

AD-A168 528

BOUNDS FOR THE SYSTEM RELIABILITY FUNCTION(U) ARIZONA
UNIV TUCSON DEPT OF MATHEMATICS J G SHANTHIKUMAR
MAY 85 AFOSR-A5 AFOSR-84-0205


1/1

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 12/1

NL





MICROCOPY

CHART

AD-A168 528

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

②

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS													
2. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY NA		3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited													
3. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE NA															
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) AFOSR-TR- 86 - 0335													
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Department of Mathematics University of Arizona		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION AFOSR/NM												
6c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Tucson, Arizona 85721		7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Bldg. 410 Bolling AFB, DC 20332 - 6448													
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION U.S. Air Force (AFOSR)		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) NM	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER AFOSR - 84 - 0205												
8c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) AFOSR/NM Building 410 Bolling AFB, DC 20332 - 6448		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS. <table border="1"><tr><td>PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.</td><td>PROJECT NO.</td><td>TASK NO.</td><td>WORK UNIT NO.</td></tr><tr><td>6.1102F</td><td>2304</td><td>AS</td><td></td></tr></table>		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.	WORK UNIT NO.	6.1102F	2304	AS					
PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.	WORK UNIT NO.												
6.1102F	2304	AS													
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Bounds for the System Reliability Function															
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) J. George Shanthikumar															
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Technical report	13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____	14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day) May 1985	15. PAGE COUNT 11												
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION															
17. COSATI CODES <table border="1"><tr><td>FIELD</td><td>GROUP</td><td>SUB. GR.</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>		FIELD	GROUP	SUB. GR.										18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Reliability, coherent system, bounds	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB. GR.													
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) A coherent system with independent non-renewable components with arbitrary lifetime distributions is considered. A simple observation leads to a hierarchy of upper and lower bounds that converge to the exact system reliability. The simplest of these bounds is shown to be tighter than the bounds of Gertsbakh (1985).															
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS ☐															
21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified															
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Maj. Brian W. Woodruff		22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code) (202) 767-5027	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL AFOSR/NM												

DTIC FILE COPY

DTIC
ELECTE
JUN 06 1986
E

86 6 6 042

Bounds for System Reliability Function

J. George Shanthikumar*
School of Business Administration
University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720

May 1985

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.

*Supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research,
U.S.A.F., under Grant AFOSR-84-0205.
Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purposes
of the United States Government.

Abstract

A coherent system with independent non-renewable components with arbitrary lifetime distributions is considered. A simple observation leads to a hierarchy of upper and lower bounds that converge to the exact system reliability. The simplest of these bounds is shown to be tighter than the bounds of Gertsbakh (1985).

AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (AFSC)
NOTICE OF TRANSMISSION TO DTIC
This technical report is approved and is
approved for distribution under DTIC
Distribution Statement: DTIC-12.
FORTRAN J. K. K. K.
Chief, Technical Information Division

1. Introduction

Consider a coherent system consisting of n independent non-renewable components $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, with lifetime distributions F_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Let $X = \{X(t), t \geq 0\}$ be the vector performance process of these components such that $X(t) = (X_1(t), X_2(t), \dots, X_n(t))$ and $X_i(t)$ takes the value 0 if component i is up at time t and 1 otherwise. The state space S of X is then $\{0, 1\}^n$. Let ϕ be the coherent structure function of the system. That is $\phi: S \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, is non-decreasing on S and when $\phi(X(t))$ is 0 the system functions at time t and is 1 otherwise. The reliability $R(t)$ of the system at time t is then given by $1 - E\{\phi(X(t))\}$. It is of interest to obtain R . In general it is not possible to obtain explicit formula for R and one resort to algorithmic methods to compute R . Except in some special cases [e.g. Agrawal and Satyanarayana (1984), Provan and Ball (1984), and Shanthikumar (1982, 1984)], the problem is in general NP-hard [e.g. Buzacott (1980), and Ball (1984)]. Consequently approximation and bounds have been developed [e.g. Ball and Provan (1983), Gertsbakh (1985), Shanthikumar (1984), and Shogan (1976)]. In this paper we derive alternative bounds for R and compare them to that of Gertsbakh (1985).

Let $h(p) = E\{\phi(X(t))\}$, where $p_i = E\{X_i(t)\} = F_i(t)$, and let (G, B) be a partition of S such that $G = \{x: \phi(x) = 0, x \in S\}$ and define $U_\ell = \{x: ||x|| = \ell, x \in S\}$, $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, n$, where $||x|| = \sum x_i$. Suppose $\min \{||x||: x \in B\} = r$. Then $B = \bigcup_{j=r}^n V_j$, where $V_j = B \cap U_j$, $j = r, r+1, \dots, n$. With these observations one has,

$$h(p) = \sum_{x \in B} \left\{ \prod_{i \in \bar{W}(x)} p_i \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j \in W(x)} (1 - p_j) \right\}, \quad (1)$$

$$= \sum_{\ell=r}^n A_\ell, \quad (2)$$

where

$$A_\ell = \sum_{x \in V_\ell} \left\{ \prod_{i \in \bar{W}(x)} p_i \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j \in W(x)} (1 - p_j) \right\}, \quad (3)$$

$W(x) = \{k: x_k = 0, k = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$, is the set of working components in state x , and $\bar{W}(x) = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} - W(x)$.

Suppose we have upper and lower bounds $B_\ell \geq A_\ell \geq C_\ell$, $\ell = r, r+1, \dots, n$. Then we will have a sequence of upper and lower bounds for $h(p)$ and consequently for R . Specifically

$$\sum_{l=r}^{m-1} A_l + \sum_{l=m}^n C_l \leq h(\underline{p}) \leq \sum_{l=r}^{m-1} A_l + \sum_{l=m}^n B_l, \quad (4)$$

for $m=r, r+1, \dots, n+1$, [we use $\sum_{i=1}^b \gamma_i = 0, b < a$ for all γ_i]. Note that the above bounds get tighter as m increases and give the exact unreliability when $m = n + 1$. This allows one to progressively compute $A_r, A_{r+1}, \dots$, until a desired accuracy is found.

In Section 2 we develop some upper and lower bounds for A_l and compare it to that of Gertsbakh (1985). A simple numerical example is given in Section 3.

2. The Bounds

Without loss of generality assume that the components are numbered so that $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \dots \geq p_n$. Since $p_i = F_i(t)$ depend on t , this numbering may have to be altered for different values of t , unless $F_1(t) \geq F_2(t) \geq \dots \geq F_n(t)$, for all $t \geq 0$.

Proposition 2.1: Let $||V_l||$ be the number of elements in the set V_l . Then

$$\begin{aligned} ||V_l|| \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^l p_{n+1-i} \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j=l+1}^n (1 - p_{n+1-j}) \right\} &= C_l^{(1)} \\ \leq A_l &\leq ||V_l|| \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^l p_i \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j=l+1}^n (1 - p_j) \right\} = B_l^{(1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Proof: It is easily seen that for any $\underline{x} \in V_l$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^l p_{n+1-i} \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j=l+1}^n (1 - p_{n+1-j}) \right\} &\leq \left\{ \prod_{i \in \bar{W}(\underline{x})} p_i \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j \in W(\underline{x})} (1 - p_j) \right\} \\ &\leq \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^l p_i \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j=l+1}^n (1 - p_j) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The result now directly follows from (3).

□

To use the bounds $C^{(1)}$ and $B^{(1)}$ one needs to know $||V_\ell||$. Once $||V_\ell||$, $\ell = r, r+1, \dots$, are known one may use the recursion $B_{\ell+1}^{(1)} = \{ ||V_{\ell+1}|| / ||V_\ell|| \} \{ p_{\ell+1} / (1 - p_{\ell+1}) \}$ to compute $B^{(1)}$, $\ell = r, r+1, \dots$ [A similar recursion may be used for $C^{(1)}$, $\ell = r, r+1, \dots$] In some cases obtaining $||V_\ell||$ itself may turn out to be computationally difficult. In such a case the observation that $||V_\ell|| \leq \binom{n}{\ell}$ leads to a modification of $B^{(1)}$ as follows:

Proposition 2.2:

$$A_\ell \leq \binom{n}{\ell} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} p_i \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j=\ell+1}^n (1 - p_j) \right\} = B^{(2)}. \quad (6)$$

We will next obtain a modification of $B^{(2)}$. Define $P_i^+ = \sum_{j=1}^{n+1-i} p_j / (n+1-i)$ and $P_i^- = \sum_{j=i}^n p_j / (n+1-i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. For any $\underline{y} \in S$ let

$$Q_i(\underline{y}) = \begin{cases} P_i^+ & \text{if } y_i = 1 \\ 1 - P_i^- & \text{if } y_i = 0 \end{cases}$$

Then

Proposition 2.3: For any $\underline{y} \in U_\ell$,

$$A_\ell \leq \binom{n}{\ell} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} Q_i(\underline{y}). \quad (7)$$

Proof: Let P be the collection of all permutations of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\underline{z} \in U_\ell} \left\{ \prod_{i \in \bar{W}(\underline{z})} p_i \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j \in W(\underline{z})} (1 - p_j) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\ell!(n-\ell)!} \left\{ \sum_{\pi \in P} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} q_i(\pi, \underline{y}) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where

$$q_i(\pi, \underline{y}) = \begin{cases} p_{\pi(i)} & \text{if } y_i = 1 \\ 1 - p_{\pi(i)} & \text{if } y_i = 0 \end{cases}.$$

Now consider a subset P^{n-1} of P , such that the first $(n-1)$ elements in each of the permutations in P^{n-1} are identical. Then for any $\pi' \in P^{n-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\pi \in P^{n-1}} \prod_{i=1}^n q_i(\pi, \underline{y}) &= \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} q_i(\pi', \underline{y}) \sum_{\pi \in P^{n-1}} q_n(\pi, \underline{y}) \\ &\leq \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} q_i(\pi', \underline{y}) \sum_{\pi \in P^{n-1}} Q_n(\underline{y}) \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in P^{n-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} q_i(\pi, \underline{y}) Q_n(\underline{y}), \end{aligned}$$

since by definition $Q_n(\underline{y}) \geq q_n(\pi, \underline{y})$ for all $\pi \in P^{n-1}$. Note that $||P^{n-1}|| = 1$. Therefore

$$\sum_{\pi \in P} \prod_{i=1}^n q_i(\pi, \underline{y}) \leq \sum_{\pi \in P} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} q_i(\pi, \underline{y}) Q_n(\underline{y}).$$

Now defining P^{n-2} to be a subset of P such that the first $n-2$ elements of every permutation in there is identical one sees that

$$\sum_{\pi \in P^{n-2}} \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} q_i(\pi, \underline{y}) \leq \sum_{\pi \in P^{n-2}} \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} q_i(\pi, \underline{y}) Q_{n-1}(\underline{y}),$$

since by definition $2.Q_{n-1}(\underline{y}) \geq \sum_{\pi \in P^{n-2}} q_{n-1}(\pi, \underline{y})$. Note that $||P^{n-2}|| = 2$. Then

$$\sum_{\pi \in P} \prod_{i=1}^n q_i(\pi, \underline{y}) \leq \sum_{\pi \in P} \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} q_i(\pi, \underline{y}) \prod_{j=n-1}^n Q_j(\underline{y}).$$

Continuing this way and observing that $||P|| = n!$, Equation (8) leads to the required result.

□

Since (7) may give different upperbounds for different y 's, it is appropriate that we choose the minimum of such bounds. In this regard define π^* to be a permutation of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$\frac{P_{\pi^*(1)}^+}{1 - P_{\pi^*(1)}^-} \leq \frac{P_{\pi^*(2)}^+}{1 - P_{\pi^*(2)}^-} \leq \dots \leq \frac{P_{\pi^*(n)}^+}{1 - P_{\pi^*(n)}^-}. \quad (9)$$

Then using a straightforward pairwise interchange it can be shown that

Proposition 2.4

$$\min_{y \in U_l} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n Q_i(y) \right\} \\ = \prod_{i=1}^l P_{\pi^*(i)}^+ \prod_{j=l+1}^n (1 - P_{\pi^*(j)}^-).$$

Equivalently

$$A_l \leq \binom{n}{l} \prod_{i=1}^l P_{\pi^*(i)}^+ \prod_{j=l+1}^n (1 - P_{\pi^*(j)}^-) \equiv B_l^{(3)} \quad (10)$$

We will next provide an alternative upper bound for $\sum_{l=k}^n A_l$ which is tighter than that given by Gertsbakh (1985).

Proposition 2.5:

$$\sum_{l=k}^n A_l \leq \binom{n}{k} \prod_{i=1}^k P_i^+ \equiv \sum_{l=k}^n B_l^{(4)} \quad (11)$$

Proof: Observe that

$$\sum_{l=k}^n A_l \leq P\{\text{at least } k \text{ components are down at time } t\}. \quad (12)$$

Since for any $\pi \in P$,

$$P\{\text{components } \pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(k) \text{ are down}\} = \prod_{i=1}^k p_{\pi(i)},$$

one has from (12)

$$\sum_{t=k}^n A_t \leq \frac{1}{k!(n-k)!} \sum_{\pi \in P} \prod_{i=1}^k p_{\pi(i)}. \quad (13)$$

Using an analysis similar to that used for the proof of Proposition 2.3 one gets

$$\sum_{\pi \in P} \prod_{i=1}^k p_{\pi(i)} \leq n! \prod_{i=1}^k p_i^+. \quad (14)$$

Combining (13) and (14) one obtains the desired result.

□

When the lifetime of component i is exponentially distributed with rate λ_i , one has $p_i = 1 - \exp(-\lambda_i t)$, $i=1,2,\dots,n$. With $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$,

$$p_i^+ = \frac{1}{n+1-i} \sum_{j=1}^{n+1-i} (1 - \exp(-\lambda_j t))$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n+1-i} \Lambda_{i-1} t.$$

where $\Lambda_i \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{n-i} \lambda_j$. Therefore from (11), one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=r+1}^n A_t &\leq \binom{n}{r+1} \prod_{i=1}^{r+1} p_i^+ \\ &\leq \binom{n}{r+1} \prod_{i=0}^r \left\{ \frac{\Lambda_i t}{n-i} \right\} \\ &= \left(\prod_{i=0}^r \Lambda_i \right) \frac{t^{r+1}}{(r+1)!} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The right hand side of (15) is the bound obtained by Gertsbakh (1985). Clearly (11) is a tighter bound and is applicable to any component lifetime distributions.

In summary, one can use (4) along with (5), (6), (10), and (11) to obtain alternative bounds for the system reliability function R . Since the computation of these bounds are relatively simple, all these bounds may be computed and the best value can be used.

3. A Numerical Example

Consider the network shown below in Figure 1. Suppose we are interested in the reliability that node s is connected to node t by at least one path of working edges.




Figure 1: Directed Reliability Network

i	1	2	3	4	5
p_i	.1	.1	.08	.08	.08

Table 1: Edge unreliabilities (p_i).

The edge failure probabilities $p_i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ are given in Table 1. Then the minimum number of failed edges needed for a cut-set is $r=2$, and

$$V_2 = \{(0, 0, 1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 1, 1, 0)\}$$

$$V_3 = \{(0, 0, 0, 1, 1), (0, 0, 1, 0, 1), (0, 0, 1, 1, 0),$$

$(0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0, 0, 0),$

$(0, 1, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)\}$

$V_4 = \{(0, 0, 0, 0, 1), (0, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0, 0)\}$

$V_5 = \{(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)\}.$

with $||V_2|| = 3, ||V_3|| = 8, ||V_4|| = 5$ and $||V_5|| = 1$. Exact values, upper and lower bounds of $A_l, l = 2, 3, 4, 5$ are calculated using Equations (3), (5), (6), (10), and (11) and tabulated in Table 2. In this example P_i^+ is 0.088, 0.09, 0.09333, 0.1, 0.1 and P_i^- is 0.088, 0.085, 0.08, 0.08, 0.08 for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and 5 respectively. Hence $\pi^* = \langle 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 \rangle$, thus resulting in the same values for the bounds $B^{(2)}$ and $B^{(3)}$ [Equations (6) and (10)]. Substituting the upper and lower bounds for A_l in Equation (4) one obtains the bounds for the unreliability $h(p)$ [shown in Table 3].

m	2	3	4	5
$Eq(3) \sum_{l=m}^n A_l$	0.02348992	0.00483968	0.00027392	0.00000512
$Eq(5) \sum_{l=m}^n C_l^{(1)}$	0.01786112	0.00355328	0.00023552	0.00000512
$Eq(5) \sum_{l=m}^n B_l^{(1)}$	0.02907712	0.00571648	0.00029952	0.00000512
$Eq(6) \sum_{l=m}^n B_l^{(2)}$	0.08493952	0.00707072	0.00029952	0.00000512
$Eq(10) \sum_{l=m}^n B_l^{(3)}$	0.08493952	0.00707072	0.00029952	0.00000512
$Eq(11) \sum_{l=m}^n B_l^{(4)}$	0.0792	0.007392	0.0003696	0.000007392

Table 2: Exact Values, Upper and Lower Bounds for $\sum_{l=m}^n A_l$.

m	Lower bound using Eq(5)	Upper bounds Using			
		Eq(5)	Eq(6)	Eq(10)	Eq(11)
2	0.01786112	0.02907712	0.08493952	0.08493952	0.0792
3	0.02220352	0.02436672	0.02572096	0.02572096	0.02604224
4	0.02345152	0.02351552	0.02351552	0.02351552	0.0235856
5	0.02348992*	0.02348992*	0.02348992*	0.02348992*	0.0234901472

* Exact unreliability.

Table 3: Upper and Lower Bounds for $h(p)$.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank V. Ramaswami for his helpful comments.

Bibliography

1. Agrawal, A. and A. Satyanarayana (1985), "On $O(|E|)$ Time Algorithm for Computing the Reliability of a Class of Directed Networks," *Opns. Res.*, 32, 493-515.
2. Ball, M.O. (1984), "An Overview of the Computational Complexity of Network Reliability Analysis," Working paper series MS/S 84-010, College of Business and Management, Univ. of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.
3. Ball, M.O. and J.S. Provan (1983), "Calculating Bounds on Reachability and Connectedness in Stochastic Networks," *Networks*, 13, 253 -278.
4. Buzacott, J.A. (1980), "A Recursive Algorithm for Finding Reliability Measures Related to the Connection of Nodes in a Graph," *Networks*, 10, 311 -327.
5. Gertsbackh, I. (1985), "Simple Bounds on System Reliability Function," *Comm. Stat.-Stochastic Models*, 1, 117-123.
6. Provan, J.S. and M.O. Ball (1984), "Computing Network Reliability in Time Polynomial in the Number of Cuts," *Opns. Res.*, 32, 516-526.
7. Shanthikumar, J.G. (1982), "Recursive Algorithm to Evaluate the Reliability of a Consecutive-k-out-of-n: F system," *IEEE Trans. Reliability*, R-31, 442-443.
8. Shanthikumar, J.G. (1984), "Lifetime Distributions of Consecutive-k-out-of-n: F Systems with exchangeable lifetimes," Working Paper, School of Business Administration, University of California at Berkeley.
9. Shanthikumar, J.G. (1984), "Simple Bounds for Network Reliability," Management Science Working Paper No. MS-8, University of California at Berkeley.
10. Shogan, A.W. (1976), "Sequential Bounding of the Reliability of a Stochastic Network," *Opns. Res.*, 34, 1027-1044.

END

DTIC

7-86