



)

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

3

AD	)-A1	62 <sup>′</sup>	121	REPORT DOCUM									
IA REPORT	SECURITY CI SSIFIED			روی مراجع کی کرونی ک	16. RESTRICTIVE M								
	Y CLASSIFIC	ATION AUTI	HORITY	······	3. DISTRIBUTION/A								
-	SIFICATION/		INGSCHED		Approved for unlimited	or public r	elease; dis	stribut					
N/A								المراجعي الموانعين					
4. PERFORM	IING ORGANI	ZATION REI	PORT NUM	BER(S)	5. MONITORING OR	+···	5 - 109						
SA NAME O	FPERFORMI	NG ORGANIZ	ZATION	B. OFFICE SYMBOL	78. NAME OF MONI	TORING ORGAN	IZATION						
Corne	ll Univer	sity		(If applicable)	AFOSR/NM								
	<b>S (City. State o</b> a, NY 14			• <u>•</u> ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	7b. ADDRESS (City, State and 21P Code) Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332-6448								
	F FUNDING/	PONSORING	G.	B. OFFICE SYMBOL	9. PROCUREMENT	INSTRUMENT ID	DENTIFICATION	NUMBER					
AFOSR				(if applicable) NM	AFOSR-84-0165								
	S (City, State			·	10. SOURCE OF FU	10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS.							
Bolli	ng AFB, I	5.0. 20	332-0440	D	PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.	WORK					
of Lo	ncinde Securit ad Sharin AL AUTHOR Taylor	ng Syste		reliability	61102F	2304	Α5						
of Lo 12. PERSON H/M. 13. TYPE ( Angres 16. Supple 17. FIELD	AL AUTHOR Taylor DF REPORT	ng Syste (S) 7 DTATION CODES SUB	IS. TIME C FROM]]	18 SUBJECT TERMS of fault toler replacement	14. DATE OF REPO November Continue on reverse if n ant systems, 1 models	RT (Yr., Mo., De) 1985	y) 15. PAGE 5	ber)					
of Lo 12. PERSON H/M. 13. TYPE ( Angress 14. SUPPLE 17. FIELD 19. AUSTRA Resea increa fault repla this	ACT (Continue arch was beases the t toleran	ng Syste (S) 7 OTATION CODES SUB. on neverse if conducte 10ad on it load s vidually e entire	ans 13b. TIME C FROM[]] . GR. . GR.	18. SUBJECT TERMS ( fault toler	14. DATE OF REPO November (Continue on reverse if n ant systems, 1 models mer/ tems, where the onents. The op veloped. Where and that determ	AT (Yr., Mo., Dep 1985 eccenery and iden oad sharing e failure o ptimal replaise failed comines the o	15. PAGE 5 18/7y by block number g systems, f one componacement the mponents can ptimal poli first year DEC 0	nent ory for nnot be cy for of <b>IC</b> CTE 6 1985					
of Lo 12. PERSON H/M. 13. TYPE ( Angra 16. SUPPLE 17. PIELD 19. AUSTRA Resea incred fault repla this	ACT (Continue aced indiacing the grant.	ng Syste (S) 7 OTATION CODES SUB ON NOVERS (/ conducte load on it load s vidually entire	IS. TIME C FROM . GR. 	IL SUBJECT TERMS ( fault toler replacement ad sharing syst nonfailed compo systems was dev gorithm was fou Two papers ha	14. DATE OF REPO November (Continue on reverse if n ant systems, 1 models mer/ tems, where the onents. The op veloped. Where and that determ	AT (Yr., Me., De) 1985 eccenery and iden oad sharing e failure o timal repla e failed con times the of red in the	15. PAGE 5 18/7y by block number g systems, f one compo- acement the mponents ca ptimal poli first year <b>DEC O</b> DEC O	nent ory for nnot be cy for of <b>IC</b> CTE					
of Lo 12. PERSON H/M. 13. TYPE C Angress 10. SUPPLE 17. FIELD 19. AUSTRA Resea incra fault repla this 20. OISTRA	ACT (Continue aced indiacing the grant.	ng Syste (S) T DTATION CODES SUB on reverse (f conducte load on it load s vidually entire	INS INE TIME C FROM GR. GR. ACCOMPY AN ed on lo n other sharing y, an al system. OF ABSTRA	IL SUBJECT TERMS ( fault toler replacement ad sharing syst nonfailed compo systems was dev gorithm was fou Two papers ha	14. DATE OF REPO November (Continue on reverse if a rant systems, 1 models wr/ cems, where the onents. The op reloped. Where and that determ ave been prepar	AT (Yr., Mo., Day 1985 accessory and iden coad sharing a failure o b failed con times the o ced in the CURITY CLASSIF	15. PAGE 5 18/7y by block number g systems, f one compo- acement the mponents ca ptimal poli first year <b>DEC O</b> DEC O	nent ory for nnot be cy for of <b>IC</b> CTE 6 1985					
of Lo 12. PERSON H/M. 13. TYPE ( ADDYSE 14. SUPPLE 17. FIELD 19. ADSTRU Resea incro fault repla this 20. OISTRU UNCLASSI	ACT (Continue aced indiacing the grant.	ng Syste (S) T T T T T T T CODES SUB. ON NOVERSE IF CONDUCTED I DOAD ON A USAN CODES SUB. CODES CODES SUB. CODES CODES SUB. CODES CO	IS. TIME C FROMI . GR. . GR.	IL SUBJECT TERMS of fault toler replacement didentify by Nock numb ad sharing syst nonfailed compo systems was dev gorithm was fou Two papers ha	14. DATE OF REPO November (Continue on reverse if a rant systems, 1 models Meri rems, where the onents. The op reloped. Where and that determ ave been prepar	AT (Yr., Mo., Dep 1985 eccenery and iden oad sharing e failure o btimal repla e failed con ines the o red in the CURITY CLASSIN ed	15. PAGE 5 18/7y by block number g systems, f one compo- acement the mponents ca ptimal poli first year <b>DEC O</b> DEC O	nent ory for nnot be cy for of <b>IC</b> CTE 6 1985 E					

۰.	٤.	٩	j,	٠				٠	۰.		•	•	 ١.	 ۰.	- 12	1
<u>ا_</u>	•	۰.	۰.		•	٩.	۰.		٠.	•	٠	•	1	•	-0	

AFOSR - TR -

## FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT AFOSR-84-0165 The Reliability of Load Sharing Systems Howard M. Taylor, Cornell University Principal Investigator

1096

NTIS GRA&I DTIC TAB

Unannousced Justification

Distribution/

Availability Codes

Avail and/or

QUALITY INSPECTED

3

Special

Bv\_

Dist

Approv. Aletete

1. Summary. In a load sharing system, the failure of one or more components increases the load on other nonfailed components, thereby increasing their chances of failure, and the failure of the system. Examples of load sharing systems include many mechanical, thermal and electrical structures. System reliability is measured by the probability that the system is capable of performing its prescribed task or surviving for a prescribed duration. Traditional reliability models often postulate that component failures are statistically independent and, thus, do not describe load sharing systems.

The optimal replacement theory for fault tolerant load sharing systems was developed under the support of the grant. As components fail, the system deteriorates. Where failed components cannot be replaced individually, an algorithm was found that determines the optimal policy for replacing the entire system.

Load sharing systems arise as models for the failure process of certain composite materials such as Kevlar fibers embedded in an epoxy matrix, or for certain semi-crystalline polymer fibers themselves. Because of the astronomical numbers of components in these models, their analysis is quite difficult. Progress was made in developing a simple model that accurately describes the failure process, but is far more easily understood and manipulated.

2. Research Objectives. In a <u>load sharing system</u>, the failure of one or more components increases the load on other nonfailed components, thereby increasing their chances of failure, and the failure of the whole system. Examples of load sharing systems include: (a) Heat shields on a space re-entry vehicle. The failure of loss of some shields increases the burden on others;

MO.

AIR POPPE OF PERSON

(b) Fibrous composite materials. Many mechanical structures share loads among components. As one such example, consider a fibrous composite material consisting of parallel stiff fibers embedded in a plastic matrix. Failure of some fibers under an initial tensile load increases the stress on adjacent or nearby fibers.

(c) Networks of electric power generators, where the failure of one source causes the load on other sources to increase in order to meet total system demand.

Appropriate measures of system reliability in these examples are: (a) The probability that the system is capable of performing its prescribed task, such as supporting a specified mechanical load, or (b) The probability distribution of time to system failure. Traditional reliability analysis has concentrated on systems in which component failures are statistically independent. This assumption is not valid where load sharing among components appears, and thus traditional reliability techniques cannot be used to determine system performance.

Our research is directed towards developing and analyzing models and algorithms that predict system reliability from knowledge of component reliabilities and the load sharing and other features of the system. Such models are needed to guide experimentation and the interpretation of statistical data, to evaluate alternative system designs, and as a basis for the development of optimum policies for maintenance and repair of systems and components.

3. Status of Research. We have made substantial progress on two of our specific objectives:

(a) In an optimal replacement model, a system deteriorates over time, and based on its current state, one wishes to decide in an optimal manner whether or not to replace the system with a statistically identical new one. Optimal replacement problems are the special class of sequential decision models that are distinguished by having only two actions available at any state: (i) To replace the system with a new and statistically identical one, or (ii) To continue operation with the current system. Often there is a notion of total failure, at which point replacement is mandated.

Replacement models for systems having indistinguishable components that fail over time, while allowing the system to continue to perform at a reduced level, have been studied. Our contribution was to develop the model in which the individual system components are distinguishable so that it is important to know exactly which components are operating at any given time, and not merely their total number. Moreover, we allowed the individual component failure rates to depend on the state of the entire system. Such a feature is important in studying load sharing systems in which the load that a component had been carrying prior to its failure is, upon that component's failure, shifted to other components, thereby possibly increasing their failure rates. We were motivated to study this problem in part by the importance in modern practice of so-called fault tolerant systems, systems that can continue to operate even though some of their components have failed. In addition to simple redundancy, many such systems feature function migration in which the function served by a component is shifted to another component upon the first component's failure.

Our main contribution has been to develop an algorithm that determines an optimal replacement policy for a fault tolerant system having distinguishable components whose failure rates are system dependent. The rate at which the system produces income is assumed to decrease as the system deteriorates, and the system replacement cost is assumed to rise. Our algorithm is of the so-called greedy type. It begins with the policy that continues to operate the system, (that is, does not replace it), only if all components are operational. The algorithm then enlarges this continuation set in a monotonic manner, state by state, to arrive

3

at the optimal such continuation set. If there are N system components, then there are  $2^N$  system states. The optimal policy will be specified by a class of these system states, the class of states in which the system is allowed to continue to operate. There are, then,  $2^2$  such possible continuation sets of states.

(b) If a modern high strength-low weight polymer material, such as a Kevlar fiber or Kevlar-epoxy composite, is suspended under a constant weight, it will eventually fail, an example of what is called stress rupture or static fatigue. The failure process begins at the atomic level where random fluctuations cause sufficient thermal energy to exist in a molecule to overcome certain local energy barriers, and a molecule may slip relative to other molecules or rupture at one of its atomic bonds. As molecules slip or rupture, neighboring molecules become overloaded, thus increasing their failure rates. Such molecule failures accumulate locally, forming minute cracks that are the irreversible changes in the microstructure that ultimately lead to macroscopic failure of the material.

Because a Kevlar-epoxy strand can have a strength to weight ratio that is 50 times that of steel, these materials are of growing importance in aircraft and elsewhere. Nationwide, much research effort is being devoted to their study, but virtually all of this research is experimental or, more recently, simulation. In contrast, we are developing purely mathematical models that characterize the failure process. The key notion is the load sharing and local stress concentrations in the near vicinity of failed elements. We have made great progress over the past decade, and our models are now providing results and insights that cannot be achieved by experimentation or simulation. Our long term goal is to work more closely with material scientists, both to communicate our results to them, and to improve our models. Unfortunately, the mathematical analysis of these models is extremely difficult, requiring a high level of proficiency in probability theory. During this past year, we have

4

developed a simpler model that captures the essence of the failure process, but is far easier to understand. We hope that these mathematical models will become the accepted framework for describing the failure process in certain composite materials, both for design and experimentation.

4. Publications.

"Optimal replacement for fault tolerant systems", by H. M. Taylor and B. Rodriguez. To appear: <u>Naval</u> <u>Research Logistic Quarterly</u>.

"A model for the failure process of semi-crystalline polymer materials under static fatigue", by H. M. Taylor. (In final preparation.)

