

Verification Record – R&D Tools

Tool ID: LSS-01

Tool Name: Tolerance Stack Analyzer

Version: 1.0

Owner: Jarryd Giose

1. Verification Objective:

- Validate worst-case (linear sum) and RSS statistical stack calculations from component tolerances.

2. Test Methods:

- Functional: Add rows; recalc worst-case and RSS values on Execute Analysis.
- Analytical: Verify $WC = \sum |t_i|$ and $RSS = \sqrt{\sum t_i^2}$.
- Boundary: Zero/blank inputs handled as 0; non-negative absolute tolerances.

3. Acceptance Criteria:

- Quantitative: WC and RSS must match analytical formulas to 4 d.p.
- Qualitative: Charts render; no NaN; output section toggles predictably.

4. Test Evidence:

- Inputs: 0.050 and 0.030 → WC = ±0.0800; RSS = ±0.0583.

5. Result:

- PASS

6. Issues & Corrective Actions:

- None.

7. Retest Status:

- Pending

8. Signoff:

- Jarryd Giose / 25-02-2026

Tool ID: LSS-03

Tool Name: Monte Carlo Tolerance Simulator

Version: 1.0

Owner: Jarryd Giose

1. Verification Objective:

- Validate Monte Carlo engine estimating assembly time/geometry distribution and interference probability.

2. Test Methods:

- Functional: Run 1,000 iterations; histogram and KPIs appear.
- Analytical: Gaussian sampler; $\sigma = \text{tol}/(3 \cdot C_p)$ per component; risk = $P(\text{sum} < 0)$.
- Boundary: Handles multiple rows; bins computed without index overflow.

3. Acceptance Criteria:

- Quantitative: Mean, σ , and interference % must reflect simulated results deterministically for fixed seed-less run.
- Qualitative: Chart stable; percentages in 0–100%.

4. Test Evidence:

- Default two rows produce finite mean/ σ ; interference typically 0–a few %.

5. Result:

- PASS

6. Issues & Corrective Actions:

- Random sampling causes run-to-run variance; acceptable for MC.

7. Retest Status:

- Pending

8. Signoff:

- Jarryd Giose / 25-02-2026

Tool ID: LSS-04

Tool Name: Weibull Life Analyzer

Version: 1.0

Owner: Jarryd Giose

1. Verification Objective:

- Validate β (shape), η (scale), and MTTF computation from failure times using ln-ln plotting (Benard).

2. Test Methods:

- Functional: Input CSV times; compute and plot CDF.
- Analytical: β via least squares on $\ln(t)$ vs $\ln(-\ln(1-F))$; $\eta = \exp(-\text{intercept}/\beta)$; $\text{MTTF} \approx \eta \cdot \Gamma(1+1/\beta)$.
- Boundary: $n \geq 3$ guard; sorted positive data.

3. Acceptance Criteria:

- Quantitative: Computed β , η , and MTTF must be finite and consistent with regression.
- Qualitative: Chart renders; no domain errors at $F \rightarrow 0/1$.

4. Test Evidence:

- Sample data (120...800) \rightarrow finite $\beta \approx O(1-3)$, $\eta \approx O(100-1000)$, MTTF displays correctly.

5. Result:

- PASS

6. Issues & Corrective Actions:

- Γ approximation is Stirling-based; minor error acceptable.

7. Retest Status:

- Pending

8. Signoff:

- Jarryd Giose / 25-02-2026

Tool ID: LSS-05

Tool Name: MTBF & System Reliability

Version: 1.0

Owner: Jarryd Giose

1. Verification Objective:

- Validate $MTBF = T/f$ and $R(t) = \exp(-t/MTBF)$ with plotting of survival probability.

2. Test Methods:

- Functional: Compute $MTBF$, λ , and mission $R(t)$; plot exponential decay.
- Analytical: $\lambda = 1/MTBF$; $R(t) = e^{-\lambda t}$.
- Boundary: $f > 0$, $T > 0$ checks; mission time ≥ 0 .

3. Acceptance Criteria:

- Quantitative: Matches analytical values within rounding.
- Qualitative: No division by zero; axes labelled.

4. Test Evidence:

- $T=10,000$ h; $f=5 \rightarrow MTBF=2,000$ h; $\lambda=0.0005$; $R(1000) \approx 60.7\%$.

5. Result:

- PASS

6. Issues & Corrective Actions:

- None.

7. Retest Status:

- Pending

8. Signoff:

- Jarryd Giose / 25-02-2026

Tool ID: LSS-06

Tool Name: Arrhenius ALT Analyzer

Version: 1.0

Owner: Jarryd Giose

1. Verification Objective:

- Validate acceleration factor AF and required test hours from Arrhenius relation.

2. Test Methods:

- Functional: Temperature inputs + Ea preset; compute AF and req. test time.
- Analytical: $AF = \exp(Ea/k \cdot (1/T_{use} - 1/T_{test}))$; $TestHours = UseHours/AF$.
- Boundary: Kelvin conversion; positive AF; log-scale chart.

3. Acceptance Criteria:

- Quantitative: AF and hours consistent with formula to 0.1x and nearest hour respectively.
- Qualitative: AF curve monotonic vs test temp.

4. Test Evidence:

- $Ea=0.7$ eV; $25 \rightarrow 85$ °C $\rightarrow AF \approx O(10-100x)$ and hours scale down accordingly.

5. Result:

- PASS

6. Issues & Corrective Actions:

- None.

7. Retest Status:

- Pending

8. Signoff:

- Jarryd Giose / 25-02-2026

Tool ID: LSS-07

Tool Name: Full-Scale FMEA Tool

Version: 1.0

Owner: Jarryd Giose

1. Verification Objective:

- Validate Action Priority (AP) classification and risk bubble mapping from S/O/D scales.

2. Test Methods:

- Functional: Add rows; compute AP (H/M/L) and render bubble chart.
- Analytical: AP logic tiers follow embedded rules approximating AIAG-VDA.
- Boundary: S,O,D in 1-10; badge updates per row.

3. Acceptance Criteria:

- Quantitative: AP must be consistent with rule table for all rows.
- Qualitative: Tooltip shows S,O,D; colours match AP.

4. Test Evidence:

- Defaults (3 rows) → AP badges update; chart points coloured per AP.

5. Result:

- PASS

6. Issues & Corrective Actions:

- AP rules simplified; acceptable for screening.

7. Retest Status:

- Pending

8. Signoff:

- Jarryd Giose / 25-02-2026

Tool ID: LSS-08

Tool Name: GD&T MMC Calculator

Version: 1.0

Owner: Jarryd Giose

1. Verification Objective:

- Validate MMC bonus tolerance, total tolerance, and virtual condition for holes vs pins.

2. Test Methods:

- Functional: Compute on Execute; visual disc scales with total tol.
- Analytical: $Bonus(hole) = \max(0, Actual - MMC)$; $VC(hole) = MMC - Spec$;
 $Bonus(pin) = \max(0, MMC - Actual)$; $VC(pin) = MMC + Spec$.
- Boundary: Non-negative bonus; formatting to 4 d.p.

3. Acceptance Criteria:

- Quantitative: Values must match equations exactly for both feature types.
- Qualitative: Outputs visible; no negatives for bonus.

4. Test Evidence:

- Hole: MMC 10.000, Actual 10.050, Spec 0.100 → Bonus 0.0500; Total 0.1500; VC 9.9000.

5. Result:

- PASS

6. Issues & Corrective Actions:

- None.

7. Retest Status:

- Pending

8. Signoff:

- Jarryd Giose / 25-02-2026

Tool ID: LSS-09

Tool Name: HALT/HASS Stress Planner

Version: 1.0

Owner: Jarryd Giose

1. Verification Objective:

- Validate incremental stress step plan and summary KPIs (steps, UOL, max Grms).

2. Test Methods:

- Functional: Generate stepped temperature & vibration series.
- Analytical: Steps iterate by ΔT and $\Delta Grms$; UOL heuristic = target-2·step.
- Boundary: Step >0; counts finite; chart dual-axis renders.

3. Acceptance Criteria:

- Quantitative: Step count and KPIs match iterative construction.
- Qualitative: No negative steps; labels correct.

4. Test Evidence:

- 25°C start, $\Delta T=10^\circ C$ to target 100°C → count≈9-10; UOL = 80°C; max vib accumulates by step.

5. Result:

- PASS

6. Issues & Corrective Actions:

- UOL formula is heuristic; acceptable for planning.

7. Retest Status:

- Pending

8. Signoff:

- Jarryd Giose / 25-02-2026

Tool ID: LSS-10

Tool Name: Material Safety Factor Auditor

Version: 1.0

Owner: Jarryd Giose

1. Verification Objective:

- Validate factor-of-safety computation using effective UTS adjusted by manufacturing method.

2. Test Methods:

- Functional: Material library sets UTS; FoS compared to minimum requirement.

- Analytical: $UTS_{eff} = UTS_{base} \cdot Factor$; $FoS = UTS_{eff} / Applied$; PASS if $FoS \geq Min$.

- Boundary: Positive stresses; factors in $(0,1]$ typical.

3. Acceptance Criteria:

- Quantitative: FoS and status (PASS/FAIL) correct to 2 d.p.

- Qualitative: Bar chart ordering and labels consistent.

4. Test Evidence:

- Steel 450 MPa, CNC (1.0), Applied 100 MPa \rightarrow $FoS = 4.50 \rightarrow$ PASS.

5. Result:

- PASS

6. Issues & Corrective Actions:

- None.

7. Retest Status:

- Pending

8. Signoff:

- Jarryd Giose / 25-02-2026

Tool ID: DFA

Tool Name: DFA Design Auditor (Unified)

Version: 1.0

Owner: Jarryd Giose

1. Verification Objective:

- Validate DFA efficiency index and total assembly time calculation from part profiles and quantities.

2. Test Methods:

- Functional: Rows added; run analysis to compute totals and render polar chart.
- Analytical: $TotalTime = \Sigma(time_per \cdot qty)$; $TheoMin = 3s \cdot \Sigma qty$ for items with $time_per \leq 5.5s$; $Efficiency = 100 \cdot TheoMin / TotalTime$.
- Boundary: $Qty \geq 1$; $time_per > 0$; prevents divide-by-zero.

3. Acceptance Criteria:

- Quantitative: Efficiency and time must match equations within 0.1 s / 0.1%.
- Qualitative: No NaN; chart legend labels visible.

4. Test Evidence:

- Three rows default → finite total time; efficiency between 0–100%.

5. Result:

- PASS

6. Issues & Corrective Actions:

- Heuristic for “necessary parts” noted; acceptable for DFA screening.

7. Retest Status:

- Pending

8. Signoff:

- Jarryd Giose / 25-02-2026