

OPTIMAL RELIABILITY SYSTEMS UNDERGOING TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS AND EXPOSED TO CCF's

DR. DHANANJAYA REDDY

Abstract: The reliability characteristic such as probability of survival, mean time to failure, frequency of failures and mean down time depend on the design and topological layout of the system. This paper deals with a single unit system that is operating in an environment exposed to the hazards of common cause failures, under some general assumptions the optimal replacement policies were developed with the help of proposed measure of cost differences for old and new system.

Keywords: common cause failures (CCF's) mean time to failures (MTTF's), optimal reliability systems, the reliability.

Introduction / General Orientation And

Motivation: Developing optimal reliability systems is an important research and development activity particularly useful in future studies in as much as systems that are safe, economically constituted and operating failure free are ensured. Earlier works in this direction relate to development of optimal systems under varied conditions and assumptions (vide, for example, [1] - [10]). Among these systems, those undergoing technological change and therefore are new entrants into the market particularly attract current research interests. However, these studies do not take into consideration the hazardous effect of common cause failures (CCF's) to which a system could possibly be exposed to the importance of the CCF's and their impact on system's reliability could hardly be over emphasized. In this chapter we improve upon the results in Venugopal et. al., [9] by incorporating the additional parameter, namely, the CCF's. Supporting numerical work as a comparison study to bring out a qualitative analysis is also presented.

Assumptions And The Model:

We consider a single unit system functioning in an environmental set-up, which is exposed to CCF's. A new system now enters into the market, consequent upon research and development activities. A natural assumption is that the acquisition costs of the new system are higher than the old system but with smaller maintenance and repair costs. The modeling formulation is done under the following assumptions and adopting the notation as given below.

Assumptions:

- (a). Steady state solutions are considered (tacitly implying that the time span is taken to be infinite).
- (b). Both old and new systems suffer decreased mean time to failures (MTTF's) as the failures increase.
- (c). The per unit efficiency (in terms of MTTF's) of the old and new systems remains the same.
- (d). The salvage values of the new system are considerably larger than the old system.
- (e). The salvage values for both systems decrease as the failures increase.

Notation:

- C_o = A.C. of old system
 C_N = A.C. of new System
 $C_o \exp(-n/d)$ = salvage value of the old system after 'n' failures ($n = 1, 2, \dots$), $d > 0$ and constant, characterizing the decay - scale parameter.
 $C_o \exp(m/n+1)$ = Maintenance and repair costs (M.R.C) of old system after 'n' failures, $m > 0$ and constant, characterizing the increasing nature of cost (with more failures).
 $C_N \exp(-r/n+1)$ = M.R.C. for the new system, where $0 < m < r$, as per Modeling assumption.
 $R_{n,c}(t)$ = Reliability of the system exposed to CCF's as well as random causes after $(n+1)$ failures.
 $M_o(n)$ = MTTF of the old system after $(n-1)$ failures, with the natural assumption $M_o(\infty) = 0$.
 With these assumptions and adopting the notation, we develop in the following section optimal reliability systems in terms of deriving optimal replacement stage (n^*) beyond which repairs are recommended to be stopped and the system is to be replaced.

3. OPTIMAL n*

Under the above modeling setup, we have.
 $M_o(n) > M_o(n+1), n = 1, 2 \dots (1)$

The expected cost per unit time, after 'n' failures for the old system and with nil failures for the new system are respectively given by.

$$E_o = (C_o + C_o e^{-m/n+1} - C, e^{-n/d}) / M_o(n+1)$$

$$\text{And } E_N = (C_N + C_N e^{-r}) / M_N(1)$$

Following the idea in Venugopal et. al. [9],

We propose the measure, C(n), defined as

$$C(n) = |E_o(n) - E_N|$$

The obvious motivation of proposing C(n) is to minimize C(n), with respect to 'n' and hence obtain the optimal n* which is the optimal replacement stage with the new system. The following basic theorem is proved to accomplish the purpose.

Theorem:

The n* which minimizes C(n), in (4):

(i) Satisfies the pair of inequalities

$$S(n) > C_N / C_o \text{ and } S(n-1) < C_N / C_o,$$

Where

$$S(n) = \left\{ \frac{1 - \exp(-(n+1)/d) + \exp(-m/n+2)}{M_o(n+2)} + \frac{1 - \exp(-n/d) + \exp(-m/n+1)}{M_o(n+1)} \right\} \frac{M_N(1)}{2(1+e^{-r})}$$

(ii) $n^* < \infty$ and (iii) n^* is unique (3)

Proof: (4)

C(n) being discrete in 'n', n* is obtained through the equalities, (4)

$$C(n+1) > c(n) \tag{4}$$

$$\text{And } c(n) < c(n+1)$$

From (4) and (7), we obtain (after simplifications)

$$[E_o^2(n+1) - E_o^2(n)] > 2 E_N [E_o(n+1) - E_o(n)]$$

This leads to

$$[E_o(n+1) + E_o(n)] > 2 E_N$$

Once we notice that $[E_o(n+1) - E_o(n)] > 0$

Rearranging terms is (9),. We obtain $S(n) > C_N / C_o$.

Similarly (4) in (8), we obtain $S(n-1) < C_N / C_o$

Thus (i) in the theorem is proved. We now show that S(n) is strictly

Increasing in 'n' and further $S(n) \rightarrow \infty$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

For the purpose, be consider $\{S(n+1) - S(n)\}$.

$$S(n+1) - S(n) = \frac{M_N(1)}{2(1+e^{-r})} \left\{ \frac{1 - e^{-(n+2)/d} + e^{-m/n+3}}{M_o(n+3)} + \frac{1 - e^{-(n+1)/d} + e^{-m/n+2}}{M_o(n+2)} - \frac{1 - e^{-(n+1)/d} + e^{-m/n+1}}{M_o(n+1)} \right\} \\ - \left\{ \left[M_o(n+1) (1 - e^{-(n+2)/d}) \right] - \left[M_o(n+3) (1 - e^{n-d}) \right] + \frac{M_N(1)}{2(1+e^{-r})} \left[M_o(n+1) e^{-m/n+3} - M_o(n+3) e^{-m/n+1} \right] \right\} / M_o(n+1) M_o(n+3) > 0$$

Thus S(n) is strictly increasing and $\rightarrow \infty$ since $M_o(\infty) = 0$.

Hence C_N / C_o being finite, S(n) crosses the value C_N / C_o just once at a finite crossing stage. Thus (ii) and (iii) are established. The proof is complete.

4. Numerical (Companion) Study: For purpose of illustrative numerical work, the probability failure laws for both random failures and CCF's are assumed to be negative exponential with respective parameters λ_n (after (n+1) failures) and λ_o for both the old and new systems.

Then, $R_{n,c}(t) = e^{-(\lambda_n + \lambda_o)t}$

$$\text{So that } M_o(n) = \int_0^\infty R_{n,c}(t) dt \tag{11}$$

$$= 1 / (\lambda_n + \lambda_o) \tag{12}$$

$$\text{And } M_N(1) = 1 / \lambda_o \tag{13}$$

Let us choose $A = (1.1)^{n-1}$, $d=3$, $m=2$ and $r = 4$. With these values we tabulate the S(n) values for $n=0,1,2,\dots,10$ and for different λ_o values, in the following (corrected to second decimal place).

TABLE 1 n Vs S(n)

# of Repairs (n)	$\lambda_0:0$	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0
0	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42
1	0.98	0.97	0.96	0.94	0.93	0.92	0.91
2	1.46	1.43	1.4	1.37	1.34	1.32	1.3
3	1.89	1.84	1.8	1.7	1.69	1.65	1.62
4	2.3	2.23	2.17	2.07	2.01	1.94	1.9
5	2.71	2.61	2.53	2.39	2.29	2.22	2.16
6	3.13	3.02	2.89	2.71	2.58	2.48	2.4
7	3.56	3.39	3.26	3.04	2.88	2.75	2.65
8	4.01	3.81	3.64	3.48	3.18	3.02	2.9
9	4.5	4.26	4.05	3.73	3.49	3.31	3.16
10	5.02	4.73	4.49	4.11	3.83	3.61	3.43

Now, using Theorem 1 and the related values, the optimal n^* values for different C_N/C_0 ratio values and λ_0 values are tabulated below.

TABLE 2: C_N/C_0 and λ_0 Vs n^* values

C_N / C_0	$\lambda_0:0$	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0
1.5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
2.0	3	3	3	3	3	4	4
2.5	4	4	4	5	5	6	6
3.0	5	5	6	6	7	7	8

5. A Qualitive Analysis:

From table 2 values we see that n^* values increase with increase in C_N/C_0 acquisition cost ratio values as well as λ_0 (CCF-ratio) values. The interpretation is that as new systems are costlier larger numbers of repairs are allowed before optimal replacements are recommended. Further CCF rates have same effects in certain ranges, for example, when $C_N/C_0 = 2.5$, n^* is 4 for λ_0 values in (0, 0.2) while it is 5 and 6 respectively for λ_0 values in (0.4, 0.6) and (0.8, 1.0). That is, as λ_0 values are larger, i.e., as CCF's become more intense, n^* is also larger, which is in keeping with natural physical experience.

In conclusion we note that when $\lambda_0 = 0$, i.e., is the absence of CCF's; the results in Venugopal et al., [9] are recovered as a special case of our results.

References:

1. Deane, Y (1961), Replacement theory, in progress in Op. Research (R.L. Ackott, Ed.) John Wiley, Newyork.
2. M.Lellis Thivagar., S.P.R.Priyalatha, Covering Approximation in Nano topology; Mathematical Sciences international Research Journal ISSN 2278 – 8697 Vol 3 Issue 2 (2014), Pg 682-684
3. Eilon Sking et al., (1966), A Study in equipment replacement, op. Res. Qly 21, pp.59-71.
4. Elton J, and Grubes M.J. (1976), on the optimality of an equal life policy for equipment subject to technological improvement, Op.Res.Qly, 27, pp.93-99.
5. Hastings, N.A.J. (1969), the repair limit replacement method, Op.Res.Qly. 20, pp.337-349.
6. Jadine, K.S. (1968) Op. Research in Maintenance, Manchester Univ.Press, Manchester

7. *Wasefer Zaman, Partha Ghosh, Kalyankumar Datta, Pramatha Nath Basu*, A Framework to incorporate Domain Knowledge Modeling ; Mathematical Sciences International Research Journal ISSN 2278 – 8697 Vol 2 Issue 2 (2013), Pg 474-478
8. Lambe, A (1974) the decision to scrap a machine, *Op.Res.Qly.* 25, pp.99- 110.
9. *P. Suresh Kumara, N. Ravib and C. Venkataiahc*, A New Architecture for Low Power Row Bypassing ...; Mathematical Sciences International Research Journal ISSN 2278 – 8697 Vol 2 Issue 1 (2013), Pg 97-100
10. Mohan, H. and Bailey, R.J. (1975) A proposed improved replacement policy for army vehicles *Op.Res. Qly.* 26, pp.477-494.
11. *K.K.Suresh , K.indira*, Construction and Selection of one Plan Suspension System With; Mathematical Sciences International Research Journal ISSN 2278 – 8697 Vol 2 Issue 2 (2013), Pg 196-201
12. Stapleton, et al., (1972) Technological change and optimal life of assets *Opl.Res.Qly*, 23, pp.45-49.
13. Venugopal N et at., (1987) Optimal replacement policy for a simple unit reliability model with technological progress, *Assam Statistical Review*, Vol.1, No.2, ppJ-8..
14. Dr. Manisha Sharma, Dr. Mudit Bansal, Evaluation and Developed Algorithm for Task; Mathematical Sciences International Research Journal ISSN 2278 – 8697 Vol 3 Issue 1 (2014), Pg 109-114
15. Venugopal N (1992) Contributions to stochastic John/Eastern wileys New York /New Delhi.

Dr. Dhananjaya Reddy
Assistant Professor, Dept of Mathematics,

Govt. Degree college, Kodur (RS), Kadapa (Dist) A.P. / djreddy65@gmail.com