International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET) e-ISSN: 2395-0056
Volume: 07 Issue: 05 | May 2020 www.irjet.net p-ISSN: 2395-0072

Automation of Failure Modes and Effects Analysis using Fault Tree Analysis

Shivani Pansare[1], Dr B Sathish Babu[2]

[1]Under Graduate Student, Department of Computer Science Engineering, RV College Of Engineering, Karnataka, India
[2]Professor, Department of Computer Science Engineering, RV College Of Engineering, Karnataka, India

---***---

Abstract: *When analyzing a program for a safety property, it is necessary to make sure that the review takes into consideration not just the system's usual operations, but also the irregular and misused operations that lead to risky and unsafe conditions. Standard activities conform to a system's operating requirements; usage cases and examples are widely used to evoke and log them. Abnormal activities or failure events were used to describe instances of misuse / negative scenarios; they lead to inacceptable device actions such as potential security failures and threats [3]. Failure Modes and Effects Analysis (FMEA) is a popular form of study of safety systems widely employed today in essential safety industries. Although software is accessible to help engineers execute supervisory tasks, such as creating table and completing documents, the smart aspect of an FMEA plan remains a manual and painstaking operation. Therefore, one of the main concerns of FMEA is that the time needed to perform the research will ultimately prolong the duration of the design and production processes and that the work is de facto simply saleable to the consumer and not a substantive tool capable of refining the product. In this article, a new approach to automatic synthesis of FMEAs was discussed, building on previous work to automate fault tree analysis [4]. This methodology is generic, i.e. not confined to a single environment, and theoretically applicable to a number of architecture models commonly applied.*

Keywords: Failure Modes, Effects Analysis, automated synthesis, Fault Tree Analysis, risk priority number, Boolean Algebra,

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The strategy of Failure Modes and Effects Analysis (FMEA) is a comprehensive way of defining and prioritizing a process's possible failure modes and their effects. Completing an FMEA cycle entails defining main product features, possible modes of failure, plausible triggers of these failures, and the related controls currently in effect. The severity, event frequency and likelihood of ranking occurrence are then applied to the mode of failure, its effects and controls respectively. For each combination of failure mode, impact and power, the sum of the three ranks results into a risk priority number (RPN). RPN prioritizes the rising and essential characteristics to be defined by the FMEA. [1]

The aim behind FMEA automation is to define the distinctive failure modes of the segment in a network, evaluate their effect on frame behavior, and finally recommend suitable countermeasures to resolve such impacts on various platforms. Additionally, the time expended on manual component monitoring and method checking should be greatly minimized and there'll be no code reliability concerns.

Risk in an FMEA is the replacement for failure. This possibility is viewed as though there has already been a mistake and corrective action is required. Successful FMEA operation helps define potential forms of failure based on familiarity of related goods and processes. It is commonly utilized in different phases of the commodity life cycle in the production and growth industries. Effects Analysis is the analysis of the effects of these errors on various device stages. [7]

The conventional brainstorming technique is sadly often rather boring, time-consuming and vulnerable to mistake. Automating the method guarantees a more accurate, reliable FMEA worksheet to be produced in just a few minutes, that is needed today. However, to be genuinely useful, this automation will accompany the product at any stage of design across the full design cycle: architecture; subsystem; and component.

2.0 FAULT TREE ANALYSIS

Fault Tree Analysis (FTA) was originally developed in the 1960s in order to facilitate the Minuteman missile system research [5]. FTA is a backward safety research approach that starts with the final sign of a system's unsafe state (hazard) and systematically aims to classify all leading factors that contribute to the insecure condition. For this reason, the approach uses logical operators like AND / OR to create a logical connection between occurrences that eventually leads to a device failure [6].

The resulting fault tree is a Boolean representation of all occurrences that may possibly result in the undesirable top occurrence. At different stages of mathematical complexity, there is a substantial body of scientific literature on approaches and uses to fault tree.

The first phase in evaluating these models is to define the local component failure pattern in the design as a series of failure expressions that demonstrate how each component's performance failures will be triggered by intrinsic system failures and component input deviations. The program architecture is also used to determine dynamically how local process errors propagate across ties and induce functional errors at system outputs. Originally, this broad view of failure is contained in a set of fault trees that are dynamically generated by moving backwards through the system layout, moving from the final elements of the design to the software inputs, and evaluating the fault representations of the elements found through this rendering. [2]

The fault trees obtained using this method demonstrate how the logical combinations of device faults trigger functional faults or malfunctions at machine outputs. These fault trees can associate divisions and basic occurrences where they report common cause of failure, i.e. faults in components contributing to further defects in the system. The product of the fault tree propagation process is a web of coupled fault trees which record conceptual associations between failure of the component and system failure.

These fault trees' top occurrences reflect machine faults. Leaf nodes embody component failure modes while the intermediate body occurrences (and interruption logic) monitor system fault propagation and incremental device malfunction conversion through system failures. [2]

In the ultimate stage of the cycle, an automatic algorithm eliminates this complicated body of fault propagation logic from the study, which transforms the web of coupled fault trees into a basic table of direct connections between device and machine failures. [2]

Usually only the results of specific errors are analyzed in a classic FMEA manual. One advantage of generating an FMEA through fault trees would be that fault trees log the effects of the differences in device failure and this useful information may then be passed on to the FMEA.

Focusing on more testing is one essential application of this method of analysis. The FMEA program can be used to enhance the automatic or embedded testing of source code as checks will absolve several potential faults enabling the FMEA review to provide an engineer with a minimal collection of potential faults. Thus, an iterative process of FMEA analysis and test generation based on the basic configuration and actions of the system should guarantee that the full number of possible faults is exonerated and the unintended consequences of the remainder are identified.

The key drawback of the fault tree framework is that due to the inferential complexity of the technique the researcher can neglect possible crucial failures. Nonetheless, where insufficient concept detail is necessary the deductive method may be successfully utilized. Each of these vulnerabilities has any significance but is not inherently essential to the electronic equipment study.

3.0 BENEFITS OF FTA

FTA is a very effective standardized method of calculating service efficiency that is commonly used. Working through the highest level, the fault-tree method utilizes a Boolean algebra and a rational inferential analysis for constructing a schematic summary of the relationships between multiple fault occurrences at various process stages. It helps determining the root issues of the fault cases in a network. This logical approach enables a detailed structure of interactions to be developed that can affect the balance between the events in the process [8]. The various advantages of FTA are as follows.

1. A Human Error Record. FTA incorporates, where applicable, equipment, software, and human factors in the study. The FTA solution requires the entire spectrum of failure origins.

2. Pinpoint deductive shortcomings. Using the rationale of a thorough review of failure and methods such as '5 why s,' FTA lets the team concentrate on the triggers of each occurrence in a systematic series contributing to failure.

3. Reflect on one error at a time. The FTA may begin with a general failure mode, such as not starting the car, or it may concentrate on failing one aspect of the vehicle, such as not inflating the airbag within a vehicle as anticipated. At the beginning of the research, the team selects the field for emphasis.

4. Build an interactive guide for evaluating and controlling processes. Reportedly, the management enjoys visuals, so it allows to center the team on crucial elements for dynamic programs.

5. Show device activity and possible encounters. FTA calls for the study of the multiple forms a flaw may exist which can reveal non-obvious pathways to failure that many methods of evaluation are lacking.

6. Provides an alternate means for the device to be analyzed. FMEA, and other resources provide a way to investigate device efficiency, FTA offers a resource that focuses on one-on-one failure modes. A change in the reference frame often illuminates new and essential aspects of the method.

7. Show device activity and possible encounters. FTA calls for the study of the multiple forms a flaw may exist which can reveal non-obvious pathways to failure that many methods of evaluation are lacking.

8. Draw attention to critical device elements relevant to machine failure. The FTA cycle will contribute to a specific item or substance that triggers the failure of several ways, while improving the one element will reduce the other potential failures.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

FMEA is a common method used in any business or sector where possibility of failure affects the consumers of a product, procedure or service [4]. The primary justification for carrying out an FMEA is to take steps to deter a malfunction, enhance quality of design by monitoring or assessment, or regulation of operation through examination.

FMEA automation is a valuable way to recognize and pinpoint vulnerable points in an operating system's vital safety structures. The time spent in manual monitoring of products and systems as a consequence of automation would be significantly decreased.

The FMEA is essentially a complete inductive (forward logic) study, but the likelihood of failure can only be calculated or minimized by knowing the process of failure [9]. When modeling systems, where component activity depends on parameter values, qualitative models have obvious limitations. In order to resolve this, an engineer must create a different (possibly complex) state transformation table for that part of the mechanism [5]. This element of a system may then be viewed as a single item. The shortcomings of the individual components that are grouped cannot, therefore, be included in the resulting FMEA.

The possibility of implementing a structured, manual procedure for electronics equipment FMEA is regarded separately from the degree of automation deemed feasible for the technique. Such fields of concern would be regarded as a different subject in order to be able to personally apply the structured methodology.

REFERENCES

[1] Failure Modes and Effects Analysis (FMEA) System Deployment in a Semiconductor Manufacturing Environment; Rick Whitcomb Mark Rioux National Semiconductor S. Portland, Me 04106; 1994 IEEUSEMI Advanced Semiconductor Manufacturing Conference.
[2] Papadopoulos, Y., Parker, D., & Grante, C. (n.d.). Automating the failure modes and effects analysis of safety critical systems. Eighth IEEE International Symposium on High Assurance Systems Engineering, 2004. Proceedings. doi:10.1109/hase.2004.1281774.
[3] I. Alexander, Initial Industrial Experience of Misuse Cases in Trade-off Analysis. ICRE, 2002.
[4] Papadopoulos Y., McDermid J. A., Sasse R. Heiner G., “Analysis and synthesis of the behaviour of complex programmable systems in conditions of failure”, Reliability Engineering and System Safety, 2001, 71:229-247.Gregory R. Andrews. "A method for solving synchronization problems", Science of Computer Programming, 1989
[5] H.A. Watson, "Launch Control Safety Study" in , NJ, USA: Murray Hill, 1961.
[6] NASA Fault Tree Analysis With Aerospace Applications, [online]Available: http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/codeq/doctree/fthh.pdf
[7] D. Bell, L. Cox, S. Jackson, P. Schaefer, "Using causal reasoning for automated failure modes & effects analysis (FMEA)", Proc. Ann. Reliability & Maintainability Symp., pp. 343-353, 1992.
[8] G Cristea and DM Constantinescu 2017 IOP Conf. Ser.: Mater. Sci. Eng. 252 012046
[9] Potential failure mode and effects analysis in design (design FMEA) and potential failure mode and effects analysis in manufacturing and assembly processes (process FMEA) reference manual, 1994.