



SOMMACT Self Optimising Measuring MACHine Tools
Grant Agreement no.: **CP-FP 229112-2**
Start Date: 2009-09-01
Duration: 36 month



Partners:

ALESAMONTI S.r.l. (IT) - Project Coordinator
API VARESE (IT)
FIDIA S.p.A. (IT)
HAWLAT GmbH (DE)
IBS PE BV (NL)
INRIM (IT)
ISM-3D SL (SP)
KOVOSVIT MAS AS (CZ)
SUPSI (CH)
TTS S.r.l. (IT)
University of Huddersfield (UoH) (UK)
WEISS GmbH (DE)

Deliverable D2.1

Report on error source analysis

Document title: **D2 1_Analysis_of_Errors_Draft.doc**

Reference WP/Task: **WP2 / T2.1**

Lead Task beneficiary: **THE UNIVERSITY OF HUDDERSFIELD**

Author: **Simon FLETCHER**

Date: **2010-03-25**

Revision: **00**

Status: **Draft** Final

Nature ¹⁾: **R**

Dissemination level ²⁾: **RE**

1) **R** = Report, **P** = Prototype, **D** = Demonstrator, **O** = Other

2) **PU** = Public, **PP** = Restricted to other programme participants, **RE** = Restricted to a group specified by the consortium, **CO** = Confidential, only for members of the consortium



Executive summary

This report discusses various measured machine tool errors, considering their significance for SOMMACT in terms of identification and correction. The following list summarises the main categories of errors considered.

- Geometric errors – Static errors that are a function of the machine physical shape.
- Non-rigid errors – Quasi-static errors caused by the finite stiffness in the machine structure and joints and variation in mass distribution.
- Thermal errors – Change in the size and shape of the machine structural elements caused by variation in their temperature, induced by either internally generated heat (endogenous) or by environmental temperature change (exogenous).
- Dynamic errors – High frequency errors caused by vibration or inertia effects or by inaccuracies, update times or incorrect assumptions in the electrical and mechanical control loops.

Various characteristics of the errors are considered to determine their significance for the SOMMACT project. Errors vary in their spatial and temporal propagation as well as their fundamental magnitude. These, in particular, affect the applicability of the proposed TiLOR and SEM solutions for their identification. For an error to be recoverable by the TiLOR approach, the rate of change in the error needs to be negligible for a time period deemed to be the minimum acceptable between sparse measurement on a suitable reference artefact.

Additional errors, potentially insignificant in magnitude or possibly not identified under normal calibration strategies, are also discussed and considered as contributors to uncertainty during self-calibration and on-machine measurement (OMM).

Information about the errors is obtained primarily from measured data obtained from a variety of machines in varying environments during research and commercial activity carried out by the University of Huddersfield. Also included are very applicable non-rigid and Environmental Temperature Variation Error (ETVE) test results obtained by the SOMMACT machine tool builders for Task 1.2.

An interactive tool in the form of an Excel spreadsheet '*Spatial and Temporal overview.xlsx*' is described. This tool enables adjustment of the significance of different potential error sources for machine or application specific spatial and temporal sensitivity analysis.



Table of contents

Executive summary.....	2
Table of contents	3
Table of figures	4
1 Geometric errors	5
1.1 Reversal error.....	5
1.2 Responsiveness	5
1.3 Geometric compensation.....	7
2 Thermal.....	10
2.1 Environmental.....	10
2.1.1 Effects seen on geometric components	10
2.1.1.1 Linear positioning	10
2.1.1.2 Geometric shape	12
2.1.2 ETVE tests	13
2.1.2.1 Medium horizontal ram 5-axis machine	13
2.1.2.2 ALESAMONTI machine - AT127.....	15
2.1.2.3 Alesamonti machine – MCS100.....	16
2.1.2.4 Large 5-axis gantry	17
2.1.2.5 Thermal time constant.....	18
2.1.3 Workpiece	19
2.2 Internally generated.....	20
2.2.1 Position independent error	20
2.3 Combined position dependent and independent error	22
2.3.1 Ballscrew	22
2.3.2 Bending	23
2.4 Position dependent thermal error	24
2.4.1 Bending effect	24
3 Non-rigid.....	26
3.1 Table mass variation	27
3.1.1 Small C-frame machine.....	27
3.1.2 ALESAMONTI machine – MCS100.....	27
3.1.3 Prediction	29
3.2 Table bend.....	29
4 Dynamic errors.....	32
4.1 Hunting	32
4.2 Reversal	32
4.3 Other dynamic	33
5 Sensitivity chart.....	34
5.1 Components of the chart	34
6 Conclusions and suggested actions.....	37
6.1 Thermal error.....	37
6.2 Finite stiffness error.....	37
7 Identification of main reports/documents produced	38
8 Bibliography	38
Appendix A - Sensitivity chart overview	39



Table of figures

Figure 1. Positioning error of an axis with and without a linear scale for position feedback	5
Figure 2. Example movement profile for responsiveness test	6
Figure 3. Responsiveness test error chart for large gantry axis	6
Figure 4. Responsiveness test error chart for saddle on large gantry machine.....	7
Figure 5. Geometric volumetric compensation results for small machines	7
Figure 6. Geometric volumetric compensation results for medium to large machines.....	8
Figure 7. Effect of error compensation on an aluminium NAS979 workpiece.....	8
Figure 8. Y-axis positioning repeatability	10
Figure 9. Y-axis drift test result	11
Figure 10. Position independent and dependent thermal error with linear scale.....	11
Figure 11: Change in X-axis rotation about the Y axis with temperature	12
Figure 12. Change in X straightness in Z with temperature	12
Figure 13. Linear scale internal air temperature	13
Figure 14. Spindle to workpiece error during 42 h ETVE test.....	14
Figure 15. ALESAMONTI machine – AT127, ETVE temperature and X displacement chart	15
Figure 16. ALESAMONTI machine - AT127, ETVE sensitivity chart	15
Figure 17. ALESAMONTI machine – MCS100, ETVE temperature and Z displacement chart	16
Figure 18. ALESAMONTI machine – MCS100, ETVE sensitivity chart	16
Figure 19. Large 5-axis gantry machine configuration.....	17
Figure 20. Spindle displacement during ETVE test on large 5-axis gantry machine	17
Figure 21. Large horizontal borer multi-day ETVE test results	18
Figure 22. Simple Aluminium component on which a thermal analysis was run.	19
Figure 23. Temperature homogeneity in simple workpiece	20
Figure 24. High speed spindle thermal and mechanical growth with change in spindle speed	21
Figure 25. Effect of temperature on standard tool taper	21
Figure 26: Temperature increase along Z-axis ballscrew	22
Figure 27. Positioning error caused by ballscrew expansion.....	23
Figure 28. Axis guideways bend due to heat from drive motor.....	23
Figure 29. General column bending diagram.....	24
Figure 30. Effect of variation in source of bending.....	25
Figure 31. Movement of tool tip compared to overall strain difference	25
Figure 32. Non-rigid error on a medium sized C-frame vertical milling machine	26
Figure 33. Unloaded (left) and loaded (right) moving table non-rigid error	27
Figure 34. Configuration of MCS100 machine tool	27
Figure 35. ALESAMONTI MCS100 machine, ECX sensitivity to mass variation	28
Figure 36. ALESAMONTI MCS100 machine, EAX sensitivity to mass variation	28
Figure 37. Polynomial fitting and prediction of non-rigid error	29
Figure 38. Set-up of laser pitch error measurement and differential Talyvel measurement	30
Figure 39. X-axis configuration resulting in table bend	30
Figure 40. Comparison of laser pitch error measurement compared to table bend error	30
Figure 41. Table bend error on Knee type machine tool.....	31
Figure 42. Large horizontal boring machine vertical (Y) axis hunting.	32
Figure 43. Dynamic measurements of positioning error during small movements	33
Figure 44. 2 µm step size bi-directional responsiveness test	33
Figure 45. Excel spreadsheet tool for error sensitivity analysis	34
Figure 46. Draft question set for ETVE	36
Figure 47. High resolution linear positioning error measurement	36