



PM PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

PMPA

EXECUTIVE BRIEF

INDUSTRIAL SHRINK WRAPPER

PROFIT CENTER DECISION BRIEF

THE PMPA QUESTION

Is this PM program positioned to protect asset performance while making effective use of maintenance resources?

Executive Brief

1. What was assessed?

Submitted PM program plus customer provided economic inputs. This assessment does not assign a production operating state.

Customer economics: \$75 Average Loaded Maintenance Labor Rate (CUSTOMER PROVIDED) | Productive Downtime Value: \$1,000/hr (CUSTOMER PROVIDED) | Critical Asset = YES (CUSTOMER PROVIDED) | Functional Backup = NO (CUSTOMER PROVIDED)

Current maintenance effort: Separate PM frequencies, not one event: Daily 0.50 technician hours; Weekly 1.16 technician hours; Monthly 2.25 technician hours; Quarterly 2.25 technician hours; Semi-annual 1.00 technician hours; Annual 2.00 technician hours. Hours from different frequencies are not summed as a single event. This is not elapsed downtime.

Direct labor / event: Per PM frequency, not one event: Daily \$37.50; Weekly \$87.00; Monthly \$168.75; Quarterly \$168.75; Semi-annual \$75.00; Annual \$150.00.

2. Overall conclusion

This PM program is generally positioned to protect asset performance, but four work-instruction gaps should be corrected to improve execution consistency. Work associated with submitted LOTO/isolation sequences warrants downtime-window review and may be occurring within an equipment-unavailability window, subject to validation. Estimated potential profit by PM frequency, not summed: Daily up to \$170; Weekly up to \$670; Monthly up to \$1,340. Validated recoverable elapsed downtime is not yet established.

3. What is working and should be preserved?

KEEP / PRESERVE

This program includes clear inspection expectations that tell the technician what conditions to look for. Safety and work-control requirements are explicitly recognized in the submitted sequence. That recognition does not mean the submitted work-control direction is adequate.

4. Most important customer decisions

KEEP / PRESERVE	Preserve the stated required operating and isolation states Required operating or isolation states are stated in the submitted work. That required execution state is assessed independently of downtime optimization.
KEEP / PRESERVE	Preserve scheduled service replacements that are consistent with equipment-class practice Scheduled replacement of common service items is reasonably consistent with equipment-class maintenance practice. This does not certify exact OEM optimization.
KEEP / PRESERVE	Preserve executable task identity — what is being maintained, and the action to perform Submitted maintainable tasks identify what is being maintained and the action to perform, so a qualified technician can execute the work from the wording and context.

IMPROVE	State Measurement Acceptance or Action Criteria State the acceptance criterion, response criterion, actionable limit, or sufficiently specific governing source so a measurement result can support the next maintenance action.
IMPROVE	Define What a Successful Protective or Shutdown Test Proves State what successful operation of the protective or shutdown test looks like so the test can be completed and verified.
IMPROVE	Define the Required Finished Condition or Governing Reference State the required finished condition or governing technical reference so completed work can be verified.
IMPROVE	Establish Executable LOTO/Isolation Direction and Restoration Boundaries State executable LOTO/isolation direction, whether the control is row-scoped or continuing, and the restoration/re-energization boundary so the technician can apply and then release the intended control.
VALIDATE	Review Whether Work Associated With LOTO/Isolation Sequences Requires Equipment Downtime Work associated with submitted LOTO/isolation sequences is not automatically recoverable elapsed downtime. Eligibility is a site/OEM determination. Do not add task-level labor estimates merely to make a financial calculation possible.

KEEP / PRESERVE is a demonstrated strength. IMPROVE is an established deficiency. VALIDATE is a specific unresolved question. The Improvement Roadmap lists remaining items.

These KEEP / IMPROVE / VALIDATE items are PM enhancement opportunities. They are not automatically profit opportunities.

5. Supported business / financial conclusion

DIRECT PM LABOR / EVENT	DOWNTIME OPPORTUNITY	POTENTIAL PROFIT
\$37.50–\$168.75 <i>per PM frequency</i>	Identified <i>qualified downtime-review candidate</i>	UP TO \$112,970 / YEAR <i>annualized estimated potential — conditional, not guaranteed, not validated recovery</i>

How potential profit is identified

ANNUALIZED ESTIMATED POTENTIAL PROFIT
UP TO \$112,970 / YEAR

9 Is the Work Package Ready to Execute?		FAIL
WHAT WE ASSESSED	Whether a qualified technician has enough information to perform the defined work consistently from the submitted work package and any explicitly referenced governing information. Trade, tools, consumables, sequence, and labor estimates may support readiness, but they do not override a missing execution-critical criterion. A customer corporate template is not required.	
WHAT WE FOUND	The submitted PM program provides a work package, but it is not yet sufficiently defined for consistent execution. Established gaps: claimed protective-function tests that do not state what successful operation looks like; work that does not state the required finished condition or governing reference; decision-supporting measurements without an acceptance or action criterion; non-executable LOTO/isolation direction and/or continuing isolation without a restoration/re-energization boundary. This does not imply the program is unusable or that technicians are unqualified.	
WHY IT MATTERS	A missing decision trigger, required finished condition, or other execution-critical criterion leaves the technician to interpret when work is complete. That is a work-instruction gap. It does not mean the entire PM is unusable.	

10 Is the Maintenance Interval Technically Supported?		PASS
WHAT WE ASSESSED	Whether the named interval has an established engineering basis for this installed equipment and operating context. The current interval is not judged wrong merely because that basis is not in the program.	
WHAT WE FOUND	The named interval is consistent with ordinary preventive-maintenance practice for this work class. No interval deficiency or specific challenge warrant was established from available evidence. This does not certify the exact installed-equipment engineering basis or the exact OEM/model, or that every submitted task belongs at this interval. Confirm the interval against the installed equipment and operating context before changing the current frequency.	
WHY IT MATTERS	Confirm the interval against the installed equipment and operating context before changing frequency.	

11 Is Condition-Based Maintenance Applied Where Evidence Supports It?		PASS
WHAT WE ASSESSED	Whether inspect or measure tasks are consistent with condition-detection practice, and whether a P-F relationship is established from the submitted evidence. P-F hours are not invented.	
WHAT WE FOUND	11 inspect or measure tasks use condition-detection methods appropriate to the submitted work. No specific missed CBM/P-F opportunity or inappropriate time-based intervention was established. Condition text and interval wording do not prove a P-F relationship. A named program interval is not a validated P-F interval. P-F hours are not invented. This does not certify an exact P-F interval.	
WHY IT MATTERS	Condition-detection work can be recognized without proving a P-F relationship. Confirm that relationship before changing interval logic. P-F hours are not invented.	