

Understanding specifications for process calibrators

Application Note

The initial selection of a calibrator is often based on a specification sheet, a written description of the equipment's performance in quantifiable terms that applies to all calibrators having the same model number. Since specifications are based on the statistics of a large sample of calibrators, they describe the performance of a group rather than a single, specific calibrator. Any single calibrator would meet all the specifications, and usually would significantly exceed most of the various specification details.

Good specifications have the following characteristics:

- They are complete.
- They are easy to interpret and use.
- They include the effects found in normal usage, such as environment and loading.

Completeness requires that sufficient information be provided so the user can determine the bounds of performance for all anticipated outputs (or inputs), all possible and permissible environmental conditions within the listed bounds, and all permissible loads.

Ease of use is also important. Many specifications can be confusing and difficult to interpret, thus causing mistakes in interpretations that can lead to application errors or faulty calibrations.

The requirement for completeness conflicts somewhat with that for ease of use; one can be traded for the other. The challenge of specification design is to mutually satisfy both, which is sometimes accomplished by bundling the effects of many

error contributions within a useful and common window of operation. For example, the listed performance may be valid for a period of six months when used in a temperature range of 23 + 5 °C, and in humidity up to 80 percent, and for all loads up to a specified maximum rating. This is a great simplification for the user since the error contributions of time, temperature, humidity, and loads are included in the basic specification and can be ignored as long as operation is maintained within the listed bounds.

The importance of specifications

Comprehensive specifications are essential in maintaining a chain of traceability and in ensuring global uniformity of products, quality and product safety.

Traceability

Traceability is a term that refers to the fact that instruments have been proven to conform with the official standards for the parameters which they measure. This means the measurements made by this equipment are traceable to national standards. A certified instrument is one which itself has been regularly tested by even better-performing certified devices. Specific test procedures are used, and the results are documented and must be repeated at specific intervals of time. This chain sequence of comparing to superior performing certified devices is repeated until, finally, specific comparisons are made with standards maintained by national authorities, such as the National Institute of



Standards and Technology (NIST) in the U.S. This unbroken chain of comparisons is often called a “traceability chain.”

For a process calibrator, traceability refers to the fact that the process calibrator's test and measurement functions have been verified to perform within its required specifications, and that this usage of the calibrator falls within the appropriate limits of performance, including signal levels, environmental conditions, conditions of use and time between performance verifications. The performance is usually checked using the procedures recommended by the manufacturer and the recommended types of superior performing equipment.

Traceable measurements ensure the uniformity and quality of manufactured goods and industrial processes. They are essential to the development of technology. Without traceable measurements, there can be a variance in product/

process quality that often proves costly. Bad quality is expensive, both in terms of cost to rectify and in damage to a company's reputation.

Traceable measurements also support equity in trade as well as compliance to regulatory laws and standards.

The growing global acceptance of the ISO 9000 quality standards has also led to an increase in commercial requirements for the traceable calibration of test and measurement equipment. The purpose, with an eye to product quality and fitness for use, is to ensure that the products manufactured in one country will be acceptable in another on the basis of agreed-to measurement standards, methods, and practices.

How good should a calibrator's specifications be?

Whether doing instrument calibration, industrial process control, or even product performance testing, the equipment performing the test must always have superior performance when compared to the tolerances of the test. The term Test Uncertainty Ratio (TUR) describes the ratio of the test tolerance to the superior performance of the testing equipment and other contributing error factors. To eliminate undesired effects due to errors in the calibration equipment, it is ideal for the performance of the test equipment to be ten or more times better than the test tolerance limits. However this is often not practical to achieve. Consequently, it has been shown that if the equipment is three to five times better than the test tolerance then the error of the calibration equipment has no practical consequence. As a result, it is commonly accepted in industry that a ratio of four to one is an adequate TUR. For example, if a transmitter with an accuracy specification of 1 percent is to be checked by a calibrator, the performance of the calibrator during the test must be

better than or equal to .25 percent (thereby having a minimum of four times better performance than the transmitter).

As transmitters and other devices being tested become more accurate it is frequently difficult in the field to achieve the historical rule of thumb 4:1 TUR. This results in lower confidence in your calibration, especially if the result is near the maximum allowable error. For most users, conducting a detailed statistical uncertainty analysis is not practical. There are relatively simple methods to regain that confidence such as guardbanding, which are beyond the scope of this application note.

For more information on guardbanding, visit, www.fluke.com/guardbanding.

How should a calibrator's performance compare to its specifications?

It must be understood that the published specifications of equipment apply to an entire population of equipment provided by a manufacturer, not just one individual piece of equipment. Consequently, an individual piece of equipment should not just marginally meet its published specifications, but usually should perform much better than its published specification. Just how much better is determined by the philosophy and policies of the manufacturer. This refers to the confidence level or coverage factor that supports a specification. There is no accepted standard used uniformly throughout industry. Sometimes it can be 95 percent, or as low as 64 percent, or even 99 percent or higher for conservative specification philosophies. Fluke's philosophy is for a confidence level of 99 percent or better. (Using statistics, this confidence refers to a coverage of nearly three standard deviations of errors.) A benefit of such a conservative approach is that the typical true performance of an individual

instrument on a specific specification is approximately one-third the maximum error as published in its specification. This improves the actual TUR by about a factor of three when compared to the TUR calculated from a published specification sheet. For example, a calibrator with a published specification of .25 percent can provide actual performance with typical errors of approximately .08 percent or even better.

A caution to be considered when selecting different alternatives from different manufacturers: there may be a hidden effect due to differing confidence level philosophies. The different manufacturers' varying confidence level philosophies can cause major misinterpretations. For example, a conservative specification of .1 percent can have a typical performance of about .03 percent; however, a somewhat liberally specified unit of .08 percent can have typical performance that only just equals that specification, and often could have performance outside of this range. However, an uninformed comparison of the two alternatives tends to favor the .08 percent unit, which would, in fact, provide much inferior performance. Two rules to use when comparing independent specifications: (1) try to ascertain the confidence levels of the specifications so both can be compared on an equal basis, and (2) consider a published specification a general indication of performance (always try to test the actual performance of different devices as a basis for selection).

Interpreting specifications

Many companies have complex procedures and tests that a calibrator must pass prior to purchase and acceptance. But before that evaluation can begin, one must decide which calibrators should be evaluated. The calibrator specifications are usually the first step in the process.

Ideally, specifications are a written description of a calibrator's performance that objectively quantifies its capabilities. It should be remembered that specifications do not equal the performance—they are performance parameters. They can be conservative or aggressive. Manufacturers are not bound by any convention as to how they present specifications. Reputable manufacturers will attempt to describe performance of their products as accurately and clearly as possible without hiding areas of poor performance by omission of relevant specifications. Some manufacturers, like Fluke, will specify their products conservatively, and their calibrators will usually outperform their specifications. Other manufacturers may manipulate specifications to make an instrument appear more capable than it really is. Impressive specifications touted in advertisements or brochures may be incomplete and reflect only a small part of the total usable calibrator performance.

Advertisements and product literature often make liberal use of footnotes, asterisks, and superscripts. In general, there are two types of footnotes—those that inform and those that qualify. Always read all footnotes carefully and determine which have a direct effect on the specification.

The buyer should also be aware that a calibrator specification applies to an entire product run of a particular instrument model. For example, the specification for a Fluke 754 applies to all 754s made; it does not describe the actual performance of any individual 754. Since the variation in the performance of individual calibrators from nominal tends to be normally distributed, a large majority of the units of a specific model should perform well within their specification limits. In fact, most individual calibrators can be expected to perform much better than specified, although the performance of an individual




Figure 1. Uncertainty as a function of time.

calibrator should never be taken as representative of the model class as a whole.

The calibrator that is purchased will most likely give excellent performance even though there is always a small chance that its performance will be marginal, or even out of specification, at some parameter or function.

Accuracy vs. uncertainty

Typically, the number on the cover of a data sheet or brochure will read “accuracy to 0.02 percent.” This is commonly accepted usage equivalent to saying “measurement uncertainty of 0.02 percent”. This means that measurements made with this device can be expected to be within 0.02 percent of the true value. In examining a specification, you need to be aware that a specification such as this (1) is often over the shortest time interval, (2) is often over the smallest temperature span, (3) is sometimes a relative specification, and (4) may be derived using a non-conservative confidence level. The impact of each of these factors is discussed below.

1. Time

Specifications usually include a specific time period during which the calibrator can be expected

to perform as specified. Setting this time period or calibration interval is necessary to account for the drift rate inherent in a calibrator's analog circuitry. This is the calibration interval, or the measure of a calibrator's ability to remain within its stated specification for a certain length of time. Time periods of 30, 90, 180, and 360 days are common and practical. For Fluke 750 Series calibrators, this time period may be either one or two years. While the specifications for Fluke calibrators include variations in performance due to the passage of time, other manufacturers' calibrators may not be specified in the same manner. Figure 1 shows how a calibrator's uncertainty increases over time. When evaluating specifications, make sure you're comparing the same time intervals.

Key components of a specification

The analysis of specifications can be complicated. To have a clear picture of the true specifications, you should be aware of the key components of a specification, and how to extract them from all the footnotes, from the fine print, and from the specification itself. Each specification must be carefully considered when comparing calibrators from different vendors. The four most important components of a documenting process calibrator specification are:

- time
- temperature
- allowance for traceability to standards
- confidence level

Any calibrator can be specified to super-high performance levels at the time of calibration. Unfortunately, such levels are good for only the first few minutes following calibration. If the specifications for a calibrator do not state the time interval over which they are valid, the manufacturer should be contacted for a clarification.

2. Temperature

Performance over the specified temperature range is also critical. Make sure the temperature intervals specified will meet your workload requirements.

The specified temperature range is necessary to account for the thermal coefficients in the calibrator's analog circuitry. The most common ranges are centered about room temperature, $23 \pm 5^\circ\text{C}$. This range reflects realistic operating conditions. It should be remembered that temperature bounds must apply for the entire calibration interval. Thus, a temperature range specification of $23 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ presumes very strict long-term control of the operating environment. Such a temperature range would not be representative of normal operation for a process calibrator.

Outside the specified range, a temperature coefficient (TC) is used to describe the degradation of the accuracy specification. The TC represents an error component that must be added to a calibrator's specification if it is being used outside of its nominal temperature range.

For example, in Figure 2 we are looking at the uncertainty as a function of temperature at full scale on the 30 volt dc range of a Fluke 754 calibrator. The dashed line shows the specified accuracy for a $23 \pm 5^\circ\text{C}$ temperature range common on most Fluke calibrators. Within the span of the dashed line, the accuracy is within the specifications of 0.025 percent of full scale. This is in line with a specification of "0.02 percent of reading + 0.005 percent of full scale when used at $23 \pm 5^\circ\text{C}$." This applies for a range of 18°C to 28°C . Beyond




Figure 2. Uncertainty vs temperature, at full scale on the 30 volt dc range.

this range, the instrument's performance degrades as shown by the solid line. TC will usually be given in a specification footnote, and will take the form:

$$TC = x \% / ^\circ\text{C}$$

where x is the amount that the performance degrades per change in degree beyond the base range specification. To calculate the accuracy due to temperatures outside of the given specification, the temperature modifier, tmod, is needed. The formula is:

$$t_{\text{mod}} = |TC \times \Delta t|$$

Where:

Δt = operating temperature minus the temperature range limit

t = the proposed operating temperature

range limit = the range limit that t is beyond

If one wishes to use a calibrator in an ambient temperature outside of its specified range, the effects of TC must be added to the baseline accuracy specification when calculating the total accuracy. The tmod term is used to calculate the total specification using the general formula:

$$\text{total spec} = (\text{basic accuracy at a specific temp. range}) + t_{\text{mod}}$$

For example, suppose we have a calibrator whose rated accuracy is 0.025% @ $23 \pm 5^\circ\text{C}$. Its TC is 0.0012% / °C. To calculate

the accuracy of the calibrator for operation at 32°C or 90°F :

$$t = 32$$

$$\text{range limit} = 23 + 5 = 28$$

$$t_{\text{mod}} = 0.0012\% |32 - 28|$$

$$= 0.0012\% |4| = 0.005\%$$

$$\text{total spec} = 0.025\% + 0.005\%$$

$$= 0.03\%$$

As can be seen, the specification may change dramatically when the effects of performance due to temperature are considered.

Knowing how to calculate tmod will be necessary when comparing two instruments that are specified for different temperature ranges. For example, Fluke specifies most of its calibrators with a range of $23 \pm 5^\circ\text{C}$. However, another manufacturer may specify a calibrator at $23 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$. To truly compare the two calibrators, one needs to put them in the same terms ($23 \pm 5^\circ\text{C}$) using the preceding calculation.

The most modern calibrators and instruments are specified to operate in wider temperature ranges because calibration instruments are no longer used outside of the closely-controlled laboratory. Calibration at the process plant demands greater temperature flexibility. The preceding equation was used to characterize the degradation in performance that occurs when the calibrator is operated outside the $23 \pm 5^\circ\text{C}$ temperature range restriction on the data sheet.

3. Allowance for traceability to standards

Uncertainty specifications must also be evaluated as relative or total. Relative uncertainty does not include the additional uncertainty of the reference standards used to calibrate the instrument. For example, when a calibrator’s uncertainty is specified as relative to calibration standards, this covers only the uncertainty in the calibrator. This is an incomplete statement regarding the instrument’s total uncertainty. Total uncertainty includes all uncertainties in the traceability chain: the relative uncertainty of the unit, plus the uncertainty of the equipment used to calibrate it.

4. Confidence level

The most critical factor in a calibrator’s performance is what percentage of the calibrators will be out of calibration at the end of its calibration interval. Specifications must be conservative to ensure the calibrator is in tolerance—with a high degree of confidence—at the end of its calibration interval.

For example, say that vendors X and Y offer calibrators. Vendor X’s specifications state that its calibrator can supply 10 V with an accuracy of 0.019 percent, and vendor Y’s specification is 0.025 percent accuracy for the 10 V output. Neither of the data sheets for the calibrators supply a confidence level for the specifications, nor do they state how the accuracy is distributed.

When questioned, the vendors will state that their specifications are based on a normal distribution of accuracy and have the following confidence levels. Their responses are tabulated in Table 1.

Vendor	Stated spec @10 V	Confidence level (coverage factor)
X	0.019 %	95 %
Y	0.025 %	99 %

Table 1. Specification comparison




Figure 3. Same performance, different specifications.

In this example, as shown in Figure 3, the actual performance of the calibrators is identical! Vendor X, choosing a confidence level of 95 percent, is willing to risk 5 percent of their calibrators being found out of spec at the end of the stated time interval, and states a spec of 0.019 percent. The shaded and solid areas under the normal distribution curve represent the fraction of the calibrator population at risk. Vendor Y, choosing a confidence level of 99 percent, is willing to risk only 1 percent of their calibrators being found out of spec, and states a spec of 0.025 percent. The solid areas under the

curve represent the fraction of the calibrator population at risk. So you see, identical calibrator performance can yield different specifications, depending on how aggressive the calibrator manufacturer chooses to be with the specifications of your calibrator.

Before making a purchase, it is critical to gain an understanding of a vendor’s philosophy with respect to confidence level and ask the vendor to clarify the confidence level when there is doubt as to what it is. Fluke uses a very conservative 99 percent confidence level for its specifications for calibrators and standards.

Other considerations

Accuracy specifications are an important part of determining whether or not a particular calibrator will satisfy a need. There are, however, many other factors that determine which calibrator is best suited for an application, some of which are described below.

The workload

Remember that the calibrator’s specification must match your workload requirements. There is a tendency for manufacturers to engage in a numbers race, with each new calibrator having more and more impressive specifications, although often this has little bearing on true workload coverage.

Support standards

The support standard will typically be three to ten times more accurate than the calibrators supported. This is known as the test uncertainty ratio (TUR). Specialized calibrators or those that require exotic support equipment on an infrequent basis may best be served by an outside service bureau.

Manufacturer support

Manufacturer support is also important. Can the manufacturer provide support as calibration needs grow and vary? Are in-house experts available to assist with technical issues? Are training programs available? Are service facilities conveniently located? Is there an adequate line of support products and accessories?

Reliability

Reliability is another important consideration in how useful a calibrator will be. Precision electronic calibrators can have a seemingly high failure rate. Any condition that causes the calibrator to fall outside of its extremely tight tolerance constitutes a failure. One should ask for a Mean-Time-To-Fail (MTTF) rate to determine when the first failure might occur. Failures upon delivery usually make this interval shorter than the Mean-Time-Between-Failure (MTBF) rate. Whichever is quoted, consider whether the number is based on actual field experience or just calculated projections.

Service philosophy

When a calibrator does fail, the manufacturer’s approach to service is critical. A responsive service organization is essential to getting equipment back in action fast. Issues to consider include one’s proximity to service center locations, stocking levels for spare parts and sub-assemblies, availability of service manuals and service training for one’s own technicians, all of which go into determining how soon equipment can be returned to service.

Reputation

Finally, the manufacturer’s reputation should be assessed. Overall, how credible are its claims with respect to performance, reliability, and service? Will the company still be in business five years from now? All of these issues define the true cost of owning and using a calibrator.



Terminology

Accuracy—how close the measurement of a parameter is to the true value of that parameter. Often expressed as a percentage of the reading or as a percent of full scale.

Confidence level—the percentage of the area of the normal curve that lies within the confidence interval. A confidence level of 95 percent is obtained when the range of confidence is from minus two standard deviations to plus two standard deviations. Fluke usually uses a confidence level of 99 percent or greater when specifying test instruments.

Hysteresis—the maximum difference between output readings for the same measurand point, one point obtained while increasing from zero and the other while decreasing from full scale. The points are taken on the same continuous cycle. The deviation is expressed as a percent of full scale.

NIST—(National Institute of Standards and Technology): the U.S. national standards laboratory, which is legally responsible for maintaining the standards on which all U.S. measurements are based.

Noise—a disturbance, caused by random changes in voltage and current, which interferes with the measurement of a signal.

Nonlinearity—the deviation from standard line output plotted against linear input.

Repeatability—the ability of a calibrator to output the same readings given the same conditions of temperature, humidity, time, atmospheric pressure, etc.

Resolution—the smallest discernible amount that can be either measured or generated within a specific function's range. In a calibrator, it often refers to either the smallest incremental change that can be made in a signal sourcing function, or the smallest measurable change in a signal measurement function.

Test uncertainty ratio (TUR)—The test uncertainty ratio for a calibration point is the specified uncertainty of the instrument under test divided by the specified uncertainty of the calibrator or standard used to test it. The specifications for the instruments must reflect the same confidence level.

Traceability—a characteristic of a calibration, analogous to a pedigree. A traceable calibration is achieved when each test instrument, calibrator, and standard, in a hierarchy stretching back to the national standard, is itself properly calibrated, and the results properly documented. The documentation provides the information needed to show that all the calibrations in the chain of calibrations were properly performed.

This application note has been adapted from "Chapter 31: Instrument Specifications," in *Calibration: Philosophy in Practice*, Second Edition, Fluke Corporation 1994.

For more information about this useful, comprehensive textbook, call 1-800-FLUKE in the U.S. or contact your local Fluke representative.

Fluke. *Keeping your world up and running.®*

Fluke Corporation

PO Box 9090, Everett, WA 98206 U.S.A.

Fluke Europe B.V.

PO Box 1186, 5602 BD Eindhoven, The Netherlands

For more information call:

In the U.S.A. (800) 443-5853 or

Fax (425) 446-5116

In Europe/M-East/Africa +31 (0) 40 2675 200 or

Fax +31 (0) 40 2675 222

In Canada (800)-36-FLUKE or

Fax (905) 890-6866

From other countries +1 (425) 446-5500 or

Fax +1 (425) 446-5116

Web access: <http://www.fluke.com>

©2002-2014 Fluke Corporation.
Specifications subject to change without notice.
Printed in U.S.A. 4/2014 1261947D_EN

Modification of this document is not permitted without written permission from Fluke Corporation.