \quad C(0, \chi_\alpha^2, f) = \alpha = 0.0513167, \quad (34)$$

so that

$$f s_x^2 / \sigma_x^2 \geq \chi_\alpha^2 \Rightarrow \text{the CI for } \sigma_x : 0 < \sigma_x \leq b s_x, \quad \sigma_y \geq 0, \quad b \equiv \sqrt{f / \chi_\alpha^2} \geq 1. \quad (35)$$

$$f s_y^2 / \sigma_y^2 \geq \chi_\alpha^2 \Rightarrow \text{the CI for } \sigma_y : 0 < \sigma_y \leq b s_y, \quad \sigma_x > 0, \quad b \equiv \sqrt{f / \chi_\alpha^2} \geq 1. \quad (36)$$

The intersection of the two infinite CIs is shown as the hatched region in Figure 5.

Note then, as in Section IV, the $(1 - \alpha)^2$ CI for the CEPT is given by solving for $\underline{CHR}$

$$K = CEP / s_x = \underline{CHR} / (b s_x) \Rightarrow \underline{CHR} = b CEP, \quad (37)$$

where, in general,

$$\underline{CHR} \leq CHR \text{ (see Section IV for } CHR). \quad (38)$$

In the case where (2) holds, INVELP with standard deviations $b s_x$ and $b s_y$ is used to find $\underline{CHR}$. For the same reasons given in the previous section in the discussion of the nonzero means case, (37) cannot be used (See the paragraph before Table 4.).

We ask in the COP case if we can raise CLR ; i.e., ease the requirement for a decision. Therefore, using DGINV, we ask for the value of $\chi_{(1-\alpha)}^2$ such that

$$C(0, \chi_{(1-\alpha)}^2, f) = 1 - \alpha = 0.9486833, \quad (39)$$

so that

$$f s_x^2 / \sigma_x^2 \leq \chi_{(1-\alpha)}^2 \Rightarrow \text{the CI for } \sigma_x : 0 < a s_x \leq \sigma_x, \quad \sigma_y \geq 0, \quad a \equiv \sqrt{f / \chi_{(1-\alpha)}^2} \leq 1. \quad (40)$$

$$f s_y^2 / \sigma_y^2 \leq \chi_{(1-\alpha)}^2 \Rightarrow \text{the CI for } \sigma_y : 0 < a s_y \leq \sigma_y, \quad \sigma_x > 0, \quad a \equiv \sqrt{f / \chi_{(1-\alpha)}^2} \leq 1. \quad (41)$$

The intersection of the two infinite CIs is shown as the hatched region in Figure 6.

Note then, as in Section IV, the $(1 - \alpha)^2$ CI for the CEPT is given by solving for $\overline{\text{CLR}}$

$$K = CEP/s_x = \overline{CLR}/(a s_x) \Rightarrow \overline{CLR} = a CEP, \quad (42)$$

where, in general,

$$\text{CLR} \leq \overline{\text{CLR}} \text{ (see Section IV for CLR)}. \quad (43)$$

In the case where (2) is used instead of (1), INVELP with standard deviations a_{s_x} and a_{s_y} is used to find $\overline{\text{CLR}}$. Equation (42) cannot be used for the same reasons given in the previous section; (see the paragraph before Table 4.)




Figure 5. With Confidence $(1 - \alpha)^2$, $0 \leq \text{RT} < \text{bR}$




Figure 6. With Confidence $(1 - \alpha)^2$, $\text{aR} \leq \text{RT} < \infty$

Table 5 Contains $\overline{\text{CLR}}$ And $\underline{\text{CHR}}$; It Supplements Table 4.Table 5. Listing of $\overline{\text{CLR}} \geq \text{CLR}$, $\underline{\text{CHR}} \leq \text{CHR}$
Using Data From Tables 1 and 4

CI↓ Means →	$\bar{x} = 0, \bar{y} = 0$	$\bar{x} \neq 0, \bar{y} \neq 0$
$\overline{\text{CLR}}$	19.1306	19.5547
$\underline{\text{CHR}}$	31.5975	32.5010

Perhaps the most efficient strategy in what has been discussed so far, to evaluate whether COR, COP, or MOT holds, is to determine $\overline{\text{CLR}}$ or $\underline{\text{CHR}}$ at each new set of sequential bombing tests. Given RTn , FP , n_0 , Δn , and $J_{\max}$, where n_0 denotes the initial number of bomb drops, Δn is the increment number of bomb drops added at each test after the initial n_0 drops, and $J_{\max}$ denotes the assigned number of Δn s, incremental bomb drops to be made, after which all testing stops.

Using the data from Tables 1 and 2, with (1), $\text{CEP} = 23.717$ and with (2), $\text{CEP} = 24.269$, assign the following:

$$n_0 = 10, \Delta n = 4, J_{\max} = 3. \quad (44)$$

Tests, as described in Section 4 and this section, are conducted for each n , where

$$n = n_0 + j\Delta n, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, J_{\max}. \quad (45)$$

The results are given in Table 6 of page 15. CIs can be identified from the table accordingly:

1. Conventional $(1 - \alpha)^2 (= .90)$ CI for the CEPT: $(L(1), H(1)) = (\text{CLR}, \text{CHR})$
2. Minimum $(1 - \alpha)^2 (= .90)$ CI for the CEPT: $(L(2), H(2)) = (\text{MLR}, \text{MHR})$
3. Symmetric $(1 - \alpha)^2 (= .90)$ CI for the CEPT: $(L(3), H(3)) = (\text{SLR}, \text{SHR})$
4. Maximum CLR $(1 - \alpha)^2 (= .90)$ CI for the CEPT: $(L(4), H(4)) = (\overline{\text{CLR}}, \infty)$
5. Minimum CHR $(1 - \alpha)^2 (= .90)$ CI for the CEPT: $(L(5), H(5)) = (0, \underline{\text{CHR}})$

For example, for the zero means case, for the symmetric CI at $n = 18$, one obtains from the table (13.7266, 30.6586) with a $\text{CEP} = 22.1926$; the minimum CHR CI is (0, 30.6462). For the nonzero means case, one obtains for the symmetric CI at $n = 18$, (14.0863, 31.6683) with a $\text{CEP} = 22.8205$; the minimum CHR = CI is (0, 31.6598).

If $\text{RTn} = 16.5$ and $\text{FP} = 0.10$, then COP holds for the zero means case, since $18.15 < \overline{\text{CLR}} = 19.1306 < \text{CEP}$ at $n = 22$. In the nonzero means case, COP also holds since $18.15 < \overline{\text{CLR}} = 18.8265 < \text{CEP}$ for $n = 10$. On the other hand, let $\text{RTn} = 34.2$ and $\text{FP} = 0.1$, then COR holds in the zero means case, since $\underline{\text{CHR}} = 30.6462 < 30.78$ for $n = 18$, but in the nonzero means cases MOT holds, since for $n = 10, 14, 18, 22$, $\underline{\text{CHR}} > 30.78$.

In the unlikely event that $\text{RP} \approx \text{CEPT}$ or $\text{RN} \approx \text{CEPT}$, it may require a very large value of n to conclude whether COP or COR holds.

Table 6. Listing of CIs for CEPT-Using Data From Previous Tables

L(1)=CLR, L(2)=MLR, L(3)=SLR, L(4)= $\overline{\text{CLR}}$, L(5)=0							
H(1)=CHR, H(2)=MHR, H(3)=SHR, H(4)= ∞ , H(5)= $\overline{\text{CHR}}$							
j, n, m	L(m)	H(m)	CEP	j, n, m	L(m)	H(m)	CEP
$\bar{x}$	$\bar{y}$	s_x	s_y	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{y}$	s_x	s_y
0.0	0.0	29.4891	12.4880	3.8299	-2.1856	30.8210	12.9603
0, 10, 1	16.9769	42.4081	24.2501	0, 10, 1	17.7882	46.1287	25.5357
0, 10, 2	15.6089	39.3400	24.2501	0, 10, 2	16.2745	42.4788	25.5357
0, 10, 3	10.0136	38.4866	24.2501	0, 10, 3	9.8215	41.5872	25.5357
0, 10, 4	17.9640	∞	24.2501	0, 10, 4	18.8265	∞	25.5357
0, 10, 5	0.0	38.4866	24.2501	0, 10, 5	0.0	41.5872	25.5357
$\bar{x}$	$\bar{y}$	s_x	s_y	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{y}$	s_x	s_y
0.0	0.0	26.9855	13.4646	1.5335	-2.3071	27.9590	13.7662
1, 14, 1	17.2129	36.9126	23.4708	1, 14, 1	17.7751	38.9652	24.3463
1, 14, 2	16.2033	34.9524	23.4708	1, 14, 2	16.6815	36.7593	24.3463
1, 14, 3	12.7839	34.1578	23.4708	1, 14, 3	12.8455	35.9331	24.3463
1, 14, 4	18.0811	∞	23.4708	1, 14, 4	18.6803	∞	24.3463
1, 14, 5	0.0	34.1564	23.4708	1, 14, 5	0.0	35.9326	24.3463
$\bar{x}$	$\bar{y}$	s_x	s_y	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{y}$	s_x	s_y
0.0	0.0	26.2413	12.0934	4.0512	-2.2699	26.6783	12.2229
2, 18, 1	16.7947	32.7412	22.1926	2, 18, 1	17.3269	33.8762	22.8205
2, 18, 2	16.0203	31.3648	22.1926	2, 18, 2	16.5234	32.3927	22.8205
2, 18, 3	13.7266	30.6586	22.1926	2, 18, 3	14.0863	31.6683	22.8205
2, 18, 4	17.5552	∞	22.1926	2, 18, 4	18.0945	∞	22.8205
2, 18, 5	0.0	30.6462	22.1926	2, 18, 5	0.0	31.6598	22.8205
$\bar{x}$	$\bar{y}$	s_x	s_y	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{y}$	s_x	s_y
0.0	0.0	27.5922	13.3219	0.2657	-2.4986	28.2403	13.3934
3, 22, 1	18.3685	33.4977	23.7170	3, 22, 1	18.7754	34.5007	24.2689
3, 22, 2	17.6720	32.3322	23.7170	3, 22, 2	18.0454	33.2535	24.2689
3, 22, 3	15.7998	31.6342	23.7170	3, 22, 3	16.0451	32.5316	24.2689
3, 22, 4	19.1306	∞	23.7170	3, 22, 4	19.5547	∞	24.2689
3, 22, 5	0.0	31.5975	23.7170	3, 22, 5	0.0	32.5010	24.2689

The next section describes the Fortran 95 computer program that outputs the results of Table 6 as well as whether MOT or COP or COR holds given RN, RP.

VI. FORTRAN PROGRAMS FOR CEP AND CONFIDENCE INTERVALS

The total software package is made up of 69 double-precision Fortran 95 subprograms. Each of their *call lines* is listed in Appendix B. The first 14 were developed by the author; the remaining 55 are supporting routines from the NSWC Library of Mathematics Subroutines, [6]. Of the first 14, we shall discuss the first 5; the remaining 9 are supporting routines. The software is stored in a file named WEEV4.FOR.

The Program routine, MEANSTDV, is actually not necessary and can be deleted. It is a test routine for the software that uses, as input, a file JDATA. If the user wishes, the software could be run with a read-in input of 0.5 or 0.9, and 2 when requested, and directing the results by WEEV4 > f8; then making a DOS file “compare,” FC f8 JDATATEST. The files should be duplicates except for the last line, which calls on the Lahey subroutines DATE and TIME. The required JDATA on the first line would list the two integers 1 and 22, on the 2nd line store x_1 , y_1 , and the following 21 lines would contain the remaining miss distances of Table 1, x_i , y_i , ($i = 2, 22$).

The 2nd listed routine,

CONFREG(N,X,Y,PCEP,PC,ISV,RN,RP,XYM,SXY,RCEP,RLH,DEC),

is the main routine for WEEV4, and it is the only one a user needs to call. Its call line specifies the necessary input and output. The first ten variables are required input; the last three are output.

INPUT

N	Number of bomb drops.
X	N-element array containing the x-coordinate miss distances.
Y	N-element array containing the y-coordinate miss distances.
PCEP	Probability measure for the CEPT. Usually taken as 0.50.
PC	Assigned confidence level for CIs. Taken as 0.9 in the examples.
ISV	If 0(> 0), then do zero(nonzero) means case.
RN	Value $(1 - FP) RT_n$. In computer numerical example $FP = 0.125$, $RT_n = 16 \frac{2}{3}$, $RN = 14.583333$. If $RN < 0$, the contractor evaluation is skipped.
RP	Value $(1 + FP) RT_n$. In computer example $RP = 18.75$.
XYM	Two-element array containing means $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$.
SXY	Two-element array containing standard deviations s_x and s_y .

OUTPUT

- RCEP Estimated CEP. If $ISV = 0$ uses INVGCE, else uses INVELP.
- RLH Eight-element array with the following elements (See Table 6):
- RLH(1) – CLR, Left endpoint of the conventional CI for CEPT.
 - RLH(2) – CHR, Right endpoint of the conventional CI for CEPT.
 - RLH(3) – MLR, Left endpoint of the minimum CI for CEPT.
 - RLH(4) – MHR, Right endpoint of the minimum CI for CEPT.
 - RLH(5) – SLR, Left endpoint of the symmetric CI for CEPT.
 - RLH(6) – SHR, Right endpoint of the symmetric CI for CEPT.
- If CHR > 2, then SLR and SHR set to -1.
- RLH(7) – CLR, Maximum CLR, left endpoint of a CI for CEPT.
 - RLH(8) – CHR, Minimum CHR, right endpoint of a CI for CEPT.
- DEC A 3-character variable specifying contractor performance:
- COR, COP, MOT; if input $RN < 0$, ignore DEC.

The next three routines are called by CONFREG. MNSTD is used to compute $\bar{x}$, $\bar{y}$, and s_x , s_y . CONFMS is used to find the three CIs: namely, CCR, MCR, and SCR. EVAL is used to determine if the contractor is to be rewarded, COR; if the contractor is to be penalized, COP; or if more testing is needed, MOT.

VII. REFERENCES

1. Jarnagin, M. P., *Computation of the CEP and CIs in Bombing Tests*, Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, VA, May 1971. Informal Memorandum
2. Taub, A. E. and Thomas, M. A., *CIs for CEP Where Errors are Elliptical Normal*, NSWC TR 83-205, November 1983, Naval Surface Weapons Center, Dahlgren, VA.
3. Thomas, M. A. and Taub, A. E., *Weapon Accuracy Assessment for Elliptical Normal Miss Distances*, NSWC/DL TR-3777, January 1978, Naval Surface Weapons Center, Dahlgren, VA.
4. Weingarten, H. and DiDonato, A. R., "A Table of Generalized Circular Error," *Mathematics of Computation*, Vol. 15, No. 74, April 1961, 169-173.
5. DiDonato, A. R. and Jarnagin, M. P., *A Method for Computing the Generalized Circular Error Function and the Circular Coverage Function*, NWL Report No. 1768, January 1962, Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, VA.
6. Morris, A. H., *NSWC Library of Mathematics Subroutines*, NSWCDD/TR-92/425, January 1993, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division, Dahlgren, VA.
7. Abramowitz, M. and Stegun, I., (Editors), *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*, Applied Mathematics Series 55, June 1955.
8. DiDonato, A. R., *An Inverse of the Generalized Circular Error Function*, NSWCDD/TR-04/43, June 2004, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren, VA.
9. DiDonato, A. R. and Jarnagin, M. P., *Integration of the General Bivariate Gaussian Distribution over an Offset Ellipse*, NWL Report No. 1710, August 1960, Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, VA.
10. DiDonato, A. R., *An Inverse of the Elliptic Coverage Function*, NSWCDD/TR-05/90, April 2005, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren, VA.
11. Hald, A., *Statistical Theory with Engineering Applications*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1952.
12. DiDonato, A. R. and Morris, A. H., "Computation of the Incomplete Gamma Function Ratios and Their Inverse," *ACM Trans. Math Software*, Vol. 12, 1986, 377-393.
13. DiDonato, A. R. and Hageman, R. K., *Computation of the Percentage Points of the Chi-Square Distribution*, NSWCDDL TR-3569, 1977, Naval Surface Weapons Center, Dahlgren, VA.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY

BLANK PAGE

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY

The first number listed with each item, refers to the page where it is first introduced.

$C(\gamma, \delta, f)$	- Integral of the Chi-square distribution density from γ to δ , 7
<u>CHR</u>	- The minimum value CHR can take for a given α , 12
<u>CLR</u>	- The maximum value CLR can take for a given α , 13
CEPT	- True CEP, 1, 6
α	- Confidence level, 7, 9
Δn	- Increment number of bomb drops added at each test after the first, 14
$(1 - \alpha)$	- $(1 - \alpha) = \sqrt{PC}$, 7
CCI	- Conventional confidence interval, 6
CCR	- Conventional confidence interval for CEPT, 11
CEP	- Estimated circular error probable, 1
CHR	- R, Right endpoint of the CCI, CCR, for CEPT, 11
CH _x	- Right endpoint of the CCI for σ_x . See (24), 7
CH _y	- Right endpoint of the CCI for σ_y . See (24), 7
CI	- Confidence interval(s), 1, 8
CLR	- R, Left endpoint of the CCI, CCR, for CEPT, 11
CL _x	- Left endpoint of the CCI for σ_x . See (24), 7
CL _y	- Left endpoint of the CCI for σ_y . See (24), 7
COP	- Contractor is penalized, 12
COR	- Contractor is rewarded, 12
ELP	- Elliptic Coverage Function, 2
ELP	- ELP subroutine to compute ELP, 5
f	- number of degrees of freedom, 2
FP	- A fixed decimal associated with RT _n , 11
GCE	- GCE subroutine to evaluate GCE, 3
GCE	- Generalized Circular Error Function, 2
INVELP	- Subroutine to compute R of $P(R, H, K, s_x, s_y)$, 5
INVGCE	- Subroutine to compute K of $V(K, c)$, 4
J _{max}	- Maximum number of Δn s, 14
K	- Dimensionless radius of GCE. $K = R/u$, 3
K	- y-coordinate of the mean of the Elliptic Coverage Function, 5

MCI	- Minimized confidence interval, 6, 9
MCR	- Minimum confidence interval for CEPT, 11
MHR	- R, Right endpoint of the MCI, MCR, for CEPT, 11
MHx	- Right endpoint of the MCI for σ_x . See (33), 10
MHy	- Right endpoint of the MCI for σ_y . See (33), 10
MLR	- R, Left endpoint of the MCI, MCR, for CEPT, 11
MLx	- Left endpoint of the MCI for σ_x . See (33), 10
MLy	- Left endpoint of the MCI for σ_y . See (33), 10
MOT	- More testing required, 12
n0	- Initial number of bomb drops, 14
PC	- Assigned probability for the confidence interval of the CEPT, 7
PCEP	- Percentage/100 of the UBND contained in the target circle, 1
$P(R, H, K, s_x, s_y)$	- Elliptic Coverage Function, 2
R	- Estimated CEP (computed), 1
R	- Used interchangeably with the estimated CEP, 2
RBD	- Radar bomb director, 1
RN	- $=(1-FP)RT_n$, 12
RP	- $=(1+FP)RT_n$, 12
RT	- True CEP=CEPT, 1
RTn	- A pre specified nominal value for the CEP, 1
SCI	- Symmetrical confidence interval, 6, 9
SCR	- Symmetrical confidence interval for CEPT, 11
SHR	- R, Right endpoint of the SCI, SCR, for CEPT, 11
SHx	- Right endpoint of the SCI for σ_x . See (33), 10
SHy	- Right endpoint of the SCI for σ_y . See (33), 10
SLR	- R, Left endpoint of the SCI, SCR, for CEPT, 11
SLx	- Left endpoint of the SCI for σ_x . See (33), 10
SLy	- Left endpoint of the SCI for σ_y . See (33), 10
UBND	- Uncorrelated Bivariate Normal Distribution, 1
$V(K, c)$	- Generalized Circular Error Function, 2

APPENDIX B
LIST OF FORTRAN 95 SUBPROGRAMS

BLANK PAGE

APPENDIX B

LIST OF FORTRAN 95 SUBPROGRAMS

- 1 PROGRAM MEANSTDV
- 2 SUBROUTINE CONFREG(N,X,Y,PCEP,PC,ISV,RN,RP,XYM,SXY,RCEP,RLH,DEC)
- 3 SUBROUTINE MNSTD(N,X,XM,VX2,SX2)
- 4 SUBROUTINE CONFMS(N,P,RL0,RH0,RL1,RH1,RL2,RH2)
- 5 SUBROUTINE EVAL(N,RN,RP,CHR)
- 6 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION FD(X) !FOR MINIMUM CONF INTERVALS,
USED IN FMIN IN CONFMS
- 7 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION FA(X) !FOR SYMMETRIC CONF INTERVALS,
USED IN FMIN IN CONFMS
- 8 SUBROUTINE INVGCE(P,C,R,IJ,IERR)
- 9 SUBROUTINE INVELP(PP,H1,K1,S1,S2,R,P,I)
- 10 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION F2(X) !NEEDED FOR DZERO OF INVELP
- 11 SUBROUTINE DQ(R,PX,II)
- 12 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION F1(X) !FUNCTION FOR DQXGS ROUTINE
- 13 SUBROUTINE GRUB(R) !INITIAL ESTIMATE FOR R FROM GRUBBS' APPROX
- 14 SUBROUTINE PSQR(A,P,X,I) !1ST APPROX, X, USES GRUBBS' ESTIMATE
- 15 INTEGER FUNCTION IPMPAR (I)
- 16 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DPMPAR (I)
- 17 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DEPSLN (L)
- 18 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DXPARG (L)
- 19 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DSIN1 (X)
- 20 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION REXP (X)
- 21 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DREXP (X)
- 22 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION ALNREL(A)
- 23 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DLNREL (A)
- 24 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION RLOG(X)
- 25 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DRLOG (X)
- 26 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION ERF (X)
- 27 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION ERFC1 (IND, X)
- 28 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DERF (X)
- 29 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DERFC (X)
- 30 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DERFC1 (IND, X)
- 31 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DERFC0 (X)
- 32 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION ERFI (P, Q)

33 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DERFI (P, Q)
 34 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DAERF (X, H)
 35 SUBROUTINE PNI (P, Q, D, W, IERR)
 36 SUBROUTINE DPNI (P, Q, D, W, IERR)
 37 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION GAMMA(A)
 38 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION GLOG(X)
 39 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION GAM1(A)
 40 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION GAMLN (A)
 41 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION GAMLN1 (A)
 42 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DGAMMA(A)
 43 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DPDEL(X)
 44 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DGAM1 (X)
 45 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DGAMLN (A)
 46 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DGMLN1 (X)
 47 SUBROUTINE GRATIO (A, X, ANS, QANS, IND)
 48 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION RCOMP (A, X)
 49 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DRCOMP (A, X)
 50 SUBROUTINE GAMINV (A, X, X0, P, Q, IERR)
 51 SUBROUTINE DGRAT (A, X, ANS, QANS, IERR)
 52 SUBROUTINE DGR29 (A, Y, L, Z, RTA, ANS, QANS)
 53 SUBROUTINE DGR17 (A, Y, L, Z, RTA, ANS, QANS)
 54 SUBROUTINE DGINV (A, X, P, Q, IERR)
 55 SUBROUTINE BESI(X, ALPHA, KODE, N, Y, NZ)
 56 SUBROUTINE ASIK(X,FNU,KODE,FLGIK,RA,ARG,IN,TOL,Y)
 57 SUBROUTINE CIRCV (R, D, J, P, IERR)
 58 SUBROUTINE ERFC0 (IND, X, E, Y)
 59 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION ERFCR (X)
 60 DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION DZERO (F, AX, BX, AERR, RERR)
 61 SUBROUTINE FMIN(F, A0, B0, X, W, AERR, RERR, ERROR, IND)
 62 SUBROUTINE DQPSRT(LIMIT, LAST, MAXERR, ERMAX, ELIST, IORD, NRMAX)
 63 SUBROUTINE DQELG (N, EPSTAB, RESULT, ABSERR, RES3LA, NRES,
 EPMACH, OFLOW)
 64 SUBROUTINE DQXGS (F, A, B, EPSABS, EPSREL, RESULT, ABSERR, IER,
 LIMIT, LENIW, LENW, LAST, IWORK, WORK)
 65 SUBROUTINE DQXGSE(F, A, B, EPSABS, EPSREL, LIMIT, RESULT, ABSERR,
 IER, ALIST, BLIST, RLIST, ELIST, IORD, LAST, VALP, VALN, LP, LN)

66 SUBROUTINE DQXCPY (A, B, L)

67 SUBROUTINE DQXLQM (F,A,B,RESULT,ABSERR,RESABS,RESASC,VR,VS,LR,LS,
KEY,EPMACH,UFLOW,OFLOW)

68 SUBROUTINE DQXRUL (F,XL,XU,Y,YA,YM,KE,K1,FV1,FV2,L1,L2)

69 SUBROUTINE DQXRRD (F,Z,LZ,XL,XU,R,S,LR,LS)

BLANK PAGE

DISTRIBUTION

	<u>Copies</u>		<u>Copies</u>
DOD ACTIVITIES (CONUS)		DR DARCY MAYS	1
DEFENSE TECHNICAL	2	DEPT OF STATISTICAL SCIENCES	
INFORMATION CENTER		OPERATIONS RESEARCH	
8725 JOHN J KINGMAN ROAD		VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY	
SUITE 0944		PO BOX 842014	
FT BELVOIR VA 22060-6218		RICHMOND VA 23284-2014	
CODE A76 (TECHNICAL LIBRARY)	1	DR JEFFREY BIRCH	1
COMMANDING OFFICER		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
CSSD NSW		VIRGINIA TECH	
6703 W HIGHWAY 98		417-A HUTCHESON HALL	
PANAMA CITY FL 32407-7001		BLACKSBURG VA 24061	
NON-DOD ACTIVITIES (CONUS)		DR DONALD RICHARDS	1
JOHN CHIN	4	DEPT OF STATISTICS	
GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS SECTION		UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA	
101 INDEPENDENCE AVENUE SE		103 HALSEY HALL	1
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS		CHARLOTTESVILLE VA 22904-4135	
WASHINGTON DC 20540-4172		DR ED CARLSTEIN	1
DOCUMENT CENTER	1	DEPT OF STATISTICS	
THE CNA CORPORATION		UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA-	
4825 MARK CENTER DRIVE		CHAPEL HILL	
ALEXANDRIA VA 22311-1850		NEW WEST BUILDING	
CHRISTOPHER ZAFFRAM	1	CHAPEL HILL NC 27599-3260	
MCCDC STUDIES AND ANALYSIS BRANCH		DR MARCIA GUMPERTZ	1
3300 RUSSELL ROAD		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
QUANTICO VA 22134		NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY	
DR EDWARD WEGMAN	1	RALEIGH NC 27695-8203	
CENTER FOR COMPUTATIONAL SCIENCES		DR JAMES D LYNCH	1
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
157 SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY II BUILDING		UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA	
FAIRFAX VA 22030		COLUMBIA SC 29208	
DR JAMES GENTLE	1	DR JAMES R SCHOTT	1
DEPT OF APPLIED ENGINEERING AND		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
STATISTICS		UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA	
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY MS 4A7		PO BOX 162370	
4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE		ORLANDO FL 32816-2370	
FAIRFAX VA 22030		DR MYLES HOLLANDER	1
DR N RAO CHAGANTY	1	DEPT OF STATISTICS	
DEPT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS		FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY	
OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY		PO BOX 118545	
HAMPTON BLVD		GAINESVILLE FL 32611-8545	
NORFOLK VA 23529		DR JACK D TUBBS	1
DR SAID E SAID	1	INSTITUTE OF STATISTICS	
DEPT OF STATISTICS		BAYLOR UNIVERSITY	
EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY		PO BOX 97140	
GREENVILLE NC 27858		WACO TX 76798	

DISTRIBUTION (Continued)

	<u>Copies</u>		<u>Copies</u>
DR JAMES STAPLETON	1	MS EDITH E LANDIN	1
DEPT OF STATISTICS AND PROBABILITY		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY		IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY	
EAST LANSING MI 48824		102 SNEDECOR HALL	
DR ENSOR KATHERINE	1	AMES IA 50011-1210	
DEPT OF STATISTICS		DR DALE ZIMMERMAN	1
RICE UNIVERSITY		DEPT OF STATISTICS AND ACTUARIAL SCIENCE	
P.O. BOX 1892 MS 138		UNIVERSITY OF IOWA	
HOUSTON TX 77251-1892		241 SCHAEFFER HALL	
MS BETSEY COGSWELL	1	IOWA CITY IA 52242-1409	
DEPT OF STATISTICS		DR JOHN E BOYER	1
HARVARD UNIVERSITY		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
1 OXFORD ST		KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY	
CAMBRIDGE MA 02138-2901		DICKENS HALL 101	
DR EDWARD R SCHEINERMAN	1	MANHATTAN KS 66506	
DEPT OF MATHEMATICS		DR DHARAM V CHOPRA	1
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
104 WHITEHEAD HALL		WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY	
BALTIMORE MD 21218		1845 N FAIRMOUNT	
DR BENJAMIN KADEM	1	WICHITA KS 67260-0033	
DEPT OF MATHEMATICS		MS CAROLYN J COOK	1
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
COLLEGE PARK MD 20742		COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY	
DR WAYNE A MUTH	1	101 STATISTICS BLDG	
DEPT OF STATISTICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE		FORT COLLINS CO 80523-1877	
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY		DR DENNIS L YOUNG	1
PO BOX 6330		DEPT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS	
MORGANTOWN WV 26506-6330		ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	
MS SHARON DINGESS	1	TEMPE AZ 85287-1804	
DEPT OF STATISTICS		DR DOOD KALICHARAN	1
CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
10900 EUCLID AVE YOST 323		COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	
CLEVELAND OH 44106-7054		2990 BROADWAY MC 4403	
DR DOUGLAS WOLFE	1	NEW YORK NY 10027	
DEPT OF STATISTICS		DR LU ANN CUSTER	1
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
1958 NEIL AVE		UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN	
COLUMBUS OH 43210-1247		439 WEST HALL	
DR ERIK V NORDHEIM	1	ANN ARBOR MI 48109-1092	
DEPT OF STATISTICS		DR ROBERT SMYTHE	1
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
1210 W DAYTON ST		OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY	
MADISON WI 53706-1613		KIDDER HALL 44	
DR GARY OEHLERT	1	CORVALLIS OR 97331	
DEPT OF STATISTICS			
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA			
224 CHURCH ST SE STE 313			
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55455-0493			

DISTRIBUTION (Continued)

	<u>Copies</u>		<u>Copies</u>
DR KENT ESKRIDGE	1	DR ANDREW BARRON	1
DEPT OF STATISTICS		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN		YALE UNIVERSITY	
926 OLDFATHER HALL		PO BOX 208290	
LINCOLN NE 68588		NEW HAVEN CT 06520-8290	
DR WILLIAM D WARDE	1	DR KESAR SINGH	1
DEPT OF STATISTICS		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY		RUTGERS UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY	
301 MSCS BLDG		501 HILL CENTER BUSCH CAMPUS	
STILLWATER OK 74078-1056		PISCATAWAY NJ 08854	
DR ISHWAR V BASAWA	1	DR ROBERT SMYTHE	1
DEPT OF STATISTICS		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA		GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	
ATHENS GA 30602		WASHINGTON DC 20052	
DR WILLIAM GRIFFITH	1	DR STEPHEN L BIEBER	1
DEPT OF STATISTICS		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY		UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING	
LEXINGTON KY 40506-0027		PO BOX 3332	
DR REBECCA W DOERGE	1	LARAMIE WY 82071-3332	
DEPT OF STATISTICS		DR HOWARD B CHRISTENSEN	1
PURDUE UNIVERSITY		DEPT OF STATISTICS	
1399 MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE BLDG		BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY	
WEST LAFAYETTE IN 47907		230A TMCB	
DR LARRY WASSERMAN	1	PROVO UT 84602	
DEPT OF STATISTICS		DR ELGIN PERRY	1
CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY		2000 KING'S LANDING RD	
PITTSBURGH PA 15213		HUNTINGTOWN MD 20639-9743	
DR SATISH IYENGAR	1	INTERNAL	
DEPT OF STATISTICS		Z31 TECHNICAL LIBRARY	3
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH		G308 CHARLES GARNETT	1
2703 CATHEDRAL OF LEARNING		Q20 DR WILLIAM FARR	1
PITTSBURGH PA 15260		Q21 DR ALAN BERGER	1
DR DIPAK K DEY	1	Q21 DR JOHN CRIGLER	1
DEPT OF STATISTICS		G72 NGA PHAM	1
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT		Q41 DR MICHAEL RUDZINSKY	1
196 AUDITORIUM ROAD		W11 STEVEN ANDERSON	1
STORRS CT 06269		W12 WILLIAM ORMSBY	1
		W21 DAVID CLAWSON	1
		W60 ROBERT HILL	1
		W30 DR ARMIDO DIDONATO	2
		W30 MICKEY SKAMANGAS	1
		W31 DR ROBERT MCDEVITT	1

BLANK PAGE

