



THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE AND SALE; ITS DISTRIBUTION IS UNLIMITED

SOME PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN THE APPLICATION OF FINITE SOURCE QUEUEING MODELS

by

Zeev Barzily Donald Gross Henry D. Kahn

Serial T-360 26 September 1977

The George Washington University School of Engineering and Applied Science Institute for Management Science and Engineering

Program in Logistics

Contract N00014-75-C-0729 Project NR 347 020 Office of Naval Research

DDC 20CPULAR OCT 27 1977 551 B

This document has been approved for public sale and release; its distribution is unlimited.

REFURI DUCUMENI	ATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS
REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
1Serial - T-360		
TITLE (and Subtitle)		STYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
SOME PRACTICAL CONSIDERAT	IONS IN THE APPLICA- (9)
TION OF FINITE SOURCE QUE	UEING MODELS.	5. PERFORMING ORCORD NUMER
	ner fri dat men nel gener a nel angene. Delse se sen effet "ne sette delse af de se de sette des annes de sen e	
AUTHOR(s)		B. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(.)
ZEEV/BARZILY	(15)	NØØØ14-75-C-Ø729
DONALD/GROSS		- property and a second s
PER COMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND	ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIV	ERSITY	
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20037		
CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDR	ESS	TE REPORT DATE
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH	()	26 SEPTEMBER 1977
ARLINCTON, VIRGINIA 22217		29
MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS	(It different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
(12)	32.1	
	- The	NONE 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING
		SCHEDULE
		Approved for public release
		Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatra	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro	Approved for public releas Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetre	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro	Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatra	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro	Approved for public releas Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatra	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro	Approved for public releas Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatra	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro	Approved for public releas Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatra	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro	Approved for public releas Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatra	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro	Approved for public releas Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatra SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro roeseary and identify by block number)	Approved for public releas Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the about SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if ne MACHINE REPAIR PROBLEM	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro coseery and identify by block number) TR/	Approved for public releas Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatra SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide If ne MACHINE REPAIR PROBLEM FINITE SOURCE QUEUES	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro cesseary and identify by block number) TRA UNI	Approved for public releas Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetre SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if ne MACHINE REPAIR PROBLEM FINITE SOURCE QUEUES SPARES PROVISIONING	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro ceeseary and identify by block number) TRA UNI	Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the about SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if ne MACHINE REPAIR PROBLEM FINITE SOURCE QUEUES SPARES PROVISIONING	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro cesseary and identify by block number) TRA UNI	Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatra SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if ne MACHINE REPAIR PROBLEM FINITE SOURCE QUEUES SPARES PROVISIONING ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if new	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro coesary and identify by block number) TRA UNI	Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatra SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if ne MACHINE REPAIR PROBLEM FINITE SOURCE QUEUES SPARES PROVISIONING ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if ne This paper considers s finite source (machine repa	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro coseary and identify by block number) TRA UNI coseary and identify by block number) some practical aspects air) queueing models.	Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetre SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if ne MACHINE REPAIR PROBLEM FINITE SOURCE QUEUES SPARES PROVISIONING ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if ne This paper considers a finite source (machine repa calling populations are dev	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro coseary and identify by block number) TRA UNI some practical aspects air) queueing models. veloped to investigate	Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited INSIENT ANALYSIS EQUAL FAILURE RATES of an application of Exact models for small (a) transient effects;
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetre SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if ne MACHINE REPAIR PROBLEM FINITE SOURCE QUEUES SPARES PROVISIONING ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde if ne This paper considers s finite source (machine repa calling populations are dev (b) the effect of assuming	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro ceeseary and identify by block number) TRA UNI ceeseary and identify by block number) some practical aspects air) queueing models. veloped to investigate population items opera	Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited NSIENT ANALYSIS EQUAL FAILURE RATES of an application of Exact models for small (a) transient effects; te continuously, when, in
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetre SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if ne MACHINE REPAIR PROBLEM FINITE SOURCE QUEUES SPARES PROVISIONING ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if ne This paper considers s finite source (machine repa calling populations are dev (b) the effect of assuming fact, they may be idle a population with upper	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro cesseary and identify by block number) TRA UNI cesseary and identify by block number) some practical aspects air) queueing models. veloped to investigate population items opera ortion of the time; and tal failure rates, but	Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited INSIENT ANALYSIS EQUAL FAILURE RATES of an application of Exact models for small (a) transient effects; te continuously, when, in (c) the effect of having assuming all items fail
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetre SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde II ne MACHINE REPAIR PROBLEM FINITE SOURCE QUEUES SPARES PROVISIONING ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde II ne This paper considers s finite source (machine repa calling populations are dev (b) the effect of assuming fact, they may be idle a pop population items with unequat the population average v	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro cesseary and identify by block number) TRA UNI cesseary and identify by block number) some practical aspects air) queueing models. yeloped to investigate population items operation ortion of the time; and all failure rates, but yalues. Implications fi	Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited NSIENT ANALYSIS EQUAL FAILURE RATES of an application of Exact models for small (a) transient effects; te continuously, when, in (c) the effect of having assuming all items fail rom the small population —
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetre SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if ne MACHINE REPAIR PROBLEM FINITE SOURCE QUEUES SPARES PROVISIONING ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if ne This paper considers a finite source (machine repa calling populations are dev (b) the effect of assuming fact, they may be idle a pop population items with unequat the population average v	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro cesseary and identify by block number) TRA UNI cesseary and identify by block number) some practical aspects air) queueing models. veloped to investigate population items opera ortion of the time; and hal failure rates, but values. Implications f	Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited Distribution Unlimited NSIENT ANALYSIS QUAL FAILURE RATES of an application of Exact models for small (a) transient effects; te continuously, when, in (c) the effect of having assuming all items fail rom the small population
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetre SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if ne MACHINE REPAIR PROBLEM FINITE SOURCE QUEUES SPARES PROVISIONING ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde if ne This paper considers as finite source (machine repairs) calling populations are dev (b) the effect of assuming fact, they may be idle a pop population items with unequal the population average v FORM 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 68 S/N 0102-014-6601	ct entered in Block 20, if different fro cesseary and identify by block number) TRA UNI cesseary and identify by block number) some practical aspects air) queueing models. veloped to investigate population items opera ortion of the time; and al failure rates, but values. Implications for SIS OBSOLETE	Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited Distribution Unlimited NSIENT ANALYSIS QUAL FAILURE RATES of an application of Exact models for small (a) transient effects; te continuously, when, in (c) the effect of having assuming all items fail rom the small population

t

ζ.

NONE 20. Continued models and from models which bound and approximate larger population sizes are discussed. ACCESSION for Villa Soction 🖌 NTIS E of Section [] DDC UNANNO JUSTICA BY _____ DISTRIBUTION ANALASSICATION COULS Dist. AVAIL. COMPANY SPECIAL NONE

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY School of Engineering and Applied Science Institute for Management Science and Engineering

Program in Logistics

Abstract of Serial T-360 27 July 1977

SOME PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN THE APPLICATION OF FINITE SOURCE QUEUEING MODELS

by

Zeev Barzily Donald Gross Henry D. Kahn

This paper considers some practical aspects of an application of finite source (machine repair) queueing models. Exact models for small calling populations are developed to investigate (a) transient effects; (b) the effect of assuming population items operate continuously, when in fact they may be idle a portion of the time; and (c) the effect of having population items with unequal failure rates, but assuming all items fail at the population average values. Implications from these small population models and from models which bound and approximate larger population sizes are discussed.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY School of Engineering and Applied Science Institute for Management Science and Engineering

Program in Logistics

SOME PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN THE APPLICATION OF FINITE SOURCE QUEUEING MODELS

by

Zeev Barzily Donald Gross Henry D. Kahn

1. Introduction

Finite source queueing models (machine repair models) (see [4], pp. 118-125) can be useful for a variety of applications. One area of application is in spares provisioning, where, for a given population of operating units (for example, aircraft engines, computer control modules, or lathes) which stochastically fail and are repairable, it is desired to know how many spare units to have on hand as well as the capacity of the repair facility in order to guarantee a certain service level. Gross, Kahn, and Marsh [5] treat such an application in detail.

In the Gross et al study [5], where it was desired to determine the spares inventory and repair capacity over a changing multi-year planning horizon, three key assumptions were necessary in order to apply the classical queueing theoretic solutions. These assumptions are (i) all units in the population are identical, (ii) units and repair facilities operate continuously, and (iii) the system is always in steady state. In addition, units are assumed to fail according to a Poisson process and repair times are assumed to be exponentially distributed random variables. Since these latter two assumptions were considered to be fairly realistic in a variety of situations, it is the three assumptions enumerated above which are investigated here.

2. Populations with Unequal Failure Rates

When applying the classic machine repair theory, one must assume all units are identical in order to obtain the steady-state system size probabilities required for determining the system service level for a given number of spares and repair channels. The question naturally arises, is this an adequate assumption? Steady-state probabilities obtained by making this simplifying assumption approximate the true probabilities. It is conceptually possible to model a finite source queue with spares having different failure rates for the calling units, but for a system of any reasonable size the equations become unwieldy.

In this section we study a finite source machine repair model having one machine and one spare. Here we allow the calling units to have different failure rates. In particular, the effect of approximating the steady-state probabilities by assuming that all units have failure rates equal to the average failure rate of the calling units is investigated.

In general, letting M denote the population size, y the number of spares, and c the number of repair channels at the repair facility, the model we work out in detail here is for M = y = c = 1. Unit 1 has a Poisson failure rate λ_1 and Unit 2 λ_2 . It is assumed that service times are independent exponentially distributed random variables with mean $1/\mu$, and that if Unit i (i=1,2) is operating at time t, the probability it will have failed by time t + Δt is $\lambda_1 \Delta t + o(\Delta t)$. The following states may be defined for the system.

- 2 -

State	Unit 1	Unit 2
0	Operating	Spare
1	Operating	Repair
2	Spare	Operating
3	Repair	Operating
4	Queue	Repair
5	Repair	Queue

The steady-state probabilities must satisfy the following balance equations:

 $\lambda_{1} p_{0} = \mu p_{1}$ $(\lambda_{1} + \mu) p_{1} = \lambda_{2} p_{2} + \mu p_{5}$ $\lambda_{2} p_{2} = \mu p_{3}$ $(\lambda_{2} + \mu) p_{3} = \mu p_{4} + \lambda_{1} p_{0}$ $\mu p_{4} = \lambda_{1} p_{1}$ $\mu p_{5} = \lambda_{2} p_{3}$ $\sum_{i=0}^{5} p_{i} = 1 ,$ (1)

where p_i is the steady-state probability that the system is in state i, i=0,1,...,5. Solution of the system of Equations (1) yields

$p_1 = \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu} p_0 ,$	$p_4 = (\lambda_2/\mu)^2 p_0$,	
$\mathbf{p}_2 = \frac{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 + \mu)}{\lambda_2(\lambda_2 + \mu)} \mathbf{p}_0 ,$	$\mathbf{p}_{5} = \frac{\lambda_{1}\lambda_{2}}{\mu^{2}} \left(\frac{\lambda_{1}+\mu}{\lambda_{2}+\mu}\right) \mathbf{p}_{0} ,$	
$p_3 = \frac{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 + \mu)}{\mu(\lambda_2 + \mu)} p_0$,		(2)
	u^2 () $\pm u$	

$$P_{0} = \frac{\mu^{2}\lambda_{2}(\lambda_{2}+\mu)}{\mu^{3}(\lambda_{1}+\lambda_{2}) + \mu^{2}(\lambda_{1}+\lambda_{2})^{2} + 2\lambda_{1}\lambda_{2}(\mu\lambda_{2}+\mu\lambda_{1}+\lambda_{1}\lambda_{2})}$$

- 3 -

The measure of system performance that we use here is the steadystate probability that a request for a spare unit is met without delay, and is equivalent to the steady-state probability that a failed unit encounters less than y units in repair or waiting for repair. The probability that a failed unit finds the system in a particular state is different from the arbitrary time probabilities given by Equation Set (2). In common queueing terminology these are termed "arriving customer" probabilities, but in this paper they will be designated "failure point" probabilities since they correspond to the occurrence of component failures. For a finite source-no spares queue (see, e.g., Cooper [3], pp. 82 ff), the "failure point" probabilities are equivalent to the general time probabilities for a finite calling population of one less, but this relationship does not hold for the spares case.

The appropriate failure point probabilities denoted by q_n , as contrasted to the general time probabilities denoted by p_n , may be derived as follows.

Using Bayes' Theorem,

q_n = Pr{system is in state n | failure about to occur}

$$= \frac{\Pr\{\text{system is in state n}\}\Pr\{\text{failure about to occur} | \text{system in state n}\}}{\sum_{n} \Pr\{\text{system is in state n}\}\Pr\{\text{failure about to occur} | \text{system in state n}\}}$$

The queueing system considered here may be modeled as a birth-death process with

$$Pr{failure in t, t+\Delta t} = \lambda_n \Delta t + o(\Delta t) ,$$

where

$$\lambda_{n} = \begin{cases} \lambda_{1}, & n=0,1 \\ \lambda_{2}, & n=2,3 \\ 0, & n=4,5 \end{cases}$$

Thus, for n=0,

$$q_0 = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{p_0[\lambda_1 \Delta t + o(\Delta t)]}{(p_0 + p_1)[\lambda_1 \Delta t + o(\Delta t)] + (p_2 + p_3)[\lambda_2 \Delta t + o(\Delta t)]} .$$

Dividing the numerator and denominator by Δt and taking the limit yields

$$q_0 = \frac{\lambda_1 p_0}{\lambda_1 (p_0 + p_1) + \lambda_2 (p_2 + p_3)}$$
,

where the p_n are given by Equation Set (2). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}_{1} &= \frac{\lambda_{1}\mathbf{p}_{1}}{\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{p}_{0}+\mathbf{p}_{1}) + \lambda_{2}(\mathbf{p}_{2}+\mathbf{p}_{3})} \\ \mathbf{q}_{2} &= \frac{\lambda_{2}\mathbf{p}_{2}}{\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{p}_{0}+\mathbf{p}_{1}) + \lambda_{2}(\mathbf{p}_{2}+\mathbf{p}_{3})} \\ \mathbf{q}_{3} &= \frac{\lambda_{2}\mathbf{p}_{3}}{\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{p}_{0}+\mathbf{p}_{1}) + \lambda_{2}(\mathbf{p}_{2}+\mathbf{p}_{3})} \end{aligned}$$

The availability, or the probability that a failed unit encounters less than y=1 units in the system, is therefore

$$A = q_0 + q_2$$

$$= \frac{\mu(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 2\mu)}{2(\mu^2 + \lambda_1 \mu + \lambda_2 \mu + \lambda_1 \lambda_2)}$$
(3)

For purposes of comparison, consider the M=1, y=1, c=1 queue with exponential service, mean $1/\mu$. It is assumed that the two units in the system have failure rates λ_1 and λ_2 , but that both units operate with the average failure rate $(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2$. Thus the probability that a unit operating at time t fails by time t + Δ t is assumed to be $[(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2]\Delta t + o(\Delta t)$. The approximate general time probabilities are then (see [4], p. 123),

$$\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{1} = \frac{\lambda_{1} + \lambda_{2}}{2\mu} \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{0} ,$$
$$\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{2} = \left(\frac{\lambda_{1} + \lambda_{2}}{2\mu}\right)^{2} \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{0} ,$$

- 5 -

$$\hat{p}_{0} = \frac{\mu^{2}}{\mu^{2} + \mu(\lambda_{1} + \lambda_{2})/2 + (\lambda_{1}^{2} + 2\lambda_{1}\lambda_{2} + \lambda_{2}^{2})/4}$$

where

and the approximate "failure point" probabilities are

$$\hat{q}_0 = \frac{\hat{p}_0(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2}{\hat{p}_0(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2 + \hat{p}_1(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2} ,$$

$$\hat{q}_1 = \frac{\hat{p}_1(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2}{\hat{p}_0(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2 + \hat{p}_1(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2} ,$$

where the \hat{p}_i are defined above and

It follows that the availability for this system, or the failure point probability of zero units in the system, assuming an average failure rate for both units, is

$$\hat{A} = \hat{q}_{0}$$

or

$$\hat{A} = \frac{2\mu}{2\mu + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2} . \tag{4}$$

The approximate availability given by \hat{A} always underestimates the exact availability A . That is,

 $A > \hat{A}$,

with equality holding only when $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$. This may be shown as follows: rewriting Equations (3) and (4) in terms of $\rho_1 = \lambda_1/\mu$ and $\rho_2 = \lambda_2/\mu$ yields

$$A = \frac{2 + \rho_1 + \rho_2}{2(1 + \rho_1 + \rho_2 + \rho_1 \rho_2)}$$
$$\hat{A} = \frac{2}{2 + \rho_1 + \rho_2} \cdot$$

T-360

It is easy to see that $A \ge \hat{A}$ since

$$A - \hat{A} = \frac{(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^2}{2(1 + \rho_1 + \rho_2 + \rho_1 \rho_2)(2 + \rho_1 + \rho_2)} \ge 0 .$$
 (5)

The expression (5) is zero only when $\rho_1 = \rho_2$ or, equivalently, when $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$. Therefore, the approximate \hat{A} is a lower bound on the exact availability.

Some calculations for A and \hat{A} are shown in Table I for different values of ρ_1 and ρ_2 . In most cases the percent difference between A and \hat{A} is small even though there is a large difference between ρ_1 and ρ_2 . The greatest difference is 27.22% for $\rho_1 = .1$ and $\rho_2 = 2.5$. For cases where both ρ_1 and ρ_2 are less than one, the largest difference is 7.11% for $\rho_1 = .1$ and $\rho_2 = .9$. These results suggest that \hat{A} is a reasonable approximation for the true availability, particularly as the differences in the failure rates will probably be small for most practical cases.

It seems reasonable to assume that the approximate availability, based on using the arithmetic mean of the failure rates, will always be a lower bound on the actual availability for systems involving larger numbers of calling units and more than two failure rates. This is intuitively appealing since it would be expected that, with unequal failure rates, the less reliable units are "down" (i.e., in the service facility) more frequently than the more reliable units. Thus the units that are "up" at a given time tend to be better than average, so that the effective aggregate failure rate for the units in the system is less than the arithmetic average of the failure rates of the units.

3. Noncontinuous Operation

Classical finite source queueing theory assumes the units in the operating population operate continuously (along with the repair facilities/

- 7 -

COMPARISON OF ACTUAL AND APPROXIMATE AVAILABILITY CALCULATIONS

TABLE I

	and the second se	Concession of the local division of the loca		Concentration of the local division of the l		Statement of the local division of the local	Statement and a statement of		Statement and the statement of the state				
2 ⁰ 1 ⁰		.2	e.	4.	s.	9.	<i>ı</i> .	8.	6.	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5
	A A X dif	.871212 .869565 .19	.910973 .909091 .21	.811688 .800000 1.44	.787879 .769231 2.37	.767045 .740741 3.43	.748663 .714286 4.60	.732323 .689655 5.83	.717703 .666667 7.11	.704545 .645161 8.43	.654545 .555555 15.12	.621212 .487805 21.48	.597403 .434783 27.22
.2	Å Â dif		.801282 .800000 .16	.773809 .769231 .59	.750000 .740741 1.23	.729167 .714286 2.04	.710784 .689655 2.97	.694445 .666667 4.00	.679825 .645161 5.10	.666667 .625000 6.25	.616667 .540540 12.30	.583333 .476191 18.37	.559524 .425532 23.95
е.	Å Â d1f			.741758 .740741 .14	.717949 .714268 .51	.697115 .689655 1.07	.678733 .666667 1.78	.662393 .645161 2.60	.647773 .625000 3.52	.634615 .606061 4.50	.584615 .526316 9.97	.551282 .465116 15.63	.527472 .416607 21.00
4.	Å Å Å dif				.690476 .689655 .12	.669643 .666667 .44	.651260 .645161 .94	.634921 .625000 1.56	.620301 .606061 2.30	.607143 .588235 3.11	.557143 .512820 7.96	.523810 .454545 13.22	.500000 .408163 18.37
	Å Å X d1f					.645833 .645161 .10	.627451 .625000 .39	.611111 .606061 .83	.596491 .588235 1.38	.583333 .571429 2.04	.533330 .500000 6.25	.500000 .444440 11.11	.476190 .400000 16,00
9.	Å Â X d1f						.606618 .606061 .09	.590278 .588235 .35	.575658 .571429 .73	.562500 .555555 1.23	.512500 .487805 4.82	.479167 .434783 9.26	.455357 .392157 13.88
۲.	Å Å Å dif							.571895 .571429 .08	.557276 .555555 .31	.544118 .540540 .66	.494118 .476190 3.63	.460784 .425532 7.65	.436975 .384615 11.98
8.	Å Å Å dif								.540936 .540936 .07	.527778 .526316 .28	.477778 .465116 2.65	.444444 .416667 6.25	.420635 .377358 10.29
6.	Å Å dif									.513158 .512820 .07	.463158 .454545 1.86	.529825 .408163 5.04	.406015 .370370 8.78

- 8 -

T-360

repairmen). In practice, this often is not the case. For example, if we are concerned with provisioning spares for engines belonging to a fleet of aircraft, not all aircraft are always operating. Thus any engine (population component) may operate only a fraction of the time, say α .

There are two possible ways to account for this. One way is to decrease the failure rate appropriately; that is, if λ is the actual failure rate for continuously operating units and each unit operates, on the average, a fraction α , then we use an adjusted failure rate $\lambda' = \alpha \lambda$. For example, if a unit has a mean time between failures (MTBF = $1/\lambda$) of 1000 hours and operates only half the time on the average, we would assume its MTBF to be 2000 hours.

A second way to account for noncontinuous operations is to adjust the population size; that is, use an effective population size of $M' = \alpha M$. In many cases this may actually be closer to reality, as exemplified by the aircraft engine problem. In reality, the situation more closely resembles a population of size αM where each unit operates at full failure rate λ , rather than a population of M where each unit operates at a reduced failure rate $\alpha \lambda$.

When applied to a fleet of gas-turbine engine ships where provisioning for the gas generator component of the engine is desired, both adjustment procedures were compared based on absolute and percentage differences in availability (this example is detailed in Gross, et al [5]). The results given in Table II show that there is very little difference between the methods, even for small M, α , and low availabilities. Even though the population size adjustment may more closely reflect the real situation, the advantage to adjusting the failure rate is that no round off difficulties are met, since failure rate is a continuous quantity while population size is discrete.

4. Transient Effects

In order to account for population and reliability growth over a multi-year planning horizon while utilizing classical steady-state theory,

T-360

- 9 -

T-	3	6	n
-	-	U	v

-	DT	-	
'I'A	к	.н.	11
	_		_

ADJUSTMENT OF POPULATION SIZE VERSUS ADJUSTMENT OF FAILURE RATE

м	α	c	У	Α(αλ)	A(aM)	Δ	%Δ
10	.8	3	3	.955	.956	.001	0.04
		2	2	.802	.805	.003	0.36
	.6	2	2	.878	.881	.003	0.37
	.4	2	2	.940	.942	.002	0.22
		1	1	.637	.660	.023	3.51
	.2	1	1	.813	.827	.014	1.69
50	. 8	8	8	. 971	972	.001	0.02
50	••	6	7	.904	.905	.001	0.12
		5	5	.655	.661	.006	0.81
	.6	5	5	.855	.858	.003	0.36
		4	3	.473	.485	.012	2.51
	.4	3	5	.895	.901	.006	0.72
		4	4	.886	.890	.004	0.39
		3	3	.683	.698	.015	2.20
182	.8	10	10	.849	.847	002	-0.15
		8	11	.757	.756	001	-0.05
		11	8	.667	.665	002	-0.24
	.6	6	9	.727	.740	.043	1.78
		7	7	.711	.718	.007	0.92
		9	6	.633	.637	.004	0.64
	.4	5	10	.965	.966	.001	0.05
		7	7	.945	.945	.000	0.00
		10	5	.771	.772	.001	0.04
		5	5	.702	.707	.005	0.75
		/	4	.589	.591	.002	0.33
				. 339	. 346	.005	2.02

- 10 -

it was necessary to assume the population reached new steady-state levels instantaneously each year in the planning horizon. For this approximation to be valid, the transient effects must be small after a relatively short period, say three months.

Again, for a small size model (M = y = c = 1) we can analytically work out transient solutions in closed form. The derivation follows.

Assuming both units fail at Poisson rate $~\lambda~$ and are repaired exponentially at mean rate $~\mu$, the differential difference equations resulting from a birth-death analysis are

$$p'_{0}(t) = -\lambda p_{0}(t) + \mu p_{1}(t)$$

$$p'_{1}(t) = -(\lambda + \mu) p_{1}(t) + \lambda p_{0}(t) + \mu p_{2}(t)$$
(6)
$$p'_{2}(t) = -\mu p_{2}(t) + \lambda p_{1}(t) .$$

Taking Laplace transforms (LT), we get

$$\begin{split} & \overline{sp}_{0}(s) - p_{0}(0) = -\lambda \overline{p}_{0}(s) + \mu \overline{p}_{1}(s) \\ & \overline{sp}_{1}(s) - p_{1}(0) = -(\lambda + \mu) \overline{p}_{1}(s) + \lambda \overline{p}_{0}(s) + \mu \overline{p}_{2}(s) \\ & \overline{sp}_{2}(s) - p_{2}(0) = -\mu \overline{p}_{2}(s) + \lambda \overline{p}_{1}(s) , \end{split}$$

or the following three equations in three unknowns to be solved,

$$(s+\lambda)\overline{p}_{0}(s) - \mu \overline{p}_{0}(s) + 0\overline{p}_{0}(s) = p_{0}(0)$$

$$-\lambda \overline{p}_{0}(s) + (s+\lambda+\mu)\overline{p}_{1}(s) - \mu \overline{p}_{2}(s) = p_{1}(0)$$
(7)
$$0 \overline{p}_{0}(s) - \lambda \overline{p}_{1}(s) + (s+\mu)\overline{p}_{2}(s) = p_{2}(0) .$$

To solve these, we can use Cramer's rule. Thus it is first necessary to evaluate the determinant of the denominator,

$$D = \begin{vmatrix} s+\lambda & -\mu & 0 \\ -\lambda & s+\lambda+\mu & -\mu \\ 0 & -\lambda & s+\mu \end{vmatrix}$$
$$= (s+\lambda)(s+\lambda+\mu)(s+\mu) - \lambda\mu(s+\lambda) - \lambda\mu(s+\mu) .$$

- 11 -

T-360

Expanding and cancelling yields

$$D = s^{3} + 2s^{2}\lambda + 2s^{2}\mu + s\lambda\mu + s\lambda^{2} + s\mu^{2}$$

= $s(s^{2} + 2s\lambda + 2s\mu + \lambda\mu + \lambda^{2} + \mu^{2})$. (8)

In order to invert the LT, we would like D to be of the form

D = (s+a)(s+b)(s+c),

which we obtain by letting

$$a = 0$$

$$b = \lambda + \mu + \sqrt{\lambda \mu}$$

$$c = \lambda + \mu - \sqrt{\lambda \mu} ;$$

that is, (8) is equivalent to

$$D = s(s + \lambda + \mu + \sqrt{\lambda\mu})(s + \lambda + \mu - \sqrt{\lambda\mu}), \qquad (9)$$

which can be verified by expanding and cancelling.

Now if we use the initial condition $p_0(0) = 1$, $p_1(0) = p_2(0) = 0$, that is, if all units are "up," the right-hand side of (7) becomes 1,0,0 and

$$\overline{p}_{2}(s) = \frac{\begin{vmatrix} s+\lambda & -\mu & 1 \\ -\lambda & s+\lambda+\mu & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda & 0 \end{vmatrix}}{D} = \frac{\lambda^{2}}{D} .$$
(10)

From a table of LT inverses (see, for example, Abromowitz and Stegun [1]),

$$\overline{f}(s) = \frac{1}{(s+a)(s+b)(s+c)}$$
, $(a \neq b \neq c)$

yields

$$f(t) = -\frac{(b-c)e^{-at} + (c-a)e^{-bt} + (a-b)e^{-ct}}{(a-b)(b-c)(c-a)},$$

so that

$$P_{2}(t) = \frac{\lambda^{2} \left[2\sqrt{\lambda\mu} + (\lambda + \mu - \sqrt{\lambda\mu})e^{-(\lambda + \mu + \sqrt{\lambda\mu})t} - (\lambda + \mu + \sqrt{\lambda\mu})e^{-(\lambda + \mu - \sqrt{\lambda\mu})t} \right]}{2\sqrt{\lambda\mu}(\lambda^{2} + \lambda\mu + \mu^{2})}$$

and

- 12 -

T-360

$$\overline{p}_{1}(s) = \frac{\begin{vmatrix} s+\lambda & 1 & 0 \\ -\lambda & 0 & -\mu \\ 0 & 0 & s+\mu \end{vmatrix}}{D} = \frac{\lambda(s+\mu)}{D} = \frac{s\lambda}{D} + \frac{\mu\lambda}{D}$$

Using (9) for D and (10) gives

$$\overline{p}_{1}(s) = \frac{\lambda}{(s+\lambda+\mu+\sqrt{\lambda\mu})(s+\lambda+\mu-\sqrt{\lambda\mu})} + \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \overline{p}_{2}(s) .$$

Inversion gives $[\overline{f} = 1/(s+a)(s+b) \Rightarrow f = \frac{1}{b-a}(e^{-at} - e^{-bt})]$,

$$p_{1}(t) = \frac{\lambda}{2\sqrt{\lambda\mu}} \left[e^{-(\lambda+\mu-\sqrt{\lambda\mu})t} - e^{-(\lambda+\mu+\sqrt{\lambda\mu})t} \right] + \frac{\mu}{\lambda} p_{2}(t) .$$

Rather than solving for $\overline{p}_0(s)$ and inverting, it is easier to use

$$p_0(t) = 1 - p_2(t) - p_1(t)$$

Now since availability at time t is the <u>conditional</u> probability that a failing unit finds the repair system empty, that is, the other unit "up," we have

$$A(t) = \frac{p_0(t)}{p_0(t) + p_1(t)} = \frac{1 - p_2(t) - p_1(t)}{1 - p_2(t)}.$$
 (11)

Results can be obtained for an initial condition with both units "down" in a similar fashion and are given by

$$p_{0}(t) = \frac{\mu^{2} \left[2\sqrt{\lambda\mu} + (\lambda+\mu-\sqrt{\lambda\mu})e^{-(\lambda+\mu+\sqrt{\lambda\mu})t} - (\lambda+\mu+\sqrt{\lambda\mu})e^{-(\lambda+\mu-\sqrt{\lambda\mu})t} \right]}{2\sqrt{\lambda\mu}(\lambda^{2}+\lambda\mu+\mu^{2})}$$

and

$$P_{1}(t) = \frac{\lambda}{\mu} P_{0}(t) + \frac{\mu}{2\sqrt{\lambda\mu}} \left[e^{-(\lambda+\mu-\sqrt{\lambda\mu})t} - e^{-(\lambda+\mu+\sqrt{\lambda\mu})t} \right].$$

These results were used to produce Figures 1 and 2. Figure 1 shows convergence to steady state for two cases yielding the same steady-state availability, one with large λ and μ and the other with small λ and μ .¹ We note that the large λ,μ case converges much faster, although both converge quite quickly for the "both up" initial condition. This illustrates

¹ λ , μ are given in units per day.



- 14 -

the two factors affecting convergence to steady state, which are (i) the role of decay of the exponential term and (ii) how far the initial availability is from the steady-state value. For Condition (i) we desire λ and μ large since the transient terms are $e^{-(\lambda+\mu\pm\sqrt{\lambda\mu})t}$, while for Condition (ii) A(0) = 1 is much closer to A(∞) = .9 than is A(0) = 0.

Figure 2 shows isopercent error at t=3 months on the $\lambda-\mu$ plane. The shapes of the curves also illustrate the two effects described above, namely, small percentage error for λ and μ both large, and the effect of initial condition closeness to steady state, since each point on an isopercent error curve has a different $A(\infty) = \mu/(\lambda+\mu)$. The dashed line shows all $\lambda-\mu$ combinations for $A(\infty) = .9$ and we see the percentage errors even for small λ,μ , when A(0) = 1, are small.

To obtain similar results for larger population sizes is algebraically untenable. For transient analysis, unlike the unequal failure rate problem, making inferences based on the small model is not intuitively as comfortable. Thus we take a different approach to transient analysis for large populations -- that of the imbedded Markov chain.

The analysis of the convergence to steady state in Markovian queues can be carried out either through a numerical procedure, as described by Cohen [2], or through an imbedded Markov chain approach, in which the system is observed upon failures of machines. We preferred the imbedded Markov chain approach here because we are interested in the state of the system upon failures of machines, and because by this procedure we are able to obtain some results which we cannot obtain using the other approach.

Let λ_n and μ_n denote the arrival and service rates, respectively, when there are n machines in the system. Thus,

$$\lambda_{n} = \begin{cases} M\lambda & , & n \leq y-1 \\ [M - (n-y)]\lambda & , & y \leq n \leq M+y \\ 0 & , & otherwise, \end{cases}$$

and

T-360

- 15 -



Figure 2.--Isopercent error map, $\lambda - \mu$ plane at t=3 months.

- 16 -

$$\mu_{n} = \begin{cases} n\mu , & 0 \leq n \leq c \\ c\mu , & c < n . \end{cases}$$

Denote by N(m) the state of the system upon the mth failure, where $\{N(m)=n\}$, n=0,1,2,..., means that the mth failure sees n failed machines in the system. Let

$$p_{n,j} = P[N(m)=j | N(m-1)=n],$$

and denote by A_n and S_n the interfailure time and the time to the completion of the first service, respectively, given that $\{N(m)=n\}$. As both service times and interarrival times are exponential, we note that for $j\leq n$,

For j = n+1, there must be an arrival before a service completion. Thus we have,

The probabilities $P_{M+y-1,j}$, $j=1,\ldots,M+y-1$, that were not specified in (12), are equal to $P_{M+y-2,j}$ since at least one completion of service should take place before any arrival can occur. We use now the fact that the parameters of A_n and S_n are λ_{n+1} and μ_{n+1} , respectively, and obtain from (12) that

$$p_{n,n+1} = \frac{\lambda_{n+1}}{\lambda_{n+1} + \mu_{n+1}}, \quad n=0,1,\ldots,M+y-2.$$
 (13)

Expression (13) can now be used to establish that, for j=n in (12),

$$P_{n,n} = \frac{\mu_{n+1}}{\mu_{n+1} + \lambda_{n+1}} \frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_n + \mu_n} .$$

Applying the recursive relation in (12) for $j \le n$ yields

$$p_{n,j} = \prod_{i=j+1}^{n+1} \frac{\mu_i}{\mu_i + \lambda_i} \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \mu_j}, \quad j=0,1,...,n .$$
 (14)

Now let N(0) denote the initial state of the system and let

$$q_{m}(i) = P[N(m)=i]$$
, m=0,1,2,..., i=0,1,...,M+y-1.

Denoting by

1

$$q'_{m} = (q_{m}(0), q_{m}(1), \dots, q_{m}(M+y-1)),$$
 (15)

we obtain

$$q'_{m+1} = q'_{m}P$$
,

where P is the transition matrix $\{p_{i,j}\}$. It is well known then that q'_m has a limit as $m \neq \infty$, and let $q' = \lim_{m \neq \infty} q'_m$. Denote

$$Q_{m}(j) = \sum_{i=0}^{J} q_{m}(i)$$
, m=0,1,2,..., j=0,1,...,M+y-1,

and

$$Q(j) = \sum_{i=1}^{j} q(i)$$

A natural initial situation is, of course, all machines up, and one would like to know how this situation would affect the future state vectors. This leads us to the lemma below.

- 18 -

Proof: Let

 $L_{j} = \begin{pmatrix} \ell_{j,0} \\ \ell_{j,1} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \ell_{j,M+y-1} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (16)$

where

hence

$$Q_{m}(j) = q'_{m} L_{j}$$
 (17)

Using (15) and the fact that q'P = q', we obtain

$$Q_{m+1}(j) - Q(j) = (q'_m - q')PL_j$$
, (18)

where PL_{i} is a column vector whose ith element equals

$$F_{i}(j) = \sum_{k=1}^{j} P_{i,k}$$
 (19)

From (14) we can see that $p_{n+1,j} < p_{n,j}$ so therefore

$$F_{i}(j) \ge F_{i+1}(j)$$
 (20)

Thus the right-hand side of (18) is nonnegative since the elements in the column vector PL_j are decreasing and the sum of the first k elements of $(q'_m - q')$ is always nonnegative and larger than the magnitude of the k+lst element from the hypothesis of the lemma, $Q_m \geq Q'$.

 $\ell_{j,i} = \begin{cases} 1, & i \leq j \\ 0, & i > j \end{cases};$

Since the measure of the system's performance -- the availability -- was defined as

$$A(m) = Q_{m}(y-1)$$
,

we may conclude from Lemma 1 that if the initial vector satisfies

- 19 -

$$Q_0(j) \ge Q(j)$$
, $j=1,...,M+y$,

then

$$A(m) \ge Q(y-1) = A(\infty)$$
, $m=1,2,3,...$ (21)

The lemma cannot be extended to include $A(m) \ge A(m+1)$. This is because

$$A(m) - A(m+1) = q'_{m}(I-P)L_{y-1} = q_{m}(y-1) \frac{\lambda_{y}}{\lambda_{y} + \mu_{y}} - \sum_{k=y}^{M+y-1} q_{m}(k)F_{k}(y-1) ; (22)$$

hence, the lemma's conditions can be met while Expression (22) is negative. Thus we can only state that the steady-state availability is always less than the transient availabilities.

The decision to purchase spares or to add servers is often made periodically; so it is important to study the relation between time and number of arrivals. It is clear that as $\lambda_n \leq M\mu$ then the time to the kth arrival is stochastically smaller than an Erlang random variable with parameters M λ and k ($\Gamma(M\lambda,k)$). Furthermore, as the system stays mainly in the states in which $\lambda_n = M\lambda$, it is obvious that the use of $\Gamma(M\lambda,k)$ as the distribution of the time to the kth arrival is highly justified. Nevertheless, if one desires more accurate results for the relations between time and number of arrivals, the results of the following discussion may be applied.

Let $T_n(k)$ denote the time to the kth arrival given $\{N(0){=}n\}$. Then

$$P[T_{0}(k) \leq t] = \int_{0}^{t} \lambda_{0} e^{-\lambda_{0}y} P[T_{1}(k-1) \leq t-y]dy ,$$

$$P[T_{1}(k) \leq t] = \int_{0}^{t} \mu_{1} e^{-\mu_{1}y} e^{-\lambda_{1}y} \int_{u=0}^{t-y} \lambda_{0} e^{-\lambda_{0}u} P[T_{1}(k-1) \leq t-y-u]dudy$$

$$+ \int_{0}^{t} \lambda_{1} e^{-\lambda_{1}y} e^{-\mu_{1}y} P[T_{2}(k-1) \leq t-y]dy ,$$
(23)

and for $n \ge 1$ we obtain

- 20 -

T-360

$$P[T_{n}(k) \leq t] = \int_{0}^{t} \mu_{n} e^{-\mu_{n}y} e^{-\lambda_{n}y} P[T_{n-1}(k) \leq t-y]dy$$

$$+ \int_{0}^{t} \lambda_{n} e^{-\lambda_{n}t} e^{-\mu_{n}t} P[T_{n+1}(k-1) \leq t-y]dy$$

Denoting

and all and a second seco

$$P_{n,k}^{\star}(s) = \int_{t=0}^{\infty} e^{-st} dP[T_n(k) \le t]$$

yields after applying Liebnitz's rule, changing order, and evaluating integrals,

$$P_{n,k}^{\star}(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda_{0}}{\lambda_{0}^{+s}} P_{1,k-1}^{\star}(s) &, n = 0 \\ \frac{\mu_{1}}{\mu_{1}+\lambda_{1}+s} \frac{\lambda_{0}}{\lambda_{0}+s} P_{1,k-1}^{\star}(s) + \frac{\lambda_{1}}{\lambda_{1}+\mu_{1}+s} P_{2,k-1}^{\star}(s) &, n = 1 , (24) \\ \frac{\mu_{n}}{\mu_{n}+\lambda_{n}+s} P_{n-1,k}^{\star}(s) + \frac{\lambda_{n}}{\mu_{n}+\lambda_{n}+s} P_{n+1,k-1}^{\star}(s) &, n > 1 \end{cases}$$

where $P_{i,0}^{*}(s) = 1$, i=1,2,... From (24) we obtain

$$E[T_{n}(k)] = \frac{dP_{n,k}^{\star}(s)}{ds} |_{s=0} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\lambda_{0}} + E[T_{1}(k-1)] &, & n = 0\\ \frac{1}{\lambda_{1}^{+}\mu_{1}} + \frac{\mu_{1}}{\lambda_{1}^{+}\mu_{1}} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{0}} + E[T_{1}(k-1)]\right) \\ + \frac{\lambda_{1}}{\lambda_{1}^{+}\mu_{1}} E[T_{2}(k-1)] &, & n = 1\\ \frac{1}{\mu_{n}^{+}\lambda_{n}} + \frac{\mu_{n}}{\mu_{n}^{+}\lambda_{n}} E[T_{n-1}(k)] \\ + \frac{\lambda_{n}}{\lambda_{n}^{+}\mu_{n}} E[T_{n+1}(k-1)] &, & n > 1 \end{cases}$$
(25)

- 21 -

T-360

We illustrate the convergence to steady state with data from the machine repair problem given in Gross et al [5]. In that study it is assumed that all changes in the parameters of the system occur simultaneously once a year. These changes include the addition of new machines, spares, and servers; an increase in the service rate; and a decrease in the failure rates of all units. Both the units added and the spares added are assumed to be up. Let

$$J(i,\tau) = \min\{k : E[T_i(k) \ge \tau\}$$
 (26)

As we observe the system upon failures of machines, we desire to associate the annual points of change in the system's parameters to cumulative counts of failures. We chose J(0,365) to represent the annual number of failures. This assumption and the data from Figure 2 in [5] is presented in Table III.

TABLE III

THE PARAMETERS FOR FIGURE 3

Year	М	с	у	λ ^a	l/μ ^a	Steady State Avail- ability	J(0,365)	Cumulative Count of Failures TJ(0,365)
75	10	3	3	0.0015	65.0	0.920	5	5
76	28	5	6	0.0015	62.5	0.920	15	20
77	50	8	8	0.0015	60.0	0.915	26	46
78	82	10	10	0.0013	57.5	0.913	37	73
79	121	12	11	0.0010	55.0	0.905	46	119

 ${}^a\lambda$ and μ are shown in units per day.

Figure 3 shows the availability versus time for the data of Table III, assuming an initial condition of all units up, using Equations (13) and (14) to calculate the p_{ij} and then performing successive multiplication with the P matrix; thus yielding q's, Q's and A's. From

- 22 -



Figure 3 we can see that when the number of calling machines is small (and therefore J(0, 365) is small) then the system's situation is quite far from steady state even after J(0, 365) failures. As the number of calling units increases, the availability after J(0, 365) failures approaches the steady-state availability.

To obtain some feeling about the sensitivity of the rate of convergence to steady state as a function of λ and μ , we calculate the value of

$$\Delta(m) = \frac{Q_m(y-1) - Q(y-1)}{Q(y-1)} \cdot 100.0 ,$$

for N(0) = 0 , m = J(0,90) , M = 10 , and c = y = 3 . Table IV gives Δ , J , and selected steady-state availabilities for a variety of M λ versus c μ cases. The display of the table is similar to that of Figure 2 in that small values of M λ are at the bottom and small values of c μ are at the left. We can see the same type of effect as caused by the A(0) = 1 curve of Figure 2, although the "belly" is reached for much higher M λ ; that is, for fixed c μ , the errors increase up to a certain value of M λ and then start to decrease. Again we see the same two effects as in Figure 2; namely, the influence of the proximity of the starting availability to the steady-state value, and the damping effect of large M λ and c μ on the transient terms (hence the "belly" situation). Selected steady-state availabilities are shown which point out that in the realistic availability range (greater than 0.8, for example) the percent errors from steady state after three months are quite small unless both M λ and c μ are very low.

- 24 -

TABLE IV

	0.30	1.17 34	1.53 32	1.32 30	.18 13 .804	.14 12 .845	.10 11 .882
	0.27	1.85 32	2.70 30	2.23 29	.36 13 .757	.27 12 .805	.19 11 .850
ch	0.24	2.79 30	3.66 29	4.34 27	.72	.54 12 .753	.39 11 .807
MÀ AND	0.21	5.29 27	5.89 27	8.10 25	1.52 13	1.16 12	.84 11 .747
NCTION OF	0.18	7.73 25	9.19 25	11.68 24	3.31 13	2.57 12	1.88 11
AS A FUI	0.15	11.27 23	14.10 23	20.32 22	7.48 13	5.99 12	4.51 11
$\left[\begin{pmatrix} (0,90) \\ (0,90) \\ A(\infty) \end{pmatrix} \right]$	0.12	16.75 21	21.73 21	35.52 20	17.82 13	14.88 12	14.82 10
of [^Δ (0.09	26.10 19	34.59 19	65.40 18	57.51 12	50.78 11	42.06 10
VALUE	0.06	44.8 17	59.7 17	139.3 16	242.3 11	176.5 11	157.0 10
	0.03	94. 15	389 . 14	444. 14	2691. 10	1946. 10	2144. 9
	WY CH	0.0625	0.0525	0.0425	0.145	0.130	0.115

T-360

- 25 -

0.30	.1 ² 9.915	.04 8	.06	.10 5	.08	.05 3	.02
0.27	.23 9 .891	.16 8	.11	.17 5	.12	.07 3	.02
0.24	.43 9 .857	.30 8 .901	.20	.28	.19 4	.11	.03
0.21	.87 9 .810	.60 8 .866	.40 7 .915	.500	.32	.17 3	.04
0.18	1.88 9 .740	1.29 8 .813	.83 7 .878	.94 5 .931	.58	.29	.07
0.15	4.33	2.97 8 .730	1.89 7 .818	1.92 5 .893	1.13	.54	.12
0.12	11.03 9	7.63 8	4.84 7 .714	4.42 5 .825	2.49 4 .915	1.11 3	.22
0.09	32.44 9	23.02 8	14.79 7	12.21 5 .688	6.56 4 .836	2.76 3 .945	.49
0.06	128.0 9	94.5 8	62.2 7	47.6 5	24.0 4 .635	9.3 3 .857	1.5
0.03	2034. 8	1088. 8	741. 7	566. 5	235. 4	71. 3 .508	9. 1 .915
My Ch	0.100	0.085	0.070	0.055	0.040	0.025	0.010

TABLE IV--continued

T-360

REFERENCES

- ABROMOWITZ, M. and I. A. STEGUN (1964). <u>Handbook of Mathematical</u> <u>Functions</u>. National Bureau of Standards, Applied Mathematics Series 55.
- [2] COHEN, J. W. (1969). <u>The Single Server Queue</u>. North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, London; Wiley Interscience Division, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.
- [3] COOPER, R. B. (1972). Introduction to Queueing Theory. Macmillan, New York.
- [4] GROSS, D. and C. M. HARRIS (1974). <u>Fundamentals of Queueing Theory</u>. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.
- [5] GROSS, D., H. D. KAHN and J. D. MARSH (1975). Queueing models for spares provisioning, Technical Paper Serial T-322, Program in Logistics, The George Washington University; and to appear in the <u>Naval Res. Logist. Quart.</u>, 24 (4).

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY Program in Logistics Distribution List for Technical Papers

The George Washington University Office of Sponsored Research Library Vice President H. F. Bright Dean Harold Liebowitz Mr. J. Frank Doubleday ONR Chief of Naval Research (Codes 200, 430D, 1021P) **Resident Representative** OPNAV **OP-40 DCNO**, Logistics Navy Dept Library OP-911 OP-964 Naval Aviation Integrated Log Support NAVCOSSACT Naval Cmd Sys Sup Activity Tech Library Naval Electronics Lab Library Naval Facilities Eng Cmd Tech Library Naval Ordnance Station Louisville, Ky Indian Head, Md. Naval Ordnance Sys Cmd Library Naval Research Branch Office Boston Chicago New York Pasadena San Francisco Naval Research Lab Tech Info Div Library, Code 2029 (ONRL) Naval Ship Engng Center Philadelphia, Pa. Hyattsville, Md. Naval Ship Res & Dev Center Naval Sea Systems Command Tech Library Code 073 Naval Supply Systems Command Library Capt W. T. Nash Naval War College Library Newport **BUPERS** Tech Library FMSO Integrated Sea Lift Study USN Ammo Depot Earle **USN Postgrad School Monterey** Library Dr. Jack R. Borsting Prof C. R. Jones **US Marine Corps** Commandant Deputy Chief of Staff, R&D Marine Corps School Quantico Landing Force Dev Ctr Logistics Officer Armed Forces Industrial College Armed Forces Staff College Army War College Library Carlisle Barracks Army Cmd & Gen Staff College **US Army HQ** LTC George L. Slyman

Army Trans Mat Command

Army Logistics Mgmt Center Fort Lee Commanding Officer, USALDSRA New Cumberland Army Depot US Army Inventory Res Ofc Philadelphia HO, US Air Force AFADS-3 Griffiss Air Force Base **Reliability Analysis Center** Maxwell Air Force Base Library Wright-Patterson Air Force Base HQ, AF Log Command Research Sch Log Defense Documentation Center National Academy of Science Maritime Transportation Res Board Library National Bureau of Standards Dr E. W. Cannon Dr Joan Rosenblatt National Science Foundation National Security Agency WSEG British Navy Staff Logistics, OR Analysis Establishment National Defense Hdgtrs, Ottawa American Power Jet Co George Chernowitz **ARCON** Corp General Dynamics, Pomona General Research Corp Dr Hugh Cole Library Planning Research Corp Los Angeles Rand Corporation Library Carnegie-Mellon University Dean H. A. Simon Prof G. Thompson Case Western Reserve University Prof B. V. Dean Prof John R. Isbell Prof M. Mesarovic Prof S. Zacks **Cornell University** Prof R. E. Bechhofer Prof R. W. Conway Prof J. Kiefer Prof Andrew Schultz, Jr. Cowles Foundation for Research Library Prof Herbert Scarf Prof Martin Shubik Florida State University Prof R. A. Bradley Harvard University Prof K. J. Arrow Prof W. G. Cochran Prof Arthur Schleifer, Jr. New York University Prof O. Morgenstern Princeton University Prof A. W. Tucker Prof J. W. Tukey Prof Geoffrey S. Watson

Purdue University Prof S. S. Gupts Prof H. Rubin Prof Andrew Whinston Stanford Prof T. W. Anderson Prof G. B. Dantzig Prof F. S. Hillier Prof D. L. Iglehart **Prof Samuel Karlin** Prof G. J. Lieberman Prof Herbert Solomon Prof A. F. Veinott, Jr. University of California, Berkeley Prof R. E. Barlow Prof D. Gale Prof Rosedith Sitgreaves Prof L. M. Tichvinsky University of California, Los Angeles Prof J. R. Jackson Prof Jacob Marschak Prof R. R. O'Neill Numerical Analysis Res Librarian University of North Carolina Prof W. L. Smith Prof M. R. Leadbetter University of Pennsylvania Prof Russell Ackoff Prof Thomas L. Saaty University of Texas Prof A. Charnes Yale University Prof F. J. Anscombe Prof I. R. Savage Prof M. J. Sobel **Dept of Admin Sciences** Prof Z. W. Birnbaum University of Washington Prof B. H. Bissinger The Pennsylvania State University Prof Seth Bonder University of Michigan Prof G. E. P. Box University of Wisconsin Dr. Jerome Bracken Institute for Defense Analyses Prof H. Chernoff MIT Prof Arthur Cohen Rutgers - The State University Mr Wallace M. Cohen **US General Accounting Office** Prof C. Derman Columbia University Prof Paul S. Dwyer Mackinaw City, Michigan Prof Saul I. Gass University of Maryland Dr Donald P. Gaver Carmel, California Dr Murray A. Geisler Logistics Mgmt Institute

Prof J. F. Hannan Michigan State University Prof H. O. Hartley Texas A & M Foundation Mr Gerald F. Hein NASA, Lewis Research Center Prof W. M. Hirsch **Courant Institute** Dr Alan J. Hoffman IBM. Yorktown Heights Dr Rudolf Husser University of Bern, Switzerland Prof J. H. K. Kao Polytech Institute of New York Prof W. Kruskal University of Chicago Prof C. E. Lemke Rensselaer Polytech Institute Prof Loynes University of Sheffield, England Prof Steven, Nahmias University of Pittsburgh Prof D. B. Owen Southern Methodist University Prof E. Parzen State University New York, Buffalo Prof H. O. Posten University of Connecticut Prof R. Remage, Jr. University of Delaware Dr Fred Rigby Texas Tech College Mr David Rosenblatt Washington, D. C. Prof M. Rosenblatt University of California, San Diego Prof Alan J. Rowe University of Southern California Prof A. H. Rubenstein Northwestern University Dr M. E. Salveson West Los Angeles Prof Edward A. Silver University of Waterloo, Canada Prof R. M. Thrall **Rice University** Dr S. Vaida University of Sussex, England Prof T. M. Whitin Wesleyan University Prof Jacob Wolfowitz University of Illinois Mr Marshall K. Wood National Planning Association Prof Max A. Woodbury **Duke University**