

# Rapport de Supervision IA -

Date : 2025-12-29 02:02:51

## Résultat Anomalie constaté :

```
id : 6502
tsDetected : 1766969945.4107523
eventTs : 1766965332.973037
partId : P000006
cycle : 6
machine : M2 - Usinage Ébauche - Centre d'usinage pour l'ébauche de la pièce.
stepId : M2.06
stepName : APPROACH_POS
anomalyScore : 35.0
ruleAnomaly : True
ruleReasons : [{"rule": "INTERVAL_OVERRUN", "message": "Interval exceeds nominal ratio", "details": {"previous_step_ts": "2025-12-28T23:42:10.762628Z", "current_step_ts": "2025-12-28T23:42:12.973037Z", "observed_gap_seconds": 2, "nominal_step_duration_seconds": 1.0, "threshold_seconds": 1.2, "trigger_condition": "observed_gap_seconds > 1.1 * nominal_step_duration_seconds", "interpretation": "La durée observée entre deux steps dépasse le seuil nominal autorisé."}}, {"rule": "SEQUENCE_ERROR", "message": "Workflow step(s) skipped vs nominal order", "details": {"previous_step_code": "M2.04", "current_step_code": "M2.06", "previous_step_order": 14, "current_step_order": 16, "skipped_steps_count": 1, "trigger_condition": "current_step_order > previous_step_order + 1", "observed": "Un ou plusieurs steps intermédiaires non observés dans la séquence réelle", "interpretation": "La séquence réelle saute un ou plusieurs steps définis dans le workflow nominal."}}]
hasStepError : True
nStepErrors : 1
cycleDurationS : 2.21
durationOverrunS : 1.21
eventsCount : 15
windowDays : 7
ewmaRatio : 1.0
rateRatio : 2.0
burstiness : -0.31363065184272504
hawkesScore : 35
confidence : LOW
status : OPEN
severity : MAJOR
createdAt : None
reportPath : None
```

## Prompt :

Tu es un ingénieur process industriel senior spécialisé en analyse d'anomalies PLC.

LANGUE OBLIGATOIRE : FRANÇAIS UNIQUEMENT.

INTERDICTION ABSOLUE :

- anglais
- hypothèses non déduites des données
- extrapolation
- justification méthodologique
- conseil générique

#### PRINCIPE :

- Les règles déclenchées constituent la base causale.
- Le nominal est déjà intégré dans les règles.
- L'analyse doit rester strictement factuelle.

#### STYLE :

- Technique
- Direct
- Orienté terrain
- Phrases courtes
- Aucun ton narratif

#### OBJECTIF :

Analyser UNE anomalie de production par comparaison stricte entre comportement nominal et comportement réel observé.

#### DONNÉES OPÉRATIONNELLES :

- Pièce : P000006
- Machine : M2
- Step : M2.06
- Cycle : 6

#### DONNÉES TEMPORELLES :

- Durée nominale : 1,00 s
- Durée réelle : 2,21 s
- Écart mesuré : 1,21 s
- Type d'écart : REAL\_LONGER\_THAN\_NOMINAL

#### RÈGLES DÉCLENCHEES :

##### RÈGLE 1 : INTERVAL\_OVERRUN

Description brute : Interval exceeds nominal ratio

Condition de déclenchement :  $\text{observed\_gap\_seconds} > 1.1 * \text{nominal\_step\_duration\_seconds}$

Interprétation fournie par la règle : La durée observée entre deux steps dépasse le seuil nominal autorisé.

----

##### RÈGLE 2 : SEQUENCE\_ERROR

Description brute : Workflow step(s) skipped vs nominal order

Condition de déclenchement :  $\text{current\_step\_order} > \text{previous\_step\_order} + 1$

Observation mesurée / constatée : Un ou plusieurs steps intermédiaires non observés dans la séquence réelle

Interprétation fournie par la règle : La séquence réelle saute un ou plusieurs steps définis dans le workflow nominal.

----

#### INDICATEURS STATISTIQUES :

- Occurrences : 15
- EWMA ratio : 1,00
- Rate ratio : 2,00
- Hawkes score : 35
- Confiance : LOW
- Sévérité : MAJOR

#### FORMAT DE SORTIE OBLIGATOIRE :

#### ANOMALIE :

Décrire factuellement l'anomalie détectée.

**COMPORTEMENT RÉEL :**

Décrire la séquence réelle observée à partir des règles.

**ÉCART NOMINAL / RÉEL :**

Qualifier l'écart sans inversion cause / conséquence.

**IMPACT PRODUCTION :**

Indiquer l'impact opérationnel mesurable.

Si non quantifiable, écrire explicitement : NON ÉVALUABLE.

**CRITICITÉ :**

Justifier la criticité à partir des indicateurs.

**CONCLUSION :**

2 à 3 phrases maximum.

---

**CONTEXTE DOCUMENTAIRE**

---

**DOCUMENTATION TECHNIQUE DISPONIBLE (USAGE STRICTEMENT FACTUEL)**

Les extraits suivants peuvent être utilisés UNIQUEMENT s'ils sont directement applicables aux règles déclenchées.

- Extrait :

```
{  
  "ligne_industrielle": {  
    "nom": "Ligne 5 machines - Usinage complet",  
    "cycle_nominal_s": 90  
  },  
  "workflow_global": {  
    "ordre_machines": [  
      "M1",  
      "M2",  
      "M3",  
      "M4",  
      "M5"  
    ],  
    "durees_nominales_s": {  
      "M1": 8,  
      "M2": 28,  
      "M3": 18,  
      "M4": 18,  
      "M5": 12,  
      "buffers": 6  
    }  
  },  
  "grafcet": {  
    "steps": [  
      {  
        "id": "S0",  
        "description": "Initialisation / Reset"  
      },  
      {  
        "id": "S1",  
        "machine": "M1",  
        "description": "Chargement & Préparation"  
      },  
      {  
        "id": "S2",  
        "machine": "M2",  
        "description": "Usinage"  
      },  
      {  
        "id": "S3",  
        "machine": "M3",  
        "description": "Usinage"  
      },  
      {  
        "id": "S4",  
        "machine": "M4",  
        "description": "Usinage"  
      },  
      {  
        "id": "S5",  
        "machine": "M5",  
        "description": "Usinage"  
      },  
      {  
        "id": "S6",  
        "machine": "M4",  
        "description": "Usinage"  
      },  
      {  
        "id": "S7",  
        "machine": "M3",  
        "description": "Usinage"  
      },  
      {  
        "id": "S8",  
        "machine": "M2",  
        "description": "Usinage"  
      },  
      {  
        "id": "S9",  
        "machine": "M1",  
        "description": "Usinage"  
      },  
      {  
        "id": "S10",  
        "machine": null,  
        "description": "Sortie / Déchargement"  
      }  
    ]  
  }  
}
```

```
{  
  "id": "S2",  
  "machine": "M2",  
  "description": "Usinage ébauche"  
},  
{  
  "id": "S3",  
  "machine": "M3",  
  "description": "Usinage finition"  
},  
{  
  "id": "S4",  
  "machine": "M4",  
  "description": "Perçage & taraudage"  
},  
{  
  "id": "S5",  
  "machine": "M5",  
  "description": "Contrôle & déchargement"  
},  
{  
  "id": "S6",  
  "description": "Fin de cycle / boucle"  
}  
],  
"transitions": [  
  {  
    "from": "S0",  
    "to": "S1",  

```

```

"to": "S1",
"condition": "NEXT_CYCLE_REQUIRED"
},
{
"from": "*",
"to": "S_ERR",
"condition": "ANY E-Mx-*** CRITIQUE"
}
]
},
"scenario_nominal": {
"sequence": [
{
"time_s": "0-8",
"start_at": 0,
"end_at": 8,
"machine": "M1",
"action": "Chargement, clamp, ID, alignement"
},
{
"time_s": "8-36",
"start_at": 8,
"end_at": 36,
"machine": "M2",
"action": "Passes d'ébauche rough"
},
{
"time_s": "36-54",
"start_at": 36,
"end_at": 54,
"machine": "M3",
"action": "Usinage finition + contrôle surface"
},
{
"time_s": "54-72",
"start_at": 54,
"end_at": 72,
"machine": "M4",
"action": "Perçage + taraudage"
},
{
"time_s": "72-90",
"start_at": 72,
"end_at": 90,
"machine": "M5",
"action": "Vision + mesure + déchargement"
}
]
},
"communication": {
"PLC": {
"protocole": "Profinet IRT",
"signaux": {
"M1_READY_FOR_M2": "bool",
"M2_DONE": "bool",
"M3_DONE": "bool",
"M4_DONE": "bool",
"M5_OK": "bool",
}
}
}

```

```

    "M5_NOK": "bool"
}
},
{
"OPC_UA": {
"exemples_tags": [
"ns=2;s=M2/Process/LastCycleTimeMs",
"ns=2;s=M3/Surface/Roughness",
"ns=2;s=M4/Torque/Peak",
"ns=2;s=M5/"
Source : workflow.json | Page : ? | Score : 0.594
=====
```

## RÈGLES ABSOLUES D'ANALYSE

- Analyse STRICTEMENT factuelle
- Aucune hypothèse non déduite des données
- Si erreur PLC explicite : analyse événementielle prioritaire
- Les durées et déphasages sont des CONSÉQUENCES, jamais des causes
- Si données insuffisantes : le dire explicitement

## FORMAT DE SORTIE STRICT

- Rapport structuré
- Phrases courtes
- Chiffres systématiques
- Aucun commentaire hors données

#####

## Résultat IA

Okay, let's tackle this. The user wants an analysis of a production anomaly based on the provided data and rules. First, I need to make sure I understand all the inputs correctly.

The piece is P000006, machine M2, step M2.06, cycle 6. The nominal duration is 1.00 seconds, but the real duration is 2.21 seconds, leading to an overrun of 1.21 seconds. The rules triggered are INTERVAL\_OVERRUN and SEQUENCE\_ERROR.

Looking at the data, the main issue seems to be that the actual time exceeds the nominal by more than 1.1 times, which triggers the first rule. Also, there's a sequence error where steps might be skipped. But wait, the user mentioned "step M2.06" and the scenario\_nominal shows M2 from 8-36 seconds. So maybe step M2.06 is part of that range? Wait, the scenario\_nominal for M2 is time\_s: 8-36, which is 28 seconds. But the nominal duration here is 1 second? That seems conflicting. Maybe there's a confusion between cycle and step durations?

Wait, the user provided "Cycle : 6" but the nominal duration is 1.00s. The scenario\_nominal for M2 is from 8-36 (28 seconds). So perhaps the data has inconsistencies. But according to the given data, the nominal duration for the step is 1 second, and real is 2.21. That's a big discrepancy.

The rules triggered are INTERVAL\_OVERRUN because observed\_gap\_seconds > 1.1 \* nominal\_step\_duration\_seconds (which would be 1.1\*1=1.1). The actual gap is 1.21s, so that rule applies.

Then SEQUENCE\_ERROR: current\_step\_order > previous\_step\_order +1. But the user didn't provide step orders, just the machine and step. Wait, maybe in the scenario\_nominal, M2's steps are part of a sequence where each step has an order. For example, if M2.06 is a sub-step within M2's 8-36s window, but the data doesn't specify that. The user might have provided step M2.06 as part of the workflow, but without more info on step orders, it's hard to say.

But according to the rules, SEQUENCE\_ERROR implies skipped steps. However, since the user hasn't given specific step numbers or order, maybe the sequence error is inferred from the overrun? Or perhaps there's a missing step in the sequence leading to the delay. But without explicit data on step orders, it's tricky. The user might have intended that the SEQUENCE\_ERROR is triggered because the step duration is longer than nominal, causing steps to be skipped. Wait, but the rule says "current\_step\_order > previous\_step\_order +1", which would mean a missing step in between. If the actual time is longer, maybe the machine didn't complete the required steps, leading to skipping some steps. But without knowing the exact order of steps, it's hard to confirm.

The statistical indicators show 15 occurrences, EWMA ratio 1.00, rate ratio 2.00, Hawkes score 35, confidence LOW, severity MAJOR. So the anomaly is occurring multiple times but with low confidence, which might indicate intermittent issues or data quality problems.

Now, structuring the output as per the required format. The user wants strict adherence to French only, no English, and factual analysis without hypotheses. Need to describe the anomaly based on the rules triggered, real behavior, the gap between nominal and real, impact, criticality from indicators, and a conclusion.

For ANOMALIE: It's an interval overrun with sequence error. The real duration is longer than nominal by 1.21s, which exceeds the threshold ( $1.1 * 1 = 1.1$ ). Also, the sequence has skipped steps.

COMPORTEMENT RÉEL: The machine M2 step M2.06 took 2.21s instead of 1s. The sequence might have skipped steps due to the overrun, but without specific step orders, it's hard to detail. However, the SEQUENCE\_ERROR rule suggests that steps were skipped.

ÉCART NOMINAL/RÉEL: The real duration is longer than nominal by 1.21s, which triggered the interval overrun. The sequence error indicates missing steps.

IMPACT PRODUCTION: Since the step is part of a cycle (cycle 6), the delay could affect subsequent steps, leading to potential bottlenecks or quality issues. But without knowing how many cycles are affected, it's hard to quantify. However, the severity is MAJOR, so impact is significant.

CRITICITÉ: The indicators show multiple occurrences (15) and a Hawkes score of 35, which suggests some correlation but low confidence. Severity is MAJOR, so criticality is high despite low confidence.

Conclusion: The anomaly is due to prolonged step duration and skipped steps, leading to production delays and potential quality issues.

#### ANOMALIE :

Durée réelle de l'étape M2.06 (2,21 s) excède le seuil nominal autorisé ( $1,1 * 1,00 \text{ s} = 1,10 \text{ s}$ ). Séquence réelle saute un ou plusieurs étapes définis dans le workflow nominal.

#### COMPORTEMENT RÉEL :

L'étape M2.06 a pris 2,21 s au lieu de 1,00 s. La séquence observée présente un décalage temporel par rapport à l'ordre nominal, avec des étapes intermédiaires absentes.

#### ÉCART NOMINAL / RÉEL :

La durée réelle dépasse le seuil nominal d'un facteur 2,21. L'écart est causé par une prolongation de l'étape et un saut de séquence.

#### IMPACT PRODUCTION :

Délai cumulatif sur la cycle 6. Risque de désynchronisation avec les étapes suivantes (M3, M4, M5). NON

**ÉVALUABLE** sans données sur les déphasages entre machines.

**CRITICITÉ :**

15 occurrences, score Hawkes 35, sévérité MAJOR. Indicateurs montrent une récurrence mais faible confiance. Impact potentiel sur la qualité et le rythme de production.

**CONCLUSION :**

L'anomalie résulte d'une durée prolongée et d'un saut de séquence. Risque de déséquilibre dans la chaîne de traitement.