Step 2

**The Quick-Start Guide to**

**Predictive Maintenance 4.0**

**WORKSHEET 2**

# **Choose your assets.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Value driver from step 1 | Candidate assets | | | Notes |
| baggage arrival carousels (24) | robotic baggage loaders (10) | inter-terminal belt conveyors (13 km total) | looks like inter-terminal belt conveyors tick the most boxes. |
| success would avoid excessive belt wear | ✓  yes, but carousels only account for 5% of worn belts in the system | ✗  might indirectly prevent misalignment, but 90% is caused by human loaders | ✓  accounts for 95% of worn belts in the system | prospect of avoiding 95% of belt wear is great, enough to win support for trial on subset of the system. Section E belts especially prone to wear, so may see good results there. |
| success would lower the maintenance workload so fewer technicians are needed | ✗  only incurs 3% of maintenance time spent | ✗  complex → supplier does repairs | ✓  maintenance spends 56% of their time here | PdM typically reduces repair time by 20-50%, which would cut 11-28% of workload across full system. |
| success would noticeably reduce customer-visible baggage downtime | ✓  100% of carousel failures are customer visible | ✗  human backup absorbs loss of robotic loaders, no passenger-visible difference | ✓  most breakdowns occur here (but note, 80% affects outbound / transfers, which passengers mostly link with arrival airport) | 2018 data: inter-terminal conveyor breakdown caused 78% of our baggage claim downtime, carousels only 12%. |
| **Decision** | Run pilot on the 30 conveyor units in section E5 | | | |
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