



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

***DEVELOPMENT OF SERVICE TOOL FAILURE MODE AND
EFFECT ANALYSIS (STFMEA) MODULE FOR AUTOMOTIVE
SERVICE CENTERS***

ERIALDI BIN SYAHRIAL

FK 2011 164

**DEVELOPMENT OF SERVICE TOOL FAILURE MODE AND
EFFECT ANALYSIS (STFMEA) MODULE FOR AUTOMOTIVE
SERVICE CENTERS**

ERIALDI BIN SYAHRIAL

MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

2011

**DEVELOPMENT OF SERVICE TOOL FAILURE MODE AND EFFECT
ANALYSIS (STFMEA) MODULE FOR AUTOMOTIVE SERVICE CENTERS**

By

ERIALDI BIN SYAHRIAL

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science**

December 2011

In dedication to:

My dear parents, for their continuous support and encouragement;

my beloved wife, Aslina Binti Siman for her uncounted caring as well as
my daughter and son, Nur Aifa Eryna and Muhammad Fi Firdaus who always cheers
my family.

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science

DEVELOPMENT OF SERVICE TOOL FAILURE MODE AND EFFECT ANALYSIS (STFMEA) MODULE FOR AUTOMOTIVE SERVICE CENTRES

By

ERIALDI BIN SYAHRIAL

December 2011

Chairman : Ir. Hj. Mohd Rasid bin Osman

Faculty : Engineering

Failure Mode and Effect Analysis (FMEA) is one of well-known quality tools, which evolved gradually since its inception in NASA aerospace industry in the year 1963. Then, it has spread to the automotive industry to quantify and prevent possible potential failures at the early stage before reaching the customer. Based on a survey conducted at selected Malaysian automotive service centres, the result shows that the actual service tools utilization by service personnel was only 14.2%. That means the service procedures that performed by service personnel were not followed the service requirements and it could cause to a safety issue to the service personnel, customer and vehicle. Besides that, the service personnel are lack of technical knowledge on FMEA implementation and less awareness on the effect of not using service tools during service or repair. The objective of this study is to establish Service Tool Failure Mode and Effect Analysis (STFMEA) Module for Malaysia automotive industry in order to identify potential failure modes, potential effects, potential causes, service control detection and service control prevention. In this research, a new Occurrence Rating Table and STFMEA Datasheet were developed first in order to support the STFMEA Module development. A car

automotive company is known as VATA was selected and four (4) of the VATA service centres were identified as case study companies. The two most available service tool's brand, known as 'Service Tool A and 'Service Tool B' tools were selected and they became the focus items at each of identified service centres. During the initial study, a FMEA awareness survey was conducted and 98% of users fully understood about the FMEA application and advantages. Another survey was conducted to all users on the new Occurrence Rating Table and as a result, 98% of users answered correctly the questions related to new Occurrence Rating Table application. From the analysis conducted in four (4) VATA service centres, the highest Risk Priority Number (RPN) is 700. Towards ensuring the STFMEA Module is easy to be applied and do not affect the daily servicing tasks, the module was established in Microsoft Excel with some information linked to pdf file format as agreed by all the 23 service personnel during STFMEA Module presentation and actual application. The advantages of the module are the users can directly access all the FMEA datasheets, understand the potential risks and captured service tool technical information immediately. According to the end users feedback during STFMEA Module survey, 100% of the participated service personnel agreed that they could understand all the potential failure modes easily as well as realise with all the potential effect if the service tool is not being used during after sales service. All these feedbacks show that the developed Service Tool Failure Mode and Effect Analysis (STFMEA) Module is a very valuable and user-friendly quality tool for after sales service personnel at VATA service centres.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putera Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains

**PEMBANGUNAN MODUL ANALISIS TAHAP KEGAGALAN DAN KESAN
PADA PERALATAAN KHAS SERVIS UNTUK PUSAT SERVIS AUTOMOTIF**

Oleh

ERIALDI BIN SYAHRIAL

Disember 2011

Pengerusi : Ir. Hj. Mohd Rasid bin Osman

Fakulti : Kejuruteraan

Analisis Tahap Kegagalan dan Kesan adalah merupakan salah satu alat kualiti yang amat dikenali ramai yang berkembang dari semasa ke semasa bermula dari pelaksanaan awal oleh syarikat angkasa lepas, NASA pada tahun 1963. Kemudian, alat kualiti ini telah digunakan secara meluas dalam industri automotif untuk mengenalpasti dan mengelak kemungkinan potensi kegagalan di peringkat awal pembangunan sebelum ia berlaku kepada pelanggan. Berdasarkan kaji sedikit di syarikat-syarikat kajian kes, keputusannya menunjukkan bahawa kadar sebenar penggunaan peralatan khas servis oleh juruteknik-juruteknik hanyalah 14.2%. Ini menunjukkan prosedur-prosedur servis yang dilaksanakan oleh juruteknik adalah tidak mengikut keperluan servis di mana ia boleh mengakibatkan isu keselamatan kepada juruteknik, pengguna kenderaan dan kenderaan tersebut. Selain daripada itu, juruteknik-juruteknik yang sediaada mempunyai pengetahuan teknikal yang agak sedikit di dalam pelaksanaan Analisis Tahap Kegagalan dan Kesan serta kurang kesedaran tentang kesan yang mungkin boleh berlaku jika tidak menggunakan peralatan khas servis semasa servis dan baikpulih kenderaan. Objektif utama penyelidikan ini ialah untuk menghasilkan Modul Analisis Tahap Kegagalan dan Kesan bagi peralatan khas

servis dalam industri automotif agar ia dapat mengenalpasti potensi tahap kegagalan, potensi kesan, potensi sebab, kawalan kenalpasti masalah servis dan kawalan untuk mengelak masalah servis jika tidak menggunakan peralatan khas servis semasa menjalankan kerja-kerja penyelenggaraan dan penggantian alat kenderaan untuk kenderaan pelanggan di pusat servis kenderaan. Di dalam kajian ini, Jadual Kelas Kekerapan yang baru dan Analisis Tahap Kegagalan dan Kesan bagi peralatan khas servis telah dihasilkan terlebih dahulu dalam mengukuhkan pembangunan Modul Analisis Tahap Kegagalan dan Kesan untuk peralatan khas servis. Syarikat automotif dikenali sebagai VATA telah dipilih dan empat (4) pusat servis kenderaan VATA telah pun dikenalpasti sebagai syarikat kajian kes. Dua jenama peralatan khas servis yang paling banyak iaitu yang bernama 'Peralatan Khas Servis A' dan 'Peralatan Khas Servis B' telah dipilih dan semua peralatan ini telah menjadi perkara fokus di setiap pusat servis kenderaan tersebut. Semasa penyelidikan awal, satu kaji selidik berkaitan kesedaran Analisis Tahap Kegagalan dan Kesan telah dijalankan dan 98% daripada pengguna sangat memahami tentang keseluruhan penggunaan dan kelebihan Analisis Tahap Kegagalan dan Kesan ini. Satu lagi kaji selidik telah dijalankan ke atas semua pengguna mengenai Jadual Kelas Kekerapan yang baru ini dan dari kaji sedikit tersebut, 98% daripada pengguna telah menjawab dengan betul mengenai penggunaan Jadual Kelas Kekerapan yang baru ini. Daripada analisis yang dilaksanakan di empat (4) pusat servis kenderaan VATA, Nombor Keutamaan Risiko yang tertinggi ialah 700. Bagi memastikan Modul Analisis Tahap Kegagalan dan Kesan untuk peralatan khas servis mudah digunapakai dan tidak mengganggu tugas harian di pusat servis, satu pengkalan data menggunakan Microsoft Excel telah dibangunkan dimana sebahagian maklumat telah

dihubungkan terus ke fail format 'pdf' seperti yang dipersetujui oleh kesemua 23 juruteknik berpengalaman semasa pembentangan dan penggunaan sebenar Modul Analisis Tahap Kegagalan dan Kesan untuk peralatan khas servis. Kelebihan-kelebihan modul ini adalah para pengguna dapat melayari terus kesemua dokumen Analisis Tahap Kegagalan dan Kesan, memahami semua risiko yang berpotensi dan mengenalpasti dengan jelas maklumat teknikal peralatan khas servis. Berdasarkan maklumbalas para pengguna semasa kaji selidik Modul Analisis Tahap Kegagalan dan Kesan untuk peralatan khas servis, para pengguna yang terlibat di dalam kaji sedikit ini sangat bersetuju 100% bahawa mereka mudah memahami kesemua potensi tahap kegagalan dan menyedari keseluruhan potensi kesannya jika peralatan khas servis tidak digunakan semasa servis selepas jualan. Berdasarkan kesemua maklumbalas ini, ini menunjukkan bahawa Pembangunan Modul Analisis Tahap Kegagalan dan Kesan untuk peralatan khas servis adalah sangat bernilai dan alat kualiti yang mesra pelanggan untuk penggunaan juruteknik servis di pusat-pusat servis kenderaan VATA.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All the praise to Allah the Al-Mighty for his blessing and benevolence.

The author wishes to express his sincere gratitude and appreciation to the numerous individuals who have contributed towards the completion of this thesis:

- To all my supervisors: Ir. Hj. Mohd Rasid bin Osman, Prof. Datin Dr. Napsiah binti Ismail, Prof. Dr. Wong Shaw Voon for their invaluable advise, supervision and assistance;
- To all related engineers and technicians at VATA automotive company for their participation in verifying STFMEA datasheets;
- To all top management and service personnel at four (4) VATA service centres as case study companies for their willingness to participate in interviews, presentations, discussions, meetings, verification and validation sessions in order to achieve all the research objectives;
- To all other individuals that directly and indirectly involved in this research

Thank you for all the supports, contributions and co-operations.

May Allah bless you all.

I certify that a Thesis Examination Committee has met on 13 December 2011 to conduct the final examination of Erialdi bin Syahrial on his thesis entitled “Development of Service Tool Failure Mode and Effect Analysis (STFMEA) Module for Automotive Service Centers” in accordance with the Universities and University College Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The committee recommends that the student be awarded the Master of Science.

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

Norzima binti Zulkifli, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Shamsuddin bin Sulaiman, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

B.T. Hang Tuah bin Baharudin, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Shahrul Kamaruddin, PhD

Associate Professor
School of Mechanical Engineering
Universiti Sains Malaysia
(External Examiner)

SEOW HENG FONG, PhD

Professor and Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 2 March 2012

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Mohd Rasid bin Osman, P Eng

Lecturer
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Napsiah binti Ismail, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Wong Shaw Voon, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

BUJANG BIN KIM HUAT, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

DECLARATION

I declare that the thesis is my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously and is not concurrently, submitted for any other degree at Universiti Putra Malaysia or other institutions.



ERIALDI BIN SYAHRIAL

Date: 13th December 2011

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Example of Design FMEA (DFMEA) Severity Rating Table (AIAG, 2000)	25
2.2 Example of Process FMEA (PFMEA) Severity Rating Table (AIAG, 2000)	26
2.3 Example of Design FMEA (DFMEA) Occurrence Rating Table (AIAG, 2000)	28
2.4 Example of Process FMEA (PFMEA) Occurrence Rating Table (AIAG, 2000)	29
2.5 Example of Design FMEA (DFMEA) Detection Rating Table (AIAG, 2000)	30
2.6 Example of Process FMEA (PFMEA) Detection Rating Table (AIAG, 2000)	32
2.7 Simple example of PFMEA (Gilchrist, 1992)	39
2.8 DFMEA (Sharma <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	40
2.9 Detail example of PFMEA (Ookalkar <i>et al.</i> , 2009)	41
2.10 DFMEA (Marcello Bralia, 2000)	44
2.11 PFMEA (Ben Daya and Abdul Raouf, 1996)	45
3.1 Comparison DFMEA, PFMEA and STFMEA format	65
4.1 Total VATA service branches	82
4.2 Detail of case study companies	83
4.3 Types of Service Tool A	89
4.4 Applicable VATA models for each type of STA	90
4.5 Types of Service Tool B	91

4.6	Applicable VATA models for each type of STB	93
4.7	Total working and involved service personnel at each case study companies	94
4.8	Percentage of STA service tools utilization at VATA SCA	96
4.9	Percentage of STB service tools utilization at VATA SCA	98
4.10	New Occurrence Rating Table for STFMEA	100
4.11	Result of 3 main questions during new Occurrence Rating Table Survey	102
4.12	Result of remaining 2 questions during new Occurrence Rating Table Survey	103
4.13	A new Occurrence Rating Table test result summary	104
4.14	Example of basic STFMEA datasheet	108
4.15	RPN for 14 types of STA at VATA SCA	110
4.16	Severity of 10 for STA	116
4.17	Severity of 10 for STB	118
4.18	Comparison of Total Spare Part and Service Tool Log Book Data	119
4.19	Current Service Control Prevention and Current Service Control Detection for STA	121
4.20	Current Service Control Prevention and Current Service Control Detection for STB	122
4.21	STFMEA datasheets verification result summary	124
4.22	Service Tool FMEA datasheets validation result summary	125

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 FMEA Process Flow (Tay and Lim, 2006)	37
2.2 FMEAs on catalyst package and exhaust system in Ford Motor Company (Ginn <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	43
3.1 Methodology of Service Tool FMEA (STFMEA) Module development	51
3.2 Flow Chart of Stage 1 in STFMEA Module development	54
3.3 Flow Chart of Stage 2 in STFMEA Module development	56
3.4 Flow Chart of Stage 3 in STFMEA Module development	59
3.5 Flow Chart of Stage 4 in STFMEA Module development	60
3.6 Design Failure Mode and Effect Analysis (DFMEA) form	63
3.7 Process Failure Mode and Effect Analysis (PFMEA) form	64
3.8 A proposed Service Tool Failure Mode and Effect Analysis (STFMEA) form	64
3.9 Process flow of new product introduction (VATA, 2005)	67
3.10 Flow Chart of Stage 5 in STFMEA Module development	72
3.11 Example of blank datasheet for basic STFMEA	74
3.12 Flow Chart of Stage 6 in STFMEA Module development	76
3.13 Flow Chart of Stage 7 in STFMEA Module development	78
4.1 Service Tool FMEA Awareness Survey results	86
4.2 Example of basic STFMEA form	88
4.3 Actual scenario of STA service tools at VATA SCA	97

4.4	Actual scenario of STB service tools at VATA SCA	99
4.5	Example of full Service Tool FMEA datasheet	107
4.6	STA RPN Pareto Diagram at VATA SCA	111
4.7	STA RPN Pareto Diagram at VATA SCB	111
4.8	STA RPN Pareto Diagram at VATA SCC	112
4.9	STA RPN Pareto Diagram at VATA SCD	112
4.10	STB RPN Pareto Diagram at VATA SCA	114
4.11	STB RPN Pareto Diagram at VATA SCB	114
4.12	STB RPN Pareto Diagram at VATA SCC	115
4.13	STB RPN Pareto Diagram at VATA SCD	115
4.14	STA with Occurrence Rating 10	117
4.15	STB with Occurrence Rating 10	120
4.16	Front Page of STFMEA Module	126
4.17	Main Menu of STFMEA Module	127
4.18	Example of Service Tool A (STA) details	127
4.19	Example of Basic FMEA Form	128
4.20	Example of Full FMEA Form	129
4.21	End User Feedback on STFMEA Module	130

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

FMEA	-	Failure Mode and Effect Analysis
STFMEA	-	Service Tool Failure Mode and Effect Analysis
DFMEA	-	Design Failure Mode and Effect Analysis
PFMEA	-	Process Failure Mode and Effect Analysis
SFMEA	-	Service Failure Mode and Effect Analysis
RPN	-	Risk Priority Number
VATA	-	Car Manufacturing Company in Malaysia
SCA	-	Service Center A
SCB	-	Service Center B
SCC	-	Service Center C
SCD	-	Service Center D
STA	-	Service Tool A
STB	-	Service Tool B
CD	-	Compact Disc
4M	-	Man, Machine, Method and Material
SRT	-	Severity Rating Table
ORT	-	Occurrence Rating Table
DRT	-	Detection Rating Table

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
APPROVAL	ix
DECLARATION	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvi
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background	1
1.1.1 Problem Statement	3
1.2 Objectives of the Research	5
1.3 Scope of the Research	6
1.4 Layout of the Thesis	7
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Quality Definition	9
2.2 FMEA History	9
2.3 FMEA Definition	10
2.4 FMEA Objectives	11
2.5 FMEA Application	12
2.6 FMEA Types	15
2.6.1 Design Failure Mode and Effect Analysis (DFMEA)	16
2.6.2 Process Failure Mode and Effect Analysis (PFMEA)	17
2.6.3 Service Failure Mode and Effect Analysis (SFMEA)	18
2.7 FMEA Factors	19
2.7.1 Potential Failure Mode	20
2.7.2 Potential Failure of Effect	20
2.7.3 Potential Cause	21
2.8 FMEA Rating Tables	21
2.8.1 Severity Rating Table (SRT)	24
2.8.2 Occurrence Rating Table (ORT)	27
2.8.3 Detection Rating Table (DRT)	29
2.9 FMEA Output	33
2.10 FMEA Organization Category	34
2.11 FMEA Process Flow or Approach	35

2.12	FMEA Application	38
2.12.1	PFMEA in Process A (Example)	38
2.12.2	DFMEA in Nozzle Box Design	39
2.12.3	PFMEA in Healthcare Industry	40
2.12.4	DFMEA and PFMEA in Automotive Industry	43
2.12.5	DFMEA in Injection Line System	44
2.12.6	PFMEA in PCB Insertion Process	45
2.13	Significant Gap	46
2.14	FMEA Benefits	46
2.15	Summary	48
3	METHODOLOGY	
3.1	Introduction	49
3.2	Stage 1: Categorise the current level of FMEA implementation at VATA service centres	53
3.2.1	Identify the case study company	54
3.2.2	Identify the category of FMEA practice at VATA service centres	55
3.3	Stage 2: Assess the interest level of FMEA at VATA service centres	56
3.3.1	Conducting initial survey by using Service Tool FMEA Awareness Survey Form	57
3.3.2	Conduct discussion and demonstrate sample on Service FMEA benefits	58
3.3.3	Analyze survey result and end user feedback	58
3.4	Stage 3: Identify and discuss the service product at VATA service centres	59
3.4.1	Identify the types of Service Tool A (STA) and Service Tool B (STB)	60
3.4.2	Presentation and discussion at VATA service centres	60
3.5	Stage 4: Determine the suitable Service Tool FMEA Rating Tables	60
3.5.1	Produce STFMEA datasheet	62
3.5.2	Modify standard FMEA form	63
3.5.3	Establish new Occurrence Rating Table and utilizing existing DFMEA Severity Rating Table and PFMEA Detection Rating Table	67
3.5.4	Study and analyze service records on the frequency of replaced spare parts and frequency of service tool used	69
3.5.5	Establish new Occurrence Rating Table (ORT)	70
3.5.6	Conduct survey using new Occurrence Rating Table Survey Form	70
3.5.7	Conduct new Occurrence Rating Table (ORT) validation process using new ORT Test Form and new ORT Checklist	71

3.6	Stage 5: Produce full and basic Service Tool FMEA datasheets and analyse RPN	72 73
3.6.1	Complete full STFMEA datasheet	
3.6.2	Simplify full STFMEA datasheet and develop basic STFMEA Datasheet	74
3.6.3	Conduct presentation to all potential FMEA users at VATA service centres	74
3.7	Stage 6: Provide Service Tool FMEA datasheets to end users for verification and validation	75 76
3.7.1	Provide all the basic STFMEA datasheets to end users	
3.7.2	Conduct STFMEA datasheet validation process using STFMEA Test Form and STFMEA Checklist	77 77
3.8	Stage 7: Produce Service Tool FMEA Module	
3.8.1	Develop Service Tool FMEA (STFMEA) Module by integrating basic STFMEA datasheets and full FMEA datasheets	78
3.8.2	Conduct presentation and simulation on STFMEA Module application	79 80
3.9	Summary	
4	RESULT AND DISCUSSION	
4.1	Introduction	81
4.2	Stage 1: Current level of FMEA implementation at VATA service centres	81
4.2.1	Case study companies' justification	82
4.2.2	Actual FMEA practise at VATA service centres	84
4.3	Stage 2: Interest level of FMEA at VATA service centres	85
4.3.1	Service Tool FMEA Awareness Survey	85
4.3.2	Discussion and demonstrate sample on Service Tool FMEA	86
4.4	Stage 3: Service product at VATA service centres	88
4.4.1	Service Tool A (STA)	89
4.4.2	Service Tool B (STB)	91
4.4.3	Presentation and discussion at VATA service centres	94
4.5	Stage 4: Suitable Service Tool FMEA Rating Tables	95
4.5.1	Study and analyse service records	95
4.5.2	Establishment of new Occurrence Rating Table (ORT)	100
4.5.3	Verification on new Occurrence Rating Table (ORT)	101
4.5.4	Validation of new Occurrence Rating Table (ORT)	103
4.6	Stage 5: Establishment of full and basic Service Tool FMEA datasheets and analyze RPM	104
4.6.1	Development of full STFMEA datasheets	105
4.6.2	Simplify full STFMEA datasheet and develop basic STFMEA Datasheet	107

4.6.3	Analyze Risk Priority Number (RPN)	109
4.6.3.1	Risk Priority Number (RPN) for STA	109
4.6.3.2	Risk Priority Number (RPN) for STB	113
4.6.3.3	Severity and Occurrence Result for STA	116
4.6.3.4	Severity and Occurrence Result for STB	118
4.6.3.5	Detection Result for STA and STB at VATA SCA, VATA SCB, VATA SCC and VATA SCD	120
4.7	Stage 6: Verification and validation of Service Tool FMEA datasheets	123
4.7.1	Verification of basic STFMEA datasheets	123
4.7.2	Validation of basic STFMEA datasheets	124
4.8	Stage 7: Development of STFMEA Module	125
4.9	Acceptance of STFMEA Module	129
4.10	Summary	131
5	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
5.1	Conclusion	133
5.2	Recommendations for Future Research	135
5.2.1	Perform STFMEA on other service tools	136
5.2.2	Develop STFMEA Module System	136
5.2.3	Establish on-line system for STFMEA Module	137
5.2.4	Re-evaluate RPN Result	138
	REFERENCES / BIBLIOGRAPHY	139
	APPENDICES	A.1
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	B.1