



American  
Gear Manufacturers  
Association

---

Technical Resources

Revision of  
ANSI/AGMA 9000-C90

Reaffirmed December 8, 2016

## **American National Standard**

# **Flexible Couplings - Potential Unbalance Classification**

# American National Standard

## **Flexible Couplings — Potential Unbalance Classification**

ANSI/AGMA 9000-D11

[Revision of ANSI/AGMA 9000-C90]

Approval of an American National Standard requires verification by ANSI that the requirements for due process, consensus, and other criteria for approval have been met by the standards developer.

Consensus is established when, in the judgment of the ANSI Board of Standards Review, substantial agreement has been reached by directly and materially affected interests. Substantial agreement means much more than a simple majority, but not necessarily unanimity. Consensus requires that all views and objections be considered, and that a concerted effort be made toward their resolution.

The use of American National Standards is completely voluntary; their existence does not in any respect preclude anyone, whether he has approved the standards or not, from manufacturing, marketing, purchasing, or using products, processes, or procedures not conforming to the standards.

The American National Standards Institute does not develop standards and will in no circumstances give an interpretation of any American National Standard. Moreover, no person shall have the right or authority to issue an interpretation of an American National Standard in the name of the American National Standards Institute. Requests for interpretation of this standard should be addressed to the American Gear Manufacturers Association.

**CAUTION NOTICE:** AGMA technical publications are subject to constant improvement, revision, or withdrawal as dictated by experience. Any person who refers to any AGMA technical publication should be sure that the publication is the latest available from the Association on the subject matter.

[Tables or other self-supporting sections may be referenced. Citations should read: See ANSI/AGMA 9000-D11, *Flexible Couplings - Potential Unbalance Classification*, published by the American Gear Manufacturers Association, 1001 N. Fairfax Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Alexandria, Virginia 22314, <http://www.agma.org>.]

Approved August 10, 2011

### **ABSTRACT**

This standard describes potential coupling unbalance and identifies its sources. The standard breaks down the requirements into usable groups and outlines how to calculate the potential unbalance of the coupling. The AGMA method of computing coupling potential unbalance is provided. A guide is provided for balance class selection for purchasers who have not defined the coupling balancing requirements for their system.

Published by

**American Gear Manufacturers Association**  
**1001 N. Fairfax Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Alexandria, Virginia 22314**

Copyright © 2011 by American Gear Manufacturers Association  
All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, in an electronic retrieval system or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

ISBN: 978-1-55589-995-0

## Contents

Foreword .....	vi
1 Scope .....	1
1.1 Application .....	1
1.2 Exclusions .....	1
1.3 Additional considerations .....	2
2 Normative references .....	2
3 Definitions and symbols .....	2
3.1 Balancing .....	2
3.2 Types of unbalance .....	3
3.2.1 Static unbalance .....	3
3.2.2 Couple unbalance .....	3
3.2.3 Dynamic unbalance .....	3
3.3 Additional balancing definitions .....	4
3.3.1 Rigid rotor .....	4
3.3.2 Axis of rotation (spin axis) .....	4
3.3.3 Principal inertia axis displacement .....	4
3.3.4 Amount of unbalance .....	4
3.3.5 Potential unbalance .....	4
3.3.6 Repeatability of unbalance .....	4
3.3.7 Residual unbalance .....	4
3.3.8 Balance class .....	5
3.3.9 Mandrel (arbor) .....	5
3.3.10 Mounting fixtures .....	5
3.3.11 Bushing .....	5
3.3.12 Mandrel assembly .....	5
3.3.13 Mounting surface .....	5
3.3.14 Rigidifying hardware .....	5
3.3.15 Running surface .....	5
3.3.16 Unbalance correction .....	5
3.3.17 Component balancing .....	5
3.3.18 Balancing without a mandrel (mandrelless balancing) .....	5
3.3.19 Indicating surface .....	5
3.3.20 Aligning surface .....	5
3.3.21 Assembly balancing .....	5
3.3.22 Assembly balancing using component balanced parts .....	5
3.3.23 Balance tolerance .....	5
3.3.24 Inherent unbalance .....	6
3.3.25 Pilot surface .....	6
3.4 Symbols .....	6
4 Responsibility .....	8
5 Coupling balance class .....	8
5.1 Standard classes of coupling balance .....	8
6 Coupling balance class selection .....	8
6.1 Unbalance limit .....	8
6.2 Selection bands .....	9
6.3 System sensitivity factors .....	10
7 Factors contributing to the potential unbalance of uncorrected (not balanced) couplings .....	10
7.1 Inherent unbalance of an uncorrected coupling .....	10
7.2 Coupling pilot surface eccentricity .....	10
7.3 Coupling pilot surface clearance .....	10

7.4	Hardware displacement	10
7.5	Hardware weight differences	11
8	Factors contributing to the potential unbalance of corrected (balanced) couplings	11
8.1	Balance tolerance	11
8.2	Balancing machine minimum achievable residual unbalance	11
8.3	Mandrel assembly or balancing fixture unbalance	11
8.4	Mandrel assembly mounting surface eccentricity	11
8.5	Mandrel assembly clearance(s)	11
8.6	Coupling pilot surface eccentricity	11
8.7	Coupling pilot surface clearance	12
8.8	Hardware displacement	12
8.9	Hardware weight differences	12
8.10	Coupling bore eccentricity to running surface	13
9	Determination of coupling potential unbalance	13
9.1	Uncorrected coupling	13
9.1.1	Inherent unbalance of uncorrected coupling components, $U_1$	13
9.1.2	Unbalance due to coupling pilot surface eccentricity, $U_{P1}$	14
9.1.3	Unbalance due to coupling pilot surface clearance, $U_{P2}$	15
9.1.4	Unbalance due to hardware displacement, $U_{H1}$	15
9.1.5	Unbalance due to hardware weight differences, $U_{H2}$	16
9.1.6	Total potential unbalance	16
9.2	Component balanced coupling	16
9.2.1	Balance tolerance (residual unbalance), $U_{per}$	16
9.2.2	Unbalance due to balancing machine minimum achievable residual unbalance, $U_{mar}$	16
9.2.3	Unbalance due to mounting fixture effects	16
9.2.4	Coupling pilot surface effects	17
9.2.5	Unbalance due to hardware effects	18
9.2.6	Total potential unbalance	18
9.3	Assembly balanced couplings (using a mandrel)	18
9.3.1	Balance tolerance (residual unbalance), $U_{per}$	18
9.3.2	Unbalance due to balancing machine minimum achievable residual unbalance, $U_{mar}$	18
9.3.3	Unbalance due to mounting fixture effects	18
9.3.4	Unbalance due to coupling pilot surface eccentricity, $U_{P1}$	19
9.3.5	Unbalance due to coupling pilot surface clearance, $U_{P2}$	19
9.3.6	Unbalance due to hardware effects	19
9.3.7	Total potential unbalance per balancing plane	19
9.4	Assembly balanced couplings (without a mandrel)	19
9.4.1	Balance tolerance (residual unbalance), $U_{per}$	19
9.4.2	Unbalance due to balancing machine capability, $U_{mar}$	20
9.4.3	Mounting surface effect	20
9.4.4	Unbalance due to alignment error	20
9.4.5	Unbalance due to coupling pilot surface eccentricity, $U_{P1}$	20
9.4.6	Unbalance due to pilot surface clearance, $U_{P2}$	20
9.4.7	Unbalance due to hardware effects	20
9.4.8	Total potential unbalance	21
	Bibliography	61

## Annexes

A	Centroid location of two non-concentric circular areas (cylinders) about a third axis . . . . .	22
B	Example of how to calculate the potential unbalance of an uncorrected symmetrical assembly . . . .	23
C	Example of the calculation of the potential unbalance of a component balanced coupling . . . . .	28
D	Example of the calculation of the potential unbalance of an assembly balanced coupling using a mandrel . . . . .	33
E	Example of the calculation of the potential unbalance of an assembly balanced coupling without the use of a mandrel . . . . .	38
F	Example of how to calculate the potential unbalance of an uncorrected high performance symmetrical assembly . . . . .	42
G	Example of the calculation of the potential unbalance of a component balanced high performance coupling . . . . .	46
H	Example of the calculation of the potential unbalance of an assembly balanced high performance coupling without the use of a mandrel . . . . .	51
I	Derivation of the equation for the calculation of hardware displacement . . . . .	55
J	Derivation of the equation for the calculation of unbalance due to hardware weight differences . . . .	56
K	An example of how flexible coupling and impeller balance affects a centrifugal pump shaft and its bearings . . . . .	57
L	Comparison of ANSI/AGMA 9000-D11 and ISO 1940-1:2003 on a potential unbalance basis . . . . .	60

## Figures

1	Static unbalance . . . . .	3
2	Couple unbalance . . . . .	3
3	Dynamic unbalance . . . . .	3
4	Quasi-static unbalance . . . . .	4
5	Selection bands . . . . .	9
6	Coupling pilot surface clearance – assembly balanced . . . . .	12
7	Coupling pilot surface clearance – component balanced . . . . .	12
8	Component or portion of a component . . . . .	14
9	Components to be assembled to each other . . . . .	14
10	Hardware clearance . . . . .	15

## Tables

1	Typical examples of coupling pilot surfaces . . . . .	6
2	Symbols and definitions . . . . .	6
3	Standard classes of coupling balance . . . . .	8
4	Values of coupling balance class . . . . .	9

## Foreword

[The foreword, footnotes and annexes, if any, in this document are provided for informational purposes only and are not to be construed as a part of ANSI/AGMA Standard 9000–D11, *Flexible Couplings – Potential Unbalance Classification*.]

This standard was developed after intensive study of existing standards, literature, design practices, and manufacturing procedures for the balancing of flexible couplings. The intent of this document is to offer designers, manufacturers and users standard criteria for the unbalance classification of flexible couplings.

The information contained within this standard does not necessarily agree with some existing specifications for other rotating components and equipment. This standard is based upon the design criteria, related to the balancing of couplings, that have evolved over many years of successful industry practice.

At first, the coupling industry informally adopted, by usage, one tenth ounce–inch as a standard of unbalance tolerance. It soon became evident that for larger couplings this was an impractical tolerance. It also became evident that the runout of the balancing arbor as well as its own unbalance were very important factors in the final potential unbalance remaining in the corrected coupling. These facts were pointed out in Paper AGMA 519.01, October, 1967, the first AGMA technical paper written on the subject of flexible couplings. Shortly after the publication of this paper, Product Group 5 asked the Technical Committee to write an AGMA balancing standard for flexible couplings. It was recognized that existing balancing specifications such as MIL–STD 167 (ships) and ISO 1940 did not address flexible couplings.

AGMA 515.01 was intended as a guide to coupling users. The first rough draft of this standard was made in October of 1968. The first committee draft was prepared in February of 1972. It was approved by the membership on July 9, 1973.

AGMA 515.02 was a revision of AGMA 515.01. It was reviewed by the members of the Flexible Couplings Product Group 5 in January, 1974 and was revised in January, 1975 and again in September, 1975. It was approved by the membership on August 18, 1976.

ANSI/AGMA 9000–C90 was a revision and redesignation of AGMA 515.02. In the revision there were changes and corrections in the method of calculating the total potential unbalance of couplings (including the effects of hardware and eccentricity). The calculations gave a more accurate value of the potential unbalance of a coupling. The examples in the appendices were revised to show a generic coupling which illustrates the calculation methods presented. It was approved by the AGMA membership in November 1989, and was adopted as a National Standard on February 28, 1990.

ANSI/AGMA 9000–D11 is a revision of ANSI/AGMA 9000–C90. This revision introduces the use of ANSI S2–1999 or ISO 1940–1:2003 for the specification of balance quality grades for components or assemblies and how to properly apply that information to flexible coupling potential unbalance. It also contains numerous annexes for generic general purpose and high performance couplings. These annexes show how to apply the calculation methods of this standard for both component and assembly balancing of flexible couplings. Each annex also contains a discussion section and a section on the “value of the balance grade” which explains why a better balance grade may not result in a better balanced coupling assembly.

The first draft of ANSI/AGMA 9000–D11 was made in October, 2005. It was approved by the AGMA membership in April, 2011. It was approved as an American National Standard on August 10, 2011.

Suggestions for improvement of this standard will be welcome. They should be sent to the American Gear Manufacturers Association, 1001 N. Fairfax Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

## **PERSONNEL of the AGMA Flexible Couplings Committee**

Chairman: Glenn Pokrandt . . . . . Rexnord Industries Coupling Operations  
Vice Chairman: Todd Schatzka . . . . . Rexnord Technical Services

## **ACTIVE MEMBERS**

T.C. Glasener . . . . . Kop-Flex, Inc.  
B.M. Greenlees . . . . . A-C Equipment Services Corporation  
C.M. Hatseras . . . . . KTR Corporation  
D.W. Hindman . . . . . Rexnord Industries Coupling Operations  
M. Kallis . . . . . Consultant  
H. Lynn, III . . . . . Consultant  
D.R. Lyle . . . . . Ameridrives Gear Coupling Operations  
J.W. Mahan . . . . . Lovejoy, Inc.  
S. McChesney . . . . . Ringfeder Corporation  
M. McGinnity . . . . . Emerson Industrial Automation  
B. Ryan . . . . . Rexnord Coupling Operations Group  
J. Sherred . . . . . Ameridrives Gear Coupling Operations  
E. Wilson . . . . . Lovejoy, Inc.

## American National Standard -

# Flexible Couplings - Potential Unbalance Classification

## 1 Scope

This standard defines classes of flexible coupling potential unbalance, one of which the user must select in order to meet the needs of their system. The classes are established using weight and speed and system sensitivity to arrive at a mass displacement value that defines the potential unbalance. The standard defines types of unbalance, provides a method of selecting balance class, identifies contributors to potential unbalance, and provides a method of determining potential coupling unbalance. The balance classes are derived from consideration of the potential unbalance of the coupling.

The balancing requirements for a flexible coupling depend upon the rotating system into which it is mounted. Each half of the coupling is mounted on a separate rotor with the whole coupling providing the connection. Each of the connected rotors is balanced independently of the coupling and the coupling is added when the rotors are installed.

This standard is used with ANSI S2.19-1999 or ISO 1940-1:2003 which apply to balance quality requirements of rigid rotors. If ANSI S2.19-1999 or ISO 1940-1:2003 is used for balancing coupling components and assemblies in the balancing machine, then potential unbalances are introduced after the coupling is disassembled and reassembled either in the balancing machine or the rotor system. These potential unbalances are primarily the result of:

- balancing mounting fixture inaccuracies;
- displacement of coupling components with respect to the axis of rotation of the rotor system during disassembly and reassembly of the coupling.

### 1.1 Application

This standard is applicable to couplings and addresses potential unbalance which could be expected of a coupling in service. This standard accounts for issues of runout and clearances in the calculation of potential unbalance and resulting balance class. It should be noted that a flexible coupling is generally an assembly of several components having diametral clearance and eccentricities between the pilot surfaces. ANSI S2.19-1999 (ISO 1940-1:2003) addresses residual unbalance as measured in the balancing machine. For an example, see annex K.

### 1.2 Exclusions

This standard does not take into account arbitrary balance standards developed by other standards organizations (e.g., American Petroleum Institute). In addition, this standard does not address the unbalance effects caused by:

- shaft runout;
- keys that protrude beyond the hub or shaft;
- unfilled keyways or keyseats;