# Predictive Maintenance Analytics
## for Smart Manufacturing

### Insights Report and Business Recommendations


**Prepared by:**

Roua Smida
Rooya Jelassi
Mohamed Al Aziz Shabou
Mohamed Nidhal El Moulaa

**Tunis Business School**


**January 5, 2026**

## Abstract

This report analyzes predictive maintenance data from a smart manufacturing facility, uncovering key drivers of machine failures and providing actionable recommendations to reduce downtime and costs. Using 10,000 event records, we identify high-risk machines, products, and failure modes, and propose targeted interventions for operational improvement.


## Contents

# 1 Executive Summary

This report delivers a comprehensive analysis of predictive maintenance data for a smart manufacturing facility operating CNC milling machines. Leveraging 10,000 machine event records from three machines (A, B, C) and three product types (L, M, H) over a seven-day period, we identify actionable insights to drive operational excellence and cost savings.

## 1.1 Key Insights

- **Failure Rate:** 3.39% (339 failures in 10,000 events).
- **Machine B:** Highest failure rate (3.66%).
- **Product L:** Most failure-prone (3.92%).
- **HDF:** Main failure mode (115 occurrences, 32% of indicators).
- **Tool Wear:** Failures increase above 130 minutes.

## 1.2 Why These Results Matter

- **Business Impact:** Downtime costs the facility $2,500–3,400 weekly, with potential for 25–35% reduction through targeted actions.
- **Strategic Value:** Data-driven maintenance transforms operations from reactive to proactive, improving reliability and reducing costs.

**This report provides a roadmap for immediate and long-term improvements, with clear recommendations, limitations, and future directions.**

# 2 Analytical Framework

This analysis addressed ten key questions defined in the project scope:

## 2.1 Research Questions Investigated

1. Overall machine failure rate and distribution across failure modes
2. Product types exhibiting highest failure rates
3. Machines experiencing most frequent failures
4. Operating conditions associated with failures
5. Temperature and tool wear differences: failed vs. normal operations
6. Failure rate evolution over time
7. Temperature and tool-wear thresholds for increased failure risk
8. Failure distribution across shifts and time periods
9. Critical product-machine combinations
10. Production impact and most effective preventive actions

### 2.2 Key Performance Indicators Tracked

Our dashboards visualize eight core KPIs:

- Machine Failure Rate (%)
- Failure Count and Rate by Mode (HDF, OSF, PWF, TWF, RNF)
- Failure Rate by Product Type (L/M/H)
- Failure Rate by Machine/Line
- Average Process Temperature at Failure vs. Normal Operation
- Average Tool Wear at Failure vs. Normal Operation
- Number of Failures by Shift and Time Period
- Estimated Lost Production Events

## 3 Key Findings

### 3.1 Overall Reliability Performance

The facility recorded **339 machine failures** across 10,000 production events, resulting in an overall failure rate of **3.39%**. While this indicates generally reliable operations, the cost implications are significant:

- Each failure causes production delays, emergency repairs, and potential order fulfillment issues
- Assuming 30 minutes average downtime per failure and 100 events/day production capacity, failures result in approximately **17 hours of lost production per week**
- With typical CNC operation costs of $150–200/hour, this translates to **$2,500–3,400 weekly losses**

### 3.2 Machine-Level Analysis

**Machine B is the weakest link** in the production line:

| Machine | Total Events | Failures | Failure Rate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Machine B | 3,333 | 122 | 3.66% |
| Machine C | 3,333 | 111 | 3.33% |
| Machine A | 3,334 | 106 | 3.18% |
| **Total** | **10,000** | **339** | **3.39%** |

Table 1: Failure rates by machine

**Why this matters:** Machine B's 15% higher failure rate compared to Machine A suggests mechanical wear, calibration drift, or inadequate cooling. Addressing Machine B alone could reduce total facility failures by up to 5%.

### 3.3 Product Type Impact

Product Type L exhibits the **highest failure rate**, significantly outpacing other product types:

- **Product L:** Highest failure count (approximately 200+ failures) – associated with more demanding machining requirements
- **Product M:** Moderate failure count (approximately 50–80 failures)

- **Product H:** Lowest failure count (approximately 20–30 failures) – premium product with tighter process controls

**Why this matters:** Product L likely requires more aggressive machining parameters, increasing mechanical stress. This suggests Product L operations need differentiated maintenance protocols and potentially upgraded tooling.

### 3.4 Failure Mode Distribution

Heat Dissipation Failure (HDF) is the **dominant failure mode**, accounting for approximately 32% of all failure indicators:

*Note: A single failure event may trigger multiple failure modes simultaneously, so percentages represent the share of each mode among all failure indicators recorded.*

| Failure Mode | Count | Share of Indicators |
|---|---|---|
| Heat Dissipation Failure (HDF) | 115 | 31.5% |
| Power Failure (PWF) | 95 | 26.0% |
| Overstrain Failure (OSF) | 90 | 24.7% |
| Tool Wear Failure (TWF) | 46 | 12.6% |
| Random Failure (RNF) | 19 | 5.2% |
| **Total Indicators** | **365** | **100%** |

Table 2: Distribution of failure modes

**Why this matters:** The prevalence of HDF indicates **systemic cooling inadequacy** across the facility. Unlike random failures, thermal issues are predictable and preventable through cooling system upgrades.

### 3.5 Operating Conditions and Failure Thresholds

Our analysis identified a **clear tool wear threshold** associated with failures:

- **Average tool wear across all events:** 108 minutes (matching dashboard KPI of 107.95)
- **Observed threshold for increased risk:** Operations exceeding 130 minutes show elevated failure probability
- **Recommended replacement interval:** 120–130 minutes for preventive maintenance

**Why this matters:** Tools operating beyond 130 minutes of cumulative wear show exponentially higher failure risk. Implementing automated alerts at this threshold would enable proactive tool replacement before failure occurs.

### 3.6 Critical Machine-Product Combinations

The heatmap analysis revealed high-risk combinations:

- **Machine B + Product L:** 4.26% failure rate (highest risk)
- **Machine A + Product L:** 3.99% failure rate
- **Machine C + Product M:** 3.51% failure rate

**Why this matters:** These combinations require **differentiated maintenance protocols**. Machine B should not be assigned Product L batches during high-demand periods, or should receive enhanced pre-production checks when processing Product L.

# 4 Business Recommendations

Based on the analysis, the following business recommendations are prioritized for maximum impact and feasibility.

## 4.1 1. Prioritize Preventive Maintenance for Machine B

**Action:** Launch a bi-weekly preventive maintenance program for Machine B, including calibration, bearing checks, cooling system inspection, and tool alignment.

**Impact:** Expected 30–40% reduction in Machine B failures, with a facility-wide reduction of 10–12%.

**ROI:** Saves $5,000–7,000 per 10,000 events; cost-effective at $200–300 bi-weekly.

## 4.2 2. Upgrade and Audit Cooling Systems

**Action:** Invest in HVAC upgrades, localized cooling, and real-time temperature monitoring. Schedule quarterly cooling system audits (filters, coolant, thermal imaging).

**Impact:** Reduces HDF by 50–60%, prevents 10–15 failures quarterly, and maintains long-term reliability.

**ROI:** Payback in 6–9 months; annual savings $15,000–20,000.

## 4.3 3. Implement Tool Wear Monitoring and Alerts

**Action:** Deploy real-time tool wear tracking with alerts at 110 and 130 minutes, and mandatory replacement at 130 minutes.

**Impact:** Prevents 70–80% of tool wear failures; reduces emergency downtime.

**ROI:** Immediate; $4,500–6,000 saved per 10,000 events.

## 4.4 4. Differentiate Maintenance for Product L

**Action:** Create a Product L-specific protocol: pre-batch checks, lower tool wear limits (120 min), enhanced cooling, and post-batch inspection.

**Impact:** Reduces Product L failures by 28–34 per 10,000 events.

**ROI:** Positive for batches over 200 units.

## 4.5 5. Optimize Production Scheduling

**Action:** Restrict Machine B from Product L assignments during peak periods; use scheduling software to route high-risk batches to other machines.

**Impact:** Prevents 8–10 failures per 10,000 events at zero direct cost.

## 4.6 6. Deploy Predictive Maintenance Dashboards

**Action:** Install real-time dashboards for operations and maintenance teams, showing machine health, tool wear, and alerts.

**Impact:** Improves response time by 40–50%, reduces mean time to repair by 20–30%.

**ROI:** $8,000–10,000 annual savings.

## 4.7 7. Develop Machine Learning Failure Prediction

**Action:** Build and integrate a predictive model using historical sensor data to forecast failures 2–4 hours in advance.

**Impact:** Shifts 30–40% of maintenance from reactive to proactive; reduces unplanned downtime by 25–35%.

**ROI:** Payback in 4–6 months; long-term savings $15,000–20,000 annually.

### 4.8 8. Foster Data-Driven Maintenance Culture

**Action:** Train maintenance and operations staff on dashboard use, predictive alerts, and root cause analysis. Establish KPIs and incentives for reduced downtime and proactive interventions.
**Impact:** Sustains improvements, increases buy-in, and ensures continuous optimization.

**These recommendations are designed for phased implementation, balancing quick wins with strategic investments.**

## 5 Limitations and Constraints

While the analysis is robust and actionable, several limitations should be acknowledged:

### 5.1 Data Limitations

- **Short observation window:** Only 7 days of data (Jan 1–7, 2025) may not capture seasonal or long-term trends.
- **Synthetic dataset:** The AI4I 2020 data simulates real-world patterns but may lack the full complexity of actual operations (e.g., operator skill, raw material variability).
- **Missing context:** No operator IDs, raw material batches, ambient conditions, or prior maintenance history are included.
- **Estimated costs:** Downtime and repair costs are based on industry averages, not facility-specific accounting.

### 5.2 Analytical Limitations

- **Correlation, not causation:** Associations (e.g., tool wear and failures) are strong but not definitive proof of causality.
- **Machine B ambiguity:** Higher failure rate may reflect mechanical issues, tougher assignments, or unmeasured factors (e.g., age, prior repairs).
- **Rare events:** Some failure modes (e.g., RNF with only 19 cases) have limited statistical power for detailed analysis.

### 5.3 Implementation Constraints

- **Budget:** Recommendations require $30,000–50,000 in capital plus $1,000–1,500/month operating costs; smaller facilities may need to phase investments.
- **Scheduling flexibility:** Restricting Machine B assignments assumes production flexibility that may not always exist.
- **Staffing:** Increased preventive maintenance requires adequate workforce; lean teams may face implementation challenges.

**These limitations do not undermine the value of the insights, but should inform implementation and future data collection.**

# 6 Future Improvements

To further strengthen predictive maintenance and business value, the following improvements are recommended:

## 6.1 Enhance Data Collection

- **Expand sensor coverage:** Add vibration, acoustic, power consumption, coolant flow, and environmental sensors.
- **Capture richer context:** Record operator IDs, shift info, raw material batches, maintenance logs, and part quality data.
- **Longer observation:** Collect data for 6–12 months to capture trends, seasonality, and rare events.

## 6.2 Advance Analytics Capabilities

- **Real-time anomaly detection:** Use streaming analytics to flag abnormal conditions before failures occur.
- **Survival analysis:** Apply advanced statistical models to optimize replacement intervals and understand risk factors.
- **Prescriptive analytics:** Optimize maintenance and production schedules for cost and uptime.

## 6.3 Integrate with Business Systems

- **ERP integration:** Automate work orders, inventory, and cost tracking based on machine health data.
- **Mobile alerts:** Provide real-time notifications and digital checklists to maintenance staff.
- **Vendor collaboration:** Share data with equipment vendors for remote diagnostics and proactive service.

## 6.4 Build a Data-Driven Culture

- **Staff training:** Upskill teams on dashboard use, predictive alerts, and data-driven decision making.
- **KPIs and incentives:** Tie performance metrics to downtime reduction and proactive maintenance.
- **Continuous improvement:** Hold regular review meetings to discuss insights, trends, and improvement ideas.

**These steps will enable a mature, scalable predictive maintenance program and maximize business value.**

## 7 Conclusion

This Business Intelligence analysis has revealed **clear, actionable opportunities** to reduce machine failures and optimize maintenance operations. With an overall failure rate of 3.39% (339 failures per 10,000 events), the facility experiences significant downtime that can be substantially reduced through data-driven interventions.

Our analysis identified three primary drivers of failures:

1. **Machine-specific issues:** Machine B exhibits 15% higher failure rates, indicating need for targeted preventive maintenance
2. **Thermal management deficiencies:** Heat dissipation failures account for approximately 32% of all failure indicators, pointing to systemic cooling inadequacy
3. **Tool wear thresholds:** Clear correlation between tool wear beyond 130 minutes and elevated failure risk

The eight recommendations presented offer a **roadmap for 25–35% reduction in unplanned downtime** through a combination of:

- Low-cost operational changes (production scheduling rules, alert systems)
- Medium-cost infrastructure upgrades (cooling systems, monitoring dashboards)
- Strategic investments in advanced analytics (predictive ML models)

With total implementation costs of $30,000–50,000 in capital investment and $1,000–1,500 monthly operating costs, the **expected payback period is 6–9 months**, with long-term annual savings of $20,000–30,000 in reduced downtime and emergency repair costs.

Beyond immediate cost savings, this initiative establishes the **foundation for a mature predictive maintenance program** that can scale to additional machines, integrate with broader manufacturing systems, and continuously improve through machine learning and advanced analytics.

The key to success is **prioritization and phased implementation:**

1. **Phase 1 (Immediate – 0–30 days):** Deploy low-cost interventions (Recommendations 5, 6)
2. **Phase 2 (Short-term – 1–3 months):** Implement tool wear alert system and Machine B priority maintenance (Recommendations 1, 3)
3. **Phase 3 (Medium-term – 3–6 months):** Complete cooling infrastructure upgrade and Product L protocols (Recommendations 2, 4)
4. **Phase 4 (Long-term – 6–12 months):** Develop and deploy predictive ML models (Recommendations 7, 8)

This phased approach ensures quick wins build momentum and credibility while larger investments are planned and executed systematically.

**In summary,** this project demonstrates the power of Business Intelligence to transform manufacturing operations from reactive firefighting to proactive optimization. The insights generated are not merely academic exercises but practical, implementable solutions that deliver measurable business value.