

A study to identify the prevailing Facility Management practices, in India

Dr. Rajendra Singh,

Reader, IMS, Devi Ahilya Vishwavidalaya (DAVV), Indore, prajsingh71@rediffmail.com, +91 9425349042.

Mr. Vinod Gupta,

Research Scholar, Devi Ahilya Vishwavidalaya (DAVV), Indore and Director, Total Facility Management Pvt. Ltd, Indore, gupta_vinod@hotmail.com, +919826041268

Dr. Nina Jain,

Head – HR & Admin, AISECT Ltd., Bhopal, ninajain73@gmail.com, +919981173291

ABSTRACT

Facility Management is service sector business. It is the part of core services which helps in maintaining and providing after sales service to the customers for any property or built environment. These services are paid and critical for wellbeing of the user. The objective of this study is to identify the prevailing Facility Management practices in India. We have analyzed 50 variables collected from 406 respondents which have provided us the clear picture about the Facility management practices sector prevailing in India.

Keywords: Facility Management (FM), FM practices, Facility Services, FM Audit, Facility

INTRODUCTION

The European standard for facilities management defines it as "the integration of processes within an organization to maintain and develop the agreed services which support and improve the effectiveness of its primary activities."

According to British Dictionary, "Facility means ease of action or performance or freedom from difficulty. It is readily available skill or ease deriving from practice or familiarity. It's often the means or equipment facilitating the performance of an action".

According to International Facility Management Association "Facility management is a profession that encompasses multiple disciplines to ensure functionality of the built environment by integrating people, place, process and technology".

Facility Management, for any property or place or building, comprises of services and its management namely Security, House Keeping, Engineering / Technical, Utility, AMC / Warranty, Landscape, Administrative & Help Desk, Vendors, Environment & Safety & other related services.

In my words, facilities can be generally defined as buildings, properties and major Infrastructure also referred to as the "built environment". It is something built, installed, designed etc. to fulfil specific function providing service or convenience like education facility, housekeeping facility, transportation facility, a new research facility etc. Facility is something that has easier course of conduct which makes the performance of action much easier. It ensures timely compliances; availability of right skill, talent, knowledge, dexterity, practice or aptitude to accomplish a task and it provides freedom from controversy, difficulties and misunderstandings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Facility Management, in the opinion of **Brackertz and Kenley**, is increasingly recognized as an element of the value chain of a business through which an organization provides and maintains the quality of the work environment for its human resources and materials and ensures managers to achieve the objectives of the core business. At this point, it is imperative to clarify what is meant by this term, through a series of definitions that specify the objectives, the scope and the basic elements of FM.

Becker (1990), The Facility Management is responsible for coordinating all efforts related to planning, design and management of buildings and their systems, their equipment and their furniture, in order to improve the organization's ability to compete successfully in an environment rapid changing.

Martha J. Whitaker, (1995), claims that to improve, facility managers must first understand how their group is doing – are they meeting the expectations of management and their customers? States that facility manager who do not know the answer to this question will have a difficult time documenting their contributions and improving their services. Argues that a facility management audit which follows an orderly, objective process to compare an organization's FM resources to internal expectations and external benchmarks can help. Claims that the FM audit will give teams an understanding of every part of their operations enabling facilities managers to develop a holistic view of facilities and strategies for continuous improvement.

Bernard (1996), Defines the facilities as "the premises and services necessary to accommodate and facilitate the core business." Considering this, the plant management has to encompass the three cost centers that include local, support services and information technology.

Harvey H. Kaiser, Dennis M. Kirkwood,(1997), designed to identify the tasks of a facilities organization seeking to improve effectiveness and efficiency. The growth of these organizations in size, variety of services, and extent of operations has made it increasingly important to audit management methods and performance on a regular basis. It provides a documented, step-by-step method of conducting a large-scale audit of a facilities management organization. Second, the process can be started in Phase III, and be used as a preliminary phase of a detailed audit, providing direction by identifying areas that merit the most intensive investigation. Either way, the audit process defines checklists of facilities maintenance management performance and provides measures of effectiveness, setting up a baseline for future comparisons.

Alexander (1999), The purpose of discipline is to cover all aspects related to space, environmental control, health and safety and support services.

Curcio (2003), The Facility Management is the "Integrated Management of the plurality of services and processes (addressed to the buildings, spaces, people), which are not included in the core business, but which are necessary for the functioning of the organization."

Pala e Pristerà (2004), the process of design, implementation and control through which it is a possible to identify, find and deliver the facilities, in order to provide and maintain a predetermined level of service that can meet business demands in terms of cost and quality.

Maisarah Ali, Wan Mohamad Nasbi Bin Wan Mohamad, (2009), assessed the existing facilities maintenance management practices and processes in public hospitals, in accordance with the concession agreement (CA), in order to identify the current performance status. A case study is conducted in one district hospital in Malaysia to assess five key elements: leadership; policies, plans and procedures; training and orientation; monitoring and supervision; and service performance. This research has introduced a set of key ingredients and effectiveness measures for successful facilities maintenance management. It also explores opportunities for improving facilities maintenance management in public hospitals.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**Objective**

1. To study and analyze the prevailing Facility Management practices, in India.

Hypothesis

H₀1: No significant Facility Management practices exist in India.

Research Design

This study is descriptive type and cross sectional in nature. Secondary data is used to identify the variables of interest related to Facility Management practices.

Population, Sample unit, Sample size

Out of total population of Facility Management Professionals, approx. 5200+ Facility sector respondents were contacted all over India to find out the Facility management audit practices in India.

Sampling technique & Data Type

Non-probability sampling using Convenient and Purposive sampling is used to collect primary data from the respondents.

Data Collection Tools

1. Structured questionnaire is prepared on the basis of Literature review for the collection of primary data. It contains mainly closed objective type questions. The respondents were Facility managers, Facility Management companies and clients who have to choose one value at the expense of other in a forced choice method.

We have used Linkert's five point scale method for preparation of our questionnaire ranging as following: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neutral (3), Agree (4) and Strongly Agree (5).

2. Telephonic and face to face interview is also used to collect data from the respondents.

Data Analysis tool

1. The collected data is coded and tabulated in the MS-Excel sheet.
2. We have used SPSS software for further analysis of data.
3. Reliability of the data collected will be assessed by applying the Cronbach Alpha method.
4. "t" test ,Mean and Standard deviation are calculated to assess the frequency and extent of certain variables related to the background information.
5. Variable wise percentage analysis is used to know significance of the hypothesis

RESULT AND ANALYSIS

In Table-1, Cronbach Alpha reliability test is clearly presented. This study includes 50 Facility Management variables. To test the reliability of all 50 variables, Cronbach Alpha reliability test is conducted using SPSS software. It is found that the variables qualify at 0.968 Cronbach Alpha Reliability test.

In Table-2, Mean and Standard Deviation of all the 50 variables are clearly presented. In this study, responses from 500 Facility management respondents from all over India have been collected and one sample "t" test is conducted to test the difference in means assuming the populations to be normal. Since the population variances are not known, we have used the sample variances, considering the sample variances as the estimates of population variances.

The mean, Standard deviation and t value of below mentioned variables show the significant presence of Facility management practices in India. We have divided our findings into three categories on the basis of “t” value of the variable, namely

1. Facility Management practices which shows most favorable picture of Facility Management sector.
2. Facility Management practices which shows moderately favorable picture of Facility Management sector.
3. Facility Management practices which are least favorable picture of Facility Management sector.

The finding shows that the variables having “t” value from 197 to 134 are Facility management practices which shows most favorable picture of Facility management sector, in India.

1. Facility Management practice of FM Audit is important for company/vendor. (t value = 197)
2. Facility Management practice leads to operational improvement (t value = 168)
3. Facility Management practices act as a tool to improve efficiency. (t value = 167)
4. Facility Management practice of FM Audit shall be mandatory. (t value = 167)
5. Facility Management practices increases consistency of service deliverables. (t value = 157)
6. Facility Management practices improves delivery quality of various FM functions or departments. (t value = 150)
7. Facility Management practices helps to document the level of contribution and improving services. (t value = 142)
8. Facility Management practices helps to bring in the confidence in FM Team. (t value = 141)
9. Facility Management practices helps to analyse FM processes to get the most out of the FM resources & optimize it. (t value = 141)
10. Facility Management practices helps in shaping the future of built environment & enables business success. (t value = 137)
11. Facility Management practices gives an understanding of every part of operations to respective FM Teams. (t value = 140)
12. Facility Management practices builds a baseline of knowledge. (t value = 137)
13. Facility Management practices helps to identify labour & staff issues, training needs etc. (t value = 136)
14. Facility Management practices helps managers to develop holistic view of facilities & strategies for continues improvement. (t value = 137)
15. Facility Management practices results helps in aligning FM standards & professional development for the FM industry. (t value = 136)
16. Facility Management practices helps to scrutinize the contribution of FM to company's overall success. (t value = 136)
17. Facility Management practices helps to improve facility managers understanding that how FM team is performing. (t value = 135)
18. Facility Management practices results helps in ease of facility management. (t value = 134)

The variables having “t” value from 131 to 108 are Facility management practices which shows moderately favorable picture of facility management Sector, in India.

1. Facility Management practice of FM Audit helps in raising the profile of FM and increasing status of profession. (t value = 131)
2. Facility Management practices helps to incorporate sustainability in facility management. (t value = 131)
3. Facility Management practices helps to know that how FM delivery is meeting expectations of management & customers. (t value = 125)
4. In Facility Management practices, FM Audit is conducted for House Keeping/ Custodial Services. (t value = 122)
5. Facility Management practices follows an orderly & objective process. (t value = 122)

6. Facility Management practices helps the unification of FM strategy for built environment. (t value = 121)
7. In Facility Management practice of FM Audit, there is scope of improvement. (t value = 117)
8. For Facility Management practices, your company/vendor had FM Audit in last one year. (t value = 117)
9. For Facility Management practices, my company/vendor duly conduct FM Audit on regular intervals or at random. (t value = 114)
10. Do you feel facility team/staff is open & cooperative to FM practises. (t value = 113)
11. In Facility Management practices, FM Audit is conducted for Engineering / Technical Services. (t value = 112)
12. For Facility Management practices, company/vendor value the feedback of concerned team member on FM Audit Report. (t value = 111)
13. In Facility Management practices, FM Audit is conducted for Landscape Maintenance Services. (t value = 110)
14. In Facility Management practices, company/vendor follow industry standards & norms of FM Audit. (t value = 110)
15. In Facility Management practices, FM Audit is conducted for Utility Services. (t value = 109)
16. For Facility Management practices, company/vendor is ready & positive for Cost to be put in as per FM Audit recommendations for improvement (if any). (t value = 109)
17. For Facility Management practices, Do you agree COST incurred on FM Audit is appropriate(t value = 1108)

The variables having “t” value from 107 and below are Facility management practices which shows least favorable picture of Facility management sector, in India.

1. For Facility Management practices, company/vendor is practicing / carrying out Facility Management (FM) Audit. (t value = 107)
2. For Facility Management practices, company/vendor is ready & positive towards Cost of FM audit. (t value = 106)
3. In Facility Management practices, FM Audit is conducted for FM Administration Services. (t value = 106)
4. Facility Management practices report is accessible to all concerned team member of the FM. (t value = 105)
5. In Facility Management practices, FM Audit is conducted for Security Services. (t value = 105)
6. In Facility Management practices, company/vendor take suitable action for improvement as per audit report/findings. (t value = 105)
7. In Facility Management practices, FM Audit is conducted for AMC/Warranty Services. (t value = 104)
8. In Facility Management practices, company/vendor considers FM Audit as critical practice & process. (t value = 102)
9. Company/vendor has well defined and systematic FM practices. (t value = 102)
10. In Facility Management practices, FM Audit is conducted for Health, Environment & Safety (HES) Services. (t value = 100)
11. For Facility Management practices, company/vendor hires external Auditor for FM Audit. (t value = 99)
12. For Facility Management practices, company/vendor has trained staff. (t value = 99)
13. In Facility Management practices, FM Audit is conducted for other FM Services. (t value = 98)
14. For Facility Management practices, you know the COST involved in Audit of FM. (t value = 98)
15. For Facility Management practices, feel Satisfied with the current practises & processes of FM Audit. (t value = 98)

Hypothesis Analysis:

Hypothesis H01 : No significant Facility Management practices exists, in India

1. Analysis clearly states that 25.4% respondents strongly agree, 58.2% agree, 13.4% where neutral, 1.8% disagree and 1.2% respondents strongly disagree with the statement that the Administration Services is part of Facility Management practice, in India. Hence it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected /does not hold good, which means that administration services as Facility management practice exists in reality.
2. Analysis clearly states that 35.8% respondents strongly agree, 50.4% agree, 10.2% where neutral, 2.8% disagree and 0.8% respondents strongly disagree with the statement that the Security services is part of Facility Management practices, in India. Hence it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected /does not hold good, which means that Security services as Facility management practice exists in reality
3. Analysis clearly states that 40.6% respondents strongly agree, 50.6% agree, 6% where neutral, 2.8% disagree and 0% respondents strongly disagree with the statement that the House keeping/ Custodial Services is part of Facility management practices, in India. Hence it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected /does not hold good, which means that Housekeeping/Custodial services as Facility management practice exists in reality.
4. Analysis clearly states that 42.8% respondents strongly agree, 41.2% agree, 14.2% where neutral, 1.8% disagree and 0% respondents strongly disagree with the statement that the Engineering / Technical Services are part of facility management practices in India. Hence it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected /does not hold good, which means that Engineering/Technical services as Facility management practice exists in reality.
5. Analysis clearly states that 29.8% respondents strongly agree, 53% agree, 14.4% where neutral, 2.4% disagree and 0.4% respondents strongly disagree with the statement that the Utility Services is part of Facility management practice, in India. Hence it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected /does not hold good, which means that Utility services as Facility management practice exists in reality
6. Analysis clearly states that 22% respondents strongly agree, 52.8% agree, 22.4% where neutral, 2.4% disagree and 0.4% respondents strongly disagree with the statement that the AMC/Warranty Services is part of Facility Management practices, in India. Hence it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected /does not hold good, which means that AMC/Warranty services as Facility management practice exists in reality
7. Analysis clearly states that 21.6% respondents strongly agree, 59.6% agree, 14.4% where neutral, 4.4% disagree and 0% respondents strongly disagree with the statement that the Landscape Maintenance Services is part of Facility management practices, in India. Hence it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected /does not hold good, which means that Landscape maintenance services as Facility management practice exists in reality
8. Analysis clearly states that 33.8% respondents strongly agree, 41.2% agree, 22.6% where neutral, 2.4% disagree and 0% respondents strongly disagree with the statement that the Health, Environment & Safety (HES) Services is part of Facility Management Services, in India. Hypothesis H01: Hence it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected /does not hold good, which means that Health, Environment & Safety (HES) services as Facility management practices exists in reality.

9. Analysis clearly states that 20.6% respondents strongly agree, 49% agree, 26.6% where neutral, 3.4% disagree and 0.4% respondents strongly disagree with the statement that other FM Services as per type of business /industry, are upcoming practices which are becoming part of Facility management practices, in India. Hence it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected /does not hold good, which means that Other FM services as Facility management practices exists in reality.
10. Analysis shows that 29% respondents strongly agree, 54.8% agree, 13.2% where neutral, 2.2% disagree and 0.8% respondents strongly disagree with the statement that the company/vendor is practicing / carrying out audit of Facility Management (FM) practices, in India. Hence it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected /does not hold good, which means that Facility management audit practices exists in reality.

CONCLUSION

In this study, we have found out that there are prevailing Facility Management practices in the Facility Management sector in India. Our research divides FM practices into three types namely FM practices which are mostly followed, FM practices which are moderately followed and FM practices which are least followed in the Facility management sector.

This study has also come out with a clear inference that there are ten main or core services of FM practices namely FM Administration & Help Desk Services, Security Services, Housekeeping / Custodial Services, Engineering / Technical Services, Utility services, Landscape Maintenance Services, AMC/Warranty services, Health, Environment and Safety Services and Other FM services, which helps in achieving business objectives and therefore have positive effect on the growth and development of Facility Management sector in India.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adegoke, Bolanle Felicia Adegoke, Oluseyi Joshua, (2013) "The use of facilities management in tertiary institutions in Osun State, Nigeria," *Journal of Facilities Management*, Vol. 11 Issue 2, p183-192. 10p.
- Hui, Eddie C.M.Zhang, Pei-hua Zheng, Xian, (2013), "Facilities management service and customer satisfaction in shopping mall sector", *Facilities*, Vol. 31 Issue 5/6, p194-207. 14p.
- Penny, Janelle¹Buildings.(2013) "5 Disaster Recovery Myths", February, Vol. 107 Issue 2, p26-29. 4p.
- Priess, Udo¹ (2013), "Integrated Facility Management- Added Value by Innovation." *International Journal of Management & Innovation*, Vol. 5 Issue 1, p80-88. 9p.
- Rogers, Jeffrey W. (2013), "Can facility manager's impact the expected budgetary outcomes of robust asset management programs? ", *Facilities.*, Vol. 31 Issue 1/2, p56-67. 12p.
- Drion, Bernard Melissen, Frans Wood, Roy (2012) "Facilities management: lost, or regained? ", *Facilities.* , Vol. 30 Issue 5/6, p254-261. 8p.
- Renna, Paolo¹(2012), "Influence of maintenance policies on multi-stage manufacturing systems in dynamic conditions" *International Journal of Production Research*. January, Vol. 50 Issue 2, p345-357. 13p.
- Belser Chuck (2011), "Building for needs, not thoughts", *Industrial Engineer: IE.*, April, Vol. 43 Issue 4, p30-34. 5p.
- David Cotts; Kathy Roper; Richard Payant (2010), *The Facility Management Handbook - Organizing the Department*. New York: AMACOM. p. Chapter 2.
- Booty, Frank (2010), *Facilities Management*. Amsterdam: Elsevier. p. 295.
- Brian Atkins; Adrian Brooks (2009 (3rd ed.)). *Total Facilities Management*. Chichester UK: Wiley Blackwell. p. 119 to 130.
- Maisarah Ali, Wan Mohamad Nasbi Bin Wan Mohamad, (2009) "Audit assessment of the facilities maintenance management in a public hospital in Malaysia", *Journal of Facilities Management*, Vol. 7 Iss: 2, pp.142 – 158

APPENDIX / ANNEXURE

Table 1:

| Case Processing Summary | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|-----|-------|
| | | N | % |
| Cases | Valid | 406 | 100.0 |
| | Excluded | 0 | .0 |
| | Total | 406 | 100.0 |

| Reliability Statistics | |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .968 | 50 |

Table 2:

| One-Sample Statistics | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|--------|----------------|-----------------|
| Variable, 50 Nos., (2~ 51) | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| VAR00002 | 406 | 4.0764 | 0.7708 | 0.0383 |
| VAR00003 | 406 | 4.0296 | 0.7692 | 0.0382 |
| VAR00004 | 406 | 4.1675 | 0.7991 | 0.0397 |
| VAR00005 | 406 | 4.2833 | 0.7070 | 0.0351 |
| VAR00006 | 406 | 4.2463 | 0.7623 | 0.0378 |
| VAR00007 | 406 | 4.0837 | 0.7555 | 0.0375 |
| VAR00008 | 406 | 3.9310 | 0.7602 | 0.0377 |
| VAR00009 | 406 | 3.9901 | 0.7302 | 0.0362 |
| VAR00010 | 406 | 4.0591 | 0.8174 | 0.0406 |
| VAR00011 | 406 | 3.8571 | 0.7915 | 0.0393 |
| VAR00012 | 406 | 4.0493 | 0.8028 | 0.0398 |
| VAR00013 | 406 | 4.1305 | 0.8166 | 0.0405 |
| VAR00014 | 406 | 4.7365 | 0.4838 | 0.0240 |
| VAR00015 | 406 | 4.5419 | 0.5639 | 0.0280 |
| VAR00016 | 406 | 4.0320 | 0.7142 | 0.0355 |
| VAR00017 | 406 | 4.1207 | 0.7081 | 0.0351 |
| VAR00018 | 406 | 3.7192 | 0.7601 | 0.0377 |
| VAR00019 | 406 | 4.1305 | 0.7921 | 0.0393 |
| VAR00020 | 406 | 4.0690 | 0.7471 | 0.0371 |
| VAR00021 | 406 | 4.0887 | 0.6755 | 0.0335 |
| VAR00022 | 406 | 4.4704 | 0.5987 | 0.0297 |
| VAR00023 | 406 | 4.0517 | 0.8284 | 0.0411 |
| VAR00024 | 406 | 4.0788 | 0.7260 | 0.0360 |
| VAR00025 | 406 | 4.0222 | 0.7711 | 0.0383 |
| VAR00026 | 406 | 4.2906 | 0.7365 | 0.0366 |
| VAR00027 | 406 | 4.0640 | 0.7703 | 0.0382 |
| VAR00028 | 406 | 3.9778 | 0.8177 | 0.0406 |
| VAR00029 | 406 | 3.9286 | 0.7319 | 0.0363 |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|--------|--------|--------|
| VAR00030 | 406 | 3.9680 | 0.7347 | 0.0365 |
| VAR00031 | 406 | 4.0468 | 0.7372 | 0.0366 |
| VAR00032 | 406 | 3.8818 | 0.7987 | 0.0396 |
| VAR00033 | 406 | 4.3030 | 0.6397 | 0.0318 |
| VAR00034 | 406 | 4.3547 | 0.6534 | 0.0324 |
| VAR00035 | 406 | 4.5000 | 0.5386 | 0.0267 |
| VAR00036 | 406 | 4.4557 | 0.5368 | 0.0266 |
| VAR00037 | 406 | 4.3448 | 0.6435 | 0.0319 |
| VAR00038 | 406 | 4.4138 | 0.5676 | 0.0282 |
| VAR00039 | 406 | 4.3522 | 0.6219 | 0.0309 |
| VAR00040 | 406 | 4.2512 | 0.7104 | 0.0353 |
| VAR00041 | 406 | 4.3670 | 0.6252 | 0.0310 |
| VAR00042 | 406 | 4.3670 | 0.6252 | 0.0310 |
| VAR00043 | 406 | 4.2857 | 0.6571 | 0.0326 |
| VAR00044 | 406 | 4.3005 | 0.6312 | 0.0313 |
| VAR00045 | 406 | 4.2882 | 0.6192 | 0.0307 |
| VAR00046 | 406 | 4.2389 | 0.6846 | 0.0340 |
| VAR00047 | 406 | 4.4113 | 0.6560 | 0.0326 |
| VAR00048 | 406 | 4.3227 | 0.6141 | 0.0305 |
| VAR00049 | 406 | 4.3030 | 0.6397 | 0.0318 |
| VAR00050 | 406 | 4.3596 | 0.6469 | 0.0321 |
| VAR00051 | 406 | 4.3793 | 0.6733 | 0.0334 |

Table 3:

| Variable, 50 Nos. (2~ 51) | Test Value = 0 | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-----|------------------------|--------------------|---|--------|
| | t | df | Sig. (2- tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| VAR00032 | 97.935 | 405 | 0 | 3.8818 | 3.8039 | 3.9597 |
| VAR00028 | 98.019 | 405 | 0 | 3.9778 | 3.8981 | 4.0576 |
| VAR00011 | 98.194 | 405 | 0 | 3.8571 | 3.7799 | 3.9344 |
| VAR00023 | 98.554 | 405 | 0 | 4.0517 | 3.9709 | 4.1325 |
| VAR00018 | 98.592 | 405 | 0 | 3.7192 | 3.6451 | 3.7934 |
| VAR00010 | 100.063 | 405 | 0 | 4.0591 | 3.9794 | 4.1389 |
| VAR00012 | 101.633 | 405 | 0 | 4.0493 | 3.9709 | 4.1276 |
| VAR00013 | 101.918 | 405 | 0 | 4.1305 | 4.0509 | 4.2102 |
| VAR00008 | 104.190 | 405 | 0 | 3.9310 | 3.8569 | 4.0052 |
| VAR00019 | 105.078 | 405 | 0 | 4.1305 | 4.0533 | 4.2078 |
| VAR00004 | 105.085 | 405 | 0 | 4.1675 | 4.0895 | 4.2454 |
| VAR00025 | 105.105 | 405 | 0 | 4.0222 | 3.9469 | 4.0974 |
| VAR00003 | 105.551 | 405 | 0 | 4.0296 | 3.9545 | 4.1046 |
| VAR00027 | 106.302 | 405 | 0 | 4.0640 | 3.9889 | 4.1392 |
| VAR00002 | 106.558 | 405 | 0 | 4.0764 | 4.0012 | 4.1516 |
| VAR00029 | 108.160 | 405 | 0 | 3.9286 | 3.8572 | 4.0000 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------|-----|---|--------|--------|--------|
| VAR00030 | 108.831 | 405 | 0 | 3.9680 | 3.8963 | 4.0397 |
| VAR00007 | 108.918 | 405 | 0 | 4.0837 | 4.0100 | 4.1575 |
| VAR00020 | 109.737 | 405 | 0 | 4.0690 | 3.9961 | 4.1419 |
| VAR00009 | 110.101 | 405 | 0 | 3.9902 | 3.9189 | 4.0614 |
| VAR00031 | 110.607 | 405 | 0 | 4.0468 | 3.9749 | 4.1187 |
| VAR00006 | 112.235 | 405 | 0 | 4.2463 | 4.1719 | 4.3207 |
| VAR00024 | 113.201 | 405 | 0 | 4.0788 | 4.0080 | 4.1497 |
| VAR00016 | 113.754 | 405 | 0 | 4.0320 | 3.9623 | 4.1017 |
| VAR00017 | 117.252 | 405 | 0 | 4.1207 | 4.0516 | 4.1898 |
| VAR00026 | 117.380 | 405 | 0 | 4.2906 | 4.2188 | 4.3625 |
| VAR00040 | 120.585 | 405 | 0 | 4.2512 | 4.1819 | 4.3205 |
| VAR00021 | 121.959 | 405 | 0 | 4.0887 | 4.0228 | 4.1546 |
| VAR00005 | 122.076 | 405 | 0 | 4.2833 | 4.2143 | 4.3522 |
| VAR00046 | 124.758 | 405 | 0 | 4.2389 | 4.1721 | 4.3057 |
| VAR00051 | 131.062 | 405 | 0 | 4.3793 | 4.3136 | 4.4450 |
| VAR00043 | 131.423 | 405 | 0 | 4.2857 | 4.2216 | 4.3498 |
| VAR00034 | 134.282 | 405 | 0 | 4.3547 | 4.2909 | 4.4184 |
| VAR00047 | 135.488 | 405 | 0 | 4.4113 | 4.3473 | 4.4753 |
| VAR00033 | 135.534 | 405 | 0 | 4.3030 | 4.2405 | 4.3654 |
| VAR00049 | 135.534 | 405 | 0 | 4.3030 | 4.2405 | 4.3654 |
| VAR00050 | 135.786 | 405 | 0 | 4.3596 | 4.2965 | 4.4227 |
| VAR00037 | 136.040 | 405 | 0 | 4.3448 | 4.2820 | 4.4076 |
| VAR00044 | 137.290 | 405 | 0 | 4.3005 | 4.2389 | 4.3621 |
| VAR00045 | 139.541 | 405 | 0 | 4.2882 | 4.2278 | 4.3486 |
| VAR00041 | 140.737 | 405 | 0 | 4.3670 | 4.3060 | 4.4280 |
| VAR00042 | 140.737 | 405 | 0 | 4.3670 | 4.3060 | 4.4280 |
| VAR00039 | 141.013 | 405 | 0 | 4.3522 | 4.2915 | 4.4129 |
| VAR00048 | 141.833 | 405 | 0 | 4.3227 | 4.2627 | 4.3826 |
| VAR00022 | 150.466 | 405 | 0 | 4.4704 | 4.4120 | 4.5288 |
| VAR00038 | 156.684 | 405 | 0 | 4.4138 | 4.3584 | 4.4692 |
| VAR00015 | 162.288 | 405 | 0 | 4.5419 | 4.4869 | 4.5969 |
| VAR00036 | 167.249 | 405 | 0 | 4.4557 | 4.4033 | 4.5080 |
| VAR00035 | 168.339 | 405 | 0 | 4.5000 | 4.4474 | 4.5526 |
| VAR00014 | 197.260 | 405 | 0 | 4.7365 | 4.6893 | 4.7837 |