

JAERI-M

9 1 4 6

A CODE TO EVALUATE INSPECTION DATA BY
PAIRED COMPARISON METHOD

— NPT-JAPAN SYSTEM II, PART II —

October 1980

Hideo NISHIMURA, Koji IKAWA and Mitsuho HIRATA

日 本 原 子 力 研 究 所
Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute

この報告書は、日本原子力研究所が JAERI-M レポートとして、不定期に刊行している研究報告書です。入手、複製などのお問い合わせは、日本原子力研究所技術情報部（茨城県鹿嶋郡東海村）あて、お申しこしてください。

JAERI-M reports, issued irregularly, describe the results of research works carried out in JAERI. Inquiries about the availability of reports and their reproduction should be addressed to Division of Technical Information, Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute, Tokai-mura, Naka-gun, Ibaraki-ken, Japan.

JAERI-M 9146

A Code to Evaluate Inspection Data by Paired Comparison Method
- NPT-JAPAN System II, Part II -

Hideo NISHIMURA, Koji IKAWA and Mitsuho HIRATA⁺

Division of Power Reactor Projects, JAERI

(Received September 29, 1980)

A sampling plan was investigated from the point of view of the counter-strategies to the diversion of an amount of nuclear material. Assuming that an inspection would be carried out based on such a plan, a method for evaluating inspection data obtained during and/or after the inspection was developed on the same basis as the plan, and was materialized as a computer code which is an element of the safeguards information treatment system of Japan. The code was successfully applied to the inventory verification of a fast critical assembly.

Key words : Safeguards, Inspection Planning, Inspection Evaluation,
Paired Comparison, NPT-JAPAN System , Computer Code

⁺) Office of Planning , JAERI

対比較法による査察データ評価用コード

NPT - JAPAN System II, Part II

日本原子力研究所動力炉開発・安全性研究管理部

西村秀夫・猪川浩次・平田実穂⁺

(1980年 9月29日受理)

核物質の転用に対する対抗戦略の観点からサンプリング計画を検討した。査察はそのような計画に基づいてなされるものであるとの仮定に立ち、査察中ないし査察後に得られた査察データを評価するための方法を開発し、これをコンピュータ・コードとして完成した。このコードは、わが国の国内保障措置情報処理システムの一部を成すものである。本コードを高速臨界実験装置の在庫検認に対して適用したところ、満足すべき結果を得ることが出来た。報告書には、その結果を適用例として示す。

⁺ 企画室

目 次

1. はじめに	1
2. 査察計画	2
2.1 物質収支	2
2.2 核物質の転用	4
2.3 アトリビュート(計数)検査	5
2.4 バリアブル(計量)検査	6
3. 対データ比較法	10
3.1 単一ストラータの場合	10
3.2 複数ストラータの場合	16
3.3 特殊ケース: データ偽造, 平均値の問題	21
3.4 D統計	24
4. 入力形式	28
5. 入・出力サンプル	36
6. サンプル出力の解析	40
7. 結 言	42
謝 辞	43
参考文献	43

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Inspection Planning	2
2.1 Material Balance	2
2.2 Diversion of Nuclear Material	4
2.3 Attribute Testing	5
2.4 Variable Testing	6
3. Paired Comparison Method	10
3.1 Single Stratum	10
3.2 Several Strata	16
3.3 Special Cases : Falsification, Average Value	21
3.4 \hat{D} Statistics	24
4. Input Form	28
5. Sample Input and Output	36
6. Analysis of Sample Output	40
7. Conclusion	42
Acknowledgement	43
References	43

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the safeguards objectives is to verify that all source or special fissionable material in all peaceful nuclear activities is not diverted to nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or for purposes unknown.

Such verification activities should be planned, performed and evaluated on a logical and technological basis. Logically or mathematically speaking, the verification should be done by rejecting the alternative hypothesis that the diversion of nuclear material has occurred.

The diversion hypothesis requires studies of the diversion strategies, according to which the diversion might be performed, and their counter-strategies, by which the diversion could be detected. This is one of the main themes of the inspection planning.

According to the inspection planning, the inspection is carried out on site of a facility under the peaceful nuclear activities. Then, an inspection report is produced during and/or after the inspectors' visit to the facility.

This inspection report should be carefully analyzed in consistency with the philosophy applied to the inspection planning. The purpose of this paper is to try to give a practical and convenient solution to such a problem with the mathematical description and with the scope, functions and handling of the computer code which has been developed reflecting the results of the study.

The following sections of this paper discuss the inspection planning and the analysis method of paired comparison by critically reconstructing the works^{1,2,3)} on a same theoretical basis, give the input form to and sample output from the code, and analyze the output from a viewpoint of how to use the code. The code is a revised version of the one previously reported^{4,5)}.

2. INSPECTION PLANNING

2.1 Material Balance

There are three kinds of material balances in an MBA on a material balance period, i.e. the true material balance, the operator's material balance which might be falsified, and the material balance estimated by inspector. These material balances are expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MUF}_T &= \text{BI}_T + R_T - S_T - W_T - \text{EI}_T, \\ \text{MUF}_O &= \text{BI}_O + R_O - S_O - W_O - \text{EI}_O, \\ \text{MUF}_I &= \text{BI}_I + R_I - S_I - W_I - \text{EI}_I, \end{aligned}$$

where BI is the beginning inventory, R is all receipts, S is all shipments, W is all waste disposals, EI is the ending inventory and MUF is the material unaccounted for. Suffixes T, O and I denote True, Operator and Inspector, respectively. Suppose that these variables are all defined exactly without any measurement errors and that any values estimated by inspector are not biased, then the following relations are obtained:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BI}_T &= \text{BI}_I, \\ R_T &= R_{\text{SRD}} + R_F + R_I, \\ S_T &= S_I - S_F - S_{\text{SRD}}, \\ W_T &= W_I - W_F - W_{(\text{SRD})}, \\ \text{EI}_T &= \text{EI}_I, \end{aligned}$$

where R_{SRD} is $R_T - R_O$, R_F is $R_O - R_I$, S_F is $S_I - S_O$, S_{SRD} is $S_O - S_T$, W_F is $W_I - W_O$, and $W_{(\text{SRD})}$ is $W_O - W_T$. If the shipper to and the receiver from the MBA are all honest, R_{SRD} and S_{SRD} mean the real shipper-receiver differences even if the operator falsifies his values R_O and S_O . $W_{(\text{SRD})}$, however, does not have any so-called receivers. On the other hand, R_F , S_F and W_F represent the differences between the operator's and the inspector's values, and these values are not zero if the operator falsifies his values R_O , S_O and W_O . Hence, MUF_T is related with MUF_I as follow:

$$\text{MUF}_T = \text{MUF}_I + R_{\text{SRD}} + R_F + S_F + S_{\text{SRD}} + W_F + W_{(\text{SRD})}.$$

If the relations: $R_T = R_I$, $S_T = S_I$ and $W_T = W_I$ are attained, however, MUF_T is represented like this:

$$\text{MUF}_T = \text{MUF}_I.$$

Requirements needed to attain these relationships are:

1) the seals should be detached from the received material under the inspector's observation so as to preserve R_T .

2) measurements should be done just after the seals are detached. The inspector should observe these measurements so as to reduce R_{SRD} to zero.

3) just after the operator's measurements, the inspector should pick up a suitable number of samples and measure them not so as to permit the existence of non-zero R_F .

4) the inspector should observe the operator's measurements for shipments and/or waste disposals in order not to permit the falsification of an amount of S_F and/or W_F by the operator.

5) just after the measurements, the inspector should define S_I and/or W_I by his measurements and attach a seal to prevent the existence of S_{SRD} and/or $W_{(SRD)}$.

These requirements are based on the fact that the inspector could not measure all the items so that he must rely on the operator's measurements to estimate his values. It should be noted that in the courses of 3) and 5) above a temporary seal might be used.

If these requirements could be attained, then MUF_I (or $MUF_0 - \hat{D}$) or \hat{D} and MUF_0 evaluation approach is useful, where \hat{D} represents the following relation:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{D} &= MUF_0 - MUF_I, \\ &= (BI_0 - BI_I) + (R_0 - R_I) - (S_0 - S_I) - (W_0 - W_I) - (EI_0 - EI_I), \\ &= (BI_0 - BI_I) + R_F + S_F + W_F - (EI_0 - EI_I).\end{aligned}$$

On the contrary, if these requirements could not be attained, a severer procedure of evaluation should be applied as follows:

1) the hypothesis: $(BI_0 - BI_I) - (EI_0 - EI_I) = 0$ should not be rejected.

2) the hypothesis: $\hat{D} = 0$ should not be rejected so as to guarantee the relation: $R_F + S_F + W_F = 0$.

3) the hypotheses: $R_{SRD} = 0$, $S_{SRD} = 0$ and $W_{(SRD)} = 0$ should not be rejected by analyzing the shipper-receiver differences or by using seals.

4) the hypothesis: $MUF_0 = 0$ (and/or $MUF_0 - \hat{D} = 0$) should not be rejected.

It is desirable that the hypotheses: $BI_0 = BI_I$, $EI_0 = EI_I$, $R_F = 0$, $S_F = 0$ and $W_F = 0$ are not rejected at the same time.

2.2 Diversion of Nuclear Material

As to how to divert a quantity of nuclear material, there are two diversion strategies; one is to divert it by relatively large quantity within a relatively short time interval (abrupt diversion) and the other is to divert it by relatively small quantity within a relatively long time interval (protracted diversion).

Counter-strategies to such diversion possibilities should be based on a philosophy of timely detection of diversion of significant amounts of nuclear material, i.e. the threshold amount, TA, of nuclear material needed to fabricate a nuclear explosive device should be detected within the critical time, CT, needed to convert the material to a weapon with the detection probability $1-\beta$ and misjudgement probability α .

Against the abrupt diversion, an attribute testing is effective if it is done timely, i.e. periodically in the critical time interval or randomly with a mean time interval and a variance. On the other hand, a variable testing is useful against the protracted diversion if it is performed in a suitable time interval.

Then the inspection would be carried out like this:

- 1) All receipts, shipments and waste disposals should be verified by the variable testing so as to make it possible to verify the material balance or MUF at the end of the material balance period. At the same time the attribute testing for the purpose of 2) below might be used in parallel to make maximum use of inspection manpower by cutting the inspectors' travelling time.
- 2) Running inventory should be verified by the attribute testing in order to prove the running book inventory against the abrupt diversion in an appropriate time span.
- 3) At the end of the period, physical inventory should be verified by the variable testing. The data obtained by the inspector's measurement on the beginning inventory, all the receipts and shipments, and the ending inventory, and their corresponding source data recorded on book or measured by the operator make it possible to verify the over-all material balance against the protracted diversion.

The attribute measurement is able to detect with nearly 100 percent probability the defection of the nominal item quantity ranging from 100 percent to a smaller one depending on the relative standard deviation of the measurement error (for example: 100 - 4δ). If the measurement has high accuracy and precision, the detectable defection range is widened to a much smaller percentage. As the result the range covered by the variable testing is narrowed and, hence, the material balance period could be extended longer because it requires much more time to accumulate the quantity TA by smaller removals. On the contrary, if the measurement accuracy and precision are poor, the material balance period must be shortened because of the possibility of easy accumulation of the quantity.

2.3 Attribute Testing

For the attribute testing, number of samples to be measured during inspection is calculated for each stratum of nuclear material using the formula:

$$n = N (1 - \beta^{1/r}), \quad r = \frac{M}{\bar{x}}, \quad (1)$$

where n is the sampling size, N is the total number of items contained in the stratum, M is a goal quantity such as the threshold amount or less quantity than that, \bar{x} is the average content of the item, and hence r is the number of defects needed to accomplish the diversion of an amount M. This formula is derived from the following exact equation based on the hypergeometric probability density function with some modifications which give a little greater sampling size than the rigorous one;

$$\beta = \frac{\binom{r}{0} \binom{N-r}{n}}{\binom{N}{n}}. \quad (2)$$

Such modifications make it possible to analyze the data obtained during the inspection by giving a sampling size of more than two even though the stratum contains a small content of nuclear material and/or a small number of items.

On site inspection it is important to judge the discrepancies between the operator's and inspector's measured data based on the reject limit (for example: 4δ). In the evaluation stage, it should be tested whether the

assigned measurement accuracy (δ) has been attained during inspection. Reflecting the results of such analysis the discrepancies should be re-evaluated.

2.4 Variable Testing

The variable testing should cover the defection range below the lower limit of that of the attribute testing. Since it is considered that the accuracy of the variable testing is higher than that of the attribute testing, the range could be divided into two parts: one is the attribute mode detection range and the other is the bias detection range.

For the attribute mode detection, number of samples to be measured during or after the inspection is calculated for each stratum of nuclear material just like the attribute testing with an exception of introduction of γ as follows:

$$n_{V1} = N (1 - \beta^{1/r}), \quad r = \frac{M}{\gamma \bar{x}}, \quad (3)$$

where n_{V1} is the sampling size, N is the total number of items contained in the stratum, M is the goal quantity, \bar{x} is the average content of the item, γ is the lower limit of the defection rate detected in the attribute testing, and r is the number of defects needed to accomplish the diversion of the amount M . It should be noted that γ is set to 1 if the attribute measurements work for the variable testing at the same time.

At the course of evaluation it should be judged whether the discrepancies between the operator's and inspector's measured data are significant or not based on the reject limit (for example: $4\sigma_d$).

For the bias detection, number of samples to be measured by the audit team is calculated using the following equation:

$$M = Z_{1-\alpha} \sigma_{\hat{D}|H_0} + Z_{1-\beta} \sigma_{\hat{D}|H_1}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\sigma_{\hat{D}|H_0}^2 = \sigma_{\hat{D}s}^2 + \sigma_{\hat{D}r|H_0}^2, \quad (5)$$

$$\sigma_{\hat{D}|H_1}^2 = \sigma_{\hat{D}s}^2 + \sigma_{\hat{D}r|H_1}^2, \quad (6)$$

and Z is the cumulative normal distribution function, suffixes s and r denote systematic and random error components, respectively, and suffixes H_0 and H_1 denote the null hypothesis: $\hat{D}=0$ and the alternative hypothesis: $\hat{D}=M$, respectively.

The amount of $\sigma_{\hat{D}_r|H_0}$ is related to the sample size n for the whole material balance using the minimum variance propagation method:

$$\sigma_{\hat{D}_r|H_0}^2 = \frac{(\sum N_i \sigma_{dri})^2}{n} \quad (7)$$

where N_i is the number of items of the i -th stratum and σ_{dri} is the random component of the standard deviation of the difference between the operator's and inspector's measured values for an individual item in the i -th stratum. And the sample size for the i -th stratum is as follows:

$$n_{V2i} = n \left(\frac{N_i \sigma_{dri}}{\sum N_i \sigma_{dri}} \right). \quad (8)$$

Therefore if $\sigma_{\hat{D}_r|H_0}$ is obtained by solving Eq. (4), the sample size is fixed. In order to solve Eq. (4), the following relation is assumed:

$$\sigma_{\hat{D}_r|H_1} = 2\sigma_{\hat{D}_r|H_0}. \quad (9)$$

As to the propagation of measurement errors for each stratum, the following relations are assumed:

$$\sigma_{dr}^2 = \bar{x}^2 (\delta_{Orw}^2 + \delta_{Irw}^2 + \delta_{Ore}^2 + \delta_{Ire}^2 + \delta_{Orf}^2 + \delta_{Irf}^2) \quad (10)$$

$$\sigma_{ds}^2 = \bar{x}^2 (\delta_{Osw}^2 + \delta_{Isw}^2 + \delta_{Ose}^2 + \delta_{Ise}^2 + \delta_{Osf}^2 + \delta_{Isf}^2) \quad (11)$$

where σ_{ds} is the systematic error standard deviation of the difference between the operator's and inspector's measured values for an individual item, δ denotes the relative standard deviation, and suffixes O , I , r , s , w , e , and f denote operator, inspector, random error, systematic error, weighing, element factor, and fissile factor, respectively. In this model the sampling error and the effect of the number of measurements to give an average value to each item are contained in each error component.

The systematic and random error variances of \hat{D} are described as follows:

$$\sigma_{Ds}^2 = \sum_i (N_i \sigma_{dsi})^2 \quad (12)$$

$$\sigma_{Dr|H_0}^2 = \sum_i (N_i \sigma_{dri})^2 / n_i \quad (13)$$

In Eq.(13), if n_i is fixed so as to minimize the variance, Eq.s (7) and (8) are easily concluded. Eq.(12) means that the systematic error for an individual item is constant over items in the same stratum and that it has a different value for a different stratum and it has the expected mean value of zero in the case of the same measurement technique (method and instrument) being used without the so-called long term systematic error.

In order to deal with the long term systematic error correctly, the measurement techniques should be identified and allocated to each stratum. In our computer code system, this procedure can be applied but the real function has not yet been built in.

After the preparation mentioned above, Eq.(4) can be solved. Sometimes, however, Eq.(5) does not give a suitable value for $\sigma_{Dr|H_0}$ because of a large quantity of σ_{Ds} . In such a case, in principle, the material balance period should be shortened so as to reduce the value of σ_{Ds} . The alternative methods contain re-evaluating the systematic errors and their propagation formula, deviding the material balance area into two or more small material balance areas, fully utilizing the containment/surveillance devices and drastically improving the measurement techniques.

At the stage of verification, the attained goal quantity is expressed as follows:

$$M' = Z_{1-\alpha} \sigma_{D|H_0} + Z_{1-\beta} S_{\hat{D}} \quad (14)$$

where $S_{\hat{D}}$ is the observed error standard deviation. If $M \geq M'$, it is concluded that the sampling size is adequate. On the contrary if $M' > M$, it should be concluded that the sampling plan is unreasonable.

In order to check the design value of the random error standard deviation, the following hypothesis testing should be performed:

The null hypothesis $H_0: S_{\hat{Dr}} = \sigma_{Dr|H_0}$, against the alternative hypothesis $H_1: S_{\hat{Dr}} = 2\sigma_{Dr|H_0}$.

where $S_{\hat{D}r}$ is the observed random error standard deviation. For this testing, sample size (n_{V3}) of more than 12 is required for the whole strata. If it is necessary to check the hypothesis stratum-wise, this number n_{V3} should be adopted for each stratum as its sample size.

Whether or not the hypothesis H_0 is rejected, the hypothesis $\hat{D}=0$ should be verified by using the value of $\sigma_{\hat{D}|H_0}$ based on the design information as the standard deviation of \hat{D} because the actual standard deviation could be contaminated by the diversion. In the case of $S_{\hat{D}r} < \sigma_{\hat{D}r|H_0}$, however, $\sigma_{\hat{D}|H_0}$ should be replaced by $S_{\hat{D}}$ because the high accuracy of measurements and/or concentrated inspection efforts make it possible to evaluate more severely the hypothesis $\hat{D}=0$ resulting in the attained goal quantity as follows:

$$M' = Z_{1-\alpha} S_{\hat{D}} + Z_{1-\beta} S_{\hat{D}} \quad (15)$$

For the variable testing the sample size finally results in the maximum value of n_{V1} and n_{V2} , and n_{V3} if the variance test is applied to each stratum.

3. PAIRED COMPARISON METHOD

3.1 Single Stratum

Under the situation of no diversion, the operator's and inspector's measured values of item i in a stratum are expressed as follows:

$$x_{0i} = \mu_i + s_0 + r_{0i} \quad (16)$$

$$x_{Ii} = \mu_i + s_I + r_{Ii} \quad (17)$$

where x_{0i} is the operator's value of the item, x_{Ii} is the inspector's value, μ_i is the true value, s_0 and s_I are the systematic errors for the operator and inspector, respectively, and r_{0i} and r_{Ii} are the corresponding random errors.

Since the sample variance and covariance are given by:

$$S_x^2 = \frac{\sum x_i^2 - (\sum x_i)^2/n}{n-1} \quad (18)$$

$$S_{xy} = \frac{\sum x_i y_i - (\sum x_i \sum y_i)/n}{n-1}, \quad (19)$$

the following relations are obtained from Eqs.(16) and (17) if the covariance terms between μ_i and r_{0i} , μ_i and r_{Ii} , and r_{0i} and r_{Ii} , are equal to zeros:

$$S_0^2 = S_\mu^2 + S_{r0}^2 \quad (20)$$

$$S_I^2 = S_\mu^2 + S_{rI}^2 \quad (21)$$

$$S_{0I} = S_\mu^2 \quad (22)$$

Since the values of S_μ^2 , S_{r0}^2 and S_{rI}^2 estimate σ_μ^2 , σ_{r0}^2 and σ_{rI}^2 , respectively, the following hypothesis testings can be made:

- 1) The null hypothesis $H_{01}: \sigma_{r0}^2 = \sigma_{rI}^2$ against the alternative hypothesis $H_{11}: \sigma_{r0}^2 \neq \sigma_{rI}^2$
- 2) The null hypothesis $H_{02}: (\sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2) = \sigma_{rm}^2$ against the alternative hypothesis $H_{12}: (\sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2) \neq \sigma_{rm}^2$
- 3) The null hypothesis $H_{03}: \sigma_{r0}^2 = \sigma_{\varepsilon 0}^2$ and $\sigma_{rI}^2 = \sigma_{\varepsilon I}^2$ against the

alternative hypothesis H_{13} : $\sigma_{r0}^2 \neq \sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2$ or $\sigma_{rI}^2 \neq \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2$, or both.

4) The null hypothesis H_{04} : $\sigma_{rI}^2 = \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2$ (or $\sigma_{r0}^2 = \sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2$) against the alternative hypothesis H_{14} : $\sigma_{rI}^2 \neq \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2$ (or $\sigma_{r0}^2 \neq \sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2$),

where σ_{rm}^2 , $\sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2$ and $\sigma_{\epsilon I}^2$ are the given (or design) values for the corresponding variances.

According to the reference 1), the following calculations are made:

1) For the H_{01} testing,

$$t = \frac{r}{\sqrt{(n-1)/(1-r^2)}}, \quad r = \frac{S_0^2 - S_I^2}{(S_0^2 + S_I^2)^2 - 4S_{0I}^2}, \quad (23)$$

H_{01} is rejected if $|t| > t_{1-(\alpha/2)}(n-2)$, where $t_{1-(\alpha/2)}(n-2)$ is the critical value of Student's t distribution with $(n-2)$ degrees of freedom at the significance level of α .

2) For the H_{02} testing,

$$R = (n-1)(S_0^2 + S_I^2 - 2S_{0I}) / \sigma_{rm}^2 \quad (24)$$

H_{02} is rejected if $R < \chi_{\alpha/2}^2(n-1)$, resulting in $\sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2 < \sigma_{rm}^2$, or if $R > \chi_{1-(\alpha/2)}^2(n-1)$, resulting in $\sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2 > \sigma_{rm}^2$, where $\chi_{\alpha/2}^2(n-1)$ and $\chi_{1-(\alpha/2)}^2(n-1)$ are the lower and upper critical values of chi-square distribution with $(n-1)$ degrees of freedom at the α significance level.

3) For the H_{03} testing,

$$\lambda_3 = 2[\ln L(\hat{\Omega}) - \ln L(\hat{\omega}_3)] \quad (25)$$

where

$$\ln L(\hat{\Omega}) = -n - 0.5n \ln(S_0^2 S_I^2 - S_{0I}^2) \quad (26)$$

$$\ln L(\hat{\omega}_3) = 0.5n \ln(\hat{\sigma}_{\mu \epsilon 0}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{\mu \epsilon I}^2 + \sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2 \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2) - n \left[\frac{(\hat{\sigma}_{\mu \epsilon I}^2 + \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2) S_0^2 - 2\hat{\sigma}_{\mu \epsilon 0}^2 S_{0I} + (\hat{\sigma}_{\mu \epsilon 0}^2 + \sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2) S_I^2}{2(\hat{\sigma}_{\mu \epsilon 0}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{\mu \epsilon I}^2 + \sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2 \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2)} \right] \quad (27)$$

and

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\mu}^2 = \frac{S_{\sigma_{\epsilon I}}^2 + 2S_{0I} \sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2 \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2 + S_{I\sigma_{\epsilon 0}}^2}{(\sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2 + \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2)^2} - \frac{\sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2 \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2}{\sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2 + \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2} \quad (28)$$

H_{03} is rejected if $\lambda_3 > \chi_{1-\alpha}^2(2)$.

4) For the H_{04} testing,

$$\lambda_4 = 2[\ln L(\hat{\Omega}) - \ln L(\hat{\omega}_4)] \quad (29)$$

where $\ln L(\hat{\omega}_4)$ is calculated using Eq.(27) with the value of $\hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon 0}^2$ from Eq.(31) replacing $\sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2$. $\hat{\sigma}_{\mu}^2$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon 0}^2$ are obtained by solving the following equations with the iteration method:

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\mu}^2 = \frac{S_{0\sigma_{\epsilon I}}^2 + 2S_{0I} \hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon 0}^2 \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2 + S_{I\sigma_{\epsilon 0}}^2}{(\hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon 0}^2 + \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2)^2} - \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon 0}^2 \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2}{\hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon 0}^2 + \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2} \quad (30)$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon 0}^2 = \frac{S_{I\sigma_{\mu}}^2 - 2S_{0I} \hat{\sigma}_{\mu}^2 (\hat{\sigma}_{\mu}^2 + \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2) + S_0 (\hat{\sigma}_{\mu}^2 + \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2)^2}{(\sigma_{\epsilon I}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{\mu}^2)^2} - \frac{\sigma_{\epsilon I}^2 \hat{\sigma}_{\mu}^2}{\sigma_{\epsilon I}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{\mu}^2} \quad (31)$$

H_{04} is rejected if $\lambda_4 > \chi_{1-\alpha}^2(1)$.

In our computer program, these hypotheses are automatically tested if the values of σ_{rm} , $\sigma_{\epsilon 0}$ and/or $\sigma_{\epsilon I}$ are given by the input. If one of these values is not given, the relevant hypothesis is not tested. If the relative standard deviation δ is given instead of the standard deviation σ , σ is replaced by $\bar{x}_0 \delta$ in the calculation formulas mentioned above. However, the output given by the program is converted to δ in such a case.

The best estimated random error standard deviations for the operator's and inspector's measurements are given as follows:

A) If H_{01} is rejected and if the other hypotheses are not tested, then

$$\sigma_{r0}^2 = S_0^2 - S_{0I}$$

$$\sigma_{rI}^2 = S_I^2 - S_{OI}$$

If $\sigma_{r0}^2 < 0$ (or $\sigma_{rI}^2 < 0$),

$$\sigma_{r0}^2 = 0 \text{ (or } \sigma_{rI}^2 = 0)$$

$$\sigma_{rI}^2 = S_0^2 + S_I^2 - 2S_{OI} \text{ (or } \sigma_{r0}^2 = S_0^2 + S_I^2 - 2S_{OI})$$

If $S_{OI} < 0$,

$$\sigma_{r0}^2 = S_0^2$$

$$\sigma_{rI}^2 = S_I^2$$

In the case of negative S_{OI} , this term is set to zero in the H_{01} testing, i.e. in Eq.(23).

B) If H_{01} is not rejected and if the other hypotheses are not tested, then

$$\sigma_{r0}^2 = \sigma_{rI}^2 = (S_0^2 + S_I^2 - 2S_{OI})/2$$

If $S_{OI} < 0$,

$$\sigma_{r0}^2 = \sigma_{rI}^2 = (S_0^2 + S_I^2)/2$$

C) If H_{01} and H_{02} are both rejected and if H_{03} and H_{04} are not tested, the result is the same as A). In the H_{02} testing, S_{OI} is set to 0 if it is negative.

D) If H_{01} is rejected and H_{02} is not rejected and if H_{03} and H_{04} are not tested,

$$\sigma_{r0}^2 = \sigma_{rm}^2 \frac{S_0^2 - S_{OI}}{S_0^2 + S_I^2 - 2S_{OI}}$$

$$\sigma_{rI}^2 = \sigma_{rm}^2 \frac{S_I^2 - S_{OI}}{S_0^2 + S_I^2 - 2S_{OI}}$$

If $S_0^2 < S_{OI}$, $S_0^2 - S_{OI}$ is replaced by 0 and $S_I^2 - S_{OI}$ is replaced

by $S_0^2 + S_I^2 - 2S_{0I}$ just like A). If $S_I^2 < S_{0I}$, then $S_I^2 - S_{0I}$ and $S_0^2 - S_{0I}$ are replaced by 0 and $S_0^2 + S_I^2 - 2S_{0I}$, respectively. If $S_{0I} < 0$, S_{0I} is set to 0 in these equations and in the H_{02} testing, i.e. in Eq.(24).

E) If H_{01} is not rejected and H_{02} is rejected and if H_{03} and H_{04} are not tested, the result is the same as B).

F) If H_{01} and H_{02} are not rejected and if H_{03} and H_{04} are not tested, then

$$\sigma_{r0}^2 = \sigma_{rI}^2 = \sigma_{rm}^2/2$$

G) If H_{04} is rejected and if H_{03} is not tested, the result is one of the estimations from A) to F) reflecting the results of the hypothesis testings. In the H_{04} testing, $\hat{\sigma}_\mu^2$ is set to 0 if it is negative and $\hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon 0}^2$ is re-calculated from Eq.(31), and $\hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon 0}^2$ is set to 0 if it is negative and $\hat{\sigma}_\mu^2$ is re-calculated from Eq.(30).

H) If H_{04} is not rejected and if H_{03} is not tested, then

$$\sigma_{rI}^2 = \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2 \text{ (or } \sigma_{r0}^2 = \sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2)$$

$$\sigma_{r0}^2 = \hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon 0}^2$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon 0}^2$ is from Eq.(31). If this value is zero, again the results of the hypothesis testings are taken into account for this term.

I) If H_{03} is rejected,

$$R_0 = \ln\left(\frac{S_0^2 - S_{0I}}{\sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2}\right)$$

and $R_I = \ln\left(\frac{S_I^2 - S_{0I}}{\sigma_{\epsilon I}^2}\right)$

are calculated. If $S_0^2 < S_{0I}$ or if $|R_I| < |R_0|$, the testing of H_{04} :

$\sigma_{rI}^2 = \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2$ is performed. If $S_I^2 < S_{0I}$ or if $|R_I| > |R_0|$, the testing of H_{04} :

$\sigma_{r0}^2 = \sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2$ is performed. Therefore the result is G) or H).
In the H_{03} testing, $\hat{\sigma}_{\mu}^2$ is set to zero if it is negative.

J) If H_{03} is not rejected,

$$\sigma_{r0}^2 = \sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2$$

$$\sigma_{rI}^2 = \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2$$

After the evaluation of the random error variances, a hypothesis testing of the difference between the operator's and inspector's mean values can be made by using these random error variances and the systematic error variances given by the input:

The null hypothesis $H_{05}: \mu_0 = \mu_I$ against the alternative hypothesis $H_{15}: \mu_0 \neq \mu_I$

In order to test this hypothesis, the statistic z is calculated as follows:

$$z = \frac{(\bar{x}_0 - \bar{x}_I)}{\sigma_d} \quad (32)$$

where

$$\sigma_d^2 = \sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2 + \frac{\sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2}{n} \quad (33)$$

and n is the number of items with paired measurements.

H_{05} is rejected if $|z| > z_{1-(\alpha/2)}$, where $z_{1-(\alpha/2)}$ is the critical value of the cumulative normal distribution at the α level of significance.

The estimate of the true mean is

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{w_0 \bar{x}_0 + w_I \bar{x}_I}{w_0 + w_I} \quad (34)$$

where

$$w_0 = \left(\sigma_{s0}^2 + \frac{\sigma_{r0}^2}{n} \right)^{-1} \quad (35)$$

and

$$w_I = \left(\sigma_{sI}^2 + \frac{\sigma_{rI}^2}{n} \right)^{-1} \quad (36)$$

The variance of $\hat{\mu}$ is $(w_0 + w_I)^{-1}$.

Estimation of the systematic error variances based on the paired measurements is poor if there is only one stratum on the material and if the same measurement technique is applied to the stratum. However, a hypothesis testing can be made:

The null hypothesis $H_{06}: \sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2 = \sigma_{sm}^2$ against the alternative hypothesis $H_{16}: \sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2 \neq \sigma_{sm}^2$, where σ_{sm}^2 is a variance given by input or by the sum of design values of the operator's and inspector's systematic error variances.

Assuming that the mean value of d is zero,

$$\begin{aligned} S_d^2 &= d^2 \\ &= (\bar{x}_0 - \bar{x}_I)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

An estimate of the combined systematic error variance is

$$\sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2 = S_d^2 - \frac{\sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2}{n} \quad (38)$$

It is expected that the ratio

$$R = \frac{\sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2}{\sigma_{sm}^2} \quad (39)$$

has the chi-square distribution with 1 degree of freedom, so that H_{06} is rejected if $R < \chi_{\alpha/2}^2(1)$ or if $R > \chi_{1-(\alpha/2)}^2(1)$.

3.2 Several Strata

If the same measurement technique is used over several strata, it is expected that the random error standard deviation is constant over the entire strata and that the value of the systematic error is distributed as the normal distribution with a suitable standard deviation around a mean value of zero. Here, it is assumed that the long term systematic error does not exist. The mathematical model of measured values is again expressed by Eqs. (16) and (17). The hypothesis testings can be made except for the H_{03} testing and, if it is convenient, a hypothesis testing is broken down into two parts.

- 1) The null hypothesis $H_{01,1}: \sigma_{r0}^2 \leq \sigma_{rI}^2$ against the one-sided alternative hypothesis $H_{11,1}: \sigma_{r0}^2 > \sigma_{rI}^2$

For this testing, a statistic P is calculated as follows:

$$P = -2 \sum_{i=1}^m \ln p_i \quad (40)$$

where m is the number of strata, and p_i is calculated from

$$t_i = t_{1-p_i}(n_i-2) \quad (41)$$

Here t_i is from Eq.(23) for each stratum. $H_{01,1}$ is rejected if $P > \chi_{1-\alpha}^2(2m)$, where $\chi_{1-\alpha}^2(2m)$ is the critical value of chi-square distribution with 2m degrees of freedom at the α level of significance.

- 2) The null hypothesis $H_{01,2}: \sigma_{r0}^2 \geq \sigma_{rI}^2$ against the one-sided alternative hypothesis $H_{11,2}: \sigma_{r0}^2 < \sigma_{rI}^2$

For this testing, p_i is replaced by $(1-p_i)$ in 1) above and $H_{01,2}$ is rejected if $P > \chi_{1-\alpha}^2(2m)$. The combined conclusion from 1) and 2) is that

$\sigma_{r0}^2 = \sigma_{rI}^2$ if both null hypotheses are not rejected, $\sigma_{r0}^2 < \sigma_{rI}^2$ if $H_{01,2}$ is rejected, and $\sigma_{r0}^2 > \sigma_{rI}^2$ if $H_{01,1}$ is rejected.

- 3) The null hypothesis $H_{02,1}: \sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2 \leq \sigma_{rm}^2$ against the one-sided alternative hypothesis $H_{12,1}: \sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2 > \sigma_{rm}^2$

A statistic is calculated as follows:

$$R = \sum_{i=1}^m R_i \quad (42)$$

where R_i is from Eq.(24) for each stratum. $H_{02,1}$ is rejected if $R > \chi_{1-\alpha}^2(df)$, where df is the degrees of freedom which is obtained by summing (n_i-1) over strata.

- 4) The null hypothesis $H_{02,2}: \sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2 \geq \sigma_{rm}^2$ against the one-sided alternative hypothesis $H_{12,2}: \sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2 < \sigma_{rm}^2$

For this testing, the same statistic as 3) is used. In this case, however, $H_{02,2}$ is rejected if $R < \chi_{\alpha}^2(df)$. The combined conclusion from 3) and 4)

is that $\sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2 = \sigma_{rm}^2$ if both null hypotheses are not rejected,

$\sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2 < \sigma_{rm}^2$ if $H_{02,2}$ is rejected, and $\sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2 > \sigma_{rm}^2$ if $H_{02,1}$ is rejected.

5) The null hypothesis $H_{04,1}: \sigma_{r0}^2 = \sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2$ against the one-sided alternative hypothesis $H_{14,1}: \sigma_{r0}^2 > \sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2$ or $\sigma_{r0}^2 < \sigma_{\epsilon 0}^2$

A statistic is calculated as follows:

$$\lambda_4 = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_{4i} \quad (43)$$

where λ_{4i} is from Eq.(29) for each stratum. $H_{04,1}$ is rejected if $\lambda_4 > \chi_{1-\alpha}^2(m)$.

6) The null hypothesis $H_{04,2}: \sigma_{rI}^2 = \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2$ against the one-sided alternative hypothesis $H_{14,2}: \sigma_{rI}^2 > \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2$ or $\sigma_{rI}^2 < \sigma_{\epsilon I}^2$

For this testing, the same statistic as 5) is used. In this case, however, the roles of σ_{r0}^2 and σ_{rI}^2 are reversed in the calculations for Eq.(29).

$H_{04,2}$ is rejected if $\lambda_4 > \chi_{1-\alpha}^2(m)$.

In our computer code system for analysis of paired data, these hypotheses are tested automatically if the values of σ_{rm} , $\sigma_{\epsilon 0}$ and/or $\sigma_{\epsilon I}$ are given by input. If one of these values is not given, the relevant hypothesis is not tested. If the relative standard deviation δ is given instead of the standard deviation σ , σ is replaced by $\bar{x}_0 \delta$ in the calculation formulas mentioned above. However, the output from the system is converted to δ in this case.

The best estimated random error standard deviations for the operator's and inspector's measurements are given for each stratum just like the case of single stratum. After that estimation, an average variance is calculated over all strata as follows:

$$V_0 = \frac{2\sigma_{r0}^4 + (\sigma_{\mu}^2 \sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{\mu}^2 \sigma_{rI}^2 + \sigma_{r0}^2 \sigma_{rI}^2)}{n-1} \quad (44)$$

where σ_{r0} and σ_{rI} are the values estimated above, and σ_{μ} is from Eq.(30) if $H_{04,1}$ is not rejected, from the equation with the roles of σ_{r0}^2 and σ_{rI}^2 reversed in Eq.(30) if $H_{04,2}$ is not rejected, from the mean value of these

if both hypotheses are not rejected, or from S_{0I} with a negative fix-up to zero if these hypotheses are not tested. In the case of $\sigma_{r0} = \sigma_{rI}$ in the H_{0I} testing, Eq.(44) is simply reduced as follows:

$$V_0 = \frac{C}{n-1} \quad (44)'$$

where C is a constant (set to 1).

Over the m strata,

$$\sigma_{r0}^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m V_{0i}^{-1} \sigma_{r0i}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^m V_{0i}^{-1}} \quad (45)$$

If the relative standard deviation is the case,

$$\delta_{r0}^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m V_{0i}^{-1} \bar{x}_{0i}^{-2} \delta_{r0i}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^m V_{0i}^{-1} \bar{x}_{0i}^2} \quad (46)$$

Estimation of σ_{rI}^2 is carried out like σ_{r0}^2 reversing the roles of σ_{r0}^2 and σ_{rI}^2 in Eqs.(44), (45) and (46).

At the same time, another estimation of random error variances is carried out as follows assuming that the prior knowledge about these variances is not available or is poor even if available:

Instead of V_0 in Eq.(44),

$$V_0 = \frac{S_0^2 (2S_0^2 - 4S_{0I}^2 + S_I^2) + S_{0I}^2}{n-1} \quad (47)$$

σ_{r0i}^2 in Eq.(45) (or δ_{r0i}^2 in Eq.(46)) is replaced by $S_0^2 - S_{0I}^2$ (or $(S_0^2 - S_{0I}^2)/\bar{x}_0^2$) if $H_{0I,1}$ or $H_{0I,2}$ is rejected, and by $(S_0^2 + S_I^2 - 2S_{0I}^2)/2$ (or $(S_0^2 + S_I^2 - 2S_{0I}^2)/(2\bar{x}_0^2)$) if $H_{0I,1}$ and $H_{0I,2}$ are not rejected. For estimation of σ_{rI}^2 , the roles of σ_{r0}^2 and σ_{rI}^2 are reversed in Eq.(47) and so forth.

If the value of σ_{r0}^2 or σ_{rI}^2 is negative, it is set to zero.

As for the estimation of systematic error variances, Eq.(37) is replaced by Eq.(48) under the same assumption that the mean of d is zero:

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_d^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{d_i^2}{m} \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{(\bar{x}_{0i} - \bar{x}_{1i})^2}{m}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{48}$$

Eq.(38) is replaced by:

$$\sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2 = S_d^2 - \frac{\sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i}
 \tag{49}$$

where σ_{r0} and σ_{rI} are given for each estimation of random error variances, i.e. two kinds of evaluation of systematic error variances are carried out.

The hypothesis testing H_{06} is divided into two hypotheses:

- 1) The null hypothesis $H_{06,1}$: $\sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2 \leq \sigma_{sm}^2$ against the one-sided alternative hypothesis $H_{16,1}$: $\sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2 > \sigma_{sm}^2$

For this testing, the ratio R is calculated instead of Eq.(39):

$$R = \frac{m (\sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2)}{\sigma_{sm}^2}
 \tag{50}$$

It is expected that the ratio has the chi-square distribution with m degrees of freedom, so that $H_{06,1}$ is rejected if $R > \chi_{1-\alpha}^2(m)$.

- 2) The null hypothesis $H_{06,2}$: $\sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2 \geq \sigma_{sm}^2$ against the one-sided alternative hypothesis $H_{16,2}$: $\sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2 < \sigma_{sm}^2$

For this testing, the same statistic as 1) above is used. $H_{06,2}$, however, is rejected if $R < \chi_{\alpha}^2(m)$. The combined conclusion from 1) and 2) is that

$\sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2 = \sigma_{sm}^2$ if both null hypotheses are not rejected, $\sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2 < \sigma_{sm}^2$ if $H_{06,2}$ is rejected, and $\sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2 > \sigma_{sm}^2$ if $H_{06,1}$ is rejected.

In the case of multi-strata, the hypothesis testing of the mean differences is carried out for each stratum, too. The procedure of testing is the same as the case of single stratum, i.e. Eq.(32) is calculated for each stratum under the condition of Eq.(33) and the hypothesis H_{05} is judged stratum-wise so as to be rejected if $|z| > z_{1-(\alpha/2)}$.

In Eq.(33), however, two possibilities to the variances are taken into account: one is that the systematic and random error variances are all from the estimated values and the other is that they are all from the design values given by input. For each case, the hypothesis testing is carried out. It should be noted that in our system these testings are repeated for the alternative estimation of random and systematic error variances.

3.3 Special cases: Falsification, Average value

Falsification

Falsification of data might be attempted by the potential divertor in order to conceal the diversion of an amount M of nuclear material. Hence, it should be kept in mind that the data given by the operator might be contaminated by falsification. In such a case the paired data are expressed in general as follows:

$$x_{0i} = \mu_i + s_0 + r_{0i} + \Delta + \eta_i \quad (51)$$

$$x_{Ii} = \mu_i + s_I + r_{Ii} \quad (52)$$

where x_{0i} is the operator's value of the item i , x_{Ii} is the inspector's value, μ_i is the true value, s_0 and s_I are the systematic errors for the operator and inspector, respectively, r_{0i} and r_{Ii} are the corresponding random errors, and Δ and η_i are the constant bias and the variable bias due to falsification, respectively. $\Delta + \eta_i$ is either an amount of diversion or only a falsified value, or a mixed value of these.

If any covariances between the terms at the right hand side of Eqs.(51) and (52) are negligibly small, the following equations are derived easily:

$$s_0^2 = s_\mu^2 + s_{r0}^2 + s_\eta^2 \quad (53)$$

$$s_I^2 = s_\mu^2 + s_{rI}^2 \quad (54)$$

$$s_{0I} = s_\mu^2 \quad (55)$$

Eq.(53) shows in comparison with Eq.(20) that the operator's random error variance is inflated by the variable bias variance s_η^2 when the paired data

analysis is carried out.

The situation, however, would be changed if the potential divertor uses a sophisticated technique, or only if $\Delta + \eta_i$ is the case of diversion. It is possible to correlate η_i with μ_i strongly, because the variance of μ_i is in general greater than that of r_{0i} , or only because $\mu_i + \Delta + \eta_i$ is the true value which the operator has measured before the diversion of $\Delta + \eta_i$.

In the extreme case of the former or in the latter case, μ_i can be replaced by y_i , which is the sum of μ_i , Δ and η_i , resulting in no correlation occurring between the terms. In this case, Eqs.(51) and (52) are replaced by:

$$x_{0i} = y_i + s_0 + r_{0i} \quad (56)$$

$$x_{Ii} = y_i + s_I + r_{Ii} - \Delta - \eta_i \quad (57)$$

Eqs.(53), (54) and (55) are replaced by:

$$s_0^2 = s_y^2 + s_{r0}^2 \quad (58)$$

$$s_I^2 = s_y^2 + s_{rI}^2 + s_\eta^2 \quad (59)$$

$$s_{0I} = s_y^2 \quad (60)$$

Eq.(59) shows that the estimation of the inspector's random error variance is heavily contaminated by the variable bias variance if the paired data are analyzed under the usual procedure. Since the variance of μ_i is not a suitable parameter for safeguards in general, it is meaningless to analyze s_μ^2 and/or s_y^2 relying on them. So the effect of the variable bias variance should be analyzed.

It is considered that the real situation is between the state expressed by Eqs.(53), (54) and (55), and the state expressed by Eqs.(58), (59) and (60). Therefore, the analysis of the combined random error variance is most important, i.e. the results of the hypothesis testing of H_{02} in the case of single stratum or $H_{02,1}$ and $H_{02,2}$ in the case of multi-strata should be carefully analyzed.

In this respect, our computer code provides a factor ρ^2 and a critical value R_1 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^2 &= \frac{\sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2, \text{ actual}}{\sigma_{r0}^2 + \sigma_{rI}^2, \text{ design}} \\ &= \frac{\chi_{1-\alpha}^2(df)}{\chi_{\alpha}^2(df)} \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

$$R_1 = \rho^2 \chi_{1-\alpha}^2(df) \quad (62)$$

where df is the degrees of freedom. The factor ρ^2 gives a real target value to the hypothesis testing of the combined random error variance. On the other hand, the critical value R_1 can be used for judging whether the alternative hypothesis is true or not when the null hypothesis is rejected, i.e. it is considered that the alternative hypothesis is not true if $R > R_1$, where R is from Eq.(24) or Eq.(42).

The constant bias, which is assumed to be constant in a stratum and may have a different value in a different stratum with a non-zero mean value, gives a great deal of effect to the estimation of the combined systematic error variance. The variance is heavily inflated by the variance of the constant biases and their non-zero mean value itself. Again it is important to analyze the results of the hypothesis H_{06} or $H_{06,1}$ and $H_{06,2}$. For this purpose, the parameters ρ^2 and R_1 are provided by the code. This time, however, ρ^2 means that:

$$\rho^2 = \frac{\sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2, \text{ actual}}{\sigma_{s0}^2 + \sigma_{sI}^2, \text{ design}} \quad (63)$$

It should be noted that the discussion in this section can be applied to the case of sampling errors, too. Hence, a big value of the combined random error variance or the combined systematic error variance may occur due to an unanticipated bigger value of sampling error.

Average value

The operator sometimes gives an average value or a nominal value to the parameter of an item. In such a case, x_{0i} in Eq.(16) is a constant value,

and S_0^2 and S_{0I} in Eqs.(20) and (22) are both zero. Apparently the estimate of σ_{rI}^2 contains the sample variance. As for the hypothesis testings, H_{01} can not be tested because r^2 gives 1 in Eq.(23), H_{02} testing has a possibility for us to lead to a wrong conclusion because of S_I^2 in Eq.(24) containing the sample variance, H_{03} and H_{04} can not be tested because the argument of \ln in Eq.(26) becomes zero, and the results of H_{05} and H_{06} testings are not guaranteed because of incorrect estimation of the random error variance.

Considering these points, the strata in which the average value is given are neglected during the course of estimation of random error variances. Since it is considered that there is a case having a really small sample variance, however, the hypothesis testings of H_{02} , H_{05} and H_{06} are carried out in such strata as the second case. The results of these testings should be carefully analyzed because the estimated random error variance may contain the variance of variable biases if the average value is falsified at the same time.

3.4 \hat{D} statistics

The statistic \hat{D} which has been introduced in Section 2.1 is the algebraic sum of the differences between the operator's and inspector's values on the beginning inventory, all the receipts, shipments and waste disposals, and the ending inventory. A component of \hat{D} , for example the ending inventory, is expressed as follows:

$$EI_0 - EI_I = \sum_{i=1}^m N_i d_i \quad (64)$$

where m is the number of the strata which belong to the ending inventory, N_i is the number of items in the i -th stratum, and d_i is the mean difference between the operator's and inspector's values of the items.

d_i has the following form.

$$d_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (x_{0ij} - x_{Iij})}{n_i} \quad (65)$$

where n_i is the number of paired measurements in this stratum, and x_{0ij}

and x_{Iij} are the operator's and inspector's values of the j -th item in the i -th stratum, respectively. These values are expressed as follows:

$$x_0 = w_0 e_0 f_0 \quad (66)$$

$$x_I = w_I e_I f_I \quad (67)$$

where w , e and f are weight, element factor and fissile isotope factor, respectively, and these parameters are separately analyzed for the estimation of their error variances. The expression of Eqs.(66) and (67) to the quantities of nuclear material is one of possibilities which we call Method 1. Other possibilities including Method 1 are:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Method 1 : } x &= w e f \\ \text{Method 2 : } x &= w e \bar{f} \\ \text{Method 3 : } x &= w \bar{e} f \\ \text{Method 4 : } x &= \bar{w} e f \\ \text{Method 5 : } x &= w \bar{e} \bar{f} \\ \text{Method 6 : } x &= \bar{w} e \bar{f} \\ \text{Method 7 : } x &= \bar{w} \bar{e} f \\ \text{Method 8 : } x &= \bar{w} \bar{e} \bar{f} \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where \bar{w} , \bar{e} and \bar{f} mean the average values of w , e and f , respectively. If no datum is given on a parameter in Eq.(68), such a parameter is automatically set to one. In the sampling plan described before in this paper, it was assumed that the method 1 was applied to the inspection. Here, however, more general description is given in order to correspond with any inspection situations.

The variance of \hat{D} is expressed as follows:

$$\sigma_{\hat{D}}^2 = \sigma_{D_s}^2 + \sigma_{D_r}^2 \quad (69)$$

where

$$\sigma_{D_s}^2 = \sum_i N_i^2 \bar{x}_i^{-2} (\delta_{0s w i}^2 + \delta_{I s w i}^2 + \delta_{0 s e i}^2 + \delta_{I s e i}^2 + \delta_{0 s f i}^2 + \delta_{I s f i}^2) \quad (70)$$

and

$$\sigma_{\hat{D}_r}^2 = \sum_i N_i^2 \bar{x}_i^2 (\delta_{Orwi}^2/n_{Orwi} + \delta_{Irwi}^2/n_{Irwi} + \delta_{Orei}^2/n_{Orei} + \delta_{Irei}^2/n_{Irei} + \delta_{Orfi}^2/n_{Orfi} + \delta_{Irfi}^2/n_{Irfi}) \quad (71)$$

In the above expressions, N means the number of items, n means the number of paired data, \bar{x} means the mean value of nuclear material of the items, δ means the relative standard deviation, and suffixes i, O, I, s, r, w, e and f denote stratum, operator, inspector, systematic error, random error, weight, element factor and fissile isotope factor, respectively. If the standard deviation is given instead of the relative standard deviation, it is replaced by $\bar{x}\delta$.

Each of the relative standard deviations is given as the design value or as the estimated value. Therefore, there are two kinds of $\sigma_{\hat{D}}$, i.e. $\sigma_{\hat{D},\text{design}}$ and $\sigma_{\hat{D},\text{actual}}$. However, the paired data cannot give an accurate value to the systematic error variance because of a small number of data sets. On top of that, it is assumed in the inspection planning that the variances are not inflated due to diversion. Then, the systematic error variances are always from the design values. Noting this point and using the smaller value of these two, the following hypothesis testing is carried out:

The null hypothesis $H_0: \hat{D} = 0$ against the two-sided alternative hypothesis $H_1: \hat{D} \neq 0$

A statistic D^* is calculated:

$$D^* = \frac{|\hat{D}|}{\sigma_{\hat{D}}} \quad (72)$$

H_0 is rejected if $D^* > z_{1-(\alpha/2)}$, where $z_{1-(\alpha/2)}$ is the cumulative normal distribution at the α level of significance.

Our computer code is still under development so that at present the \hat{D} statistics can be applied only to the component of \hat{D} , e.g. receipts, shipments or the ending inventory. In the stage of the real \hat{D} statistics, however, the following hypothesis should be tested rather than the hypothesis H_0 which is more suitable for applying to the component of \hat{D} , because it is important to detect the amount M under the design accuracy of the measurements and its actual one and under the given significance

levels of α and β :

The null hypothesis $H_0' : -\hat{D} \leq 0$ against the one-sided alternative hypothesis $H_1' : -\hat{D} > 0$.

For this testing, Eq.(72) is replaced by:

$$D^* = \frac{-\hat{D}}{\sigma_{\hat{D}}} \quad (73)$$

And H_0' is rejected if $D^* > z_{1-\alpha}$.

At the same time, Eq.(14) or (15) should be calculated in order to check whether the goal quantity M is attained or not. At present, our code can not give this value M' to \hat{D} but to the component of \hat{D} with a critical value M_1 for the alternative hypothesis:

$$M_1 = M' + z_{1-\beta} S_{\hat{D}} \quad (74)$$

where $S_{\hat{D}}$ is the actual standard deviation of \hat{D} . If $\hat{D} > M_1$, it should be concluded that statistically $\hat{D} > M'$.

4. INPUT FORM

The inspection gives us many kinds of information, such as the results of examination of records, comparison between records and reports, verification of inventory changes, updating of book inventory, verification of inventory, installation and servicing of containment and surveillance (C/S) devices and/or verification of C/S measures, verification of quality and functioning of operator's measurement system on site, and activities and observations in respect of MUF, SRDs and accidental losses on site. The treatment of all these data is out of this report. It is restricted only to the data needed to analyze the paired measurements in this report.

The input forms should be completed according to the following instructions whereby P.xx ($1 \leq xx \leq 80$) refers to the position of the information within the 80 character record.

The input cards begin with the program request card followed by the special information required by each program and the inspection information if the INS program is called, and again followed by the program request card and so on until the end card appears. The programs called by the input should be INS, INFR and INVR in this order.

Program Request Card

P. 1 - P.60 : Title of the job, character type input (A60)

P.61 - P.64 : Selection of the program, (A4)

= 'INS' for the inspection information treatment

= 'INFR' for the evaluation of measurement error variances

= 'INVR' for the flow/inventory verification

= 'blank' for the end of job

P.65 - P.80 : not used, blank (16X)

Special information required by the INS program

P. 1 - P. 6 : Number of inspection reports, integer number input (I6)

Special information required by the INFR programFirst card

P. 1 - P. 4 : Control of data plotting, character type input (A4)

= 'PLOT' for the plotting only

= 'PASS' for the evaluation only

= 'FULL' for the evaluation after the plotting

P. 5 - P.80 : not used, blank (76X)

Second card

P. 1 - P.12 : not used, blank (12X)

P.13 - P.18 : Plotting option, integer type input (I6)

= 0 for the direct difference expression

= 1 for the relative percent difference expression

P.19 - P.80 : not used, blank (62X)

Third card

P. 1 - P.60 : Significance levels of α for each hypothesis testing, real type input (5E12.5), given as follows:

P. 1 - P.12 : for H_{01}

P.13 - P.24 : for H_{02} and H_{06}

P.25 - P.36 : for H_{03}

P.37 - P.48 : for H_{04}

P.49 - P.60 : for H_{05}

Special information required by the INVR program

First card

P. 1 - P. 6 : Selection of subroutines, integer type input (I6).

Only one option is available at present.

= 3

P. 7 - P.80 : not used, blank (74X)

Second card

P. 1 - P.12 : Significance level of α , real type input (E12.5)

P.13 - P.24 : Significance level of β , (E12.5).

If no datum is given, then β is set to α .

Third card

P. 1 - P.80 : Blank data for returning from the INVR program to the main program

Inspection Information

There are four kinds of data which are treated in our code, i.e.(1) MBA data for the identification of a set of data -Form MI- which are punched

in one card, (2) measurement error data given as the design values -Form EI- which may need several cards repeatedly for each of the measurements, (3) stratum data which specify the number of samples, measurement methods, quantities of nuclear material, etc. in the stratum -Form SI- for which a set of three cards is repeated for each stratum, and (4) paired data for the analysis described in the previous sections -Form PI- which may need several cards for each of the measurements.

Completion of Form MI

- P. 1 - P. 4 : Organization code, character type (A4)
- P. 5 - P. 8 : Facility code, (A4)
- P. 9 - P.12 : MBA code, (A4)
- P.13 - P.18 : Date of the report, integer number (I6), e.g. 781127 is the input for November 27, 1978.
- P.19 - P.22 : Report No., (I4)
- P.23 - P.25 : Number of strata, (I3)
- P.26 : Type of the paired data, (A1)
 ='I' for inventory
 ='R' for receipt
 ='S' for shipment
 ='W' for waste disposal
- P.27 : Stratification, (A1), for future use
- P.28 - P.57 : Numbers of measurement techniques (instruments and/or methods) for the following kinds of measurements (10I3)
- P.28 - P.30 : weighing by operator
- P.31 - P.33 : weighing by inspector
- P.34 - P.36 : volume measurement by operator
- P.37 - P.39 : volume measurement by inspector
- P.40 - P.42 : density measurement by operator
- P.43 - P.45 : density measurement by inspector
- P.46 - P.48 : element factor by operator
- P.49 - P.51 : element factor by inspector
- P.52 - P.54 : fissile isotope factor by operator
- P.55 - P.57 : fissile isotope factor by inspector
- P.58 : Type of the measurement errors given in the form EI, (I1)
 = 1 for standard deviation
 = 2 for coefficient of variation (relative standard deviation)
- P.59 - P.63 : not used, blank (5X)

- P.64 - P.78 : Name of the reporter, (A15)
 P.79 - P.80 : Type of the input form, (A2)
 = 'MI'

Completion of Form EI

- P. 1 - P. 4 : Report No., integer number (I4)
 P. 5 - P. 8 : Entry No., (I4), in sequential
 P. 9 - P.11 : not used, blank (3X)
 P.12 - P.15 : MBA code, character type (A4)
 P.16 - P.17 : not used, (2X)
 P.18 - P.77 : Standard deviations, or coefficients of variation, of measurement errors for the measurement techniques used for each kind of measurements, real numbers (6E10.0), given as follows, and repeated in the same format if more than three measurement techniques are used:
 P.18 - P.27 : random error component of the first measurement technique
 P.28 - P.37 : systematic error component of the first measurement technique
 P.38 - P.47 : random error component of the second measurement technique
 P.48 - P.57 : systematic error component of the second measurement technique
 P.58 - P.67 : random error component of the third measurement technique
 P.68 - P.77 : systematic error component of the third measurement technique
 P.78 : Type of the measurement, (A1)
 = '1' for weighing by operator
 = '2' for weighing by inspector
 = '3' for volume measurement by operator
 = '4' for volume measurement by inspector
 = '5' for density measurement by operator
 = '6' for density measurement by inspector
 = '7' for element factor by operator
 = '8' for element factor by inspector
 = '9' for fissile isotope factor by operator
 = '0' for fissile isotope factor by inspector

P.79 - P.80 : Type of the input form, (A2)
 ='EI'

Completion of Form SI-1

P. 1 - P. 4 : Report No., integer number (I4)

P. 5 - P. 7 : Stratum No., (I3)

P. 8 - P.11 : MBA code, character type (A4)

P.12 : KMP code, (A1)

P.13 - P.16 : Material description, (A4)

P.17 - P.24 : Name of stratum, (A8)

P.25 - P.30 : Number of items in the stratum, (I6)

P.31 - P.32 : Method for defining the quantities of nuclear material, (I2).

If no datum is given on a parameter such as weighing, element factor or fissile isotope factor, that parameter is automatically set to one.

= 1 for wef , where w , e and f denote weight, element factor and fissile isotope factor, respectively.

= 2 for $w\bar{e}\bar{f}$, where \bar{f} means the mean value of f .

= 3 for $w\bar{e}f$

= 4 for $w\bar{e}\bar{f}$

= 5 for $w\bar{e}\bar{f}$

= 6 for $w\bar{e}\bar{f}$

= 7 for $w\bar{e}\bar{f}$

= 8 for $w\bar{e}\bar{f}$

P.33 - P.72 : Numbers of samples taken for the measurements by operator and inspector, (10I4), given for each measurement as follows:

P.33 - P.36 : weighing by operator

P.37 - P.40 : weighing by inspector

P.41 - P.44 : volume measurement by operator

P.45 - P.48 : volume measurement by inspector

P.49 - P.52 : density measurement by operator

P.53 - P.56 : density measurement by inspector

P.57 - P.60 : element factor by operator

P.61 - P.64 : element factor by inspector

P.65 - P.68 : fissile isotope factor by operator

P.69 - P.72 : fissile isotope factor by inspector

P.73 - P.77 : not used, blank (5X)

P.78 : Stratum data No., (A1)

= '1'

P.79 - P.80 : Type of the input form, (A2)

= 'SI'

Completion of Form SI-2

P. 1 - P. 4 : Report No., integer number (I4)

P. 5 - P. 7 : Stratum No., (I3)

P. 8 - P.11 : MBA code, character type (A4)

P.12 - P.41 : Number of the measurement technique used in the stratum, (10I3), given for each measurement as follows. If the value is given, the corresponding measurement errors are taken into account in the \hat{D} statistics whether the paired data are given or not.

P.12 - P.14 : weighing by operator

P.15 - P.17 : weighing by inspector

P.18 - P.20 : volume measurement by operator

P.21 - P.23 : volume measurement by inspector

P.24 - P.26 : density measurement by operator

P.27 - P.29 : density measurement by inspector

P.30 - P.32 : element factor by operator

P.33 - P.35 : element factor by inspector

P.36 - P.38 : fissile isotope factor by operator

P.39 - P.41 : fissile isotope factor by inspector

P.42 - P.76 : Combined random error variances of the measurements by the operator and inspector, real number (5E7.0), given for the following measurements:

P.42 - P.48 : weighing

P.49 - P.55 : volume measurement

P.56 - P.62 : density measurement

P.63 - P.69 : element factor

P.70 - P.76 : fissile isotope factor

P.77 : not used, blank (1X)

P.78 : Stratum data No., (A1)

= '2'

P.79 - P.80 : Type of the input form, (A2)

= 'SI'

Completion of Form SI-3

- P. 1 - P. 4 : Report No., integer number (I4)
 P. 5 - P. 7 : Stratum No., (I3)
 P. 8 - P.11 : MBA code, character type (A4)
 P.12 : not used, blank (1X)
 P.13 - P.24 : Total weight of nuclear material in the stratum. If no datum is given on the weighing as the paired data, the value given here is used for the \hat{D} statistics.
 P.25 - P.36 : Total volume of nuclear material in the stratum
 P.37 - P.48 : Average density over the stratum
 P.49 - P.60 : Average element factor over the stratum. If no datum is given on the element factor as the paired data, the value given here is used for the \hat{D} statistics.
 P.61 - P.72 : Average fissile isotope factor over the stratum. If no datum is given on the fissile isotope factor, the value given here is used for the \hat{D} statistics.
 P.73 - P.77 : not used, blank (5X)
 P.78 : Stratum data No., (A1)
 ='3'
 P.79 - P.80 : Type of the input form, (A2)
 ='SI'

Completion of Form PI

- P. 1 - P. 4 : Report No., integer number (I4)
 P. 5 - P. 8 : Entry No., (I4)
 P. 9 - P.11 : Stratum No., (I3)
 P.12 - P.15 : MBACode, character type (A4)
 P.16 : Continuation code, (A1), for future use
 P.17 : Element code, (A1)
 ='D' for depleted uranium
 ='N' for natural uranium
 ='E' for enriched uranium
 ='P' for plutonium
 ='T' for thorium
 P.18 - P.77 : Paired data for each of the measurements, real number (6E10.0), given as follows, and repeated in the same format if more than six items are measured:
 P.18 - P.27 : amount of weight, volume, density, element

factor or fissile isotope factor by operator
or by inspector for the first item

P.28 - P.37 : amount for the second item

P.38 - P.47 : amount for the third item

P.48 - P.57 : amount for the fourth item

P.58 - P.67 : amount for the fifth item

P.68 - P.77 : amount for the sixth item

P.78 : Type of the measurement, (A1)

= '1' for weighing by operator

= '2' for weighing by inspector

= '3' for volume measurement by operator

= '4' for volume measurement by inspector

= '5' for density measurement by operator

= '6' for density measurement by inspector

= '7' for element factor by operator

= '8' for element factor by inspector

= '9' for fissile isotope factor by operator

= '0' for fissile isotope factor by inspector

P.79 - P.80 : Type of the input form, (A2)

= 'PI'

5. SAMPLE INPUT AND OUTPUT

Table 1 shows the sample data which were obtained in the course of the verification activities on the physical inventory at the Fast Critical Assembly (FCA) of JAERI. The measurements on the side of the audit team consist of the weighing of nuclear material by a scale and the non-destructive measurement by a high resolution gamma ray spectrometry for the determination of fissile isotope content. The element factor was not measured, but it is assumed that the factor is one without any measurement errors. The variable measurement data in Table 1 are analyzed here.

The input data to the system run by a FACOM 230-75 computer are given in Table 2.

Table 3 shows the sample output from the system after the input has been processed.

The first line of the output is the input title to the INS program. Following the line, input data are printed out without any modifications to the data, so that this output is convenient to the user to check his input data.

Following the output from the INS program, the output from the INFR program is given. The first line is also the input title to the program. In the next line, PROBLEM NO. corresponds to the material category number, so that the analysis on each material begins from this line. The analysis is carried out on the measurement of weight, measurement of element factor and measurement of isotope factor in this order, so that the next line is MEASUREMENT OF WEIGHT. Following the line, MBA code and KMP code are given for identification of the job. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAIRED DATA SETS corresponds to that of the stratum.

INFERENCE ABOUT MEAN DIFFERENCE is now indifferent option. LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE (ALPHA) APPLIED FOR HYPOTHESIS TEST H01, H02, H03, H04 AND H05 are given by input. For the H_{06} test, α for H_{02} is used. RANDOM AND SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCES ASSIGNED BY SHIPPER (or Operator) AND RECEIVER (or Inspector) are given by input for each group which corresponds to each stratum. Here, SUM is a given value or the sum of the shipper's and receiver's error variances unless a special value for SUM is given in input.

LIST OF MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT NUMBERS is given by input for each stratum. SHIPPER AND RECEIVER DATA are the paired data given by input. Here, DIFFERENCE is a simple difference (S-R) or a % difference $((S-R)/S*100)$ according to the input option.

The message of INPUT DATA SHOULD BE ANALYZED WITHOUT THEIR RE-ARRANGEMENT is now indifferent because such test as judging the order of the paired data is not performed in this system and because always this statement appears.

NUMBER OF GROUPS means the number of strata in the material.

BOUNDARY NUMBER means the upper boundary number of each groups or strata. In the NUMBER OF DATA INCLUDED IN EACH GROUP, the first line is the group number and the second one is the number of paired data included in each group.

In the SHIPPER AND RECEIVER DATA AFTER RE-ARRANGEMENT, the paired data are re-arranged in increasing order of the receiver's values.

The PLOTTING OF SHIPPER-RECEIVER DIFFERENCES gives a bird's eye view over the differences between paired data.

The first diagram gives the shipper-receiver differences (S-R or $(S-R)/S*100$ according to the input option) versus each paired datum in the order of input data by dividing the differences into 20 groups from the maximum positive difference to the maximum negative difference. The figures on the left side show the group number in which the group of zero-differences is adjusted to 0. The figures on the right side column show the center value of each group. In the second diagram, the receiver's values are divided into 100 groups from the maximum value to the minimum value.

The shipper-receiver differences are plotted versus these groups. In the diagram, * denotes one point, 2, 3 and 4 denote two-, three-, and four-fold multiple points, respectively, and x denotes more than four-fold multiple points. From these two diagrams, it is easily found out how big the differences are, how the distribution of these differences is and how about the distribution of the receiver's values.

According to the number of strata which belong to the same material category, statistical inferences of random and systematic error variances are made as a single group or multi-groups. Both treatments are similar, so that we give some explanations to the case of multi-groups according to the sample output.

STATISTICAL INFERENCE ON PAIRED DATA SETS WITH MULTI-GROUP is the begin-

ning statement on the inferences. The paired data are printed out for each stratum, and sample averages, variances and covariances are calculated and printed out for each stratum. Here, AVS and AVR are the shipper's and the receiver's sample average, respectively, and SS2 and SR2 are the shipper's and the receiver's variances, respectively.

On hypothesis testings, descriptions are given in Section 3. However, it should be noted that VRSE, VRRE, VRXE, VSSE and VSRE correspond to σ_{r0}^2 , σ_{rI}^2 , σ_{μ}^2 , σ_{s0}^2 and σ_{sI}^2 , respectively, and VRS, VRR, VRM and VSM correspond to $\sigma_{\varepsilon0}^2$, $\sigma_{\varepsilon I}^2$, σ_{rm}^2 and σ_{sm}^2 , respectively.

In the H_{05} testing, SIG-D, AL, NOTR and RJCT denote σ_d , α , NOT REJECTED and REJECTED, respectively.

Finally, estimates of the random error variances for each measurement method are printed out. Here, WEI is given 1, 2 or 3 according to whether the measurement is for weight, element factor or fissile isotope factor, respectively.

The similar output described above is obtained for the measurement of element factor and for the measurement of fissile isotope factor. If the measurement is not performed, only the title is printed out.

These outputs are repeatedly printed out for each material category.

The output from the program INVR is started from the input title to this program. VARIABLES PAIRED COMPARISONS is one of the titles of the sub-functions of the program, but it always appears in this system because the other sub-functions are not used. ALPHA and BETA are given by input. CASE NO. corresponds to the number of the material category. ORG. CODE, FAC. CODE, MBA CODE, DATE OF INS. REPORT and INS. REPORT NO. are all given by input. INVENTORY VERIFICATION DATA is a title always printed out. STRATA, SCALES, ANAL.S and NDAS refer to numbers of strata, scales, analysis methods and NDAs, respectively. MEASUREMENT-ERROR COEFFICIENTS OF VERIFICATION denotes whether the kind of measurement error is coefficients of variation or standard deviations depending on input data. SYSTEMATIC means the systematic errors which are given by input. RANDOM,DESIGN and RANDOM, ESTIMATE mean the random errors given by input and the random errors estimated in the INFR program, respectively. MATERIAL CODE is given by input. In SAMPLE SIZE, numbers of samples to be measured in each stratum are given for weight, element factor and fissile isotope factor for operator

and for inspector. In MEASUREMENT, scale numbers, analysis method numbers and NDA numbers to be used in each stratum are given for operator and for inspector. In this column, STRATUM refers to the stratum number, MATERIAL refers to the MBA code, KMP code and material description in this order, ITEM refers to the number of items, and METHOD refers to the method number. In the next column, OP. WEIGHT and INS. WEIGHT refer to the weights measured by operator and by inspector, respectively. OP. E FACTOR and INS. E FACTOR refer to the element factors measured by operator and by inspector, respectively. OP. I FACTOR and INS. I FACTOR refer to the fissile isotope factors of operator and of inspector, respectively. These values are average values over each stratum and give the DIFFERENCE according to the method number. RESULTS OF CALCULATIONS gives values to the parameters described in Section 3.4.

Finally the decision whether \hat{D} is equal to zero or not is statistically given and the attained goal quantity is printed out with the critical value which gives a rejection criterion of the \hat{D} being the quantity when \hat{D} is not equal to zero.

The output is repeated for each material category.

6. ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE OUTPUT

Sample input was prepared from the data obtained in the course of the physical inventory taking at the Fast Critical Assembly of JAERI. The operator's data are based on the shipper's values. On the other hand, the inspector's data are based on measurements made by inspectors during the inspection. All nuclear materials have plate type fixed shapes with several types of quantities which were manufactured under a high quality control. Number of samples was decided based on the sampling plan in which a stratification was made for each type of plates, the goal quantity was set to 8 Kg Pu, α and β were both set to 5 %, the maximum defection rate for variable testing was set to 30 %, and the design values were used to the random and systematic errors. The samples were randomly picked up and were measured by scales for deciding sample weights and by a high resolution gamma ray spectrometry for deciding quantities of their fissile isotopes.

On the measurement of sample weights, the plotting of operator-inspector differences given in Table 3 shows a good result of consistency except for one point in which 0.3 % discrepancy is found. This discrepancy, however, is not significant because it does not exceed the critical value of $4\sigma_d$ (4×0.2 %) which was obtained based on the design value.

The result of the hypothesis testings shows that the random and systematic error variances observed are less than those given as design values. This means that the measurement on weighing was satisfactorily made by both operator and inspector independently, and that any falsification on measurement errors is not found out.

Measurement of element factors was not performed and it was only assumed that the factors would be unit. However, it is considered that the quantity of Pu would be deduced from the measurement of fissile isotopes which was made by comparing the intensity of gamma ray emitted by fissile isotopes of the sample to that of a standard sample, if the sample thickness is within a suitable range. Therefore, the measurement of fissile isotope factors is important.

On the measurement of fissile isotope factors, the maximum difference between operator's and inspector's values is 2 %. This discrepancy is not significant because it is within the critical value of $4\sigma_d$ (4×1 %) which

was obtained based on the design value.

The result of the hypothesis testings shows that the average random error variance of inspector is slightly greater than that designated. This happens because nominal or average values appear in the operator's data and then because the variance of the true fissile isotope factors of the samples is added to the inspector's random error variance. However, since the combined random error variance is smaller, it is concluded that the measurement on fissile isotope factors was satisfactorily made by both side and that any falsification on measurement errors does not exist.

The difference between operator's and inspector's inventories estimated is about 0.5 Kg fissile Pu. This value is statistically judged as being zero, that is the operator's inventory record has been verified. The attained goal quantity is 4.9 Kg fissile Pu. The value obtained by converting this value to Kg Pu unit is less than the target goal quantity of 8 Kg Pu, so that the inspection intensity was sufficient to verify the physical inventory of the FCA.

7. CONCLUSION

A comprehensive subsystem for safeguards information treatment has been developed. In this system, inventory/flow data of an operator can be verified based on the paired comparison method by testing measurement errors and by analyzing the statistic \hat{D} .

Implementation of safeguards requires special procedures to the safeguards information system reflecting the actual situation on the site of a facility. Our system described in the preceding sections has a few special features. For example, nominal values or average values are acceptable as the paired data as well as measured data. One or two kinds of measurements, e.g. weighing only, is also acceptable to the \hat{D} statistics analysis. The system, however, should be improved on a run by run basis in order to correspond with the actual situation.

Another feature of our system is that the consistency between the inspection planning and the inspection verification is maintained from the point of view of the safeguards concept. That is, a procedure for inspection planning is beforehand defined and the verification is carried out on that thoughts on which the inspection planning is based.

We have established a total system of safeguards information treatment named NPT-JAPAN^{4,5)}. This system, however, cooperates with an ideal situation, so that it is often difficult to treat with actual cases. We are now improving the system on a subsystem by subsystem basis. After these works, we will re-construct the system with more efficiency and with more perfectness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are thankful to Mr. H. Yoshida, chief of FBR Designing Laboratory, for his support to the study.

REFERENCES

- 1) Jaech, J.L.: Statistical Methods in Nuclear Material Control, TID-26298 (1973).
- 2) Hough, C.G., Schneider, R.A., Stewart, K.B., Jaech, J.L., and Bennett, C.A.: Example of Verification and Acceptance of Operator Data - Low Enriched Uranium Fabrication, BNWL-1852 (August 1974).
- 3) Hough, C.G., and Beetle, T.M.: Statistical Methods for Planning of Inspections, International Symposium on the Safeguarding of Nuclear Materials, IAEA-SM-201/99 (October 1975).
- 4) Kurihara, H., Haginoya, T., Natsume, H., Hirata, M., and Kawashima, Y.: Present Status and Development of Japan's Safeguards System, IAEA-CN-36/173 (May 1977).
- 5) Miyasaka, S., Koreki, S., Nishimura, H., Ikawa, K., Hirata, M., and Takeda, S.: Experience at Japan in Complying with IAEA Data Reporting Requirement, IAEA Safeguards Workshop Seminar (September 1978).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are thankful to Mr. H. Yoshida, chief of FBR Designing Laboratory, for his support to the study.

REFERENCES

- 1) Jaech, J.L.: Statistical Methods in Nuclear Material Control, TID-26298 (1973).
- 2) Hough, C.G., Schneider, R.A., Stewart, K.B., Jaech, J.L., and Bennett, C.A.: Example of Verification and Acceptance of Operator Data - Low Enriched Uranium Fabrication, BNWL-1852 (August 1974).
- 3) Hough, C.G., and Beetle, T.M.: Statistical Methods for Planning of Inspections, International Symposium on the Safeguarding of Nuclear Materials, IAEA-SM-201/99 (October 1975).
- 4) Kurihara, H., Haginoya, T., Natsume, H., Hirata, M., and Kawashima, Y.: Present Status and Development of Japan's Safeguards System, IAEA-CN-36/173 (May 1977).
- 5) Miyasaka, S., Koreki, S., Nishimura, H., Ikawa, K., Hirata, M., and Takeda, S.: Experience at Japan in Complying with IAEA Data Reporting Requirement, IAEA Safeguards Workshop Seminar (September 1978).

TABLE 1 LISTING OF THE DATA MEASURED DURING THE FCA PIT AND THE CORRESPONDING BOOK VALUES

MATE RIAL STRATUM NO.	ITEM NO.	WEIGHT BOOK ATT./VAR.	FISSILE ISOTOPE FACTOR BOOK ATT.	FISSILE ISOTOPE FACTOR AUDIT VAR.	MATE RIAL STRATUM NO.	ITEM NO.	WEIGHT BOOK ATT./VAR.	FISSILE ISOTOPE FACTOR BOOK ATT.	FISSILE ISOTOPE FACTOR AUDIT VAR.
PU92 2-4-1/16	1	92,129	92,131	0,91968 0,91891 0,91348	PU92 2-4-1/16	26	91,600	91,605	0,92000 0,91238 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	2	91,879	91,882	0,91790 0,91413 0,92041	PU92 2-4-1/16	27	91,420	91,424	0,92000 0,90880 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	3	91,959	91,962	0,91886 0,91385 0,92346	PU92 2-4-1/16	28	92,010	92,012	0,91862 0,92911 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	4	92,393	92,397	0,91889 0,93279 0,92020	PU92 2-4-1/16	29	91,500	91,503	0,92000 0,90209 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	5	91,360	91,363	0,92000 0,91643 0,92225	PU92 2-4-1/16	30	91,040	91,044	0,92000 0,91100 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	6	92,400	92,401	0,91706 0,91762 0,91744	PU92 2-4-1/16	31	91,390	91,395	0,92000 0,91413 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	7	92,452	92,453	0,91790 0,92543 0,91602	PU92 2-4-1/16	32	92,260	92,261	0,91687 0,90613 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	8	92,467	92,471	0,91768 0,92727 0,92438	PU92 2-4-1/16	33	92,400	92,402	0,91862 0,92350 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	9	92,146	92,164	0,91834 0,92543 0,92116	PU92 2-4-1/16	34	91,500	91,497	0,92000 0,90852 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	10	91,690	91,694	0,92000 0,92268 0,91928	PU92 2-4-1/16	35	92,312	92,328	0,91864 0,92065 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	11	91,510	91,516	0,92000 0,91441 0,92206	PU92 2-4-1/16	36	92,132	92,134	0,91935 0,91624 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	12	92,062	92,064	0,91855 0,91542 0,92585	PU92 2-4-1/16	37	91,778	91,780	0,91913 0,90191 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	13	92,341	92,362	0,91847 0,91918 0,92412	PU92 2-4-1/16	38	92,565	92,568	0,91875 0,92571 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	14	91,350	91,353	0,92000 0,90834 0,91762	PU92 2-4-1/16	39	92,049	92,053	0,91790 0,89740 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	15	91,547	91,548	0,91887 0,90365 0,91234	PU92 2-4-1/16	40	91,490	91,494	0,92000 0,92479 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	16	91,130	91,131	0,92000 0,90044 0,0	PU92 2-4-1/16	41	91,610	91,615	0,92000 0,91395 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	17	92,235	92,233	0,91887 0,93159 0,0	PU92 2-4-1/16	42	91,320	91,322	0,92000 0,91229 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	18	92,106	92,108	0,91875 0,92268 0,0	PU92 2-4-1/16	43	91,490	91,494	0,92000 0,91845 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	19	92,174	92,174	0,91855 0,91376 0,0	PU92 2-4-1/16	44	91,690	91,691	0,92000 0,91303 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	20	92,151	92,151	0,91859 0,92608 0,0	PU92 2-4-1/16	45	91,540	91,547	0,92000 0,89915 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	21	91,330	91,334	0,92000 0,91303 0,0	PU92 2-4-1/16	46	91,806	91,806	0,92000 0,91744 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	22	91,330	91,327	0,92000 0,90623 0,0	PU92 2-4-1/16	47	92,001	92,000	0,91859 0,91753 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	23	92,262	92,277	0,91724 0,91505 0,0	PU92 2-4-1/16	48	91,690	91,695	0,92000 0,90705 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	24	91,790	91,797	0,92000 0,90531 0,0	PU92 2-4-1/16	49	91,530	91,527	0,92000 0,90999 0,0
PU92 2-4-1/16	25	92,125	92,128	0,91734 0,92240 0,0					
PU92 2-2-1/16	1	46,140	46,136	0,91930 0,91579 0,91274	PU92 2-2-1/16	20	45,860	45,854	0,91930 0,87430 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	2	45,890	45,890	0,91930 0,91441 0,91524	PU92 2-2-1/16	21	46,280	46,284	0,92000 0,87063 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	3	46,300	46,299	0,91930 0,91790 0,90554	PU92 2-2-1/16	22	46,280	46,284	0,91930 0,87742 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	4	46,260	46,258	0,92000 0,92056 0,92430	PU92 2-2-1/16	23	46,095	46,100	0,91930 0,86925 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	5	46,140	46,004	0,91930 0,92249 0,90920	PU92 2-2-1/16	24	46,130	46,128	0,92000 0,88614 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	6	46,010	46,015	0,91930 0,91689 0,91370	PU92 2-2-1/16	25	45,900	45,904	0,91930 0,86898 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	7	46,220	46,217	0,91930 0,92460 0,92610	PU92 2-2-1/16	26	45,980	45,980	0,91930 0,86879 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	8	46,280	46,285	0,92000 0,92726 0,91787	PU92 2-2-1/16	27	45,950	45,947	0,91930 0,87614 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	9	46,170	46,172	0,91930 0,92148 0,91369	PU92 2-2-1/16	28	45,960	45,948	0,91930 0,88073 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	10	45,960	45,953	0,91930 0,91597 0,91331	PU92 2-2-1/16	29	46,140	46,136	0,91930 0,85034 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	11	45,930	45,929	0,91930 0,92120 0,91194	PU92 2-2-1/16	30	46,210	46,208	0,92000 0,86264 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	12	46,010	46,011	0,92000 0,87357 0,0	PU92 2-2-1/16	31	46,350	46,350	0,91930 0,91542 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	13	45,800	45,795	0,91930 0,89312 0,0	PU92 2-2-1/16	32	46,190	46,187	0,91930 0,88173 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	14	46,060	46,059	0,91930 0,89477 0,0	PU92 2-2-1/16	33	45,880	45,884	0,91930 0,89899 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	15	46,370	46,367	0,91930 0,89348 0,0	PU92 2-2-1/16	34	45,950	45,946	0,91930 0,87953 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	16	46,000	45,999	0,92000 0,87136 0,0	PU92 2-2-1/16	35	45,960	45,950	0,91930 0,87678 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	17	45,930	45,930	0,91930 0,88091 0,0	PU92 2-2-1/16	36	45,880	45,880	0,91920 0,88412 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	18	46,310	46,308	0,91930 0,89817 0,0	PU92 2-2-1/16	37	46,328	46,328	0,91930 0,90560 0,0
PU92 2-2-1/16	19	45,810	45,811	0,91930 0,88036 0,0	PU92 2-2-1/16	38	46,146	46,152	0,91970 0,86769 0,0

TABLE 1 LISTING OF THE DATA MEASURED DURING THE FCA PIT AND THE CORRESPONDING BOOK VALUES

MATE RIAL	ITEM STRATUM NO.	WEIGHT BOOK	AUDIT ATT./VAR.	FISSILE ISOTOPE FACTOR BOOK	AUDIT ATT. VAR.	MATE RIAL	ITEM STRATUM NO.	WEIGHT BOOK	AUDIT ATT./VAR.	FISSILE ISOTOPE FACTOR BOOK	AUDIT ATT. VAR.				
PU92	2-1-1/16	1	22,365	22,371	0.91788	0.93818	0.91845	PU92	2-1-1/16	3	22,396	22,401	0.91834	0.91834	0.92277
PU92	2-1-1/16	2	22,351	22,354	0.91760	0.93441	0.91298	PU92	EX221/16	3	39,379	39,391	0.91996	0.91812	0.91669
PU92	EX221/16	1	39,381	39,395	0.91996	0.91996	0.92403	PU92	EX221/16	3	39,379	39,391	0.91996	0.91812	0.91669
PU92	EX221/16	2	39,554	39,566	0.91822	0.92382	0.92107	PU92	EX221/16	3	39,379	39,391	0.91996	0.91812	0.91669
PU81	2-2-1/16	1	51,690	51,693	0.81300	0.81300	0.80807	PU81	2-2-1/16	7	51,600	51,599	0.81300	0.81641	0.0
PU81	2-2-1/16	2	51,530	51,530	0.81300	0.81235	0.82080	PU81	2-2-1/16	8	51,610	51,613	0.81300	0.80251	0.0
PU81	2-2-1/16	3	51,360	51,361	0.81300	0.81032	0.80192	PU81	2-2-1/16	9	51,690	51,693	0.81300	0.82723	0.0
PU81	2-2-1/16	4	51,540	51,542	0.81330	0.81633	0.0	PU81	2-2-1/16	10	51,710	51,716	0.81300	0.78544	0.0
PU81	2-2-1/16	5	51,420	51,421	0.81309	0.81292	0.0	PU81	2-2-1/16	11	51,480	51,484	0.81300	0.81202	0.0
PU81	2-2-1/16	6	51,760	51,760	0.81300	0.82755	0.0	PU81	2-2-1/16	11	51,480	51,484	0.81300	0.81202	0.0
PU81	2-1-1/16	1	26,340	26,339	0.81300	0.81300	0.82325	PU81	2-1-1/16	3	26,350	26,354	0.81300	0.81170	0.79745
PU81	2-1-1/16	2	26,470	26,465	0.81300	0.81178	0.80702	PU81	2-1-1/16	3	26,350	26,354	0.81300	0.81170	0.79745
PU75	2-2-1/16	1	54,470	54,471	0.75690	0.75682	0.75305	PU75	2-2-1/16	7	54,490	54,495	0.75690	0.77688	0.0
PU75	2-2-1/16	2	54,560	54,570	0.75690	0.75962	0.74843	PU75	2-2-1/16	8	54,320	54,320	0.75690	0.75826	0.0
PU75	2-2-1/16	3	54,770	54,774	0.75690	0.75910	0.77064	PU75	2-2-1/16	9	54,570	54,575	0.75690	0.76825	0.0
PU75	2-2-1/16	4	54,320	54,321	0.75690	0.75675	0.0	PU75	2-2-1/16	10	54,590	54,589	0.75690	0.77257	0.0
PU75	2-2-1/16	5	54,500	54,507	0.75690	0.76462	0.0	PU75	2-2-1/16	11	54,500	54,502	0.75690	0.75455	0.0
PU75	2-2-1/16	6	54,540	54,540	0.75690	0.75970	0.0	PU75	2-2-1/16	11	54,500	54,502	0.75690	0.75455	0.0

Table 2 Sample Input for FACOM 230-75 except for \$NO, \$GJOB and \$JEND cards

.....1.....*.....2.....*.....3.....*.....4.....*.....5.....*.....6.....*.....7.....*.....8

T,2/TIME 1M
 C,2/CORE 128
 W,2/PAGE 160
 P.0/PCH 0

*DLIEDRUN RFNAME=J2417,NPTJ2

*DISK F25

*DISK F26

*DISK F30

*DATA

FCA PIT EVALUATION, 1978-09-28 H,NISHIMURA

INS

1										
JAERFCA	FCA	780925	1	71	1	1	1	12	H,NISHIMURA	MI
1	1	FCA	0,001		0,001					1E1
1	2	FCA	0,001		0,001					2E1
1	3	FCA	0,005		0,005					9E1
1	4	FCA	0,005		0,005					0E1
1	1FCA	VPU922-4-1/16			1	15	15		15 15	1S1
1	1FCA	1 1					1 1			2S1
1	1FCA							0,919065		3S1
1	1	1FCA	P92,129		91,879	91,959	92,393	91,360	92,400	1P1
1	2	1FCA	P92,452		92,467	92,146	91,690	91,510	92,062	1P1
1	3	1FCA	P92,341		91,350	91,547	91,130	92,235	92,106	1P1
1	10	1FCA	P92,131		91,882	91,962	92,397	91,363	92,401	2P1
1	11	1FCA	P92,453		92,431	92,164	91,694	91,516	92,064	2P1
1	12	1FCA	P92,362		91,353	91,548	91,131	92,233	92,108	2P1
1	19	1FCA	P,91968		,91790	,91886	,91889	,92000	,91706	9P1
1	20	1FCA	P,91790		,91768	,91834	,92000	,92000	,91855	9P1
1	21	1FCA	P,91847		,92000	,91887	,92000	,91887	,91875	9P1
1	28	1FCA	P,9134760		,9204053	,9234643	,9201966	,9222490	,9174424	0P1
1	29	1FCA	P,9160187		,9243826	,9211609	,9192842	,9220565	,9258536	0P1
1	30	1FCA	P,9241209		,9176248	,9129363	,90044	,93159	,92268	0P1
1	2FCA	VPU922-2-1/16			1	11	11		11 11	1S1
1	2FCA	1 1					1 1			2S1
1	2FCA							0,919276		3S1
1	1	2FCA	P46,14		45,89	46,30	46,26	46,14	46,01	1P1
1	2	2FCA	P46,22		46,28	46,17	45,96	45,93	46,01	1P1
1	8	2FCA	P46,136		45,890	46,299	46,258	46,004	46,015	2P1
1	9	2FCA	P46,217		46,285	46,172	45,953	45,929	46,011	2P1
1	15	2FCA	P,9193		,9193	,9193	,9200	,9193	,9193	9P1
1	16	2FCA	P,9193		,9200	,9193	,9193	,9193	,9200	9P1
1	22	2FCA	P,9127403		,9152388	,9055415	,9243034	,9092007	,9137022	0P1
1	23	2FCA	P,9261045		,9178689	,9136857	,9133125	,9119421	,87357	0P1
1	3FCA	VPU922-1-1/16			1	3	3		3 3	1S1
1	3FCA	1 1					1 1			2S1
1	3FCA							0,918180		3S1
1	1	3FCA	P22,365		22,351	22,396				1P1
1	2	3FCA	P22,371		22,354	22,401				2P1
1	3	3FCA	P,91788		,91760	,91834				9P1
1	4	3FCA	P,9184465		,9129824	,9227683				0P1

Table 2 Sample Input for FACOM 230-75 (continued)

.....*.....1.....*.....2.....*.....3.....*.....4.....*.....5.....*.....6.....*.....7.....*.....8

1	4FCA	VPU92EX221/16		1	3	3				3	3	1SI	
1	4FCA	1 1				1	1					2SI	
1	4FCA									0,918585		3SI	
1	1	4FCA	P39,381	39,554	39,379							1PI	
1	2	4FCA	P39,395	39,566	39,391							2PI	
1	3	4FCA	P,91996	,91822	,91996							9PI	
1	4	4FCA	P,9240254	,9210650	,9166867							0PI	
1	5FCA	VPU812-2-1/16		1	3	3					3	3	1SI
1	5FCA	1 1				1	1						2SI
1	5FCA									0,813052			3SI
1	1	5FCA	P51,69	51,53	51,36	51,42		51,76		51,61			1PI
1	3	5FCA	P51,693	51,530	51,361	51,421		51,760		51,613			2PI
1	5	5FCA	P,8130	,8130	,8130	,8133		,8130		,8130			9PI
1	7	5FCA	P,8080739	,8207983	,8019171	,81292		,82755		,80251			0PI
1	6FCA	VPU812-1-1/16		1	3	3					3	3	1SI
1	6FCA	1 1				1	1						2SI
1	6FCA									0,813117			3SI
1	1	6FCA	P26,34	26,47	26,35								1PI
1	2	6FCA	P26,339	26,465	26,354								2PI
1	3	6FCA	P,8130	,8130	,8130								9PI
1	4	6FCA	P,8232547	,8070166	,7974462								0PI
1	7FCA	VPU752-2-1/16		1	3	3					3	3	1SI
1	7FCA	1 1				1	1						2SI
1	7FCA									0,756924			3SI
1	1	7FCA	P54,47	54,56	54,77	54,32		54,50		54,54			1PI
1	3	7FCA	P54,471	54,570	54,774	54,321		54,507		54,540			2PI
1	5	7FCA	P,7569	,7569	,7569	,7569		,7569		,7569			9PI
1	7	7FCA	P,7530507	,7484269	,7706416	,75675		,76462		,75970			0PI
FCA PIT EVALUATION, 1978-09-28 H.NISHIMURA										INFR			
FULL													
1													
0,05		0,05		0,05		0,05		0,05		0,05			
FCA PIT EVALUATION, 1978-09-28 H.NISHIMURA										INVR			
3 1													
0,05													

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

1	6FCA	VP0812-1-1/16	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	151	0.0	0.0	251
1	6FCA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	351	0.0	0.0	251
1	6FCA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	351	0.0	0.0	251
1	6FCA	P 2.63400E+01	2.64700E+01	2.63500E+01	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	351	0.0	0.0	251
1	2	6FCA	P 2.63340E+01	2.64650E+01	2.63540E+01	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	351	0.0	0.0	251
1	3	6FCA	P 8.13000E-01	8.13000E-01	8.13000E-01	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	351	0.0	0.0	251
1	4	6FCA	P 6.23255E-01	6.07017E-01	7.97446E-01	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	351	0.0	0.0	251
1	7FCA	VP0752-2-1/16	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	151	0.0	0.0	251
1	7FCA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	351	0.0	0.0	251
1	7FCA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	351	0.0	0.0	251
1	1	7FCA	P 5.44700E+01	5.45600E+01	5.47700E+01	5.43200E+01	5.43200E+01	5.43200E+01	5.43200E+01	5.43200E+01	5.43200E+01	5.45000E+01	5.45400E+01	351	0.0	0.0	251
1	3	7FCA	P 5.44710E+01	5.45700E+01	5.47740E+01	5.43210E+01	5.43210E+01	5.43210E+01	5.43210E+01	5.43210E+01	5.43210E+01	5.45070E+01	5.45400E+01	351	0.0	0.0	251
1	5	7FCA	P 7.56900E-01	7.56900E-01	7.56900E-01	7.56900E-01	7.56900E-01	7.56900E-01	7.56900E-01	7.56900E-01	7.56900E-01	7.56900E-01	7.56900E-01	351	0.0	0.0	251
1	7	7FCA	P 7.53031E-01	7.48427E-01	7.70642E-01	7.56750E-01	7.56750E-01	7.56750E-01	7.56750E-01	7.56750E-01	7.56750E-01	7.56750E-01	7.59700E-01	351	0.0	0.0	251

FCA PIT EVALUATION, 1978-09-28 H.NISHIMURA

INFR

***** PROBLEM NO. 1 *****

MEASUREMENT OF WEIGHT
MBA CODE NO. FCA KMP CODE NO. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAIRED DATA SETS = 41 INFERENCE ABOUT MEAN DIFFERENCE = 1
LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE (ALPHA) APPLIED FOR HYPOTHESIS TEST, H01, H02, H03, H04 AND H05
0.50000E-01 0.50000E-01 0.50000E-01 0.50000E-01

RANDOM AND SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCES ASSIGNED BY SHIPPER (OPERATOR) AND RECEIVER (INSPECTOR)

GROUP NO.	SHIPPER	RECEIVER	SUM
1	0.1000E-05	0.1000E-05	0.2000E-05
2	0.1000E-05	0.1000E-05	0.2000E-05
3	0.1000E-05	0.1000E-05	0.2000E-05
4	0.1000E-05	0.1000E-05	0.2000E-05
5	0.1000E-05	0.1000E-05	0.2000E-05
6	0.1000E-05	0.1000E-05	0.2000E-05

Table 3. Sample Output (continued)

		GROUP NO. 7		SHIPPER		RECEIVER		SUM	
		RANDOM ERROR VARIANCE		0.1000E-05		0.1000E-05		0.2000E-05	
		SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE		0.1000E-05		0.1000E-05			
LIST OF MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT NUMBERS									
GROUP	1	SCALE NO.	OF OPERATOR	1	SCALE NO.	OF INSPECTOR	2		
GROUP	2	SCALE NO.	OF OPERATOR	1	SCALE NO.	OF INSPECTOR	2		
GROUP	3	SCALE NO.	OF OPERATOR	1	SCALE NO.	OF INSPECTOR	2		
GROUP	4	SCALE NO.	OF OPERATOR	1	SCALE NO.	OF INSPECTOR	2		
GROUP	5	SCALE NO.	OF OPERATOR	1	SCALE NO.	OF INSPECTOR	2		
GROUP	6	SCALE NO.	OF OPERATOR	1	SCALE NO.	OF INSPECTOR	2		
GROUP	7	SCALE NO.	OF OPERATOR	1	SCALE NO.	OF INSPECTOR	2		
SHIPPER AND RECEIVER DATA									
SHIPPER	1	9	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
RECEIVER	0.921290E+02	0.918790E+02	0.919590E+02	0.923930E+02	0.923410E+02	0.913600E+02	0.924000E+02	0.924520E+02	0.924670E+02
DIFFERENCE	0.921310E+02	0.918820E+02	0.919620E+02	0.923970E+02	0.913630E+02	0.924010E+02	0.924530E+02	0.924530E+02	0.924310E+02
	-0.217175E-02	-0.326545E-02	-0.326261E-02	-0.432902E-02	-0.432840E-02	-0.108166E-02	-0.108105E-02	-0.108105E-02	0.389320E-01
SHIPPER	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
RECEIVER	0.921460E+02	0.916900E+02	0.915100E+02	0.920620E+02	0.923410E+02	0.913500E+02	0.915470E+02	0.461400E+02	
DIFFERENCE	0.921640E+02	0.916940E+02	0.915160E+02	0.920640E+02	0.923620E+02	0.913530E+02	0.915480E+02	0.461360E+02	
	-0.195338E-01	-0.436221E-02	-0.655723E-02	-0.217126E-02	-0.227417E-01	-0.328436E-02	-0.109174E-02	0.867071E-02	
SHIPPER	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
RECEIVER	0.458900E+02	0.463000E+02	0.462600E+02	0.461400E+02	0.460100E+02	0.462200E+02	0.462800E+02	0.461700E+02	
DIFFERENCE	0.458900E+02	0.462990E+02	0.462580E+02	0.460040E+02	0.460150E+02	0.4662170E+02	0.462850E+02	0.461720E+02	
	0.0	0.216070E-02	0.432308E-02	0.294756E+00	-0.108675E-01	0.649126E-02	-0.108041E-01	-0.433150E-02	
SHIPPER	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	
RECEIVER	0.459600E+02	0.459300E+02	0.223650E+02	0.223510E+02	0.223960E+02	0.393810E+02	0.395540E+02	0.393790E+02	
DIFFERENCE	0.459530E+02	0.459290E+02	0.223710E+02	0.223540E+02	0.224010E+02	0.393950E+02	0.395660E+02	0.393910E+02	
	0.152306E-01	0.217811E-02	-0.268278E-01	-0.134234E-01	-0.223259E-01	-0.355524E-01	-0.303385E-01	-0.304733E-01	
SHIPPER	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	
RECEIVER	0.516900E+02	0.515300E+02	0.513600E+02	0.263400E+02	0.264700E+02	0.263500E+02	0.544700E+02	0.545600E+02	
DIFFERENCE	0.516930E+02	0.515300E+02	0.513610E+02	0.263390E+02	0.264650E+02	0.263540E+02	0.544710E+02	0.545700E+02	
	-0.530433E-02	0.0	-0.194783E-02	0.379623E-02	0.188879E-01	-0.151810E-01	-0.163486E-02	-0.183271E-01	
SHIPPER	41								
RECEIVER	0.547700E+02								
DIFFERENCE	0.547740E+02								
	-0.730274E-02								

INPUT DATA SHOULD BE ANALYZED WITHOUT THEIR RE-ARRANGEMENT.

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

NUMBER OF GROUPS	BOUNDARY NUMBER						
	15	26	29	32	35	36	41
NUMBER OF DATA INCLUDED IN EACH GROUP							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
15	11	3	3	3	3	3	
SHIPPER AND RECEIVER DATA AFTER RE-ARRANGEMENT							
	1						
SHIPPER	0.223510E+02	0.223650E+02	0.223960E+02	0.223980E+02	0.263400E+02	0.263390E+02	0.393810E+02
RECEIVER	0.223540E+02	0.223710E+02	0.224010E+02	0.263390E+02	0.2633540E+02	0.264650E+02	0.393950E+02
DIFFERENCE	-0.134234E-01	-0.268278E-01	-0.223259E-01	0.379623E-02	-0.151810E-01	0.188879E-01	-0.355524E-01
	2						
SHIPPER	0.395540E+02	0.458900E+02	0.459300E+02	0.459600E+02	0.461400E+02	0.461400E+02	0.461700E+02
RECEIVER	0.395660E+02	0.458900E+02	0.459290E+02	0.459530E+02	0.460040E+02	0.460150E+02	0.461720E+02
DIFFERENCE	-0.303385E-01	0.0	0.217811E-02	0.152306E-01	0.294756E+00	-0.108675E-01	-0.433150E-02
	3						
SHIPPER	0.462200E+02	0.462170E+02	0.462580E+02	0.462800E+02	0.462990E+02	0.513600E+02	0.516900E+02
RECEIVER	0.462170E+02	0.462170E+02	0.462580E+02	0.462800E+02	0.462990E+02	0.513610E+02	0.516930E+02
DIFFERENCE	0.649126E-02	0.0	0.432308E-02	-0.108041E-01	0.215070E-02	0.0	-0.183486E-02
	4						
SHIPPER	0.545600E+02	0.547700E+02	0.547700E+02	0.547700E+02	0.547700E+02	0.915470E+02	0.918790E+02
RECEIVER	0.545700E+02	0.547740E+02	0.547740E+02	0.547740E+02	0.547740E+02	0.915480E+02	0.918820E+02
DIFFERENCE	-0.183271E-01	-0.730274E-02	-0.730274E-02	-0.328436E-02	-0.328400E-02	-0.109174E-02	-0.326545E-02
	5						
SHIPPER	0.919590E+02	0.920620E+02	0.921290E+02	0.921460E+02	0.923340E+02	0.923330E+02	0.924670E+02
RECEIVER	0.919620E+02	0.920640E+02	0.921310E+02	0.921640E+02	0.923620E+02	0.923970E+02	0.924310E+02
DIFFERENCE	-0.326261E-02	-0.217126E-02	-0.217173E-02	-0.192538E-01	-0.227417E-01	-0.432902E-02	-0.389330E-01
	6						
SHIPPER	0.924540E+02	0.924540E+02	0.924540E+02	0.924540E+02	0.924540E+02	0.924540E+02	0.924540E+02
RECEIVER	0.924540E+02	0.924540E+02	0.924540E+02	0.924540E+02	0.924540E+02	0.924540E+02	0.924540E+02
DIFFERENCE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

STATISTICAL INFERENCE ON PAIRED DATA SETS WITH MULTI-GROUP

DATA GROUPS

GROUP	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
SHIPPER	0.921290E+02	0.918790E+02	0.919590E+02	0.923930E+02	0.913600E+02	0.924000E+02	0.924520E+02	0.924670E+02
RECEIVER	0.921310E+02	0.918820E+02	0.919220E+02	0.923970E+02	0.913630E+02	0.924010E+02	0.924530E+02	0.924310E+02
DIFFERENCE	-0.200081E-02	-0.300026E-02	-0.300026E-02	-0.399971E-02	-0.300026E-02	-0.999451E-03	-0.999451E-03	0.359993E-01
GROUP	1	10	11	12	13	14	15	
SHIPPER	0.921460E+02	0.916900E+02	0.919100E+02	0.920620E+02	0.923410E+02	0.913500E+02	0.915470E+02	
RECEIVER	0.921640E+02	0.916940E+02	0.915160E+02	0.920640E+02	0.923620E+02	0.913530E+02	0.915480E+02	
DIFFERENCE	-0.179966E-01	-0.399971E-02	-0.500052E-02	-0.199890E-02	-0.209999E-01	-0.300026E-02	-0.999451E-03	
GROUP	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
SHIPPER	0.461400E+02	0.458900E+02	0.463000E+02	0.462600E+02	0.461400E+02	0.460100E+02	0.462200E+02	0.462800E+02
RECEIVER	0.461360E+02	0.458900E+02	0.452900E+02	0.462580E+02	0.460940E+02	0.460150E+02	0.462170E+02	0.462850E+02
DIFFERENCE	0.400066E-02	0.0	0.100040E-02	0.199986E-02	0.136001E+00	-0.500011E-02	0.300026E-02	-0.500011E-02
GROUP	3	10	11					
SHIPPER	0.461700E+02	0.459600E+02	0.459300E+02					
RECEIVER	0.461720E+02	0.459530E+02	0.459290E+02					
DIFFERENCE	-0.199986E-02	0.699997E-02	0.100040E-02					
GROUP	3	2	3					
SHIPPER	0.223650E+02	0.223510E+02	0.223960E+02					
RECEIVER	0.223710E+02	0.223540E+02	0.224010E+02					
DIFFERENCE	-0.600004E-02	-0.300026E-02	-0.500011E-02					
GROUP	4	2	3					
SHIPPER	0.393810E+02	0.395540E+02	0.393790E+02					
RECEIVER	0.393950E+02	0.395660E+02	0.393910E+02					
DIFFERENCE	-0.140009E-01	-0.120001E-01	-0.120001E-01					
GROUP	5	2	3					
SHIPPER	0.516900E+02	0.515300E+02	0.513600E+02					
RECEIVER	0.516930E+02	0.515300E+02	0.513610E+02					
DIFFERENCE	-0.300026E-02	0.0	-0.100040E-02					

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

GROUP	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SHIPPER	0.263400E+02	0.264700E+02	0.263500E+02					
RECEIVER	0.263390E+02	0.264650E+02	0.263540E+02					
DIFFERENCE	0.999928E-03	0.499984E-02	-0.400019E-02					
GROUP	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SHIPPER	0.544700E+02	0.5445600E+02	0.547700E+02					
RECEIVER	0.544710E+02	0.5445700E+02	0.547740E+02					
DIFFERENCE	-0.4999451E-03	-0.999926E-02	-0.399971E-02					
SAMPLE AVERAGE(AVS,AVR), VARIANCES(SS2,SR2), COVARIANCES(CSSR)								
GROUP	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
AVS	0.919790E+02	0.461182E+02	0.223707E+02	0.394380E+02	0.515267E+02	0.263867E+02	0.546000E+02	
AVR	0.919814E+02	0.461053E+02	0.223753E+02	0.394507E+02	0.515280E+02	0.263860E+02	0.546050E+02	
SS2	0.162724E+00	0.217563E-01	0.530336E-03	0.100930E-01	0.272333E-01	0.523331E-02	0.237000E-01	
SR2	0.161095E+00	0.230044E-01	0.566333E-03	0.998032E-02	0.275590E-01	0.473700E-02	0.238711E-01	
SSR	0.161835E+00	0.215405E-01	0.547166E-03	0.100360E-01	0.273950E-01	0.497499E-02	0.237751E-01	
***** HYPOTHESIS TESTS *****								
(1) HYPOTHESIS H01-1 TEST (H01-1,VRSE IS LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO VRRE / H11-1,VRSE IS GREATER THAN VRRE)								
OBSERVED STATISTIC P = 0.11460661E+02								
CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC P = 0.23684790+02 WITH 14 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE								
H01-1 IS NOT REJECTED, THEN PROCEED H01-2 TEST								
(2) HYPOTHESIS H01-2 TEST (H01-2,VRRE IS LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO VRSE / H11-2,VRRE IS GREATER THAN VRSE)								
OBSERVED STATISTIC P = 0.1020281E+02								
CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC P = 0.23684790+02 WITH 14 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE								
H01-2 IS NOT REJECTED, THE CONCLUSION IS THAT THE HYPOTHESIS (VRSE=VRRE) IS CONSISTENT WITH THE DATA.								
ESTIMATED RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES ARE THEN,								
VRSE	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6		
VRRE	0.8820781E-08	0.3948736E-06	0.2330910E-08	0.4288792E-09	0.4395286E-09	0.1460157E-07		
	0.8820781E-08	0.3948736E-06	0.2330910E-08	0.4288792E-09	0.4395286E-09	0.1460157E-07		
VRSE	GROUP 7	GROUP						
VRRE	0.3521872E-08							
	0.3521872E-08							

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

```

(3) HYPOTHESIS H02-1 TEST ( H02-1.(VRSE+VRRE) IS LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO VRM / H12-1.(VRSE+VRRE) IS GREATER THAN VRM)
***TARGET VALUE H00**2 = 0.2243433F+01 AND CRITICAL VALUE R1 FOR ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS = 0.1090362E+03
OBSERVED STATISTIC P = 0.4114872E+01
CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.4860237D+02 WITH 34 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
H02-1 IS NOT REJECTED. THEN PROCEED H02-2 TEST

(4) HYPOTHESIS H02-2 TEST ( H02-2.(VRSE+VRRE) IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO VRM / H12-2.(VRSE+VRRE) IS LESS THAN VRM)
OBSERVED STATISTIC R = 0.4114872E+01
CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.2166420D+02 WITH 34 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
H02-2 IS REJECTED, THE CONCLUSION IS THAT (VRSE+VRRE) IS LESS THAN VRM,
ESTIMATED RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES ARE THEN,
      GROUP 1      GROUP 2      GROUP 3      GROUP 4      GROUP 5      GROUP 6
VRSE 0.8420781E-08 0.3948736E-06 0.2330910E-08 0.4288792E-09 0.4395286E-09 0.1460157E-07
VRRE 0.8420781E-08 0.3948736E-06 0.2330910E-08 0.4288792E-09 0.4395286E-09 0.1460157E-07

      GROUP /      GROUP
VRSE 0.3521872E-08      GROUP
VRRE 0.3521872E-08      GROUP

(5) HYPOTHESIS H04-1 TEST ( H04-1.VRRE IS EQUAL TO VRR / H14-1.VRRE IS GREATER OR LESS THAN VRR)
*****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 1, SO THAT VRSE(OH VRRE) = 0.0 AND VRXE = 0.1923420E-04
*****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 2, SO THAT VRSE(OH VRRE) = 0.0 AND VRXE = 0.1022920E-04
*****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 3, SO THAT VRSE(OH VRRE) = 0.0 AND VRXE = 0.1059724E-05
*****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 4, SO THAT VRSE(OH VRRE) = 0.0 AND VRXE = 0.6489210E-05
*****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 5, SO THAT VRSE(OH VRRE) = 0.0 AND VRXE = 0.1025738E-04
*****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 6, SO THAT VRSE(OH VRRE) = 0.0 AND VRXE = 0.7516360E-05
*****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 7, SO THAT VRSE(OH VRRE) = 0.0 AND VRXE = 0.7949934E-05
OBSERVED STATISTIC LAMBDA4 = 0.1218067E+03
CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC LAMBDA4= 0.1406714D+02 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
H04-1 IS REJECTED, THE CONCLUSION IS THAT VRRE IS GREATER OR LESS THAN VRR.
ESTIMATED RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES ARE THEN,
      GROUP 1      GROUP 2      GROUP 3      GROUP 4      GROUP 5      GROUP 6
VRSE 0.8420781E-08 0.3948736E-06 0.2330910E-08 0.4288792E-09 0.4395286E-09 0.1460157E-07
VRRE 0.8420781E-08 0.3948736E-06 0.2330910E-08 0.4288792E-09 0.4395286E-09 0.1460157E-07

      GROUP 7      GROUP
VRSE 0.3521872E-08      GROUP
VRRE 0.3521872E-08      GROUP
    
```

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

(6) HYPOTHESIS H04-2 TEST (H04-2*VRSE IS EQUAL TO VRS / H14-2*VRSE IS GREATER OR LESS THAN VRS)

*****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 1. SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.0
 *****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 2. SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.0
 *****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 3. SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.0
 *****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 4. SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.0
 *****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 5. SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.0
 *****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 6. SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.0
 *****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 7. SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.0
 OBSERVED STATISTIC LAMDA4 = 0.1221910E+03
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC LAMDA4 = 0.1406714D+02 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

H04-2 IS REJECTED, THE CONCLUSION IS THAT VRSE IS GREATER OR LESS THAN VRS.
 ESTIMATED RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES ARE THEN,

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
VRSE	0.8820781E-08	0.3948736E-06	0.2330910E-08	0.4288792E-09	0.4395286E-09	0.1460157E-07
VRRE	0.8820781E-08	0.3948736E-06	0.2330910E-08	0.4288792E-09	0.4395286E-09	0.1460157E-07

	GROUP 7
VRSE	0.3521872E-06
VRRE	0.3521872E-08

EVALUATED ESTIMATES OF THE RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES AND THEIR STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF EACH DATA GROUP

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
VRSE	0.8820781E-08	0.3948736E-06	0.2330910E-08	0.4288792E-09	0.4395286E-09	0.1460157E-07
S.D	0.331902E-04	0.6283897E-03	0.4827949E-04	0.2070940E-04	0.2096494E-04	0.1208370E-03
VRRE	0.8820781E-08	0.3948736E-06	0.2330910E-08	0.4288792E-09	0.4395286E-09	0.1460157E-07
S.D	0.331902E-04	0.6283897E-03	0.4827949E-04	0.2070940E-04	0.2096494E-04	0.1208370E-03

	GROUP 7
VRSE	0.3521872E-06
S.D	0.5934536E-04
VRRE	0.3521872E-08
S.D	0.5934536E-04

FINAL ESTIMATES OF THE RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS AVERAGED OVER THE DATA SET GROUPS

FOR THE SHIPPER VARIANCE = 0.6064774E-07 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.2462676E-03
 FOR THE RECEIVER VARIANCE = 0.6064774E-07 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.2462676E-03

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

FINAL ESTIMATE OF THE COMBINED SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE (VS+VSR)
 ***FOR THE ESTIMATION OF SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE, THE ASSIGNED RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES ARE USED.

FOR THE SHIPPER VARIANCE = 0.6064774E-07 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.2462676E-03
 FOR THE RECEIVER VARIANCE = 0.6064774E-07 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.2462676E-03

COMBINED SYSTEMATIC VARIANCE = 0.0 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.0

(7) HYPOTHESIS H06-1 TEST (H06-1.(VSSE+VSRE) IS LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO VSM / H16-1.(VSSE+VSRE) IS GREATER THAN VSM)
 ***TARGET VALUE ROU**2 = 0.6490480E+01 AND CRITICAL VALUE R1 FOR ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS = 0.9130249E+02
 OBSERVED STATISTIC R = 0.0
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.1406714D+02 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
 H06-1 IS NOT REJECTED. THEN PROCEED H06-2 TEST

(8) HYPOTHESIS H06-2 TEST (H06-2.(VSSE+VSRE) IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO VSM / H16-2.(VSSE+VSRE) IS LESS THAN VSM)
 OBSERVED STATISTIC R = 0.0
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.2167350D+01 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
 H06-2 IS REJECTED, THE CONCLUSION IS THAT (VSSE+VSRE) IS LESS THAN VSM.

(9) HYPOTHESIS H05 TEST (H05.AVS IS EQUAL TO AVR / H15.AVS IS NOT EQUAL TO AVR)
 BASED ON ESTIMATED ERRORS

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
AVS-AVR	-0.2401352E-02	0.1290798E-01	-0.4667282E-02	-0.1266766E-01	-0.1334190E-02	0.6666183E-03
SIG-D	0.4992422E-04	0.1050089E-03	0.2010767E-03	0.2010767E-03	0.2010767E-03	0.2010767E-03
Z	0.2903290E+00	0.2653886E+01	0.1037584E+01	0.1597422E+01	0.1287728E+00	0.1256409E+00
Z(1-AL/2)	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01
TEST	NOTR	RJCT	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR

	GROUP 7
AVS-AVR	-0.4999161E-02
SIG-D	0.2010767E-03
Z	0.4553473E+00
Z(1-AL/2)	0.1959964D+01
TEST	NOTR

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

BASED ON DESIGN VALUES OF ERRORS

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
AVS-AVR	-0.2401352E-02	0.1290798E-01	-0.4667282E-02	-0.1266766E-01	-0.1334190E-02	0.6666183E-03
SIG-D	0.1460593E-02	0.1477098E-02	0.1632993E-02	0.1632993E-02	0.1632993E-02	0.1632993E-02
Z	0.1787465E-01	0.1894859E+00	0.1277617E+00	0.1966967E+00	0.1985628E-01	0.1547064E-01
Z(1-AL/2)	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01
TEST	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR

	GROUP 7
AVS-AVR	-0.4999161E-02
SIG-D	0.1632993E-02
Z	0.5606863E-01
Z(1-AL/2)	0.1959964D+01
TEST	NOTR

***FOR THE ESTIMATION OF SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE, THE ASSIGNED RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES ARE NOT USED.

THE RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES DERIVED FROM THE OBSERVED DATA (SS2, SR2, SSR)

FOR THE SHIPPER VARIANCE = 0.6064774E-07 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.2462676E-03
 FOR THE RECEIVER VARIANCE = 0.6064774E-07 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.2462676E-03
 COMBINED SYSTEMATIC VARIANCE = 0.0 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.0

- (7) HYPOTHESIS H06-1 TEST (H06-1.(VSSE+VSRE) IS LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO VSM / H16-1.(VSSE+VSRE) IS GREATER THAN VSM)
 ***TARGET VALUE ROU**2 = 0.6490480E+01 AND CRITICAL VALUE R1 FOR ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS IS 0.9130249E+02
 OBSERVED STATISTIC R = 0.0
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.1406714D+02 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
 H06-1 IS NOT REJECTED, THEN PROCEED H06-2 TEST
- (8) HYPOTHESIS H06-2 TEST (H06-2.(VSSE+VSRE) IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO VSM / H16-2.(VSSE+VSRE) IS LESS THAN VSM)
 OBSERVED STATISTIC R = 0.0
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.2167350D+01 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
 H06-2 IS REJECTED, THE CONCLUSION IS THAT (VSSE+VSRE) IS LESS THAN VSM.

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

(9) HYPOTHESIS H05 TEST (H05*AVS IS EQUAL TO AVR / H15*AVS IS NOT EQUAL TO AVR)												
BASED ON ESTIMATED ERRORS												
		GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6					
AVS-AVR		-0.2401352E-02	0.1290798E-01	-0.4667282E-02	-0.1266766E-01	-0.1334190E-02	0.6666183E-03					
SIG-D		0.8992422E-04	0.1050089E-03	0.2010767E-03	0.2010767E-03	0.2010767E-03	0.2010767E-03					
Z		0.2903290E+00	0.2655366E+01	0.1037584E+01	0.1597422E+01	0.1297728E+00	0.1256409E+00					
Z(1-AL/2)		0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01					
TEST		NOTR	RJCT	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR					
		GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6					
AVS-AVR		-0.4999161E-02	0.1290798E-01	-0.4667282E-02	-0.1266766E-01	-0.1334190E-02	0.6666183E-03					
SIG-D		0.2010767E-03	0.1477098E-02	0.1632993E-02	0.1632993E-02	0.1632993E-02	0.1632993E-02					
Z		0.4553473E+00	0.1894859E+00	0.1277617E+00	0.1966967E+00	0.1585628E-01	0.1547064E-01					
Z(1-AL/2)		0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01					
TEST		NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR					
BASED ON DESIGN VALUES OF ERRORS												
		GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6					
AVS-AVR		-0.2401352E-02	0.1290798E-01	-0.4667282E-02	-0.1266766E-01	-0.1334190E-02	0.6666183E-03					
SIG-D		0.1466059E-02	0.1477098E-02	0.1632993E-02	0.1632993E-02	0.1632993E-02	0.1632993E-02					
Z		0.1787466E-01	0.1894859E+00	0.1277617E+00	0.1966967E+00	0.1585628E-01	0.1547064E-01					
Z(1-AL/2)		0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01					
TEST		NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR					
		GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6					
AVS-AVR		-0.4999161E-02	0.1290798E-01	-0.4667282E-02	-0.1266766E-01	-0.1334190E-02	0.6666183E-03					
SIG-D		0.1632993E-02	0.1477098E-02	0.1632993E-02	0.1632993E-02	0.1632993E-02	0.1632993E-02					
Z		0.5606865E-01	0.1894859E+00	0.1277617E+00	0.1966967E+00	0.1585628E-01	0.1547064E-01					
Z(1-AL/2)		0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01					
TEST		NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR					

FINAL ESTIMATES OF THE RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES FOR EACH SCALE

REPORT NO.	MRA	WEI	NO. OF SCALE
1	1	2	2
THE SCALE NO.	1	VARIANCE	0.6054774E-07
THE SCALE NO.	2	VARIANCE	0.8064774E-07

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

MEASUREMENT OF ELEMENT FACTOR

MEASUREMENT OF ISOTOPE FACTOR
 MBA CODE NO. = FCA KMP CODE NO. = V TOTAL NUMBER OF PAIRED DATA SETS = 41 INFERENCE ABOUT MEAN DIFFERENCE = 1
 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE (ALPHA) APPLIED FOR HYPOTHESIS TEST, H01, H02, H03, H04 AND H05
 0.50000E-01 0.50000E-01 0.50000E-01 0.50000E-01

RANDOM AND SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCES ASSIGNED BY SHIPPER(OPERATOR) AND RECEIVER(INSPECTOR)

GROUP NO.	SHIPPER	RECEIVER	SUM
1	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	0.5000E-04
RANDOM ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	
SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	
2	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	0.5000E-04
RANDOM ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	
SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	
3	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	0.5000E-04
RANDOM ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	
SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	
4	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	0.5000E-04
RANDOM ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	
SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	
5	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	0.5000E-04
RANDOM ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	
SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	
6	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	0.5000E-04
RANDOM ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	
SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	
7	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	0.5000E-04
RANDOM ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	
SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE	0.2500E-04	0.2500E-04	

LIST OF MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT NUMBERS

GROUP	SCALE NO. OF OPERATOR	SCALE NO. OF INSPECTOR
1	1	2
2	1	2
3	1	2
4	1	2
5	1	2
6	1	2
7	1	2

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

SHIPPER AND RECEIVER DATA			5	6	7	8
SHIPPER	0.919680E+00	0.917900E+00	0.920000E+00	0.917060E+00	0.917900E+00	0.917680E+00
RECEIVER	0.913476E+00	0.920405E+00	0.922249E+00	0.917442E+00	0.916019E+00	0.924383E+00
DIFFERENCE	0.674802E+00	-0.272936E+00	-0.244457E+00	-0.416978E-01	0.204957E+00	-0.730386E+00
SHIPPER	0.918340E+00	0.920000E+00	0.918470E+00	0.920000E+00	0.916870E+00	0.919300E+00
RECEIVER	0.921161E+00	0.919264E+00	0.924121E+00	0.917625E+00	0.912936E+00	0.912740E+00
DIFFERENCE	-0.307175E+00	0.778051E-01	-0.615252E+00	0.258174E+00	0.645761E+00	0.713554E+00
SHIPPER	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00	0.920000E+00	0.919300E+00
RECEIVER	0.915239E+00	0.905541E+00	0.913702E+00	0.926105E+00	0.917869E+00	0.913686E+00
DIFFERENCE	0.441772E+00	0.149663E+01	0.608920E+00	-0.740182E+00	0.231642E+00	0.610718E+00
SHIPPER	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00	0.918340E+00	0.919960E+00	0.918220E+00	0.919960E+00
RECEIVER	0.913312E+00	0.911942E+00	0.922768E+00	0.924025E+00	0.921065E+00	0.916687E+00
DIFFERENCE	0.651312E+00	0.800382E+00	-0.482207E+00	-0.441910E+00	-0.309839E+00	0.355810E+00
SHIPPER	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.756900E+00	0.756900E+00
RECEIVER	0.608074E+00	0.820798E+00	0.807017E+00	0.797446E+00	0.753051E+00	0.748427E+00
DIFFERENCE	0.605916E+00	-0.959200E+00	0.735965E+00	0.191313E+01	0.508561E+00	0.111945E+01
SHIPPER	0.756900E+00					
RECEIVER	0.770647E+00					
DIFFERENCE	-0.181551E+01					

INPUT DATA SHOULD BE ANALYZED WITHOUT THEIR RE-ARRANGEMENT.

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

NUMBER OF GROUPS		BOUNDARY NUMBER						
7		15	26	29	32	35	38	41
NUMBER OF DATA INCLUDED IN EACH GROUP								
1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
15	11	3	3	3	3	3		
SHIPPER AND RECEIVER DATA AFTER RE-ARRANGEMENT								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
SHIPPER	0.756900E+00	0.756900E+00	0.756900E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00
RECEIVER	0.748427E+00	0.753051E+00	0.770642E+00	0.797446E+00	0.801917E+00	0.807017E+00	0.808074E+00	0.820798E+00
DIFFERENCE	0.111945E+01	0.508561E+00	-0.181551E+01	0.191313E+01	0.136321E+01	0.735969E+00	0.605916E+00	-0.939200E+00
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
SHIPPER	0.813000E+00	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00	0.918870E+00	0.917600E+00	0.919300E+00
RECEIVER	0.832255E+00	0.905541E+00	0.909201E+00	0.911942E+00	0.912740E+00	0.912936E+00	0.912982E+00	0.913312E+00
DIFFERENCE	-0.126134E+01	0.149663E+01	0.109859E+01	0.800382E+00	0.713554E+00	0.645761E+00	0.503226E+00	0.651312E+00
	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
SHIPPER	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00	0.917900E+00	0.919960E+00	0.917080E+00	0.920000E+00
RECEIVER	0.913476E+00	0.913686E+00	0.913702E+00	0.915239E+00	0.916019E+00	0.916687E+00	0.917442E+00	0.917625E+00
DIFFERENCE	0.674582E+00	0.610716E+00	0.608920E+00	0.441772E+00	0.204957E+00	0.355810E+00	-0.416978E-01	0.258174E+00
	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
SHIPPER	0.920000E+00	0.917820E+00	0.920000E+00	0.918890E+00	0.917900E+00	0.918220E+00	0.919340E+00	0.920000E+00
RECEIVER	0.917880E+00	0.918448E+00	0.919284E+00	0.920197E+00	0.920405E+00	0.921065E+00	0.921161E+00	0.922056E+00
DIFFERENCE	0.231642E+00	-0.617180E-01	0.778051E-01	-0.142193E+00	-0.272938E+00	-0.309839E+00	-0.307175E+00	-0.223532E+00
	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
SHIPPER	0.920000E+00	0.918340E+00	0.918860E+00	0.919960E+00	0.918470E+00	0.920000E+00	0.917680E+00	0.918550E+00
RECEIVER	0.922249E+00	0.922768E+00	0.923446E+00	0.924025E+00	0.924121E+00	0.924303E+00	0.924383E+00	0.925854E+00
DIFFERENCE	-0.244457E+00	-0.462207E+00	-0.501088E+00	-0.4441910E+00	-0.615252E+00	-0.467760E+00	-0.730386E+00	-0.795122E+00
	41							
SHIPPER	0.919300E+00							
RECEIVER	0.926105E+00							
DIFFERENCE	-0.740182E+00							

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

STATISTICAL INFERENCE ON PAIRED DATA SETS WITH MULTI-GROUP

DATA GROUPS																
GROUP	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
GROUP 1	SHIPPER	0.919680E+00	0.917900E+00	0.918860E+00	0.918890E+00	0.920000E+00	0.917060E+00	0.917900E+00	0.917680E+00							
	RECEIVER	0.913476E+00	0.920405E+00	0.923464E+00	0.920197E+00	0.922249E+00	0.917442E+00	0.916019E+00	0.924383E+00							
	DIFFERENCE	0.620399E-02	-0.250530E-02	-0.460429E-02	-0.130659E-02	-0.224900E-02	-0.392394E-03	0.188130E-02	0.188130E-02	-0.670260E-02						
GROUP 2	SHIPPER	0.918340E+00	0.920000E+00	0.920000E+00	0.918550E+00	0.918470E+00	0.920000E+00	0.918670E+00								
	RECEIVER	0.921161E+00	0.912284E+00	0.922056E+00	0.925854E+00	0.924121E+00	0.917625E+00	0.912936E+00								
	DIFFERENCE	-0.282091E-02	0.715807E-03	-0.205849E-02	-0.730360E-02	-0.565091E-02	0.237520E-02	0.593370E-02								
GROUP 3	SHIPPER	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00	0.920000E+00	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00	0.919300E+00								
	RECEIVER	0.912740E+00	0.915239E+00	0.905541E+00	0.924303E+00	0.909201E+00	0.913702E+00	0.926105E+00								
	DIFFERENCE	0.655970E-02	0.406121E-02	0.137585E-01	-0.430340E-02	0.100993E-01	0.559780E-02	-0.680450E-02								
GROUP 4	SHIPPER	0.917600E+00	0.917600E+00	0.918340E+00	0.922768E+00	0.922768E+00	0.916687E+00									
	RECEIVER	0.918446E+00	0.912982E+00	0.912982E+00	0.912982E+00	0.912982E+00	0.916687E+00									
	DIFFERENCE	-0.566497E-03	0.461760E-02	-0.442830E-02												
GROUP 5	SHIPPER	0.919960E+00	0.918220E+00	0.919960E+00	0.916687E+00	0.916687E+00	0.916687E+00									
	RECEIVER	0.924025E+00	0.921065E+00	0.921065E+00	0.916687E+00	0.916687E+00	0.916687E+00									
	DIFFERENCE	-0.406539E-02	-0.284500E-02	-0.284500E-02	0.927331E-02	0.927331E-02	0.927331E-02									
GROUP 6	SHIPPER	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00									
	RECEIVER	0.808074E+00	0.820798E+00	0.801917E+00	0.801917E+00	0.801917E+00	0.801917E+00									
	DIFFERENCE	0.492610E-02	-0.779830E-02	0.110829E-01	0.110829E-01	0.110829E-01	0.110829E-01									

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

GROUP	6							
SHIPPER	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00
RECEIVER	0.823255E+00	0.807017E+00	0.797446E+00					
DIFFERENCE	-0.102547E-01	0.598340E-02	0.155538E-01					
GROUP	7							
SHIPPER	0.756900E+00	0.756900E+00	0.756900E+00					
RECEIVER	0.753051E+00	0.748427E+00	0.770642E+00					
DIFFERENCE	0.384930E-02	0.847310E-02	-0.137416E-01					
SAMPLE AVERAGE (AVS+AVR), VARIANCES (SS2+SR2), COVARIANCES (SSR)								
GROUP	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
AVS	0.918813E+00	0.919427E+00	0.917940E+00	0.919380E+00	0.813000E+00	0.813000E+00	0.756900E+00	
AVR	0.920049E+00	0.914876E+00	0.918066E+00	0.920592E+00	0.810263E+00	0.809239E+00	0.809239E+00	
SS2	0.916669E-06	0.801811E-07	0.139597E-06	0.100921E-05	0.0	0.0	0.0	
SR2	0.153048E-04	0.361794E-04	0.240496E-04	0.136317E-04	0.927193E-04	0.170225E-03	0.0	
SSR	-0.368486E-06	0.869359E-06	0.179323E-05	-0.411195E-06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.137385E-03

***** HYPOTHESIS TESTS *****

(1) HYPOTHESIS HO1-1 TEST (HO1-1.VRSE IS LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO VRRE / H11-1.VRSE IS GREATER THAN VRRE)

OBSERVED STATISTIC P = 0.3906927E+00

CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC P = 0.15507310+02 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

HO1-1 IS NOT REJECTED. THEN PROCEED HO1-2 TEST

(2) HYPOTHESIS HO1-2 TEST (HO1-2.VRRE IS LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO VRSE / H11-2.VRRE IS GREATER THAN VRSE)

*****STATISTIC P OR (1-P) WAS ZERO AT GROUP 2, SO IT WAS KEPT AWAY FROM THIS HYPOTHESIS TESTING

OBSERVED STATISTIC P = 0.37089370E+02
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC P = 0.12591590+02 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

HO1-2 IS REJECTED. THE CONCLUSION IS THAT VRSE IS LESS THAN VRRE.

ESTIMATED RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES ARE THEN:

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
VRSE	0.1085821E-05	0.0	0.0	0.1193964E-05	0.0	0.0
VRRE	0.1812896E-04	0.4083638E-04	0.2449103E-04	0.1612721E-04	0.1402778E-03	0.2575378E-03
	GROUP 7	GROUP				
VRSE	0.0					
VRRE	0.2398078E-03					

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

(3) HYPOTHESIS H02-1 TEST (H02-1.(VRSE+VRRE) IS LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO VRM / H12-1.(VRSE+VRRE) IS GREATER THAN VRM)
 ***TARGET VALUE ROU**2 = 0.2243433E+01 AND CRITICAL VALUE R1 FOR ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS = 0.1090362E+03
 OBSERVED STATISTIC R = 0.4072324E+02
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.4860237D+02 WITH 34 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
 H02-1 IS NOT REJECTED, THEN PROCEED H02-2 TEST

(4) HYPOTHESIS H02-2 TEST (H02-2.(VRSE+VRRE) IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO VRM / H12-2.(VRSE+VRRE) IS LESS THAN VRM)
 OBSERVED STATISTIC R = 0.4072324E+02
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.2166428D+02 WITH 34 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
 H02-2 IS NOT REJECTED, THE CONCLUSION IS THAT THE HYPOTHESIS (VRSE+VRRE)=VRM IS CONSISTENT WITH THE DATA,
 ESTIMATED RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES ARE THEN,

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
VRSE	0.2825483E-05	0.0	0.0	0.3446544E-05	0.0	0.0
VRRE	0.4717452E-04	0.5000000E-04	0.5000000E-04	0.4655345E-04	0.5000000E-04	0.5000000E-04

VRSE 0.0
 VRRE 0.5000000E-04

***ALTHOUGH THE NOMINAL VALUES WERE ALLOWED IN THE ABOVE TEST, THEY SHOULD BE KEPT AWAY FROM THE TEST, AS THE RESULT,

(3) HYPOTHESIS H02-1 TEST (H02-1.(VRSE+VRRE) IS LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO VRM / H12-1.(VRSE+VRRE) IS GREATER THAN VRM)
 ***TARGET VALUE ROU**2 = 0.2441957E+01 AND CRITICAL VALUE R1 FOR ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS = 0.1009435E+03
 OBSERVED STATISTIC R = 0.1521830E+02
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.4133714D+02 WITH 26 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
 H02-1 IS NOT REJECTED, THEN PROCEED H02-2 TEST

(4) HYPOTHESIS H02-2 TEST (H02-2.(VRSE+VRRE) IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO VRM / H12-2.(VRSE+VRRE) IS LESS THAN VRM)
 OBSERVED STATISTIC R = 0.1521830E+02
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.1692788D+02 WITH 28 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
 H02-2 IS REJECTED, THE CONCLUSION IS THAT (VRSE+VRRE) IS LESS THAN VRM.
 ESTIMATED RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES ARE THEN,

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
VRSE	0.1085821E-05	0.0	0.0	0.1193964E-05	0.0	0.0
VRRE	0.1812896E-04	0.4083638E-04	0.2445103E-04	0.1612721E-04	0.1402778E-03	0.2575378E-03

VRSE 0.0
 VRRE 0.2398078E-03

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

(5) HYPOTHESIS H04-1 TEST (H04-1.VRRE IS EQUAL TO VRR / H14-1.VRRE IS GREATER OR LESS THAN VRR)

*****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 1, SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.1085821E-05 AND VRXE= 0.0
 *****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 2, SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.0 AND VRXE= 0.9485000E-07
 *****WARNING ITERATION NO. REACHED 1000, BUT CONVERGENCE FACTOR WAS NOT SATISFIED, I.E. TEMP= 0.0001 AT GROUP 3
 *****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 3, SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.0 AND VRXE= 0.1656715E-06
 *****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 4, SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.1193964E-05 AND VRXE= 0.0
 OBSERVED STATISTIC LAMDA4 = 0.1454032E+02
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC LAMDA4= 0.9487729D+01 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

H04-1 IS REJECTED, THE CONCLUSION IS THAT VRRE IS GREATER OR LESS THAN VRR.
 ESTIMATED RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES ARE THEN.

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
VRSE	0.1085821E-05	0.0	0.0	0.1193964E-05	0.0	0.0
VRRE	0.11912896E-04	0.4083638E-04	0.2445103E-04	0.1612721E-04	0.1402778E-03	0.2575378E-03

VRSE 0.0
 VRRE 0.2398078E-03

(6) HYPOTHESIS H04-2 TEST (H04-2.VRSE IS EQUAL TO VRS / H14-2.VRSE IS GREATER OR LESS THAN VRS)

*****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 1, SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.1812896E-04 AND VRXE= 0.0
 *****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 2, SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.4279834E-04 AND VRXE= 0.0
 *****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 3, SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.2854172E-04 AND VRXE= 0.0
 *****NEGATIVE FIX-UP TAKEN AT GROUP 4, SO THAT VRSE(COR VRRE)= 0.1612721E-04 AND VRXE= 0.0
 OBSERVED STATISTIC LAMDA4 = 0.1143981E+03
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC LAMDA4= 0.9487729D+01 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

H04-2 IS REJECTED, THE CONCLUSION IS THAT VRSE IS GREATER OR LESS THAN VRS.
 ESTIMATED RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES ARE THEN.

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
VRSE	0.1085821E-05	0.0	0.0	0.1193964E-05	0.0	0.0
VRRE	0.11912896E-04	0.4083638E-04	0.2445103E-04	0.1612721E-04	0.1402778E-03	0.2575378E-03

VRSE 0.0
 VRRE 0.2398078E-03

Table 3. Sample Output (continued)

EVALUATED ESTIMATES OF THE RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES AND THEIR STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF EACH DATA GROUP

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
VRSE	0.1085821E-05	0.0	0.0	0.1193964E-05	0.0	0.0
S.D	0.1042027E-02	0.0	0.0	0.1092687E-02	0.0	0.0
VRRE	0.1812896E-04	0.4083638E-04	0.2445103E-04	0.1612721E-04	0.1402778E-03	0.2573378E-03
S.D	0.4257811E-02	0.6330335E-02	0.4944798E-02	0.4015869E-02	0.1184389E-01	0.1604798E-01

	GROUP 7
VRSE	0.0
S.D	0.0
VRRE	0.2398078E-03
S.D	0.1546573E-01

FINAL ESTIMATES OF THE RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS AVERAGED OVER THE DATA SET GROUPS

FOR THE SHIPPER VARIANCE = 0.5412868E-06 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.7357219E-03
 FOR THE RECEIVER VARIANCE = 0.5206671E-04 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.7215727E-02

***ALTHOUGH THE NOMINAL VALUES WERE ALLOWED IN THE ABOVE TEST, THEY SHOULD BE KEPT AWAY FROM THE TEST, AS THE RESULT.

FINAL ESTIMATES OF THE RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS AVERAGED OVER THE DATA SET GROUPS

FOR THE SHIPPER VARIANCE = 0.6280268E-06 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.7924827E-03
 FOR THE RECEIVER VARIANCE = 0.2655353E-04 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.5153012E-02

FINAL ESTIMATE OF THE COMBINED SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE (VSS+VSR)

***FOR THE ESTIMATION OF SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE, THE ASSIGNED RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES ARE USED.

FOR THE SHIPPER VARIANCE = 0.6280268E-06 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.7924827E-03
 FOR THE RECEIVER VARIANCE = 0.2655353E-04 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.5153012E-02
 COMBINED SYSTEMATIC VARIANCE = 0.1800178E-05 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.1341707E-02

(7) HYPOTHESIS HC6-1 TEST (H06-1,(VSSE+VSRE) IS LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO VSM / H16-1,(VSSE+VSRE) IS GREATER THAN VSM)
 ***TARGET VALUE H0U**2 = 0.6490480E+01 AND CRITICAL VALUE R1 FOR ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS = 0.9130249E+02
 OBSERVED STATISTIC R = 0.2520249E+00
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.1406114D+02 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

H06-1 IS NOT REJECTED, THEN PROCEED H06-2 TEST

Table 3 Sample Output. (continued)

(8) HYPOTHESIS H06-2 TEST (H06-2.(VSSE+VSRE) IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO VSM / H16-2.(VVSSE+VVSRE) IS LESS THAN VSM)
 OBSERVED STATISTIC R = 0.2520249E+00
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.2167350D+01 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
 H06-2 IS REJECTED, THE CONCLUSION IS THAT (VSSE+VSRE) IS LESS THAN VSM.

(9) HYPOTHESIS H05 TEST (H05.AVS IS EQUAL TO AVR / H15.AVS IS NOT EQUAL TO AVR)

BASED ON ESTIMATED ERRORS

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
AVS-AVR	-0.1271432E-02	0.4550874E-02	-0.1257360E-03	-0.1212358E-02	0.2736911E-02	0.3760844E-02
SIG-D	0.1900600E-02	0.2066695E-02	0.329357E-02	0.329357E-02	0.329357E-02	0.329357E-02
Z	0.7051675E+00	0.2394375E+01	0.4156332E-01	0.4001355E+00	0.1021507E+01	0.1403673E+01
Z(1-AL/2)	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01
TEST	NOTR	RJCT	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR

BASED ON DESIGN VALUES OF ERRORS

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
AVS-AVR	-0.4730821E-03	0.4550874E-02	-0.1257360E-03	-0.1212358E-02	0.2736911E-02	0.3760844E-02
SIG-D	0.329357E-02	0.7385469E-02	0.8164966E-02	0.8164966E-02	0.8164966E-02	0.8164966E-02
Z	0.1896571E+00	0.6701903E+00	0.1677610E-01	0.1615034E+00	0.4123023E+00	0.5665529E+00
Z(1-AL/2)	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01
TEST	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

***FOR THE ESTIMATION OF SYSTEMATIC ERROR VARIANCE, THE ASSIGNED RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES ARE NOT USED.

THE RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES DERIVED FROM THE OBSERVED DATA (SS2, SR2, SSR)

FOR THE SHIPPER VARIANCE = 0.3511175E-06 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.5925517E-03
 FOR THE RECEIVER VARIANCE = 0.5269286E-04 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.7258985E-02
 COMBINED SYSTEMATIC VARIANCE = 0.0 STANDARD DEVIATION = 0.0

(7) HYPOTHESIS H06-1 TEST (H06-1.(VSS+VSRE) IS LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO VSM / H16-1.(VSS+VSRE) IS GREATER THAN VSM)

***TARGET VALUE R01**2 = 0.6490480E+01 AND CRITICAL VALUE R1 FOR ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS = 0.9130249E+02
 OBSERVED STATISTIC R = 0.0
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.1406714D+02 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

H06-1 IS NOT REJECTED, THEN PROCEED H06-2 TEST

(8) HYPOTHESIS H06-2 TEST (H06-2.(VSS+VSRE) IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO VSM / H16-2.(VSS+VSRE) IS LESS THAN VSM)

OBSERVED STATISTIC R = 0.0

CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTIC R = 0.2167350D+01 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT THE 0.050 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

H06-2 IS REJECTED, THE CONCLUSION IS THAT (VSS+VSRE) IS LESS THAN VSM.

(9) HYPOTHESIS H05 TEST (H05.AVS IS EQUAL TO AVR / H15.AVS IS NOT EQUAL TO AVR)

BASED ON ESTIMATED ERRORS

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
AVS-AVR	-0.1231432E-02	0.4550874E-02	-0.1257360E-03	-0.1212358E-02	0.2736911E-02	0.3760844E-02
SIG-D	0.1880496E-02	0.2195946E-02	0.4204917E-02	0.4204917E-02	0.4204917E-02	0.4204917E-02
Z	0.7127055E+00	0.2254009E+01	0.3257526E-01	0.3136018E+00	0.8005947E+00	0.1100113E+01
Z(1-AL/2)	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01
TEST	NOTR	RJCI	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR

GROUP

	GROUP 7
AVS-AVR	-0.4730821E-03
SIG-D	0.4204917E-02
Z	0.1486417E+00
Z(1-AL/2)	0.1959964D+01
TEST	NOTR

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)
 BASED ON DESIGN VALUES OF ERRORS

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6
AVS-AVR	-0.1231432E-02	0.4550874E-02	-0.1257360E-03	-0.1212358E-02	0.2736911E-02	0.3760844E-02
SIG-D	0.7302967E-02	0.7385489E-02	0.8164966E-02	0.8164966E-02	0.8164966E-02	0.8164966E-02
Z	0.1835202E+00	0.6701903E+00	0.1677610E-01	0.1615034E+00	0.4123023E+00	0.566529E+00
Z(1-AL/2)	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01	0.1959964D+01
TEST	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR	NOTR
AVS-AVR	GROUP 7	GROUP				
SIG-D	-0.4730821E-03					
Z	0.8164966E-02					
Z(1-AL/2)	0.7654972E-01					
TEST	NOTR					

FINAL ESTIMATES OF THE RANDOM ERROR VARIANCES FOR EACH SCALE
 REPORT NO. MBA WEI NO. OF SCALE
 1 FCA 3 VARIANCE 0.6280288E-06
 THE SCALE NO. 1 VARIANCE 0.2655353E-04
 THE SCALE NO. 2

FCA PIT. EVALUATION, 1978-09-28 H. NISHIMURA

INVR

VARIABLES PAIRED COMPARISONS

ALPHA RETA
 0.50000E-01 0.50000E-01

CASE NO. = 1 ORG. CODE = JAER FAC. CODE = FCA MBA CODE = FCA DATE OF INS. REPORT = 780925 INS. REPORT NO. = 1

INVENTORY VERIFICATION DATA

STRATA SCALES ANAL.S NDAS
 7 2 0 2

MEASUREMENT-ERROR COEFFICIENTS OF VARIATION

SCALE	SYSTEMATIC	RANDOM, DESIGN	RANDOM, ESTIMATE
1	1.00000E-03	1.00000E-03	2.46268E-04
2	1.00000E-03	1.00000E-03	2.46268E-04
NDA INSTRUMENT	SYSTEMATIC	RANDOM, DESIGN	RANDOM, ESTIMATE
1	5.00000E-03	5.00000E-03	7.92403E-04
2	5.00000E-03	5.00000E-03	5.15301E-03

Table 3 Sample Output (continued)

STRATUM	MATERIAL	ITEM	METHOD	SAMPLE SIZE		ELEMENT FAC.		ISOTOPE FAC.		MEASUREMENT		NDA	INSPECTOR SCALE	ANAL.	NDA
				WEIGHT OP.	INS.	OP.	INS.	OP.	INS.	OPERATOR SCALE	ANAL.				
1	FCA V PU92	1	1	15	15	0	15	1	15	1	0	1	2	0	2
2	FCA V PU92	1	1	11	11	0	11	1	11	1	0	1	2	0	2
3	FCA V PU92	1	1	3	3	0	3	1	3	1	0	1	2	0	2
4	FCA V PU92	1	1	3	3	0	3	1	3	1	0	1	2	0	2
5	FCA V PU91	1	1	3	3	0	3	1	3	1	0	1	2	0	2
6	FCA V PU91	1	1	3	3	0	3	1	3	1	0	1	2	0	2
7	FCA V PU75	1	1	3	3	0	3	1	3	1	0	1	2	0	2
STRATUM	DIFFERENCE	OP.	#WEIGHT	INS.	#WEIGHT	OP.	#WEIGHT	INS.	#WEIGHT	OP.	#WEIGHT	INS.	#WEIGHT	OP.	#WEIGHT
1	-2.17370E+02														
2	6.36497E+02														
3	-1.44064E+00														
4	-3.81270E+00														
5	9.26888E+01														
6	1.83866E+01														
7	-2.09721E+01														
	OP.	#WEIGHT	INS.	#WEIGHT	OP.	#WEIGHT	INS.	#WEIGHT	OP.	#WEIGHT	INS.	#WEIGHT	OP.	#WEIGHT	INS.
	9.18813E-01														
	9.19427E-01														
	9.17940E-01														
	9.19380E-01														
	8.13000E-01														
	8.13000E-01														
	7.56900E-01														
	5.03977E+02														
	1.50297E+03														
	1.47027E+03														
	3.11808E+02														
	1.53195E+03														
	1.47027E+03														
	4.30314E+02														
	3.35321E-01														
	1.95996E+00														

RESULTS OF CALCULATIONS

ESTIMATED DIFFERENCE BETWEEN OPERATOR'S AND INSPECTOR'S MEASURED QUANTITIES =
 VARIANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE (OPS.) = 2.25891E+06 ITS STANDARD DEVIATION =
 ITS SYSTEMATIC PART = 2.16169E+06
 ITS RANDOM PART = 9.72243E+04
 VARIANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE (DES.) = 2.34686E+06 ITS STANDARD DEVIATION =
 ITS SYSTEMATIC PART = 2.16169E+06
 ITS RANDOM PART = 1.85170E+05
 CRITICAL VALUE OF STATISTICS Z =

***** 0=0
 ATTAINED GOAL QUANTITY M = 4.94433E+03 AND CRITICAL VALUE FOR ALTERNATIVE M1 = 7.41649E+03