

Re: Japans Moon Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2005–03/2125.html>

From: Sander Vesik (sander_at_haldjas.folklore.ee)

Date: 03/14/05

Date: Mon, 14 Mar 2005 19:06:03 +0000 (UTC)

In sci.space.policy Rand Simberg <simberg.interglobal@org.trash> wrote:

> *On 13 Mar 2005 12:20:05 –0800, in a place far, far away, "Will"*
> *<mclean1382@aol.com> made the phosphor on my monitor glow in such a*
> *way as to indicate that:*
>
>
>>> *>That is debatable. The US airmail was losing a pilot about every*
>>> *>100,000 miles when it started. On the New York–San Francisco route,*
>>> *>that's about a 2% fatality rate per trip.*
>>>
>>> *A NY/SF route consisted of many "trips" (i.e., takeoff/landing) so*
>>> *that is a gross overstatement of the percentage. And without looking*
>>> *at the statistics, I suspect that most of those were a result of*
>>> *weather and primitive navigation equipment, than with reliability of*
>>> *the aircraft themselves.*
>>>
>>>
>>> *If your mission is to get a payload from NY to SF, the measure of*
>>> *reliability is if it performs the trip intact.*
>
> *And the probability of failing to do so goes up with the number of*
> *individual flights required to do so, unless the reliability of each*
> *of them is a hundred percent. Reliability doesn't make sense if it's*
> *not per flight.*
>

Per–mission reliability absolutely makes sense. That all the other subtrips are perfectly safe gives you no real benefits if the 'land on moon' one is 75% likely to kill you.

--

Sander

+++ Out of cheese error +++